

Community Museum Governance: The (Re)Definition of Sectoral Representation and Policy
Instruments in Ontario

Robin Nelson

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Doctorate in Philosophy degree in Public Administration

School of Political Studies
Faculty of Social Science
University of Ottawa

© Robin Nelson, Ottawa, Canada, 2021

Abstract

Research on museum policy often focuses on provincial or national museums, which are typically government agencies. These institutions are directly accountable to government and have an articulated role in an explicit federal or provincial museum policy. However, most Canadian museums are community museums – that is, nonprofit or municipal museums that collect and interpret locally relevant materials and have public programs targeting the community in which they are based. Community museums' relationships with government(s) differ due to their legal structures (municipal, nonprofit), relatively small budgets, and limited number of staff. Within museum policy, community museums are distinct because they lack a direct relationship with a provincial or national government. Yet, in Canada, all levels of government are involved in their governance through regulatory and supportive activities. In particular, provincial governments have included community museums in museum policies, which tend to focus on professionalization, standards of operation, and simplifying access to resources. In other words, policies targeting community museums often subject them to norms, aiming to establish parameters and best practices for their operations. These actions seek to define and shape community museums, which raises the question: how are these policies (re)created, (re)assembled, and coordinated?

Using archival research and interviews, this thesis documents community museum governance in Ontario, where provincial museum advisors and associations emerged as museum professionals embedded in policy development and implementation in the 1950s. Considering the advisors and associations' service delivery and advocacy activities, actor-network theory (ANT) is used to discuss their work assembling and coordinating policy for Ontario's community museums. Their work distinguishes community museum governance from the governance of national or provincial institutions because they define and establish norms, contribute to change in governance, and enact ongoing change as they (re)assemble resources for community museums. The advisors and associations have facilitated relationships between museums and actors related to museums' work as educational institutions, sites of local action, tourism operators, agents of social change, and collecting institutions, resulting in multiple configurations of actors supporting and regulating museum activities.

This thesis has found the advisors and associations historically worked for a museum community to address its needs, resulting in written policy and museums' inclusion in government instruments. These established instruments have, to some extent, reduced the need for ongoing advocacy by targeting museums with a clear objective and normalizing museums' participation in policy areas outside of culture. However, these instruments also reflect and reinforce historic inequities in community museum governance, privileging municipal museums with historic access to provincial support and, as a result, the capacity to advocate for their own interest through an association. Responding to growing government disinterest, the provincial museum association has refocused its efforts from defining a community in need to defining a sector that contributes to society and the economy through partnerships that can address diverse policy objectives.

Keywords: community museums, policy translation, cultural policy, sociology of translation, subnational

Acknowledgements

I only completed my thesis because of the support and help I received.

First and foremost, I would like to thank the research participants without whom the research would not have been possible. Members of the Ontario museum community were generous with their time and ideas.

I would like to thank my friends and family for their patience. Jason, Riley, and Giles, in particular, made this process a little more bearable.

I would like to acknowledge the support I received from my colleagues who helped keep me on track. The Thesez-Vous writing retreats gave me the motivation I needed to write. Chris provided some invaluable guidance and an ear when I needed.

Most importantly, I would like to thank my committee for being an understanding and important resource. My advisor, Jonathan Paquette, was patient, wise, and a friend, ensuring I was able to write and submit during quarantimes. Jennifer Wallner and Christian Rouillard were great teachers that provided important advice. Eric Champagne and Stephen Boyle provided invaluable comments. Thank you.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge my funders. This research was made possible due to funding from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council as well as the University of Ottawa.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IV
LIST OF TABLES	VIII
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	IX
INTRODUCTION	1
Community Museums in Canada: A Distinct Area of Study	1
Community Museum Governance: The Study of Cultural and Museum Policy	7
Dissertation Outline	10
CHAPTER ONE	
COMMUNITY MUSEUM AND POLICY: LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH PROBLEM	18
1.1 Introduction	18
1.2 Museum Policy: Defining the Object, Conceptualizing Change	22
1.2.1 Institutional Tales of Origins: Museum Policy as a Sub-Sectoral Policy	22
1.2.2 Shifting Discourses: Museum Policy and Museums as Policy Instruments	27
1.2.3 Networks: Museum Policy as a Social and Ideational Process	33
1.3 Community Museums: The Problem of Simplification	36
1.4 The Case Study: Ontario Museum Policy	38
1.5 Conclusion: Research Question	43
CHAPTER TWO	
MUSEUM POLICY AS TRANSLATION: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	45
2.1 Introduction	45
2.2 Policy Translation: Policy Through an ANT and Sociology of Translation Lens	46
2.2.1 Actor-Network Theory and the Sociology of Translation	46
2.2.2 Policy Translation	51
2.2.3 Policy Instrumentation: Agency within Structure	58
2.3 Conclusions: A Theoretical Framework	63

CHAPTER THREE	
METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH: THEORY INFORMED DESIGN	65
3.1 Introduction	65
3.2 Theory Informed Design	65
3.3 Methods and Data	69
3.3.1 Actors	69
3.3.2 Interviews	72
3.3.2.1 Interview Participants	72
3.3.2.2 Interview Procedures	74
3.3.3 Data Collection: Assembling Non-Human Actors and Intermediaries	75
3.3.4 Data Analysis and Writing	77
3.4 Conclusion: Limitations	80
CHAPTER FOUR	
THE EVOLUTION OF MUSEUM GOVERNANCE: CASE STUDY ANALYSIS	81
4.1 Introduction	81
4.2 The Evolution of Museum Governance: From Museum to Heritage to Cultural Policy	83
4.2.1 Development and Encouragement: Development through Local Initiative, Encouragement through the OHS (1880s - 1953)	83
4.2.2 Unwritten and Enthusiastic: Unwritten Policies, Enthusiastic Governance (1953 – 1978)	84
4.2.2.1 1950s and 1960s	86
4.2.2.2 1970s	89
4.2.3 Quality and Accountability: Quality through Policy, Accountability with Standards (1978-1990)	99
4.2.4 Uncertainty and Disinterest: Uncertain Museum Communities, Disinterested Governments (1990 -)	105
4.2.4.1 Museum Policy	106
4.2.4.2 Cultural Policy	114
4.3 Unpacking Museum Governance	119
4.3.1 Explaining Moments of Change	120
4.3.2 Governance as Ongoing Change	126
4.4 Conclusion: The Advantages and Problems of Simplification	130
CHAPTER FIVE	
THE WORK OF GOVERNING: TRANSLATION ACTIVITIES	133
5.1 Introduction	133
5.2 Translating Museum Governance: Constructing, Enacting, and Serving a Community	136
5.2.1 Representing the Community/Sector: Constructing a Shared Meaning	138
5.2.1.1 The Standards and Associated Tools: Actors Enrolling Persisting Definitions	142
5.2.1.2 From Community Need to Sectoral Accomplishment: Museums 2025	162

5.2.2	Serving the Museum Community: Providing Responsive Assistance and Enacting Community	171
5.2.2.1	The Advisors and Regional Consultants: A Changing Advisory Role	173
5.2.2.2	The OMA and Regional Museum Networks: Training as a Community Building Role	188
5.2.2.3	The OHS: Capacity Building	198
5.3	Different Roles and Resulting Power Dynamics: Defining the Advisors and Associations through their Relationships	201
5.3.1	The Advisors' Dual Identity: Empowered and Restricted through Provincial Definition	203
5.3.2	The Associations as Membership Organizations: Enabled and Restricted through Participation	212
5.4	Conclusion: A Hierarchy of Community Museums	223
CHAPTER SIX		
LEGITIMIZING SUPPORT: PROBLEMATIZATIONS IN MOBILIZED MUSEUM GOVERNANCE		
6.1	Introduction	226
6.2	Legitimizing Museum Work and Rationalizing Support	228
6.2.1	Museums as Educational	230
6.2.2	Museums as Local Action	238
6.2.3	Museums as Tourist Assets	244
6.2.4	Museums as Agents of Social Change	251
6.2.5	Museums as Inherently Valuable	257
6.3	The Evolving Logic of Governance	262
6.3.1	Governance Across Actors	264
6.3.2	Governance Across Territory	269
6.3.3	Governance Across Time	279
6.4	Conclusion: Shifting Perspectives	289
CONCLUSION		
294		
Summary		
295		
Research Implications		
301		
A Complex Web of Action, A Weak Base of Support		
302		
Standards, Museums and Other Instruments		
305		
Power and Community Museums		
308		
Future Research		
310		
BIBLIOGRAPHY		
312		
Primary Sources		
312		
Acts and Regulations		
312		
Ontario		
312		
Other Government Publications		
313		
Canada		
313		

Ontario	314
Municipal	316
Other	316
Museum, Association, and Related Publications	316
Secondary Sources	322
APPENDICES	333
Appendix A: Interview Participants	333
Appendix B: Email Template	337
Appendix C: Informed Consent	338
Appendix D: Question Guides	340
Question Guide for Advisors / Conservators	340
Question Guide for Service Organizations	340
Appendix E: Document Collection	342

List of Tables

Table 4.1: A Timeline of Museum Governance: A Period of Development and Encouragement..	84
Table 4.2: A Timeline of Museum Governance: Unwritten and Enthusiastic (1950s-1960s).....	89
Table 4.3: A Timeline of Museum Governance: Unwritten and Enthusiastic (1970s)	99
Table 4.4: A Timeline of Museum Governance: Quality and Accountability	105
Table 4.5: A Timeline of Museum Governance: Uncertainty and Disinterest (Museum Policy) ..	114
Table 4.6: A Timeline of Museum Governance: Uncertainty and Disinterest (Cultural Policy) ...	119
Table 5.1: Similarities and Differences in the Construction of the Community and Sector.....	141
Table 5.2: The Standards and Museums 2025 Redefinition of Museum Governance.....	170
Table 6.1: Legitimizing Museum Support	229
Table 6.2: Provincial Ministry/Department Responsible for Community Museums	232
Table 6.3: Key Actors Supporting the Five Legitimizations.....	263

List of Abbreviations

AAM	American Association (Alliance) of Museums
AGO	Art Gallery of Ontario
ANT	Actor Network Theory
Applebaum-Hebert	Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee
CCDI	Canadian Centre for Diversity and Inclusion
CCI	Canadian Conservation Institute
CFIP	Cultural Facilities Improvement Program
CMA	Canadian Museums Association
CMS	Certificate in Museum Studies
CMOG	Community Museums Operating Grant
HODG	Heritage Organization Development Grant
ICOM	International Council of Museums
JOCA	JobsOntario Community Action
MAP	Museums Assistance Program
Massey Commission	Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences
MAIEC	Museum Accessibility, Inclusion, and Engagement Collaborative
NMC	National Museums Corporation
OAAG	Ontario Association of Art Galleries
OHS	Ontario Historical Society
OMA	Ontario Museum Association
OMN	Ottawa Museum Network
OPP	Obligatory passage point

OTF / Trillium	Ontario Trillium Foundation
ROM	Royal Ontario Museum
The Ministry	The provincial Ministry responsible for community museums
TODS	Tourism-Oriented Directional Signing
WHS	Waterloo Historical Society

Introduction

Community Museums in Canada: A Distinct Area of Study

Museums are important cultural institutions that preserve, interpret, and exhibit a collective memory. Within Canada, conserving and presenting patrimony is not the exclusive domain of national or provincial institutions. Instead, most museums are community museums.¹ As the Canadian Museums Association (CMA) argues, “the real stories that shaped this country are found in local, regional and small museums and galleries across our incredible land,” reflecting the “rich tapestry” of Canadian heritage (2016, 2). These community museums provide space to study, enjoy, and learn about the tangible and/or intangible heritage of a relatively small geographic area and/or specific identity group.² In so doing, the CMA argues museums unite Canadians, contribute to the economy, improve the quality of life in the communities they serve, and act as catalysts for creativity or social change (Canadian Museums Association [CMA] 2018a). Considering the potential significance of museums’ work, national, provincial, and local governments in Canada support and regulate museum activity.³ However, the federal and

¹ Due in part to conflicting definitions of museums broadly and community museums specifically, there is no comprehensive data set for the number of museums in Canada and a breakdown of museum types. However, most museums are locally based with smaller budgets. For example, a 2016 CMA document provides statistics on a sample of museum budgets. In the data set, over 60% of museums had a budget of less than \$500,000.

² This definition is adapted from the ICOM definition for a museum.

³ The public more broadly has expressed support. In a survey on Canadians views about museums, over 90% of respondents believed children should be exposed to museums, noting they have a role in improving our quality of life, education, and preservation (TeleResearch Inc. 2003). A more recent survey on perceptions of museum funding found over 90% of respondents believed museums offer a window on our souls (Innovative Research Group 2008).

provincial governments do not have a singular museum policy. Since community museums are different than national or provincial institution, their relationships with governments differ.

Community museums are most notably different due to their focus. National and provincial museums have mandates relating to the preservation and presentation of international, national, or provincial patrimony. For example, the National Gallery of Canada contains works from European, American, Asian, Canadian, and Indigenous artists. The Canadian Museum of History aims to enhance knowledge of Canadian history and identity. In contrast, community museums have a narrow focus, considering a region or identity group. For example, the Grey Roots Museum & Archives is concerned with the human and natural history of Grey County. The Glengarry Nor'Westers & Loyalist Museum tells the story of loyalists that migrated to the region. These regionally focused institutions most often maintain facilities and collections that are historically significant to their community, providing public programming to those audiences.

Reflecting their regional focus, community museums are more reliant on their local communities for survival than national or provincial institutions. Volunteers are particularly significant, representing over 80% of the museum workforce in Canada.⁴ While they play a significant role in larger institutions (Ashley 2012), they are critical for community museums with limited staff, which necessarily rely heavily on volunteers to accomplish even basic activities.⁵ The participation of volunteers is a "barometer of the museum's success in engaging

⁴ Volunteers represented 65% of the national museum workforce in 1997/1998 (CMA 2016, 2001). The 2017 *Government of Canada Survey of Heritage Institutions* shows the number of museum volunteers continues to far surpass the combined number of full-time, part-time, and contract workers, making up almost 82% of the workforce (Canadian Heritage 2017).

⁵ A 1994 provincial report on 197 community museums in Ontario demonstrated that 20% of the museums did not have any full-time staff, and another 35% only had one full-time staff member. For more information see: Museum and Heritage Organization Programs. 1994. Analysis of 1993 Museum Operating Grant. Rg47-41 B932597 1994-95

the community” (CMA 2001, 5), making community museums possible (CMA 2006). Municipal support is also critical to community museums as local groups provide core financial and non-financial forms of assistance to museums in their jurisdiction (Hill Strategies Research Inc. 2016). Community museums, therefore, exist due to local volunteers and governments, which sustain their operations.

Considering funding, national, provincial, and community museums all rely on public support from the higher levels of government. Public funding is important to Canadian museums because Canada does not have the culture of museum donations seen in other countries like the United States (Cole 2016). However, community museums have a less secure source of support from their provincial and national governments than provincial and national museums. Provincial and national institutions are established through acts that define the institutional mandate and a role for their respective level of government, which then financially supports its museum(s). For example, in 1912, the Province of Ontario formally established the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM) with an act stating they would bear half of the maintenance costs. By 1992, the ROM had a budget of over 29 million dollars. The Province provided almost 23 million, giving the museum 78% of its budget (ROM 1992).⁶ In comparison, community museums have emerged from local action, resulting in smaller allocations from the higher levels of government. The federal government has limited short-term project grants for community museums but does not provide direct operational funding.⁷ The provincial governments have different approaches

CMOG museum program 2. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁶ The federal government similarly allocates funding to the six national museums, providing over \$200 million or over 80% of their budgets in 2011-2012 (Langlois 2013). Notably, the Government of Ontario’s contribution to the ROM has decreased as a percentage of their budget. In 2019/2020, the Province provided over 27 million, which was only 45% of the ROM’s operating fund (ROM 2020).

⁷ For example, while the federal government provided over \$200 million to the national museums in 2011-2012, it

and policies. However, importantly, they do not define themselves as primarily responsible for community museums. For example, the Province of Ontario defines municipal responsibility for community museums but also has a community museum policy that includes an operating grant, which is significantly smaller than their aforementioned contributions to the ROM. In 1992, the budget for the provincial operating grant to community museums was only 3.3 million dollars for 197 museums, averaging to around 6 thousand dollars for seasonal museums and 23 thousand dollars for year-round museums.⁸

In addition to funding differences, provincial community museum policies are distinct due to a focus on standards and professional development. For example, Ontario has standards attached to their community museum grant, while Alberta has an accreditation program with standards through the museum association. In other provinces, such as Manitoba and Nova Scotia, community museums need to provide copies of their internal policies and/ or undergo evaluations to access operational funding. Provinces also have programs for professional development, such as New Brunswick's Professional & Organizational Development Grant.

To improve community museums' access to professional development, provinces and the federal government support museum associations. These museum associations disseminate information, advocate for museums, and train museum workers. For example, the Ontario Museum Association (OMA) describes itself as an advocate, convenor, professional body, and thought leader (OMA 2020). There are also regional associations such as the Ottawa Museum Network (OMN), providing more targeted assistance through professional development or marketing. Federally, the Canadian Museums Association provides a network "to offer

only provided 7.1 million to museums accessing the Museums Assistance Program (Canadian Heritage 2015).

⁸ Museum and Heritage Organization Programs. 1994. Analysis of 1993 Museum Operating Grant. Rg47-41 B932597 1994-95 CMOG museum program 2. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

leadership for, advocate on behalf of and create meaningful connections among Canadian museums and professionals in the sector in order to help increase the value of museums to Canadian society” (CMA 2020). These associations articulate best practices, such as the CMA’s *Ethics Guidelines* (1999) or the British Columbia Museum Association’s best practices modules (e.g., BCMA 2005).

Complementing the work of associations, provincial governments have or had museum advisors who provide(d) advice and assistance to community museums. During the 1970s, there were advisors in all provinces⁹ that worked with community museums to help them access provincial and federal services, listening to museum workers as they engaged in their work. Similarly, the federal government has agencies working to improve community museums with training and resources. For example, the Canadian Conservation Institute (CCI) provides museums with free resources on collections care, preventative conservation, and other issues related to conserving museum objects. Notably, the CCI has also established best practices for the sector, which it circulates through resources and workshops.

Governments (e.g., Ministry of Tourism Culture and Sport 2017) as well as provincial, national, and international museum associations (e.g., Willie 2014) articulate best practices for community museums. They have changing expectations relating to all areas of museum work, such as emerging digital preservation needs (e.g., Canadian Heritage Information Network 2017) or museums’ changing relationships with their communities (e.g., CMA 2018b). Workers at the provincial and national museums are comparatively well positioned to focus on these issues, enacting and developing best practices, because they specialize and are hired for roles related to their expertise. Conversely, community museum workers necessarily become “a jack of all

⁹ See Segger (1987), McAvity (1981), and Ross, David. 1974, July. Letter to the President of the CMA. RG47-51 B328429 Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

trades” (Bachmann 2016). Despite high expectations, it is unlikely that one person has the experience and training to do *all* aspects of museum work, such as conservation, public programming, and human resources. As a result, community museums share a more pronounced and ongoing need for training and resources to enact evolving best practices.

In addition to difficulties meeting changing expectations for museums as museums, community museums have different capacities than their national or provincial counterparts to influence, respond to, or adhere to relevant government legislation. Like any institution with a physical space open to the public, museums must meet changing government requirements for accessibility and safety. To manage their collections, museums face additional regulations, such as those relating to firearms or copyright. Community museums also navigate distinct sets of policies and requirements, depending on their internal governance structure. For instance, municipal museums operate with support and restrictions from municipal initiatives, regional plans, and provincial legislation for municipalities.¹⁰ A nonprofit museum faces regulatory measures surrounding their nonprofit and, usually, charity status. They also have to meet employment regulations, such as labour standards or employment equity legislation. However, unlike their national or provincial counterparts, community museums often lack an HR department unless they are municipal, benefiting from municipal structures. A small number of people deal with these issues in a community museum, which requires time and resources to ensure compliance.¹¹

¹⁰ For example, a Province of Ontario *Museum Note* states municipal museums operate within supports and restrictions related to “their municipality’s policies, procedures and by-laws, a Regional Official Plan, *Municipal Act*, *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act*, *Ontario Human Rights Code*, and *the Ontario Heritage Act*” (Tourism and Culture c. 2011).

¹¹ In comparison, the provincial Royal Ontario Museum (ROM) has about 500 full-time and part-time staff (Ashley 2012).

In short, community museums have significant mandate, legislative, budgetary, and staffing differences from their federal and provincial counterparts. They often take a multidisciplinary approach to conserving and representing the heritage of a distinct identity group or region, operating within restrictions and support from all three levels of government. Within this context, the limited number of staff engage in museum work, such as collections care and public programming, while also trying to understand the diverse regulatory requirements they face and attain support from multiple sources to meet their mandates. In addition to financial support, community museum policy in Canada involves the establishment of standards, training, and resources. These activities seek to define and shape community museums, which raises the question: how are these policies (re)created, (re)assembled, and coordinated?

Community Museum Governance: The Study of Cultural and Museum Policy

Cultural policy includes both regulation and support for community museums. However, culture is a debated term, and, as a result, there is no one accepted definition of cultural policy. Broadly, “the actions that a state and its many operational entities take that affect the cultural life of its citizens, whether directly or indirectly, whether intentionally or unintentionally, constitute the cultural policy of a state” (Mulcahy 2006a, 267). Notably, the word unintentional implies the existence of implicit cultural policies of relevance to cultural institutions— that is, “policies that are not labelled manifestly as ‘cultural’, but that work to prescribe or shape cultural attitudes and habits over given territories” (Ahearne 2009, 141). There are, therefore, a range of government actions and inactions of relevance to museums.

These government actions and inactions can be segmented into multiple policy worlds, such as policies affecting performing art, cultural industries, or museums. There are (at least) two distinct museum policy worlds. For relatively large public museums, government policy involves support for disciplines,¹² the definition of a mandate, and recurrent funding. The remaining museums are subject to a different policy world with distinct histories and objectives. For example, in France, modern cultural policy emerged in 1792 with a dual system where the state was active at the national and local levels. The system continues today with the Réunion des musées nationaux as a group of elite museums with a direct connection to the state (Bodenstein and Poulot 2012) and the service des musées de France, which coordinates a more extensive network of museums and provides rules for museum management to ensure the conservation and study of collections (Ministère de la culture 2020). In comparison, British museum policy focused on developing and using national collections that supported distinct disciplines while municipal museums developed through the work of societies or individuals (Lawley 2003). Legislation then extended the powers of local authorities to provide museums in the 1960s and 1970s. The development of legislation empowering local authorities reflects broader cultural policy trends following the Second World War. Countries, like the United Kingdom and Canada, began to more actively construct cultural policies and rationalize support for museums, including local and nonprofit institutions — that is, community museums. There was thus a consolidation of a dual system at the national and provincial levels – one for larger public institutions and one for the others.

¹² For example, Canada has distinct museums for art history, natural history, human history and anthropology, as well as science. Conversely, Canada's community museums are often interdisciplinary, collecting artefacts of relevance to different disciplines.

Despite the bifurcation of museum policy, cultural policy research has focused on national or provincial institutions (e.g., Jaffry and Apostolakis 2011; Greffe 2011; Nisbett 2013b), with some notable exceptions (e.g., Gray 2015c; McCall 2009; Stylianou-Lambert, Boukas, and Christodoulou-Yerali 2014). While there are a number of graduate thesis of relevance (e.g., Tivy 2006; Carter 2000), community museum policy in Canada is not well documented. For instance, research focused on museum workers' action in relation to policy confirms the active role they can play in shaping the parameters within which museums operate (e.g., McCall 2009, Poullard 2012). However, due, in part, to the weak nature of policy networks in the cultural sector (Gray 2015a), the role of community museum workers and those who represent them in the development or implementation of museum policy is understudied. Within Canada, research describing significant networks have focused on national museums and elitism in their development (e.g., Brison 2005, Dickson 1991). There has been limited consideration of the role of museum associations or advisors outside of the associations' own publications, which serve to promote their work (e.g., Duncan 1988).

Responding to gaps in the research, this thesis aims to understand the development of a policy world for community museums. While the research focuses on Ontario, similar measures were put in place in different provincial and national jurisdictions. In particular, provincial museum advisors and associations emerged across Canada by the 1970s to establish best practices and coordinate governance. Ontario community museum governance is particularly interesting because the Province was the first to establish museum advisors and provincial standards. Expertise within government and an early acceptance of the state's role drove policy development. However, community museums, which developed in isolation, organized associations through which they shaped the evolution of policy in Ontario.

Dissertation Outline

To better understand community museum governance, this thesis examines the work of those governing the sector in Ontario. It considers the provincial museum advisors and associations' practices, asking: how are community museum policies (re)created, (re)assembled, and coordinated? The research describes and explains the change in community museum governance, examines the work of governing as advocacy and service delivery, and discusses power dynamics within governance practices.

Chapter One defines the need for research on community museum governance with a literature review, identifying gaps and strengths in the existing research on change in cultural and museum policy. The review is divided into three parts to examine research focusing on institutions, ideas, and interests. First, research on institutional origins documents the establishment of cultural institutions or policies targeting museums, demonstrating a shift in the level of government concerned with the development of cultural policy. Second, scholars examining a perceived instrumentalization of culture have similarly documented a shift to more regional policies. Research on cultural policy discourse also demonstrates the active role cultural workers can play when they resist, adapt, and mobilize so-called instrumental objectives for culture. Third, research on cultural policy networks demonstrates the ability of organized interests to affect policy. However, there is a limited understanding of networks related to community museums.

There is a simplification of museum policy in the existing research due to a lack of attention to community museum governance. Individual projects focus on consistency or change, even though community museum governance necessarily involves both. Moreover, the realities of multilevel governance and the role of non-governmental actors in governing is

understudied. As a result, the work of legitimizing community museums relationship to government and rationalizing their support is not well understood.

Addressing the gap in existing research, Chapter One presents Ontario museum governance as the case study and reviews the related research. The existing literature demonstrates that community museums in Ontario receive support from the federal, provincial, and municipal governments as well as provincial and federal museum associations. There is research on individual policies with some projects mentioning interactions between the levels of government and/or the associations. However, there is a focus on the establishment of policies or programs, resulting in a limited consideration of continued interaction and the breadth of relevant government activities influencing community museums.

Chapter Two outlines the theoretical framework, reviewing literature on actor-network theory, the sociology of translation, policy translation, and policy instrumentation. Actor-network theory (ANT) is a range of approaches to studying the social and natural worlds as generated through relationships (Law 2007). Within ANT, the sociology of translation studies how actor-networks – that is, “processes of organizing in which heterogeneous actors, both human and non-human, are constantly negotiating and re-negotiating programs of action” (Belliger and Krieger 2016, 14) – are formed, providing a nuanced perspective on consistency and change as actors continuously enact actor-networks. Drawing on the sociology of translation, policy translation studies governance as the co-production of many actors (Clarke 2012). During policy translation, there is a constant (re)inscription of power relations (Lendvai and Stubbs 2009). As such, policy translation research demonstrates the role of non-state actors or specific actors within government in structuring power relationships as they define roles, associate entities, and compel others to remain faithful to alliances (Callon 1986a). To that end, they translate government instruments, which can then generate and structure further

translation activities. There are thus chains of interdependence that encourage consistency, while ongoing translation provokes change.

Considering the theoretical positions reviewed in Chapter Two and the discussion on museum policy in Chapter One, Chapter Two concludes with three sets of broad propositions on the implications of theory to community museum governance, which have guided the research. According to policy translation, community museum policies are the relationships mobilized to enact museums. However, there are necessarily multiple overlapping museum policies as museums are defined differently and many actors engage in translation. Through translation, museums are enrolled as targets or tools of various policy instruments with diverse objectives, which influences power relationships in the sector and has a range of unintended effects. Museum professionals engage in translation activities to enact museums. For example, they may engage in policy attachment, defining museums as relevant to other sectors, in order to legitimize museum activities and rationalize support.

Chapter Three outlines the theory informed design of the research project. Conducting a case study on community museum governance in Ontario, I learnt from those with a responsibility for community museum governance – that is, the provincial museum advisors, the Ontario Museum Association, other museum associations, and articulated policies. To that end, I interviewed 30 individuals, conducted archival research at the Archives of Ontario, and engaged in document analysis. The analysis was ongoing, involving several iterations. While there are limitations to this research design, I learned from those governing community museums in Ontario, validating my conclusions with member checking and peer review.

Presenting the research findings, Chapter Four outlines a historical timeline of community museum governance in Ontario in four periods. During the first period (1880s – 1953), the Ontario Historical Society (OHS) encouraged community museums' development across Ontario,

which often received municipal support. Marking the beginning of a second period (1953 – 1978), the provincial and federal governments became involved with provincial museum advisors, a provincial operating grant, and project-based funding that encouraged museum development. Museum workers organized to form a section within the OHS (1953) and then the Ontario Museum Association (1971). These associations circulated information on emerging government programs, connected museums to each other, encouraged standards in museums, provided professional development, and advocated for the sector. After an increase in the number of community museums related to the available provincial and federal project support, the provincial government listened to calls for museum standards from the advisors and associations, developing and implementing standards as requirements for the operating grant during the third period (1978 – 1990). Starting in the 1990s, the provincial and federal governments began reducing support for community museums and culture more broadly while also increasing regulatory requirements, such as new standards. The fourth and ongoing period of governance (1990s – ongoing) is defined by government disinterest and an increasing role for the associations as they help community museums navigate the restrictions and support within which they operate.

The timeline describes community museum governance as both changing and consistent. Importantly, the advisors and associations help museums navigate a complex policy environment and contribute to their governance. As they work for change and/or consistency, they have offered causal explanations for community museum governance's evolution. In particular, changes in government, the effects multi-level governance, and changing economic conditions prompt and allow for changes in governance. In addition to evolving through the (re)creation of entities governing community museums, governance is constantly changing as the advisors and associations respond to need and context, the museum field becomes more

professional, the roles of existing actors are renegotiated, and new means of forming relationships develop.

Chapter Five focuses on the advisors' and associations' work of governing — that is, advocacy and service delivery activities. These practices inform changes and consistency in governance but are also redefined due to changing relationships. In order to advocate for museums, the advisors and associations construct, enact, and advocate for museums as a collective, working to (re)create and (re)define supportive actors, such as policy instruments. In particular, they constructed and advocated for a museum community and sector. The construction of both a community and sector involved iterative consultations with community museums to build consensus, starting with pre-existing ideas about museums' needs and governments' willingness to address those needs. However, the construction of a sector is association-led, responding to changes in community museums' and museum advisors' relationships with government. Governments have become disinterested in funding community museums or supporting an advisory service and more receptive to data-based arguments related to diverse policy objectives. As a result, the more recently constructed sector defines museums' contributions to society, using research, instead of focusing on community museums' needs. Nevertheless, policy instruments (re)created and (re)defined while advocating for a museum community continue to structure relationships in community museum governance.

As they construct the museum community or sector, the advisors and associations define roles for themselves providing direct services that address needs. Their relationships to the Province and community museums enable their work providing advice, training, or capacity building, which also legitimizes their advocacy activities. As a result, changes in those relationships both reflect and contribute to changes in service delivery and, therefore, governance.

Historically, as civil servants, the advisors had greater access to other government actors and particular information. They were also given the authority to advocate locally and write new provincial policies, developing policy instruments. However, the Province has (re)defined the scope of their work, reducing their capacity to govern the sector. The associations are more reliant on the community museums they serve to define and, at times, deliver advocacy and service delivery. As a result, the OMA's advocacy work has historically reflected the consensus of the more well-resourced community museums – that is, provincially supported municipal museums. For example, the voices of small, historic house museums were silenced in the creation of consensus on the museums community's needs in the 1970s. There is thus a hierarchy of museums in community museum governance, which is compounded by the advisors' reduced capacity.

As the advisors and associations engage in service delivery and advocacy, they legitimize museum activities and rationalize support according to different aspects of museum work. Chapter Six explores these rationalizations, outlining five common arguments for museums' value in Ontario – that is, museums as educational institutions, products of local action and sites of local activity, tourist attractions, agents of social change, and inherently valuable collecting institutions. The advisors and associations assemble and advocate for relevant resources, such as guides to developing relationships with the community, and policies, such as curriculum, that support museum involvement in those areas. There are, therefore, multiple overlapping and intersecting actor configurations supporting different museum objectives. As a result, distinct museum advisors and the two provincial associations enact different museum policies, reflecting their own focus, expertise, and capacity. There are additional differences related to context as legitimization work changes with the audience, region, and individual museum. Over time, legitimization work has also changed as museum work is seen as less valuable to those outside

the museum community and museum workers seek to (re)define museums' role in society. The OMA has emerged as the key actor rationalizing support for museums and the museum sectors' objectives. They use data and anecdotal arguments to legitimize and raise the profile of museum work in its diversity. However, museums established before the 1990s had access to a richer tapestry of support related to the distinct legitimization work of diverse advisors and associations, which may further reinforce a hierarchy of community museums.

To summarize the key implications of my research, the conclusion engages with the propositions outlined in Chapter Three, outlining three main findings related to those propositions. First, I have found a shift in the work of governing, moving from an emphasis on the museum community's need to the sector's contributions to society and various policy objectives. The thesis documents community museum governance, demonstrating a broad range of government instruments support and regulate museum work. Importantly, community museums have diverse aims and, as a result, their governance intersects with other policy areas. Advisors and associations emerged to define needs, assembling resources relating to museums' diverse objectives. The existence of multiple roles for museums and diverse forms of support or regulation can strengthen attempts to legitimize museum work and rationalize support from various actors connected to distinct policy areas, such as education or tourism. However, museums' diversity also causes a disaggregation of effort, which weakens legitimization work given insufficient resources to engage in ongoing translation on multiple fronts. Despite the difficulties, advocating for the sectors' diverse contributions instead of the museums community's needs is necessary due to government disinterest in museums as collecting institutions.

Second, the establishment of instruments targeting museums with a clear rationalization or legitimizing museums' participation in a policy area reduces the need for ongoing

legitimization work from the advisors or associations. Importantly, the advisors and associations defined these instruments and the objectives they support as legitimate within and outside the museum community. Within the museum community, they built consensus on community museums' needs and possible roles to legitimize instruments, discouraging opposition and efforts to dismantle existing programs. Within government, the government instruments have rationalized support and/or legitimize museums' involvement in policy areas despite growing government disinterest in museums.

Third, community museum governance has resulted from the co-production of the advisors, associations, community museums enacting those associations, and other government actors. However, the museum advisors and associations distinguish community museum governance from the governance of provincial or national institutions. Particular museums are, therefore, advantaged within governing because they have the resources and capacity to engage with associations, which often stems from their relationship with their municipality and/or historical inclusion in the provincial operating grant.

Chapter One

Community Museum and Policy: Literature Review and Research Problem

1.1 Introduction

Most Canadian museums are community museums – that is, nonprofit or municipal museums that collect and interpret relevant local materials and have public programs targeting the community in which they are based. The importance of community museums in Canada has a long history. In 1932, British scholars Miers and Markham compiled a list of publicly accessible museums in Canada for the Carnegie Corporation of New York, noting the significance of local historical society museums in British Columbia and Ontario (Miers and Markham 1932). After this early survey pointed to the predominance of nonprofit museums in some provinces, the number of community museums grew across Canada in the 1960s when the provincial and federal governments encouraged villages, towns, and municipalities to develop projects celebrating the approaching Canadian centennial. These community museums cover a wide range of topics and issues that are most often significant to a narrow region and/or identity group. In a province like Ontario, municipalities and local historical societies established community museums to pay tribute to settlers, memorialize distinguished residents, educate visitors about agriculture, and preserve artifacts related to the navigation of the Great Lakes (Key 1973).

The community museums' experiences are commonly documented through single case studies in fields like museology or heritage studies where communicating the structure and nature of these institutions is seen as pertinent (e.g., McTavish 2018). However, community museums are relatively absent from the museum and cultural policy literature. There are

notable exceptions, such as research on local authority museums in the United Kingdom (e.g., Gray 2015c; McCall 2009; Stylianou-Lambert, Boukas, and Christodoulou-Yerali 2014). Nonetheless, much of the museum policy research remains focused on the national or subnational – that is, provincial or state – museums, such as the British Museum, the Louvre, or the Royal Ontario Museum (e.g., Jaffry and Apostolakis 2011; Greffe 2011; Nisbett 2013b).

The limited scope of the literature may relate to museums' position relative to other sectors. Gray (2014) observes the museum sector is relatively small in terms of expenditure, generally politically uncontentious, and a low priority for governments. Museum policy literature then focuses on the limited number of case studies where major institutions are prominently documented and/or there is public attention to a contentious issue. For example, in Canada, Ashley's (2014 2012) work on the Royal Ontario Museum, a provincial agency and the country's largest museum, considers public engagement relating to controversial subjects and the role of volunteer labor. Continuing to focus on national or, in Canada, sub-national museums as examples, research approaching museum policy from a sectoral lens has traced the development of large institutions in relation to government subsidies, the transformation of managerial practices, or the evolution of cultural policy narratives (e.g., Gibson 2008; Maddison 2004; Paquette 2010).

Within the cultural sector, there is sub-sectoral disaggregation as actors organize and operate differently depending on their sub sector (Gray 2015a). Museums are similarly subject to sub-sectoral disaggregation as they organize and are governed differently depending on their internal governance structure. Gray (2015b) identifies a hierarchy of group engagement in the museum sector, but there is also a hierarchy of government interest. National and subnational governments have a primary responsibility for their own museums as articulated in distinct legislation, such as Canada's *Museums Act* (1990) or Ontario's *Royal Ontario Museum Act*

(1990). Community museums have a fundamentally different relationship with governments without the same supportive obligations related to ownership.

In the Canadian context, federalism is another element that further complicates the museum/government relationships since culture is a shared responsibility across the different jurisdictions (Paquette 2019). Federal, provincial, and local governments can all contribute to the development, support, and regulation of community museums, which then experience overlapping and intersecting policies. In addition to support programs and regulatory measures targeting community museums, they also navigate policies more broadly from all levels of government, such as regulations and programs targeting nonprofit organizations.

In addition to government actors, there are government supported associations and networks at the municipal, regional, provincial, interprovincial, national, and international levels that work for cultural organizations and museums, offering a range of services. For example, a community museum in Ottawa may benefit from the work of museum specific groups, such as the Ottawa Museum Network, the Ontario Museum Association, the Learning Coalition, the Canadian Museums Association, the American Alliance of Museums, and the International Council of Museums. They could also benefit from the work of non-museum specific organizations such as the Capital Heritage Connexion or the Ontario Nonprofit Network.

Beyond policies and actors that support culture and museums, community museums operate within a dynamic environment with factors that influence how they experience policies and programs. For example, many governments and nonprofits started working to help museums before the advent of personal computers and the internet, which have changed how museums operate and access services. Museums have also had to adapt to changing safety expectations for buildings, which include historic houses, and evolving understandings of accessibility needs. Other key issues in Canada include a changing relationship with Indigenous

Peoples, a growing awareness of diversity and inclusion issues, as well as a fluctuating job market.

Although community museums exist within such a complex policy and operating environment, they remain understudied within the policy literature, which often focuses on larger institutions. Policies for national and provincial museums, which have greater financial and human resources than community museums, articulate a mandate, support disciplines, and involve a relatively secure source of funding. Conversely, community museums navigate policies from all levels of government, which often focus on regulation, the development of best practices, and the coordination of the sector.

My research aims to document community museum policy, contributing to cultural and museum policy research in Ontario. Ontario has an articulated policy for community museums as well as its cultural agencies. The Province has provided community museum grants since 1953, which required local support, and articulated an official museum policy in 1981. The *Ontario Heritage Act* (1990) and *Municipal Act* (2001) enable municipalities to develop and support museums. The broader cultural policy framework remains relevant as community museums receive support from a range of programs offered by the different levels of government targeting culture, such as interdependent federal and provincial project grants. There are also policies museums can benefit from that are not labeled as cultural, such as those targeting nonprofits, and arm's length organizations that can support community museums, such as the Ontario Trillium Foundation (Gattinger and Saint-Pierre 2011).

This chapter begins with an outline of cultural and museum policy literature, focusing on discussions of consistency and/or change. After discussing the limitations to the literature in explaining change in community museum governance, I outline the existing knowledge on Ontario museum governance to present the case study. The chapter concludes with the

research question and introduces the need for a theoretical perspective that explains and describes ongoing moments of change.

1.2 Museum Policy: Defining the Object, Conceptualizing Change

Researchers study museum policy as a component and specific instance of cultural policy, sharing cultural policy's main orientations. Museum policy is thus studied as a sub-field or sub-sectoral dimension of cultural policy. While there are private for-profit examples, Canadian museums are often government institutions and/or government funding enables their activities. As such, museum policy can refer to the policies and actions of museums. At the same time, there are relationships that enable and/or shape museums' work, such as museums' relationship to government funding programs and broader cultural policies. These relationships are also museum policy. While some researchers have specialized their research on museums' relationships to government (e.g., Gray 2008 2014; Paquette 2011 2010), museum policy remains understudied relative to other areas of cultural policy. In this section, I review the literature on museum policy's main characteristics, highlighting the limitations in explaining change in policy for community museums. Reflecting the literature, I consider museums as part of cultural policy more broadly and the relationships supporting or regulating museums as museum policy.

1.2.1 *Institutionalist Tales of Origins: Museum Policy as a Sub-Sectoral Policy*

Scholars have focused on the origins of cultural policy, identifying government support for museums as a component of early action (e.g., Gattinger and Saint-Pierre 2011). Emphasizing

the larger national museums, these works document the development of museums as part of a cultural policy framework. For example, Bennett's (1995b) work describes the development of national museums, such as England's National Gallery, as part of an early cultural policy that aimed to maximize culture's utility. More recent scholarship on the United Kingdom also describes the development of institutions governing regional or local authority museums (Phillips, Woodham, and Hooper-Greenhill 2015). Comparing Swedish and French cultural policy, Zimmer and Toepler (1999) consider the founding of the national museum and Louvre respectively as part of the foundation of cultural policy with most museums in France developing with a direct relationship to the Ministry of Culture. Providing a non-European example, Bordat (2013) outlines the institutionalization of Mexican cultural policy, which involved protecting cultural heritage as a key role of the state. She identifies the creation of the National Museum as the genesis of action in the cultural sector.

Literature on Canadian cultural policy has similarly described the origins of state-defined cultural policies, including commissions on culture and the development of state cultural institutions like museums or agencies supporting museums (e.g., Bell 1987; Cohnstaedt 2007; Dorais 1987; Gattinger, Saint-Pierre, and Gagnon 2008; Meisel and Van Loon 1987). As scholars document institutional origins, their collective works demonstrate a shift in the level of government leading new museum policy development in Canada. Early works are concerned with the development of federal institutions (Harvey 1998), such as the Canadian Conservation Institute and their mobile laboratories (McCawley and Stone 1983). Canada developed national museums in the late 19th and early 20th centuries (Paquette 2010). For example, the federal government created the Historic Sites and Monuments Board in 1919 then acquired and developed sites, such as those related to military history, but the pace of development was sporadic (Cameron 2000). The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters

and Sciences (Massey Commission) in 1951, which included chapters on historic sites and museums, then contributed the development of museum policy in Canada, leading to new programs supporting museums and culture in the 1960s and 1970s (Paquette 2010). These initiatives led to long-lasting components of a federal museum policy and are discussed as part of the presentation of the case below.

The literature also demonstrates that the Canadian federal government engaged in multiple cultural policy related consultations leading to reports on culture in the 1980s, such as the Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee (Applebaum-Hebert) in 1982. With some notable exceptions, such as changes in the national museums' governance structure, few recommendations led to broad changes in cultural policy implementation and new federal cultural institutions (Bashevkin 1988). Since the development of the Department of Canadian Heritage in 1993, the creation of new federal institutions and policies for museums has been limited. The Federal government held consultations on a new museum policy, releasing *Towards a New Museum Policy* in 2005, and the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage released *Moving Forward: Towards A Stronger Canadian Museum Sector* in 2018 (Dabrusin 2018), calling for a museum policy review. Canada's newest cultural policy articulation – *Creative Canada Policy Framework* (2017) – has a section on national museums and does not discuss community museums. However, museum policy has changed in implementation with changing funding levels (e.g., Flegel 2002; Canadian Conference of the Arts, Canadian Arts Coalition, and Saskatchewan Arts Alliance 2015), evolving government priorities, and the creation of new project grants. Reflecting, in part, the limited development of new policy documents and initiatives, the literature on Canadian federal museum policy for community museums in the 1990s and onward is even more limited.

A shift toward subnational cultural policy research demonstrates that provinces have established policies and institutions for culture broadly (Gattinger, Saint-Pierre, and Gagnon 2008). Provinces responded to federal action related to culture with the development of cultural policies and related institutions, such as Quebec's *Ministre des Affaires culturelles* in 1961 (Handler 1987) and New Brunswick's *Historical Resource Administration* in 1967 (Pichette 2001). Research demonstrates increased provincial action in culture into the 2000s, which includes the creation of articulated and comprehensive cultural policies that lead to new programs and support for museums (Gattinger and Saint-Pierre 2011; Nelson 2015 2020a). While the subnational focus in Canadian cultural policy research reflects a gradual shift from federal to provincial leadership in cultural policy broadly, the literature remains focused on change in relation to origins and so-called major shifts.

When looking at museum policy more specifically, the research suggests multi-layered change dynamics. Some provinces had provincial museums and support for community museums predating an explicit federal museum policy for community museums (Gattinger and Saint-Pierre 2011; Tivy 1994). Provincial support for museums continued as provinces began to establish cultural policies and institutions in response to federal action, including museum policies that responded to federal initiatives. For example, Ontario's *Historical and Museums Branch* proposed a revised program for the development of Ontario museums following the 1972 federal museum policy (Tivy 1994). As the federal and provincial governments both engage in museum policies for community museums as part of their broader cultural policies, the research demonstrates the governments have established new cooperative policies. For example, cooperation between the federal, provincial, and municipal governments resulted in the *Manitoba Museum* (Jeannotte 2010). Jenkins (2009, 2005) similarly demonstrates that Ontario museums, such as the *ROM* and *AGO*, have benefited from federal-provincial

cooperation through capital funding programs. Canadian museums thus experience policy change as different levels of government become engaged in different aspects of museum policy and, at times, cooperate in the development of new initiatives. However, research demonstrating these kinds of changes have relied on provincial museums as examples.

In short, the collective works on Canadian cultural policy demonstrate change as focus shifts from the federal to provincial levels in cultural policymaking and the establishment of cultural institutions. Museums' relationships with policy change as the governments create new policies and institutions independently, responsively, and in cooperation for culture and/or museums specifically. However, individual research projects often have a new institutionalist orientation, demonstrating a new institutionalist understanding of change.

Cultural policies arguably function as institutions because they create rules that control access to government support, reinforcing or creating unequal dynamics as particular organizations are afforded access to the cultural policy institutions and others are not (d'Ovidio and Cossu 2016; Le Galès 2001; Ulldemolins and Zamorano 2014). For example, the Canadian Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism called for museum programming that celebrated groups other than the British and the French, reflecting the colonial underpinning of early Canadian museums (Paquette, Beauregard, and Gunter 2017). As Janes (2013, 223) argues, using a Canadian museum as an example, prejudice towards others is "embedded in the bricks and mortar of the museum."

Research has, therefore, demonstrated path dependency in activities of both museums and governments supporting museums, documenting legacies of past approaches as they continue to influence subsequent initiatives (e.g., Bordat 2013; Kiwan 2007; O'Brien 2010). For example, museums are resistant to changing their practices in response to changing economic realities and support programs (Janes 2013). A series of papers on the neoliberal turn in

subnational cultural policy in Canada argue contextual and institutional factors temper the introduction of new approaches (Gattinger and Saint-Pierre 2010; Jeannotte 2010; Marontate and Murray 2010). Marontate and Murray (2010) demonstrate support for libraries, provincial archives, and museums are examples of early cultural policy in both Nova Scotia and British Columbia. Despite an active creative city movement in both provinces, libraries, provincial archives, and museums continue to benefit from the largest portion of cultural expenditures as the governments continue a legacy of support. Continued support for museums within changing cultural policy logics is thus an example of path dependency.

There is limited attention to the path dependency dynamics within community museum policy. For example, Bell (1987) describes Canada's 1972 National Museum Policy, which included the creation of the Museum Assistance Program (MAP) to provide grants to Canadian museums. However, the focus is on the difficulties the National Museum Corporation (NMC) then faced as the NMC became responsible for MAP's implementation. While the program continues to exist today and is the only national program focused on non-national museums, there is no academic research describing its development. Cultural policy research taking a new institutionalist approach is also limited with a focus on policy as defined by the state. The narrow focus excludes policies influencing community museums that are not explicitly cultural such as the student employment programs providing community museums with staff for their busier summer season (Nelson 2020a).

1.2.2 Shifting Discourses: Museum Policy and Museums as Policy Instruments

Bridging institutional and discourse perspectives with discursive institutionalism, Barbieri (2012) explains change in Catalonia cultural policy through a study of political discourse and the cultural

policy subsystem's characteristics. His research reflects a broader tradition of explaining cultural policy change with reference to changing discourse. To that end, a range of scholars have worked to document shifting discourses in cultural policy, considering changing justifications for the support and use of culture (e.g., Bennett 1995; Craik 2005; Hesmondhalgh et al. 2015; McGuigan 2004; Pyykkönen 2012). Within this context, museums are both supported and mobilized for a variety of ends.

Governments target and use culture as an instrument of public policy more broadly. For example, cultural organizations, such as museums, can be used as tools for social cohesion, the dissemination of messages, or economic development (e.g., Baeker 2002; Belfiore 2002; Greffe 2004; Grodach and Loukaitou-Sideris 2007; Primorac, Obuljen Koržinek, and Uzelac 2015). Bennett's (1995) seminal work, *The Birth of the Museum*, explains museums' development as government tools to educate and transform the unsophisticated public.

On a provincial and federal level in Canada, cultural policy has historically been seen as a tool to maintain a distinct Canadian identity and re-enforce sovereignty (e.g., Bristow 2003; Cohnstaedt 2007; Etling 2003; Meisel and Van Loon 1987). More recently, former Prime Minister Harper has been accused of using cultural policy to (re)shape Canadian identity to support his policies (Finkel 2014). For example, in 2012, the Government announced they were renaming the Canadian Museum of Civilization to Canadian Museum of History, which also involved a change in the museum's mandate to de-emphasize critical research and focus on a shared national history. The rebranding is seen as an action to support "connections and patterns of reciprocal identification among the Harper administration, cultural production, and Canadian national identity, mediated through the museum site" (Aronczyk and Brady 2015). Museum policy thereby changes as changing governments rationalize support differently.

Scholars studying discourse within cultural policy in the 21st century argue culture is most prominently used in relation to the creative city movement and urban development strategies (e.g., Florida 2003; Oakley 2009; Roy-Valex and Bellavance 2015). For example, Kredell (2012) attributes the heightened visibility of film in Toronto's cultural policy to a rise in instrumentalism and economic justifications for spending. The idea of the creative city contributes to a shift toward more local cultural governance and changes in governance, constructing artists as the implementers rather than the targets of cultural policy (Paquette 2008). As local governments engage in urban cultural development, they have taken new approaches to cultural policy, such as cultural planning and mapping (Kovacs 2010 2011). Museums are implicated in these processes as cultural organizations, becoming tools of cultural development. Within this framework, government support for museums shifts away from operational support towards special projects and, in particular, capital projects as seen with the Royal Ontario Museum and Art Gallery of Ontario renovation projects (Jenkins 2005 2009).

Research on the instrumentalization of culture has a strong normative and prescriptive orientation, commenting on perceived adverse effects to core cultural activities as focus shifts from explicitly cultural objectives – that is, from intrinsic to instrumental aims. For museums, instrumentalism involves a shift from traditional concerns, such as preservation, to a broader range of issues, including inspiration, inclusion, and economic regeneration (Gray 2007). While the critique is not universal and some authors discuss the advantages of instrumentalism (Gibson 2008; Napoli 2008), there is concern for the effects of economic imperatives (Glow and Johanson 2009; Stupples 2017). Demonstrating this concern, Lehrer and Wieditz (2009) observe creative city policies have directly and indirectly supported gentrification in Toronto. Using museums and art galleries as an example, Gray (2007) argues instrumentalization may put

cultural organizations in more precarious positions when organizations cannot clearly demonstrate the benefits from using “culture” to the instrumental end.

Within this context, research describes cultural workers’ and institutions’ resistance to economically driven policies. For example, d’Ovidio and Cossu (2016) study a group’s (re)action to the creative city movement, providing alternative cultural options than those that would be promoted through the state’s creative model. McGuigan (2004) discusses a civil discourse in cultural policy, drawing on the idea of the public sphere as a space for rational-critical debate with consequences for policy. Within this example, revolutionary and reformist actions seek “to counter governmental abrogation of responsibility and unrestrained cultural capitalism” (60). Studying Toronto-based arts interventions, McLean (2017) considers the complicity and resistance of queer and feminist women artists within a creative city discourse. Through performative acts of disidentification, artists change policy, de-centering masculinist and competitive creative city policies and practices. Resistance thus provides the potential for moments of change.

Research on resistance and museum policy describes museums as spaces for resistance to government action in areas other than culture. For example, Gunter (2017) describes Canada ecomuseums¹ as a movement that resists and challenges the cultural sector’s government-imposed discourses. Ecomuseums become intermediaries, providing a space to mobilize ideas for action and, ultimately, policy change. Similarly, Janes (2013) describes museums as places to resist the status quo, while Vlachou (2019) discusses museums as spaces for dialogue on contemporary policy issues, such as migration, and notes taking a stand can involve actively

¹ Ecomuseums are community museums focused on the community and empowering local people (Gunter 2017). They often lack the focus on collections seen in other community museums, such as those operated by local historical societies.

defending a position. Museums, and ecomuseums more specifically, have the potential to create policy change for the community as an intermediary.

Looking at policy for museums, research within museum studies has focused on overcoming and adapting to a changing policy environment, describing the resistance of individuals within museums. For example, at the Glenbow Museum, individuals purportedly resisted revenue generating activities, which responded changing expectations in the policy instruments that funded the museums, due to adherence to professional standards or so-called misplaced altruism (Janes 2013). Despite calls for museum advocates to resist marketplace thinking (Griffin 2008), there is limited research on museums' resistance as part of museum policy development. However, Poulard (2012) demonstrates curators can challenge existing museum policy models, leading to change.

Discussing negotiation, adaptation, or participation rather than resistance, those taking a more neutral position on the value of instrumentalization have demonstrated the role of actors in policy change as they engage with and mobilize discourse to particular ends. For instance, Bashevkin (1988) finds socioeconomic elites have had considerable influence on government action within Canadian federal cultural policy due to a concern with identity and sovereignty. More recently, Grodach (2013) argues that the effects of creative approaches are not necessarily good or bad as the vague concept can be mobilized differently. As such, authors consider participatory governance and the ability of those in the cultural sector to advocate for themselves (Besch and Minson 2001). For example, Leslie and Rantisi (2012) describe a collaborative and participatory model of governance in a Montreal neighborhood, highlighting the need for socially progressive politics to moderate neoliberal politics.

Within research focused on museum policy, there is an acknowledgement that policy rhetoric does not necessarily filter to museum curator activities (McCall 2009). The recognition

that these curators and other actors are not necessarily passive participants in instrumentalization, and policy more generally, is a major contribution of museum policy literature to discussions of cultural policy and change. Agents within the museum sector can contribute to and reinforce instrumentalization (Gray 2009) as they engage in policy attachment - that is, “the idea that policy development in certain policy areas takes place through the attachment of that area to other policy concerns” (Gray 2002, 80). Despite the constraints and limitations on participation, research on policy attachment demonstrates it can lead to shifts in policy content and intention (Doustaly and Gray 2010). Rather than a top-down allocation of non-cultural objectives to cultural organizations, agents recognize that other sectors have more resources or significance associated with them. They then strategize and develop arguments to demonstrate culture can deliver benefits for another field, aligning cultural policies to non-cultural objectives to gain access to additional resources and/or credibility (Gray 2008). Policy attachment establishes the legitimacy of museums through their association to government objectives (Gray 2015). While acknowledging the complicity of actors within the cultural field, policy attachment research often continues to discuss instrumentalism in negative terms, suggesting attachment strategies are chosen because actors have limited options or have been forced in some way (Belfiore 2004). Attachment strategies are seen as reactive responses that ultimately co-opt culture to the detriment of the sector (Nisbett 2013a).

While instrumentalist goals can constrain cultural workers, policy can also be shaped by the goals of cultural workers (Glow and Johanson 2009). Accordingly, Nisbett builds on conceptions of policy attachment and argues instrumentalism is more nuanced than is often portrayed. Her research demonstrates that museums can proactively advocate the generation of new policies, justifying cultural spending in instrumental terms. The case study involved a museum persuading the government to adopt a policy they initiated, formulated, and eventually implemented, which

described their activities in instrumental terms. The policy was advantageous for the museum as it enabled them to increase the scope of their existing work. Further illustrating Nisbett's arguments, Paquette (2011) demonstrates actors associated with science centers in Ontario (re)produce and renew instrumentalism. They actively worked to create and maintain scientific cultural policies and favorable policy environments.

In short, articles on discourse show change as cultural policy has become an increasingly regional responsibility due to the largely economic justifications underlining cultural and museum policy discourse. Actors associated with museums can mobilize dominant discourses for their own objectives, engaging in policy attachment to advocate for change. While policy attachment research implies and, occasionally, demonstrates actors' ability to affect change, there is limited research discussing policy attachment strategies in general and those seen within community museums specifically. As seen above in the literature with a new institutionalist orientation, the research showing policy attachment within specific case studies has focused on major institutions such as the British Museum (Nisbett 2013a). In contrast, research on local authority museums in the Scottish Borders demonstrates that changing discourses in cultural policy and cultural policy's attachment to other policy areas does not necessarily filter down to museums' activities and experiences (McCall 2009). Additional research is, therefore, needed to explore actors' relationships with cultural policy discourses and the extent to which broader discourses have influenced policy implementation.

1.2.3 *Networks: Museum Policy as a Social and Ideational Process*

While the policy attachment research demonstrates the roles of actors in mobilizing particular discourses, network analysis considers the relationships between actors as they enable or work

for particular policies. For example, Lee (2015) does a social network analysis of entrepreneurs in the creative industries, demonstrating how those interacting in the creative industries engage in a knowledge exchange that contributes to the spread of policy ideas. Others consider networks in policy development or discuss the development of new networks in relation to new goals (e.g., Ponzini 2009; Stevenson, Rowe, and McKay 2010). Considering the development of the Canada Council, Upchurch (2007) demonstrates the role of Vincent Massey's friendships and social networks in arts policy formation in Canada, including relationships formed working with museums. The research demonstrates museums are involved in networks related to cultural policy formation (O'Brien 2010).

The network research often focuses on the sector's ability to form strong policy networks to advocate for their interests, considering the relationship between interest groups and government as well as demonstrating the varying effects of weak vs. strong networks. For instance, studies have documented the ability of well-organized networks to oppose government and advocate for their interest as well as the failure of weak networks to do the same (Grodach and Silver 2012; Oakley et al. 2014). Reflecting a bias toward so-called strong networks, scholars have focused on areas that preclude a consideration of the policy networks that include community museums. For example, Brison (2005) describes the creation of a Canadian Museums Committee by the American Carnegie Corporation in association with the National Gallery of Art in the 1930s to suggest ways and means to advance Canadian museums and galleries. However, the committee excluded local museums or associations, women, and francophones. It included representatives from major institutions, working to solidify the National Gallery as the infrastructural base for culture in Canada.

As the Canadian Museums Committee demonstrates, actors within the cultural sector organize around subsectors and themes to advocate for their interests (Gray 2015a), reflecting

the fragmentation in the sector that can weaken networks' ability to advocate for culture (Wyszomirski 1995). Within this context, service organizations are crucial to bringing actors together (Paquette and Redaelli 2015). Museums tend to form museums associations, which have essential roles in circulating information, training, and advocacy (e.g., Carter and Macias-Valadez 2016; Foryth and Leavens 2010; Teather 1990). Within Canada, there are museum associations at the regional, provincial, and federal levels that remain understudied. However, they have or have had their own journals, which contain articles that further demonstrate museums' own role in mobilizing support and shaping policies. For example, Ontario museums engaged in projects funded through a provincial program aimed to raise awareness of different peoples of Ontario (Grant 1992). The journals also illustrate the changing environment within which museums operate and interact with policy. The CMA's *Muse* has discussed changing employment conditions (Brown 2004) as well as changing government perceptions of museums and their responsibilities (Chandler 2005). The OMA's *Ontario Museum Annual* published articles on the changing relationships with Indigenous Peoples (Doxtator 1993) and a changing technological environment (Gerrard 1994).

In short, there is research in cultural policy broadly demonstrating the ability of organized networks to push for change in policy or affect change through the spread of ideas. Research acknowledges the significance of museum associations, which are arguably networks, to museums. Service associations' journals demonstrate museums changing experiences with policy. However, the shape and role of these networks in community museum policy are not well understood.

1.3 Community Museums: The Problem of Simplification

Museum policy research has demonstrated change as scholars describe institutions, ideas, and actors. For instance, there is change in the level of government leading cultural policy development. Discourse analysis has demonstrated broader changes in the objectives and orientation of policies. Research on policy attachment and networks has shown individuals and organized actors provide opportunities for change, shaping policy development and resisting or adapting policy in implementation. However, the literature has paid little attention to community museums and has not adequately explained or documented community museum policy's evolution. Reflecting a limited ability to explain community museums' relationships to government, scholars have presented a simplified depiction of museum policy due, in part, to the focus on state museums that have a more direct relationship with one level of government.

First, there is a tendency to research policies or programs in isolation. However, the cultural sector is complex with a plurality of actors concurrently supporting and regulating local organizations, such as community museums. For example, Redaelli (2018) and others (e.g., Paquette 2008) have discussed multi-level or local culture governance, demonstrating multiple sources of support within civil society and different levels of government. Importantly, federalism leads to multi-level governance in Canada as culture is not the designated responsibility of any one level of government (Paquette 2019). As such, a focus on a single museum policy or program has provided a limited view, failing to acknowledge the realities and complexities of community museums' governance.

Second, a focus on national or provincial museum policies provides a limited understanding of how support for museums is rationalized and museum work is legitimized. There are multiple justifications for support that apply to the different kinds of museums. However, as Gray (2015b)

argues, there are different power relationships, assumptions, and intentions at the local and national levels. For example, Hill (2016) discusses municipal museums as the creation of specific groups that cooperated and negotiated, using the museum as a tool to enhance their standing. She also mentions the importance of the museum association to municipal museums' professionalization which is not usually highlighted in research on national museums. Unlike municipal museums, national museums are often used to make political statements about nationhood (Gray 2015b; Kaluza 2014). Further, national and provincial museums often developed through the work of individuals trained in associated academic disciplines, such as archaeology or geology (Dickson 1991). Although the processes of rationalization and legitimization, at the national, provincial, and local levels differ, there has been greater attention paid to the national and provincial contexts.

Third, scholarship has focused on describing change or consistency. However, the literature discussed holistically shows community museums are embedded within a policy environment with elements of both change and consistency. For example, responsibility for culture is increasingly seen as a municipal responsibility in Ontario due, in part, to the creative city movement (Paquette 2008), but federal and provincial institutions established under a different logic persist (Gattinger and Saint-Pierre 2010). Community museums also interact with policies that are not explicitly labeled as cultural at multiple levels of government, which experience change dynamics. For example, a museum's capacity and, more specifically, human resources affect its ability to access a project grant as part of articulated museum policy. However, summer employees and those doing project work are often funded through government employment programs. As a result, changes in the employment programs can lead to changes in museums' ability to access unchanged project grants (Nelson 2020a). Community museum policies, therefore, remain or change while intersecting and interacting with other

policies that are experiencing their own change dynamics. As these museum policies are implemented and components remain static, their relationships with museums are not static due to the overlapping policies, programs, and practices. Research is needed to further understand changes in these relationships.

In short, there is a gap in the museum policy research. The attention to a single policy or program, which reflects a focus on national or provincial institutions, has limited understanding of multi-level governance. The processes of legitimizing and rationalizing support for community museums are not well understood. Further, community museums evolving relationships with government, within the context of multi-level governance, are not well understood.

1.4 The Case Study: Ontario Museum Policy

Ontario is the largest province by population with cities actively producing creative city policies and the only Canadian English Master's program in Museum Studies. There is thus an existing body of literature discussing Ontario cultural and museum policies. In particular, there is extensive research on Ontario museum policy at the graduate level (e.g., Brooks-Joiner 1986; Linauskas 2004; Tivy 2006; Carter 2000), demonstrating the vital role of individual and private actors in the establishment of Ontario museum policy. To some extent, the research shows Ontario museum governance reflects the change dynamics outlined above and shares some of the limitations discussed.

As seen in other provinces, Ontario museums are subject to cultural policy from multiple levels of government, which have shifted in focus over time. Federally, early intervention in culture includes the establishment of the National Gallery of Canada (1880), National Museum of Canada (1927), and the Canadian War Museum (1942) in Ontario. The Royal Commission on

National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (1961) is seen as a turning point leading to policies and institutions that continue to exist, such as the Historic Sites and Monuments Act (1953). In 1964 the Centennial Commission began providing funding for cultural infrastructure, including museums, in preparation for the centennial celebrations in 1967 (Filewod 2018), contributing to a rise in the number of museums in Canada.

After establishing the National Museums of Canada (NMC) to incorporate the national museums into a single administration in 1968, the Federal Government announced the National Museum Policy in 1972. The NMC then became responsible for the National Programmes - that is, the Museum Assistance Programmes (MAP), the International Programmes, the Canadian Information Network, the Canadian Conservation Institute (CCI), and the Mobile Exhibits Programmes (Bell 1987). These programmes experienced difficulties due, in part, to a lack of necessary funding (Mccawley and Stone 1983) and bureaucratic difficulties (Bell 1987). However, elements from the policy continue and reappear over time. For example, the National Museum Policy introduced museumobiles, which carried didactic displays from the National Museums across Canada in the 1970s (Ord 2003). Eleven government ministries and agencies then cooperated with a museum professional to circulate museumobiles in 1999 (Rouillard 2002).

The federal programmes established for museums through the National Museum Policy continue to influence museums, such as MAP and CCI. However, the Federal Government disbanded the NMC and moved those programmes to the Department of Communications then the Department of Canadian Heritage in 1993. The Government announced the *Canadian Museum Policy* in 1990 but did not follow through on the promised increase to MAP and the

policy is currently functionally irrelevant.² While there have been discussions about a new museum policy, there have been no new initiatives specific to museums. Museums have experienced notable changes to the museum policy, such as reductions to MAP levels and the elimination of a peer review panel. There are also new cultural policy related programs and initiatives, such as the Cultural Spaces Program. However, there is an absence of academic research on these changes due, perhaps, to the focus on state-owned museums rather than the museums more directly affected by these changes.

Provincially, Gattinger (2011) notes that before the 1970s the government's cultural policy was primarily reactive to sporadic demands from different groups and the policies of other levels of governments. In the 1970s they began to address culture in a more proactive and comprehensive way, occupying the role of a reluctant partner then patron state with an educative role for culture. Culture becomes a distinct area of activity in the 1980s, related to the fear of being subsumed by American culture. During this time, the Province establishes a fairly distinctive community museum policy. Finally, Gattinger (2010) identifies a more recent quasi-neoliberal policy. There are thus shifts in the discourse around cultural policy in Ontario, changing cultural policy's explicit focus.

Looking at museum policy more specifically, the Ontario Historical Society (OHS) encouraged local historical societies to develop museums after their advocacy for a provincial museum telling a provincial story failed in the early 20th century. Members of the OHS organized to lobby for museums, asking the Province to include museums in the Department of Education's Community Programmes Branch's matching grants to municipalities for adult education and recreational programs. The Department began providing grants to municipal museums in 1953.

² For example, the policy designates a Department that no longer exists as responsible for its implementation.

The same year, the OHS organized a local museums committee, which provided training to Ontario's museums and successfully advocated for a museum advisor in 1959 (Tivy 2006).

Tivy (2006) demonstrates an interaction between government policies as federal centennial funding contributed to an increase in provincially supported museums in the late 1960s. In 1971, museum workers formed the Ontario Museum Association (OMA), which then developed a training program supported through the federal National Museum Policy (1972). At the same time, the number of provincial museum advisors grew, the provincial grant increased, and the provincial operating grant expanded to include nonprofit museums. In the late 1970s, Museums received matching project funding through MAP and provincial lottery programs for culture. There was thus a clear relationship between provincial and federal action at that time, leading to museum development and capital projects.

Due to the rapid development of museums funded through federal and provincial programs, Tivy (2006) explains that the OMA and museum advisors were concerned about the state of collections. The OMA and OHS then advocated for a provincial museum policy based on standards, which the provincial museum advisors developed in consultation with museums and the associations. These standards affected museum development (Linauskas 2004; Tivy 2006; Carter 2000).

The existing research on Ontario provides expansive descriptions of particular moments in the establishment of a cultural or museum policy. For example, Files (1991) describes the establishment of a ministry with explicit cultural responsibilities. Tivy (2006) identifies policies outside an official museum policy that influence museums, but her discussion is limited to ideas of collection and display. Although there seems to be consistency in the Province's official museum policy, the consistency in museums' relationships with the policy is assumed due to consistent documents. There has been limited consideration of change in museums'

relationships with government beyond the Province's broad policy framework as articulated in policy documents. Research is most interested in the effects of standards rather than a critical consideration of why changes occurred and why those changes specifically. Aside from an acknowledgement of the effects of federal project grants from the 1960s to the 1980s, there is little understanding of the interdependent dynamics after 1990 and a limited consideration of the municipal as it relates to provincial action.

Municipally, policies differ from government to government, making generalizations difficult. However, Ontario's municipalities have been active in the creative city movement. Research has examined cultural planning studies in cities across Ontario (Jeannotte 2013 2016; Kovacs 2010 2011) and Toronto is studied as part of the creative city movement (Goldberg-Miller 2017). There are also policies more broadly influencing the landscape of museum governance. For example, during the 1990s and 2000s the provincial government undertook reforms in the municipal sector (Cote and Fenn 2014), which necessarily influenced the cultural organizations subject to both provincial and municipal reforms. The interactions between these policies and those of other levels of government in shaping cultural organizations' relationships is not well documented.

Nonprofits have also played key roles in Ontario cultural policy, intersecting with government policies. Research on the Multicultural History Society of Ontario (MHSO) demonstrates the tensions as provincial actors helped establish the organization and subsequently shaped activities as part of multiculturalism policies. The original director expressed pride in their achievements but saw ethnic history as the "handmaiden of multiculturalism" (Daniel 2012). As noted above, the OHS and OMA played key roles in the development of an official museum policy in Ontario (Tivy 2006). However, their continued and ongoing roles within museum governance are less understood.

Research has also considered individual cultural organizations and museums in Ontario inscribed in broader policies and practices. For example, Gordon (2009) demonstrates pioneer villages, which are often funded through the provincial operating grant for museums, are active agents in education policy, providing schoolchildren with a memory of the past that normalizes the present. His work highlights the importance of policies that are not explicitly labeled as cultural, such as education policy. The Ontario curriculum has undergone several significant shifts, which have shifted museum operations and programming (Carter 1992 2000). When focused on museums' experiences, scholars have thereby shown the effects of an additional policy area, which directly intersects with the Province's museum policy given the education and interpretation standard. However, the breadth and depth of interdependent government action and inaction influencing community museums is unclear.

In short, there is research on broad changes in policy that have influenced Ontario's museums. It is evident that non state actors have played a key role in the major moments of change and there are intersections in the policies of the levels of government. However, as seen in cultural and museum policy research more broadly, the scope of actors involved in governance and their roles as they shape governance over time is not well understood. There is also little attention paid to municipal policies in relation to the policies of the other levels of government. Research is needed to more clearly understand ongoing dynamics of change.

1.5 Conclusion: Research Question

Museum policy research is limited due to a focus on a single policy or program in isolation, national or provincial institutions, and change *or* consistency. Research considering governance and networks have broadened analysis, illustrating the complex policy environment within which

museums operate. In particular, policy attachment literature demonstrates one of the means through which cultural actors, including those in museums, can exert agency.

As explored in the next chapter, policy translation provides a lens to describe actors' work in museum governance, helping explain change and power configurations in the province. My research considers sectorial dynamics differently than the dominant approaches explored, considering the advisors' and associations' practices. I ask: how are community museum policies (re)created, (re)assembled, and coordinated? Building on the existing research on Ontario museum policy, I aim to further describe the complexities of community museum governance. My research describes change over time, explaining how change occurs with a consideration of practice and acts of governing.

Chapter Two

Museum Policy as Translation: Theoretical Framework

2.1 Introduction

Drawing on actor-network theory (ANT) and the sociology of translation, policy translation provides a theoretical tradition to consider actors and change in community museum governance. ANT is a range of material-semiotic tools, sensibilities, and analyses investigating the social and natural worlds as continuously generated by webs of relations (Law 2007). Scholars taking an ANT approach study actor-networks – that is, “processes of organizing in which heterogeneous actors, both human and non-human, are constantly negotiating and re-negotiating programs of action” (Belliger and Krieger 2016, 14). The sociology of translation and policy translation are ANT approaches, defining translation as the process through which actors become connected (Zapata Campos and Zapata 2013). Within a policy translation framework, museum policies and governance are the relationships mobilized to do the work of museums, including relationships between museums, government actors, associations, and policy instruments. Policy instrumentation builds on policy translation and provides a framework within public administration research to study these policy instruments as both actors and institutions in community museum governance.

This chapter outlines the contributions of policy translation and instrumentation to studying museum governance. Each section contains a discussion of the approaches’ strengths, weaknesses, and existing contributions to understanding museum policy. The chapter concludes with a theoretical framework for research on community museum governance in Ontario, drawing from the literature reviewed. The framework aims to address gaps in knowledge identified in Chapter One, drawing from different theoretical perspectives to address the limitations identified.

2.2 Policy Translation: Policy Through an ANT and Sociology of Translation Lens

Michel Callon and Bruno Latour developed actor-network theory (ANT) in the early 1980s to understand scientific innovation and technological change (Law and Singleton 2014), drawing on the work of Science and Technology Studies. Within ANT, Callon (1986a, 1986b) founded the sociology of translation as a framework that emphasizes the continuity of displacement and transformation. Policy translation builds on the sociology of translation to acknowledge uncertainty, the centrality of practice, and complexity within the policy process (Freeman 2009). Policies are not the result of institutional decision-making. Instead, they are relational assemblages, where translation defines rules and roles (Callon 1986a). To better understand the contributions and potential of policy translation to understanding community museum governance, this section begins with a discussion of key terms within ANT and the sociology of translation. To conclude, the section outlines the application of policy translation.

2.2.1 Actor-Network Theory and the Sociology of Translation

In ANT, an actor is “any element which bends space around itself, makes other elements dependent upon itself and translates their will into a language of its own” (Callon and Latour 1981, 286). Non-human entities, such as chairs and texts, are therefore included in the analysis according to what they do rather than what they may mean (Fenwick and Edwards 2005). Actor networks themselves can also be described as an actor because when an actor-network acts as a unit, the action and seemingly simple author of the action replaces the network, making it invisible (Callon 1991). As such, individual government workers or funding programs can be

actors within museum policy as an actor-network. At the same time, they can be actors within an actor-network punctualized as an actor, such as a department or agency.

In order to understand how entities are translated into an actor-network, Callon (1986a) identifies four moments of translation - that is, (1) problematisation, (2) intersement, (3) enrolment, and (4) mobilization. These moments overlap and overflow, making it impossible for translation to ever conclude. The first, problematisation, is a propositional and hypothetical moment that involves defining actors (Hamilton 2011). Actors seek to redefine the identity, goals, or inclinations of potential allies according to their own objectives. At the same time, other actors are simultaneously attempting to build their own overlapping and competing networks, causing continuous change (Callon 1986a). In addition to explaining change, problematization helps demonstrate actor-networks are continuously sustained through negotiation (Latour 1996) and the world is enacted in materially heterogeneous ways. As realities are enacted in practices and there are multiple practices, there are multiple realities (Law and Lien 2012).

Within policy research, scholars can, therefore, expect the presence of different understandings and definitions for museum policy amongst actors engaged in translation work. The overlapping and competing networks defined through problematization cause change but also illustrate different realities for actors within these actor networks. For example, those working for a national or provincial museum may define museum policy according to the act(s) that establish them, outlining their capacities and powers. These acts define their goals and the role of the national or provincial government. Community museums will necessarily define museum policy with reference to other policies or programs and not all community museums will have the same goals. As a result, they may define their own roles or the roles of their allies differently.

Building on the processes of problematization, the second moment, interestment, attempts to impose and stabilize actor identities (Hamilton 2011). In other words, actors attempt to form alliances with other actors. The translation then achieves the third moment, enrolment, if the interestment is successful. Enrolment is the elements and devices that accompany interestment, enabling success (Callon 1986a). The enrolment of agents involves assembling the forms of social interaction that enable the agents to perform the identity required of them in the network (Hamilton 2011). For example, Clarke (2015) argues people are enrolled into particular managerial approaches through the appeal of working in and contributing to a well-managed organization, a desire to make a difference or contribute to a project, and the idea that there is no alternative. In museum governance, enrolment can involve the creation of service organizations or the development of policy documents.

Policies and programs service as obligatory passage points (OPP) - that is, the construction of mandatory action (Callon 1986a). Actors control other entities so they perform some predetermined course of action, forcing them to pass through a particular point (Rice 2011). For example, McGrath (2015) notes public tendering for the provision of local services has become an OPP for organizations. Baya-Laffite (2016) describes Environmental Impact Assessments as an OPP within a sustainable development problematization. Museum governance is thus made possible through the creation of OPPs for museums, including application processes for funding or mandatory adherence to particular regulation.

The final moment of translation, the mobilization of allies, involves a spokesperson (Callon 1986a) as the actor-network is mobilized to perform a role and knowledge in a particular way (Fenwick and Edwards 2005). Translation and the circulation of intermediaries can lead to agreement - that is, alignment and coordination. Successful translations create shared space (it aligns) within which there is a high degree of coordination between actors based on the

translation's rules and conventions. Alignment and coordination lead to convergence of translations and longevity (Callon 1991). Strongly convergent actor-networks' behaviour is known and predicted, becoming a single point with a united voice within other networks (Hamilton 2011). Using the language of ANT, the actor-networks become black-boxed because the stable associations have become firmly established and certain practices are placed in a hierarchy that is no longer considered (Rice 2011).

The concept of a black box helps to explain consistency through consensus building within actor networks. However, as noted above, the translation and network can be contested at any time and can be in a constant state of contestation (Callon and Latour 1981). Actor-networks are of variable durability due to the level of convergence as well as the varying durability of materials used in enrolment. For example, thoughts do not last long, speech lasts a little longer, and text lasts longer still. Stable actor-networks are thus embodied in and performed by a range of durable materials (Law 1992). The sociology of translation provides a framework to study both consistency and change as actors continuously enact actor-networks.

The sociology of translation has been criticized in application. When applied as a heuristic framework, it can freeze and distort processes of translation because researchers seek to describe all moments, which may not be appropriate. Moreover, there is a tendency to focus on translation as it is related to successful and prominent translations (Fenwick and Edwards 2005). Despite these criticisms, the sociology of translation has provided a useful conceptual framework to consider activities that involve linking diverse people as each restates the work of others into their own language and practices, according to their own objectives. For example, Nauta (2006) demonstrates how NGOs can engage in strategic translation, managing the community, the government, and their own conflicting interests, to achieve their objectives.

While the terms explore are herein key within the sociology of translation, the concept translation also functions more broadly as a descriptive term. Used as a descriptor, translation denotes shifting meanings (Soneryd and Amelung 2016). Translation's use as a descriptor is not incongruous with the sociology of translation and does, to some extent, reflect Callon's use of the word. In particular, Callon (1986a) argues that the notion of translation emphasizes continuous displacement and transformation. The primary difference between translation as a descriptor and a concept is in the sociological focus on actors and relationships, which is not necessarily a focus in descriptive uses.

In short, translation is an approach that focuses on agency, considering networks to understand dynamics of change and consistency with their complexities. It is distinct from other network approaches due to the inclusion of non-human actors and emphasis on the dynamic processes through which actors relate. During translation, actors attempt to mobilize a particular conception of reality but compete and exist with multiple overlapping networks, which leads to change and instability. Importantly, actor-networks include punctuated actors that speak for actor-networks with a high degree of alignment and coordination, leading to more stability and the capacity to translate others.

While ANT and translation is not a dominant theoretical approach within museum policy research, there are existing instances of intersection. In particular, discussions of policy attachment discussed in Chapter One reflect ideas of agency outlined in the sociology of translation (Paquette and Redaelli 2015). Kefi and Pallud (2011) define museums as mediators based on an actor-network theory understanding of mediation. They see mediation as the set of processes shaping people's cognition and emotive framework, observing content driven and visitor-oriented mediation. The notion of mediation is common in the cultural sector in discussions of how people come together around culture, considering the ways agents attempt

to enroll other actors into a particular configuration according to their objectives (Hutchison and Collins 2009). For example, Bennett (2005) describes museums as places where entities are constructed and mobilized in social programs. The term translation is also used to describe the displacement that occurs as the translated entity travels, such as Steorn's (2012) discussion on translating abstract ideas into museum practice. Similarly, Silverman's (2014) *Museum as Process* is a collection of works that consider the translation of knowledge as it moves between specific communities and global sites, such as museums.

ANT and the Sociology of Translation thereby contribute to understanding through their conception of agency and the contested nature of translation. Scholars have drawn on understandings of translation to understand the policies and programs of museums. To understand policy for and governance of museums, an understanding of policy translation is needed.

2.2.2 Policy Translation

Building on the sociology of translation, policy translation is a governance perspective where governance results from the co-production of many actors (Clarke 2012). Studying policy translation involves studying governance practices, which are relational assemblages of elements, resources, and capacities assembled in a certain way for particular interests and purposes (McCann and Ward 2013). Within this perspective, scholars study policy as translation and the translation of policy. They have contributed to understanding how policy moves and governance changes across space and/or time. After defining policy as translation and the translation of policy, this section considers policy translation's contributions to understanding policy diffusion, transfer, implementation, and power.

According to a policy translation perspective, public policy is a translation. As Freeman (2009) explains,

Policy is made in words, and it moves. The documents in which policy consists take up problems and representations of problems, and claims made for and about them by different sets of advocates. They recast those claims as questions and positions, interpreting and converting them into decisions, programmes and instruments. This process is continuous, as ideas and purposes move between actors and locations and are replicated at different levels of organisation (431).

At the same time, policy is translated as it is enrolled into the translations of other actors. Both the objects of governance and actors involved in governance are constantly transformed through their relationships. For example, translation activities can shift the meaning of governance, such as participatory governance, as instruments and forms of governance change due to translation (Soneryd and Amelung 2016). Policy translation research, therefore, focuses on how policies or instruments are constantly changing, emphasizing the interactions between actors, sites, scales, and contexts (Balen and Leyton 2016). For example, a funding program targeting community museums may change as it is developed through consultation, implemented through relationships with museums, and accessed in different contexts. Further, a federal program may be adapted for a provincial context or vice versa.

Considering the translation of policy as it moves across jurisdictions, policy translation is primarily discussed in opposition to policy diffusion and policy transfer research (e.g., Johnson and Hagström 2005; Knutsson 2012; Noémi Lendvai and Stubbs 2007; McCabe 2007). Policy diffusion research argues policies in one jurisdiction are influenced by the policies of other jurisdictions. For example, Alasuutari and Kangas (2020) consider the diffusion of cultural policy as a concept and governmental structure formulated at UNESCO in the 20th century. Latour (1987b) argues that the diffusion model does not explain displacement through time and space. Instead, an entity spreads due to some initial energy, inertia, and the medium through which it circulates. Within this conception, policy is a finite and finished product (Clarke et al. 2015). A

transfer approach shifts the focus from what is being transferred to how, identifying basic mechanisms (Stone 2012). For example, Mattocks (2018) studies the European Union's Open Method of Coordination as a platform for transferring cultural policy best practices.

Conversely, translation approaches argue that displacement occurs due to those interacting, which necessarily influences an entity. Each actor does not merely resist or transmit an entity but maintain and shape it according to their projects (Latour 1987). The policy translation literature conceives of policy development as messy and non-linear (Noémi Lendvai and Stubbs 2007), arguing diffused elements become disembodied from their original context and are modified in their new context (Johnson and Hagström 2005). Accordingly, actors enrolled in actor-networks are expected to change and (re)define roles as they develop relationships with other entities whose roles are also (re)defined as they move across space, contributing to a broader policy translation. For example, Rindzevičiūtė, Svensson, and Tomson (2016) examine the translation of the creative industries in Lithuania. Rather than discussing an original concept's movement or adaptation to a new context, they argue there is no original concept. Translation is a productive process that enables the (re)formation of identities and practices.

When studying policy as it travels through time, policy translation examines the work of governing within governance. Governing "more helpfully denotes a troubled and turbulent set of relationships, processes, and practices that were once rather more comfortably identified as the state" (Clarke 2012). It disrupts perspectives whereby the state has a central role to one with an assemblage of apparatuses, personnel, and practices. Instead, the approach implies forms of the state but points to the dispersed and diverse arrangements through which practice occurs. For example, Zapata Campos and Zapata (2013) argue chains of translations are how policy programs are enacted, demonstrating how local actors can transform projects initiated by

international organizations so the projects fit better within the local context. Watson and Michael (2016) similarly describe policy as a series of translations. While much of the research focuses on the translation of a particular program or policy, McDermont (2013) highlights the multiple and complex role that voluntary service organizations inhabit as they deliver services to the public, arguing they become translators in multiple domains. These works demonstrate the key role of actors involved in implementing policies and programs, such as street-level bureaucrats and service organizations, play in translating policy.

Works on translation in implementation also challenges a rigid acceptance / resistance dichotomy, proposing a broader conception of non-acceptance behaviors (McDermott, Fitzgerald, and Buchanan 2013). As per ANT, actors do not have to fully accept alternative problematizations as they cooperate and attempt to enroll others into a network. The faithful obedience of an order without any modification of some kind is unlikely or impossible (Latour 1987). Translation research, therefore, challenges ideas of power relationships within much of the literature and, more specifically, works taking a governmentality perspective that prioritize the power of the state (Herbert-Cheshire 2003; McDermott, Fitzgerald, and Buchanan 2013).

Policy translation research's conception of power aligns with Callon's (1986a) original articulation, which identifies translation as an approach to study power. According to Callon (1986a), understanding power "means describing the way in which actors are defined, associated and simultaneously obliged to remain faithful to their alliances" (19). Power is a relationship whereby an actor's behavior is directed by another actor (Herbert-Cheshire 2003). Importantly, an actor cannot possess power because, like agency, it is a consequence of action (Latour 1987). Different actors do not possess different amounts of power, but rather they have different methods and materials to generate themselves in relation to others (Law 1992). During translation, actor identities, the possibility of interaction, and the margins of maneuver are

negotiated. The social and natural world take form, resulting in entities controlling other entities. There is thus a constant (re)inscription of power relations (Lendvai and Stubbs 2009). Certain translations favor particular interest over others, which can shift or perpetuate power relationships between actors (Zapata Campos and Zapata 2013). Power resides in delegation as allies join forces, attributing their actions to a spokesperson, as well as discipline whereby delegates are convinced to conform to particular patterns of action and representation. Power is informed by whose metaphor brings actors together (Leigh Star 1990). As such, a policy translation perspective studies how actor-networks are (re)formed and what actors act as spokespeople to understand the power dynamics within governance.

As Callon (1986a) notes in his original use of the term, the sociology of translation's perspective is similar to Foucault's, rejecting power as a resource and discussing power as exercised through relations (Hebert-Cheshire 2003). However, unlike Foucauldian approaches and reflecting a neo-pluralist orientation, there is no central figure whose interests dominate as an actor-network's goals necessarily result from varying degrees of compromise amongst elements (Rutland and Aylett 2008). The dispersed and diverse power relationships can be better understood through research on how actors are defined, associated, and compelled to remain faithful to alliances (Callon 1986a). Policy translation literature, therefore, highlights the actions of non-state actors or specific actors within government in structuring power relationships. For instance, Herbert-Cheshire's (2003) work demonstrates local people's capacity to negotiate, challenge and transform rural policy. Within museum governance, museums themselves and museum workers are therefore expected to have some role in structuring power relations in addition to state and other actors, such as museum associations.

Policy translation and ANT authors exploring the implications of translation activities on power relationships argue governmentality and translation approaches are complementary (Voß

and Freeman 2016). A governmentality perspective studies the ways states come to manage people, reflecting institutionalist orientations, but does not pay attention to how priorities are formed and the role of agency. Generally, studies consider governmentality in discussions of implementation and translation in discussions of agenda setting. For example, Rutland and Aylett (2008) study action on climate change, using ANT to understand how collective priorities emerge and governmentality to understand how the state achieves its agenda. Herbert-Cheshire (2003) argues that governmentality literature has documented the ways states act at a distance to influence citizens' conduct. She argues that the conclusion to draw from these studies is not that citizens have no power, but that there has been insufficient attention to the ways they too can act on the practices of government. She draws on ANT and notions of translation to demonstrate that since policy is the outcome of negotiations between the state and locals, the local population can negotiate, challenge, and transform policies.

Within my research, I draw on policy instrumentation as explored in the next section and De Certeau's (1988) theories to consider power within policy translation. Studying translation, Mannell's (2014) uses De Certeau to describe practitioners' translation activities as they translate international gender policies into practices. Aligning with a translation perspective, De Certeau (1988) aimed to shift the focus in cultural studies away from the act of production and product, towards how human actors use products every day. Since individuals are not passively guided by rules, De Certeau wanted to understand how actors resist being reduced, studying how things are manipulated. The author positions his approach as analogous to Foucault and governmentality as it attempts to investigate micro-operations within technocratic structures. The approach is also contrary to governmentality perspectives as the goal is to consider the actions taken by the individuals within the structures. When considering his approach and a

policy translation perspective, it is analogous in considering individuals' actions but contrary in an acknowledgement of technocratic structures not always defined as part of the actor network.

De Certeau's distinction between a strategy and a tactic provides a useful frame to considering translation activities, reflecting an instrumentation orientation in the acknowledgement of institutions. A strategy is the relationships and potential actions that become possible when a subject can be isolated from an environment. It assumes a sense place that can be circumscribed as *proper* and thus serves as the basis for generating relations with those exterior and distinct from it. Strategies thereby create and maintain the space or institutions within which actors operate. A tactic is a calculus, which cannot count on a "proper" - that is, a spatial or institutional localization - and, as a result, there is no borderline distinguishing the other as a visible totality. Those employing tactics do not have a clearly articulated space and, as such, depend on time, watching for opportunities that can be seized. Importantly, tactics are adaptations rather than resistance per-se. They are actions or relationships possible within space defined externally. Strategies and tactics are distinguished according to their relationship between place and time - that is, "strategies pin their hopes on the resistance that the establishment of a place offers to the erosion of time; tactics on a clever utilization of time and the opportunities it presents" (De Certeau 1988, 38). As such, tactics can never completely overturn or resist the strategies that define the space in which actions are carried out. However, competing strategies can create new spaces. Mannell (2014) uses the distinction as a means to discuss the limited power of local actors as they use tactics to make partial alterations to the strategies dominating social spaces.

In short, policy translation draws attention to change in governance. The approach encourages a study of the labor involved as part of public policy translation, which results in (re)inscriptions of power relations. Studying museum policy through a translation perspective

can enable a better understanding of the actors involved in museum governance and the moments of translation that enact a museum policy. Policy translation and museum policy research intersect through their use of De Certeau. To my knowledge, a policy translation perspective has not been used directly to study museum governance. However, there are several key implications. Within a policy translation perspective, a museum policy is an actor-network made to act and exist through its many connections between entities. A state document, such as an articulated museum policy, is then a spokesperson for a particular translation, defining roles for actors and creating obligatory passage points that help enroll entities into particular configurations. There is a multiplicity of museum policies as museums and those speaking for museums become spokespeople for their own museum policy translations that promote particular objectives, which are not necessarily pre-existing to the actor-network. Policy objectives are created and transformed as those governing the sector engage in problematization and other moments of translation. Not all museum policy translations enroll entities over time, and some are more resistant to change than others.

2.2.3 Policy Instrumentation: Agency within Structure

Policy instrumentation is a sociological approach to studying instruments that recognizes institutions and provides a more robust language to consider consistency in policy translation. Government instruments, which are methods “through which collective action is structured to address a public problem” (Salamon 2002, 19), play a role in problematization, connecting actors around an issue during policy translation. These instruments require composition or construction and are not readily available objects. They are translated and are actors engaged in translation, relating other entities. As actors engaged in policy translation, instruments are not

neutral devices but have their own effects, which are independent of the objectives originally pursued and can differ from the expected (Lascoumes and Le Galès 2007). Instruments provide constraints and possibilities while privileging certain actors and interests over others. Once established, they shape the distribution of resources and enable collective action to stabilize, making behavior more predictable and visible. In other words, instruments function as both institutions and actors within an actor-network, forming and structuring relationships with other entities. Within this section, I highlight three key contributions of instrumentation research to policy translation perspectives – that is, explanations for consistency, descriptions of policy change, and a consideration of power relationships.

First, instrumentation research enables a better understanding of consistency in actor networks. Lascoumes and Simard (2011) argue instruments are actor-networks and can generate translation activities, which they define as “activities that allow heterogeneous actors to come together around questions on which they agree to work together in a network” (30). A larger number of groups will support instruments with flexibility as they satisfy divergent rationalities that are potentially incompatible. They then establish, extend, and deepen chains of interdependence, organizing the circulation of information and resources under the direction of an ensemble of actors (Baudot 2011 2014 2015). Looking at the evolution of participatory tools, Simard (2014) notes experiences within a sociopolitical space allows actors to evolve their perceptions and positions in relation to one another. As such, an instrument leads “a specific problematizing of the issue in question in so far as it arranges variables in a hierarchy and may go so far as to propose an explanatory system” (Lascoumes and Simard 2011, 31). Instruments can, therefore, contribute to consistency within an actor-network as they (re)create chains of interdependency and obligatory passage points for a particular problematization, providing a concrete conception of relationships.

Second, instrumentation research describes how particular change occurs as actors enroll instruments into different configurations. An instrument is linked to the contextualized modes of appropriation and it is possible to observe professional mobilizations, reformulations, and resistance (Lascoumes and Simard 2011). Most prominently, instrumentation research argues policy entrepreneurs can use or interpret instruments in unintended ways (Lascoumes and Le Galès 2007), reflecting the new institutionalist orientation of instrumentation research. New institutionalism discusses policy entrepreneurs as actors who utilize their relationships and resources to encourage institutional change (Campbell 2007; Pierson 2004). Similarly, instrumentation scholars consider how the instrument's use may not reflect its intended use, altering its development (Crespin 2006). In particular, Le Bourhis and Lascoumes (2014) make a valuable contribution to considering agency, broadening consideration of resistance in ways that reflect policy translation. Rather than defining resistance as simply reducing or circumventing the influence of an instrument (Lascoumes and Simard 2011), they argue there are multiple points of resistance, which is a widespread phenomenon and permanent feature of government instruments. Moreover, it is possible to observe internal and implicit resistance. Le Bourhis and Lascoumes (2014) demonstrate resistance within implementation is a preoccupation of instrument research, which studies appropriations as integral to instruments' development. Intermediary actors reinterpret instruments, reorienting them according to their knowledge and routines. For example, Larminat (2014) examines the implementation of computer software within probation services, highlighting the different uses of the instrument by those charged with implementation. These appropriations reconfigure the device's identity and power relations, creating multiple identities for the instrument (Amicelle and Jacobsen 2016). In other words, instruments enroll and are enrolled into multiple concurrent and overlapping translations, which necessarily (re)shapes the instrument.

Finally, policy instrumentation research has contributed to discussions of power relationships in ways that complement a translation approach. Foucault's (2009) work on governmentality and subsequent applications (Lascoumes 2008; Le Galès 2011; Miller and Rose 2008) inform the sociological approach to instruments. Lascoumes and Le Galès have both argued instruments are central to Foucault's conception of governmentality (Halpern, Lascoumes, and Le Galès 2014; Lascoumes 2005; Le Galès 2011), describing instruments as condensed forms of governmentality (Lascoumes 2005). In particular, they consider Foucault's notion of instrumentation as the choice and effects of public action (Lascoumes 2004). Accordingly, the sociological approach emphasizes the power relations associated with instruments, advocating a focus on policy instrumentation – that is, “the set of problems posed by the choice and use of instruments (techniques, methods of operation, devices) that allow government policy to be made material and operational” (Lascoumes and Le Galès 2007, 4). Policy instrumentation involves both understanding the choice of one instrument over another and also a consideration of the effects produced by these choices, examining their political effects and the power relations that they organize. In the language of policy translation, policy instrumentation, therefore, involves understanding the creation of a particular OPP or choice of an actor as well as a consideration of how the enrolment (re)defines the roles and relationships of other actors.

There are some weaknesses in the policy instrumentation approach that policy translation addresses. Few studies examine the effect of multiple tools as they interact within a policy field (Sandfort, Selden, and Sowa 2008). Reflecting a weakness in the museum policy literature, the instrumentation research is limited in its simplification through a focus on dichotomies, such as the focus on intended vs. unintended effects where policy instruments are according to a deliberate strategy of change or unintended uses affect their development. However, in

practice, unintended effects and developments are largely only identified as such when they are perceived as negative (Menon and Sedelmeier 2010). The literature is also limited to discussing resistance as opposition to manifestations of external control. Although Le Bourhis and Lascoumes (2014) discuss appropriation as resistance, they create a typology that considers resistance as bypass, hijacking, or neutralization, neglecting forms of appropriation. Further, appropriation is generally considered from the instrument's perspective, which creates a dichotomy between the intentionality of the designers and unintentional effects of the users. Consideration of those interacting with the instruments is, therefore, limited to either actively subverting the intentions of the designer or total compliance. The narrow focus on singular instruments and dichotomies, neglects the active role people play in addressing their objectives.

In short, a sociological approach to instruments is, to some extent, an application of the sociology of translation within public policy literature. It has enabled a wide range of insights on governance. In particular, instrumentation highlights the relationship between government instruments and actors. While instrumentation research draws on Callon's work, it demonstrates a stronger sense of institutions, acknowledging the relevance of translation approaches in unstable domains due to the focus on fluidity and change (Halpern, Lascoumes, and Le Galès 2014). Actors have a role in shaping the development of instruments, but instruments also shape actors' structure and actions. The instrumentation literature provides insights on the discussion of museums as an instrument, the instrumentalization of museums, and, more generally, the meanings ascribed to instrument. For example, in a study on Turkish Cultural Policy, Girard, Polo, and Scalbert Yücel (2018) consider cultural projects, conventions, guides, brochures, and so on as value laden cultural policy instruments that are adapted and transformed as they circulate.

2.3 Conclusions: A Theoretical Framework

My research draws on policy translation and instrumentation research to contribute to discussions of agency within the museum governance, studying translation to better understand the work of governing Ontario's museums. De Certeau's (1988) discussion on strategies and tactics will enable a better understanding of these translation activities, acknowledging the existing hinterland and power relationships as translation occurs. Providing additional insights into the hinterland, policy instrumentation has a stronger tradition in public administration research, highlighting the effects of institutions as instruments are enrolled into actors' policies.

Considering the theoretical positions in museum policy, translation, and instrumentation research, three sets of broad propositions have guided my research. First, governments' choices of policy instruments in different regions and sectors are changing (Le Galès 2011). In particular, there has been an increase in the forms of instruments governments use due to the emergence of new modes of managing conduct, the hybridization of more traditional instruments, and an increase in partnerships with non-state actors (Issalys 2005). Government activity has become less hierarchical as instruments require the mobilization of a wide variety of actors in their construction and implementation, suggesting the emergence of a new collaborative governance (Salamon 2002). The first and foundational proposition of my research is, therefore: (1) Actors, such as cultural organizations, can interact with multiple policy instruments with diverse objectives in which they occupy multiple roles.

Second, following a sociological approach, instruments are institutions and may shape actor behavior in ways that are not necessarily intended. The multiple instruments with which an actor interacts may have a range of effects on the actor. Propositions regarding these potential effects are: (2.a) Instruments, including those that mobilize as well as target an actor, influence

power relations between the actor and the state. (2.b) Instruments, including those that mobilize as well as target an actor, have a range of unintended effects on the actor.

Third, translation research demonstrates actors can exert agency in their interactions with government instruments. Accordingly: (3.a) Actors can and do engage in translation activities, such as problematization and enrolment, in order to promote their interests. (3.b) Translations enroll actors into particular relationships that influence power dynamics between actors. Considering museum policy more specifically: (3.c) Those governing museums engage in a range of activities, such as policy attachment, to enroll actors into a translation according to their objectives.

Chapter Three

Methodological Approach: Theory Informed Design

3.1 Introduction

As explained in Chapters One and Two, my research aims to provide a detailed understanding of the complexities of community museum governance through a policy translation lens. It aims to understand the translation work of the provincial advisors and associations. I ask: how are community museum policies (re)created, (re)assembled, and coordinated?

Responding to this question and considering the methodological implications of policy translation, this chapter describes my methodological approach. It begins with four implications of ANT as they apply to my research design and scope. I also provide the research plan, including an outline of the methodology and actors studied. Taking a historical approach, I conducted a case study analysis of Ontario museum governance from the 1950s to 2019. To that end, I studied four groups of actors with an articulated responsibility for community museum governance in Ontario – that is, provincial museum advisors, the Ontario Museum Association, other museum associations, and articulated policies. To learn from these actors, I conducted semi-structured interviews, archival research, and document analysis. After outlining the research procedures for the interviews and work with documents, the final sections of this chapter describe the analysis and reflects on the limitations of the research.

3.2 Theory Informed Design

The theoretical underpinnings of policy translation make a qualitative research design most appropriate. Qualitative research is useful when exploring a relatively understudied issue to

provide a detailed understanding of complexity within context in ways that listen to individuals. According to Creswell (2013), qualitative research begins with the assumptions and use of the theoretical framework. There are four key implications of the sociology of translation and ANT that have informed my research approach.

First, while scholars take a wide range of approaches, ANT often provides social-historical or ethnographic accounts, sharing the mantra ‘follow the actors themselves.’ Latour describes the original intention of ANT scholars as “being faithful to the insights of ethnomethodology” because “actors know what they do and we have to learn from them not only what they do, but how and why they do it” (Latour 1999, 19). ANT scholars, therefore, conduct inductive research and follow the trajectory of actors to identify moments where particular movements are made. For example, Callon’s (1986a) seminal work outlining the elements of the sociology of translation uses a case study and gives a social-historical account of scallops in St Brieuc Bay, following the trajectory of the scallops, fishers, and scientists.

Case studies are a useful research strategy for examining contemporary phenomena within real-life contexts and, more specifically, in situations where there are no clear boundaries between phenomenon and context (Yin 2003). They are used within ANT to learn from actors, describing their trajectory and relationships. For example, Latour’s (1999) *Pandora’s Hope* contains case studies on the Amazon rainforest and Pasteur. As such, my research begins as a case study of Ontario community museum governance, tracing moments of translation and identifying relationships associated with governance from the 1950s to 2019.

Second, ANT approaches share the assumption that the local is all there is to be studied (Fenwick and Edwards 2005). Entities relevant to the actor network are associated with an entity or entities within the network. A relational ontology thereby guides my research, meaning I listened to the actors and enabled them to define the boundaries of museum policy in Ontario.

Considering heterogeneity and the range of relationships, my limited capacity to trace all possible connections and ontologies is a potential problem, leading to the question: which actors do I follow (Fenwick and Edwards 2005)?

Decisions were guided by the idea of black boxes and provincial-level translators. Notably, any actor relating other entities is a translator. A museum worker will translate and speak for policy at their institution. However, some actors translate and speak for policy on a broader scale. These provincial-level translators are the spokespeople who engage in translation to assemble a community museum policy for multiple museums and speak for it in their own language on behalf of community museums across Ontario. These translators are also black-boxed actor-networks, punctuated as a node within museum policy, which is also an actor-network. In particular, provincial museum advisors and association representatives are provincial-level translators that can act as a single actor but exist as actor-networks. The museum advisors exist through their relationships within government and with museums, while the association representatives exist through their relationships with other members of the association and museum community. I consider the relationships between these provincial-translators and actors outside their black box in relation to their work for community museums in Ontario.

In Ontario, the government has defined community museums with reference to their operating agency - that is, a nonprofit corporation, a council of a municipality, a public library board, a council of an Indian Band, or a conservation authority. According to the regulation guiding the community museum operating grant, a museum is an institution that is established for the "purpose of acquiring, conserving, studying, interpreting, assembling and exhibiting to the public for its instruction and enjoyment a collection of artifacts of historical interest" (R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 877). They have a definable site, an independent bookkeeping system, a statement of

purpose, a catalogued collection they own, a governing body solely responsible for the institution, and a curator. They are not art museums, established as temporary exhibition spaces, or community recreation centres.

Third, research methods both describe and produce reality (Law 2004). As I engage in the case studies, I, therefore, engaged in a process of translation. Due to the implications of a relational ontology and research as translation, my research acknowledges ontological heterogeneity. As Mol (2002) observed, researchers can encounter ontological multiplicity whereby different objects and worlds are enacted within one practice. For example, Mol's (2002) research into physicians' diagnoses and treatment demonstrated atherosclerosis was enacted differently in different contexts, such as the radiology department or the surgical theatre.

Finally, ANT invites researchers to avoid making assumptions. However, making choices as to what to study assumes particular categories. Choosing an entry point for a study is based on assumptions and creates bounds for the study (Fenwick and Edwards 2005). Accordingly, I have engaged in critical self-reflection to better understand the biases I bring to my research and the methods proposed herein to investigate the research problem (Johnson 1997). As I collect and translate data, my understanding of museums and cultural policy is informed by my experiences, practices, and education. I have a Bachelor of Art in Art History with a minor in Museum Studies as well as a Master's in Museum Studies. I have also worked and volunteered within museums as a student in various roles, including a collections assistant, researcher, manager, tour guide, and event organizer. My employers received funding through the Government of Canada's Young Canada Works program for my employment on three occasions. In those roles, I had previously met two of the research participants, but was never employed by or with a participant. While I have not worked in a museum or related institution during this

research project, I am a member of the Ontario Museum Association, Canadian Museums Association, and Ontario Historical Society. I also volunteered for the Friends of the Canadian War Museum, participating on their events committee.

3.3 Methods and Data

A case study approach calls for the collection of multiple forms of data. My research, therefore, involved semi-structured interviews, archival research, and the collection of related materials online or through other sources. Within this section, I build on the discussion of Ontario museum policy in Chapter One. I define the groups of actors involved in Ontario museum governance identified in my research. Following some of the foundational works in ANT (Callon 1986a; Latour 1988 1996 1999), my research takes a historical approach, considering museum policy translation from the 1950s to 2019. As such, I have relied on interviews and document analysis in order to learn from the actors themselves. After providing a detailed account of how I obtained the interview and textual data, this section concludes with a description of the data analysis.

3.3.1 Actors

There are four groups of actors with a self-defined responsibility for governing Ontario's community museum. While the actors do not necessarily use the term governing to describe their activities, they enact governance and, at times, have acted as spokespeople for museums in Ontario. In the language of ANT and policy translation, these actors are translators and spokespeople provincially in Ontario. They have direct relationships with museums and museum

workers. The groups have also been consulted as part of and/or involved in the development of the Government of Ontario's articulated policies targeting museums.

First, provincial museum advisors and conservators are provincial-level translators within the provincial government directly responsible for implementing museum policy in Ontario. The Government of Ontario began employing museum advisors in 1959 to provide technical advice and assistance as well as process the pre-existing operating grant for community museums. They began hiring conservators to advise museums on conservation issues in 1981, ending the practice around 2000. My research began with these actors, who then identified the other groups as significant within their pre-existing written problematizations of museum governance and interviews.

The second group includes representatives of the primary provincial museum association, the Ontario Museum Association (OMA). The OMA, established in 1971-1972, is a provincially and, at times, federally funded association with a mission to strengthen the capacity of individuals and institutions active in the Ontario museum sector. The Association is an actor-network represented through individuals, including executive directors, presidents and past presidents, committee members, employees, and OMA publications. Actors representing the OMA articulated a responsibility for museums in Ontario and also identified the other groups as significant to Ontario's community museums.

The third group includes actors that those within the first two groups frequently, but not always, identified as significant to community museum governance in Ontario. More specifically, group three includes translators with other service organizations - that is, the Ontario Historical Society (OHS), the Canadian Museums Association (CMA), and regional museum networks. As seen with the OMA there are a range of actors representing these organizations, such as executive directors and publications. The OHS was the earliest association for museums in

Ontario, taking an active interest in Ontario's community museums from the late 19th century and establishing a committee for museums in 1953. The CMA is a national museum association that has worked for and represented museums across Canada since 1947. There are also regional museum networks across Ontario, such as the Ottawa Museum Network, that were established at different points in time and play different roles. The actors within the third group consulted in my research reaffirmed the importance of the OMA and provincial advisors to museum governance.

Finally, there are non-human actors that engage in translation, enacting museum governance. In particular, regulations and policy documents govern the sector, assigning roles and responsibilities to other actors. The Province of Ontario has a provincial museum policy, standards for community museums, and a regulation governing an operating grant. The actors within the first three groups identified a range of non-human actors responsible for museum governance that I analyzed as part of my research.

In short, the four groups of actors consulted are the advisors, which includes museum advisors and conservators, the OMA, secondary service organizations, and governing documents. There are other actors that could have been included but were not identified as central to the governance of Ontario Museums by those consulted. For example, the federal government has a conservation service and project grants that museums in Ontario can access. These programs have or had consultants working with museums. However, actors within the other groups indicated there is no federal equivalent to the provincial advisors historically or contemporaneously. The four groups represent the researcher's own translation based on an understanding of actors' problematizations.

3.3.2 Interviews

3.3.2.1 Interview Participants

Research on the first three groups of actors relied primarily on interviews but also involved analyzing actors' communications, including publications, communications, and YouTube videos. According to the relational ontology of ANT and sociology of translation, I selected interviewees based on their relationship to museums in Ontario within three broad groups of human actors defined above. For a list of interview participants, see Appendix A. The interviews took place from 2017 to 2019, starting with the museum advisors.

For the first category of actors – that is, the provincial museum advisors, including the provincial conservators – I compiled a list of advisors from 1959 to 2017 as identified in correspondence and/or in interviews with other advisors. Due to the difficulties of tracking all short-term appointments, the list only includes those who worked as a museum advisor or conservators within two or more calendar years as confirmed in interviews and written documentation. The list includes 28 names, but at least three individuals were no longer living as of 2017. Using publicly available information and introductions from those already interviewed, I contacted 16 and interviewed 11 individuals identified as a conservator and/or museum advisor. I conducted follow up interviews with two of the advisors. The participant who worked as an advisor the longest worked in that position for 33 years. The participant who worked as an advisor the shortest had contract appointments in two calendar years. I also interviewed an additional individual due to their role in the OMA not included in this group who worked as advisor briefly within one calendar year. Of the advisors interviewed, all but one identified a direct relationship with the OMA and/or OHS as an employee, through committee work, or as an instructor.

For the second category, I conducted interviews with 15 people associated with the OMA, excluding the museum advisors who also worked or volunteered for the Association. I interviewed three of the six executive or managing directors and was unable to contact the three executive or managing directors I did not interview. I also interviewed nine of the OMA's 26 current or past presidents, including at least two presidents from each decade except the 1970s. I contacted 11 of the current or past presidents. I conducted three additional interviews with individuals who worked or volunteered for the OMA at the recommendation of OMA representatives already interviewed.

For the third category, I conducted seven interviews with eight people, excluding the museum advisors who played a volunteer role in this category. However, some of these interview participants are members of the first or second groups. An OMA executive director that I interviewed also served as the executive director of the CMA. He served as the CMA's executive director from 1981 to 2018. An OMA past president I interviewed also served as the president of the CMA. At the recommendation of an OMA executive director, I interviewed the executive director of a regional museum association who collaborates with the OMA. I interviewed the current director of the OHS with an OHS employee who works with museums. A past OHS director worked as a museum advisor and was interviewed in that capacity with questions on OHS activities as well. Those interviewed in the third group were contacted based on recommendations with one exception. I interviewed a director of a small nonprofit museum with a relationship to the OHS due to the museums' experiences with a highway sign policy.

To summarize, I interviewed a total of 29 individuals involved in the work of governing Ontario museums and one individual museum director to provide context on a specific policy issue. While the groups used to select participants were useful in conducting research and will

inform discussion, they are also limiting because actors often occupy multiple concurrent roles with the actor-networks. For instance, as noted above, it is not uncommon for a museum advisor to also be involved in the associations. Moreover, the interviewees are currently at different points in their careers and had careers before or after the role for which I interviewed them (see Appendix A). For example, Dorothy Duncan worked in a museum before becoming a museum advisor in 1975. After working as the museum section manager, she became the OHS' Executive director in 1982. In addition to listing interview participants, Appendix A includes information on actors' multiple memberships.

3.3.2.2 Interview Procedures

For all actor groups, I used the same procedures. After receiving approval from the Office of Research Ethics and Integrity at the University of Ottawa, I contacted interview participants primarily by email. A copy of the introductory email is available in Appendix B. In most cases, I used publicly available information. However, two participants did not have emails listed online. One participant was retired and no longer affiliated with the associations. I received his phone number through a research participant. Another participant only had their phone number listed online and I received their email through a research participant. Prior to the interview, participants received the Informed Consent Form (Appendix C) and were able to choose their level of anonymity. All interviews were conducted with the verbal and written consent of participants. While English was not the first language of all participants, all participants were fluent in English and conduct work in English.

I conducted semi-structured in-depth interviews with open-ended questions (see Appendix D) in person at a location of the participants' choosing or, in one case, over the telephone. The interviews were recorded digitally, transcribed verbatim by the researcher, and sent to the

participants once. Interviewees had the right to strike interview content and/or add to the transcript upon reflection. In some cases, I asked follow-up questions via email. I also conducted two follow-up interviews.

Once transcribed, the interviews were treated as documents and analyzed as described below. Importantly, the problematization within the interviews provides a narrative. Narratives are chronological succession of events bound together with principles of logical coherence and events that disrupt equilibrium (Franzosi 1998). The interviews and other documents were, therefore, analyzed as narrative problematizations.

3.3.3 Data Collection: Assembling Non-Human Actors and Intermediaries

Documents were collected and analyzed as both actors and intermediaries. As noted above, documents are the fourth category of actors that enroll museum policy, providing a problematization and translating entities to organize relationships. They are also translated and enrolled into museum governance by other actors. I accessed the policy, program, and other documents that actors within groups one, two, and three identified as significant to museum governance in Ontario, such as the museum standards and the regulation governing the grant program. I also accessed materials more broadly to support interview data. Non-human entities may function as an intermediary, passing between actors and thereby documenting moments of translation. Through texts, specific ontologies are constructed and performed while others are made invisible (Nimmo 2011). As such, I sought documents written and/or published by groups one, two, and three, such as correspondence, annual reports, presentations, and resources.

In order to access documents as actors and intermediaries in their various roles, I searched in libraries, archives, and online. I conducted archival research at the Archives of

Ontario, consulted the personal archives or received documents from select interview participants, and sought related documents through libraries, such as the ROM Library. Appendix E provides a list of the data collection work conducted. Data collection occurred in three overlapping stages. I collected data relating to group one then groups two and three, seeking data relating to group four throughout the process. This archival and documentary research began before and continued during the interviews, taking place from 2017 to 2018.

For the first group, I primarily conducted archival work. Museum advisor archival documents (1959 - 2006) include correspondence, briefing notes, internal memorandums, presentations, museum notes, and policy related publications. I obtained access to documents from 1997 and later through a freedom of information request with the Archives of Ontario. Additional documents were available through personal correspondence, online, and in libraries.

For the second group most of the documents were available through libraries and online. Some correspondence, meeting minutes, and funding related documents were available through the Archives of Ontario. The OMA related documents accessed for my research include correspondence (1971 - 2006), annual reports (1992 - 2017), *Currently* (1977 - 2008), the Newsletter and *Museum Quarterly* (1977 - 1990), special publications (1977 - 2019), reports and submissions (1974 - 2019), the website, *Ontario Museum Annual* (1992 - 1995), strategic plans (1986 - 2016), press releases and other messages (1983 - 2016), as well as other archival documents available through the museum advisors' records at the Archives of Ontario.

For the third group most of the documents were also available through libraries and online. However, I also accessed OHS documents through the Archives of Ontario. CMA documents are available through Library and Archives Canada but were not accessed for my research due to time and scope. The OHS related documents include the Museums Committee newsletters (1953 - 1984), Museum Workshop reports (1954 - 1970), special publications and

reports, the *OHS Bulletin* (1978 - 2019), *Ontario History* (1955 - 2019), and annual reports (2011 - 2017). CMA related documents include correspondence (1970s - 1990s), reports (1988 - 2018), annual reports (1984 - 2016), newspaper articles (1982 - 1995), *Muse* (1983 - 2019), factsheets (2009), *Museogramme* (1973 - 1994), *Gazette* (1967 - 1981), strategic reports (1981), and special publications.

Finally, I sought government documents identified as significant by the first three groups of actors more broadly through the Archives of Ontario and libraries. For example, I accessed the different regulations that have governed the Community Museum Operating grant (O. Reg. 57/57, O. Reg. 293/61, O. Reg 81/69, O. Reg 720/73, O. Reg. 837/74, O. Reg. 398/81, and O. Reg. 877). Other relevant documents include those associated with Wintario, the education curriculum, highway signs, the fire code, and accessibility legislation.

For all three groups, I digitized documentary sources using ScannerPro from multiple points of time to facilitate analysis. Considering the large volume of material, memoing was an important part of the process. Memos were used to record reflexive and descriptive notes throughout the process.

3.3.4 Data Analysis and Writing

As part of the data collection described above, I assembled transcripts, correspondence with participants, audiovisual materials, written documents relating to the four groups of actors, and the notes I wrote throughout the process. The data was organized into Scrivener as it was collected. Within this section, I outline the processes used in analysis and writing, following the theoretical orientation described above and in Chapter Two.

As seen in Latour's (1988) analysis tracing the development of pasteurization, an ANT approach that relies on historical texts records what each actor says of the other, which allows the investigator to follow transformation – that is, the translations, drifts, and diversions of writers. Importantly, human and non-human actors, such as policy documents, are treated symmetrically. The method enables scholars to trace the inter-definitions of actors, reflecting the problematization and interestment stages of translation.

Following Latour, I used the materials collected, such as the policy documents, the archival materials, and interview transcripts, to record what each actor says of the other, developing a list of entities or codes identified across actor problematizations as significant to museum governance. As I organized the data into Scrivener, I read the material and created an initial list of actors identified within museum governance. I then expanded on the list of actors as I recorded the problematization present within each text, recording what each actor said of the other. In order to facilitate comparison and analysis, I continued to (re)organize the data according to the source and actors defined, creating spreadsheet databases that organized the materials chronologically.

While developing lists of actors defined within materials, I grouped the data according to themes, such as the actors' type and role. Types of actors include private actors, nonprofit actors with different levels of government input, quasi government actors, and government actors. However, these distinctions proved less pertinent than themes that organized the data according to roles. Actor roles within museum governance broadly include funding, educational, advocacy, and regulatory. For example, the Museum Advisors defined themselves as both government actors and museum professionals who are members of the museum community. They identified several roles for themselves, such as educative or advocacy. In order to facilitate

theme analysis, I also organized the data according to the themes: translation activity, change, and power.

To guide analysis and the development of themes, I relied on the theoretical propositions derived from the literature as seen in Chapter Two, engaging in pattern matching. Explanation building is a pattern matching analytic technique, comprising a series of iterations. The first step involves making an initial proposition as seen in my review on policy translation. The research considers the findings of the case study in relation to the proposition, revising the proposition as necessary (Yin 2003).

I engaged in explanation building throughout my research, using writing as an analytical tool to determine the implications of the case study. For example, in order to develop a comprehensive understanding of museum governance as it developed through time, I wrote a detailed history of museum governance according to the translations of each actor group. Beginning with the first proposition – that is, actors can interact with multiple policy instruments with diverse objectives in which they occupy multiple roles – I was able to elaborate on the types of instruments and definitions of roles for policy instruments within museum governance, articulating common understandings amongst translator groups.

In addition to writing as a tool in explanation building, I created visual representations of the data according to the different actor groups. For example, throughout the research, I maintained multiple timelines of museum governance. I also created word maps that demonstrated all of the actors or types of actors mentioned in a particular year.

In short, data analysis involved recording what actors said about each other. I developed lists of entities enrolled in museum governance as actors and/or intermediaries, organizing data according to themes and engaging in explanation building. Data collection and analysis was

recursive and dynamic (Merriam and Tisdell 2015) with the analysis became increasingly intensive as the study progressed.

Importantly, I engaged in validation strategies as I collected and analyzed data. While acknowledging ontological heterogeneity and, as such, difference in translators' articulation of museum governance, I sought corroborating evidence through other sources where possible. I also provided some opportunities for feedback from selected interview participants, which allowed for member checking. Presenting aspects of my research at conferences and publishing on my findings (Nelson 2020b 2021 In Press), I engaged in external checks of the research process through peer review.

3.4 Conclusion: Limitations

In sum, my research involves interviews and archival analysis, following an ANT orientation in my research methods with a case study on community museum governance in Ontario from the 1950s to 2019. There are limitations to the approach. In particular, in learning from the actors the approach, by definition, excludes what the actors do not know. Time and resources have also bound my research, meaning I focused my research on specific relationships that recurred throughout actor translation. Focusing on recurring elements to some extent obscures the differences in individual translations. However, the approach has enabled me to learn from the actors governing museums in Ontario.

Chapter Four

The Evolution of Museum Governance: Case Study Analysis

4.1 Introduction

According to the Ontario Historical Society's Executive Director, Rob Levery (Interview, 2018), understanding the OHS' history is crucial to understanding who they are and what they still do today. Similarly, museum advisors and the Ontario Museum Association representatives interviewed discussed the significance of key moments in history to ongoing museum governance in Ontario. As a former museum advisor observed, "this is how it grew here; it grew differently here because we had different circumstances" (Interview, Graham 2017).

Considering consensus on a shared history and its importance, this chapter translates problematizations articulated in interviews and texts into a timeline, which describes Ontario community museum governance's evolution from the 1880s to 2019 as it is understood in a specific moment. While data collection focused on the 1950s to 2019, some actors interviewed, texts consulted, and secondary sources detailed significant developments from the 1880s that contributed to community museums' establishment across Ontario and calls for government policy. Within this timeline, I have identified key moments of change and resistance to change in governing actors as well as ongoing change as actors (re)negotiate roles, engaging in relationships through evolving mediators. The key moments of change described divide the evolution of Ontario museum governance into four periods, marked by the (re)creation of entities to govern community museums. The timeline considers all three levels of government because the intersecting and overlapping work of governments characterizes community museum governance, necessitating provincial museum advisors and professional associations to help museums navigate their complex policy environment.

The first period occurred prior to the development of provincial museum associations and Government of Ontario instruments targeting museums. During this period, the Ontario Historical Society (OHS) encouraged the development of community museums. The 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s then involved the creation of new actors – that is, a provincial museum grant, the OHS’s Museum Section, provincial museum advisors, the OMA, and a federal museum policy – to govern museums, focusing on training and improving existing institutions while continuing to encourage new museums. Consultation for an articulated provincial policy in 1978 marked the beginning of a third period, which focused on encouraging excellence in existing museums with the creation of standards and associated resources. However, the period was short-lived. Throughout the 1990s, governments reduced spending on museums and associations. The fourth and ongoing period is, therefore, defined by reduced federal and provincial roles. There is an increased emphasis on the local and a shift from museum policy toward broader cultural policies in government. The provincial museum advisors, therefore, have a reduced role and the associations have redefined their roles, emphasizing advocacy or capacity building, to address a perceived absence of government leadership.

Following the historical account of museum governance, the discussion comments on its institutionalist orientation. The timeline demonstrates shifts in museum governance according to the development of new actors, which then influence community museum development. In addition to explaining these moments, the description alludes to ongoing forms of change that community museums face. The ongoing change reinforces the need for advisors and/ or associations, distinguishing community museum governance from provincial and national institutions’ governance. However, the sequential ordering of events into a readable timeline also limits understanding of the dynamic nature of multi-level governance, providing a starting point for discussion rather than a complete description.

4.2 The Evolution of Museum Governance: From Museum to Heritage to Cultural Policy

4.2.1 *Development and Encouragement: Development through Local Initiative, Encouragement through the OHS (1880s - 1953)*

Ontario community museums begin to appear as historical society museums in 1892. At that time, there were no federal or provincial interventions guiding or supporting their development, but some museums received support from their individual municipalities (Miers and Markham 1932). Community museums also received encouragement and advice from the Ontario Historical Society.

Historical societies founded the OHS in 1888, establishing three roles for themselves in relation to Ontario's community museums - that is, publishing, incorporation, and advocacy (Nelson In Press). The Province supported their activities and gave the OHS a \$500 grant in 1898 to start *Ontario History*, which publishes articles concerning Ontario's past. Then, the Province passed *An Act to Incorporate the Ontario Historical Society*, giving the OHS the power to incorporate affiliates. As they worked to publish articles related to Ontario's history and incorporate affiliated historical societies, the OHS also advocated for a provincial museum. However, in 1912, *An Act to provide for the Establishment of a Provincial Museum* established the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM) as a provincial museum not devoted to provincial heritage. In response, the OHS began more actively encouraging new historical societies with museums to preserve Ontario's history (Duncan 1988). By 1932, the OHS had 23 affiliates and 15 of those operated museums, which represented over 10% of recorded museums open to the public in Canada at the time (Miers and Markham 1932).

In short, community museums in Ontario developed in the late 1800s and early 1900s due to local action encouraged by the OHS with limited governance on a provincial level. For

example, the Waterloo Historical Society (WHS) was an OHS affiliate operating a museum during this period, which developed with the OHS' encouragement. In 1912, an individual proposed founding a local historical society to the local library board. The Board approved the proposal and recommended contacting the OHS president. At a public meeting, the OHS' president then provided advice and encouraged the development of a museum as part of the Historical Society. The WHS became an affiliate and began operating a museum in the local library with the help of a municipal grant.¹

Table 4.1: A Timeline of Museum Governance: A Period of Development and Encouragement

Year	Moment
1888	OHS founded
1889	<i>An Act to Incorporate the Ontario Historical Society</i>
1912	<i>An Act to provide for the Establishment of a Provincial Museum</i>

4.2.2 Unwritten and Enthusiastic: Unwritten Policies, Enthusiastic Governance (1953 – 1978)

Within the second period, community museum governance became more dynamic with the introduction of new actors. The provincial and federal governments began encouraging the development of museums in support of municipal action. In particular, the Province reformed existing programs to provide a museum operating grant and museum advisors, encouraging the establishment of museums across the province. Advisors interviewed characterize this period by the emphasis on fieldwork to help the relatively isolated museums and the lack of written policy

¹ They also received a provincial grant for their publications. The history of the WHS is outlined in detail in Tivy, (2006). A brief history of the Society is available online (Waterloo Historical Society n.d.). The Society outlined the development of the association in their annual reports (Waterloo Historical Society 1913-1940).

for them to follow. For example, the first manager stated, “there was nothing written. We made it up as we went along, and we did what we thought was right ... within the parameters of professional knowledge of the day” (Interview, Styrmo 2017).

At the time, there were few museum professionals in Ontario.² Museum workers lacked training, museum facilities were insufficient, and, compounding these problems, new museums continued to open in isolation. They were most often small, run by volunteers, and surviving on nominal budgets. The advisory service aimed to assemble resources to address these issues. At the same time, the OHS developed a Museums Section in 1953. The Canadian Museums Association had formed at a meeting of the American Association of Museums in Quebec in 1947 but did not become active in training until the 1960s.³ Workers who participated in the OHS and CMA formed the Ontario Museum Association in 1971-1972. Like the advisors, these groups focused on improving the quality of Ontario’s museums, working to connect museums to what they needed.⁴

² There was a lack of trained museum professionals across the country. The 1951 Massey Report observes, “The authors of the Report devoted much of their attention to the absence from Canadian museums of trained curators whose services they regarded as of the very first importance. Only about twenty of Canada’s museums at that time possessed competent well-trained curators (36). The Report also notes that local museums work under “discouraging conditions.” (31)

³ The CMA began in 1947 at a meeting of the American Museum Association in Quebec. They aimed to advance museum services, promote the welfare and better administration of museums, as well as improve the qualifications and practices of museum professionals (Withrow 1987). They circulated information through their publications and training was a key objective for the first three decades. However, the CMA began to phase out its basic training in the 1970s and advocacy became the major goal for the Association (Young 1997). As the Executive Director of the CMA from 1980 to 2018, John McAvity, noted, “The CMA is primarily the national advocate for museums and the advancement of museums.” They advocate for museums broadly at the national level, looking at policy but also needs assessments and funding solutions to problems (Interview, McAvity 2017).

⁴ The creation of these provincial and national groups reflected a growing concern with training in museums internationally. The International Council of Museums was created in 1946. Further, as noted in the footnote above, the CMA began at an American Museum Association (AMA) meeting in Quebec in 1947. The AMA had formed much earlier in 1906.

4.2.2.1 *1950s and 1960s*

In 1953, the OHS became more explicitly involved in community museum governance when museum workers formally organized a museums committee, which became the Museum Section in 1956 and the Museums Committee in 1985.⁵ The Museum Section's purpose was to "ascertain the needs and desires of the museums of the province, establish standards, exchange ideas, disseminate information and unite all in a fellowship of museums" (Taylor 1962, 2). Originally, they did so through three tasks. They published a newsletter, offered training opportunities to address museum problems, and prepared a list of local museums for the provincial government (Nelson In Press).

The same year, the Province of Ontario provided the first official provincial operating grants to municipal museums through the Department of Education's Community Programmes Branch, which already provided funding for recreational programs.⁶ The Department passed a revised regulation for their grant program with a subsection on museums, allowing for up to \$1,000 in funding to municipal councils that appropriated funds for a museum they owned and opened to the public.⁷ Responsibility for the museum program moved to the Department of

⁵ They were established at an OHS conference. They aimed to assist local museums in every possible way (Local Museums Committee 1953).

⁶ They awarded a combined total of \$3,000 to five municipal museums. The Regulation governing the grant - Ontario Regulation 57/57: Programmes of Recreation - passed under the Department of Education Act in 1957, which gave the Minister of Education the authority to make regulations providing funding for "the maintenance of historical, literary and scientific institutions" and "programmes of adult education."

⁷ To access the grant, the municipalities corresponded with the Branch's regional representatives who determined eligibility. In order to administer the grants, the Branch's 13 field representatives sent the "Application for Grant and Financial Statement of Museum" to eligible municipalities each year. The representatives communicated with municipal clerks to ascertain eligibility and ensure the applications, which simply asked for financial information, were completed correctly. They confirmed the museums' opening hours and owning authority, circulating a longer survey every five years with sections on housing, financing, the nature of material on display, staff, programming, and general comments. Once the municipalities submitted the application, which asked for financial information, the

Travel and Publicity's new Historical Branch in 1957, which became part of the Department of Tourism and Information in 1964. During that time, the grant changed with the inclusion of conservation authorities⁸ and Indian Band Councils⁹ as eligible owning organizations.

The Department began hiring a museum advisor in 1959 to administer the grant program. The advisors encouraged museums to apply, determined where to send the applications, and contacted the museum or municipality if there were any errors in their submissions. More importantly, the advisor began providing technical advice and assistance to community museums across the province. Previously, the Community Programmes Branch had offered some basic assistance, communicating with the OHS on museum issues. However, they lacked a specialist in museums.¹⁰ The new museum specialist was able to provide a range of museum specific assistance, such as writing master plans or, after expanding to include a second advisor with a specialty in exhibition design, exhibition planning.

The advisors' expertise was increasingly needed in the 1960s as government programs encouraged the establishment of new museums. In 1963, the Province had added an establishment grant to the museum grant regulation, which provided a maximum grant of

representatives checked the calculations and forwarded them to the central office or returned them to the municipality for correction. The Branch then checked for the accuracy of calculations but trusted the representative as to the eligibility requirements. Correspondence and forms relating to this period are available in: Rg5-15 B398335 13.24. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁸ The 1946 *Conservation Act* allows municipalities with a shared watershed to petition the Province to form a Conservation Authority. The conservation authorities are corporate bodies that manage natural resources and, at times, the historic sites or museums on their land.

⁹ The 1876 *Indian Act* established Indian Band Councils as a governing actor with responsibilities representing and governing First Nations in Canada.

¹⁰ The Branch provided technical advice related to theatre, art and crafts, music, social recreation and recreation in rural areas, parent education, group discussions and forums, use of radio in local programmes, as well as citizenship training. Additional information on the Branch's existing advisory service is available in: RG2-74-4 B229473. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

\$2,000 for newly established museums.¹¹ During the 1960s, the Province also partnered with the federal government to provide funding for municipalities engaged in centennial projects, including the “construction or restoration of libraries, museum buildings, concert halls and other buildings of historical significance.”¹² Due in part to the availability of capital funding, the number of museums in the provincial program, receiving a grant and advisory services, then increased from 27 museums in 1959 to 101 museums in 1969.

The existing associations responded to the increased number of museums with the development of resources and training opportunities, working alongside the advisors. In particular, the CMA received centennial funding to establish a permanent secretariat in 1966. The OHS’ Museums Section received a special annual grant from the Province to assist with their annual training conference in the 1950s and 1960s.¹³ These associations were then expected to play a role in training museum workers, improving the sector. However, they were new and underdeveloped, so museum workers (particularly those from well-resourced museums) also sought assistance from associations outside of Canada, such as the United Kingdom’s Museums Association and the American Association of Museums.

To summarize, during the 1950s and 1960s, documents governing museums began defining a supportive role for government in community museum governance. In particular, the Province and municipal governments had a role in providing operating support to museums that emerged from local action. While the Province initially limited its support to municipal

¹¹ A history of the grant program is available in: RG47-51 B101712 policy papers I. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

¹² The shared Centennial Grants Programme aimed to “promote interest in, to plan, to implement programmes and to encourage municipalities to carry out local centennial projects of a lasting nature.” To that end, the governments passed the Confederation Centennial Act and National Centennial Act. See: Federal- Provincial Centennial grants programme December 27, 1963. Rg47-51 B101635 centennial grants program. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

¹³ It was a miscellaneous grant through the department responsible for museums at the time.

museums, the program expanded to include conservation authorities and Indian Band Councils as owning agencies. Both the federal and provincial governments also encouraged museum development with funding to construct or restore museum buildings. At the same time, they supported the associations and museum advisors who were concerned with the quality of the growing quantity museums. Provincial support did not continue to increase proportionately to the increasing number of museums they encouraged. Concerned with the expanding budget, a treasury order froze the total operating grant allocation at \$96,000 in 1969, necessitating prorata reductions to museum grants in 1970 and 1971.

Table 4.2: A Timeline of Museum Governance: Unwritten and Enthusiastic (1950s-1960s)

Year	Moment
1953	OHS forms a Museums Committee/ Section Provincial operating grants to municipal museums officially begin
1957	Historical Branch formed
1959	First provincial museum advisor hired
1963	Establishment grant created
1965	Number of museum advisors begins to increase.
1966	CMA establishes a secretariat
1967	Canadian centennial
1969	Museum operating grant frozen through treasury order

4.2.2.2

1970s

The 1970s saw a redefinition of both federal and provincial support to community museums in Ontario, beginning with the articulation of federal cultural and museum policies.¹⁴ As actors negotiated and responded to new federal initiatives, the Province worked to more clearly define their own role in culture with a new Ministry and associated programs, increasing the number of

¹⁴ The Secretary of State, Gerrard Pelletier, outlined a federal cultural policy of democratization, decentralization, pluralism, federal-provincial cooperation, and international cooperation in 1970. A new museum policy was one component of this plan.

museum advisors and funding to museums. The advisors began working with a new service organization when members of the OHS' Museum Section and CMA formed the Ontario Museum Association (OMA) as a provincial organization devoted exclusively to museum workers. Museum governance, therefore, continued to encourage the creation of new museums with the availability of funding, but an increasing number of actors worked to assemble, (re)define, and (re)develop resources to improve the quality of community museums.

At the federal level, the Secretary of State and the National Museums of Canada (NMC) circulated progressively more detailed museum policies in 1972 and 1973,¹⁵ leading to the *National Museum Policy: A Programme for Canadian Museums* (1973). The federal programs and provincial definitions of those programs evolved throughout the 1970s as provincial and federal actors engaged in translation, aiming to redefine roles for the federal policy's three main programs - that is, the creation of a museum network to circulate exhibitions with associate museums and exhibition centers, funding programs available to community museums, and the creation of new institutions supporting museum work broadly. The establishment of the federal project grants – that is, the Museums Assistance Program – and the creation of the Canadian Conservation Institute are of particular importance to community museums in Ontario, changing

¹⁵ Despite the cultural policy of pluralism and decentralization, action related to museums was centralized and not broadly accessible to Canadians across the country. As such, Pelletier worked to define a national museum policy with democratization and decentralization as the core tenants in 1970-1971, holding a national forum on museum policy in 1970 (See files available in: MG28 L189 VOL 22. Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa). Pelletier announced the National Museums Policy in a speech to the Canadian Club of Calgary in March 1972. The speech was reprinted and circulated in the Canadian Museums Association's *Gazette* in April the same year.

The federal government had passed the *National Museums of Canada Act* in 1969, creating a corporation to run the national museums. The National Museums of Canada or National Museums Corporation (NMC) became responsible for implementing the federal museum policy. The NMC circulated a summary of the policy's components with funding amounts, information on the decision-making structure, and the application process in July 1972. They then released a more detailed booklet on the policy, its component, and eligibility in 1973, including definitions and expectations for museums.

the configuration of community museum governance. These federal activities provoked greater attention to culture at the provincial level.

The provincial museum advisors disputed the national policy's claim that its programs would help small museums, highlighting Ontario museums' lack of capacity to access federal funding.¹⁶ They recommended provincial services expand to benefit smaller institutions with limited capacity. Enabling the advisors to push for these changes, provincial responsibility for museums moved to a new Cultural Affairs Division under the Ministry of Colleges and Universities in 1973. Under the new Ministry, the museum section manager hired two additional Toronto-based advisors and opened a northern office in Sault Ste. Marie with two advisors. The help they provided continued to be reactive, unstructured, and dependent on each individual case.¹⁷ However, the advisors began to develop documents that addressed common problems faced when starting a museum¹⁸ and were able to connect museums with additional financial resources.

The advisors successfully argued for an increase in the provincial operating grant program to a maximum of \$72,000, the inclusion of nonprofit museums as eligible organizations, and the implementation of a \$5,000 development grant. The total operational grant budget increased by 800% from 1972 to 1975, with the number of new applicants increasing by only

¹⁶ The Historical and Museums Branch (1973) wrote a *Suggested Program for the Development of Local Museums in Ontario*, which made recommendations on how the Government of Ontario could "plug into" the Federal activities. It defined the new federal programs as beneficial to larger museums with pre-existing reasonable facilities, space, and continued financial support. To that end, it called for the development of standards, which occurred ten years later. The document successfully argued for an expansion of the museum advisory service, which briefly used funding from the Outreach Ontario Program to open a Sault Ste. Marie office with two advisors for northern Ontario.

¹⁷ Sometimes the museum would not even be open when the advisors arrived or the advisors would surprise a curator who had expected a letter in response (Interview, Duncan 2017).

¹⁸ See for example: Museums Section (1977)

35%. Further, the museum establishment grant, first introduced as a \$2,000 grant for newly established museums in 1963, became a \$5,000 grant purportedly due to a notation error.¹⁹ The museum advisors facilitated access to these new grants, encouraging existing museums to use the development grant to winterize so they could extend opening hours.²⁰

The increases and changes to the services for museums happened without the guidance of an articulated cultural or museum policy at the provincial level. However, the Secretary for Social Development agreed on guidelines for the development of a cultural policy in 1973, calling on the Province to encourage initiatives without becoming the focus of decision making.²¹ To that end, the Province passed the *Ministry of Culture and Recreation Act*, the *Ontario Heritage Act*, and the *Ontario Lottery Corporation Act* in 1974-1975. The new Ministry aimed to advance and encourage responsible citizenship through cultural development, including the preservation of cultural heritage. The *Ontario Heritage Act* designates the Minister of Culture and Recreation as responsible for determining the “policies, priorities and programs for the conservation, protection and preservation of the heritage of Ontario” (1174). The objectives of these acts were initially supported through funding made possible by the *Ontario Lottery Corporation Act*, which states revenue from the lottery was to be “available for the promotion and development of physical fitness, sports, recreational and cultural activities and facilities therefor” (1237).²²

¹⁹ See: Styrmo, V.N. 1976. Memorandum to Mrs. Maureen Price. RG47-51 B101712 unlabeled file. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

²⁰ See attachments to: McQuat, D.F. 1972, August. Memorandum to Mr. H. Walker. RG47-51 B328429 museum grant legislation. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

²¹ According to the guidelines, the province’s objectives should be to ensure creative and participatory cultural development in Ontario. See: Provincial Secretary for Social Development. 1973, November. Extract from: Report of the Cabinet Committee on Social Development. RG47-43 B128969 2752-4. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

²² For a detailed description of the Ministry’s establishment and its connection to the lottery grants see Files (1991).

Lottery funding led to Wintario in 1975, which used fluctuating lottery revenues to support community initiated, publicly accessible special projects from local groups. The Ministry provided matching grants for capital and non-capital projects with funding programs for heritage conservation, which museums could access.²³ The non-capital program evolved as the Ministry added, eliminated, and changed the categories according to communities' understood needs and priorities. For example, in 1975, the heritage conservation categories to promote excellence were: building conservation, heritage conservation district studies, archaeological projects, and communications.²⁴ By 1980, the heritage conservation component included more categories of relevance to museum work - that is, exhibits and events, fiscal development and/or visitation, conservation and recording, acquisition for collections, visiting heritage specialists, as well as resource material development. The capital grant funded new museum buildings, expansions, and improvements.²⁵ Museums were able to access the capital grant in conjunction with grants offered through MAP.²⁶

The Wintario grant categories and project approval process led to conflict for museums and advisors. Some museums and museum workers complained because the categories did not address the specific needs of museums. For example, the acquisition category was originally

²³ Under the leadership of a Deputy Minister, a committee rushed to establish guidelines and criteria for Wintario according to the principles of the Ministry of Culture and Recreation Act. People from different areas of the Ministry were asked to quickly submit a list of possible projects, which were placed into broad categories and evolved over time. See, for example, files available in: Rg47-46 b278553 4360-1; Rg47-46 b206468; RG47-51 B101712 policy papers III. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

²⁴ Museums were able to use the non-capital grants to fund research projects. See, for example, documents in: Rg47-51 B110105 Brant County. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

²⁵ See, for example, files in: RG47-49 B126662 13360-1; Rg47-49 B126662 13376-2. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

²⁶ According to provincial descriptions, the purpose of the federal granting program - that is, the Museum Assistance Program (MAP) - was to provide funding to upgrade museum standards with a focus on the physical plant so museums could receive exhibitions. While the circulation of exhibitions was not a provincial priority, the Wintario program did not have clear objectives for museum projects beyond supporting local action.

created to mirror a similar category for art galleries, but the requirements did not account for museums' different purchasing practices and the funding was, therefore, more difficult to access.²⁷ Wintario would also, at times, support museum projects without the approval and involvement of the advisors, resulting in museums perceived as substandard with an expectation of support. Compounding the issue, museums also accessed grants through the national museum policy and federal short-term employment programs, which "helped create museums without apparent concern for the burden of upkeep placed upon the province or municipalities" (Heritage Administration Branch 1979). Museums, anxious to take advantage of the available programs, did not account for the long-term funding required to operate a community museum, such as the cost of a permanent curator.²⁸

As governments support increased, their interests seemed fragmented to museums, leading to as much resentment as gratitude expressed through the associations.²⁹ With an

²⁷ See, for example: Heritage Conservation Division. 1978, February. Wintario Non-capital Heritage Categories. RG47-46 B206468 Heritage Conservation. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

²⁸ While the advisors describe the federal employment programs as having adverse effects, they do not define all employment programs negatively. They also worked to enroll other government programs to benefit museums. For example, the Ontario Youth Secretariat administered the Experience program, beginning in summer 1973. It funded a range of positions through 24 Provincial ministries in addition to regular summer hiring. Initially, museums could access student employees through the Ministry of Culture and Recreation's general program for nonprofit community-based organizations. Then, the advisors administered a program for museums under the experience program's umbrella from the summer of 1974 to the summer of 1979. The funded students helped museums with cataloguing and received training from the museum advisors to encourage museums to standardize cataloguing. For the first five years, the museum advisors assigned students to participating museums in teams of three. Then, in 1979, the employment extended to research projects. There were also shifts in the broader Experience program, changing the program for museums. The changes placed more onerous on the museums as students now applied directly to museums, which were invited to design projects based on their individual needs and were responsible for student supervision. The advisors fought against changes in the program, including a reduction in support from 100% to 75%. However, in 1980, the Youth Secretariat amalgamated the cataloguing program into the Ministry's general program, which was transferred to the Field Services division. For more information on the program see, for example, files available in: RG47-18. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

²⁹ The president of the OMA wrote a letter to the Minister, stating: "Interest is fragmented, allowing for methods of funding that often seem to thwart fair and well-directed support and which, when taken in the context of the whole cultural arena, cause perhaps as much resentment as gratitude." See: Inglis, R 1974, September. Letter to the

increasing number of volunteer run institutions without experience operating museums, there was a need for training in addition to the OHS' Museum Section's annual workshops and the reactive, individualized work of the advisors. Museum workers met in 1971 to establish the Province's first organization dedicated exclusively to museums, holding the OMA's inaugural meeting in April 1972. As the number of museums in Ontario continued to grow, they saw the need for an organization that did not work for the proliferation of museums, "but rather excellence, and concentrated interest on existing institutions" (Roberts 1972). The OMA's original objectives were, therefore, to disseminate information, implement training programs, represent museums to governments, provide assistance to museums, and aid in the improvement of museums (Jordan 1972).³⁰

Members of the OMA worked quickly to conceive of and offer a training program, providing seminars in their first year co-sponsored with the CMA. The National Museum Policy and funding through MAP changed the CMA's relationships within museum governance, encouraging provincial museum associations' rather than the national Association's role in training.³¹ The OMA received a grant and hired a training coordinator. Reflecting the advisors' work, the content was not standardized, there was no set curriculum, and the courses were reactive, devised in direct response to requests or current concerns.

As the federal government funded a training program, the provincial government began supporting the OMA as an advocacy organization. Starting in 1974, the OMA received funding

Honorable James Auld. Rg47-58 B100616 museums - Ontario museums policy. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

³⁰ Members articulated a need to get together on a non-institutional level to discuss problems, exchange ideas, share resources, and formulate policy (Jordan 1972).

³¹ In view of emerging provincial programs and the cost of providing training nationally, the CMA became further removed from providing training and articulated a role for themselves as a training resource center (Canadian Museums Association 1977).

from the Province for an office, staff, and committee on museum affairs. The President of the OMA hoped that museum workers could control their own destiny through the Association, helping to establish government priorities and directing funding in more practical ways (Machell 1978). Advocacy was, therefore, an important though less visible role for the Association from the beginning (Interviews, Baeker 2017; McAvity 2017).

The OMA submitted *A Museum Policy for Ontario* to the Ministry in 1975 (Inglis et al. 1975).³² In response, the Ministry convened a task force on the Brief, which quickly developed a final report without sharing the recommendations with the OMA or community museums more broadly. The Report defines a role for the OMA in Ontario museum governance – that is, providing a focal point for the Province to seek advice and information relating to Ontario museums.³³ At the same time, the Task Force rejected the OMA's recommendations for the development of a museum program. In particular, they argued there was no need for an articulated museum policy because of the existence of the 1973 guidelines (Task Force on the Ontario Museum Association Brief 1975). However, the guidelines noted an absence and called for the development of a cultural policy.

The second period ends in about 1978 and is marked by two distinct views. According to a museum advisor from 1964 to 1981 (Interview, Styrmo 2017), everything he had built was being destroyed, the heritage profile had slipped dramatically in provincial importance, and there was

³² The OMA submitted a proposed museum policy in 1975, collaborating with the OHS Museum Section and the Ontario Association of Art Galleries. Their recommendations included the creation of a museum policy, an interministerial committee on museums, a museum advisory board, a new operational grant with performance measurement, a capital grants program, a special project grant, and a provincial museum. They also asked for a review of the provincial program for museums. The province did not send the OMA a response to the brief and discussions ceased until 1978 when representatives met with Ministry staff about deconditionalization, leading to renewed discussions on a museum policy.

³³ In particular, the Brief noted their membership included the expertise to be a spokesperson for museums

little Provincial interest in once again increasing funding. However, there was also a renewed interest in developing an articulated and comprehensive provincial policy that would make museums strive for excellence rather than encourage new museum development. While calls for standards are evident as early as 1953, policy discussions gained traction in 1978 because standards addressed several core issues the Ministry, advisors, and associations identified.

First, the provincial and federal programs had contributed to an increase in the number and/or size of museums without ensuring their quality. At the same time, there were more people with training in museology due to the University of Toronto's Masters' in Museum Studies, which started as a partnership with the Royal Ontario Museum in 1969,³⁴ and the associations' training programs. While these trained professionals disliked the substandard practices in certain museums, professionalism was not widespread, and museums continued to be in poor condition. As an advisor from 1980 to 2013 stated, the collections "were moldering away...there's stuff that's gone because you would go in and it was covered with mold" (Interview, J. Carter 2017). The advisors and associations, therefore, identified an urgent need to help these museums care for cultural patrimony properly through training and the improvement of museum environments.³⁵

Second, despite contributing to the rise in the number of museums, the federal and provincial governments were reluctant to implement corresponding increases in expenditures.³⁶

³⁴ The graduates of the museum studies program held several leadership roles in the 1980s. For example, the third manager of the museum advisors – Marty Brent – graduated from the program. Greg Baeker, the OMA's second Executive Director, graduated from the program and so did Gillian Watts who worked as the conservation coordinator from 1981.

³⁵ Policy development was not done "as a kind of make work project. It was done to make the community museums in Ontario better. It was done to improve the staffing. It was done to improve practices. It was done to improve collections" (Interview, J. Carter 2017).

³⁶ In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the CMA more regularly discussed financial constraints and government cuts to museums and museum services.

The Ministry had a perceived responsibility to continue to support the museums it had helped establish and/or funded since the 1950s. However, they did not want “too many mouths to feed.”³⁷ An articulated policy allowed for the re-allocation of their scarce resources to benefit existing institutions, discouraging new, allegedly substandard museums from entering the program.

Third, there was an increased call for accountability within government and a need to justify funding programs within an environment of fiscal restraint. The provincial treasurer and a municipal reforms committee had both threatened the operating grant with calls for deconditionalization in 1974 and 1978 respectively. Deconditionalization involved eliminating or reducing conditional grant payments to municipalities to simplify transfer payments, meaning the museum operating grant budget would be incorporated into one larger transfer payment. Standards provided “the opportunity to secure funding through the Ministry by demonstrating that museums were able to meet an increased standard of excellence” (Interview, Participant A 2017).

Finally, the articulation of a policy involved a (re)assertion of the provincial primacy in cultural matters. By the end of the 1970s, the NMC redefined federal roles with the understanding that provinces were demanding more autonomy in cultural matters. While also asserting municipal responsibility, the Ministry defined a provincial role as leader in museum governance. The argument defines museums and other cultural activities as educational, and the British North America Act defines provincial responsibility in education.

³⁷ See: Baetz, Reiben C. 1979, November. Notes for a speech to the annual conference of the OMA. Rg47-51 B101712 unlabeled. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

Table 4.3: A Timeline of Museum Governance: Unwritten and Enthusiastic (1970s)

Year	Moment
1972	National museum policy announced OMA inaugural meeting
1973	<i>National Museum Policy: A Programme for Canadian Museums</i> Cultural Affairs Division created, leading to an expansion of the museum advisory service Provincial guidelines for the development of a cultural policy
1974	Ministry of Culture and Recreation Act Ontario Heritage Act Ontario Lottery Corporation Act Provincial treasurer calls for the deconditionalization of museum grants
1975	Wintario <i>A Museum Policy for Ontario</i> (OMA Brief)
1978	Municipal reforms committee calls for the deconditionalization of museum grants

4.2.3 Quality and Accountability: Quality through Policy, Accountability with Standards (1978-1990)

The next period is from 1978 to 1990 and is characterized by the development of written policy at the provincial level as well as extensive consultation at both levels of government.³⁸ As the 1970s grew to a close, the Ministry began to require more paperwork and justification for action from the advisors. The advisors began working to establish standards, taking the lead on policy development. The subsequent release of a policy in 1981 and standards in 1984 led to a (re)concentration of assistance from the advisors and associations.

³⁸ The federal government invited comments as part of the Applebaum- Hebert Federal Cultural Policy Review (1982), the National Museums Search Conferences (1985), the Bovey Task Force on the Funding of the Arts (1986), the Danby Task Force on Art Gallery Funding (1985), the Richard-Withrow Task Force on Museums (1986), as well as committee and comprehensive government responses to the reviews. As the federal government defined a reduced federal role, the provincial government more actively worked in community museum governance, asserting their leadership in heritage and museum matters. They held consultations as part of museum policy and standards developments, reviews of the lottery grant program, and a review of the Ontario Heritage Act. The consultations led to an increase in action and implementation in Ontario community museum governance, including the release of a provincial policy for community museums, a revised grant regulation, standards for museums, a provincial conservation program, and a new project grant for cultural facilities.

Using the OMA's 1975 brief as a starting point, the OMA and Ministry staff discussed provincial action in a series of meetings in the late 1970s and early 1980s. After circulating *Ontario's community Museum Programme: Directions for the 1980's* (1980) and *Guidelines for Museums Making Initial Application for a Museum Operating Grant* (1979), the advisors held two rounds of community meetings to ask for feedback on the proposed direction.³⁹ The Minister of Culture and Recreation, Reuben Baetz, announced the *Community Museums Policy for Ontario* on June 23, 1981. The advisors then developed standards based on the guidelines and feedback they received, holding additional meetings in 1983 and presenting proposed standards at the provincial associations' annual meetings.⁴⁰ The advisors once again reviewed the comments from the consultations before releasing the finalized standards for community museums in 1984. The Standards included requirements relating to research, collection records management, staff training and professional development, exhibition, interpretation and education programs, as well as conservation.

The new policy and regulation governing the museum operating grant tied the Standards to funding as an eligibility requirement.⁴¹ The advisors began requiring new museums entering

³⁹ Using the paper and guidelines as a starting point for discussion, the advisors facilitated 17 community meetings in Spring 1980 with 289 persons attending from the museum community. For a description of the process, see: Duncan, Dorothy. 1980, July. Report on Community Meetings. RG47-51 B101712 policy papers I. Archives of Ontario, Toronto. For copies of the circulated documents, see files in: Rg47-51 B101712; RG47-51 B101717. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁴⁰ There were an additional 16 regional meetings in Fall 1983 to introduce the Standards and receive client feedback. There were 200 to 350 museum workers, board members, as well as municipal clerks and councilors in attendance. While the Ministry invited written submissions as well, the response was minimal. See: History, Museums, and Administration. 1984, January. Update on MCC Standards for community Museums. RG47-51 B310103 standards for community museums. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁴¹ Due to the challenges involved in meeting the Standards, the province began providing operational funding to smaller museums through the Heritage Organization Development Grant (HODG), which had fewer requirements for organizations receiving funding. As such, museums that were unable or unwilling to meet the Standards continued to receive some financial assistance.

the program meet the Guidelines.⁴² Museums already in the program were asked to submit documentary evidence they were meeting the Standards over a period of ten years. For example, prior to the release of the Standards, between 1981 and 1983, museums submitted their statement of purpose (1981), collections management policy (1982), and conservation policy (1983). The Standards then laid out additional requirements from 1984 to 1990. For example, by 1985, museums were expected to achieve all collection record management and staff training requirements. They were also asked to have an exhibition policy, meet the storage requirement, as well as meet the relative humidity and temperature recording requirement.⁴³

With growing expectations for museums and, therefore, increasing budgets, museums expected corresponding increases in their operating grants, adhering to a new formula outlined in the grants' regulation (O. Reg. 398/81). However, the budget for the program did not increase proportionally. In 1983, the Government of Ontario invoked a pro-rata reduction to museums' expected funding levels, which resulted in a negative political reaction. Museum workers and OMA representatives wrote the Minister and spoke publicly about the reductions. A 1984 amendment, therefore, redefined the open-ended formula in the grant regulation, establishing a base level grant for all museums receiving funding. The grants were then adjusted annually for inflation with the same multiplication factor applied to all eligible applicants with some

⁴² Meeting the guidelines did not guarantee that a museum would be allowed into the program. In 1992, a museum forwarded a memo to the advisors, listing everything they had done to meet the Standards. The list included 29 items, including planning, capital projects, training, and policy development. In 1996, they received a letter indicating they would remain on the waiting list. The documents are available in: Rg47-41 b932834 Toronto Sesquicentennial Museum. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁴³ The 1985 application includes eleven attachments, asking for financial statements, board information, programming information, a description of community support, collections records management information, a copy of the exhibition policy, information related to conservation and museum environment, information on staff training, a description of research activities, and artifact acquisition expense receipts. See, for example, applications and files available in: Rg47-41 b276983. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

exceptions.⁴⁴ The grant aimed to support museums that met basic criteria annually, providing increases to those moving from part-time to full time and allowing new museums to enter only when sufficient funding was available for the pre-existing clients.⁴⁵

Reflecting the focus on pre-existing clients, the Ministry revoked the establishment and development grants for museums. Museums were encouraged to access project funding available to community projects instead. At the same time, the Province released *Places to Grow* (1980), which articulated a targeted role for the Province in providing support for planning and existing resources over new construction.⁴⁶ Provincial capital grants, therefore, began focusing on support to existing institutions. For example, in 1985, the Ministry announced the Cultural Facilities Improvement Program (CFIP) to, as the name suggests, improve the quality of cultural facilities across Ontario. The program primarily supported the improvement of existing capital resources and, secondarily, the development of new facilities, responding to demonstrated community need with a multi-year funding commitment.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ For example, a 1989 backgrounder notes five received more than 4% in recognition of increases in expenditure, 22 received the same as last year due to only adequate performance, and 9 saw a drop due to a drop in their operating expenditure. See Brent, Marty. Backgrounder: Community Museum Operating Grants. RG47-41 B412703 1989 operating grant. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁴⁵ The focus on existing clients was seen as unfair to those meeting the requirements that began applying after the change. In 1987 Toronto's First Post Office's curator wrote letters and sent in petitions because the museum did not get the grant. They had worked to meet the Standards and apply for the grant at the advisor's urging. See files available in: RG47-41 B307184. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁴⁶ *Places to Grow* (Culture and Recreation 1980) contains a number of findings of significance to museums. First, capital funding had favored sports and physical recreation. Second, operating costs were becoming a problem for new buildings across Ontario, including museums. Third, recycling and upgrading facilities was seen as preferable to new construction due to limited resources. Finally, organizations were becoming frustrated with the bureaucracy involved in accessing funding.

⁴⁷ As part of CFIP, the advisors were involved in community projects at different stages. They recommended museums apply to the program, provided written comments on drafts, and assisted museums through the capital renovations. For more information on the program, see documents available in: Rg47-108 B366624 ministry general. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

In addition to facing new or changing financial resources, non-financial forms of support also shifted to provide additional or more focused assistance to museums. Due to an insufficient financial commitment, the Canadian Conservation Institute (CCI) was unable to open the regional conservation lab in Ontario that the federal museum policy had promised. By the end of the 1970s, the CCI had fostered an expectation for free conservation services, which they were unable to meet. They, therefore, instituted a policy of mobile labs and federal cooperation with provinces in establishing their own conservation programs to meet these expectations.⁴⁸ At the same time, the provincial Ministry eliminated an advisor position and appointed a conservation coordinator to provide a unified Ministry approach to conservation. In order to address needs identified in a 1979 provincial conservation survey,⁴⁹ the new coordinator brought conservation specialists and the museum community together. To that end, the Province opened a mobile lab in 1981 and stationary lab in 1984 with two conservators. The conservation coordinator and two conservators worked as specialized advisors who provided advice and assistance that helped museums meet the new conservation standard in practical ways.

Similarly, the associations and advisors more broadly refocused activities around the Standards. For instance, the advisors wrote Museum Notes to help museums meet the objectives and delivered relevant training independently or in partnership with the associations. The associations reformed their existing training programs to address emerging needs. The

⁴⁸ The National Policy had called for the creation of the Canadian Conservation Institute (CCI) with five regional conservation centers that would carry out conservation treatments for their region according to a regional advisory committee's recommendations. However, due to insufficient financial commitments and budget cuts to the national museum programme in 1978, the Ontario regional lab never opened and, without consulting the provinces, the NMC's Board decided to close the existing regional centres in 1979.

⁴⁹ The Ministry had hired a conservator in 1979 to conduct a conservation survey in the province. For information on the survey, see McMeekin, Kemp. 1980, March. Survey of the Conservation Requirements of the Museum Community in Ontario (Draft). RG47-58 B101645 Conservation. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

OMA's training committee and a certificate development officer worked from 1978 to 1980 to create a certificate program supported with a grant from the NMC for research and development.⁵⁰ The OHS created pamphlets of relevance to museums and provided training as requested in small museums across Ontario (Interview, Duncan 2017). The Ministry supported the associations' work with operating funding and technical assistance.⁵¹

Museums improved in the 1980s due, in part, to the Standards and resources assembled to meet the Standards. The advisors and associations encouraged and facilitated access to a variety of funding and services from municipal, provincial, federal, and private actors. As the implementation period for the Standards came to a close, the Province was engaged in a heritage policy review, demonstrating a shift from museum policy and programs to a broader area of interest.⁵² While the review, eventually, led to a new Heritage Act, it did not prompt new policy documents or activities specific to museums. The Standards were not changed and, although the new Act necessitated a new regulation, there were functionally no changes to the grant program. During the review process, the Heritage Branch's Community Museums unit spearheaded the development of a conservation policy for all moveable heritage objects, including museums and archives. However, funding reductions stalled and eventually stopped

⁵⁰ For a detailed history of the OMA's training initiatives, see Carter (1981) and Chessell (1992).

⁵¹ The Ministry made grants to these organizations through the Miscellaneous Grants budget from 1974-1975 to 1977-1978. The OHS began receiving an annual government subsidy in 1898 and the OMA began receiving operational funding in 1973. The Heritage Support Operating Grant Program, later the Provincial Heritage Organization Grant, was then established as a non-statutory grant program in 1978-1979, providing funding to the OHS, OMA, and other organizations. In 1986-1987 and 1987-1988 the program budget was substantially increased to regularize the funding for the ten provincial groups receiving funding at the time. For more information on the Provincial Heritage Organization Grant, see files available in: Rg47-108 B718855. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁵² Museums were encouraged to participate in the Review, which the former OMA Executive Director, Greg Baeker, led. The Ministry made announcements in the OMA's *Currently* and at the OMA's annual conference in 1987, urging museums and the public to take part in the process.

the development of the policy in the 1990s.⁵³ The proposed conservation policy demonstrates that while governments continued to engage in periods of consultation with museums, they stopped working to address the issues museums identified in those consultations.

Table 4.4: A Timeline of Museum Governance: Quality and Accountability

Year	Moment
1979	<i>Guidelines for Museums Making Initial Application for a Museum Operating Grant</i> An advisor becomes a conservation coordinator
1980	<i>Ontario's community Museum Programme: Directions for the 1980's</i> Two rounds of advisor-led meetings on the policy and guidelines <i>Places to Grow</i>
1981	<i>Community Museums Policy for Ontario</i> Provincial mobile conservation lab established
1983	Advisor-led meetings on the proposed standards
1984	Standards Base level grants established Provincial conservation lab opens
1987	Heritage Policy Review begins

4.2.4 *Uncertainty and Disinterest: Uncertain Museum Communities, Disinterested Governments (1990 -)*

During the 1990s, the federal and provincial governments began cutting funding to community museums and/or neglecting to follow through on promised increases. Despite the reductions in spending, the Ministry released new standards in 2000 and has engaged in processes of redefining how the Standards are assessed. As the Ministry asks for more or different things from community museums, the Province has become less directly involved in museum

⁵³ They sent collecting institutions a questionnaire to ascertain conservation needs. Work on the conservation policy continued into the 1990s with the release of a discussion paper *Toward a Provincial Policy and Strategy for Object Preservation in Ontario* for public consultation. However, those working on the conservation policy under the auspices of the Review argued they had to satisfy the upper management and Queen's park with the wording and content. The policy was eventually dropped from consideration because they had difficulty writing a policy that met the government's latest priorities and did not raise the community's expectation for a costly new conservation program (Poulin 1992).

governance with only one museum advisor and a shift from museum to cultural policy. The advisor(s) are, therefore, unable to enact and assemble the same network of relationships to support museum operations. However, the associations have become more active as distinct actors working alongside, but separate from, the advisors in community museum governance.

4.2.4.1 *Museum Policy*

Considering changes in how governments define museums' roles, the fourth period involves overlapping descriptions of museum and cultural policy development. The museum policy timeline focuses on changes in operating funding, articulated museum policies, and the advisors' or associations' work. In particular, the final period has involved a reduced federal and provincial government role due to a changing financial relationship.

All levels of governments reduced spending broadly in the 1990s as a response to an economic downturn. Federally, a 1990 museum policy reaffirmed Ottawa's commitment to existing programs with increases to the Museum Assistance Program. However, they did not increase funding to promised levels and eventually implemented cuts to the program in addition to cuts to the Canadian Conservation Institute (Canadian Museums Association 1995). By 1997, provincial cultural spending had dropped 33.6% since the Provincial Conservative government took office compared to a total provincial operating spending reduction of 5.6% (Ontario Museum Association 1997). The Province reduced the museum operating grant budget by 10% in 1996 and an additional 9% in 1997.⁵⁴ In addition to operational funding cuts, the Ministry

⁵⁴ The CMOG budget was approximately 2.5 million in 1982 with annual increases of about \$100,000 until it was capped at 3.3 million in 1991. In 1995, the province awarded over 3.2 million dollars to 193 institutions. As such, the budget was approximately 2.7 million for 192 institutions in 1998. For more information on the budgetary changes, see: 1999, September. Community Museums Program Review: Discussion Paper (Draft). Rg47-51 b929760 csrcm00a.

eliminated project grants specific to museums with some short-term exceptions, such as a grant for the use of technology in museums or occasional “shovel ready”⁵⁵ opportunities (Interviews, J. Carter 2017; Graham 2017). The combined effects of government cuts were, therefore, greater for museums and culture than other sectors.

The increased costs museums incurred to meet the Provincial museum policy and other legislation amplified government cutbacks. For example, following the 1981 museum policy, museums needed staff to enact the Standards and continue to be eligible for provincial funding. The Province then implemented the *Pay Equity Act* in 1987, resulting in an increase in some museum salaries. After increasing salaries and adding staff, museums were asked to cut back on activities or lay off staff as they experienced a 10-30% decrease in municipal support and a 3% decrease from the Province in the early 1990s. The 1993 Provincial Social Contract⁵⁶ then asked municipalities to further reduce costs, which led to decreased salary expenses and, in some museums, an accompanying reduction in their CMOG funding. As such, when the Province implemented cuts to the operating grant in 1996 and 1997, museums had already experienced significant reductions. These losses made meeting the Standards more difficult.

Government funding to the associations and advisors also decreased, reducing the non-financial forms of support available to museums. For example, the Ministry reduced operational funding to the associations by over 50% from 1996 to 1997.⁵⁷ The advisors continued to conduct

Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁵⁵ “Shovel ready” grants were opportunities where organizations with a capital project ready to start could access funding from the Ministry due to the sudden availability of funding.

⁵⁶ The NDP Provincial government enacted the Social Contract was enacted in 1992 as a means to manage the provincial deficit by trimming 2 billion dollars in payroll cost through spending controls, revenue measures, and negotiations with public sector employers/employees. For information on the detrimental effects of the legislation on museums in Ontario, see Nantais-Bourdeau (1994).

⁵⁷ They reduced funding by 40.5% in 1996 and an additional 11.9% in 1997. For information on the reductions the

site visits and offer assistance on request but began describing themselves as overworked and understaffed (Interview, Pope 2017). The Province eliminated two conservator positions, meaning there were only three advisors and one conservator coordinator working to help all of Ontario's community museums. In comparison, during the 1980s there were four advisors, a conservation coordinator, and two conservators. In 1996, the conservation lab stopped providing conservation services due to provincial austerity measures.⁵⁸ Two successive conservators were then seconded to the museum advisor positions and the position was subsequently eliminated altogether.

In addition to funding cuts and reduced advisory services, community museums faced uncertainty in the enactment of policy. For example, there were changes to the provincial operating grant application process. In order to support museums at expected levels, the grant was closed to new museums in the 1980s. The Minister then sent a letter to museums in December 1998 informing them that CMOG would open to new museums and all museums would be assessed against new standards in 1999.

The reassessment of museums against the Standards occurred as part of a provincial museum policy review, prompted by a disconnect between provincial objectives and the implementation of the operating grant.⁵⁹ The Review reflects a provincial recommitment to using

organizations faced, see files in: Rg47-51 B875990. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁵⁸ The Conservation Coordinator began focusing on preventative conservation to help museums achieve greater self-sufficiency, working with the CCI, OMA, and regional groups to develop and deliver workshops. They gathered information on museums' environmental and monitoring needs, helped museums find private conservators, and answered requests for information. There was also an internship program coordinated by the Province (Interview, Holland 2017).

⁵⁹ An advisor explains that, due to the response to the provincial audit "we didn't have a choice and we tried to do it as painlessly as possible" (Interview, Graham 2017). At the same time, some advisors believe the Review recognized certain museums were beyond the Standards. The Review also aimed to address an oversubscription of museums and, particularly, underachieving museums to CMOG.

the Standards to hold museums accountable and a response to museums excluded from the program that were meeting the requirements. A 1997 Provincial Auditor's Report on Cultural Activities found the Ministry was not ensuring museums were achieving the minimum standards. Clients' rate of adherence to the Standards ranged from 16% to 96%. Despite the variances in adherence, the Ministry pro-rated the grants by the same percentage when allocating increases or decreases. Funding to museums not meeting the Standards was considered particularly unfair as there were museums on the waiting list, meeting the Standards and voicing concerns to the advisors.⁶⁰ An adviser from the 1990s remembers the advisors and museums asking, "why do these museums keep getting money when they are absolutely not trying to meet the Standards" (Interview, Pope 2017). For museums receiving funding, grants ranged from 3% to 50% of eligible expenditures due to historical funding inequities.

Despite the call for a review and evidence that museums were not meeting the Standards, provincial documents on museum governance continued to define the existing museum policy as successful. The Minister's communications to museums and the advisors' discussion paper note the review was needed because the museum community voiced a need to update the program considering new challenges.⁶¹ However, after a decade of funding reductions, the associations were not actively calling for a review or new standards.⁶²

⁶⁰ A conservator and museum advisor from the period explains, "Museums on the waiting list were saying, how come this museum down the road, which everyone acknowledges is pathetic, is getting a grant and we have done everything to meet the Standards and we're not getting anything" (Interview, Holland 2017).

⁶¹ The advisors wrote *Community Museums Program Review: Discussion Paper* (1999), which argues museums want change and are facing new challenges. They cite surveys conducted by the OMA, OHS, and the Ministry's museum staff in the early 1990s showing CMOG and the Standards helped museums improve and obtain additional support from other sources. Documents indicating a desire from the community for change are available in: RG47-51 B929760 cerv99a; RG47-51 B929720 csrcm00a; Rg47-41 b932597 CMOG 2000-01 grant admin (internal). Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁶² See *Currently* issues from 1997-2001.

The advisors wrote a discussion paper, facilitated targeted consultations, and invited written responses for the Review.⁶³ Following consultation, the Ministry decided the funding model would remain the same to avoid major decreases to individual museums, the Standards would remain a condition of the grant, and the advisory service would continue. However, they also decided to keep the operating grant open to all museums, reduce grants by a common percentage to account for additional museums, and update the Standards. In other words, the expectations for museums increased and the funding for individual museum operations decreased.

Before updating the Standards, the advisors graded museums against the existing benchmarks, which necessitated another change in the application process.⁶⁴ The Ministry removed 28 museums from the program because they did not pass and added ten museums.⁶⁵ Museums were re-assessed on the Standards in 2000 and those dropped from the program were allowed back in, causing a 6% reduction to museum grants as the budget was not increased.⁶⁶ The advisors and short term consultants assessed museums against new standards in 2001, grading two to three standards a year.⁶⁷ *The Standards for Community Museums in Ontario*

⁶³ The Ministry held three consultations with 75 museum representatives from December 1999 to February 2000 in Toronto, Brockville, and Sault Ste. Marie. They also received over 40 written submissions, including submissions from the OMA and OHS. For a description of the consultation and processes used, see documents available in: Rg47-41 b932402 CMOG review. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁶⁴ There were limited tools to assess museums on the Standards during the 1990s. Applicants were asked for a review of the previous year's activity and a plan for the next.

⁶⁵ Museums were given a score in each section and an overall percentage. They had to pass four of the six standards with an overall score of 45% or more. For more information on the assessment see: Heritage and Libraries Branch (2001).

⁶⁶ Museum advisors once again reviewed and scored the surveys, determining a passing score based on the assessments' average score.

⁶⁷ Due to a delay in creating the application caused by a union strike, the 2002 application was the same as in 2001.

(2000) include 10 new or revised standards – that is, governance, finance, collections, exhibition, interpretation and education, research, conservation, physical plant, community, and human resources.

In order to help community museums meet the new requirements, the Ministry entered into an agreement with the OMA to offer workshops on the Standards from 2001 to 2005.⁶⁸ The OMA has continued to play a significant role in subsequent changes. After increased advocacy efforts from the OMA and the appointment of a Minister with a demonstrated interest in culture in 2006, the CMOG budget approximately doubled in 2007. Then, in 2009, the Ministry made a smaller increase, accompanying the launch of a Heritage Program Review to develop a performance measurement framework. The Review also aimed to determine whether the OMA could play a role in helping museums meet the Standards. As such, the museum advisors worked with the OMA to make revised and new resources available through the OMA's website.

In addition to considering the OMA's potential roles in museum governance, the Review involved determining whether grant recipients were still meeting the Standards and the Standards reflected current priorities. The advisors, therefore, began another three-year process of assessing clients against the existing standards, using the questionnaires from the early 2000s with some changes.⁶⁹ The museums' 2013 submissions had to address the feedback or become ineligible for funding in 2014-2015.⁷⁰ Since 2015 there have been additional requests, assessing

⁶⁸ The pilot workshop series was funded when the Ministry had unspent PHO funding allocated for Minister's discretion. For more information, see: Johnson, Michael. 2001, March. Briefing Note: Backgrounder for Staff Recommendations – Grant Proposals. Rg47-41 b931945 grant admin CORR file pho 2000-2001. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁶⁹ Following the assessment in 2012, the advisors provided feedback forms with individual results, advisor comments, and information on the specific areas to be addressed. Museums completed questionnaires on governance (2010), finance (2010), community (2010), exhibition (2011), interpretation and education (2011), research (2011), human resources (2011), collections (2012), conservation (2012), and physical plant (2012).

⁷⁰ In subsequent years, the applications asked museums to provide organizational information (such as a list of board

documents that demonstrate work to attain the Standards. For example, in 2016, museums submitted a three-year exhibit plan and a social media plan to meet the exhibition and community standards, which was not previously expected.

Processing the grant has become the museum advisors' primary role in community museum governance. As museum advisors left and were not replaced, the museum section was reduced to one individual. With so few people, the museum advisor can no longer be able to travel and provide the advice that once defined the role. Instead, the advisor has described her role as the guardian of the grant. Her main responsibility is processing applications and ensuring compliance (Interview, Weinstein, 2017). Advisors interviewed, therefore, described the final period as continuing to have the components of a museum policy without the support needed to implement the museum policy objectives.

As the advisors' and governments' roles have diminished, the associations have redefined significance within museum governance. During the 1990s, the OMA had limited capacity due to funding reductions but continued working on training, advocacy, and the circulation of information.⁷¹ While their resources remain limited, the OMA has refocused their efforts and extended their work through digital technologies. In particular, they advocate for community museums' needs, working to define and address those needs in multiple ways. The OMA engaged in a planning exercise for the museum sector, resulting in *Ontario's Museums 2025: Strategic Vision & Action Plan* (2016). The plan outlined a vision for museums in 2025 with

members and financial documents), a report on their activities or annual report, and performance measurements. The performance measurements ask for the number of operating hours, employees, volunteers, visitors, memberships, and social media followers.

⁷¹ The OMA participated in consultations, wrote letters, developed position papers, monitored action, and participated on committees. However, they had limited success in preventing cuts and preserving programs. For more information, see annual reports and *Currently* issues from the late 1990s.

action steps for museums, the OMA, and governments to follow. In order to address the identified needs, they have engaged in resource creation related to diversity, worked to raise the profile of museums, and advocated for specific actions from government. The CMA has similarly refocused on advocacy and engages in special projects to address the sector's needs. For example, following the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's report, both associations are working with Indigenous-led organizations to re-evaluate the relationships between museums and Indigenous Peoples.⁷² Due to its broader focus on heritage, the OHS has a more limited role in community museum governance, but continued to publish relevant materials and incorporate nonprofits, building capacity.

In short, the written policies governing the sector have undergone limited change. While the CMA has advocated for a new federal policy, there is no new or renewed federal action specific to museums since 1990. The provincial museum program Review only resulted in revised standards and, yet, there have been significant changes in museum governance. The grant amount museums receive has fluctuated, access to the funding has been redefined, and the supportive relationships available are changing. Given funding reductions and a failure to implement changes to the museum policy as part of the Heritage Policy review, those interviewed no longer see the Province as a leader in the Museum governance. Instead, the

⁷² After the controversy surrounding the Spirit Sings exhibition at the Glenbow in Calgary, the CMA set up a task force with the Assembly of First Nations, resulting in a series of recommendations. While the United States developed legislation for the repatriation of Indigenous artifacts, the Task Force purposely did not call for legislation, defining the issue as part of museums' moral role with ethical implications. More recently, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission released a report with a recommendation that directly calls for action from the CMA, stating: "We call upon the federal government to provide funding to the Canadian Museums Association to undertake, in collaboration with Aboriginal peoples, a national review of museum policies and best practices to determine the level of compliance with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and to make recommendations" (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada 2015). The CMA, therefore, announced a working group in 2018 to review museum work with support from the Department of Canadian Heritage, the Canadian Commission for UNESCO, the Canadian Museum of History and Jameson C. Brant, Royal Bank of Canada, and a private donor.

associations seem to be leading and coordinating museum governance, while the Province focuses on maintaining accountability mechanisms.

Table 4.5: A Timeline of Museum Governance: Uncertainty and Disinterest (Museum Policy)

Year	Moments
1987	<i>Pay Equity Act</i>
1993	Social Contract
1996	10% cut to CMOG
1997	9% cut to CMOG Provincial audit
1999	Program review
Late 1990s – early 2000s	Municipal amalgamation
2000	<i>Standards for Community Museums in Ontario (revised)</i>
2001	OMA standards workshops begin
2005	Final year of Ministry – OMA collaboration on workshops
2006	OMA launches advocacy campaign Minister Caroline Di Coco appointed as Minister of Culture
2007	CMOG budget increases
2009	Heritage Program Review
2016	<i>Ontario’s Museums 2025: Strategic Vision & Action Plan</i>

4.2.4.2 Cultural Policy

Museum policy has existed within the context of a cultural policy since the creation of a Provincial Culture Affairs Division in 1973 and the release of a federal museum policy as a component of cultural policy in 1972. Advisors and associations also encouraged museums to access funding and other forms of support for culture more broadly in earlier periods. However, museums could access support targeting museums and heritage as well, such as the heritage component of the lottery grants. During the final period, support initiatives targeting museums and heritage specifically have become more limited and only briefly accessible.⁷³ Ongoing

⁷³ For example, in 2009, the province launched the three-year Museum and Technology Fund, which funded digital

funding initiatives for heritage and museum projects are part of larger funding programs for culture, reflecting a shift toward the development of cultural rather than museum policies.

Notably, museum related project grants were consumed into larger units in the fourth period. For example, in 1993, the Province of Ontario consolidated 22 existing capital programs from different ministries into a capital component of JobsOntario Community Action (May 1994), including the Cultural Facilities Improvement Program (CFIP) that 67% of CMOG museums reported using (Community Museums and Heritage Organizations Unit 1992). After a 1995 audit found JobsOntario Community Action had not developed an effective administrative framework, it was canceled (Office of the Auditor General of Ontario 1997). Similarly, the non-capital Heritage Project Grants, which 63% of CMOG museums reported using (Community Museums and Heritage Organizations Unit 1992), became part of the Cultural Project Grants. The Cultural Project Grants were cut in 1996 and 1997 then eliminated before the Province gave the Ontario Trillium Foundation, established in 1982 to invest in community-based initiatives, responsibility for funding arts and cultural projects in 1999. While Trillium provides project funding to museums, Trillium does not fund municipalities. The grants are thereby limited to nonprofit museums or used for municipal museums through an intermediary, such as a friends' organization.

The relationship between the advisors, their managers, and department also demonstrates a shift away from museum policy in the Province. Entering the 21st century, a series of professional bureaucrats - that is, generalist instead of museum professionals – have

projects in museums and the associations. In the early 2000s, the Heritage Challenge Fund Community Program briefly provided community organizations and municipalities matching funds to preserve and restore heritage buildings.

managed the museum section as the section was compressed into bigger units.⁷⁴ The resultant lack of attention has caused challenges for the advisors' translation work.⁷⁵ For example, when dismantling the conservation lab, the conservators wanted to keep the material together, giving it to a museum as an incentive to start a lab (Interview, Graham 2017). However, benefitting museums was not a priority for those outside their section and the advisors could not distribute government materials without the appropriate permissions.

The federal and provincial governments' cultural policies further demonstrate community museums are no longer a priority for government. The federal government released *Creative Canada* as a new cultural policy in 2017. The policy focuses on the creative industries, describing museums as partners with the creative industries and digital content creators. The federal government has not created new programs specific to museums, but museums are eligible for funding as cultural organizations and existing funding programs for museums have changed to reflect federal cultural policies. For example, in 2013, the Department of Canadian Heritage outlined nation-building milestones on the "Road to 2017"⁷⁶ that would receive funding priority from the Government of Canada. The MAP funding priorities then changed to include projects related to the 2017 milestones.

The Province similarly released a cultural strategy in 2016 that includes museums but describes them as one kind of cultural organization, engaging in partnerships to accomplish a

⁷⁴ Compounding the problems, the "movers and shakers" did not last long in their positions as they were promoted. Instead, the advisors were managed by their share of people who were less supportive of their work (Interview, Graham 2017).

⁷⁵ The lack of attentive and interested managers with specialized knowledge, at times, provided the advisors with the space to organize their work independently and engage in relationships to benefit museums.

⁷⁶ 2017 was Canada's 150th anniversary. While there was not the same investment in heritage as seen with the centennial in 1967, there was project funding for institutions commemorating specific milestones.

variety of objectives. Previously, Ontario cultural policy had emphasized self-sufficiency.⁷⁷ For example, the Ministry of Citizenship, Culture, and Recreation (1995 - 2001) as well as the Ministry of Culture, Tourism, and Recreation (2001-2002) aimed to protect arts and heritage by encouraging financial self-sufficiency.⁷⁸ To that end, the Ministry created grants for projects that enhanced the long-term viability of arts, heritage, and libraries.⁷⁹ They also began funding municipal cultural planning, supporting and encouraging sustainability in local action.⁸⁰ Provincial action, therefore, encouraged self-sufficient cultural organizations developed through local action and supported by their municipality.

The development of a comprehensive provincial strategy led to an articulation of cultural policy objectives beyond self-sufficiency. From 2015 to 2016, the Ministry engaged in consultation and progressively defined a provincial strategy, releasing *Telling our stories, Growing our economy: Developing a cultural strategy for Ontario, Discussion paper* (2015),⁸¹ *Culture Talks: A Summary of What we Heard from Ontarians* (2016), and *The Ontario Cultural*

⁷⁷ For example, *Sustaining our Facility Investment: SOFI III Final Report* argues cultural and recreational facilities were planned, designed, and constructed when self-sufficiency was not a priority. The Report notes cultural facilities need to diversify their revenue base and become more self-reliant (Salter et al. 2001).

⁷⁸ See, for example: Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation (1997) as well as Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation (2001).

⁷⁹ For example, the Culture Development Fund then funded projects to develop stronger boards, create more effective collaborations, improve financial capabilities, and make strategic use of new media. In order to encourage more strategic initiatives in culture, the province has also provided funding for planning, such as the Creative Communities Prosperities fund. The Creative Communities Prosperities fund aimed to encourage cultural planning in municipalities and indigenous communities (Municipal Cultural Planning Incorporated 2011).

⁸⁰ Cultural planning funding also aims to encourage self-sufficiency. Within the province's cultural planning framework, culture is supported because culture supports sustainability. The pillars of sustainability are economic prosperity, social equity, environmental responsibility, and cultural vitality (Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries 2019).

⁸¹ In response to the discussion paper, the Ministry received about 600 written submissions. They held 11 town halls with over 1,400 participants as well as meetings with local community groups, Indigenous communities, and Indigenous organizations. Participants were also invited to present and vote on ideas within a digital forum.

Strategy: Telling our stories, growing our economy (2016). The summary mentions several museum needs, such as a need to engage with youth and Indigenous Peoples. However, the Strategy focuses on museums' utility, defining museums as partners that support lifelong learning and help develop Ontarians' skills as they conserve cultural heritage. Within the new framework, cultural organizations are important partners in governance broadly.

In order to maximize the use of museums, the Strategy calls for a review of the provincial museum program. To that end, the Ministry released *Telling Ontario's Stories in the 21st Century: A Discussion Paper for Community Museums and Heritage Organizations* (2018). The document articulates a commitment to review and update provincial funding programs for museums, responding to calls from the OMA.⁸² Although the *Telling Ontario's Stories* document notes the Ministry would provide a public summary report of the responses in Spring 2018, as of December 2019 there is no public summary and the Province has not enacted changes to the grant or standards. The 2019 CMOG application continues to assess the Standards, asking for a strategic plan.

Despite the absence of new policy articulations, the discussion paper outlines a different museum policy than the 1981 *Community Museums Policy for Ontario*, which aligns with the broader *Cultural Strategy*. In particular, the goal is no longer to support museums developed through local action in their various roles. Instead, the government aims to support museums so they can meet specific objectives, including telling Ontario's stories, tackling social justice issues, providing opportunities for economic inclusion, preserving cultural assets, participating in the cultural tourism landscape, supporting small business, and showing leadership. The provincial

⁸² The provincial discussion paper refers to the Cultural Strategy, asking what changes are needed to support the Cultural Strategy's three broad themes - strengthening leadership, building capacity, and supporting diverse organizations.

role is no longer defined as promoting access to culture. Instead, the Province is committed to developing a better understanding of the impact of the digital on culture, working with others to improve the conservation of archaeological collections, and working with partners to maximize the use of cultural facilities as community hubs.

In short, there has been a redefinition of roles as governance is enacted. In particular, support for museums has become a component within broader initiatives. There is a provincial and federal shift away from museum policy to cultural policy, aiming for self-sufficient institutions that can play a role in accomplishing broader objectives. The problematization within *Telling Ontario's Stories in the 21st Century* suggests a shift in how museums are governed, but there has not yet been a new articulated policy defining the shift.

Table 4.6: A Timeline of Museum Governance: Uncertainty and Disinterest (Cultural Policy)

Year	Moment
1999	Trillium foundation given responsibility for cultural project funding
2013	"Road to 2017"
2015	<i>Telling our stories, Growing our economy: Developing a cultural strategy for Ontario, Discussion paper</i>
2016	<i>The Ontario Cultural Strategy: Telling our stories, growing our economy</i>
2017	Creative Canada
2018	<i>Telling Ontario's Stories in the 21st Century: A Discussion Paper for Community Museums and Heritage Organizations</i>

4.3 Unpacking Museum Governance

The history of museum governance described herein contains similarities with the existing research discussed in Chapters One and Two. In particular, there is a new institutionalist understanding of change with path dependent dynamics and moments of punctuation. Actors understand the establishment of policy documents, programs, and government institutions as

key moments in the development of museum policy. There is also change in governments' museum policy discourses toward more instrumental understandings of museums' value. Changes in government action then have intended and unintended effects on the museum sector. The provincial and/or federal governments are seen as responsible for an increase in the number of community museums in the 1960s and 1970s, the lack of attention paid to museums' so-called quality during this period, and community museums' subsequent improvement as they worked toward standards, using government resources.

Departing somewhat from existing understandings of the Ontario case and museum governance more broadly, the translation of problematizations into a timeline enhances our understanding of change in community museum governance. Community museum governance is changing and consistent in ways that are distinct from provincial and national museums' governance due to the complex realities of multi-level governance and their differing relationships to state institutions. The advisors and associations have emerged to help museums navigate this complex policy environment, contributing to governance's development and playing a distinct role. As they work for change and/or consistency, their problematizations have offered causal explanations for changes in museum governance and a more nuanced conception of consistency.

4.3.1 *Explaining Moments of Change*

The historical description identifies and offers explanations for moments of significant change in governance. Existing descriptions of museum policy development in Ontario note provincial programs were created due to calls from the museum community (Baeker, May, and Tivy 1992). As spokespeople for the so-called community, the advisors' and associations' translation work is

thus an explanation for change, as discussed in Chapters Five and Six. However, the advisors and associations have worked to enroll actors into more supportive relationships with museums on an ongoing basis since their creation. Additional causes are, therefore, needed to offer a more complete explanation for the evolution of community museum governance. Within the translated description, three causal factors emerge as significant within multiple moments of change or resistance to change in the actors governing community museums.

First, governments change, which contributes to changes in museum governance. Within the provincial government, the orientation of the specific Ministry and Minister responsible for museums plays a key role in enabling or preventing change. For example, the Ministry of Colleges and Universities' new Cultural Affairs Division had a budget to expand the museum program, leading to a northern advisory office and the inclusion of nonprofit museums in the operating grant. When the Minister of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation changed in 1999, the review of the provincial role in museum governance became a review of the Standards more narrowly. More recently, a former music teacher and the Minister of Culture – that is, Caroline Di Coco – approved a significant increase to the museum grant program in 2006-2007. The Ministry of Culture increased the operating grant again in 2009 and launched the three-year Museum and Technology Fund. However, the Ministry then expanded to include other areas of activity and stopped announcing new or increased museum funding. For instance, the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport from 2014-2016 focused on the sport component of his portfolio due, in part, to the 2015 Pan American Games in Toronto.

Actors consulted believe a Ministry devoted exclusively to culture is more beneficial to community museums because the Minister is not preoccupied with other areas that may be given a higher priority. Policy has changed under other Ministries. However, the two program

expansions that were not accompanied by accountability measures occurred within the newly formed Cultural Affairs Division and then the Ministry of Culture.

Municipally, there have also been changes in the government units responsible for museums. Museums can report to libraries, sports, parks, recreation, economic development, councils, a board of management, or some combination thereof. While changes in the responsible department influence museums' governance within the local jurisdiction, there is no apparent agreement on the best structure for museums. Instead, every municipality and case "is its own little animal" (Interview, Bernat 2018).

Different governments and their departments have their own priorities. Evolving government priorities affect museum specific activities. Most notably, increased calls for accountability within governments prompted standards (re)development in 1978 and 1998 then renewed assessment in 2009. Further, the development of a Historical Branch within the Department of Travel and Publicity in 1959 responded to surveys on American tourism. Support for museums became part of a provincial strategy to increase the quantity and quality of sites for American visitors. These examples demonstrate governments do not define their role within museum governance in isolation from other areas of action. Although community museum governance is not a priority for most governments, changing museum related activities can become a priority when they conflict with government policy, such as accountability efforts or a reduced service role. Community museum governance can also be prioritized when museums provide a solution to a perceived need, such as tourist activities.

While changing government priorities shape the governance of all museums, provincial and national institutions are more closely associated with the work and priorities of one government. In contrast, community museums are subject to evolving priorities at all levels. Although the timeline focuses on the provincial level, it highlighted significant moments of

change related to changing priorities at the municipal and federal levels as well. Examples include enthusiasm for municipal planning as well as the commemoration of specific events or people(s) relating to a particular conception of Canadian identity. Community museums, therefore, experience multiple overlapping and intersecting moments of change prompted by changing priorities from their municipal, provincial, and federal governments.

In addition to changing priorities, there are changes in the perceived roles of government and, more specifically, the different levels of government. Changes in the defined role of governments are most evident in the fourth period. The provincial and federal governments had articulated direct service roles for themselves in the 1970s and 1980s. However, provincial ministries more broadly are no longer considered servicing agencies within the final period, contributing to a reduced service role for the advisors and an emphasis on the role of nonprofit service organizations. The federal and provincial governments have moved away from the development of community museum policies with museum related activities. Instead, cultural policies aim to articulate a broad direction and discourse with funding to encourage self-sufficiency and economic development.

Municipalities are, therefore, once again defined as more directly responsible for community museums, reconfiguring museum governance. As an OMA Past President noted, municipalities are “picking up the ball” and “making culture work” (Interview, Doherty 2017).⁸³ Community museum governance then changes across local governments.

Second, multi-level governance creates a dynamic environment whereby changes at one level of government affect the policies of other levels. The cascading effects are most evident in museum governance during the second period. In the 1950s, municipalities were supporting and

⁸³ The OHS Executive Director similarly stated, “The province’s official or unofficial position is that it’s the role of the municipality” (Interview, Leverty 2018).

opening museums. The provincial government, therefore, began providing operational grants to municipal museums through an existing program that supported locally developed recreational activities. Following increased expenditure in culture for the Canadian Centennial with provincial and municipal cooperation, the federal government began articulating cultural and museum policies in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The federal policy discussions and subsequent funding provided the impetus for the development of the OMA and greater attention to museums at the provincial level, contributing to the expansion of provincial activities in the early 1970s and the inclusion of nonprofit museums in the provincial grant program. The federal and provincial policies then prompted the development of additional municipal museums and/or funding from municipalities for the developing nonprofit museums. The combined effect of support from the three levels contributed to an increase in the number of museums eligible for the provincial operating grant, necessitating a redefinition of the provincial role. Additional examples include the development of a conservation program at the provincial level in cooperation with the federal government, the effects of matched funding requirements for project grants, and funding initiatives targeting lower levels of government.

The timeline demonstrates the federal and subnational governments not only collaborate and coordinate in museum governance but also provoke change as they enact distinct policies. The provocation can occur due to conflicting understanding each actors' role(s) as seen with the assertion of a provincial role in response to perceived federal encroachment in the 1970s. However, conflict is not necessary as change occurs in response to the effects of relationships or to redress a perceived limitation in the enacted relationships, such as an increase in the number of museums or the failure to provide conservation services to Ontario museums.

Finally, economic downturns stall and, ultimately, prevent the development of museum policies. Alternatively, they can prompt a redefinition of the government's role with the

development of accountability frameworks, as discussed above. The need for reform in the late 1970s was reinforced by the broader environment of fiscal restraint within government. An economic downturn hampered the development of a conservation policy associated with the heritage policy review in the early 1990s. On a federal level, economic downturns following the release of the museum policies in 1972 and 1990 prevented the promised increases in expenditures. Economic difficulties in the 1990s led to disproportionate cuts to museums and contributed to a change in governments' defined role in museum governance.

The treatment of museums during periods of government restraint demonstrates the valuation of museums as frills (Interview, Duncan 2017). The provincial Community Museum Operating Grant has provided a level of consistency through these periods. However, government programs targeting community museums are particularly susceptible to cuts because the museums are not owned and operated by the provincial and federal levels. Community museums are more closely associated with their municipal governments as municipal museums or nonprofits with a history of support. Some municipalities continuously value and support museums, operating and/or financing community museums. However, local governments often believe money would be better spent elsewhere (Interview, Duncan 2017) and they can be "tighter than the paper on the wall" (Interview, Strymo 2017). For example, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing saw museums and art galleries as "gold-plated services" undeserving of public funds during the late 1990s (Zaporzan 1997). As such, community museums are often subject to funding cuts to reduce government spending.

The values actors ascribe to museums informs their possible roles within museum governance and the resources they are willing to attribute to museums. As such, an economy defined as thriving does not have the inverse effect on museum governance. The continued support of museums despite economic downturns and within periods seen as prosperous can be

attributed to the first two factors identified along with the translation work of those doing the work of governing Ontario's community museums as explored in Chapters 5 and 6.

In sum, the historical description demonstrates advisors' and associations' ability to translate community museum governance is mitigated by changes within governing actors, the effects of multi-level governance, and economic realities. These factors are present within the description but are not the only possible causes of change. Notably, interview participants indicated that there are elements affecting policy of which they are unaware or have now forgotten. The factors identified relate to the moments of change defined as shifts within actors' problematizations and only offer a preliminary explanation. However, they do not encapsulate or explain the ongoing change that is also evident.

4.3.2 *Governance as Ongoing Change*

The historical description suggests ongoing change in community museum governance in addition to the (re)articulation of official policies and (re)definition of institutions perceived as significant. The founding and continued existence of institutions does not indicate static forms of governance. Relationships shift over time and space despite the continued involvement of the "same" entities. Reflecting on the historical account, this section highlights five ways community museum governance has evolved in addition to the (re)creation of entities supporting the sector explained above.

First, the work of the advisors and associations is, by definition, continuously evolving. The associations aim to provide services in response to need. The advisors provide individualized advice and assistance. Each advisor mobilizes their own expertise and relationships to enact a policy. The policy they enact will then change across time and space as they mobilize different

relationships, work to meet particular objectives, and respond to specific contexts. The context in which they work continuously changes. Not only do they respond to the distinct needs of diverse museums located in different municipalities, but they experience change as the actor-networks they speak for are (re)negotiated. For example, the advisors have different capacities to provide assistance within the periods outlined due to changing budgets and/or reporting requirements within the Ministry. Over time there are also new or redefined actors available to support community museums, including but not limited to those outlined above as part of museum or cultural policy development. The policies the advisors' and associations enact are, therefore, unique to a time and place.

The advisors and associations are a distinctive element of community museum governance in Ontario, distinguishing community museum governance from national and provincial institutions' governance in the province. While provincial and national institutions are involved with the associations, the associations play a significant role for community museums given their more limited resources. Continuous change is, therefore, a defining element of community museum governance.

Second and relatedly, community museums and museum workers are changing, redefining their relationships. In the first two periods examined, museum workers lacked training and community museums' facilities were in poor conditions. While national and provincial museums often hired subject matter experts, community museums relied on volunteers and/or hired people from related fields, such as teachers. Community museums, therefore, required support from the advisors and associations with basic activities. They "really weren't professional enough" and needed "a lot of hand-holding" (Interview, Holland 2017). Due, in part, to the role the associations and advisors played, there is a perceived professionalism within the museum field and more museum buildings adhering to standards for

collections management within the fourth period. There continue to be volunteer run museums, but more and more museums have trained staff (Interview Holland 2017).⁸⁴ As a result, the advice and assistance that community museums need, and request, is changing. For example, there may be less support for conservation or exhibition design because there is less of a need. Museum workers now have the skills to address those issues and/or know where to access support. There are broad shifts across periods as well as ongoing change as museums confront emerging issues, including an increased awareness of social justice concerns.

Third, the roles of actors perceived as static are renegotiated within new contexts, changing the nature of the relationships mobilized to support museums. For example, increases or decreases to funding are often identified as changes in museum policy, but static allocations also change a funding source's defined role. In a 1989 backgrounder, an advisor argued "With the cost living alone increasing at 6%, provincial grants that are a 4% increase represent a declining percentage in terms of museums' budgets."⁸⁵ The associations that provide services to museums similarly face the effects of inflation without corresponding increases to their operating grant (Interview, Leverty 2018), redefining provincial operating funding's role as the recipient can accomplish less with the same amounts. The Standards provide another example of a seemingly static actor within community museum governance with a changing role.

⁸⁴ Growing professionalism has been observed since the 1980s. For example, an advisor who worked in the 21st century stated, "There's been a big turnover over in the last I would say like 3 or 4 years. Where younger people are being hired and they're coming in with at least some professional expertise. So that's changing" (Interview, Weinstein 2017).

⁸⁵ Brent, Marty. 1989, October. Backgrounder: Questions in the House Concerning Funding to Local Museums and French Language Services Act. Rg47-41 b932597 museum policy 1990. Archives of Ontario, Toronto. Federal MAP grants also failed to account for inflation, reducing their role in museum governance. See, for example, Baeker, Greg. 1985. Rethinking Federal Funding Structures: A Discussion Paper Prepared for the Government and Public Policy Committee of the Canadian Museums Association. Rg47-108 B328914 OHPR public consultation meetings. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

Following its creation, the Standards encouraged museums to upgrade, providing objectives they could work toward. Today, the Standards are, to some extent, outdated because they do not reflect current museology or new directions in museum practice. As an interview participant who has worked in or with museums since the 1980s noted, “They were good. They were rock solid and a lot of them are still perfectly good. It is just they're no longer sufficient. If you meet all those standards, you're still not running a good museum” (Interview, Kerr-Wilson 2018).

Fourth, entities mediating access to an actor can change community museum’s relationship to that actor. Most notably, digital technologies have fundamentally changed museum governance because community museums have new ways to access pre-existing entities. For example, Museum Notes and other resources were once printed and mailed to museums to provide information they needed to meet the Standards when requested or at the advisors’ initiative, necessitating relationships building between the advisors and museums. The Notes are now publicly available as PDFs through the OMA’s website and online with the Standards through the Province’s website as one of several standard resources. There are also changing means of accessing the grant as community museums must demonstrate they are meeting the Standards in new ways. The application forms and expectations are changing. The changing applications alter how museums relate to the Province and can challenge a museum’s capacity to access funding. For example, small museums are not necessarily able to produce long term exhibition plans and municipal museums struggle to provide social media plans on short notice.

Finally, there is ongoing change across space. As already noted, changes within a government’s policies can then lead to additional changes at other levels of government. However, within Ontario, there is also change across local level jurisdiction. A municipality’s enthusiasm is the biggest determinant as to whether a region has well-supported museums and

an active provincial or federal museum policy. Municipal support is “critical” (Interview, Leverty 2018). The municipalities provide financial and non-financial forms of assistance that allow museums to develop the capacity to then access resources from the other levels of government. There are also often requirements for municipal support within provincial or federal support programs. Community museum governance is, therefore, different in Toronto than Ottawa or Sault Ste. Marie.

As demonstrated, the history of community museum governance has involved ongoing change in addition to moments of change and consistency. Change is essential to the advisors’ and associations’ translation work, which defines community museum governance. Actors that appear static are not. Their roles are necessarily redefined within new contexts and/or museums’ relationships with those actors can be redefined due to changing intermediaries. Importantly, there are also changes across jurisdictions within Ontario. Community museum governance, therefore, involves both ongoing consistency and ongoing change.

4.4 Conclusion: The Advantages and Problems of Simplification

To conclude, community museums in Ontario have experienced four overlapping and intersecting phases of museum governance – that is, (1) development and encouragement; (2) unwritten and enthusiastic; (3) quality and accountability; as well as (3) uncertainty and disinterest. The timeline demonstrates moments of change in the actors governing the sector and periods with little policy development. As the provincial museum advisors, museums, and associations work to translate museum policies, calls for change in governance are ongoing. Considering the ongoing translation work, the historical description suggests three interrelated factors that help determine moments of change and resistance to change within the case study –

that is, (1) changes within governing actors and whether these actors prioritize museums; (2) the effects of multi-level governance and the (de)prioritization of museums at other levels government; as well as (3) economic downturns and associated calls for accountability. However, the involvement of advisors and associations with defined responsibilities to react to museums' needs suggests additional forms of ongoing change. Their role and the ongoing change they facilitate distinguish community governance from the governance of other museums. Community museums experience changing governance as the contexts within which they form relationships evolves and the means through which they can relate to others change.

While this Chapter provides a readable ordering of events that can facilitate discussion on change in community museum governance, there are limitations to explaining policy using a translated timeline, which simplifies the work of governing. As such, the following chapters build on the discussion above, which argues museum governance has undergone continual change as the advisors and associations enact policies specific to a time and place. They consider how relationships are built, assembled, and maintained in community museum governance.

The museum advisors and associations worked across the periods described, attempting to mobilize relationships for particular objectives. As such, Chapters Five and Six move away from a rigid temporal description of museum governance, focusing on the work of the advisors and associations across time. Chapter Five considers their work to define a museum community/sector and the ideal direction for its development, discussing moments of conflict and consensus building. Through the definition of the museum community/sector, they legitimize their actions on behalf of museums, including service delivery and advocacy. These moments of governing have informed the shape and direction of governance in Ontario. Chapter Six examines the advisors and associations' definitions of museums' value as they assemble relationships to support museum activity. They attempt to build consensus on museums' roles

with a broad range of actors, such as those associated with education or tourism. In so doing, the definitions of museum value are constructed and mobilized within a particular time and place by specific individuals, leading to additional change in museum governance beyond time. Moreover, shifts in how the arguments are constructed and articulated both reflect and influence the evolution of community museum governance.

Chapter Five

The Work of Governing: Translation Activities

5.1 Introduction

The provincial museum advisors and associations do the work of governing Ontario's community museums. Their work has shaped and is shaped by the four phases of governance, involving the (re)creation of actors governing museums. They also contribute to both ongoing consistency and change as they respond to needs and opportunities in moments of time, (re)assembling the resources that community museums need. For example, a deliberate museum policy emerged in 1953 when the Ontario Historical Society (OHS) developed a committee for museums and the Province redefined an operating grant to include museums. In 1959, the Province hired the first museum advisor and museum workers formed the Ontario Museum Association (OMA) to provide training in 1971-1972. These actors – that is, the OHS, grant, advisors, and OMA - have continued to exist in some form and structure community museum governance into the 21st century, providing consistent support and reactive assistance.

The advisors and associations' support for community museums is key to governance because community museums are under-resourced and struggle to meet their needs. In order to assemble resources, museum workers engage in relationship building. Their relationships with the advisors and associations connect them to resources, information, and skills, enabling problem solving. For example, in Ontario, community museum workers historically contacted the museum advisors "all the time, asking: I have this problem what should I do about it?" (Interview, Holland 2017) and/or sought training from their associations. The advisors and associations are resources for community museums in Ontario that provide direct assistance,

help museums form relationships, and establish best practices. In other words, they do the work of governing at the provincial level.

Focusing on the provincial advisors' and associations' practices, this chapter uses interview and archival data to discuss the work of governing as ongoing processes of negotiation and assemblage. More specifically, the (re)construction and (re)definition of an Ontario museum community and sector is central to the evolution of community museum governance in Ontario. Within this community, the provincial museum advisors and associations are the key actors. They work to (re)define and (re)articulate the community's needs, (re)assembling support to address those needs on a provincial scale. Their role is to "help [museums] out, give them information, guide them to information, and, hopefully, advocate for them" (Interview, Weinstein 2017).

Documenting the work of governing Ontario's community museums, this chapter describes the advisors' and associations' two interconnected and overlapping roles – that is, advocacy and service delivery. First, they construct, enact, and advocate for museums as a collective entity. They attempt to (re)create actors that respond to its perceived needs, enrolling their problematizations of the community / sector into more durable constructions. Due to community museums' deprioritization in government, there has been a shift from defining a community, focusing on need, to defining a sector, focusing on contribution. Moreover, this work is now led by the OMA and the advisors have become removed from the process. Second, the advisors and associations have defined roles within the collective, meeting some of its needs and enacting community as they connect museums through their work. They (re)assemble relationships to support community museums, responding to need and opportunity in moments of time. As they engage in this translation work, they (re)negotiate their relationships within and

with the museum community and government(s), resulting in moments of conflict and compromise that contribute to changes in governance.

The discussion demonstrates the differences between the advisors' and associations' relationships with government and community museums, arguing these relationships explain changes and consistency within governance because they inform the work of governing. Historically, the advisors' relationships within government gave them the authority, resources, access, and mandate to shape government instruments and serve small museums, including them in the museum community's construction. The continued presence of a museum advisor enables the continued existence of the grant with standards. However, the one advisor's reduced role both reflects and contributes to the deprioritization of community museums in government, restricting access to the existing support program. The OMA's relationships with community museums have legitimized their construction of the sector and enabled their work, which relies on participation. In particular, the involvement of workers from well-resourced museums was critical to creating the OMA, but also contributed to the development of policy that disproportionately serves municipal museums.

Considering the advisors' and associations' relationships with both government and museums as described in interviews, the conclusion argues there is a hierarchy of museums in community museum governance. Municipal museums developed capacity due to their historic access to provincial support and the advisors. Through the OMA, they then actively participated in the work of governing, leading to additional capacity building as they shaped service delivery and advocacy.

5.2 Translating Museum Governance: Constructing, Enacting, and Serving a Community

The “museum community” and “museum sector” are central to the work of governing Ontario’s community museums. The museum community is a concept that actors define differently depending on contexts. Generally, it is a group of institutions that self-identify as museums and the people associated with those institutions, including volunteers, board members, and staff (OMA 2000). It “includes museums that are staffed by volunteers; it includes communities or people who have an idea [for] a museum. It can be very grassroots to very sophisticated organizations like the Royal Ontario Museum” (Interview, Adkin 2018). Although Ontario has more than 500 museums that vary in type, size, and expressed need, the concept of a museum community obscures diversity. It provides a single actor with feelings, opinions, and a historical narrative conveyed with one voice. For example, an OMA Past President argued, “The museum community is a lot stronger because of CMOG and because of the museum advisors, but they still need support” (Interview, Doherty 2017).

Like the museum community, the “museum sector” is an actor with a distinct history and needs, but it is a more recent construction with an outward focus. The museum sector is positioned within broader areas of action that affect multiple economic sectors. As a former OMA employee observed, “for a sector, like the museum sector, you have to consider roles and responsibilities” (Interview, DiPietro 2018). The sector’s needs are thus articulated with reference to utility and publics.

Notably, the museum community/sector is constructed and enacted as the provincial museum advisors and associations advocate for and serve community museums as a collective. At the same time, the advisors and associations in Ontario are a part of and formed from the museum community. When museum workers gathered at an OHS Conference in 1953, they

created the Ontario Historical Society's (OHS) Museums Committee. They called for provincial museum advisors who were then respected as "museum people."¹ Similarly, an Ontario Museum Association (OMA) Past President noted, she became involved with the OMA by "just being part of the museum community" (Interview, Powell 2018). As members of a community, the advisors and associations want to help their peers, defining ideal roles for themselves and other entities in support of perceived needs. Their primary goal is to facilitate connections between museums and those they believe can help museum(s), translating governance for the sector. To that end, they work together, but also have distinct roles due to their relationships with government and museums. In particular, the advisors are provincially employed civil servants,² the OMA aims to work with all museums, and the OHS has a smaller role with nonprofit community museums, friends' organizations,³ and some regional museum networks.

This section documents the advisors' and associations' work within and for the museum community, exploring the moments of conflict and consensus building that occurred during the mobilization of a collective entity and the definition of their own role(s) within this collective. First, the museum advisors and associations have worked together to define a museum community/sector and advocate for its interests, which is an ongoing process of consensus building. The construction of the museum community's needs in the 1970s enabled the establishment of standards to safeguard the pre-existing grant as the Province prioritized accountability in governance. Although the Province has continued to prioritize accountability,

¹ Vincent, Ian. 1984, July. Letter to the Hon. Susan Fisher. Rg47-51 B100093 OMA 1984 May-Aug. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

² Notably, when there was a conservation coordinator and two conservators, the conservators were not technically civil servants. The Province provided the OMA with a grant to pay the conservators who worked with the advisors and at the Ministry.

³ Friends' organizations are volunteer, nonprofit groups that support the work of museums. Municipal museums in Ontario will sometimes have a friends' organizations.

the provincial and national governments have not prioritized community museums' needs since the 1980s. As such, the Standards and a museum advisor to assesses museums' adherence to those requirements persist, but the OMA is leading constructions of a sector that contributes to society and can receive support as a community partner. Second, although the advisors and associations work together and engage in similar activities, they define distinct roles for themselves, serving and enacting the community. As they govern Ontario's community museums, these roles have shifted over time with moments of conflict. In particular, the advisors' advisory role, the OMA's training role, and the OHS' capacity building role have evolved to reflect and shape changes in governance. They build consensus and legitimize their activities within the community and with government, which enables the work of governing.

5.2.1 *Representing the Community/Sector: Constructing a Shared Meaning*

The advisors and associations are advocates for community museums. They speak for museums as a collective, arguing for particular relationships and activities. Importantly, their advocacy is a component of their governing practices, involving interrelated processes of constructing a collective with shared needs and speaking for that collective.⁴ Using consensus to legitimize their

⁴ The Canadian Museums Association (CMA) began to discuss a national museum community as early as 1968 when they published *Canadian Museums and Related Institutions*, which states the "lack of a basic guide to the Canadian museum community has been an impediment to communication and therefore to the health and growth of our museums" (Key and Key 1968, v). However, the CMA's focus was and is national. The use of the "Ontario museum community" became common in the 1970s with the emergence of the Ontario Museum Association (OMA) and concerted efforts to redefine provincial activities.

The provincial museum advisors and Ontario Historical Society's (OHS) Museums Section had worked to understand museums' needs since the 1950s. The museum community, to some extent, began to emerge within the OHS. The OHS's Museums Section's *Newsletter* began relying on a shared understanding of a "we" in the 1970s. For example, in a 1973 issue, the editor stated, "we need all the encouragement and experience we can get" (Gilbank, 1973, p. 195). However, the OMA provided a punctuated actor with the articulated responsibility to represent the community to government.

arguments, they attempt to (re)create or (re)define entities that will persist over time to improve museums' potential relationships. To that end, they participate in meetings, write reports, respond to requests for a position, and make public statements to convince other actors to support or work with museums. While consensus on the contributions of a museum sector are refocusing advocacy efforts within a changing context, consensus on the needs and wants of a museum community historically directed advocacy, enabling the advisors and associations to push for or resist change in response to opportunities.

The advisors and OMA, more specifically, have actively cooperated to advocate for policies and approaches to museum governance that address specific needs. To some extent, consensus building on community museums' needs and the construction of a museum community/sector is ongoing as they enact community. The advisors and OMA develop consensus and share ideas when they make connections with and between museums, communicating in a multi-directional manner. For example, from the 1960s to the early 2000s, the advisors conducted site visits to provide advice and assistance to community museums, which gave them "a really good grounding on what was going on in Ontario at the time" (Interview, Participant A 2017). They were able to speak directly to museum workers, see the state of community museums, and discuss what they saw with a partner, developing shared understandings. They also communicated with museums about their shared problems. Similarly, both the advisors and association representatives have listened and spoken to the associations' members at conferences and other events, such as seminars, since the OHS began hosting museum-related workshops in the 1950s. These exchanges help to define and functionally enact the community, bringing community museums together and enabling conversations about shared issues. As the

OMA's inaugural letter to museums states. "only by getting together and discovering what our similarities are can we hammer out the bonds that will tie us together."⁵

In addition to ongoing interactions that create, enact, and inform definitions of the museum community, the advisors and associations engage in work to more actively and explicitly define a collective, looking for points of consensus understood in a specific moment. They identify problems and propose solutions to (re)define actor roles and the work of governing. Interview participants described two multi-year consultations, which lead to distinct definitions of the collective that reflect community museums evolving relationships with government instruments and policy. First, the advisors and associations defined a museum community in the 1970s that required government intervention to improve basic museum operations. The provincial Standards and related entities became obligatory passage points through which community museums seeking assistance had to pass, providing normative regulation and meeting calls for more accountability in government spending. The Standards entrenched a provincial role supporting museums to improve their operations. They required museum experts in government, addressed the museum community's needs, and restricted access to provincial support. However, subsequent efforts to change support for community museums based on their shared needs have been less successful. Further, OMA representatives have since commented on the outdated nature of the Standard's understanding. As such, the Association is engaged in ongoing work to enroll a new understanding of the museum sector based on extensive research.

The construction of the community and the sector both involved moments of conflict and the creation of consensus. The advisors and/or association(s) responded to government

⁵ McLauchlan, Gordon. 1972, April. Letter to Colleagues. F2091 6 B253002 correspondence - council - president July 13,1971 - Aug 26, 1975. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

accountability efforts, conducted iterative consultations with community museums, circulated texts, and began consultation efforts with pre-existing ideas about the collective. In order to maintain consensus, the advisors and/or association(s) used or attempted to use obligatory passage points to enroll definitions to withstand the passage of time. However, there has been a shift, and, unlike the community, the sector has not been incorporated into government instruments. Responding to governments' disinterest in museums, the OMA led the construction of the sector, emphasizing museums' contributions to society or the economy and relying more heavily on research. In comparison, the advisors and associations worked together to construct the museum community, emphasizing museums' needs and assuming provincial responsibility to museums (See Table 5.1). There are thus changes in advocacy practices and the work of governing that respond and contribute to changes in governance.

Table 5.1: Similarities and Differences in the Construction of the Community and Sector

Museum Community	Museum Sector
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Founded on pre-existing ideas • Involved iterative consultations with community museums • Circulated discussion papers • Responded to change in government and an emphasis on accountability for spending 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constructed from the 1950s • Consultations in the 1970s and 1980s • Advisor and association led • Emphasis on the museums' needs • Emphasis on government's responsibility to museums • Enrolled into the Standards, OMA training, and other resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constructed from the 1990s • Consultations in the 2010s • OMA led • Emphasis on museums' contribution • Uses data and research to convince government actors • Enrolled into the OMA's work and research

5.2.1.1 *The Standards and Associated Tools: Actors Enrolling Persisting Definitions*

From the 1950s into the 1970s, the advisors and OHS developed means to connect museum workers through training, newsletters, and site visits. Then, after the OMA's creation, the advisors and associations engaged in a more concerted effort to consult with the community they helped create to define the community's needs and future direction, leading to the Standards. The Standards are requirements for museum practice tied to the museum grant, which have shaped community museum governance and the work of governing since their creation in the 1980s.

When the advisors and associations advocated for standards as an eligibility requirement for the provincial operating grant, they argued the museum community supported the call for change. The community, as it was constructed in that moment of time, needed standards and had a growing conviction that provincial funding should be distributed differently. The Standards, written in collaboration, represented a consensus on the state of the museum community, the causes of its problems, and the most appropriate direction for its development. However, support for this understanding was not unanimous at the time. There was both conflict in the definition of a museum community and consensus as the community spoke in a unified voice through the advisors and associations.

When the advisors and associations do not actively engage with museum workers and museums to define the museum community and its needs, building consensus, they risk criticism (Interview, J. Carter 2017).⁶ However, they engage with museums on an ongoing basis,

⁶ For example, during the fourth period of governance, the Ministry and, by extension, the museum advisors are criticized for their inability and lack of capacity to seek input from the museum community through relationships between museums and advisors.

discussing the state of Ontario's museums. The advisors and associations' representatives, therefore, begin deliberative consultation efforts with pre-existing understandings. Due to their preconceptions, calls for standards proceeded concerted consultation work to define the museum community's need for standards. For example, the advisors talked amongst themselves about the issues they saw as part of their advisory work, such as mice in the attic of a museum (Interview, Duncan 2017). They observed a lot of problems. As one advisor stated, "Many people had buildings full of collections and not one thing was catalogued. It was a royal mess... Today, it is very hard to talk about what a mess it was because most people think I am ... making it up!" (Ibid.). In 1973, the advisors' *Suggested Programme for the Development of Local Museums in Ontario* argued "at the present time the majority of small community museums do not have the resources to cope with much more than the basic role of acting as a repository for local artifacts" (Historical and Museums Branch 1973, 7).⁷ Accordingly, the advisors recommended basic requirements and standards linked to funding.

The OHS' Museums Section's early publications also articulate a desire for standards⁸ and museum workers created the OMA, in part, to engage in training "leading to professional standards and certification" (Hough 1972, 3). At the time, those involved with community museums were often teachers and people in related fields, "scrambling to figure out what the museum business was about" (Interview, Kerr-Wilson 2018). An OMA Past President observed,

⁷ When the OMA and OHS began to call for changes to the provincial museum policy in 1973, they communicated the "general dissatisfaction in the museum community with the present grant system" and their proposals aligned with those of the museum advisors in the suggested programme. For more information on the associations' views, see correspondence and other documents available in: Rg47-58 B100616 museums - Ontario museums policy. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁸ In the OHS Museum Section's 1955 workshop report, the Director of the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM) outlined six basic requirements for museums (Heinrich 1955) and a 1962 issue of their *Newsletter* notes the Section's purpose is to establish standards (Taylor 1962).

“museums were all over the map in terms of what they were doing” (Interview, Havelka 2018). Due to museum workers’ lack of training, those engaged in the translation of a museum community through the associations in the late 1970s understood and accepted the existence of a museum community with a need for standards.

Despite the apparent consensus, the definition of a museum community in need was not universally understood amongst museum workers. In a meeting with the Ministry, the OMA president argued the advisors were better able to perceive the museum community’s needs than those directly involved who did not know what was right or wrong.⁹ As an advisor from the 1970s noted, “there were many [museums] that I don’t think realized they needed help. They wouldn’t realize that they needed help until we came, or the OMA came and gave them a workshop” (Interview, Duncan 2017).

In order to tell museums what they were doing poorly and help them improve, the advisors and association representatives built relationships through personal visits and training events throughout the 1970s. According to the first manager of the museum section, it was necessary to develop relationships so suggestions “would be received as constructive criticism and not the idle prattle of a meddling expert.”¹⁰ As such, the advisors and association representatives circulated their views on the state of the museum community and its needs to those perceived as in the community.¹¹ For example, the advisors published articles in the association newsletters and other publications, highlighting good practices and issues they had

⁹ See comments made by M. Lewis in: Meeting re: museums review June 16th, 1978 11 am Minister’s Boardroom. RG47-51 B101712 policy papers II. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

¹⁰ Styrmo, V.N. 1966, November. Letter to Clifford Cark. RG47-51 B328434 general correspondence Ontario 1968. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

¹¹ As Callon (1986b) states, during translation, entities “are converted into inscriptions: reports, memoranda, documents, survey results, scientific papers. These are sent out and received back, acted upon and reacted to” (27).

identified.¹² Museum workers responded to these problematizations, making their own contributions that the advisors and association representatives also read.

Incorporating different views, the advisors and associations created discussion papers and reports that more explicitly defined the museum community and its needs, which were circulated and rewritten, as they worked for consensus. Responses to these documents demonstrate the conflicts that existed in the 1970s about the museum community's needs. For example, the OMA formed a committee with the OHS to study provincial support to museums in 1974.¹³ The eleven-person committee sent a questionnaire to museums, sought information from Ontario Ministries, and met regularly to discuss their Brief. *A Museum Policy for Ontario* (Inglis et al. 1975) identifies five core problems besetting Ontario's museums – that is, gaps in collections, conservation problems, unqualified staff, the limited geographic availability of museums across Ontario, and inadequate funding. The OMA made eight recommendations to address these issues, including a new funding formula with performance measures and criteria accounting for provincial interests.

While the Brief represented “the collective thinking of a number of representatives from the museum community in Ontario,”¹⁴ the Ministry of Culture and Recreation's Task Force on the Brief argued the conclusions were limited due to limited representation on the committee. The

¹² For example, the first museum advisor S.J. Gooding circulated papers on standard procedures, museum records, incorporation, dating firearms, museum insurance, conservation, display, policies, and highway signs. He also circulated information in the OHS' museum workshop reports.

¹³ They had proposed a museums advisory committee to work with the Ministry, which the responsible director and assistant deputy minister opposed suggesting the OMA develop a report on the grant instead. The members of the OMA's committee were not exclusively OMA representatives. They had multiple memberships and also worked for the ROM, AGO, and CMA.

¹⁴ The Interim Committee's Report and other correspondence is available in: Rg47-58 B100616 Museums - Ontario museums policy. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

committee had included members associated with the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM), Art Gallery of Ontario (AGO), and the Ontario Association of Art Galleries (OAAG). However, the directors of the ROM, AGO, and OAAG disagreed substantially with the Brief, submitting rebuttals that drew a connection between a lack of involvement on the committee and a lack of representation in the suggestions. For example, the Director of the ROM noted 88% of the OMA's members were from outside of Toronto and the Brief, therefore, articulated a need for additional spending outside of the provincial capital. The AGO and OAAG opposed the inclusion of art galleries as part of the museum community without sufficient consideration of their distinct needs. There was thus disagreement on the definition and needs of a museum community. Rather than build consensus, the Ministry temporarily ceased museum policy discussions, adhering to the Task Force's assertion that Ontario did not need a museum policy.

Leading to a change in the Ministry's position, there was once again consensus on the needs of a museum community in 1978. The museum community spoke with one voice to oppose the deconditionalization of the grants to municipal museums. Deconditionalization was one of a series of reforms aimed to change the transfer payment system between the Province and local governments. If the municipal museums' grants were deconditionalized, they would have become part of a larger transfer payment to municipalities without a requirement for a museum. The advisors, OHS, and OMA believed municipal councils would reallocate funding away from municipal museums, undermining museums' development.¹⁵ They saw municipal councils as pragmatic without an understanding of cultural matters. As a result, municipal museums relied on the provincial leadership with an incentive grant to encourage municipal contributions (The Council of the Ontario Museum Association 1978). After the Provincial-

¹⁵ For information on the OMA and OHS' views, see correspondence and other documents available in: F2091 15 museums response to the deconditionalization of museum grants. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

Municipal Grant Reform Committee argued for the museum grant's suspension, the museum community "geared itself into action to prevent what most feared would be a major blow to museums in the Province."¹⁶ Museums and municipal clerks, including those who would be unaffected, sent the Province opposition letters.¹⁷ The OMA formed a committee that wrote and submitted a report to the provincial treasurer, arguing the proposed reforms would hinder the museum community's ability to continue providing cultural identity, citizenship development, educational opportunities, and provincial pride (Ibid.).

As the OMA fought deconditionalization, they met with Ministry of Culture and Recreation staff, prompting a renewed discussion on a museum policy. The policy discussions began with a consideration of the OMA's aforementioned Brief from 1975, which had proposed new measurements and criteria for the grant as an incentive for museums to improve. At the same time, the Director of the Wellington County Museum, who was also a member of the OMA council and would become president, sent the Ministry a position paper. He responded to the Grants Reform Committee's argument that the museum grant was not sufficiently rationalized, arguing for the rationalization of museum grants as an alternative to deconditionalization. Unlike other calls for change, he acknowledged the effects on the museum community would not be universal. Despite the potential detrimental effects to some museums, he thought it was

¹⁶ Seiling, Ken. c. 1978. Alternative to deconditionalization. RG47-51 B101712 policy papers I. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

¹⁷ The program was also threatened in 1974 after a directive from the provincial treasurer. The OMA's *Currently* indicates museums wrote letters in opposition in 1978. However, I was unable to find this correspondence in the provincial archives. Examples from 1974 are available in: Rg47-58 b100616 museums – deconditionalization. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

“time that the museum community started to consider a number of basic points.”¹⁸ In particular, it was infeasible for the Province to fund museums that would not improve.¹⁹

To avoid funding museums with poor museological practices²⁰ and improve the quality of museums opening in the province, the advisors tried to educate people on best practices before they established their museum. To that end, they wrote *Establishing a Museum?* (1977), which outlined some basic requirements for a museum such as space allocation, an interpretation philosophy, and a collection policy.²¹ Using the document as a guide, the advisors began to define standards for community museums in 1978, alongside the advisors’ and associations’ efforts opposing deconditionalization. They circulated memorandums to each other, expressing their ideas and outlining preventable problems they saw in community museums. Notably, not all of the advisors agreed the guidelines were a good idea, believing the establishment of standards should be left to the community itself and government-imposed standards could restrict development. However, those proposing a different approach were in the minority.²²

¹⁸ Seiling, Ken. c. 1978. Alternative to deconditionalization. RG47-51 B101712 policy papers I. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

¹⁹ Noting some museums would have difficulties and others would see a vindication of their existing activities, Seiling argued, “it is not feasible for the government to continue to fund those museums which cannot or do not carry out the role of preservers of their collections” (2). In particular, there were “museums whose existence must be seriously questioned. If the backers of those institutions cannot be motivated to adopt and implement good museum practice, there should be no reason for the Province to continue funding” (3). Seiling, Ken. c. 1978. Alternative to deconditionalization. RG47-51 B101712 policy papers I. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

²⁰ Notably, the advisors were key actors defining good museological practice in Ontario at this time. However, the associations, including ICOM, the American associations, the Canadian Museums Association, and OMA, began playing a more active role articulating good practice. They provided training forums to exchange ideas and some publications.

²¹ Importantly, the advisors argued groups should avoid opening museums without local support because they would struggle without this support.

²² For copies of the advisors’ correspondence and draft guidelines, see documents available in: RG47-51 B101712 policy papers I, II, and III. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

The advisors wrote *Guidelines for Museums Making Initial Application for a Museum Operating Grant* based on their circulated ideas, outlining facility development standards and an expectation for specific governing documents.²³

As they worked to define expectations, the advisors also articulated the problems of Ontario museums for discussion with the museum community. For example, the Province hired the first conservator to assess community museums' conservation problems and identify areas for improvement in the late 1970s. He administered surveys to 20 museums, visiting each site to conduct a visual inspection. According to *A Survey of the Conservation Requirements of the Museum Community in Ontario*, the community lacked an understanding of the importance of conservation, museum facilities were inadequate, and there was an insufficient number of trained conservators to address the issues (McMeekin 1980).²⁴ In addition to the survey, the advisors collaborated with other Ministry employees to write the discussion paper *Ontario's Community Museum Program: Directions for the 1980's*, which defines problems and also acknowledges diversity in the quality of Ontario's community museums. Some museums were well maintained, had trained staff, and wrote updated policies. Others were not well maintained or well run and did not have trained staff or policies. However, most needed encouragement to upgrade the services they provided.

²³ It includes a guide for museum planning with expectations for a needs assessment, space utilization, and environmental controls. The advisors expected museums to develop a statement of purpose as well as policies for collections management, conservation, security, public program, and staff management. The guidelines are available in: F2091 15 B253021 Community Museum Policy 1981. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

²⁴ Significantly, the Ministry also asked OMA "what they perceived to be the conservation requirements of the museum community" (McMeekin 1980, ii). The Council and Conservation Committee provided comments and recommendations that reflected the conclusions in *A Survey of the Conservation Requirements of the Museum Community in Ontario* (McMeekin 1980), reinforcing the OMA's capacity to speak for the museum community.

Following the creation and circulation of the guidelines and discussion paper, the advisors engaged in extensive consultation. In addition to meeting with OMA and OHS representatives, they facilitated community meetings across Ontario in Spring and Winter 1980,²⁵ giving “individuals from the museum community a chance to express their concerns.”²⁶ The advisors held open discussions on the proposed policy and support programs, circulated a questionnaire, and asked client museums to convey their concerns in writing.²⁷

Individuals expressed support for standards in principle, but many feared they were unattainable, identifying a number of issues. An advisor from the period noted, there were “some livid arguments primarily by the smaller museums, saying you're forcing this on us, what good does it do, and we can't achieve this” (Interview, J. Carter 2017). As the first manager of the museum section observed, small museums opposed the proposed changes because they recommended “professional standards to be met by all museums, when in fact it was only the larger ones [that] could afford staff of that caliber” (Interview, Styrmo 2017). Protesting the rigidity of the Standards, a museum representative wrote that “small rural establishments like ours cannot comply.”²⁸ A former OMA employee and vocal opponent to the Standards at the time, recalled

I felt that the energy was misguided. They asked museums to come up to standards, which were not necessarily applicable to the work that they were doing within their

²⁵ For the first round of meetings, 289 persons attended from the museum community and 77 members of staff of the MCR attending. In November 1980, the second set of meetings to bring the community up to date on the proposals, discuss the proposed regulation, and provide the information needed for future planning.

²⁶ Duncan, Dorothy. 1980, October. Presentation at the annual workshop. RG47-51 B101695 museum policy revisions. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

²⁷ For detailed notes on the meetings written by the advisors, see loose papers available in: RG47-51 B101715. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

²⁸ Museum correspondence available in: Rg47-51 B183638. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

own community or the quality of their collections or whatever. The bar was too high for a lot of these organizations to meet... They weren't professional; they didn't have a professional. A curator might be a librarian who happened to like working with the public and wanted to do it in a museum setting... If the purpose of the policy was to support and help museums grow, it wasn't doing that... It was stifling them because the burden of trying to develop their own policies, like a conservation policy or a public program policy and so one, was beyond [them], especially historic house people. (Interview, Kurylo 2018)

The smaller often nonprofit museums, therefore, expressed concern about the burdens the proposed guidelines would place on community museums, including expectations for staff, policies, and space that they did not have. Responding to these concerns, the advisors removed some expectations and adjusted the definition of good practice in working documents. As they listened to and incorporated feedback, they built consensus to develop a policy with minimum expectations as norms accepted by community museum workers.

Although they worked to incorporate individuals' views in policy documents, the advisors also began to obscure the diversity of opinions expressed. For example, results from the questionnaire²⁹ circulated at the community meetings in Spring 1980 indicated majority consensus on some issues, such as a belief from 78% of respondents that the guidelines for new museums were not too strict or should be stricter.³⁰ Individuals who disagreed argued the guidelines would have prevented those in attendance from opening a museum.³¹ One museum

²⁹ The advisors circulate the questionnaire at 17 meetings with 289 people from the museum community and 77 members of the Ministry. The questionnaire asked respondents to rank priorities for the museum advisors and whether the guidelines for new museums coming into the program were too strict. They were also asked for an opinion on the length of time needed for client museums to upgrade their facilities to a better standard, recommendations on the guidelines, recommendations for a new formula for museum grants, recommendations for discretionary grants, recommendations for criteria to measure quality, an opinion on the role of provincial museums, an opinion on how future policy reviews should be conducted, and some other miscellaneous questions. See: Duncan, Dorothy. 1980, July 9. Report on Community Meetings re Discussion Paper for Museum Policy. RG47-51 B101712 policy papers I. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

³⁰ Duncan, Dorothy. 1980, July 9. Report on Community Meetings re Discussion Paper for Museum Policy. RG47-51 B101712 policy papers I. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

³¹ See the advisors' notes from the meetings available in: RG47-51 B101715 loose papers. Archives of Ontario,

would have been unable to meet the size requirements because they “would have to be the largest building in [their] community.”³² Despite these smaller museums’ views, in a 1980 speech to the OHS’ Museum Section, the manager of the museum section noted meeting participants “almost unanimously” supported guidelines for new museums entering the grant program.

The resulting *Community Museums Policy for Ontario* references the consultations and perceived consensus, stating a major recommendation was that “the government move toward a more equalized system of operational grants” (Museums Section 1981, 4). Basic requirements, which would become the Standards for all museums receiving an operating grant, were central to the new system due to a focus on quality. A specific understanding of the museum community was thus enrolled into the renewed program, which became a key interestment device. In particular: (1) The museum community called for the development of a new funding formula; (2) The growth in the number of museums led to a concern about the deterioration of objects in museums, necessitating a focus on quality in policy; and (3) There are seven components to excellent museum operations for which community museums in Ontario can and should strive.

Responding to the new policy, the OMA surveyed its members, forwarding a report to the Ministry in February 1982. The community continued to express a desire “in principle” for the Standards, but respondents had reservations. In particular, respondents from small and historic house museums argued they would be unable to meet the new requirements and would become ineligible for funding. They called for flexibility and a recognition of the constraints on the dedicated volunteers running museums. While the OMA forwarded these comments and

Toronto.

³² Museum correspondence available in: Rg47-51 B183638. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

pushed for flexibility, they also minimized the findings, noting “the returns have been distorted somewhat by the tendency for those who disagree with the policy to respond more often and in greater detail than those who support it.”³³ The Report states the “silent majority’s” support for the policy and its objectives would play a major role in the OMA’s official response. The smaller museums’ participation in consultation efforts was, therefore, undermined by their limited capacity to participate in the mobilization of their voices in advocacy for the museum community. Despite not responding to the survey, the so-called silent majority centered the OMA’s responses at this time perhaps due to their participation on the council and committees. Recognizing the potential disconnect, museums at one of the 1980 community meetings suggested the Ministry continue to ask museums directly what they think rather than let the OMA be the only voice for the community.³⁴

To that end, the advisors once again sought feedback to write the final version of the Standards. They wrote the Standards in the early 1980s, reflecting on their previous consultations, interests, and ongoing experiences providing advice to community museums (Interviews, Duncan 2017; J. Carter 2017; Watts 2017). As a conservation coordinator noted, the “discussions about the Standards were with all of us. People would input as they were interested” (Interview, Watts 2017). They used their expertise to develop a prototype, which was then “peer reviewed” (Interview, J. Carter 2017). To facilitate the review, the advisors held a focused consultation with a small group of museum workers then regional meetings with over

³³ Survey results on correspondence on the surveys are available in: RG47-50_i Ontario Museum Association vol iv. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

³⁴ See the advisors’ notes from the meetings available in: RG47-51 B101715 loose papers. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

300 individuals in 1983, listening to and incorporating the feedback they received.³⁵ An advisor observed,

People within the government used their expertise to develop a prototype, which ... was peer reviewed by the museum community. To this day, I think that's a good model because it was not only government writing these things, but a peer review by those using them... We went out and did the series of consultations. After, when there was some controversy, we could say this isn't really a government initiative. This is a government initiative in concert with the Ontario Museum Association and the Ontario Historical Society ... It was developed in-house, but with there was actually a working committee of museum professionals to help develop the final draft. (Interview, J. Carter 2018)

The perception of consensus, therefore, limited opposition as the advisors argued the Standards were developed in consultation with the OMA, OHS, and museum professionals. The consultations contributed to both constructing the Standards and a community in support of those standards.

After the consultations, the advisors presented the Standards at the OMA's annual conference for additional feedback. The OMA president introduced the presentation, articulating the importance of the Standards due to the government's need for accountability in a period of fiscal restraint.³⁶ Based on discussions during the conference and the perceptions of OMA Councillors who went to the advisors' 1983 meetings, the OMA's Executive Director argued, "it is clear that the museum community is supportive in principle of standards as a means of increasing accountability for government support, thereby ensuring the continuation of the operating grant program."³⁷ Notably, the museum community's support reflects the OMA

³⁵ They held 16 regional meetings.

³⁶ Baeker, Greg. 1984, January 25. Letter to Marty Brent. Rg47-51 B310093 OMA Jan-April 1984. Archives of Ontario. Toronto. The president's speech was also mentioned in my interview with Baeker as reinforcing the need for the Standards to the museums in attendance.

³⁷ Baeker, Greg. 1984, January 25. Letter to Marty Brent. Rg47-51 B310093 OMA Jan-April 1984. Archives of Ontario. Toronto.

president's argument that the Standards were needed to maintain and rationalize funding to government. The president had also expressed this view directly to the Ministry in 1978 when he encouraged the creation of the Standards as a museum director. Active members of the OMA, therefore, reinforced definitions of the Standards as both necessary to and supported by the museum community.

After approximately six years of consultation and discussion on the needs of the museum community, the advisors released finalized standards in 1984, which incorporated feedback from the consultations. However, in the interest of consensus, not all views could be incorporated. As a former museum advisor and OHS Executive Director observed, "there were a lot of compromises made" (Duncan qtd. in CMA 1984, 1). Offering another compromise, the advisors promised flexibility when implementing the Standards.

The Standards state that in Ontario, "the museum community has long recognized and advocated the need for basic museological standards which all museums could strive to attain" (Heritage Branch 1984, 1). Acknowledging community museums' diversity, they only developed standards in six basic areas of operation that focus on the common functions of community museums regardless of size or scope. The Standards, therefore, define activities "shared by all" community museums – that is, research, collection records management, staff training, exhibition, interpretation and education programs, and conservation. Though the activities were purportedly shared, few museums were actually meeting the requirements in 1984 and were, therefore, given an implementation schedule. With the threat of a reduction or elimination of

funding, the advisors were able to encourage museums to elevate their operations and began tailoring their responsive assistance to needs associated with the new requirements.³⁸

Following the Standards' release and incorporation into provincial museum governance, their articulation of museum functions and practices continued to undergo forms of review. In Canada, the Province was the first to establish a museum advisor position (McAvity 1981) and standards. Ontario was seen as a leader in establishing best practices for museums. The advisors were, therefore, asked to present the Standards to museum workers and/or their counterparts in other provinces and countries (Interview, J. Carter 2017).³⁹ A former advisor recalled,

I've done workshops in Africa, in Kenya, and in Australia because... museums in those countries were interested in what we'd done... What we developed in Ontario was seen in the museum community - not just in Canada but, at that one point, in the world - as being something that they wanted to know about. (Ibid.)

These other jurisdictions developed or, at least, considered standards for community museums. The broader interest supported and reinforced the definition of core functions, normalizing the development and communication of best practices within community museum governance.

In addition to discussing the Standards in other jurisdictions, the advisors continued to (re)define the Standards as important to the Ontario museum community. The OMA's journal, *Museum Quarterly*, contained articles that repeated the problematizations explicit or implicit in the Standards themselves. In particular, the advisors stated that during consultations the

³⁸ The advisors assessed museums based on applications, using the grant as a carrot and the Standards as a stick (Interview, Participant A 2017). Museum workers could then present the Standards and expectations to their boards or municipalities to leverage additional support. To help museums gain local funding, the advisors made presentations and attended meetings at museums' requests. They also demonstrated a provincial commitment through other non-financial forms of assistance.

³⁹ During the interview and follow up interview, Carter discussed presenting the Standards to and/or sharing literature on the Standards with Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Alberta, British Columbia, Yukon, North West Territories, Sudan, Kenya, New Zealand, Australia, Holland, Ireland, England, the United States, and Taiwan. Interest from Alberta, Manitoba, Australia, New Zealand, and the United States is also mentioned in a CMA *Museogramme* from the period (CMA 1984).

museum community asked for a more equitable distribution of funding and standards as the basis for the new formula (Brent 1984). The statement implies the individuals consulted asked for standards. However, the advisors began the consultations with guidelines and a plan to implement standards due to a call from the advisors, the associations, and specific individuals from the museum community, such as the directors of comparatively well-resourced museums already receiving provincial support through the museum operating grant. In the early 1980s, the voices of these groups, which called for and saw a need for provincial standards, were (re)defined as the museum community's voice and the voices of dissent were minimized.

While supportive of the Standards and ideas therein, the Executive Director signaled a shift in the OMA's definition of a museum community following the Standards' release in 1984. In 1982, the OMA had sent a report to the Ministry communicating museums' concerns but emphasizing the silent majority's desire for standards that encouraged excellence. In contrast, the same Executive Director's correspondence with museum advisors in 1984 was supportive but stated it would be misleading to state concerns do not exist, (re)iterating the need for flexibility and concern about the lack of capital funding available to upgrade museums.

Reflecting attention to dissenting voices, the OMA also published alternative views on the new grant criteria alongside articles from the advisors during the 1980s. The OMA's publications served as a site for some conflict about the Standards *after* they were created and implemented. For example, a former OMA employee and curator for a small museum published an article in *Museum Quarterly* that argued the Standards conveyed a "pessimistic and paternalistic approach to cultural development which implies museums are not doing their job well of their own volition" (Kurylo 1984, 9). The article notes the Standards did not address the question of why community museums had been slow to address the problems identified, neglecting to articulate consensus on this point. Kurylo's description of the state of the museum

community lists problems preventing the attainment of the Standards – that is, funding shortages, competition for audiences, poor board relations, and insufficient means to measure museums' effectiveness.

While not predicted in the Standards, museum workers mobilized the new provincial policy to overcome some of the hurdles Kurylo identified with the advisors' assistance. Once created, there was some flexibility in how the Standards could be used in a museum setting. Museum workers, particularly those in municipal museums, used the Standards to support arguments for more funding from local governments. Further, since the Standards defined basic museum activities, museum workers showed the requirements to their municipalities or boards to argue for a new line item in the budget or the development of a new staff position. The Standards served as community museums' "most powerful instrument of instruction" because they defined "what they should be doing to conserve and preserve the collection" for municipalities and boards (Pilon 1984, 16). A former museum advisor discussed the standards as a carrot and stick that provided the opportunity to secure additional funding and support, observing

Many institutions embraced this. Particularly, municipal institutions saw this as a great argument to pitch to municipal councilors. [They argued] if we improve in these areas, which means we require investment and support from the municipality, we will be meeting best practices in this sector and doing something really positive for our communities. We will also potentially have increased funding from the Province in this next step. And so, the strongest argument that was made was with municipal museums who saw their support, in many cases, increase dramatically to sustain the work that museums were mapping out for themselves to align with the Standards. (Interview, Participant A 2017)

The Standards' problematization of museums' basic activities were thus incorporated into museums' activities across Ontario, particularly in municipal museums. The work differed from museum to museum as the advisors helped institutions identify the most critical area of action

for their institution and some museums used the new requirements to bolster pe-existing plans or ideas.

The understanding of the museum community and museum functions articulated in the Standards were also incorporated into additional resources through the work of governing. The advisors, OMA, and OHS developed means, such as publications, to educate museum workers on the best practices. Most notably, they began to provide training that reflected the requirements. For example, a former conservator noted

There were year-by-year requirements ... each museum had to prove a certain level of proficiency in each area of the Standards. In the conservation, there were multiple levels. We would help them [meet these requirements] with workshops and going there to do museum visits, which were like a museum assessment. I would go and ... others would go too to address their areas of expertise.

[I would] say, "Okay, your storage is a disaster. Here in a long report and this is how you can do it practically. You can line the shelves of the wood with the corrugated plastic signs used in in elections because they're inert. Go to the hospital get their old bed sheets. They're great for dust covers." ... And a lot of museums really benefited from that. We were able to instruct staff. We physically held workshops at our place, and we held workshops in museums. (Interview, Poulin 2017)

Another advisor remembered, "We worked with the Ontario Museum Association, or they worked with Ministry, to develop a training program, which went out to clients. Workshops, symposia, conference, speakers, and hands-on kind of training complemented the Standards" (Interview, Participant A 2017). In a 1991 survey on the Standards, a respondent noted they were "a 'child' of these standards, having been introduced and indoctrinated during the Certificate of Museum Studies seminars."⁴⁰ The OMA had launched their Certificate in Basic Museum Studies in January 1980 prior to the release of the provincial museum policy and standards. However, the Certificate became the Certificate in Museum Studies (CMS) and changed in the 1980s. The courses have since reflected and responded to the Standards. For

⁴⁰ The survey responses are available in: Rg47-41 b340871. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

example, on a flyer titled “Looking for Resources to Meet the 2005 Community Museum Standards?” the OMA lists four CMS courses, making direct connections between the courses and the Standards (OMA c.2005). Even those not in the grant program have, therefore, been encouraged to engage with the Standards as an obligatory passage point attached to the grant through the advisors’ and associations’ educational activities.

In short, the work of governing Ontario’s community museums involves advocacy work, which shapes the evolution of community museum policy in Ontario. The advisors and associations defined a museum community in need of guidance to improve during a key moment when the provincial operating grant was threatened by calls for accountability in government, efforts to reform provincial transfers to municipalities, and the Province’s unwillingness to keep expanding the grant budget as the number of museums continued to grow. Advisors and association representatives believed the museum community had expanded too rapidly in the 1960s and 1970s, leading to a number of museums without appropriate facilities or trained staff. As such, they argued for the development of standards tied to the provincial operating grant, which would both provide a rationale for the provincial support and address the community’s needs. After consulting with museum workers and reviewing the Standards based on their feedback, they argued the museum community called for standards and the requirements they developed reflected the views of that community. There was thus support for the new initiative within the community and provincial government.

While the Standards were revised in the late 1990s,⁴¹ they have enrolled a particular understanding of the community and appropriate activities for museums that has withstood the

⁴¹ While Carter describes the second standard development as less consultative, Holland describes it as more. Graham and Holland note there was a lot of communication. In order to develop revised standards, the advisors held three consultation meetings with a hand-picked selection of professionals and leaders. Holland (Interview, 2017) describes the consultations as “the typical kind of government consultation where we need someone from the north and

test of time. Importantly, once the Standards were established, the OMA provided space for members to vocalize dissenting opinions about the new requirements while also assembling resources to help museums meet them. Museums that disagreed with the Standards either left the operating grant program or worked with the advisors to improve their operations during the 1980s.⁴² The Standards became an actor shaping museum activities and goals through the definition of museum functions. As more museums began to meet the Standards, conceptions of the museum community and its needs have changed. To that end, the OMA's construction of the museum community began to diverge from the Standards following their release, allowing for member museums' distinct realities and relationships to policy. Despite disagreement, the Standards continue to act and assert the parameters of basic museum operations in Ontario, which are then mobilized within additional entities, such as training programs. The advisors and associations enrolled their understanding of community museums in obligatory passage points that have persisted.

Since creating the Standards, the advisors and associations have been less successful enrolling policy instruments targeting the museum community's need(s). For example, the

someone from the south and someone to represent the big ones and the little ones."

The advisors also engaged in research, developing a paper, and relied on their own experiences. From their experiences, they were able to identify obvious gaps. In particular, "there was the governance gap, the finance gap, and then in terms of community service there was a community relations gap" (Interview, Graham 2017).

As with the first standards, the advisors provided workshops to the museum community, working with the provincial associations and, in particular, the OMA to deliver the material. Following the implementation period, the advisors continued to work with the associations to circulate material and provide information to help museums achieve the Standards. As a government partner, the OMA worked with the advisors "in terms of getting the word out and facilitating that interaction between the advisors and the community around the new standards" (Interview, Graham 2017).

⁴² Background on Community Museums. Rg47-108 B234377 Heritage Staff Meeting Minutes 1601-13-4. Archives of Ontario, Toronto. The backgrounder states "To date one museum has withdrawn from the grant program by choice; 11 have been shifted, most by choice, to the Heritage Organization Development Program, and 204 are meeting the standards."

advisors and associations conducted surveys and wrote reports in the early 1990s as part of the Heritage Policy Review, leading to no changes in the written museum policy. The conservators also attempted to write a provincial conservation policy for collecting institutions in Ontario. However, they were unable to develop a policy that met provincial priorities and did not raise expectations for additional support (Poulin 1992). Written provincial museum policy, therefore, remained unchanged until the advisors rewrote the standards in the late 1990s and early 2000s. However, these changes were an effort to re-rationalize the program as an accountability mechanism following a critical provincial audit and did not fully address museums ongoing complaints about the inequitable distribution of funding. While accountability remains a key goal in government, meeting community museums' needs as collecting institutions is not. As a result, constructions of the community have become less pertinent to advocacy within the advisors' and associations governing practices.

5.2.1.2 *From Community Need to Sectoral Accomplishment: Museums 2025*

During the 1990s, an economic downturn led to reduced support for community museums from the provincial and federal governments. While the advisors updated the Standards and have updated expectations in implementation, the revised requirements were not accompanied with a new written museum policy. Instead, the Province continued enacting a policy of disinterest, reducing the number of advisors. As a result, advocacy practices within community museum governance have changed.

Responding to reduced government interest in community museums, the OMA has taken a leadership role in the definition of a community museum sector. For example, in 2006-2007, the OMA engaged in advocacy to increase the provincial operating grant for community

museums. The campaign aimed to address community museums' need – that is, a need for increased funding – but also emphasized museums' important work “in support of education, cultural tourism, community vitality, and the economic health of our province” (OMA 2006), using research (Interview, Adkin 2018). Importantly, the OMA coordinated a postcard campaign to demonstrate public support for museum work and involved municipalities.⁴³ An OMA Past President observed,

When we were trying to increase CMOG, [the OMA] actively worked with municipalities to have municipalities put their voice in at the table. So, it wasn't just the museum manager that was speaking ... to say we need to increase funding. It was the municipality saying, we need your help. (Interview, Powell 2018)

A grant increase then occurred as part of a provincial strategy “to further boost jobs and economic renewal” (OMA 2007). Increasing support for the grant, therefore, involved constructing a sector that includes municipal museums, contributes to society and the economy, the public supports, and has connections to broader government objectives, which can be demonstrated through research.

While maintaining the need for the operating grant and continuing to advocate for increases as seen in 2006 - 2007, individuals interviewed described the Standards, which remain connected to the provincial operating grant, as outdated. Some reject the problematization of a museum community that requires these standards to improve and argue the basic museum activities outlined no longer reflect current museology. While the Standards can be helpful, the way they are assessed changes, which “is a little overwhelming for some sites and for other sites it becomes a little insulting” (Interview, Bachmann 2018). These bureaucratic demands on museums can be intensive. An OMA Past President and Chief Administrative Officer at a historic site noted,

⁴³ The Postcard campaign was even modeled after a similar campaign that had worked in Ottawa in response to municipal cuts. Certain OMA members were involved in both campaigns.

I just find the bureaucracy is horrendous... I can understand that from the Province's point of view, the taxpayers are the ones who have a say in where their money goes... But what we have to do as an organization to get the money that they give out ... is just unbelievable. (Interview, Havelka 2018)

In other words, there is some resistance to the Standards from within the museum community amongst both municipal and nonprofit museums. Although the requirements remain fairly basic, museums have to demonstrate their adherence through extensive bureaucratic processes in order to access funding, which uses museums already limited human resources.

From an advocacy perspective, the construction of the community within the Standards is incomplete for contemporary contexts. The Standards do not clearly define community museums' role beyond the "preservation, presentation, and sustainability of material culture of Ontario" (Tourism, Culture and Sport 2017). The definition of museums' functions is insufficient when arguing for museum support due to governments' focus on broader objectives in an era of outcomes-driven cultural policy rather than museum policy. As such, the OMA's ongoing practices involve the (re)definition of the collective as a museum sector. They advocate for the (re)construction of entities to guide the sector's development and support its broader contributions to society.

The mobilization of research (Interview, Adkin 2017), such as *Research into the Sustainability of Ontario's Community Museums: CMOG Snapshot 2000-2004* (Ontario Museum Association 2008b), is a key component of the OMA's renewed advocacy. Through research, they are (re)defining a museum sector with quantitative facts and figures, such as the distribution of support and number of museums. In 2011, the OMA established a Research Task Force "mandated to explore and review the place of museums in different jurisdictions, from other provinces, territories, and the US, to the international, and in particular the UK" (Ontario Museum Association 2011). Considering funders' push for performance measurements at the

time, they aimed to find a way to measure museums' work.⁴⁴ However, the Task Force did not know what to measure because the sector's needs, objectives, and functions were no longer clearly defined. An individual who participated in the efforts recalled

We also began to realize that in a way we had to do this looking forward thing. We had to do a kind of strategic development before we could even get to the question of doing the measurables. In some ways, we needed to figure out what the measurables were... You could start spitting out various things and you realize you still haven't articulated the core, which is: Why do Museums matter? Why should they matter in a community? And you need to articulate and flesh that out. Then, you can start to define questions about how to measure it. We were kind of doing it backwards... So, we headed forward on this looking forward project. (Interview, Kerr-Wilson 2018)

The research work highlighted the need to define the sector, prompting the Looking Ahead initiative – that is, an extensive consultation effort to define the Ontario museum sector's needs and future direction (Ibid.).

While the OMA has engaged in multiple consultations with its members since its first strategic planning exercise in 1986, the Looking Ahead initiative had an unprecedented scope. The OMA formed a 12-person task force in 2014 to represent the “depth and breadth of Ontario's museum sector” (Ontario Museum Association 2015a, 11), including representatives from national, provincial, municipal, and nonprofit museums as well as galleries. As seen with the definition of a museum community in the 1970s and 1980s, the Task Force began with assumptions about the sector. In particular, the work aimed to “realize the full potential of a more collaborative, forward-looking and responsive museum sector for communities across the province” (Ontario Museum Association 2015, 12). The Task Force's aim demonstrates a change in how the Association defines museums as a collective. When defining the museum community

⁴⁴ They conducted research to identify and assess ongoing or recent “one-off government and key stakeholder museum data collection initiatives in the areas of operating, capital, special projects, and impact” (Ontario Museum Association 2013, 6), aiming to identify best practices for implementation in Ontario.

in the 1970s, the advisors and associations had focused on their needs. The Looking Ahead initiative considered need but had a broader scope. The definition of museums' relationships to other actors is key to defining a collective as a sector, which has needs related to its various contributions.

The Task Force engaged in research to identify the sector's successes and challenges, define the Ontario museum sector's profile, and study innovative approaches in the museum and cultural sectors more broadly. They sought input from museum professionals, volunteers, and other stakeholders through 140 online surveys, 31 in-depth interviews, and four facilitated discussions with approximately 250 people. They also conducted an institutional survey⁴⁵ and engaged in discussions with funders. A former OMA employee involved in the initiative recalled,

It was a very thorough undertaking. A lot of the institutions were able to participate both in a proactive way in the sense that we reached out for anyone who was interested to participate, but also in a very directed way where we actually went after people in terms of the interviews and sought out their opinion. So, there were different ways of reaching the audience, but the audience itself was fairly broad. (Interview, DiPietro 2018)

These consultations led to *Ontario's Museums 2025: Looking Ahead – Towards a Strategic Vision and Action Plan* (Looking Ahead Task Force 2015).

The discussion paper describes a sector in a state of flux, facing massive economic, cultural, and social changes. Given these challenges, those consulted expressed a “desire for new ways of working to build greater public relevancy for Ontario's museums... repositioning museums as powerhouse institutions contributing to strong societies and economies” (7). To that end, the Task Force argued for change through four themes with key outcomes – (1) vibrant and vital museums; (2) relevant and meaningful collections; (3) a strong and successful sector;

⁴⁵ The numbers differ in the different documents. In the discussion paper, it states 177 museums completed the survey, representing all 13 tourism regions.

and (4) an effective and collaborative workforce. They circulated the paper to facilitate discussion, presented their definitions at the OMA's annual conference, conducted three webinars, and engaged on social media to collect feedback.⁴⁶

Incorporating feedback, the OMA released the *Ontario Museums 2025: Strategic Vision & Action Plan* (Looking Ahead Task Force 2016) in Spring 2016 with the same four themes, but more detailed outcomes and associated action plans. Like the Standards, *Ontario Museums 2025* enrolls a specific understanding of the museum sector – that is: (1) The sector is facing financial challenges and sustainability issues; (2) Museums need to work together and change to become more relevant to all Ontarians; (3) The change involves fostering new or better relationships; and (4) Museums collections are their strength. For example, the outcomes for vibrant and vital museums include developing relationships with the public, visitors, and the museums' communities. The theme relevant and meaningful collections specifies museum activities, but also articulates a plan for more coordination and cooperation between museums across the province.

The OMA has worked to enroll *Ontario Museums 2025's* problematization of the sector into additional constructions. For example, as the Task Force (re)defined the strategy and finalized the planned outcomes, the OMA continued to engage in research to define the sector's profile. They hired Hill Strategies Inc. to analyze data they collected through survey submissions from 184 Ontario museums, statistics from the 2014-2015 Community Museum Operating Grant program, and museum related data from ArtsBuild Ontario's Bricks & Mortar survey (Hill Strategies Research Inc. 2016a). When Hill Strategies Research Inc. (2016b) released a museum profile, they also released a highlights document that organized the data according to the themes in the OMA's new strategy. For example, under the theme vibrant and vital museums,

⁴⁶ There were 82 participants in the webinars and over 1000 engagements with the paper through social media.

they highlighted museums' relationships with communities using statistics on visitors to their physical space, web visits, and programming. Data and statistics are key to defining a museum sector while consultations continue to define needs.

The definition of the museum sector in *Museums 2025* was also incorporated into the OMA's strategic plan. The OMA Past President, serving as President during the Looking Ahead initiative (2015-2017), recalled,

The other thing that we had to do was take 2025 and turn it into the OMA's strategic plan... That was important for us, taking the information about what the sector said the OMA should be because that came out of 2025 as well... We completed 2025, we got people understanding it. So, what does it mean for the OMA? Now let's try to take that course.

The other thing is to work closely with the staff to figure out: there's ambition, there's wish list, there's doable, and then there is status quo. Where within that spectrum does the OMA want to be? How can we fulfill those rules and live up to our membership expectations? The other part of the scope was to make sure that we set goals, set standards, and set a strategic plan that was visionary, matches membership needs, and is also doable. (Interview, Bernat 2018)

To that end, the OMA released *Towards 2025: The Ontario Museum Association's Strategic Plan*, which "establishes priorities for the OMA to address from Ontario's Museums 2025's 4 themes, 16 outcomes and 10 actions" (OMA 2016a, 2). For example, addressing an action under vibrant and vital museums, they planned to develop tools, strategies, and best practices for museums to "increase capacity and effectiveness in addressing accessibility, diversity and inclusion" (8). To that end, the OMA formed the Museum Accessibility, Inclusion, and Engagement Collaborative (MAIEC) with the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM) and the Canadian Centre for Diversity and Inclusion (CCDI) to engage with Ontario's museums to make the sector more diverse. The collaboration led to webinars, research on diversity in the sector, and *Inclusion 2025* (Museum Accessibility Inclusion and Engagement Collaborative 2018), which is a collection of guidelines and learnings on diversity and inclusion.

As the OMA incorporates their definition of the sector into new resources, they are also advocating for the sector with other actors, using *Museums 2025* to educate about the museum sector's role. The OMA Past President, serving as President during the Looking Ahead initiative (2015-2017), argued,

We try to ... be a voice for the community. We tried to take up that charge most recently through the *Museums 2025* documents because we did see a void there. We did see a lack of understanding across the sector, but also within the government, as to what museums are and what they could be doing... A bit of the reason the 2025 document is important for us is to reinstitute why museums exist, why they are there, and why they should continue to be funded. (Interview, Bernat 2018)

To that end, their advocacy materials include statistics linked to the key themes they defined. For example, in their 2017 pre-budget submission to the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs, the OMA argues museums are part of "Ontario's vibrant cultural sector which directly contributes \$25.3 billion towards the province's GDP" (Ontario Museum Association 2017b, 2). Museums' contributions are demonstrated with statistics on employment, engagement with volunteers, and school visits.

Ontario Museums 2025 and the OMA have called for renewed funding models to support museums' contributions. While the Province released a discussion paper on their museum program following the *Cultural Strategy's* release,⁴⁷ as of 2019 the model has not changed. It is unclear what, if any, effect the OMA's translation work around the new objectives, which are tied to their definition of the museum sector, has had on government actors.

In short, the OMA's practices involve the definition of a museum sector through extensive consultation and research, which has informed their professional development and

⁴⁷ The OMA has responded favorably to a review, stating:

The OMA, as the leading professional organization advancing a strong, collaborative and inclusive museum sector that is vital to community life and the well-being of Ontarians, invites full partnership with the Ministry in the review of the museum funding model, as it has in the past with the review of the Museum Standards with regional workshops (Furness 2018).

advocacy activities. As seen with the community's construction, the sector is constructed in response to a government emphasis on accountability and began with understandings about what the collective needs, involving extensive consultation with community museums. However, the construction of the sector differs from the community as it responds to the deprioritization of museums in government. While the community was and is connected through shared needs, the sector is connected through its shared capacity to contribute to society and the economy (See Table 5.1).

Like the Standards, *Ontario Museums 2025* is an actor that has, to some extent, helped shape museum activities and their relationships. For example, museums have collaborated with the OMA to engage in diversity work, discussing their experiences and providing examples for others to follow in *Inclusion 2025*. However, the Strategy has not had the same (re)organizing effects on museum governance as the Standards (See Table 5.2). While the Province mentioned *Ontario Museums 2025* in the discussion paper on their support for museums in 2018, there is no evidence to date that they have redefined activities to align with the articulated vision for the sector. Following the Strategy's release, the Community Museum Operating Grant applications have continued to (re)assess the Standards, asking for additional materials each year.

Table 5.2: The Standards and Museums 2025 Redefinition of Museum Governance

Standards	Museums 2025
Enrolled in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OMA, OHS, and advisors' training activities • OMA, OHS, and advisors' resource development • Provincial advisory and conservation service • Provincial (written) museum policy and operating grant • Museum activities and funded projects • Municipal museum policies 	Enrolled in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OMA training activities • OMA resource development • OMA commissioned research • OMA strategic plan • Provincial discussion paper • Some museum activities and funded projects

While the advisors and Province more broadly can use the threat of funding cuts to refocus their clients' work, associations have limited capacity to (re)define the work of governments. When they worked to govern museums alongside provincial actors empowered to make change, the OMA participated in the definition of a community and associated entities to address needs. However, the advisors are no longer empowered to (re)define provincial museum governance. Without their support and capacity, there are significant limitations to the OMA's capacity to effect change in community museum governance beyond their own practices and relationships with museums.

5.2.2 Serving the Museum Community: Providing Responsive Assistance and Enacting Community

Community museums' acceptance of the advisors and associations as spokespeople and community members enables the work of governing. As described above, the advisors' and associations' practices generate consensus and construct the community/sector. They work to (re)construct and (re)define roles for themselves in relation to community museums, participating in community. Most notably, they share a role providing assistance in response to needs and opportunities, which further legitimizes their advocacy both within and outside the museum community. Through service delivery, they govern Ontario's museums, build relationships,⁴⁸ and develop expertise beyond a single museum's needs.

⁴⁸ Prior to the strengthening of the OMA and widespread use of the internet, translators agree museums existed in relative isolation. The first manager of the museum section noted, "you have to understand 99% of people who work in community museums (well, a lot of museum people) are without a doubt the most isolated people in the world" (Interview, Styrmo 2017). Currently, there is more of a sense that "everyone knows everyone in the museum community" (Interview, Powell 2018).

The advisors and associations, to some extent, all provide advice, training, and capacity building. As a former advisor noted,

The opportunity for museum advisors was too enter at various stages in the lives institutions who were seeking to grow and develop and to help support that growth and development in a wide variety of ways. Sometimes it was direct funding, which was purposeful. Sometimes, it was helping to connect to others.

The benefit of an advisory service was [that we were] able to connect you to a lot of things, answer some specific questions that you had... research, work on a project with you over time, connect you with colleagues and training, provide you with Museum Notes, or help build your knowledge so that you could see improvements within your community museum, including building your relationship with your municipal funders. (Interview, Participant A 2017)

While the advisors and associations have many service delivery roles as identified in the quote above, I focus on the advisors as advisors, the OMA as a trainer, and the OHS as a capacity builder within this section, reflecting the respective priorities identified in interviews.

Through these service delivery activities, the advisors and associations participate in and functionally enact the museum community while also governing the sector. However, the advisors' practices have changed due to conflicting understandings of the provincial government's and its agents' role(s). The OMA's role has been (re)negotiated as the Association responds to changing funding opportunities, recognizes its limitations, and museum workers become more professional. The OHS has refocused its role in response to changing relationships between heritage organizations and governments more broadly. Within these changing contexts, the advisors and associations engage in an ongoing translation of their own roles and practices, assembling the necessary support for their activities within and outside the museum community. They govern community museums, providing a level of consistency as well as ongoing change in museum governance.

5.2.2.1 *The Advisors and Regional Consultants: A Changing Advisory Role*

Prior to the development of the museum advisor position, the Province depended “on the Ontario Historical Society to provide its members with training opportunities, as well as mutual advice and assistance” (Taylor and Garvie 1958, 11). The creation of the museum advisor position in 1959 provided an actor or actors within the provincial government with the articulated responsibility to govern the sector and respond to community museums’ needs. They have worked alongside the associations, providing training and circulating information.⁴⁹ Historically, the advisors were distinct in their capacity to offer advice and assistance to museums across the province on an individualized basis. However, changes in government have led to a redefinition of the advisors’ role. As their role is redefined within government and the advisors attempt to maintain their responsibilities to museums, there have been moments of conflict and tension. In particular, the advisors have worked to (re)define their role in relationship with changing funding programs, roles for regional consultants, and perceptions on civil servants’ role(s) more broadly. The ongoing (re)negotiation of their responsibilities reflects the deprioritization of community museums in government and also contributes to this deprioritization by limiting the work of governing.

Early advisors provided enthusiastic support to community museums across the province with individualized advice. They contacted museums by phone, wrote long letters on how to address an issue, and traveled to museums. In 1965, the advisor traveled over 32,000 kilometers

⁴⁹ The early advisors aimed to gather information then simplify and adapt it to meet community museums’ needs (Interview, Styrmø 2017). To that end, they wrote technical papers on a range of topics, such as displays, collections, and government policy.

to conduct site visits.⁵⁰ An advisor from the 1970s and 1980s explained, “We got a phone call, we got a letter, we were there to help them” (Interview, Duncan 2017). She recalled,

I think that all we needed was somebody to say: “We need help.” And we would say: “Why?” And they would try to tell us what their problem was. We would say: “We’ll be there next Tuesday.” We really defined it as practical, down to earth advice, and support... Our phones rang all the time and our mail was piled up. (Ibid.)

The advisors provided advice and assistance directly to community museums, drawn from their own experiences and education.⁵¹ They created relationships with museums to address gaps in knowledge and expertise, (re)assembling entities in a moment of time to respond to opportunities and/or need. Their responsive role is significant to community museum governance because, as government employees, they often had easier access to certain information and relationships. For example, the first manager of the museum section noted, “the people in the larger museums were very busy with Centennial projects as well. If an unknown person was to call them up and ask them a question, it might not be received all that eagerly” (Interview, Strymo 2017). The advisors were able to develop those relationships⁵² and filter the knowledge to the smaller community museums they served, reinforcing their role as experts within the museum community.

Following the release of the community museum policy, advisors continued to respond to the needs of museums and connect them with the knowledge they needed to improve. They

⁵⁰ Strymo, V. 1966, November 8. Letter to Mr. G. Clifford Carl. RG47-51 B328434 General Correspondence Ontario 1968. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁵¹ Advice and assistance drawn from the translators’ experiences are essential because the translators can help guide museums in achieving their goals through recommendations that are more practical than what is available elsewhere. For example, conservators would advise against buying expensive equipment in favor of simpler solutions like a dehumidifier and a fan. The direct advice and assistance includes services, such as restoration work, and moral support to actors within museums, “sitting down with them and saying it’s not as scary as you think” (Interview, Watts 2017).

⁵² Relationships with those working at the ROM were of particular importance given their expertise.

provided museums with context specific recommendations on how they could meet the new requirements. Most notably, the conservators worked to provide affordable suggestions for those working toward the conservation standard (Interviews, J. Carter 2017; Poulin 2017).⁵³ An advisor recalled,

Especially with Steve Poulin, he wouldn't go in and say: ... "You got to put this high-tech environmental control" ... Steve would go out and say: "Oh, you've got a seasonal museum." ... In the Spring, the place would be full of dead flies. So, he wouldn't say: "Oh, this is terrible." He'd say: "Okay, we've got to come up with a solution ... You're always going to have flies but let's find out how we can reduce the number of flies." Steve Poulin was a master at giving practical advice as a conservator... That was a service that the Ministry provided. (Interview, J. Carter 2017)

The Standards were thus a tool to guide community museums' development, providing the impetus for practical assistance and advice. However, the advisors' advice was not limited to the Standards. For example, following a tour and meeting at a community museum in 1985, an advisor wrote a letter outlining ways to improve different aspects of their operation, such as their education programs, exhibitions, audience development, and funding.⁵⁴ Within the letter, the advisor did not tell the museum what to do. He made recommendations on potential

⁵³ For example, in a 1985 letter to a community museum, the conservator Steve Poulin outlined affordable ways to address conservation issues, referencing costs and keeping expenses low. He suggests the purchase of "inexpensive Taylor hygrometers," "portable dehumidifiers" as a "practical solution for small scale problems," and accepting fewer artifacts. The letter is available: Poulin, Steve. 1983, September. Letter to Ms. Chris Miller. Rg47-51 B158575 Southwestern. Archives of Ontario, Toronto. Additional letters from conservators are available in various boxes from the RG47-41 and RG47-51 collections at the Archives of Ontario, Toronto (eg., RG47-41 B932248; RG47-51 B b158576).

⁵⁴ The correspondence is available in: Rg47-51 b158575. Archives of Ontario, Toronto. To help the museum develop interpretation and education programs, he recommended a government resource for the "Agriculture in the classroom" curriculum unit, provided the details for an education specialist with the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, and attached an order form for the OHS' "Discovering your Community" resource kit. The advisor also directed the museum to other museums with the expertise to help them meet the Province's exhibition standard. He suggested the museum contact a specific individual for financial support and write an article in the Ontario Society for Industrial Archeology's Bulletin. He argued an article would help with audience development and the Society's members may be willing to assist the museum financially or with technical support. The advisor also recommended the museum seek financial support from the provincial Cultural Facilities Improvement Program (CFIP) to upgrade the site.

relationships that could address the needs identified during a site visit, guiding the museum to a broad range of resources from sources like the Ministry of Agriculture and the OHS. The advisor demonstrated responsiveness, expertise in museum education, and familiarity with the available resources. He translated the information for the community museum, targeting their specific needs and making information easy to understand.⁵⁵

The supportive relationships between community museums and the advisors continued into the 1990s. An advisor from the period stated, “We helped them, we had a relationship with them. They could rely on us” (Interview, Priamo 2017).⁵⁶ In particular, they saw common mistakes made when starting a museum and aimed to provide guidance before problems began.

As a former conservator and advisor from the 1990s recollected,

They would get our numbers, I'm not sure how, and they would phone... We would get ... a lot of calls from people wanting to start museums and we would walk them through the process.

Sometimes it was a matter of like a 10-minute conversation when it became very clear to the person on the phone that what they wanted to do was not started a museum but start some kind of retail or tourist attraction. And other times those museums turned into real museums and they're doing really well now, such as the Clock Museum in Deep River. I got that call. It was like: “Hi, I have a collection. I want to start a museum. How do I go about that?” It is kind of cool. (Interview, Graham 2017)

The definition of the advisors’ role providing responsive assistance was thus reinforced through their own work, which the Province supported, and museums’ requests for assistance.

The advisors are now less able to provide individualized and responsive advice that once defined the role. Since the 1990s, there have been funding cuts, reducing the number of

⁵⁵ The moment of translation represents a fleeting point of contact and the information provided, such as the availability of funding or other resources, may soon become outdated.

⁵⁶ Commenting on a later period, Weinstein (Interview, 2017) notes, “In general, I find that people who are community museums are happy to have me around.” Holland (Interview, 2017) explains, “I feel very strongly that museums still really value that expert advice that they can get from someone in government.”

advisors and amount they can travel. When the advisors traveled throughout Ontario, they were in frequent contact with community museums. Museums would also call them, enabling the advisors to develop strong relationships and even friendships with museum workers. The first museum advisor manager noted,

I would spend upwards of two weeks in Northwestern Ontario and it was like going home. All these people that I visited or talked to were friends. [I was] the visiting firemen from Toronto. They were only available at night. So, I would spend a lot of the day with the people on the ground at the museum and then meet with the committees at night. So, my day would start at nine o'clock in the morning and end at ten, eleven o'clock at night... Hours didn't mean anything. (Interview, Styrmo 2017)

With only one advisor position and far less money for travel, there now is less relationship building. The advisor explains, "when the travel money dried up... we became more and more irrelevant really because we didn't know what was going on half the time. I don't know half my curators" (Interview, Weinstein 2017).

The change in the advisors' relationships with museums is evident and reinforced through their changing role as mediators to provincial project funding. Since their establishment, the advisors have mediated access to the provincial museum operating grant. They have also, at different points of time, served as mediators to project grants, such as the establishment (1963 – 1979) or development (1973-1979) grants. These funding sources enabled the museum advisors to "exercise some control over development projects,"⁵⁷ giving them "influence."⁵⁸ When the Province eliminated these grants in 1979 to encourage museums to access the broader capital

⁵⁷ Apted, Richard. 1972, June. Memorandum to Mr. Peter Glyn. RG47-51 B328429 museum grant legislation. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁵⁸ In order to receive funding, museums submitted detailed plans and received approval from the advisors who worked with them to improve their project and museum. See: McOuat, D. F. 1972, August. Re: Grants to Museums (Recommendations for Revised Regulations). RG47-51 B328429 museum grant legislation. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

programs for culture instead, the advisors continued to be a key source of information on provincial funding available for museums. They commented on applications, providing advice and assistance to those applying. Some grants, such as the Cultural Facilities Improvement Program (CFIP), asked advisors to make recommendations and give technical assistance. A former advisor recalled,

CFIP was one of the best programs put together. Because it was a sensible program. It allowed money for doing upgrades. And we did have input into that in regard to writing the description. Also, we would have input on assessing the applications. But, in my recollection, that's the only capital funding program that we had direct input on. (Interview, J. Carter 2018)

Removing an avenue through which advisors developed relationships and provided assistance to museums, the introduction of different mediators as the primary government contact for project grants in the 1970s and 1990s has contributed to a renegotiation of the advisors' role.⁵⁹

In particular, regional consultants⁶⁰ have played both a conflicting and complementary role, prompting redefinitions of the advisors' activities. The Ministry of Culture and Recreation formed in 1974-1975 with both museum advisors and regional consultants as part of a field services branch. Newer museums or groups wanting to start a museum would visit their local branch for assistance and receive the advisors' contact information. Advisors then provided assistance relating to the operating grant and museum operations, recommending museums access provincial project funding and making recommendations on these projects.⁶¹ The regional

⁵⁹ As an advisor who worked in the 1980s notes, "Some grants totally disappeared. Grants like the Wintario grants, which were project grants, came and went. Some years there would be support and opportunities for project funds. And some years none or very little or different priorities that museums would have a harder time applying for" (Interview, Participant A 2017). Correspondence from the 1990s and 2000s demonstrates a shift away from telling museums about specific funding programs the Province offers towards telling museums to contact their regional advisors or Trillium for information about available funding opportunities.

⁶⁰ The regional consultants have had various names, including field or regional officers. For consistency, I will use the term regional consultant or consultant.

⁶¹ Murdock, Susan. 1980, August. Letter to Mrs. Joyce Appel. Rg47-51 B172003 13375-5. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

consultants were primarily responsible for giving information on and access to Wintario - the new lottery funding program that provided capital funding for museum projects. The consultants offered advice and assistance relating to these projects.

In light of the regional consultants' existence and proximity to the communities they served, the Ministry considered reducing the advisors' fieldwork in the late 1970s into the 1980s.⁶² However, the associations and advisors resisted. They argued established museums were unfamiliar with the Ministry's regional services and the assistance they could provide due to the long-standing existence of the provincial operating grant and advisors.⁶³ The OMA's Executive Director noted the advisors had expertise in museum specific issues and an "excellent relationship" with clients.⁶⁴ The advisors had developed knowledge and resources related to common museum problems. Since museums faced many problems when developed in isolation, the advisors believed museums suffered when they were not involved in museum projects and, as a result, the regional consultants should play a complementary rather than primary role in the Province's relationship with community museums.⁶⁵ The Ministry maintained the advisory service, but closed the northern office and reduced the number of museum advisor positions, changing one position into a conservation advisor.⁶⁶ The redefinition of the advisors' role,

⁶² See, for example: Seiling, Ken. 1980, March. Letter to the Deputy Minister. F2091 15 B253021. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁶³ Murdock, Susan. 1978, December. Memorandum to: Museums Section; Re: Non-capital Wintario Heritage Conservation Grants. RG47-51 B101717 Museum Policy 1978. Archives of Ontario, Toronto

⁶⁴ McAvity, John. 1980, August. Letter to Mr. R. E. Secord, Field Services. F2091 15 B253021 correspondence 1980. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁶⁵ The sentiment was expressed in interviews with several advisors. Notably, the advisors also praised the consultants and had an excellent relationship with some individuals. Letters expressing frustration with the consultants and the importance of an advisor role can be found in: RG47-50 I Wintario capital 1981. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁶⁶ Correspondence indicates museum workers began resisting a reduction in the number of advisors in the 1980s. For

therefore, began in the late 1970s with a reduction in their capacity to govern community museums in the north.

The consultants' roles in museum governance grew following the 1980 Fisher Report (Fisher 1980), which studied sport and recreation in Ontario. The Report found the Ministry's "elitist" activities in culture did not have a relationship to communities and recommended a larger role for field services. The regional consultants' role was then redefined, and they began to work more actively with community museums. They gave training on nonprofit governance, mediated access to resources, and worked to connect community-based organizations with information in response to need. The consultants have continued to provide individualized assistance across the Province into the 21st century, working as "great problem solvers" (Interview, Doherty 2017). These consultants can identify community museums' needs and connect them with information, such as a private consultant's details (Interview, Brooks-Joiner 2018). In many regions, museums work extensively with their regional consultants. Discussing a specific representative, an OMA Past President and the Chief Administration Officer at a historic site noted,

Eva is fantastic in getting information out. She does it through the Halton and Norfolk Culture Association, but she also sends it out. I probably have three emails in the last week from her, reminding me of a grant opportunity or a training opportunity coming up. She has been great at that... You call her, she gets back to you. You need help writing a grant or whatever, she's there. She has an abundance of ideas and she has all these networks. She attends meetings. She is everywhere. She is great. (Interview, Havelka 2018).⁶⁷

instance, a curator wrote to their MPP in 1984 highlighting the advisors' important role and their utility to the museum, which was struggling to meet the new standards. The curator noted there were four advisors with a distinct area of expertise but that one had been eliminated, which would hurt efforts to meet the new requirements. See documents available in: RG47051 B158576 13345-1-1. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁶⁷ For many, the consultants' work has become more accessible and accessed with greater frequency than the work of the advisors.

The consultant's work providing responsive assistance and translating information in response to need or opportunity is thus similar to the advisors' traditional role. They build relationships with community museums and facilitate connections with other actors, displacing the need for the advisors.

As the advisors and consultants both provided individualized advice in the 1970s into the 2000s, many consultants were helpful resources in museum governance, complementing the advisors' work. They were "a strong partner" that saw clients more often due to proximity. As such, they could tell the advisors when there were issues requiring more specialized assistance (Interview, Participant A 2017). They also provided complimentary services on issues such as strategic planning and governance, connecting museums with the resources they needed (Interview, Holland 2017). Although some were "really good, really excellent, and wonderful to work with," some were not. A former conservation coordinator and advisor observed, "some of them were just awful" (Interview, Graham 2017). In other words, they were "excellent in some communities and in others they were less than excellent" (Interview, Duncan 2017). An advisor from the 1970s and 1980s recalled being told, "you don't need to worry about the museums. They're all fine." When she then went to museums, they "would not be ok at all" (Ibid.). Problems arose as the advisors and consultants had different perceptions of good museum work and their own roles in the museum community.

Tensions most notably developed in relation to provincially funded capital projects, such as new museum buildings or renovations. When the consultants provided advice on museum facilities, they began to encroach on the advisors' pre-existing role and, according to the advisors, gave inaccurate or incomplete information that reflected a lack of expertise. For example, in 1981 the museum section manager wrote a letter arguing there was a lack of museum advisor involvement in museum capital projects funded by the Ministry. She counted

24 inadequate museum projects that did not address the guidelines for community museums. The consultants' responses to the letter indicate they disagreed, believing there was insufficient time for the advisors to make recommendations and not all projects needed their involvement.⁶⁸

Aiming to address the mutual lack of understanding, there were attempts to improve communication.⁶⁹ The museum advisors eventually reorganized their responsibilities to reflect the regional division of the province rather than their area of expertise.⁷⁰ There were also several attempts at a working agreement in the 1980s and 1990s.⁷¹ Within these agreements, regional consultants maintained responsibility for assessing and recommending capital projects, while the advisors had responsibility for monitoring and ensuring compliance with the Standards. However, in order to do so, they worked with museums on capital projects and accessing provincial funding for those activities.⁷² The concurrent work led to confusion, duplication, the jeopardization of projects, and a tendency to undermine one another.⁷³ In one case, the museum advisors were working with a museum on an approved and funded project while the consultants were working on a competing proposal in the same region. They were

⁶⁸ Duncan, Dorothy. 1981, November. Letter to Bob Bowes RE: Capital program. RG47-50 I wintario capital 1981. Archives of Ontario, Toronto. Additional correspondence is available in: RG47-50 I wintario capital 1981. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁶⁹ Ward, Ken. 1981, December. Memo to: Bob Bowes. RG47-50 I Wintario Capital 1981. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁷⁰ As per a consultant's recommendations.

⁷¹ For an example and correspondence about working agreements, see: Rg47-109 B137981 memos to regional managers. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁷² MCC Regional Services. 1983, October. Working Agreement. RG47-51 B310103 working agreement. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁷³ Freeman, Ruth. 1992. Memorandum to Morris Zbar. RG47-108 B343842 Museums Unit. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

unaware of each other's activities until the regional consultants recommended their project, putting the Ministry in the awkward position of giving conflicting information.

As the consultants' role grew and they mediated access to funding for museums, advisors continued to believe they should be involved in all museum projects to pre-emptively resolve potential issues. An advisor from the 1970s and early 1980s remembered, "We wanted them, when they saw a problem or saw somebody they wanted to help, ... [to] at least let us know before they did it. We didn't want to kind of learn about it after the fact" (Interview, Duncan 2017). When they were not involved, museums had to re-do components of a project in order to be eligible for the museum operating grant due to the Standards. An advisor from the 1990s noted, the advisors sometimes felt they had to "clean up the mess" consultants had made (Interview, Pope 2017). Disagreeing with the advisors' perception, the regional consultants argued they must be the primary contact for everything except the museum operating grant, seeing themselves as willing and able to seek advice where it was necessary.⁷⁴ The conflict became less prominent with the introduction of a different entity to mediate access to project funding in the late 1990s.

In 1999, arts and cultural funding became the provincial Trillium Foundation's responsibility, which further redefined the advisors' and regional consultants' roles. The advisors and consultants continued to facilitate access to some funding programs, such as the Museums and Technology Fund as well as the provincial student employment program respectively. The consultants, in particular, have knowledge and a relationship to a range of provincial funding opportunities from a variety of ministries. However, Trillium has redefined the advisors' role and

⁷⁴ For examples of the correspondence, see: RG47-108 b343842 Museums Unit; RG47-40 B711672 heritage grants. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

relationships as mediators to funding. The advisors now direct museums to Trillium or other agencies about funding opportunities. An advisor observed,

Often, what I do is I refer them to somebody, or I say: “Did you look online at this or would you like to apply for this grant or how about this grant? Have you tried applying for Trillium and for this particular grant or Ontario Arts Council or whatever?” It’s actually kind of amazing how little people know about what’s available. Sometimes, they’re very good at applying for grants or funding resources or whatever. But, often, they’re... just head down doing what they’re doing to keep the museum running and they don’t really know that there’s ... opportunities. (Interview, Weinstein 2017)

Since the advisor does not facilitate access, her role becomes directing museums to other actors with whom they can develop supportive relationships. While helping museums make these connections is an important advisory role, there is less relationship building between museums and the advisor around writing project grant applications and then implementing projects that address museum functions identified in the Standards.

Despite the new role for Trillium as a mediator to cultural funding, the advisors and consultants both continue to have an advisory role in the museum community. However, their resources and capacity to provide responsive assistance are increasingly limited. There have been cutbacks with regional services (Interviews, Leverty 2018; Weinstein 2017). With “fewer staff now, they’re not available to do what they used to” (Interview, Havelka 2018). The current advisor observed, “There are fewer of them in the province as well... I would say there’s probably half the regional advisors that there were when I started. A lot of them retired” (Interview, Weinstein 2017).

That being said, due to their regional distribution and greater number, the consultants in some areas, such as northern Ontario, are better positioned to help museums. The current advisor remarked on the regional consultants’ important role and relationship to their community, stating

The regional advisors were people who were on the ground, knew the local institutions, and, because museums don't move and go anywhere, knew the local museum people. So, if I did not know the people personally, I could go to the regional advisor and say: "Hey, introduce me to these people, tell me what's going on, and has their roof collapsed?" Or, they would call me and say: "So and so has left and the municipality is not hiring a new person. Don't they have to have a person to get CMOG?" And I'd be like, "yea they do." (Interview, Weinstein 2017)

Similarly, an OMA Past President and director of a northern museum stated, "We work with our regional office quite a bit. More, very much more, than we ever would with our museum advisor" (Interview, Bachmann 2018). The comparatively limited ability of the advisor to travel to museums limits their relative role and significance.⁷⁵

In view of limited resources, there appears to be a more consistently cooperative and collaborative relationship between the advisors and regional consultants. For example, during regional meetings associated with the first standards in the early 1980s, the consultants participated as hosts and provided feedback to the advisors. The advisors described the Ottawa/Carleton staff as helpful in organizing but suspicious and hostile during the public meeting. Following the meetings, the Ottawa/Carleton staff sent a letter to express their

⁷⁵ Despite concerted efforts to serve museums across the province, northern museums often have reduced access to their advisors and associations compared to their southern counterparts. During the 1970s, the advisors opened an office in Sault Ste. Marie to provide a level of service commiserate with the south. However, the office closed in the late 1970s, decreasing physical access to the advisors. Discussing the advisors, an OMA Past President working in a northern museum noted, "We have always had limited involvement with the museum advisors. Sometimes they would actually get money to travel and do a little tour up north. Then, it's a half an hour at your museum" (Bachman 2017). There is little that can be accomplished in half an hour when compared to more sustained relationship building seen with museums located closer to Toronto.

The distances and travel expenses have also provided challenges for the associations aiming to serve the north. For example, when writing the standards, the advisors had to adjust the training requirement due, in part, to the limited access northern museums had to the associations' professional development activities. Recognizing the limitation, the associations have made focused efforts to increase the number of workshops and other services in northern Ontario. While there are challenges, some northern museums are active in their associations. An OMA Past President, CMA President, and the director of a northern museum stated, "I think that doesn't matter what museum you're in. If you're in Northern Ontario or Southwestern Ontario or Eastern Ontario, you have to get involved. [Opportunities are] not going to drop in your lap" (Interview, Bachman 2018).

personal concerns and reiterate their hope that the advisors were genuinely requesting input.⁷⁶ Conversely, the workshops associated with the revised standards in the early 2000s involved a regional consultant as the primary facilitator for French language events, including one near Ottawa.⁷⁷ This consultant is known for her positive relationships with museums and museum advisors.⁷⁸

Reflecting the similarities in the advisors' and consultants' roles, the provincial government eventually attempted to redefine the advisors as generalists. Around 2009, the Assistant Deputy Minister (ADM) attempted to change the museum advisors' title, removing the reference to museums. However, a museum advisor, who also had a position within the union, took the matter to a tribunal. He recalled,

I had to fight, and I was vice president of the union at the time so I could say things maybe others couldn't internally. The Assistance Deputy Minister at the time decided we weren't going to be called museum advisors. What they wanted to do was homogenize everybody and the argument was anyone can do any job. And I would say: "No, that's not true." Museums were dropped [from our titles]. I took it to a tribunal that I was co-chair of and made the argument that if they wanted to call us something else fine, but also include museum advisors. And I won that battle. We were given that title back. (Interview, J. Carter 2017)

Despite maintaining his title, the advisor's success was short-lived. Instead of renaming the advisors, the Province has redefined their role through attrition. In 2009, there were three museum advisors, but as they retired, they were not replaced and there is now one. While she

⁷⁶ Correspondence from the staff and notes on the meetings are available in: RG47-51 B101715. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁷⁷ For more information, including an email outlining events of the meeting, see: RG47-51 B929760 OSW04A. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁷⁸ She worked with the OHS on *Accessible Heritage* (Ontario Historical Society 2008) and participated in workshops for heritage (see, for example: Rg47-51 b929760 cerv99a. Archives of Ontario, Toronto). An advisor noted, she "was amazing. She would go driving around to all these places, talking to people and then report back to me. That was great. And we had a really good working relationship" (Interview, Weinstein 2017).

has the title advisor, there is a limitation to the advice one person can provide across the province. As a result, despite having museum expertise, the advisor's role is more focused on the grant.

In sum, the advisors have worked to (re)define their role as the Provincial actors that govern community museums, providing advice and assistance. Historically, the advisors and associations agreed on the advisors' role providing responsive assistance to community museums. Reinforcing their position, a growing number of museums accessed the advisory services during the 1960s and 1970s. The advisors were then able to expand their office, suggesting there was also consensus within the provincial government. However, with the creation of the Ministry of Culture and Recreation as well as the growing importance of generalists, the advisors have experienced periods of tension and conflict on the definition of their role providing an advisory service to community museums. They resisted redefinition but have, nonetheless, been redefined through budget cuts within a changing context.

Notably, the introduction of additional government actors with generalist responsibilities mediating access to funding was a key factor in reducing the advisors' advisory role in the museum community. The project grants had provided opportunities for both advisors and consultants to develop relationships with museums and the impetus for advice. However, as the Province redefined responsibility for project grants and reduced their support for the advisors, the consultants became increasingly important as partners and key facilitators. Following the migration of the project grant to a government agency in the late 1990s, there was a further reduction in the advisory services to museums. Both advisors and consultants are now working to enact their roles with fewer resources, which hinders their ability to provide responsive assistance to individual museums.

The redefinition of the advisory role has fundamentally changed community museums' governance and their relationship to the Province. Without provincial advisors actively engaged in the work of governing through service delivery, no one within the government has a responsibility to construct and enact a museum community as they provide guidance. Community museums are no longer treated as specialist institutions with distinct relationships with the Province. Instead, they are one community partner with whom multiple provincial actors can work, complicating governance for those without the capacity to develop a range of relationships that are not mediated through the advisors.

5.2.2.2 *The OMA and Regional Museum Networks: Training as a Community Building Role*

According to multiple Ontario Museum Association representatives interviewed, advocacy and training or professional development⁷⁹ are primary roles for the Association (Interviews, Adkin 2018; Baeker 2017; Brooks-Joiner 2018; Havelka 2018; Kerr-Wilson 2018; Kurylo 2018; McAvity 2017). Museum workers created the OMA in the 1970s to discuss problems, exchange ideas, and access resources. To that end, the OMA acted as “a resource center for information and advice,” providing training at a basic level.⁸⁰ The Associations' service delivery role differed from the advisors with a focus on museum workers' concerns rather than individual museums' challenges. Their early activities mirrored those of the Ontario Historical Society's pre-existing Museum Section. They both responded to requests for assistance with newsletters, aiming to

⁷⁹ Museum professionals in Ontario will often distinguish between training and professional development. While training often focuses on basic skills, professional development refers to ongoing educational opportunities. However, the differences are rarely clearly articulated. Within this section, I will use them interchangeably to refer to educational opportunities for museum workers.

⁸⁰ Inglis, Robin. 1974, August. Attachment to a letter, Brochure information. F2091 6 b253002 inter office correspondence 1971 - sept 11 74. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

connect museum workers to each other and information. Through their service delivery they enacted community, providing opportunities for relationships between museums.

The OMA differed as it responded to dissatisfaction with the OHS' relationships and responses to community museum workers' needs. In particular, the new association aimed to be more responsive to emerging and changing opportunities with a more dynamic training program. The development of the training program positioned the OMA as a vital member of the museum community due, in part, to the involvement of well-resourced museums, which had become less involved with the OHS by the 1960s.

Conflict regarding the OHS' Museum Section's role in museum governance emerged because of its limited "development, expansion, and independence" from the OHS.⁸¹ While the Section operated "quite freely" within the OHS, policies and by-law changes required the OHS' approval. Their activities remained fairly consistent from its foundation in 1953 to 1970. Those who wanted to participate in the Section's activities joined the OHS then paid for an additional subscription to the *Newsletter*. Participation was, therefore, limited. The first OMA president noted,

The rosters of the workshops and the membership list of this Museums Section are notable for the absence of the names of active and widely-known members of the museum industry in this Province, perhaps because of the restricted representation of the Museums Section [to] the O.H.S.⁸²

The lack of representation increasingly concerned museum workers involved with the Canadian Museums Association as the national association began to change their training model in the

⁸¹ Styrmo, V. N. 1977, October. Memorandum to: Maureen Price, RE: Ontario Historical Society Museum Section. RG47-51 B101712 unlabeled. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁸² McLauchlan, Gordon. 1971, February. Letter. F2091 6 B253002 inter office correspondence 1971 - sept 11 74. Archives of Ontario.

early 1970s, relying more heavily on provincial associations' work.⁸³ Further undermining the OHS' capacity to work with the CMA on training, there was dissatisfaction with the Historical Society's existing training activities, which no longer appealed to those working in larger well-resourced institutions.⁸⁴

The OHS' Museum Section's inability to change in response to developing needs and opportunities provided the impetus for the OMA.⁸⁵ Members of the CMA⁸⁶ residing in Ontario began to discuss a provincial association in the late 1960s, asking Ontario museum workers to a preliminary meeting in 1971. They quickly founded the association and began receiving funding through the new National Museum Policy in 1972-1973 for training.⁸⁷ The national funding and the CMA's encouragement defined the OMA's role in museum governance and the community, which the provincial museum advisors then recognized and conveyed to other members of the Ministry.⁸⁸

⁸³ The CMA had begun to seriously develop a training program in 1965. However, by 1970, the committee was in a moment of "crisis" due to insufficient resources (Patterson 1970). A 1972 description of the program states, "it is anticipated that with CMA encouragement and some further sponsorship of initial training activities the new provincial associations will quickly develop strong corps of instructors, some of whom will be available at a national or a professional level" (Canadian Museums Association 1972, 15)

⁸⁴ See, for example comments in: Gooding, James. 1962, November. Letter to: Mrs. Gwen Metomlfe (OHS chairman). RG47-51 B328434 OHS workshops 1954-1969. Archives of Ontario, Toronto. In the letter, Gooding notes staff from larger museums had not been attending the workshop and communicates displeasure with the theme.

⁸⁵ Styrmo, V. N. 1977, October. Memorandum to: Maureen Price, RE: Ontario Historical Society Museum Section. RG47-51 B101712 unlabeled. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁸⁶ Some of whom were also members of the OHS.

⁸⁷ The letter detailing the initial funding arrangement is available in: Mackenzie, C.J. 1973, March. Letter Re: Training Assistance. F2091 6 b253002 inter office correspondence 1971 - sept 11 74. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁸⁸ The advisors acknowledged the OMA's critical role in training. See: Historical and Museums Branch. 1973. Appendix B: Ontario Historical Society, Ontario Museum Association. RG47-51 B328435 Ontario Museum Association 1972-1974. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

Using the federal funding, the OMA hired a training coordinator who travelled across Ontario, circulating a questionnaire and visiting over 100 museums to assess need.⁸⁹ The coordinator worked with a committee to create seminars that responded to the community's needs and requests, involving museum advisors. For example, the OMA coordinated a travelling seminar led by two museum advisors in 1973. Students spent a week traveling with the advisors to museums in southern Ontario, receiving instruction from curators who volunteered their time. Through these training initiatives, the OMA began to develop more relationships with museum workers in the province, expanding their membership and service delivery.

The development of the OMA's training initiatives provided another intermediary through which the OMA could respond to contexts and connect community museums to other entities. Importantly, the seminars were more frequent than past opportunities in the province, enabling museum workers to meet and develop relationships with their peers. The advisors and professionals from more well-resourced museums became involved as instructors, participants, or on the training committee (Nelson 2021). They were "very liberal with their advice" (Interview, Styrmo 2017), connecting museums with knowledge and experience. Their involvement enabled the OMA to provide a range of seminars and workshops, addressing museum practice.

Seminar and workshop participants provided feedback, indicating the OMA's training helped them develop the fundamentals of museum practice. However, by 1978, members of the OMA began expressing a need for a more comprehensive program. The volunteer Training Committee, therefore, proposed a certificate program with a series of seminars, which they

⁸⁹ For more information on the first two years of the OMA training program, see: President. 1973, December. Proposal for Museum Training in Ontario 1974-1975. F2091 15 B253021 Ontario Advisory Committee. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

developed with a paid Certificate Development Officer who conducted research, interviews, and a needs assessment. The Certificate began in 1980 with eight courses and over 135 people registered in the first year (Carter 1981). During the 1980s, the Certificate was key to the OMA's service delivery role in the museum community.

Continuing to respond to participants' feedback, the program has undergone a number of changes in its content and administration (Chessell 1992), but still provides entry-level, part-time training in museum best practices. Due to the development of other training programs and the museum workforce's increased professionalization, the Certificate has become less central to the OMA's work and role within the museum community. However, it remains valuable to those in small communities and/or those moving laterally into museum work (Interviews, Adkin 2018; Bernat 2018). As an OMA Past President noted,

When the OMA started their program, there weren't that many programs out there. There's more competition now, but I still think there's a lot of value in what the OMA has to offer because it's probably one of the only professional development opportunities for museum people that you can do while you're still working full-time. (Interview, Powell 2018)

The Certificate, therefore, remains a component of the OMA's training activities and service delivery.

Responding to the needs of a paid workforce with existing expertise, the OMA continues to engage in responsive professional development. They listen to museum workers, addressing gaps in knowledge or experience "relatively quickly" and in a "nimble" manner (Interview, Bernat 2018).⁹⁰ As such, OMA Past Presidents interviewed discussed the OMA's role providing

⁹⁰ Training and professional development was a subject within most interviews with OMA Past Presidents and Executive Directors. Some focused on the curriculum program, noting it may be becoming less relevant. Others highlighted the "grassroots" and responsive nature of particular training initiatives.

training on current issues. For example, an OMA Past President discussed the OMA's Indigenous Collections Symposium, noting

Last year, for example, we had an amazing two-day seminar on Indigenous objects or Indigenous collections. We involved Indigenous folks from all over Ontario. We brought in all these experts and the elders and folks to come in... We talked about working with Indigenous folks... and how we treat them. We talked about de-accessioning. We talked about some of the efforts of de-accessioning. (Interview, Furness 2018)

Importantly, the OMA has mobilized new technologies to provide webinars on these pertinent issues, including a webinar series preceding the Indigenous Collections Symposium to provide context.⁹¹ Other issues addressed in webinars, symposia, and conferences include diversity, organizational governance, and tax regulation. These professional development opportunities are key to the OMA's training program and ongoing role in the museum community.

Despite having the knowledge, experience, and relationships to offer responsive professional development opportunities, the OMA's activities are limited due to financial and human resource capacity. By necessity, the OMA responds to available funding opportunities. For example, in 2000-2001, there was a surplus in the Provincial Heritage Organization Grant, which provides operational funding to the provincial associations. Ministry staff recommended the OMA receive a portion of the surplus for training related to the revised standards, which the OMA then offered with Ministry collaboration.⁹² Most recently, the OMA's work on diversity and inclusion was made possible due to support from a provincial Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration grant. However, as seen in nonprofits more broadly, the dependence on project

⁹¹ For example, they offered webinars relating to the Indigenous Collections Symposium to provide context to the Symposium's conversations (Ontario Museum Association 2017)

⁹² See communications available in: RG47-41 B931945 Grant admin corr file PHO 2000-2001. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

grants means the OMA is unable to engage in all projects or retain staff positions. As an OMA Past President observed,

One of the ways they exist and get to advance is to apply for grants, which is kind of unfortunate because you're always struggling. You're spending a lot of time writing grants but it's an opportunity to get projects going and projects involve the membership... [which] is what they want to see. (Interview, Havelka 2018)

Due to the reliance on project funding, the OMA is forced to ask, "what can we do with [only] a handful of people" (Interview, Furness 2018), adjusting their response to museum workers' needs accordingly.

Considering the OMA's limited resources and Ontario's size, the (re)creation of other organizations providing training to museums does not challenge their service delivery role within the museum community. The advisors and associations have encouraged more localized networks to respond to museums' training needs. For example, the OMA has encouraged regional associations since their foundation to enable cooperation on emerging issues, such as using technology in museums.⁹³ Following a 1982 OMA conference on computers, the Waterloo-Wellington Museum Management Co-operative formed to cooperate on computerized collections management (Avedon 1984). Building on their experiences, the OMA coordinated a broader project with five regional associations to automate Ontario's museums. Using funding from a provincial project grant and federal job program, the OMA facilitated training and support for museum workers through the networks (Leonard 1991; Registrar and Leonard 1992). During the 1990s and 2000s, the OMA continued to collaborate with the regional groups,

⁹³ See, for example, communication from the president to those considering a regional network in: F2091 6 b253002 inter office correspondence 1971 - Sept 11 74. Archives of Ontario, Toronto. In the 1980s they began to hold meetings with museums in different areas to further encourage their development. See, for example, documents available in: F2091 15 B253021 Regional Division of the Province. Archives of Ontario, Toronto. Similarly, the OHS has worked with the Voyageur Heritage Network to provide training (Leverty 2015), including a workshop on "Training and Resources for Museums on a shoestring budget."

working with established meeting schedules to maximize training opportunities.⁹⁴ The OMA revisited their relationships with the regional networks in 2007-2008, following a collaborative advocacy campaign for increased provincial funding and the creation of the municipally funded Ottawa Museum Network. Despite challenges obtaining funding to fully support the desired cooperative program (Ontario Museum Association 2008a), they began working with these regional groups to circulate best practices and provide training. For example, they worked with regional museum networks and clusters to provide training on digital tools with federal and provincial support in 2010-2011.⁹⁵ The regional museum networks formed a provincial collective at the OMA's 2017 annual conference, aiming to develop models for shared spaces and service delivery. The establishment of the collective re-affirms the OMA's provincial role providing training and smaller networks' potential utility to address more targeted regional needs.

Acting on behalf of a more localized museum community, the networks work independently from the advisors and associations to connect members with the resources and information they need. In some areas, regional networks actively meet and engage in skill-building activities. For example, the South West Ontario Heritage Council reports meeting quarterly for heritage related professional development and networking since the late 1980s.⁹⁶ Regional networks provide museums with a way of "getting together, sharing information, and getting some professional development" (Interview, Havelka 2018).

Despite the potential utility of local networks to provide responsive training and connect museums, their activities have been inconsistent and differ widely from one area to another.

⁹⁴ See, for example: Rg47-51 b929760 cmsw05a; Rg47-51 b929760 osw02a. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁹⁵ Information available in annual reports.

⁹⁶ Information gathered through the website (SWOHC 2016) and confirmed in personal correspondence with the Chair in January 2020.

The networks, at times, cease meeting. Since there is rarely funding to support their ongoing work, they rely on the work of an individual with an interest and the support of that individual's institution. A museum advisor who actively encouraged the development of the networks argued, "If somebody doesn't want to take on the lead, then they disappear" (Interview, J. Carter 2018). For example, the Brant Museums & Galleries Association aims to pool resources, ideas, and people. They originally formed in 1985, disbanded, then reformed in 2005 (BMGA Association 2020). An OMA Past President and museum director interviewed discussed challenges to establishing and maintaining a network, stating

There used to be many years ago... But because the distances are kind of large and things are difficult in this area, it really never took off. A lot of places [here] are only seasonal so there wasn't a lot of opportunities to get together. Some places got rid of their permanent staff and that kind of thing so there weren't any opportunities to really network. (Interview, Bachmann 2018)

Museums in northern communities and other areas without a number of well-resourced museums with paid staff, therefore, struggle to both establish and maintain networks that rely on pre-existing institutional capacity.

In short, museum workers have created formalized networks that can be mobilized for emerging and existing professional development needs, providing sites for governing and relationship building in the museum community. Museum workers dissatisfied with the OHS' capacity to respond to their needs with a robust training program created a new association. Like the OHS, the OMA circulated a newsletter that aimed to connect museum workers to each other, defining the museum community and providing valuable information. However, they also responded to the CMA's difficulties and federal funding opportunities to develop a training program that was more frequent and involved individuals from well-resourced museums. Like the CMA, the OMA has found they are unable to address all museums' professional development needs across Ontario due to limited resources and, in particular, funding. They

have, therefore, encouraged and mobilized local museum networks. While some networks can and do provide an active training program, regional networks are limited because they often do not receive funding for their activities and rely on their members' initiatives. Their activities are then inconsistent across time and regions.

The continued existence of training programs through the OMA or regional networks demonstrates non-governmental actors' significance in museum governance. The work of governing involves training and circulating information about best practices. These practices help enact a museum community by connecting museums. However, as seen with the advisors' changing role, the development of the associations' professional development shows the determining role governments play. Museums, struggling to find the resources for their own institutions, cannot fully support all professional development needs. As a result, they depend on external funding and the associations' activities are filtered through government policy. In particular, the national museum policy enabled the OMA to develop knowledge and expertise in training, the Province has provided operational funding that allowed for capacity building, and the OMA continues to access project funding from both levels of government, which determine the projects they can accomplish.

The OMA's establishment and the inconsistent development of the regional networks also demonstrates the significant role specific museums or museum workers play in sustaining associations. While the OMA has a secretariat and regional networks can be regionally funded, they both rely on labor that is unpaid or, at least, paid for by a museum with staff and a willingness to support these activities. Individuals from relatively well-resourced museums who were no longer participating in or were dissatisfied with the OHS' Museums Section created a new association. These individuals then volunteered their time and institutional resources to sustain the associations' early activities, informing the museum community's construction. The

OMA has changed their governance model and hired more paid staff.⁹⁷ However, the association continues to rely on a board and committees, working with regional networks. The OMA's work of governing the museum community is thus shaped and determined by the community's participation, which often occurs through their professional development opportunities.

5.2.2.3 *The OHS: Capacity Building*

Like the OMA, the OHS provides training to community museums as part of their service delivery. When the manager of the Province's museum section became the Executive Director of the OHS in 1981-1982, the OHS provided training relating to the new provincial guidelines and standards, responding to need, the availability of instructors, and gaps in the OMA program (Interview, Duncan 2017). However, during the 1990s, the Province reduced funding to the Provincial Heritage Operating grant by nearly half, which reduced the OMA's and OHS' budgets. While the Province has since made modest increases to the grant, it has not kept pace with inflation and was never restored to its pre-1996 amounts. The OHS' capacity to provide responsive training opportunities is, therefore, severely diminished (Interview, Anderson 2018). While the OMA maintained a focus on training, the OHS provides a smaller training program and has a reduced role in Ontario community museum governance.

The OHS' activities target a subset of the museum community, helping small organizations build institutional capacity. The Executive Director believes, "Our job is to turn the lights on so everybody can see, and everybody can participate publicly" (Interview, Leverty 2018). To that

⁹⁷ In 1999, the OMA reviewed their organizational structure, reorganizing to have task forces that focus on topical issues rather than a large number of standing committees. They kept some committees that dealt with ongoing member services (nominations and the annual conference). As a result, the task forces form to provide direction on emerging issues rather than ongoing direction to the OMA's programs.

end, the Historical Society facilitates an insurance program and provides advice to members when needed, such as recommendations on navigating Revenue Canada requirements (Interview, Leverty 2018). Most importantly, the OHS incorporates nonprofits who are then in a better position to form supportive relationships for themselves. Their incorporation role is distinctive within Ontario museum governance, enabling capacity building so museum workers are better positioned to translate their own governance. Through these capacity building activities, the OHS plays a less visible but important role serving the museum community.

The Province gave the OHS the power to incorporate affiliates in 1899. Since then, the OHS has worked to incorporate groups to assist with or run historic sites, giving them the legitimacy needed to receive donations, seek grants, and/or enter into partnerships. For example, in 2019, the OHS incorporated the Thorold Museum. Those involved described incorporation as a pillar from which everything can be built, enabling them to get insurance and issue tax receipts (Pelletier 2019). An OHS employee noted,

One of the things that we do that is really important in terms of incorporation and museum policy is incorporating friends of organizations. For museums that are run by a municipality... the museum itself can't apply for funding in certain cases because they are municipally run and operated. But some of these museums are still so small they might have one staff member part-time. So, they are still in desperate need of outside funds. A friends of organization, that often starts as the volunteers for that museum, can incorporate. Then, as an incorporated body, they can actually apply for funding in their own right to help support those small museums. (Interview, Anderson 2018)

Incorporation is significant to nonprofit and small municipal community museums because it key to funding, enabling organizations to apply for government resources or engage in fundraising.

Leading to a rise in the need for the OHS' incorporation work, governments have increasingly divested themselves of their heritage resources in the 21st century. As the Executive Director observed,

One of the overarching challenges we face — and it's been going on since about 2007 but it started before then with amalgamation in 1998 — is the federal,

provincial, and municipal level governments divesting themselves of all their heritage assets. That's a policy, get rid of everything. That's why since then we been incorporating almost one group a month. The public sector is pulling away saying we don't want these assets they're liabilities get rid of them. And that's a huge and is still ongoing. It just in the last ten days I've gotten seven applications for incorporations. (Interview, Leverty 2018)

Demonstrating the effects of multi-level governance and governments' increased divestment of heritage resources, some municipalities were uninterested in the museums they inherited following the Province's amalgamation efforts in the late 1990s and early 2000s. For example, in 2011, Toronto's Mayor purportedly proposed closing four of the city's ten museums. Three of the museums selected were in Etobicoke and North York – that is, former municipalities that became administrative districts within Toronto in 1998.⁹⁸ After the City dissolved the Montgomery's Inn Community Board, volunteers formed the Montgomery's INNovators and incorporated through the OHS. As an incorporated entity, they have the legitimacy needed to support museum operations and advocate for the museum's existence (Nelson In Press).

In short, the OHS has (re)focused their service delivery in response to their own reduced capacity and governments' apparent disinterest in heritage resources. They are increasingly working with individual groups to incorporate so these groups can form supportive relationships themselves to preserve heritage within their local communities. The OHS can then assist these organizations in their relationships with other entities, such as Revenue Canada. Notably, these incorporated entities are able to advocate for themselves, which the OHS supports. While the OHS has had the ability to incorporate since 1899, government has effectively redefined the OHS' role, creating a greater need for incorporation.

Within the museum community, the OHS' governance practices are most relevant to small, nonprofit institutions who may be receiving no operating funding from the Province or a

⁹⁸ Montgomery's Inn, Gibson House, Zion Schoolhouse, and the Market Gallery.

small grant through the Heritage Organization Development Grant. As an OMA Past President observed,

The majority of the smaller historical society run museums have stayed with the OHS. They have some different expectations, different criteria, and a different funding program. There is still a different funding program for the smaller seasonal historical societies other than the Community Museum Operating Grant. (Interview, Doherty 2017)

The larger institutions, receiving CMOG, are more often associated with the OMA due to a concern with training, advocacy, and/or networking. However, engaging in activities to construct and enact the museum community through service delivery, such as training, requires capacity. The smaller community museums associated with the OHS have limited capacity to translate their own governance, which requires time, money, and relationships. The OHS' practices are significant to enabling capacity, highlighting community museums' role translating their own governance due to the relational nature of community museum governance.

5.3 Different Roles and Resulting Power Dynamics: Defining the Advisors and Associations through their Relationships

The work of governing Ontario's community museums involves the overlapping and intersecting responsibilities of constructing need to speak for a collective and responding to those needs – that is, advocacy and service delivery. Since museums are necessarily focused on the past and can have difficulty changing, the work of governing assumes community museums require external actors to assist and direct their development. Moreover, the collective has a greater capacity to effect change or consistency in government instruments than individual community museums, highlighting the advisors' and associations' critical role in community museum governance.

While national and provincial museums are, at times, included in the collective and work with the associations, these larger institutions have different needs and, as government actors, they have greater capacity to speak for themselves. Defining community museum governance, the provincial level translators have focused on the needs of community museums. For example, when the OMA submitted a discussion paper on museums to the Ministry in 1986, they outlined current challenges and expectations for the museum community of relevance to museums broadly. However, when discussing Ontario museums' funding needs, they focused on issues with the Community Museum Operating Grant (CMOG), which only provides funding for community museums (Ontario Museum Association 1986), rather than the provincial contributions to provincial agencies. As an advisor and conservator from the late 1990s stated, "The Ministry has agencies ... but interestingly we never really interacted with them that much" (Interview, Holland 2017).

As the advisors and associations work together or with one voice to advocate for or serve community museums, they can be indistinguishable in moments of time. However, they have different relationships with both government and museums, which shapes their capacity and the scope of their activities in the museum community. Within this section, I discuss the advisors and associations distinct roles as they both advocate and deliver services through their relationships. The distinctions are critical to community museum governance, leading to particular power dynamics and defining the scope of what can be accomplish. In particular, changes in the advisors' relationship to government reflect and reinforce the deprioritization of community museums, determining possible governing practices. The OMA's close relationship to municipal and CMOG supported museums has historically shaped and enabled their activities. Although the Association has worked to engage museums more broadly, it lacks the capacity to

engage in the sustained work of advisors to include small museums in the community, which reinforces a hierarchy of community museums in governance.

5.3.1 *The Advisors' Dual Identity: Empowered and Restricted through Provincial Definition*

Museum advisors operate as part of a government institution but also define themselves as museum professionals attempting to benefit Ontario's museum community. A conservator from the 1980s stated, "we were there because we were passionate about the field we chose to work in" (Interview, Poulin 2017). A former advisor remarked,

You have to assume that as professionals in the field, working within the ministry as civil servants, you are advocates. You have to be. I mean, that's your role. They wouldn't hire you to be specialist in your field, if you're not supporting growth and development of the sector. (Interview, Participant A)

The advisors, therefore, have dual identities as both museum professionals and government representatives, which informs their governance practices as both service providers and advocates. As museum professionals, the advisors are part of a broader museum community and do the work of governing to help their community. They have been able to construct and enact a collective, champion museums' defined interests, as well as support individual museums, mobilizing the resources and relationships afforded to them as government actors. However, the advisors are also the public face of government and, as a result, they are separate from the museum community, shifting the nature of their relationships. They have additional roles within government, such as following directions related to policy, writing briefing notes on potential issues, or "trying to explain [to museums] why the government was acting the way it was" (Interview, Watts 2017). The advisors are thus subject to additional responsibilities and constraints related to their position in government, which they negotiate as they govern Ontario's community museums.

Within this section, I demonstrate the significance of the advisors' relationship with government to their relationship with community museums. The advisors' relationship to the Province distinguishes their work from the associations' and, historically, enabled the advisors to provide a service that included small museums. Changes in their relationship to government since the 1990s has redefined the advisors' role within the museum community, reducing their capacity to construct, advocate for, and serve a community that includes small institutions.

The advisors' relationship with government enables their practices within and for the museum community in four ways. First, they have greater access to certain kinds of information, informing both their responsive assistance and advocacy. In particular, the advisors have knowledge about the processes of government, which they translate to prompt timely advocacy work and/or improve museums. For example, in 1973, an advisor correctly informed the OMA that the Ministry was susceptible to pressure regarding the inclusion nonprofit museums in the grant program, encouraging advocacy.⁹⁹ To help community museums improve and meet the Standards, the advisors have provided museums and their associations with resources on future requirements. They are uniquely positioned to know what they will be assessing, tailoring their assistance and advice to address their expectations. For example, the year before asking museums for a social media plan as a CMOG requirement, the advisor

...did the presentation at the OMA conference so that people would know how to do it, what was coming, what they really needed to do, and basically kind of try to teach them how to do it. So, that was the idea behind that... We wanted to alert everybody that this was coming because no one really had social media plans.

Some people have strategies. Some ... municipalities have social media strategies, but none of them had plans. None of them real had any idea what a social media plan should look like. I wanted it to be very specific. Like: How are you planning for the next five years? What are you going to use? Do you have a Facebook page? If

⁹⁹ Home, Margaret. 1973, July. Letter to Mr. Gordon McLaughlin. F2091 6B253002 correspondence- council – president July 13, 1971 – Aug 26, 1975.

you have a Facebook page, what do you use it for? All of those things. I already knew that was a gap. (Interview, Weinstein 2017)

The presentation communicated upcoming expectations, providing information on the value of social media plans and what they include to participants at the OMA annual conference.¹⁰⁰ It was important because many museums did not have existing plans, but would have to produce one to receive the expected funding. The advisors' insider access to government information, thereby, reinforces the significance of an advisory role within the museum community.

Importantly, the translation of government information, such as grant requirements, has been a key component of the advisors' work since their inception and continues today despite the reduced role for the advisor. The museum advisor is tasked with processing the operating grant and assessing museums against the Standards, which means the advisor continues to have privileged access to information that can be translated for museums. However, she no longer has the resources to conduct site visits and offer tailored assistance to those attempting to improve their operations, translating information on an individualized basis.

Second, as actors making recommendations on museum funding, the advisors can have greater access to decision-makers within government. Early advisors, working without a written policy, were able to argue for an expanded advisory service or an increased operating grant budget in conversations with the Minister or Deputy Minister (Interviews, Styrmo 2017; Duncan 2017). The second museum section manager recalled,

When I was the section leader, I would ask for a meeting with the section's Minister. I would sit down with him and tell him what I was doing, how I was doing it, and what I needed to do it. And, by gods, they would do it. They would give me the money; they would give me the resources. (Interview, Duncan 2017)

¹⁰⁰ The presentation slides are available on the OMA's website (Fraser and Weinstein 2015). They argue for social media plans, positioning plans within the Province's community standard. In order to make a plan, they advise museums to clarify goals, identify the audience and institutional personality, audit the museums' current social media status, develop a content strategy, and use analytics. They presented some tools and platforms museums could use.

Later advisors, working to improve the quality of museums with the Standards, had less access to their Minister but continued to advocate internally. It was their “role to provide that expert point of view and advice to the non-expert, the real civil servants” (Interview, Watts 2017). However, starting in the 1990s, they became less involved with the Province’s various programs, which are now the responsibilities of other actors. Moreover, without the support of management, it became more difficult for the advisors to be heard (Interview, J. Carter 2017). An advisor and conservator from the late 1990s stated, “We wanted to move our knowledge and ideas up but, in my time there, it got stuck at the directors’ level” (Interview, Graham 2017). Making recommendations on policy became the defined responsibility of the policy advisors rather than the museum advisors (Interview, Holland 2017), limiting the museum advisors’ access. That being said, the current advisor continues to “go to bat for community museums,” arguing for the museum program to others in the Ministry (Interview, Weinstein 2017).

Within the Ministry, the museum advisors’ participation in and access to the museum community has given them a unique perspective. They can speak with authority as to the museum community’s needs and the significance of museum policy because they are members of the community they helped create. On behalf of the museum community, the advisor(s)’ role within government has enabled a responsiveness to possible opportunities for change in museum governance and threats to existing policy instruments. While the advisors’ access to decision-makers has evolved, becoming more limited in the 21st century, the one advisor’s existence and limited access still serves as an ongoing resistance to the elimination or reduction of the museum grant program. Working with the Standards, the advisor’s presence rationalizes continued government support.

Third, as provincial authorities, the advisors were able to advocate for museums at local levels, responding to the individual context and problem. For example, prior to the 1981

museum policy, some municipalities would not give their museum the entire CMOG allocation. When visiting the site, the advisors could approach the municipalities to mediate the issue (Interview, Duncan 2017). They also spent time advocating to rural municipal councils to encourage municipal spending (Interview, Styrmo 2017). They spent “a lot of time” at municipal meetings explaining why the Province was giving museums money and museums’ value to the community (Interviews, Duncan 2017; Stymo 2017). A former advisor explained,

[Municipalities] needed money for sidewalks, roads, schools, hospitals, and all those things that there were all kinds of grant programs for. They felt, in many cases, that the museums in their communities were frills and that money would be better spent on something really important... We did spend a lot of time at municipal meetings explaining to them why we were giving the museum money, why they needed it, and how they were of value to their community. (Interview, Duncan 2017)

Following the release of the Standards, museums used the threat of discontinued provincial support to get funding from their local governments to meet the Standards. In these situations, the advisors could explain the program and its value to municipalities or boards. A former conservator recalled,

I would go sometimes to a council meeting with John Carter or someone. We would have to basically speak to support the museum's pitch and say: “They really need this,” or “They would like a new staff member.” We would try to connect [the request] with the standards, saying “You have to do this, or you won’t get funding.” Not in so many words but the implicit threat was there. (Interview, Poulin 2017)

Although municipal advocacy benefiting museums receiving provincial funding, advisors have become “less and less” involved with municipal governments (Interview, Weinstein 2017), working more narrowly with municipal museum employees in the fourth period of governance marked by government disinterest.

In addition to speaking to municipalities, the advisors used their provincial authority to legitimize arguments on behalf of museums to their boards or the federal grant programs. The associations can and do speak with authority about community museums in Ontario to

municipalities or federal funders. However, the relationship between governments is different and the Standards have, historically, defined the advisors' authority, providing a consequence for those who did not listen. The ongoing reduction in the advisors' capacity to advocate to these other actors reflects and reinforces the ongoing divestment of government resources.

Finally, the Province provided the advisors with the capacity to establish entities and respond to needs in distinct ways. The advisors worked as subject matter experts in policy development, writing a museum policy and two versions of the associated standards. They were also given a budget and mandate to provide an advisory service to a large number of community museums. Illustrating the breadth of their work, in 1979 the advisors were "involved in more than 900 consultations concerned with individual museum problems and projects."¹⁰¹ Their services were of particular relevance to small and/or struggling institutions that needed help identifying problems and finding affordable solutions. Reflecting on the retired museum advisor's historic role, an OMA Past President noted, "I've known John forever... he always seemed to work with the smaller museums who were trying to get grass growing under their feet, trying to build them up. He was very encouraging with smaller groups" (Interview, Havelka 2018). The advisors listened to small museums, visiting their sites and developing relationships. The small institutions' voices were then incorporated into grant requirements, the construction of a museum community, and the development of resources for that community.

In sum, the advisors' relationship to government is critical to the work of governing Ontario's community museums. In particular, the advisors have had privileged access to information about government and government actors. As a result, they were able to provide

¹⁰¹ *Ontario's Community Museum Program: Directions for the 1980's A Discussion Paper*. Rg47-51 B101712 unlabeled. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

advice and assistance to museums that was unavailable elsewhere in the museum community.

An OMA Past President observed,

I think the OMA does a lot of great stuff and provides support but the benefit of having somebody within the government structure, providing advice and helping to navigate [is important]. I don't think the OMA can fill that role. I think that's a unique role to government. (Interview, Adkin 2018)

Due to their advisory role and employment as civil servants, the advisors were uniquely positioned within both government and the museum community to establish a policy that was accepted by both, playing a key role in a moment of significant change within community museum governance. As government actors, they had the authority to facilitate relationships and establish entities in the 1970s and 1980s. Their capacity to establish standards tied to the operating grant, in particular, was key to the evolution of museum governance in Ontario. They worked with the Standards to provide advice and assistance, influencing community museums' development across the province.

In addition to enabling their work in the community, the advisors' relationship to government has provided significant parameters that constrained their capacity to govern the museum community. First, the advisors have engaged in translation alongside other government actors who do parallel work and, therefore, limit the scope of the advisors' activities. In particular, the introduction of policy advisors who provide the government with policy advice undermines their role advocating for a museum policy. The introduction of regional consultants, providing individual advice and access to community organizations, eroded their role as advisors. More broadly, they are limited by the governments' (re)definition of an appropriate role for civil servants. The museum advisor position is, therefore, disappearing "because the emphasis is not on providing that advice. The government doesn't do that anymore. That is not seen as government's role" (Interview, Holland 2017). A former advisor noted,

There is this argument — we don't do that anymore. We're not in the business of providing advice. I find that a curious one because they still have the structure of standards, guidelines, regulations and stuff. But, to me there is some presumption that everybody knows how to do that or they're just going to do it anyway. (Interview, J. Carter 2017)

In addition to conflicting with contemporary understandings about government's role, the museum advisor's and Standards' existence conflicts with contemporary policies and programs, which focus on culture or tourism rather than museums. The advisor has, therefore, become more removed from the community further reducing the advisory role.

Second, the advisors are increasingly limited by their own funding as the government enacts a policy of disinterest in museums through budgeting. As described above, the advisors worked across the province to provide responsive assistance relating to the Standards in the 1980s. However, in 1987-1988, the manager created a list of critical museums, which became the top priority for assistance. The prioritization meant they had to "turn down other, less important requests from clients."¹⁰² The advisors also had to decline new museums from entering the program even though these museums were meeting the Standards and had worked with the advisors to address their limitations.¹⁰³ In other words, the advisors' role within government meant they had to privilege assistance to pre-existing clients, reinforcing historical inequities in how museums were treated.

As the advisors restricted access to the museum grant, they began more noticeably working for government rather than the museum community itself. Since the 1990s, the Province has become more disinterested in supporting direct service, which is reflected in the

¹⁰² Brent, Marty. N.d. Memorandum to: Museums Staff Re: Critical List – top priority for client assistance for the duration of 1987 and for 1988. RG47-41 B412603 1987 operating grant. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

¹⁰³ The Toronto's First Post Office is an example of a museum that was turned down because of insufficient funds after doing everything the advisors had asked. Additional information on their case is available in: RG47-41 B307253; RG47-41 B307184. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

budget for the advisors' advisory work. As the advisor's role becomes more narrowly focused on the grant, assistance benefits a narrower set of museums, (re)defining the advisor's position within the community. Notably, reviews of the museum grant program have led to revised standards (late 1990s) or renewed assessment (2009), but historic inequities in funding allocations have not been addressed. As an OMA Past President observed,

I do think with the way that CMOG is being given, it's a bit [off]. If you're doing really well, then I can't be doing well. It's the scarcity mentality. Because there is only a finite amount of money, everybody is treated in a different way. If we all expected we should be equal part of the pie without someone having to do less, I think it would be better. (Interview, Furness 2018)

Due to the limited funding available, the advisor and Standards, to some extent, serve to restrict access to provincial support and perpetuate inequities in the Province's relationships with community museums. Since funding allocations are based on the previous year, community museums seeking to join the support program must both meet the Standards and wait until there is additional funding available. However, there is, functionally, no longer an advisory service available to help them meet those requirements.

In short, the advisors have had different capacities to engage in both responsive assistance and advocacy for museums due to their position as civil servants. At particular points of time, they had the resources and, therefore, capacity to engage with small, nonprofit museums. However, they work within constraints, co-existing with other government actors that do similar work. Their role within the museum community necessarily changed as the Province became disinterested in having a direct service role with museums. While the museum advisor continues to mediate access to the community museum operating grant, there are regional consultants providing responsive advice or assistance who have greater access to their community and responsibility for project grants. As an OMA Past President and museum director stated,

They were very active in the museum community... You almost knew them personally. You talked to them on the phone numerous times and you had lots of personal interactions with them. They understood all of your issues and were advocating personally because they had that same issue. You felt like they were part of the voice that was speaking forward. Now, with less museum advisors, we just never hear from our museum advisor other than via email most of the time. And really, it's just related to CMOG and the grants (Interview, Powell 2018).

The advisors' reduced role represents a loss to small community museums in Ontario despite the existence of other actors doing similar work. The regional consultants and policy advisors do not usually have museum specific expertise.¹⁰⁴ Importantly, the associations do not have the same resources or access as the advisors. For example, while the OHS and OMA have leveraged their positions as provincially recognized collectives to support local action, they do not have the advisors' authority to translate municipal activities with the threat of decreased funding. The associations are also not empowered to write government policy and do not have the resources for an expansive advisory service.

5.3.2 The Associations as Membership Organizations: Enabled and Restricted through Participation

Since its foundation, the OMA has most notably governed community museums through a training program, establishing best practices. More recently, the Association has defined and is enacting a strategy for the sector. While the OMA has paid staff that does this work, it also relies on the labour of committees and a council to define the scope of their activities. These representatives, such as presidents, have multiple memberships in museums and the Association(s). Although the OMA is not a government actor, presidents most often work for

¹⁰⁴ Notably, after working as a conservator and advisor, Jane Holland became a policy advisor.

municipal or other government museums¹⁰⁵ and the associations are dependent on government(s) to enable their work, providing both constraints and opportunities. Within this section, I reflect on the distinct role of the OMA within the Ontario museum community compared to the OHS and regional networks. Then, I argue there is a hierarchy of community museums in governance due, in part, to the historic role of government or quasi-government museum workers in determining the work of the OMA.

The OMA differs from other associations in Ontario due to its provincial mandate, narrow focus on museums, and the involvement of large, well-resourced museums. The OHS is concerned with heritage more broadly, such as the preservation of cemeteries. They help museums as one kind of heritage organization and member, responding to member museums' needs. Importantly, they incorporate entities to help with capacity building so heritage organizations can engage in their own policy translation. The OHS is less active than the OMA in the museum community/sector given their broad focus. Conversely, the regional networks have a narrow focus, working to build and serve a community in a smaller area. Their membership can be restricted to museums or include heritage organizations more broadly. With some notable exceptions,¹⁰⁶ they are volunteer run, relying on member museums' work without the same resources as the OMA or OHS.

The OMA, OHS, and regional networks are all to varying degrees reliant member participation, which defines the associations' work. The involvement of members is critical because it expands their work and enables some flexibility in delivery. Further, since their work is

¹⁰⁵ While municipal governments are the most common, the presidents are, generally, from relatively well-resourced museums, which also include provincial agencies like the Royal Botanical Gardens and federal institutions like the National Gallery of Art. There have been presidents from nonprofit museums.

¹⁰⁶ The Ottawa Museum Network is a significant exception. It receives funding from the municipal government and has two permanent employees in addition to the part-time summer employees.

shaped and enacted by community museum workers, they have more authority to speak for the community, determine appropriate areas of action to address perceived needs, and define best practices. However, the reliance on members also provides limitations, creating the parameters for governance. As an OMA Past President remarked,

The OMA is a membership-based organization. It serves its members. So, if you're an organization like an emerging museum that doesn't know about the OMA or doesn't have the resources to take out a membership... The OMA does the best it can to support the sector as a whole, but at the end of the day it represents its members. (Interview, Adkin 2018)

The members define the associations' governance practices, enabling and limiting the scope of advocacy and service delivery.

A variety of museum workers, including those from both municipal and nonprofit museums, are OMA members and actively participate on the OMA's committees to define the OMA's activities. The conference planning committees, in particular, attract a wide range of volunteers because the conference moves around the province every year and people want to influence the theme or content (Interview, Furness 2018). Despite the perceived grassroots nature of the committees, the most active members frequently have or have had membership in comparatively well-resourced museums. For example, of 26 past presidents, 13 worked for municipal or quasi-municipal museums and seven worked for federally or provincially owned museums. Reflecting on the discrepancy, an OMA Past President noted,

We try to be representative. We really do. But [it] depends on who gets nominated and all of those things too... Who's been able to sit on committees? If you're a not for profit museum, sometimes you're worried about the HR policies and all those other things and can't take that time to do so... It's just sometimes a reality. Who's presenting at conferences, who stepped up for task forces and all those types of things. They tend to be municipal ones, especially recently. I think more so recently. I think there's certainly a gap growing. (Interview, Bernat 2018)

Some nonprofit museum workers do actively participate in the OMA, sitting on committees, presenting at conferences, and stepping up for task forces. In particular, from

1988 to 2018, two (of 17) presidents were from nonprofit museums. However, notably, these nonprofit museums have both received the provincial operating grant — CMOG.¹⁰⁷

Within Ontario, CMOG has increased client museums' capacity as it provides a secure source of operating revenue for museums. From 1953 to the 1970s, the grant was not available to nonprofit museums. Even after nonprofit museums became eligible, municipal museums were and are better positioned to access this provincial funding, increasing their capacity to seek other forms of assistance.¹⁰⁸ In addition to receiving a more secure source of municipal funding, they receive a range of no-cost services, such as IT or human resources and do not pay municipal taxes (Interviews, Bernat 2018; Furness 2018), which is a growing problem for many nonprofit institutions (Interview, Levery 2018). Museums receiving CMOG and, more specifically, municipal museums receiving CMOG generally have greater capacity than nonprofit museums not receiving CMOG. Capacity is related to municipal *and* provincial investment (Hill Strategies Research Inc. 2016a).

These comparatively well-resourced museums are disproportionately represented in early mobilizations of the museum community because they could pay staff. Participation on the OMA council and committees involved a prohibitive time commitment for the volunteers running

¹⁰⁷ These were both well-resourced nonprofit museums. In 2015, one had a budget of over 1 million dollars and the other had a budget of around 750 thousand. The lack of representation does not indicate a lack of nonprofit museums in the province or a lack of museums with smaller budgets. Within a survey of Ontario museums with 184 respondents, 44% identified as independent / nonprofit corporation. In this survey, 118 museums provided revenue information and, of those, 84 had budgets under 700 thousand dollars (Hill Strategies Research Inc. 2016a). An OMA Past President observed, "We have a huge amount of one person and volunteer driven museums that need to find resources" (Interview, Bernat 2018).

¹⁰⁸ There are no statistics that clearly identify how many nonprofit vs. municipal museums there are in Ontario. However, there are 414 local municipalities in Ontario. Some, such as Toronto or Ottawa, have multiple municipally-owned museums. Others have none. The number of reported museums in Ontario vary, ranging between 500 and 700. The disproportionate support for municipal museums was mentioned in several interviews with advisors, suggesting they are disproportionately represented in the funding program. From 2000-2004, they account for about 60% of provincially funded community museums and 68% of the provincial Community Museum Operating Grant funding (Ontario Museum Association 2008b). Some nonprofit museums receive funding through HODG instead.

small museums in the 1970s. For example, in 1972 the OMA president indicated Executive meetings would rarely be held on weekends. In response, a member put forth a motion to hold meetings on the weekend because volunteers had regular jobs during the week. When council considered the motion, it realized council members had to be employed at a museum, making volunteer museum workers ineligible to sit on council.¹⁰⁹ Moreover, government or quasi-government museums were more likely to enable their workers to participate in the Association.

A retired museum advisor that worked in a museum during the 1970s noted,

When I sat on OMA council, I was employed by a conservation authority¹¹⁰ and they allowed me to take off time. A lot of these smaller museums... aren't members or ... aren't allowed to take the time. So that's what the OHS was supposed to represent through the museums committee. And a lot of the not for profit museums were represented by the OHS museums committee. But that's always been a huge problem. How do you represent all museums? (Interview, J. Carter 2017)

Institutional support was, therefore, key to participation in the Association. As a result, membership on council denoted employment in a museum with existing capacity and resources, limiting representation.

Smaller museums could still contribute to discussions about the needs of community museums through consultation efforts. People within the OMA and other associations are “willing to listen to you, if you do it the right way.” However, to do so requires knowing how to participate in accepted ways, putting “yourself out there” and “a lot of hard work” (Interview, Bachmann 2018). The more active members with time, resources, and institutional support had more opportunities to shape the Associations’ construction of the museum community and identify ideal responsive activities for the OMA through internal dialogue and the mobilization of

¹⁰⁹ The correspondence on this issue is available in: F2091 6 B253002 correspondence - council - president July 13,1971 - Aug 26 , 1975. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

¹¹⁰ The 1946 *Conservation Act* allows municipalities with a shared watershed to petition the Province to form a Conservation Authority. Conservation authorities are corporate bodies that manage natural resources and, at times, the historic sites or museums on their land.

community to government through advocacy. For example, the director of a municipal museum served on the OMA council while the OMA worked with the advisors and the OHS to construct a museum community in need of standards and training, which the OMA could provide. He then attended meetings with the Ministry to advocate for standards, wrote letters to the Minister on behalf of the OMA, and wrote letters as a museum director, advocating for the enunciation of a rationale to help the museum community fight for the grant.¹¹¹ An interview participant who worked as an advisor during the 1970s remembered representatives from larger museums, such as the aforementioned director, pushing for standards rather than a museum community more broadly. He stated,

I do not recall that museums, individually or as a group, lobbied for more recognition or a policy area until 1979-80 when the management for Black Creek Pioneer Village and, I think, the Doon site in Kitchener¹¹² made presentations to the effect that they were “large” operations and required - deserved? - a larger share of the grant programme. (Interview, Styrmo 2017).

Notably, the OMA president from 1978 to 1980 – that is, during the construction of the museum community and advocacy for a museum policy with standards – worked for the Black Creek Pioneer Village.¹¹³

The “museum community” as articulated by the OMA in the late 1970s and early 1980s was, therefore, defined by a small subset of community museums who were actively participating in the OMA’s advocacy efforts. These individuals believed the quality of small community museums was poor and required improvement, which could be accomplished

¹¹¹ See, for example, correspondence available in: RG47-50 B101703 manila envelope. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

¹¹² The Doon Heritage Village is now part of the Ken Seiling Waterloo Region Museum. The museum’s namesake, Ken Seiling, was the museum director mentioned who advocate independently and through the OMA for a museum policy with standards.

¹¹³ Black Creek Pioneer Village is operated by a conservation authority.

through their training programs and government regulations. As the historic recipients of provincial funding, they also feared deconditionalization and/or the elimination of the provincial grant program. Their voices became the voice of the museum community, advocating for a rationalization that would safeguard the grant and, potentially, increase their allocation.

The construction of a museum community by the well-resourced museums shaped the development of articulated policies. On behalf of the museum community in the 1970s and 1980s, the OMA argued for change or consistency that privileged community museums receiving the provincial operating grant – that is, governance for quality not quantity. For example, during the discussions on museum policy, the Ministry responsible for museums eliminated the only capital program specific to museums. The number of community museums had expanded rapidly, and CMOG was not growing proportionately. The development of new museums posed a risk of reduced funding. Reflecting this concern, the OMA circulated without publicly countering the Minister's argument that the grant elimination was positive because the number of new museums becoming eligible for funding would level out, avoiding the problem of "too many mouths to feed" (Baetz, 1980, p.1).

The participation of larger and comparatively well-resourced museums receiving CMOG has, to some extent, continued to determine the activities of the OMA. The OMA relies on the labor of individuals with the time, resources, and experience to serve on committees and (re)define the OMA's activities. For these museum directors with knowledge, experience, and training, the absence of an advisory service and standards to guide their development does not substantially hinder their development. They have already achieved the minimum expectations. Given the necessary resources, they are able to participate in associations to better understand emerging issues, participate in the construction of the community / sector, and advocate for their needs. They are also able to identify and seek out what they need, using the associations'

collective resources to develop training or other resources. For example, the OMA's diversity work involved ten museum partner teams that engaged in a community project and wrote about their experiences to develop a resource for the sector. These museums worked with members of an advisory committee who helped them achieve their objectives. Participant museums had existing capacity to engage in these projects, initiated in response to context and available resources, and/or a pre-existing focus on *Inclusion 2025's* objectives.¹¹⁴

The resulting *Inclusion 2025* resource is available publicly on the OMA's website for everyone in the museum community. Smaller museums with fewer resources can benefit from the lessons learned without necessarily being members. Members are able to seek additional support and resources but can struggle to take full advantage of the OMA's services. As an OMA Past President remarked,

I think within the OMA membership we have a huge amount of one person and volunteer driven museums that need to find resources. Hopefully, the OMA can communicate it out there but even their most active volunteer might only be there one day a week. They're not checking email that often and they're not able to. They'll get the information from the OMA. But will they read the information? Will they take the next steps to understand what it means? Will they go to that? Hopefully they will but I think there's some difficulty. (Interview, Bernat 2018)

These smaller institutions do not have the same human resource capacity or access to the resources through their parent organization as municipal/provincial museums to complete the sample activities. Further, the advisory committee for the *Inclusion 2025* project played a role similar to the museum advisor's historic role with project funding, helping museums achieve

¹¹⁴ The Toronto Ward Museum stands out with the lowest budget of the three registered charities that participated. However, the museum emerged to fill a gap in Ontario's community museums and *Inclusion 2025* was of particular relevance to its mission. The participants included the Whitehern Historic House and Garden National Historic Site (municipal), the Ermatinger – Clergue National Historic Site (municipal), the Art Gallery of Sudbury (registered charity), the Markham Museum (municipal), Museum Windsor (municipal), Niagara Falls Museums (municipal), the Robert McLaughlin Gallery (registered charity), the ROM (provincial), the Simcoe County Museum (municipal), the Toronto Ward Museum (registered charity), and Waterloo Region Museum (municipal / regional).

their goals. In the absence of advisors, small institutions do not necessarily have the pre-existing relationships, knowledge, and expertise to complete all museum activities or engage in innovative work on diversity and other emerging concerns.

Despite the potential benefits, the OMA does not have the resources to fund an advisory service over the long term. The reliance on project-based funding models and community participation diminishes the ongoing one-on-one assistance that can be provided. Addressing this gap, the OMA has developed peer-to-peer communication and resources, providing advice and assistance on a broader scale through community building. Training opportunities and conferences enable museum workers to develop relationships with one another. An OMA Past President noted, the professionals he met as part of the OMA's courses "became part of [his] network as valued peer and colleagues" (Interview, Doherty 2017). Another Past President observed the OMA "was kind of like a family. You got to know other workers. Otherwise you would have been isolated in your own museum not knowing anybody" (Interview, Havelka 2018). Providing ongoing connections through text, the OMA has also circulated information of relevance to and from community museums through their Newsletter (1972-1978), *Museums Quarterly* (1979 - 1990), *Currently* (1977 - 2008),¹¹⁵ and online news (late 1990s -).¹¹⁶ Since the introduction of online news through digital platforms and the OMA's website in 1996, they are able to facilitate relationships with a broader audience. The OMA provides contact information for their members, a listserv, as well as online forums that enable museum workers to proactively seek assistance from their peers.

¹¹⁵ To my knowledge, the last print edition of *Currently* was published in 2008.

¹¹⁶ They circulate updates on governments' articulated museum policies or programs, but also provide information on a broad range of topics they see as relevant. For example, the 1994 issues of *Currently* translate information on employment equity legislation, provincial and federal tourism strategies, the laws pertaining to archaeological sites, an archives advisory service, as well as firearms legislation. At one point, *Currently* also circulated news about museums and museum people.

The work of governing through the Association, therefore, involves enacting community and encouraging a peer-to-peer advisory service through their training, the circulation of information, and other platforms. These activities aim to improve the quality (as defined by the museum community) of museums in the province. As such, the OMA's practices both define and enact the museum community as they rely on the participation of community museums for relevance.

In addition to participating in the OMA, some small institutions are able to seek assistance from nearby museums with the capacity to address their advisory needs. For instance, an OMA Past President, CMA Past President, and Director of a northern museum discussed working with a small museum in her region, providing advice relating to their collections. Despite a willingness to help colleagues, larger community museums also perceive their own resources as limited and do not have the mandate to provide a regional advisory service. As such, the interview participant noted,

At one point the Province was pushing us to lead [a regional network]. And we said, "What do you want us to lead? It's not our role. We could do it but it's not our role to set up these things for you guys. You guys set it up and we'll participate." We're a municipal site. The municipality gets involved and says, "Well, if we're going to be doing this, we want to see some money involved." ... We always think it would be really nice to take that kind of thing but the museums are very seasonal and it's more difficult to get that kind of thing going at this point. (Interview, Bachmann 2018)

The lack of funding to provide an advisory service through larger museums or to establish regional networks that facilitate peer-to-peer learning highlights a key issue in Ontario community museum governance – that is, the limited budget for operations and capacity building activities since the 1990s. In the absence of their own capacity, community museums are more reliant on the provincial advisors and associations to translate their governance, participating in these translation efforts to different degrees.

In short, the OMA is the primary association working to respond to the needs of museums across Ontario with direct services and advocacy, working to construct and understand museums' needs and contributions. Their work reflects the expressed needs of museum workers actively participating in the Association and the construction of a museum community. While the OMA engages in advocacy efforts that involve contact with decision makers, they do not have the same access the advisors once had or the authority to re-write policy documents. More importantly, they do not have the capacity to replace the Province's advisory services, which helped small museums and enabled museums receiving CMOG to develop the capacity they now have.

The OMA does not have the resources to continuously reach out to small museums and insist on their participation. Instead, they work to make their resources as accessible as possible. Increasingly, the OMA's members can use digital platforms to seek assistance. A former advisor and conservator noted the digital platforms are "sort of taking the place the museum advisor" (Interview, Holland 2017). People, including workers from small nonprofit museums, will ask a question online and are connected to the other museums (Interview, Adkin 2018). The OMA's strategy for the sector also represents a concerted effort to engage all museums, including those from small institutions, in the translation of a sector. To some extent, their goals reflect the expressed needs of these institutions. For example, they are calling for property tax exemptions for community museums in Ontario, which is a key issue for small nonprofit museums (Interviews, Bernat 2017; Leverty 2018; Ontario Museum Association 2017b).¹¹⁷ Despite these efforts, the small museums are at times unaware of the OMA's ongoing initiatives

¹¹⁷ As an OHS employee noted, "property taxes are a huge problem for small museums as well now. And then the lack of funding for buildings, infrastructure funding is a huge problem for our groups that run museums because if there's no way to apply to fix a furnace or to fix a leaking roof, then how are you going to keep the museum open" (Interview, Anderson 2018).

and opportunities for support available through their associations as they focus on the survival and work of their institutions (Interview, Wilson 2019).

5.4 Conclusion: A Hierarchy of Community Museums

Research on museum governance in Canada has shown a preoccupation in government policy with museums receiving funding as Crown corporations or agencies of the federal or provincial governments. For these institutions, a direct relationship to government ensures some level of support. Community museums have a more precarious relationship with the higher levels of government and smaller budgets. Due to these museums' limited capacities, associations and other sectoral translators play an important role in their governance, doing the work of governing. As Paquette and Redealli (2015) argue, the role of cultural service organizations "is so critical in bringing the actors in the field together and providing the knowledge required" (125). In Ontario, museum advisors and associations have been critical in community museum governance, bringing actors together, translating knowledge, defining the community, and shaping policies or program implementation. They define, enact, serve, and work for the museum community/sector through their dual roles as service providers and advocates.

The Province of Ontario enables and empowers the advisors' and associations' practices as they govern the sector, providing parameters for action. With the introduction of new provincial actors and a smaller budget, the advisors' role in museum governance has been redefined. In particular, the provincial advisory service expanded in the 1970s but has become increasingly limited since the 1990s. The OMA, as a nonprofit that has also undergone cuts in provincial funding, does not have the capacity and is not given funding to employ its own museum advisors. They rely on the active participation of members to inform their work. As a result,

service delivery now includes limited forms of advisory services that are reliant on member participation and information is no longer collected from visiting nonprofit museums across Ontario, which once provided valuable insights into the state of the museum community.

The OMA works to listen and respond to the voices of its members. However, the ability of small nonprofit museums to actively participate in service delivery and advocacy is limited. Historically, municipal or other government museums have had greater capacity to respond to consultations and speak through the OMA than their nonprofit counterparts, particularly nonprofit museums without CMOG funding. When specific understandings of the museum community were incorporated into policy in the 1980s, the dissent of small historic house museums was forgotten, and the views of certain museum workers already benefiting from provincial funding became the consensus. The historical privileging of municipal museums' (receiving CMOG) needs and wants contributed to governance that favors municipal museums with greater capacity.

The loss of advisors with the ability to assemble the voices of small institutions without a corresponding increase in the OMA's funding to do the same may compound the hierarchy of community museums in governance, determining who can participate in the work of governing. Although small museums are supported by the OHS and their capacity building activities, the Historical Society has a smaller role in the museum community due to their broader focus, limited budget, and the emergence of the OMA. Providing the museum community with access and knowledge, the advisors were distinct as government actors. Due to a redefinition of their role, the museum community has a reduced presence in the provincial government and a reduced capacity to voice concerns. While the advisors and associations still speak for the museum community, the community can only include museums' voices so long as they can both speak and be heard.

The development of the Standards, at times, led to a (re)focusing of the advisors' work to pre-existing clients and the quality of community museums as defined by the Standards, contributing to nonprofit museums reduced capacity to participate in the work of governing. While the advisors continued to help emerging museums, those museums did not have the same access to the CMOG grant even when they met the requirements. These inequities are reinforced and reflected in the construction and service of the collective. As a result, changes and consistencies within community museum governance often privileged a hierarchy of community museums. The OMA's efforts to define the museum sector has, to some extent, worked to dismantle this hierarchy and give voice to the small museums in the province. However, they are a membership organization and not all community museums are members. Moreover, their role as an association and nongovernmental actor limits the extent to which they can (re)define others' actions.

The OMA's ongoing construction of the sector focuses on defining museums' contributions and needs in relation to those contributions, responding to a government disinterest in museums as collecting institutions. The work of governing community museums, therefore, involves a broad range of practices and actors relating to these contributions. As such, Chapter Six examines the advisors and associations' work to assemble support according to specific rationalizations and the legitimization of museum work, demonstrating similar patterns to those seen in this chapter. In particular, community museum governance changed in the 1990s when governments reprioritized their commitments within an economic downturn. While the desire for accountability that emerged in the 1970s remains, the Province began deprioritizing community museum governance, leading to an emphasis on data and measurable objectives in policy. These changes have contributed to, but are also reinforced by, the advisors' changing role.

Chapter Six

Legitimizing Support: Problematizations in Mobilized Museum Governance

6.1 Introduction

As the provincial museum advisors and associations define the needs of community museums, they also identify community museums' diverse roles and responsibilities. Since there is no one accepted definition of museums' value or function (Gray 2011), community museum governance involves multiple policies that legitimize activities and rationalize support to reflect different museum objectives. The advisors and associations engage in legitimization work and make targeted arguments for museum support to different actors, (re)assembling a range of entities.

In order to demonstrate the existence of multiple concurrent museum policies and changes in accepted arguments for museum support, this chapter describes the advisors and associations' legitimization work within Ontario community museum governance. It documents five definitions of museums' value that are most prevalent in the advisors and associations' rationalizations for community museum support from government. Within their arguments, community museums are educational institutions, products of local action or sites of local activity, tourist attractions, agents of social change, and inherently valuable collecting institutions. The advisors and associations engage in advocacy and service delivery related to these themes, interacting with government actors of relevance, such as civil servants within the department responsible for formal education. Advocacy is particularly important as actors outside the museum community rarely share the same understanding of museums' value expressed within the community. As a result, museum support is not prioritized within

government departments without a cultural mandate. However, the advisors and associations argue museums can and do contribute to different policy areas. They assemble relationships supporting distinct definitions of museums' role, reflecting policy objectives that fall outside the responsibilities of a minister with a cultural mandate. Community museum governance in Ontario, therefore, involves actors related to education, regional governance, tourism, identity, and buildings or organizations. Policies and instruments in these areas, such as curriculum, highway sign programs, or accessibility regulations, are relevant to museum governance.

Considering the five themes, the discussion demonstrates that arguments for museum support are mobilized differently across actors, territory, and time. The individuals speaking on behalf of the museum community as advisors or association representatives have their own backgrounds and opinions on ideal museum activities, leading to change across actors. Distinct contexts also lead to distinct legitimization work, contributing to disparities over time and territory as perceptions on legitimate reasons for intervention or ideal roles for museums change. As a result, ongoing advocacy is needed to ensure museums' consideration in policy related to their activities and perceived functions. Moreover, museum governance is undergoing ongoing change reflecting the different rationalizations within the work of governing.

The conclusion argues these differences inform the support museums can receive, reinforcing historic inequities as established museums evolve and new museums are established. Community museums established in the 1980s or earlier, particularly those receiving CMOG and assistance from the advisors to meet the Standards, benefited from a rich tapestry of support and legitimization work that is no longer available. Museums established more recently, which often aim to address gaps in the numerous pioneer focused museums, may face challenges to developing the capacity now necessary for individual museums.

6.2 Legitimizing Museum Work and Rationalizing Support

The work of governing Ontario's community museums involves the interrelated activities of advocacy and service provision. As the provincial museum advisors and associations mobilize relationships around specific objectives, they advocate for and support particular definitions of museums' value(s) related to government policies. Their arguments contribute to the definition of museums as a collective to those outside the museum community/sector. They attempt to incorporate these definitions into lasting entities and supportive relationships with actors concerned with specific objectives or themes.

Within this section, I provide examples of five general understandings that have been perpetuated across the different periods of community museum governance – that is, museums as educational institutions, products of local action and sites of local activity, tourist attractions, agents of social change, and inherently valuable collecting institutions. Table 6.1 demonstrates the different arguments, using examples from both interviews and archival documents. To further illustrate each example, the sections below discuss the entities enrolled and (re)defined to support museums' defined objective(s). When actors legitimize museum support with reference to a specific goal, diverse government instruments and other actors become enrolled in museum governance.

Table 6.1: Legitimizing Museum Support

Broad Policy Justification	Trends (use in Ontario)	Examples from Interviews and Archival documents
Educational	Informal learning (1800s, 1950s – ongoing)	<p>“What happens after high school and what’s museums’ role in a classroom without walls situation?” (Interview, DiPietro 2018).</p> <p>“The Museum can be seen as an educational resource...”¹</p>
	Policy attachment: Curriculum and schools (1800s, 1970s – ongoing)	<p>“Museums do endeavor to match their school programming to provincial curriculum. Then it becomes a justification for teachers to be able send their students...” (Interview, Brooks-Joiner 2018).</p> <p>“I believe there are now new opportunities for co-operative curriculum design between community museums and school boards.”²</p>
Local action / activity	Democratic (1950s – ongoing)	<p>“They can speak for themselves. We’re sort of helping them. If they didn’t speak for history in the local communities, those assets would have been lost” (Interview, Leverty 2018).</p> <p>“The best and most applicable ideas seem to come from the community itself.”³</p>
	Sustainability (1970s – ongoing)	<p>“Communities care about museums. They get really up on their hind legs ... when there is a threat to close them because [they are] part of a community identity” (Interview, Kerr-Wilson 2018).</p> <p>“Adequate and ongoing funding support from the municipality is always an important factor in ensuring the success of the local museum.”⁴</p>
Tourism	Increased visitation (1950s – 1990s)	<p>“...museums have a tremendous tourist potential... with assistance and guidance this potential many be realized to the fullest possible extent” (Gooding 1959, 7).</p> <p>“Highway signs help increase visitation at many historical sites and museums.”⁵</p>
	Policy attachment: Tourism Industry (1990s – ongoing)	<p>“...cultural tourism initiatives benefit our museum association counterpart in Quebec...” (OMA 2005, 14).</p> <p>“...museums were very involved in all of those tourism association. First of all, because they thought they were going to get some money” (Interview, Weinstein 2017).</p>

¹ Carter, John. 1986, December. Letter. Rg47-51 B158576 South Grey Museum. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

² Carter, John. 1987, October. Letter. Rg47-51 b158575 Southwestern St. Mary District. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

³ Quance, Christina. 1976, November. Letter. Rg47-51 b110142 Fort Francis. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁴ Carter, John. 1987, January. Letter. Rg47-51 B158576 South Grey Museum. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁵ Brent, Marty. 1990, August. Provincial Highway Signs for Museums. RG47-51 B711690. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

Social Change	Cultural diversity (1990s – ongoing)	<p>“You're actively looking for people who represent those voices. So, you're looking for a board that's diverse” (Interview, Furness 2018).</p> <p>Museums “have a special responsibility to reflect Canada’s full cultural diversity” (McAvity 1994, 3).</p>
	Inclusion and social justice (2010s – ongoing)	<p>“Focus on removing barriers to, and create opportunities for, participation and engagement” (Museum Accessibility Inclusion and Engagement Collaborative 2018, 29)</p> <p>“Our focus is working on cultural diversity and providing the tools that I don't see anywhere else in the sector or beyond” (Interview, Bernat 2018).</p>
Inherent	Collecting institutions	<p>“Unlike some other provinces, our provincial museum is in all these community historical sites, museums, archives” (Interview, Levery 2018).</p> <p>“The power of museums lies in the relationships between our collections, our spaces, and people — staff, stakeholders, and members of the public — and the experiences that result from these interactions” (Looking Ahead Task Force 2016).</p>

6.2.1 *Museums as Educational*

The definition of museums as educational institutions in Ontario predates the development of provincial or federal instruments targeting community museums. Ontario archaeologists, men in the natural sciences, and educators saw value in museums that cultivated and disseminated knowledge, arguing for their existence in the 19th century.⁶ Reflecting museums’ definition as educational, the provincial operating grant for community museums originated within the Ministry of Education’s Community Programmes Branch (See Table 6.2). After responsibility for the Program moved in 1959, the new advisor(s) continued to discuss museums as “educational

⁶ By the mid-1860s, educators were advocated for object teaching in the Ontario school system. Teachers and students visited museums, which were seen as educational assets. Ontario’s Chief Superintendent of Education believed in museums’ educational value, arguing for the development of an educational museum. However, the educational museum closed following the opening of the ROM with the collections dispersed, signaling the demise of efforts to establish school museums in Ontario. For a detailed description of museums as educational institutions in Ontario, see: Carter (2000).

assets.”⁷ Translators circulated resources and assembled entities supporting the general educational function of museums.⁸ For example, as educational institutions, community museums were defined as ideal employers for the provincial student employment programs in the 1970s, providing opportunities for learning and the application of educational experiences.⁹ Starting in the 1970s, museums’ educational role is also more narrowly defined. The advisors and associations began encouraging greater connections between curriculum and museums’ public programming, which led to changes in museum governance and translation activities related to curriculum development.¹⁰

⁷ See, for example, Travel and Publicity’s annual reports or museum advisor letters available in: RG47-51 B328434 general correspondence Ontario 1968. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

As educational assets, museums required a range of resources and help. For example, at the OHS Museum Sections’ 1963 workshop, the advisor gave a presentation on the equipment and materials used in museums. The presentation discussed the significance of labels to present information, providing resources related to label making (Gooding 1963).

⁸ For example, the advisors defined museums as educational in the resource “Establishing a Museum?” (Museums Section 1977) given to developing museums. They also circulated documents as part of the museum policy development (1978-1984), arguing for museum support based on an understanding of museums as educational institutions.

⁹ For information on the student employment program and the justification for museum involvement, see documents available in: RG47-18_3 experience 76-77-78. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

¹⁰ There were corresponding changes in the provincial education system at that time. In the 1960s, *Living and Learning* (Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario 1968) articulated a more progressive approach to education with 250 recommendations. Relevant recommendations include the emphasis on creative learning processes, use of experiences as tools for discovery and exploration, provision of tours and field trips as a regular part of the learning experience, and liaison with other educational agencies. While the recommendations were not implemented or adopted slowly, *The Formative Years* (Education 1975) articulated a new curriculum policy in 1975 for primary and junior students. The associated documents recommend the use and development of programs at the local level for use in education. For more information on the history of curriculum development of relevance to museums, see: Carter (1988).

Table 6.2: Provincial Ministry/Department Responsible for Community Museums

When	Who
1953-1957	Education
1957-1964	Travel and Publicity
1964-1972	Tourism and Information
1973-1975	Colleges and Universities
1975-1982	Culture and Recreation
1982-1987	Citizenship and Culture
1987-1993	Culture and Communications
1993-1995	Culture, Tourism and Recreation
1995-2001	Citizenship, Culture and Recreation
2001-2002	Culture, Tourism and Recreation
2002-2010	Culture
2010-2011	Tourism and Culture
2011-2019	Tourism, Culture and Sport
2019-	Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries

Despite redefinitions over time, community museums' general educational role is persistently defined within Ontario museum governance. For example, in 1984, the provincial museum policy enrolled museums as educational institutions through the new standards, making educational programs a requirement for provincial funding. The Standards state museums can be educational resources for the entire community through special programs that target audiences of all ages, interests, and capacities. Looking at the associations' work, the OMA's president wrote a letter in 1986 stating "As active educational agencies, museums have a vital role to play in providing informal learning environments for visitors of all ages."¹¹ More recently, the 2016 provincial Cultural Strategy states museums provide engaging and intergenerational learning opportunities. In a 2016 press release, the OMA's Executive Director similarly defined museums' role as connecting people to ideas and information (OMA 2016b).

¹¹ Tanner-Kaplash, Sonja. 1986, November. Letter to Hon. Lily Munro. RG47-51 B310127 OMA Sept - Nov 1986. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

The complementary and intersecting argument that museums can be tools in the formal education system is evident from the 1800s.¹² However, within community museum governance, connections between schools and museums become more prevalent in the 1970s when responsibility for museums briefly moved to the Ministry of Colleges and Universities (1973-1975). Museums pushed to “get on the coattails of education” (Interview, Styrmo 2017), attaching themselves to this policy area. Community museums began to create tours, programs, and presentations related to local schools’ history curriculum. The connection to the formal education system was important because, according to an advisor who worked at the time, “in those days, education was second only to God and motherhood. It was a funding source that was never questioned” (Interview, Styrmo 2017). The greater attention to and support for education is evident in the increased number of museum advisors under the new Ministry.¹³

As the number of advisors increased, museum workers established the Ontario Museum Association, which articulated the strengthening connection between community museums and provincial curriculum. For example, a 1976 issue of the OMA’s *Newsletter* discusses educational and interpretation programs that go beyond a traditional tour.¹⁴ The OMA and the Ontario Historical Society also actively considered provincial curriculum in their professional development opportunities.¹⁵ Museums were thus encouraged through their associations’

¹² Former museum advisor, Dr. John Carter wrote a doctoral thesis on the history of museums as learning institutions in Ontario (Carter 2000).

¹³ Styrmo was able to advocate for the northern office and hire two new advisors for the main office.

¹⁴ The issue included an article by the North York Board of Education (McKeown 1976). Staff from the Joseph Brant Museum wrote an article documenting their attempts to develop curriculum-based programming with limited budget, staff, and space (Jolliffe and Gibson 1976).

¹⁵ See correspondence on the training available in: RG47-41 b932836 Hastings County Museum 2. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

meetings and publications to develop new kinds of educational activities, including curriculum-based programming.

At the same time, the advisors argued for links to the curriculum in museum programs, using the new standards (1984) as encouragement for museums to work “with school boards and the provincial curriculum” (Interview, J. Carter 2017). The Standards called for the development of interpretation and education programs in three categories – that is, public programming, special events and related exhibits, as well as school programs.¹⁶ In order to help museums achieve these objectives, the advisors wrote and/or circulated a Museum Note on developing an interpretation and educational policy, an annotated bibliography of printed materials related to museum education, relevant articles on the subject, and recommendations based on their experiences. They encouraged museums to access the Ministry of Education’s curriculum guidelines and resource materials, curriculum resources from the Ministry of Agriculture, and funding programs for short-term staff to assist in program development. They recommended the development of relationships with other local museums, school boards, teachers, teachers in training, the associations, and individuals within other ministries, such as the Ministry of Agriculture’s education specialist.¹⁷ As a former advisor recalled,

A lot of museums had no idea what Ministry of Education curriculum documents were. Not only did I write a Museum Note on developing interpretation education policy, but I [also] wrote a couple other documents, such as [a document on] preschool education.

I'd say to [museums]: “How many school boards do you have here?” And half of them didn't even know that. And I'd say: “Well, you probably have a separate board and you might have a French board. You got to find out how many boards are serving [this area] and then you have to realize that within each board they've got

¹⁶ Cooperative curriculum programs are listed as the first example of a school program.

¹⁷ For examples, see correspondence available in: Rg47-51 B158576 Murney Tower Museum; Rg47-51 B158576 South Grey Museum. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

different policies. The Province has its own set of standards and policies that everybody has to follow but each school board has [them too]." So, I was getting them to understand that.

And then I said, "You have to write what you know about your museum. Educators will know how to educate in the class, but they won't know for sure about how to use objects or object-centered learning. They won't understand that. So, you develop a package, work with teachers, test it before you implement it, see if it works, and see if the kids enjoy it." (Ibid.)

The advisors' role was, therefore, to inform museums about the potentially beneficial relationships they could develop, such as relationships with specific school boards, and provide guidance on forming these relationships, such as learning about the boards' individual policies. They defined museums as educational institutions with connections to curriculum within the museum community, facilitating relationships to support their assertions.

In addition to fostering relationships through their direct service role, the advisors and associations have worked to (re)define curriculum documents, advocating for an explicit articulation of museums' role in education. The work of former advisor Dr. John Carter most directly relates to policy translation that defines museums as sites for object-based learning associated with the curriculum. Before working as an advisor, Carter worked for the John R. Park Homestead Museum. While there, he collaborated with the Windsor Board of Education's Social Studies Resource Teacher to develop a co-operative curriculum program for the museum, writing about the experience in the OMA's *Quarterly* (Hayes and Carter 1980). He was then hired as an advisor in 1980 and helped write the provincial interpretation and education standard. In 1984, he developed relationships within the Ministry responsible for Education as he conducted a study on connections between museums and existing curriculum documents.¹⁸

¹⁸ In particular, he had a working relationship with Ray Blackwell, a visual arts consultant interested in local history. Blackwell supported museums cooperating with school boards and was amazed by the range of subjects of relevance to museums (Carter 1993).

After finding references to heritage-related activities in a wide range of subjects, Carter circulated his findings to museums, the associations, and government actors, arguing museums had a broad role in learning.¹⁹ In 1990, Carter's MPP²⁰ began working with the Ministry responsible for education. Carter was then able to meet directly with his MPP and other government actors to make his argument for museums, positioning museums as educational within both the museum community and provincial government.

When the Ministry worked to redefine their curriculum in the mid-1990s, Carter continued to foster the relationships he had developed, and the Ministry consulted with the associations on their proposals. After extensive consultation, the Province released the Common Curriculum in 1995. A new provincial government then released the Ontario Curriculum documents from 1998 to 1999. These documents, released in the 1990s, mention museums both implicitly and explicitly, reflecting Carter's work and the inclusion of the associations in the process. For example, Carter (2000) argues the Common Curriculum philosophically aligns with museum practice. It promotes integrated learning, collaboration with the broader community, as well as "the accepted museological learning techniques of problem solving and inquiry" (307). Museums are also directly and indirectly addressed in the Ontario Curriculum. For example, *The Ontario Curriculum Grades 9 and 10: The Arts* (Education and Training 1999c) mentions museums as part of the personal application of learning. The Native Studies curriculum document discusses the use of artefacts as primary sources (Education and Training 1999b) and

¹⁹ He found over 80 references to heritage-related activities in documents other than those associated with history, communicating about the research in: Carter (1988, 1993, 2000).

²⁰ The MPP was Gary Milkowski.

the English as a Second Language Curriculum calls for participation in activities, such as a museum visit (Education and Training 1999d).²¹

Following the 1990s curriculum development and associated work of the translators, it became more common for museums to have curriculum-based programming and/or consider curriculum in exhibition development (Interview, J. Carter 2017). These connections provide a justification for teachers to choose museums for field trips (Interview, Brooks-Joiner 2018), reinforcing the relevance of community museums. Curriculum based programming and relationships with schools are then used to further legitimize museum activity and argue for more supportive relationships to the provincial government, which has jurisdictional responsibility for education. For example, in a 2018 advocacy document calling for increased operational funding, the OMA notes 80% of Ontario museums provide curriculum based educational programming and almost 2 million students visit Ontario museums a year (Ontario Museum Association 2018c).

Despite the prominence of a museums as educational argument, the provincial-level translators have been unable to work as closely with the Ministry responsible for education during curriculum redesigns in the 21st century. A “pecking order” has developed within government, reflecting a move away from direct service provision and a disinterest in museums. After meeting with Deputy Ministers and other actors during curriculum development in the 1990s, Carter was told he “couldn't do that anymore” and his role became more limited without the authority to advocate for museums to other government ministries (Interview, J. Carter 2017). The OMA has continued to engage with curriculum development efforts and advocate to the relevant Ministry. Reflecting their ongoing work and the establishment of museums as key

²¹ The Classical and International Languages Curriculum provides another example, mentioning museums as an example of cooperative education and other workplace experiences (Education and Training 1999a)

educational resources in the 1990s, museums continue to be present in some curriculum documents as named community partners.²² However, there is a persistent belief amongst some advisors and OMA representatives interviewed that museums could be more present in both curriculum development and support for education. As an OMA Past President noted, the Province's process is "almost like a mystery." Essentially, "they're synergies that could be created that don't always function right now" (Interview, Powell 2018).

In short, the advisors and associations define museums as educational in broad and specific ways, facilitating relationships of relevance to these educational institutions. To some extent, the emphasis on education reflects policy attachment, connecting museums to a policy area with more support. As the advisors and associations have legitimized support for museum activities, they have become more focused on museums' specific role within formal learning institutions. As such, they have worked to translate educational policies for the benefit of museums, leading to curriculum documents that legitimize museums' participation in the Province's formal education system. However, the advisors and associations been less successful connecting museums to financial resources from the Ministry responsible for education (Interview, Kurylo 2018) and their capacity to facilitate relationships has become limited through the (re)definition of roles within government (Interview, J. Carter 2017).

6.2.2 Museums as Local Action

Two overlapping arguments legitimize federal and provincial support to community museums due to their connection to local-level activity. First, community museums should be supported

²² See, for example the Grade 9 to 12 Social Sciences and Humanities document (Education 2013).

because they are derived from local action and their support is, therefore, more democratic than support to centralized organizations, such as provincial or national museums. For example, the Ontario Ministry of Education's Community Programmes Branch (1953-1957) aimed to provide services on request and in response to need, believing individuals should choose their own leisure activities.²³ As more people chose and opened museums, the Branch started funding community museums and began a tradition of provincial support. Museums, therefore, emerged across Ontario with provincial support due to local desire rather than centralized direction.²⁴ Second, community museums should be supported to encourage local action and engagement, which leads to greater sustainability and less need for intervention from higher levels of government. Most notably, the Ministry of Culture and Recreation (1975-1982) developed museum policy to encourage the establishment of local museums to meet local needs.²⁵ Provincial support for museums then encouraged local support to enhance viability.²⁶ The two interrelated arguments have led to the assemblage of distinct museum policies by different translators.

The first strand of the local action argument is most evident in the creation of the museum operating grant. However, it also underlines the increased reliance on the Province's regional consultants to help communities and facilitate access to funding as part of regional development or recreation policies.²⁷ Within this perspective, the regional consultants rather

²³ For information on their services, see files available in: RG2-74-4 B229473. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

²⁴ Similarly, the Ministry of Culture and Recreation (1975 - 1982) aimed to serve communities by listening to what they want, creating project grant categories that reflected community needs (Fisher 1980).

²⁵ See, for example, documents available in: Rg47-51 B101712 unlabeled. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

²⁶ See, for example, documents available in: RG47-41 B307184. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

²⁷ For example, the advisors coordinated student employees doing collections work in Ontario, conducting the training. However, in the late 1970s, the Program was incorporated into the general student employment program,

than the museum advisors are key translators in local organizations' governance, which includes community museums. These regional consultants work with community museums to provide advice and access to provincial resources from different ministries, such as student employment programs or project grants. They work with local groups to build organizational capacity, using their regional expertise. Similarly, the OHS has a historic and ongoing role supporting museums by providing local groups with capacity through incorporation. As the Executive Director argued,

Our advocacy role [is] establishing democratic voice in communities across the province to defend history... we're helping them to negotiate... They can speak for themselves. We're sort of helping them. If they don't speak for history in the local communities, those assets would have been lost. (Interview, Leverty 2018)

The OHS' work helps establish democratic voices in communities across the province, supporting local initiative. These local groups are then able to influence policies in their communities.

Within the Province's museum policy, the advisors have a role supporting local organizations as they establish museums, providing relevant resources and defining museums as integral parts of their communities.²⁸ The advisors' activities often focus on viability, connecting the two strands of the local action argument. For example, in 2000 the advisors wrote a new Community Standard as a requirement for the provincial operating grant. The Standard states,

A community's heritage is part of its identity. As a steward of the community's heritage, the museum is actively engaged in the community and responsive to its needs. The museum is accessible and relevant, and draws support from its community. (Citizenship, Culture and Recreation 2000, 16)

Museums are, therefore, of the community, acting as stewards of their heritage. They respond to the community, maintaining relevance so they can rely on the community's support. In order

coordinated through regional offices. For more information, see: RG47-18_2 master copies of all forms. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

²⁸ See, for example, Museums Section (1977).

to gain local support, the advisors' advice and assistance then includes suggestions on how to increase local interest, such as changing exhibitions or extending opening hours (Interview, Duncan 2017).

Similarly, the Ontario Museum Association assembles resources around the idea that greater local involvement in museums will contribute to greater sustainability.²⁹ They encourage museums to create value and become more central to their communities. For example, in 2015 they released *Engaging your Community: A Toolkit for Museums* to help museums “assess their relevance and create a plan to deepen their relationship with the community, in turn increasing the sustainability of the museum” (Ontario Museum Association 2015b, 5). As seen with *Inclusion 2025*, the OMA worked with museums to apply the *Engaging your Community* resource and publish case studies online. These four case study museums, including three nonprofit museums, discussed sustainability in their reasons for participating, their desired outcomes, and/or the impact of the project. The sustainability work is seemingly most relevant to museums without a secure and permanent source of support from their municipal government(s). For example, the regional museum example used the resource because they represented five municipalities but were primarily funded by one. Enhancing their financial sustainability, the project enabled them to develop better relationships with community members, staff, and Councillors from the five municipalities.³⁰

Importantly, the advisors and associations encourage positive relationships with municipal governments because museums with stronger municipal support are seen as more

²⁹ As an OMA volunteer and committee member who participated in the Looking Ahead initiative stated, “Museums matter to communities. Communities care about museums. They get really up on their hind legs generally speaking when there is a threat to close them” (Interview, Kerr-Wilson 2018).

³⁰ Interestingly, three of the four museum case studies are nonprofit museums registered as charities. Of these three museums, two had expenditures under 70 thousand in 2015.

sustainable.³¹ Municipal policies are a critical component of local support because municipal governments provide the support for staff and operations. As an advisor observed,

The federal government has a specific program and there's Canada Cultural Spaces and MAP.... The provincial government just has CMOG and HODG a little bit but there is no capital program. And the municipal governments are expected to pay for operations and hire staff. (Interview, Weinstein 2017)

An OMA Past President similarly remarked,

The municipal government, in particular, was being shouldered with the responsibility of supporting community museums and public art galleries. While the federal government and provincial government provided some funding hooks and a legislature framework in some cases, it really was municipalities that were picking up the ball especially after things started to fall apart in terms of federal funding... The senior levels of government fail to recognize that at the end of the day, outside of the large institutions, it is usually municipalities that are making culture work. (Interview, Doherty 2017)

Due to the significance of municipal support, local advocacy involves not only appeals for specific forms of support, but also efforts to raise the profile of museums and encourage positive relationships with municipal actors, such as councillors. To that end, the OMA has provided resources and workshops on local advocacy.³² The advisors have made presentations directly to municipalities about museums' value, encouraged museums to leverage provincial funding for municipal support, and provided advice on developing more supportive relationships (Interviews, J. Carter 2017; Duncan 2017; Styrmo 2017). For example, through the associations' publications, the advisors circulated a Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation resource that provides advice on preparing for municipal amalgamation in the late 1990s. The resource

³¹ As stated in the OMA's *Research into the Sustainability of Ontario's Community Museums*, "Museums that are owned and operated by municipalities have growing operational sustainability over museums that are incorporated and independently governed as a nonprofit corporation" (Ontario Museum Association 2008, 3).

³² See, for example, a digital resource titled "Museums and your Municipality," which outlines the ways museums create value for their local governments (Ontario Museum Association 2018b). The 1998-1999 annual report also discusses local advocacy, highlighting the creation of a toolkit for museums (Ontario Museum Association 1999).

advised municipal museums to be pro-active and provide their new municipalities with a plan so they could consider the role of museums within their new structures and policies.³³

Despite the perceived importance of local governments to museums, the advisors no longer have the capacity to travel or make presentations to municipalities. The OMA's ability to advocate on a local level is also limited. As seen with the Ministry responsible for education, there have been attempts to work with the Ministry responsible for municipalities to advocate for local policies that support museums. To that end, the OMA has, at different points, met with actors within the responsible Ministry. However, the Ministry has been less receptive and is at times hostile to community museums. For example, in 1978 a municipal-provincial grants reform committee called for the elimination of the provincial museum operating grant. In a 1997 press release, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing called museums gold-plated services (Zaporzan 1997). An OMA Past President from the 2010s described meeting with a representative from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs as part of the OMA's annual Museums as Queen's Park day. The representative outlined a number of ways they could help museums with respect to infrastructure. However, when the OMA tried to reconnect, getting support was not simple and "it wasn't their priority to help out individual museums that were not in municipal scope" (Interview, Bernat 2018). The Queen's Park day example demonstrates that while the Ministry responsible for municipalities is no longer actively hostile toward museums, support for community museums is not a priority on a provincial scale. As another OMA Past President noted, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs is "one of those places where you think ... it would be

³³ The Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation released a series of bulletins concerning heritage and municipal amalgamation. These bulletins are available: Box #17, Series (VIII), Conservation Review Board, File 8.10. Gerrard Killan Fonds. Cardinal Carter Library, London.

Museum advisor Carter also discusses available resources in an article in the OHS' bulletin (Carter 1997).

the perfect link but how do we get there?" (Interview, Powell 2018). As such, municipal relationships necessarily take place on an individual level.

In short, there is an argument that actors should support community museums to encourage local involvement for sustainability reasons and because community museums are derived from community action. However, the advisors and associations now have limited capacity to advocate or connect museums to local resources. Within local governance, regional consultants and the museums themselves are the experts, (re)assembling the support they need. The Ontario Historical Society assists in this work, helping organizations develop capacity and legitimacy through incorporation. The advisors and OMA also try to help, working on a broader scale. They encourage strengthened relationships to enhance sustainability, providing resources and advice on forming these relationships. Their work aligns with provincial policies more generally, which aim to encourage more self-sufficient cultural organizations.

6.2.3 Museums as Tourist Assets

There are multiple discourses defining museums as economic drivers, contributing to employment and economic development.³⁴ As an OMA Past President observed, there is

recognition that museums can be tourist drivers or are tourist drivers and drive business into the province... Museums [also] employ a significant amount of people and buy a significant amount of things in the province. Museums are an important cog in that economic development wheel. (Interview, Adkin 2018)

³⁴ Museums are then eligible for funding and support as actors participating in economic growth. In periods of stimulus spending, they are often eligible for capital funds. For example, in 2006, the provincial Ministry of Finance announced a stimulus package of 6 million for Ontario workers and communities affected by the slow growth of the economy. The funding included capital grants to 23 cultural organizations, including 12 community museums. The museum advisors were involved in these grants as the staff contact for museums. In particular, O'Brien and Carter served as staff contacts. Documents on the program are available in: Rg47-51 B929761. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

Within Ontario community museum governance, museums are often valued as tourist assets within a tourism industry that contributes to the Province's GDP. During the 1950s, a survey indicated American tourists sought out museums and historic sites when traveling to Ontario (Interview, Styrmo 2017). The Province's Department of Travel and Publicity responded with a Historical Branch (see Table 6.2) that assumed responsibility for community museums and hired the first museum advisor. While museums as actors in tourism is a continuous theme across museum governance, the advisors and associations' legitimization of museum support related to tourism has changed objectives and methods. Their focus has shifted from increasing museums' profile to defining museums as one contributor to cultural tourism and, therefore, eligible for tourism-related grants or other forms of support with tourism policies.

Historically, the advisors and associations aimed to increase museums' visibility and accessibility for tourists.³⁵ In 1954, a Department of Tourism and Publicity representative presented "The Museum and the Tourist" at the OHS' Museum Section's annual workshop, lamenting a lack of signage leading to museums, which exasperated him on a recent trip (Moore 1994).³⁶ In order to address this issue, the first advisor worked with the Department of Highways to create a tourism sign policy for community museums.³⁷ The policy, which persisted with minor adjustments until the 1990s, asked the advisors to verify organizations' status as museums and supported the instillation of directional signage on provincial highways. As part of

³⁵ The provincial operating grant provides an example. In 1962, the Province altered the hours museums needed to be open, aligning expectations to reflect summer tourism. For more information see documents available in: RG47-51 B101712 policy papers I. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

³⁶ The article outlines additional issues of concern to visitors, including courteous service, organized exhibitions, the use of labels, attractive displays, and the availability of brochures.

³⁷ Until the 1990s, permission was limited to museums that were open year-round, necessitating the advisors' approval. For more information on the sign program, see: Brent, Marty. 1990, August. Provincial Highway Signs for Museums. RG47-51 B711690. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

austerity measures in 1997 and growing disinterest in direct service relationships with museums, the Province privatized directional tourism signs, which included the museums' signs. Community museums became responsible for the costs and the advisors were removed from the process. While the advisors and associations were consulted on these changes, the Program then operated independently from the relationships they assembled.³⁸

Highway sign policies re-emerged as an advocacy issue for the associations in 2018 when the Tourism-Oriented Directional Signs (TODS) program dramatically increased their rates.³⁹ Museums experienced an average unexpected increase of 142%. As such, the OMA conducted a survey of its members and wrote to the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport to voice concerns. They argued the price increase would remove funding from museums' program and outreach budgets, meaning the need to attract tourists would "take away from the quality of the tourism product and visitor experience available at the museum site" (Lalonde 2018). Importantly, the OMA was not the only organization voicing concern about the TODS increases

³⁸ Some of the provincial level translators continued to advocate on the issue. TODS was a topic with one museum advisor interviewed who voiced frustration with the program's direction. Carter (Interview) stated, "the 401 signage was limited and the TODS argument was we only put up signs for those that get the largest attendance. So small museums were losing signs." In addition to issues related to limited space, there were also conflicts regarding eligibility. He stated,

I battled with them, we battled with them constantly because they were saying, "Oh well, we don't want to restrict museums having signs." And we'd say, "No, no we're not restricted at all. There has to be some criteria for a sign. It is not an attraction because attractions have their own sign. And it's not a seasonal Museum because that doesn't. They have to be in CMOG and they have to be open year-round." Where that stands now, I have no idea because I still see signs up for museums that shouldn't have them. (Interview, J. Carter 2017)

The TODS program may have become more accessible to some small museums following the advisors' removal from the grant process. For example, Wilson (Interview, 2019) described the process of getting a sign through TODS positively. However, her museum then faced issues with municipal regulation when they attempted to use the sign.

³⁹ The increase occurred after the Province renewed the contract as the price had been frozen under the previous contract (Heritage, Sport, Tourism and 2018b).

and worked with others on the issue.⁴⁰ According to a Ministry news release, the Province listened to public outcry from small business owners and tourism operators, which led to a one-year delay in the increase.

The advocacy efforts related to TODS demonstrate museums' inclusion in and attachment to the tourism industry and policies. When defined as tourism operators, museums become one organizational type amongst a larger group advocating for their interests. References to museums' tourist role attach museums to current policy trends, which value the economic contributions of tourism, to provide funding, related services, and legitimacy. When cultural projects became the responsibility of the Ontario Trillium Foundation in 1999, the Province maintained direct responsibility for and interest in tourism projects.⁴¹ In 2008, they commissioned a study to develop a plan for the growth and long-term viability of Ontario's tourism sector, leading to funding for Regional Tourism Organizations.⁴² The Province then released a Tourism Investment Attraction Strategy in 2012 (Tourism, Culture and Sport 2012), *Growing Tourism Together: Strategic Framework for Tourism in Ontario* in 2016 (Tourism, Culture and Sport 2016), and announced consultations for a new tourism strategy two years later after a change in government (Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries 2018a), exemplifying the provincial attention to tourism. As one interview participant noted, tourism is "kind of hot and sexy" (Interview, Havelka 2018).

⁴⁰ They reported working with Attractions Ontario and the Tourism Industry Association of Ontario in an announcement to their members (Ontario Museum Association 2019a)

⁴¹ Notably, while the Province retained direct responsibility for tourism and has grants related to tourism, they also created the Ontario Cultural Attractions Fund in 1999 as an arm's length organization providing funding to increase cultural tourism (Ontario Cultural Attractions Fund 2019).

⁴² For more information on the regional tourism associations and their funding, see: Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (2017)

When museums are defined as tourism operators, museums and their associations are able to partner with tourism organizations to access and deliver services.⁴³ For example, the OMA has worked with Attractions Ontario, which supports the association's May is Museum Month activities. The OMA and Attractions Ontario partnered on the 1999 annual conference entitled "Museums + Culture = Attractions + Tourism: Be Part of the Equation," promoting relationship building with culture and tourism. Through this work, museums are encouraged to join tourism organizations and access the non-financial forms of support available through these groups and government agencies like training, networking opportunities, marketing, as well as data collection and analysis.⁴⁴

As tourism operators, museums are eligible for additional financial support from the provincial and federal governments. They can access student employment programs, capital grants, and other resources aiming to increase tourism. For example, community museums can access Celebrate Ontario, which provides funding for festivals and events.⁴⁵ The Tourism Industry Partners Program provided funding for marketing campaigns targeting out of province markets.⁴⁶ Federally, museums can access the Canadian Experiences Fund, which supports tourism products, facilities, and experiences.⁴⁷ Further, grants targeting community museums as

⁴³The OMA writes about their work with tourism organizations in: Rg47-41 b931944 2000-1ddd-9435 OMA; Rg47-51 b875990 pho grants OMA. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁴⁴ The associations circulate information on these various programs and opportunities related to tourism through their publications, encouraging museums to access support and revenue. For example, in 1983, the OHS Museums Section circulated information in their newsletter on the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation's "Attractions Monitor," which involved assessing and monitoring performance with visitation statistics (Gamble 1983).

⁴⁵ Adkin (Interview, 2018) noted, "A few of us are able to access that from time to time."

⁴⁶ The OMA circulated information on the Program in a 2017 edition of ONmuseums, which is an e-newsletter (Ontario Museum Association 2017f). For more information on the Program see (Ontario 2017).

⁴⁷ The federal government announced the fund as part of *Creating Middle Class Jobs: A Federal Tourism Growth Strategy* (Innovation, Science and Economic Development 2019a). For more information on the fund see Innovation,

cultural organizations also contain objectives related to tourism, which justifies funding with accepted policy outcomes – that is, economic well-being. For example, the Ontario Cultural Attractions Fund began in 1999 to grow cultural tourism.⁴⁸ Further, the Government of Ontario webpage on the Community Museum Operating Grant states, “These museums contribute to their communities' economic well-being as employers and tourist attractions, attracting over 3,000,000 visitors per year” (Ontario 2019).

Within these examples, museums and their translators are not necessarily assembling resources to increase visitation. Instead, they use visitation statistics to argue for museums' value, positioning community museums within the comparatively well-resourced tourism industry. For example, the OMA's advocacy documents have noted Ontario museums attract 8.7 million overnight trips (Ontario Museum Association 2015c), 19.4 million visits, and 7.5 million visits by tourists (Ontario Museum Association 2018b). Since cultural tourists spend more and stay longer than other tourists (Ontario Museum Association 2019b), the OMA uses these visitation statistics to legitimize museums as valuable tourism operators that can access the available resources. The use of statistics is key to arguments for museums' value as tourism assets given the sector's economic orientation.

The OMA most actively legitimizes museums as tourist assets, meeting with responsible Ministers, participating in consultations, and providing museums with information. Significantly, they collaborate and work with those more closely associated with tourism, such as the Tourism Industry Association of Ontario, on advocacy efforts (Ontario Museum Association 2019a).

Science and Economic Development (2019b).

⁴⁸ The Province has invested 45.75 million into the fund, which has provided support to more than 700 initiatives. For more information on the fund and its projects, see: Ontario Cultural Attractions Fund (2019)

However, they have had limited successes.⁴⁹ While community museums can access some programs for tourism, they are not always included in policies, strategies, and other initiatives. For example, the 2012 provincial tourism strategy only mentions museums once as an example of attractions or agencies *supporting* the tourism industry (Tourism, Culture and Sport 2012).⁵⁰ As seen with education, the lack of inclusion of community museums in provincial tourism initiatives may relate to an absence of museum experts in policy development and implementation within the province. Within the 21st century, Ontario Ministries have become more siloed, causing limited interaction between the advisors and tourism despite existing within the same Ministry. For example, the current advisor commented on her lack of knowledge about how well museums have been incorporated into the Regional Tourism Organizations due to the siloed nature of government operations (Interview, Weinstein 2017).

In short, the advisors and associations have worked to legitimize community museums as tourism operators to both increase visitation and support for museums. While responsibility for community museums is within the same provincial ministry as tourism, there are not the same connections and relationships that once existed. As such, a distinct museum – tourism policy no longer exists, but museums are at times attached to a broader tourism industry. Attachment can

⁴⁹ The OMA argues provincial investments in education, municipalities, and tourism need to be better leveraged to support museums and the benefits they provide (Lalonde 2016).

⁵⁰ The 2011 federal tourism strategy mentions museums more, but focuses on those operated by governments (Canada 2011). The document mentions museums 11 times, referring mostly to state-owned museums. For example, it says, “The three levels of government, directly or through various agencies, run many of Canada’s most important tourism attractions, including parks, museums, sports stadiums and convention centres” (11). It also states, “The federal government is directly involved in the tourism business. We operate key attractions, such as parks and museums, and work with other levels of government to develop tourism infrastructure and create tourism experiences” (33). However, there is mention of community museums and programs they can access, such as the Canada Cultural Spaces Fund.

lead to funding, attention, and support, but museums' value to tourism is not assumed and is consistently demonstrated with statistical data.

6.2.4 *Museums as Agents of Social Change*

Support for community museums is legitimized with arguments stating museums have a role in shaping our public memory and identity.⁵¹ An OMA Past President noted, “museums contribute to a collective sense of nationalism and identity” (Interview, Doherty 2017). As seen in legitimization efforts above, arguments rationalizing support for Ontario community museums due to their role in identity formation have evolved over time, reflecting changing demographics and greater public awareness of the historic underrepresentation of marginalized communities in museums. Museums as agents of social change is the most recent argument related to public memory and identity evident in Ontario community museum governance. In the late 1980s and 1990s, the national and provincial museum associations held events and produced resources concerned with Canada’s changing demographics. Community museums were and are still encouraged to change their programs to more accurately reflect Canada’s cultural diversity. Building on this work, more recent activities have positioned museums as active actors that are (re)examining their institutions and participating in social change. In particular, associations are asking museums to “join a provincial movement” and reflect on inherent power dynamics (Ontario Museum Association 2018a). Museums are called to “positively disrupt dominant social narratives and spark discussion on issues of access, diversity, inclusion and equity – extending

⁵¹ See, for example, statements on museums or heritage and identity in Canadian Museums Association (2009), Ministry of Culture and Communications (1990), and M. Leonard (2012).

their impact far beyond their physical space” (Museum Accessibility Inclusion and Engagement Collaborative 2018, 16).

Cultural diversity became a keyword in Ontario museum governance following Canada’s 1988 *Multiculturalism Act*. Federal and provincial initiatives funded the associations’ and some museums’ diversity-related work.⁵² The associations circulated information on different programs and encouraged museums to provide opportunities for cultural participation that addressed the population’s diversity.⁵³ In Ontario, the History of Ontario’s Peoples program most directly relates to cultural diversity funding. From 1987 to 1991, the Ontario Historical Society and Multicultural Historical Society of Ontario administered the project with funding from the Ministry of Culture and Communications. The Program aimed to promote a greater “understanding and appreciation of the diverse peoples of Ontario,” focusing on education and “making people aware” rather than capacity building or institutional change.⁵⁴

⁵² The Prime Minister announced a policy of multiculturalism in 1971. Section 27 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982) then articulated the commitment to multiculturalism. However, the Multiculturalism Act did not pass until 1988 and led to the distribution of funding for projects relating to cultures other than the French and the English.

⁵³ For example, the CMA and OMA circulated information on the Department of Canadian Heritage’s Multiculturalism program (see, for example: Canadian Museums Association 1997; Ontario Museum Association 1996).

⁵⁴ The project proposal notes the “varied ethnocultural groups that make-up Ontario” and the “many peoples of Ontario.” The Program provided up to 5,000 or 80% for projects exploring the history of Ontario’s cultural heritage. It received funding through the public education component of the multiculturalism strategy fund then the multiculturalism and race relations fund. Of the 78 grants awarded between 1987 and 1990, 33 went to First Nations band councils, cultural centres or friendship centres. Museum projects included a program on Mennonite groups, the Dutch community, and the Portuguese community in Ontario. The grant did not provide funds for expenditures relating to increased capacity, such as the purchase of recording equipment. After legal issues arose in the 1990s relating to the delegation of decision-making responsibility to the associations, the Program was discontinued. Documents relating to the program are available in: RG47-51 B711695. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

The OHS’ current Executive Director began working for the OHS as part of this program. He recalled,

It was very new in the sense that instead of the civil service giving out the money and then the minister, we had established a peer committee of people from museums, historical societies, and First Nations. We would review grants based upon the specific criteria. One of them was that they had to donate or match the equivalent amount of the donation of the grant. So, \$5,000 was the maximum

The Canadian Museums Association (CMA) also encouraged Ontario's community museums to reflect Canada's diversity, leading cultural diversity discussions in the 1990s. The CMA's Cultural Diversity and Museums Project started in the early 1990s with support from different federal sources, including the Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship as well as the newer Department of Canadian Heritage. The CMA held a symposium on cultural diversity, arguing Canada's pluralistic character must be central to museum work.⁵⁵ The national association also coordinated a community mapping project, fellowships, demonstration projects, and publications related to cultural diversity into the 21st century. Unfortunately, funding limitations stalled the development of resources and a continuation of cultural diversity projects in an era of government disinterest in museums.⁵⁶ As governments cut, froze, and eliminated funding to heritage, the associations struggled to legitimize government support to support museums' role in the (re)creation of a diverse Canadian / Ontarian identity.

In the 2010s, the associations began to more actively re-engage with ideas of cultural diversity as key to museums' value. However, they now discuss diversity in relation to inclusion, re-examining collection and employment practices. As an OMA Past President noted,

and they had to donate time or labor to match that. It was about the history of a particular culture in Ontario or their communities and their contributions to Ontario's history. So, it's kind of very positive approach. (Interview, Leverty 2018)

⁵⁵ After a delay caused by a funding freeze (Canadian Museums Association 1992), the federal government-sponsored a special symposium on museums and cultural diversity in March 1994. The event included 175 delegates. They saw the event as a first step in a larger initiative to address museums' changing role. The symposium led to the publication *Cultural Diversity and Museums: Exploring our Identities* (Canadian Museums Association 1994). The publication acknowledges museum work has been historically shaped by the concerns of the dominant cultures - French and English - reflecting and contributing to endemic racism particularly with the lack of connection between First Nations artifacts and peoples. Canadian diversity should be reflected in museum research, collections, exhibitions, and public programming.

⁵⁶ For additional information on the CMA's diversity work in the 1990s and early 2000s see their annual reports from the period. For information relating to the OMA and cultural diversity, see: RG47-41 b931431 2004-1DDD-0995; Rg47-51 b875990 pho grants OMA. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

We're having a one-day conference on diversity and inclusion. So, we know it's important to get people from other cultures here, but also people from the LGBTQ community ... So, hearing these voices, having those folks deliver these messages with us. I think the OMA ... could have been criticized before for being a little conservative... But I do think the OMA is looking at more cutting-edge things that are happening that need to be looked at that maybe other people aren't quite as brave to take on. (Interview, Furness 2018)

In particular, the OMA developed *Inclusion 2025* (Museum Accessibility Inclusion and Engagement Collaborative 2018) with funding from the Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration as well as the Ontario Trillium Foundation. The resource engages with the idea that museums have “power to shape public narrative and decide which stories and objects from the past should be preserved to present to future generations” (7). In order to re-examine practices and encourage a more inclusive approach to museum work, the resource provides guidelines on how to think about diversity and inclusion, case studies from 10 museum partners, resources to support museums’ work, as well as a list of people engaged in this work. The Association also facilitated training, research on the demographics of museum workers, and the development of networks for emerging museum professionals.

A key component of the OMA’s ongoing diversity work has been assembling the resources and expertise that already exist. The OMA sees itself as “the convener,” “the rassembleur,”⁵⁷ and “the hub” that brings together resources, expertise, and support (Interview, Lalonde 2018). Relevant organizations include, but are not limited to, the Royal Ontario Museum, the Canadian Centre for Diversity and Inclusion, the Tamarack Institute, Ryerson University, the Wallace Foundation, as well as HR Council Canada.⁵⁸

⁵⁷ “Rassembleur” is French and can be translated as bring together.

⁵⁸ *Inclusion 2025* lists additional resources and community members of relevance.

In addition to working with groups doing similar work, the OMA works alongside other associations and aims to provide complementary resources. The OMA and CMA have both reacted to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's (TRC) 2015 final report and calls to actions with new initiatives.⁵⁹ The TRC called for a CMA led committee on museum policies in Canada and their relationship to the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* objectives.⁶⁰ The CMA responded directly to the call with a committee to study museum policies in Canada. At the same time, the OMA has taken initiative to foster working relationships with Indigenous-led organizations. In particular, they held an Indigenous collections symposium in partnership with the Woodland Cultural Centre and the Indigenous Knowledge Centre at the Six Nations Polytechnic, leading to recommendations relevant to Ontario museum governance and the OMA.

The associations' work in relation to the TRC recommendations reflects stated government priorities at the provincial and federal levels.⁶¹ However, social change activities can be difficult to fund because existing government programs either do not target museums and their associations or do not have social change objectives. For example, despite the call for the CMA committee in the TRC's 2015 report, the committee was not established until 2018 due, in part, to the logistical difficulties of arranging for funding (Interview, McAvity 2017). The plan did not fit within existing federal funding programs. Similarly, the OMA initially faced some

⁵⁹ The Truth and Reconciliation Commission formed in 2009 to listen to survivors, communities, and others affected by Canada's Residential School system. They released calls to action in 2015.

⁶⁰ Call to action 67 states: "We call upon the federal government to provide funding to the Canadian Museums Association to undertake, in collaboration with Aboriginal peoples, a national review of museum policies and best practices to determine the level of compliance with the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* and to make recommendations" (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada 2015, 8).

⁶¹ For example, the Ontario government responded to the TRC with *The Journey Together: Ontario's Commitment to Reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples* (Ontario 2016).

resistance when applying for funding from the Museums Assistance Program (MAP) to address recommendations from the Indigenous Collections Symposium. However, as seen with the CMA example, they were able to work with the federal actors and eventually received funding through a different category (Interview, Lalonde 2018).⁶² Community museums have also found existing government programs related to Indigenous issues limited. They do not necessarily have the OMA's and CMA's capacity and relationships to work with government to push forward their applications. According to a recent survey, museums are "limited in their funding and resources to make the long-term and sustainable changes to address Indigenous heritage in their institutions" (Leduc 2020).

In short, museums and their associations are able to access resources targeting broader social objectives. In particular, the associations worked to assemble resources around cultural diversity in the 1990s as governments began multiculturalism programs. As they legitimize support for museums, they are now arguing museums have a role in identity building that reflects a diverse and more just society. However, as the associations work to achieve transformative change in the sector, they find accessing resources and appropriate government funding programs involves flexibility and creativity.

⁶² The OMA initially applied within the Indigenous Heritage category, which asks for an Indigenous partner. Since the funding was for recommendations from a symposium involving Indigenous partners and participants, the OMA believed the partnership was inherent. However, they did not meet the partnership requirement and were able to receive funding through a different category due to flexibility from MAP (Interview, Lalonde 2018)

6.2.5 *Museums as Inherently Valuable*

Underlining and alongside the arguments explored, there is a belief that museums are inherently valuable as collecting institutions that preserve heritage related to Ontario's story.⁶³ Unlike the examples above, arguments for museums as collecting institutions with their own value often reflects the absence of an articulated rationale for support. Museums' collection work is valuable and is, therefore, supported. According to the advisors and association representatives interviewed, the absence of a provincial museum mandated to collect provincial heritage necessitates community museums' existence. Ontario collects and tells its stories through these institutions. Within this context, the advisors and associations help museums assemble the relationships needed to enact a collecting institution with a physical space, providing information, advice, and services relating to a range of relevant topics. However, their capacity to facilitate this work has changed over time due to a government disinterest in heritage, necessitating additional justifications for government involvement.

Reflecting the belief that museums should exist, the advisors and associations assemble resources, information, and support related to community museums' administrative and regulatory needs as organizations. Community museums can require assistance on issues like employment legislation, nonprofit regulation, and tax law. As an OMA Past President working at a historic site, stated

I actually worked with a consultant putting together an employee handbook. But I have to redo it again because everything has changed and that was just two years ago... I read the paper and stuff like that at home to try and keep up... You kind of

⁶³ According to this perspective, "the Ontario Heritage Act recognizes community museums as the stewards of Ontario's rich cultural heritage, telling our stories as Ontarians and holding the collections of the province in trust for the people of Ontario" (Lalonde 2017, 1535).

handle all of those things. [Requirements] are changing rapidly. It is very difficult to keep up, I think. (Interview, Havelka 2018)

The advisors and associations, at times, try to help museums keep up with the changing expectations. For example, the OHS worked with a museum advisor and the Accessibility Directorate of Ontario with funding from the provincial EnAbling Change program to provide training and a toolkit related to provincial accessibility requirements (Ontario Historical Society 2008). Further, a range of organizations outside the museum community are of relevance to nonprofit management because they assemble information and/or training on government legislation, such as the Ontario Nonprofit Network and First Reference Inc.⁶⁴ Their work is enrolled in museum governance as the associations circulate information from and on these relevant groups.⁶⁵

Community museums can also require assistance related to collections work, such as storage or conservation. The advisors and associations deliver collections related services and advocate for these needs. For example, in 1979, the OMA worked with the Toronto Area Archivist Group to publish the *Museum and Archival Supplies Handbook*. In the early 1980s, the Province responded to a federal reduction in conservation services with a provincial program at the advisors' recommendation. Museums then had access to provincial conservators providing free assistance and advice. However, the number of conservators was reduced, and the position

⁶⁴ First Reference Inc. is an organization providing resources on employment law (Interview, Havelka 2018).

⁶⁵ The following examples provide a small sample of organizations relevant to museums discussed in the OHS, OMA, and CMA publications: private foundations, ICOM, the Society for the Study of Architecture in Canada, the American Association for State and Local History, the Association of Art Museum Directors, the North American Indian Museum Association, the Canadian Group of International Institute for Conservation, the Canadian Association of Professional Conservators, the OAAG, the Photographic Historical Society of Canada, the Ontario Agri-Food Educators, the Alliance for Canada's Audio Visual Heritage, and the Ontario Women's History Network.

was eventually eliminated, reflecting the change in governments' response to museums during the 1990s.

Despite a perceived government disinterest in collections, the advisors and associations continue to work within their capacities to address museums' needs as collecting institutions. For example, the OHS held a workshop on freedom of information legislation of concern to museums providing access to their collections (Billich 2004). More recently, the OMA partnered with the federal Canadian Heritage Information Network (CHIN) in 2014-2015 on a program called RE-ORG Canada (Interview, Bachmann 2018). They worked with a limited number of museums over a one-year period to identify issues related to the accessibility and conservation of collections (Canada 2017). An OMA Past President who participated in the program explained,

We were a pilot project and we got in on it because of the OMA. You work with six other museums ... and CHIN helps you to reorganize your collections area, to really look at your storage because that is a real crisis, I think, within the museum community now ... there has been no help with that. No funding... I think it really doesn't get enough publicity or support. But, it really gets museums working with their collection again and realizing what they need to be doing and giving them solutions. It is not just a lot of hot air and "you need to be doing this." It provides them with some practical concrete solutions. I haven't seen the federal government doing something like that for a really long time. This is spectacular. (Interview, Bachmann 2018)

The program provided opportunities to engage in collections work, which is increasingly uncommon in community museum governance. The lessons museums learnt during the project were then shared more broadly through the OMA's digital platforms (Ontario Museum Association 2017e), communicating about best practices to the community.

While there continue to be some short-term support programs for collections work that benefit a limited number of museums (e.g., RE-ORG, MAP), it has become more difficult for the advisors and associations to argue to governments for financial support that targets a perceived inherent value of museums as collecting institutions. During the 1970s and 1980s, museums had

access to a range of provincial funding that they could use for collections work, such as the lottery funding. The federal Museum Assistance Program (MAP) continues to exist and addresses collection needs, but the program budget is now less than it was in 1972 and there are few provincial options available.⁶⁶ For example, in 1993, the Province consolidated programs, including the Cultural Facilities Improvement Program, within the broader JobsOntario Community Action (JOCA) program. An article written by an OMA Past President and circulated by the OMA observed the changes would theoretical make more money available to museums. However, the Past President also noted it could become increasingly difficult to argue for museums' collection preservation needs (May 1993). Her observations were prophetic.

Experiences with the Ontario Trillium Foundation illustrates this difficulty. After becoming responsible for cultural funding in Ontario in 1999, Trillium served as an important resource for museums.⁶⁷ However, municipal museums are ineligible, the programs are difficult to navigate, and the objectives do not necessarily align with museums' work. An OMA Past President reported dissatisfaction from smaller museums because they "don't understand how the Trillium priorities can match up with their priorities" (Interview, Bernat 2018). A former conservator and museum advisor stated,

Trillium used to be a great source of grants for museums. I went on the Trillium website last year to try and figure out whether a little historical society that I was helping out could benefit... [I am] a person who has worked for different governments and been inside the system, [but] I could not understand what they

⁶⁶ As noted in a 2015 report, "the actual funding for museums and galleries is now less than its funding in 1972. When the program was first created in 1972, its initial funding level was \$6.7 million, the same amount that continues to be provided in grants and contributions to museums" (Canadian Conference of the Arts, Canadian Arts Coalition, and Saskatchewan Arts Alliance 2015, 18)

⁶⁷ For some institutions, Trillium continued to be an important funder. In particular, they have provided matching funding for capital projects (Interview, Brooks-Joiner 2018).

were talking about. It's so opaque now. As far as I can tell, most museums' projects would not be eligible ... [unless] they could slant it towards accessibility or something like that perhaps (Interview, Graham 2017).

While there are programs for accessibility that museums can and do access, the funding is not necessarily sufficient to meet the accessibility requirements that the Province imposed for public spaces. As a former advisor noted, "Not for profits have a huge problem meeting these accessibility standards...because there is no funding" (Interview, J. Carter 2017).⁶⁸ Similarly, another OMA Past President observed nonprofit museums struggle to meet accessibility requirements because they are often in historic buildings and "there is no funding out there" (Interview, Powell 2018).

In short, the advisors and associations both described growing difficulties assembling resources to support museums as collecting institutions with physical spaces subject to regulation – that is, support for an inherent value of museums. However, they believe museums have value as collecting institutions and their service role, assembling and disseminating information, reflects a general support for museums. Despite a perceived government disinterest that emerged in the 1990s, they continue to advocate for museums. Perhaps because of this disinterest, the associations do not simply argue museums have value or need support. Instead, museum support is more often legitimized to those outside the museum community according to museum objectives and functions, such as those explored above relating to education, local action, tourism, and social change.⁶⁹

⁶⁸ The lack of funding led to a need for creative solutions. The advisors provided advice and assistance to help museums make their collections more accessible despite an inability to meet all accessibility requirements (Interview, J. Carter 2017).

⁶⁹ Reflecting the discrepancy, the OMA's *Museums 2025* emphasizes museums' collections as their strength and, yet, advocacy documents mentioning the strategy emphasize museums' contributions to the policy objectives as outlined in Chapter Five.

6.3 The Evolving Logic of Governance

The five simplified arguments described above legitimize museums and rationalize support in different ways. Articulated museum or cultural policy can support the variety of legitimizations through operational funding, project funding, as well as the work of the advisors or associations. However, the diverse rationalizations can also lead to distinct assemblages of regulations and resources for museums that address overlapping concerns. As Table 6.3 illustrates, the arguments rely on support from a variety of communities and the involvement of different actors, addressing distinct concerns.

The arguments for these assemblages are in some ways complementary, co-existing, and overlapping. While they are not distinct to community museum governance, their use is context specific. Within Ontario, how translators can and do legitimize museum support changes across time, territory, and actors. These differences both reflect and contribute to changes in community museum governance, (re)shaping the work of the advisors and associations.

Table 6.3: Key Actors Supporting the Five Legitimizations

	Educational	Local Action	Tourism	Social Change	Inherent
Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Educators - Students - Subject matter specialists (e.g., veterans) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Citizens 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tourists 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First Nations - Indigenous people - Franco-Ontarians - Immigrant populations - Other marginalized populations (e.g., LGBTQ+, youth) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conservators - Publics
Private / Nonprofit Organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Educational groups (e.g., re-enactors, historical societies) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community based groups (ex. Kiwanis club) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TODS - Regional Tourism Organizations - Tourism associations (e.g., Attractions Ontario) - Tourism operators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Groups specializing in diversity work (e.g., The Canadian Centre for Diversity and Inclusion) - Groups serving or representing marginalized populations (e.g., Deaf Cultural Centre) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Collecting institutions (e.g., archives) - Suppliers - Ontario Nonprofit Network - Cultural Human Resources Council
Public institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Universities - School boards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Municipalities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tourism agencies (e.g., Destination Ontario) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Large museums (e.g., ROM) - Universities - Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) of Canada - Ontario Human Rights Commission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Collecting institutions - Ontario Heritage Trust - CCI - CHIN
Federal or Provincial Ministries or Departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agriculture - Education - Citizenship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community - Economic Development - Municipal Affairs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tourism - Economic Development - Highways 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Multiculturalism - Citizenship - Indigenous Affairs - Francophone Affairs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Culture - Municipalities - Attorney general
Regulations or other government documents of note	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Curriculum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Municipal act - Community hubs framework - Ontario's Volunteer Action Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highway sign policies - Tourism Policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Multiculturalism policies - The TRC calls to action 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Employment legislation - Taxes - Accessibility legislation - Firearms legislation - Building code - Not for profit legislation

6.3.1 *Governance Across Actors*

The work of individuals contributes to the nuances and complex tapestry of community museum governance in Ontario. Individuals legitimize museums and rationalize support differently. Most notably, museum advisors each have unique backgrounds and experiences with community museums. As individuals, they translate museum governance in distinct ways, reflecting particular conceptions of museums' value.⁷⁰ There are also two provincial museum associations that legitimize museums in their own way through service delivery and advocacy, encouraging particular relationships for the museums accessing their services. Considering the multiple advisors and associations, there are multiple concurrent community museum policies in Ontario defined through the work of distinct groups or individuals.

The museum advisors' advocacy for and advice to community museums reflect differences in how they legitimize community museums' work. For example, Carter was an advisor from 1980 to 2013. Throughout his time as an advisor, he argued museums have an educational role and can be connected to the provincial curriculum. He sent letters to museums on their educational role, participated in the associations' training on public programming, advocated for favorable curriculum guidelines, and created resources related to education. As the longest serving museum advisor, Carter worked alongside a range of colleagues with different expertise who translated their own community museum policies with a different focus. For example, the Province employed two conservators who were seconded to museum advisor positions in the late 1990s – that is, Jane Holland and Fiona Graham. During our interviews,

⁷⁰ In addition to having their own expertise and perceptions of museums' value, the advisors have approached their work differently. In particular, some advisors "were not that comfortable traveling or going out and giving direct services" (Interview, J. Carter 2017). For example, Alan Barnes worked from the early 1970s to the early 1990s when there was a budget for site visits but focused on documents like insurance and disaster planning as he disliked travel.

Carter, Holland, and Graham all stated that community museums are the provincial museum in Ontario since the Royal Ontario Museum does not have a provincial mandate.⁷¹ They also all provided general advice and assistance to community museums when working as advisors. However, Carter's work often focused on museums' educational role, while Graham and Holland described a focus on supporting museums as collecting institutions. The conservators had educational backgrounds and professional contacts related to conservation, leading to the provision of different museum policies to the museums they served. Graham (Interview, 2017) stated,

I knew everybody at CCI, so I used my connections there. If somebody had a collection or an artifact of a particular nature and I knew somebody there would have exactly the right advice for them, I would put them in touch directly through me rather than going through the CCI system where sometimes people get lost.⁷²

Conversely, when facing conservation issues, Carter would state, "that is not my specialty I do not even want to weigh in on this" (Interview, J. Carter 2017), advising museums to contact conservators instead. Advisors also reportedly focused on issues specific to historic houses,⁷³ policy development,⁷⁴ exhibitions,⁷⁵ or insurance.⁷⁶

⁷¹ Carter (Interview, 2017) stated, "Ontario doesn't have a provincial museum. The ROM isn't the Provincial Museum. It's owned by the Province, but it doesn't interpret the province... By default, the two hundred... they became in defacto the province's museums. Multiple places interpreting Ontario's history."

Graham (Interview, 2018) said, "We were there because the ministry had had a long-standing belief that the community museums of the province formed the basically the provincial museum because we don't have a provincial museum. The ROM doesn't have Ontario history as its mandate. So, therefore... it was the policy to support these museums through services."

Holland (Interview, 2017) similarly observed, "Ontario doesn't have a provincial museum like many other provinces and so we tell our story through these through the local community museums."

⁷² Correspondence from the museum advisors demonstrates Graham's use of her contacts as a conservator to answer questions and seek expertise for museums. See, for example, correspondence available in: RG47-41 B9322248. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁷³ Dorothy Duncan was an advisor, then the manager from 1975 to 1982. Several participants noted her expertise in and focus on historic houses.

Originally, museums sought support from the person assembling the resources they needed as the advisors divided responsibilities according to their expertise.⁷⁷ The advisors' work, which reflected different legitimizations of museum activity, led to a tapestry of assistance targeting different museum needs and objectives. The "opportunity for museum advisors to assist community institutions with their specialties was really helpful" (Interview, Participant A 2017). As Carter (Interview, 2017) observed

If somebody said, can you come and help me design this new exhibit, Pauline would go out. If somebody said, I need to work [with] the local school board, look at the curriculum and develop school programs, I would go out. If somebody had a problem with collections care, Gillian Watts, who was the conservation coordinator, and Steve Poulin and some of the other folks would do that.

With a growing role for regional consultants in the 1970s and 1980s, the advisors began to divide responsibility in ways that reflected a regional division of labor.⁷⁸ Museum advisors "had a region of the province to work with and a relationship with the clients in those areas" (Interview, Participant A 2017). Despite having more generalist responsibilities within their regions, the advisors continued to have specialists' experiences and expertise.

⁷⁴ As already noted, Jane Holland was a conservator. She worked from 1996 to 2001 as a conservator coordinator, then museum advisor before becoming a policy advisor. Reflecting her interest in policy, Holland (Interview, 2017) described an attention to museum policy development during her tenure.

⁷⁵ At the time of this research, Pauline Hall had passed away. However, several advisors discussed her expertise. Hall worked as an advisor from 1965 to about 1985. After she left, Priamo helped museums with both design and administration.

⁷⁶ Alan Barnes had worked as an advisor from c. 1974 to c. 1991. He was remembered as "a kind of document guy. He knew a lot of about insurance, that kind of thing" (Interview, Duncan 2017).

⁷⁷ When there was only one museum advisor, he justified hiring a second advisor to address his limitations in exhibit design (Interview, Styrmo 2017).

⁷⁸ The regional distribution of clients was discussed in interviews. Lists of advisors' clients from the early 2000 are available in Rg47-41 b932555 CMOG 2002-2003 general files (int). Archives of Ontario, Toronto. The lists reflect a regional division of labor with some overlapping regions.

While museums could still direct questions to a specific advisor with expertise or their advisor could ask a colleague for assistance, institutions experience distinct museum policies under the direction of their designated advisor. As a result, the OMA past presidents interviewed described different relationships and experiences with advisors as they worked in museums. For example, one participant discussed the advisors' advocacy role, which reflected his experiences with Daniel O'Brien who was an advisor in the 2000s. He recalled,

Daniel is in my head because I had him as my advisor for a long time and we chatted a lot. [He would say] the squeaky wheel gets the grease. He felt that within our sector we had to be a bit more vocal and do more to help him with his job. [We needed] to provide him with the tools and the understanding so he could go to his supervisors, go to the policymakers, and go further up the chain to [help them] understand what's going on. (Interview, Bernat 2018)

While the advisors were mentioned as advocates in several interviews with OMA past presidents, others experienced a lack of interest in advocacy from their advisor. When discussing the advisors' service role, some discussed Carter's assistance and his continued involvement in their regional museum network following his retirement. However, he is one person that cannot provide services to the entire province. As a result, others did not work with him but discussed accessing the other advisors' expertise, which was necessarily different. One participant did not even know their advisor and had not known their advisor for some time. Individual relationships with advisors (or a lack thereof) necessarily lead to the enactment of distinct policies.

Similarly, those interviewed have had different relationships with the museum associations, which have their own focuses and assemble distinct museum policies. The OHS' Museum Section is smaller and less active in the museum community than the OMA. The scope of their legitimization work is, therefore, more limited. At times, they have worked to assemble resources or training to support the different legitimizations discussed. However, they have more consistently worked to assemble relationships around a perceived inherent value of

museums and locally driven work in heritage. To that end, their ongoing work in incorporation and insurance supports the establishment and continued existence of small, nonprofit museums in Ontario as well as friends' organizations.

The OMA, historically, worked to raise the perceived quality of museums in the province, which involves supporting a variety of museum objectives as perceptions of a quality museum work change. Like the OHS, they have assembled support related to a perceived inherent value of museums. For example, in the 1980s into the 1990s they helped museums develop and implement digital systems to help in their collections management and collaboration. However, as discussed above, the OMA has also engaged in sustained efforts related to education, tourism, local action, and social change. They have advocated on these issues, circulated information, provided training, and produced resources.

While both provincial museum associations serve Ontario's community museums, they offer distinct museum policies and, as a result, generally serve different museums. Community museums can access the museum policies they see as most relevant through these organizations. In particular, the OMA serves museums receiving the CMOG and, therefore, working to achieve the provincial standards. The OHS works more closely with those receiving the HODG.⁷⁹ The OHS plays a niche role with these small nonprofit museums and friends' organizations, assisting with issues pertinent to their survival such as incorporation, insurance, tax regulation, and accessibility legislation. Meanwhile, the OMA provides a broader range of tools, as they work to help museums meet different objectives and attain best practices as they are understood at a particular moment. Those with capacity are able to engage with the OMA to

⁷⁹ As an OHS representative stated, "Groups that are getting CMOG tend to work more closely with the OMA. Groups that are getting HODG... are more with us" (Interview, Anderson 2018). In order to access HODG, institutions must demonstrate their not-for-profit status, which they can demonstrate with a letter of good standing from the OHS.

improve their operations and seek relationships related to the “cutting-edge” (Interview, Furness 2018) in the field. They can, therefore, work on meeting objectives and developing best practices in different areas of museum work, such as education or community building.

In short, provincial governance is different for different museums as governance is enacted through the work of individuals and groups making a specific argument, using their distinct expertise. There are, therefore, multiple overlapping museum policies that reflect individual conceptions on museums’ role and value. The provincially supported museum associations also offer two different approaches to supporting museum work, which appeal to museums with different capacities.

6.3.2 Governance Across Territory

Since the advisors have, at times, divided responsibilities according to region, there is necessarily change in governance across the province. However, change across territory is not limited to the work of individual advisors. The territory within which arguments are made determines how support for museums is rationalized. Legitimation efforts are context specific, reflecting the audience, region, and target museum(s). Relationships to context create the conditions that make the legitimization of museums and rationalization of their support possible.

The audience plays a crucial role in defining how museum work is legitimized and support is rationalized. In particular, there is a difference in how provincial-level translators rationalize museum support to those perceived as part of or external to the museum community. For example, the OMA’s advocacy efforts that mention *Museums 2025* often used statistics related to museums role in education, the economy and tourism. However, the document also

emphasizes museum collections, noting the relationships between people, space, and collection are museums' strength, distinguishing them from other organizations. As museum professionals, the advisors and associations already believe in museums' and their collections' value. Arguments to each other for their own work, therefore, focus on defining museums' needs and appropriate areas of action rather than legitimizing museums' existence. An understanding of museums' inherent value as collecting institutions is, therefore, present within (re)definitions of the advisors and associations' roles. However, they want to support museums as museums create value, which can be defined. To that end, the museum community, provincially and more broadly, has engaged in self-reflection about the appropriate role for museums given the changing socio-economic conditions within which they operate.

The OMA's strategic planning exercises most notably demonstrate a belief in museums' value with evolving understandings of museums' roles and capacities (re)shaping the Association's activities. For example, their 1986 strategic planning exercise focused on (re)defining the OMA's role given the changing realities of the museum community.⁸⁰ Similarly, the 1994 strategic plan calls museums

an integral and essential component of the cultural, social and economic fabric of the Province of Ontario where all peoples have access to knowledge and appreciation of, as well as participation in, heritage. Museums enrich the lives of individuals, creating better communities in which to live and work (Ontario Museum Association, 1994).

The OMA's role was, therefore, to enhance the mission of museums as cultural resources without defining a clear objective for those cultural resources, which play a broad role in the province and their communities. The 1998-1999 strategic planning exercise demonstrates a shift. While museums' objectives are not articulated, the new plan focuses on sustainability for both museums and the association through collaboration in a changing economic climate.

⁸⁰ See issues of *Currently* from 1986.

Reinforcing Relevance, the 2010 strategic plan, more clearly defines museums' value. Museums are collecting institutions that "comprise the core of the social, cultural, economic, and institutional memory of Ontario" (Ontario Museum Association 2010, 3), but they are also economic drivers and tourism operators. The most recent strategic plan, *Towards 2025* (OMA 2016a), does not define museums' value but builds on *Museums 2025* (Looking Ahead Task Force 2015), which defines a vision for the sector. To address the objectives in *Museums 2025*, the OMA's goals include strengthening "skills, knowledge, innovation and excellence in museum work" (OMA 2016a, 5). Areas of museum work identified include facilitating community participation, collecting, as well as addressing accessibility, diversity, and inclusion. However, these are not the only areas identified and the OMA aims to support museum work broadly.

The OMA's strategic plans demonstrate the Association has reflected on various objectives for museums. Their changing approach reflects evolving best practices and a policy environment that asks for a definition of museums' role. Within the changing contexts, the OMA's articulated understanding remains underlined by a fundamental belief in museums' value both because and beyond these roles.

Generally, there is not the same acceptance of museums' value when the advisors and associations legitimize museum support to those who are not defined as part of the museum community. There is an element of policy attachment within these interactions. Despite the diversity museum work and objectives, their legitimacy becomes attached to specific areas of action related to the audience. Legitimization efforts focus on museums' utilitarian value and change depending on the audience's potential role in museum governance. Most notably, arguments to the Minister responsible for tourism are necessarily different from arguments to the Minister responsible for education.

Arguments also differ within the various Ministries that have been responsible for community museums. For example, the Ministry for Universities and Colleges (1973 – 1975) and the Ministry of Tourism and Publicity (1957 – 1964) have education and tourism goals respectively. They were both responsible for community museums at one point (Table 6.2). Since 2010, culture and tourism have been in the same ministry once again. Despite the “silencing” that limits communication between actors, greater connections can and do occur as the Minister announces policies across areas of responsibility. An OMA Past President noted, “There's a growing link on the tourism side. At the moment, tourism and culture are in the same ministry provincially. That has not always been the case. Museums are acknowledged as being a valued and valuable tourism product” (Interview, Brooks-Joiner 2017). Community museums can then access funding targeting tourism from a Ministry with which they already have an established relationship and familiarity.

Changes in the Ministry responsible for community museums can thus lead to changes in how museums are legitimized and, by extension, the museum work that is supported. For example, the Ministry of Culture and Communications (1987 – 1993) funded the aforementioned History of Ontario's Peoples program, which supported cultural diversity projects. Ministries including tourism, such as the subsequent Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Recreation (1993 – 1995), are seen as more concerned with issues of sustainability and the economy than society. As such, grants for cultural diversity are then accessed from other ministries such as the Ministry of Francophone Affairs, which provided funding to commemorate 400 years of French heritage in Ontario. The number of Ministries significant to museum governance increases as the advisors and associations disseminate information and call for support.

Municipally, there is also evidence of changing legitimization work and, therefore, policy as responsibility for museums shifts. The OHS Executive Director observed,

One of the things with the municipalities is...Who does the museum report to? Now, with Jim in Sudbury, he was able to get the museum to report to libraries and he found that [to be] a great, very productive relationship. In a lot of areas, [museums are] under sports and recreation or parks and recreation. Many curators have told me, "They do not get it. We're not a priority." (Interview, Leverty 2018)

The orientation of the municipal department to responsible for community museums informs legitimization work. For example, an OMA committee and board member who works within a municipality discussed a change in focus when responsibility moved from community services to economic development. Community services had become problem focused and those in the department were expected to address social problems. In particular, some people who are unhoused need immediate assistance. The interview participant noted, "as a museum worker, I can't really help [with that]. That's not one of those things that museums can do" (Interview, Kerr-Wilson 2018). Arguments for museums became easier under planning and economic development. Within the new department, museums are asked to contribute to the City's vision statement – that is, "the best place in Canada to raise a child and age successfully" (Ibid.). Museum support is then rationalized within a government unit addressing long term goals relating to quality of life rather than more immediate problems. In both cases, museum work may be legitimized with reference to social change, but the timing of the goals are different, which changes the value of museums' potential contribution and likelihood of support.

Considering the role of local actors, like the municipalities, community museum governance in Ontario differs substantially geographically. Arguments for community museums as educational, local action, tourism operators, agents of social change, and collecting institutions all refer to these museums' local level relationships. In order for community museums to be connected to the formal education system, they require relationships with their local teachers,

schools, and school boards. Relationships with municipalities and community members define museums as sites of local activity with a strong or weak base of support. Community museums require relationships with other sites and regional tourism organizations, which incorporate museums into their plans in distinct ways, to position themselves as tourism assets. Relationships with Indigenous Communities and other marginalized groups are necessary for museums to work for social change. Finally, community museum collections are regionally focused, which necessitates a relationship with local heritage.⁸¹ As such, governance differs according to school boards, local support, the activities of regional tourism organizations, as well as the presence marginalized groups that have the organizational capacity and willingness to work with museums. For example, museum governance is necessarily different in areas of Ontario with school boards that encourage museum visits compared with regions that do not have the same tradition of support.⁸²

Community museums' relationships with the Province, advisors, regional consultants, and associations also differ regionally, which changes how support can be provided and rationalized. In particular, these actors have different relationships with museums in the south and north. For example, as part of an economic policy, the Province provides additional funding opportunities in northern Ontario. As a result, community museums in the north have received funding for

⁸¹ The collections in community museums have distinct relationships with their community. A former advisor and conservator observed,

Some people will say those, well you know they all just got the same stuff and why should we be supporting like 600 museums. Except that it's not the same stuff. It may look like the same typewriter or butter churn but that butter churn was that person's great grandmother's butter churn. There are more personal connections in small museums than in the nationals. (Interview, Graham 2017)

⁸² There are also multiple school boards in different regions that have distinctive relationships with museums. In particular, there are public school boards and public catholic school boards, which have their own perspectives on social issues. For example, the Roman Catholic School once blacklisted and boycotted the Halton Region Museum due to the exhibition "From Plague to Aids: Lessons from our Past." During the time period scheduled for the exhibit, there were also a high number of Roman Catholic school classes scheduled to visit. As such, the museum compromised and agreed to close the exhibit when the classes visited (Tivy 1993).

student interns to staff museums for tourists during the summer through the Northern Ontario Heritage Fund Corporation, which is a provincial agency (Stem and Hall 2015).⁸³ Their support is rationalized within an economic policy independent of southern museums.

Considering regional diversity and the specificity of individual contexts, community museums are necessarily active actors that facilitate their own relationships with relevant entities. This is, perhaps, even more pertinent in northern and rural areas where relationship building with actors located in Toronto can be more difficult. As an OMA and CMA Past President stated, “you really have to build up your community support. It can be community organizations that you work with, your local college, or your school board” (Interview, Bachmann 2018). Museums’ individual and localized relationships then contribute to additional differentiation in museum governance. These differences provide a third difference across territory – that is, the museums themselves shape their own governance.

Community museums have different capacities to assemble resources for themselves and engage with their own governance. Reaching out to and developing relationships with local actors requires human resources. People are necessary for museums to engage in any of the roles described.⁸⁴ However, not all museums have the capacity and/or mandate to work toward the objectives used to legitimize their work as a collective. An OMA Past President observed,

⁸³ The Program has funded a range of projects in the north. For example, the Sturgeon River House received funding for an expansion in the mid-1990s. For more information see: Graham, Fiona. 2000, April. Briefing Note: Sturgeon River House Museum. Rg47-41 b932835 Nipissing. Archives of Ontario.

In addition to special programs targeting the north, funding programs can prioritize northern museums. For example, in 1991-1992, the Heritage Project Acquisitions category gave “priority to infrequent applicants and clients from the north.” See: Freeman, Ruth. 1992, June. Backgrounder. RG47-41 B307253. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁸⁴ As a result, when discussing museums’ improvement, a former conservator and museum advisor stated, “It always happened when they got a staff person, a salaried staff person ... it was a person who was there and who was responsible.... if you really wanted to have museums meet the provincial interest, they have to have the staff” (Interview, Holland 2017). Responding to a survey on the Standards, a museum wrote “...the result of the standards and the renovations has been an increase in permanent staff to include a conservator, activities coordinator,

I think municipal museums tend to be better serviced, better staffed, and more able to take on challenges. And some of those don't even have to think about it because somebody else deals with it. I think there's probably a next tier of very well-run not-for-profits that have good people at the helm that can deal with [challenges] because again in this day and age with internet forms and everything else that stuff will be out there. And hopefully the OMA will fill those gaps... It's still those small one-person, volunteer-driven museums that I think are going to not be able to deal... (Interview, Bernat 2018)

Reflecting the importance of human resources, museums' responses to questionnaires on the Standards also demonstrate the determining role of staffing as well as an occasional disconnect between museums' mandates and the goals embedded in their governance. For example, a larger museum was able to hire "an Education Officer in 1990 to work with school boards to coordinate museum programmes (old and new) with ongoing curriculum development." The same year, a much smaller museum responded there was a need for curriculum-based programs, but additional staff was required to accomplish this goal. They were unable to hire the staff due to an inadequate budget. Similarly, a museum argued their ability to work toward new goals was limited as a "direct result of limited staff, financial resources and museum size." They also noted their growth and development was "restricted to increased public programming and interpretation" due to the mandate of their governing authority.⁸⁵ Considering their capacities and scopes, there are differences in how individual museums engage with each of the objectives described above.

In addition to informing their own governance, the work of individual museums shapes provincial wide governance. The advisors' and associations' rationalization of government support to museums is supported and informed by the community museums' existing work and

preparator, and curatorial assistant" (See: Rg47-41 b340871 Wellington County Museum. Archives of Ontario, Toronto).

⁸⁵ The survey responses cited in this section are available in: Rg47-41 b340871. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

local relationships. There is a reinforcing dynamic. The Province and municipalities have helped some museums develop capacity through sustained operational funding. The advisors and associations support and facilitate the work of these individual museums, which form local relationships to accomplish their objectives. The advisors and associations then use the museums' work to justify their own activities, legitimize museum work, and rationalize their support, which can then encourage the (re)development of supportive relationships such as continued operational funding through the Province.

The Markham Museum's work and their relationship with the associations illustrates these connections. The Museum has a history of and an ongoing interest in addressing issues of diversity and inclusion.⁸⁶ As a municipally owned museum, their work aligns with the goals set by the municipality, which has a diversity action plan (Town of Markham 2010).⁸⁷ As part of the municipal efforts, the Museum began to re-examine their traditional approach to museum work in 2009, leading to new community engagements and a strategic plan that emphasizes museum work in diversity. The Museum assembled support for the diversity related projects, such as funding from the federal Inter-Action Multiculturalism Grants and Contributions program. This funding supported the Canadian Museums and Youth Diversity Experience Project, which was a partnership between the Markham Museum, the CMA, and other museums.⁸⁸ The project

⁸⁶ In the 1990s, the Museum was an active participant in the CMA's work on cultural diversity. As part of the Canadian Image Project, they engaged with Markham's Chinese community to foster understanding amongst residents. Reflections on their experiences were published by the CMA and are available on the CMA's website (Liu and Macleod, n.d.).

⁸⁷ The City began a process of civic self-examination in 2006, resulting in the 2010 *Everyone Welcome: Markham Diversity Action Plan* (Town of Markham 2010). The plan included a recommendation to develop a strategic plan for the Museum and present the plan to "newcomers and visible minorities, seniors, youth and persons with disabilities for comment" (54).

⁸⁸ The project was a partnership with the CMA, City of Toronto, Scarborough Museum, Surrey Museum, Musée McCord, and Markham Museum. For information on the project and a presentation from the Museum, see: Ontario Museum Association (2013b).

reflects the Markham Museum's tendency to work with their associations on projects and the associations' subsequent use of the Museum as an example to illustrate museums' role in social change. For instance, the Museum Manager participated on the CMA LGBTQ2 task force, which used the City of Markham's universal washroom sign as an example in their draft guidelines (Canadian Museums Association 2018b). In a 2013 presentation to the provincial Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs, the Executive Director of the OMA argued museums help us understand the province's changing diversity, using the Markham Museum as an example (Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs 2013). The Manager of the Markham Museum then participated on the OMA's Looking Ahead Task Force, which recommended museums work to better reflect the diversity of the province. The ensuing resource, *Inclusion 2025*, contains case studies from ten museums doing inclusion projects, including the Markham Museum.⁸⁹ Thanks to provincial funding, these case studies are available online to serve as examples that are circulated to promote dialogue within the museum community.⁹⁰ The site provides evidence that museums are engaged in diversity and inclusion work, playing a social change role.

In short, museum governance differs across territory as rationalizations for museum support are context specific. These differentiations demonstrate the audience can inform the museum work that is legitimized and, therefore, supported. In particular, interview participants commented on the frequent changes in the ministry responsible for museums, noting the different ministries emphasize distinct aspects of museum work. Geographically there are

⁸⁹ The Markham Museum participated as a case study partner with a workshop to gather audience insights on the collection, receiving support from the OMA's advisory committee members and the Ministry of Education.

⁹⁰ *Inclusion 2025* is then described as a "valuable resource" made possible through the OMA's leadership and partnership with other organizations (Ontario Museum Association 2018d), legitimizing their own work to museums.

differences, which means community museums across the province have distinct experiences and are enabled differently. As a result of these regional disparities, community museums are largely responsible for assembling their own support, relegating the advisors and associations to a supporting role. However, the advisors and associations can use the museums' work to argue for more support or resources province wide. Moreover, individual museums have the capacity to engage in work beyond collections care because they have received past support.

6.3.3 Governance Across Time

Museums' legitimacy is constructed differently as contexts and actors change, influencing the evolution of governance over time. There was a fundamental turn in the logic underlining museum governance in the 1990s, changing how the advisors and associations legitimized museum activities. These changes reflect a shift in the arguments for support that government actors perceive as valid, moving focus from basic operational activities and projects related to those activities toward projects targeting specific objectives traditionally associated with other policy areas. The (re)definition of support represents a rejection of appeals assuming the value of museums. Responding to the changing environment, the OMA has emerged as the primary advocate for the Ontario museum community and is working most directly on emerging issues for the sector. In that role, they promote museums broadly while emphasizing utilitarian arguments for their support, relying on statistical data, and discussing museums' multiple functions. At the same time, reductions in government resources for the advisors have reduced the museum community's capacity to legitimize museum work and rationalize support according to diverse museum-related expertise within the provincial government.

The work of governing through multiple, distinct provincial rationalizations grounded in specialist knowledge necessarily changed as the advisors change. Causing a more fundamental shift, the advisor(s)' reduced capacity has reduced the concurrent legitimizations of museum work made within government. When the Province stopped employing conservators for community museums in the early 2000s, museums lost an advisor-led service delivery and advocacy focused on collections. After Carter retired, Cathy Blackbourne continued as a provincial advisor with expertise in museum-based educational programming. However, she left in 2014 and the knowledge base Blackbourne and Carter offered was not replaced as the position shifted "from specialist to generalist" (Interview, Brooks-Joiner 2018). With only one generalist advisor, provincial museum governance has become more limited, lacking the tapestry of legitimization efforts that relied on varied expertise.

Explaining, in part, the reduced role for the advisors, community museums are no longer valued as museums by the Governments of Ontario or Canada. They have become less receptive to arguments for museums that do not define a clear role and objective since the austerity related funding reductions in the 1990s. An advisor and conservator from the late 1990s noted, "it was very, very clear that museums were a very, very, very small and unimportant cog in the machine. We were. Budget wise, voice wise" (Interview, Graham 2017). This shift in government interest is illustrated through the creation of cultural, tourism, or economic policies of significance that may include museums rather than new or renewed museum policies. It is also evident in the consolidation or elimination of museum support programs discussed above.

Considering the shift in focus, arguments for museum support to governments increasingly reflect the policies of importance at the time. Museums are no longer simply educational in a general sense; they are explicitly tied to curriculum or targeted learning groups. They are not well supported to sustain local action, but relationships encourage local involvement for

sustainability reasons. While the connection to tourism historically served to increase visitation, museums' value is now attached to their economic initiative, including activities to encourage tourism in their region. Finally, museums need to not only reflect social change, but also be active participants. As an OMA Executive Director stated, "There are shifts to museums becoming more than museums with their collections and programs... in order to access additional funding" (Interview, Lalonde 2018). Similarly, an OMA Past President observed,

I think we saw a shift in funding and visibility, directing museums to becoming [about] programming. We've always done programming but ... we are guilty of it here. When we opened up this new facility in Niagara Falls, we wanted programming to provide that visibility, but I think that what we've been trying to do with [*Museums 2025*] is also highlight the fact that the reason we are here is because we have the collections. We need to focus on the collections and showcase those stories because they are falling off a little bit. Because if we're just doing programming, how are we different than a library or a University or other places around the community itself? (Interview, Bernat 2018)

In other words, museums and, to some extent, the associations have responded to reduced funding and attention from government by (re)focusing their activities away from collections work toward programming, which may address the various policy objectives highlighted above.

Governments' shift away from funding so-called core museum functions, such as opening to the public or collections management, toward specific objectives is accompanied by an emphasis on data to illustrate museums' utility. As the Executive Director of the Ottawa Museum Network argued, to demonstrate the impact of culture, "you need data ... It is not something you can make up. There needs to be data" (Interview, D. Carter 2019). An individual involved with the OMA's research efforts noted,

We are in an era where if you can't measure, it's not real... If you can't put a number to it, it's not sophisticated... It is [about] dollars and cents and bums in seats. And if you can't do that, it doesn't matter. It is just soft. The default is we have to come up with some hard measurables because otherwise we're not grownups. (Interview, Kerr-Wilson 2018)

Similarly, an OMA Past President noted, “you want to go “Oh my gosh, that was such a great day!” But you don’t” (Interview, Furness 2018). Instead, when rationalizing support or legitimizing museums, museum workers necessarily discuss revenue, memberships, the number of school programs, attendance, volunteer hours, and other indicators.

The focus on statistical data to legitimize museum work is a relatively new development. Prior to the 1990s, surveys aimed to define ideal areas for government action and museums’ value was, to some extent, assumed. For example, the advisors were able to argue for a provincial conservation program with data from a provincial conservation survey. The report assumed Ministry responsibility to improve the conservation function of museums, using the data to make recommendations on problem areas that could be addressed.⁹¹ Similarly, the OMA conducted surveys on the provincial standards in 1982 and 1992. These surveys focus on museums’ relationships to the requirements. The data was not used to justify museums’ value, but rather to (re)examine actors’ roles in relation to the Standards.⁹²

Reports on museums and the Standards in the 21st century demonstrate a shift in focus. For example, in 2008 the OMA released *CMOG Snapshot 2000-2004: Research into the Sustainability of Ontario’s Community Museums* (Ontario Museum Association 2008b). The report examines actor roles and discusses the effects of provincial operating funding on museums. However, it also emphasizes local governments’ role in museum sustainability and the economic contributions of museums, mentioning the difficulties museums face funding their educational or collections mandates. The OMA’s 2014 museum profile (Hill Strategies Research

⁹¹ For information on the surveys and subsequent report see documents available in: Rg47-58 b101645 conservation. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

⁹² The 1982 survey data is available in: RG47-50_j Ontario Museum Association Vol. IV. Archives of Ontario, Toronto. The data from 1992 is available in: Rg47-41 B932597 CMOG 2004-05 program review. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

Inc. 2016a) provides a broader picture with more specific statistical information, using surveys and data from the provincial operating grant. The document provides visitor statistics with information on the number of visitors from outside the province as well as statistics on school visits and curriculum linked programming.

The OMA mobilizes the data they collect and interpret in advocacy, legitimizing museum activities in different areas. For example, when arguing against the sudden TODS increase discussed above, the OMA conducted a survey and presented a report with statistical information to government staff.⁹³ Following the price freeze, the OMA noted, “successful advocacy efforts towards the TODS Program have demonstrated that data and stories are effective in communicating with government” (Ontario Museum Association 2019a). The increasing significance of data was also observed during interviews. An OMA Past President noted, “doing research and having good evidence based or evidence supported requests” has become a critical component of advocacy work (Interview, Adkin 2018). However, unlike research in the 1970s and 1980s, the evidence gathered focuses on the objectives of museum work and limitations to achieving those objectives rather than museum needs more generally.

Despite the need for data, there is an absence. As the OMA Executive Director noted, “that’s a big gap, there’s a big absence of crucial sectoral information” (Interview, Lalonde 2018). While there have always been significant limitations to the available information,⁹⁴ the limitations have become more pronounced as arguments for museums become more difficult without data. As a result, data collection, interpretation, and dissemination has become a more

⁹³ According to the surveys, 30% of respondents would not renew at the new prices and invoices increased by 14% on average.

⁹⁴ In the late 1990s, an advisor attempted to address this issue with a database of the information collected through the CMOG surveys. Unfortunately, the information is no longer easily accessible (Interview, Holland 2017).

pronounced role for the Ontario Museum Association.⁹⁵ The Association uses this research to inform both their advocacy work and service delivery.

Since the OMA is a product of the museum community, individuals involved most often already see value in collecting institutions. However, the OMA's activities do not focus exclusively on collections or opening museums. Their work reflects and reinforces the diverse rationalizations for museum support tied to the benefits of museum activity. As such, an emphasis on utilitarian goals is not simply policy attachment whereby the advisors, associations, and museums are connecting museum work to education, community building, tourism, or social change for funding reasons or to increase museums' profile.

The attention to different areas of activity reflects a growing professionalism within the Ontario museum community, which followed the creation of the association in the 1970s, the development of standards for museums, and increased access to professional development. An OMA Executive Director noted,

ICOM came out with their curriculum in museum studies in 72 or something. I think it was the beginning the emergence of a field and its legitimization. In the mid 70s, if you saw a museum job advertised, there would never be a mention of a certificate in museum studies or some sort of academic preparation. But by the 80s, there was almost always some requirement [for] some study that was relevant to the field. (Interview, Baeker 2017)

As those running museums became paid educated professionals that already have basic museum or related training, the community has engaged in critical self-reflection on their roles and responsibilities.

The self-reflection parallels a shift in museums internationally. In particular, discussion in Ontario on museums' role as agents of social change reflects international and national

⁹⁵ More locally, the Executive Director of the Ottawa Museum Network has also advocated for data collection to support the associations' work. To that end, she is a co-chair of the Ottawa Culture Research Group, which is an informal collaborative community aiming to share data (Ottawa Culture Research Group 2017).

discussions in the museum field. A “new museology” began to emerge in the 1970s, evolving from the perceived failings of the elitist and traditional forms of museum work (McCall and Gray 2014). During the 1990s, articles in professional journals increasingly explored the idea of a new approach to museum work, acknowledging museums as social institutions with political agendas due to inherent assumptions (e.g., Stam 1993). Within Canada, the conversation focused more narrowly on multiculturalism and cultural diversity. However, there is common ground between multiculturalism and new museological trends, including a concern for museums’ relationship with contemporary society and a perceived elitism (Canadian Museums Association 1994). The associations’ more recent attempts to assemble or create resources supporting diversity work are community led and reflect equity work being done in museums and by museum associations internationally. The wider (re)definitions of museum work have likely contributed to the shifting emphasis in legitimization efforts in Ontario.

There has also been a societal change whereby resources on social justice issues, such as diversity and inclusion in cultural organizations, are more available from a range of organizations. In this context, the OMA responds to community museums’ articulations of their own needs, which are informed by discussions amongst museums nationally and internationally. Then, the OMA partners with organizations to disseminate information or resources that have already been developed. For example, *Inclusion 2025* provides links to resources from the City of Ottawa, the Diversity Collegium, the American Alliance of Museums, the Canadian Museums Association, Airbnb, the Toronto Arts Foundation, and more. The increasing focus on social change issues since 2010, therefore, reflects broader attention to these issues demonstrated through the increased availability of resources and not government led funding initiatives for museums. As a result, museums and their associations can face difficulties funding their social change activities in practice.

Museums' role in social change is difficult to measure, which may help the advisors and associations legitimize their work to funders, such as government, considering the contemporary emphasis on data. To that end, the OMA has worked to determine measurements for museums' worth and their work in communities. However, it is a huge undertaking and, as an interview participant noted, "I don't think anybody has cracked that nut at all" (Interview, Kerr-Wilson 2018).

Given these difficulties, the OMA and other translators provide anecdotal accounts of museums' role alongside data driven arguments as they work to raise museums' profile. For example, the aforementioned OMA presentation to the provincial Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs did not rely on statistics when discussing museums' relationships with their community. Instead, the Executive Director argued for museums' value and legitimacy with anecdotal examples. Pointing to the Markham Museum, she argued, "Museums have moved well beyond the 19th century to become an important player in understanding and interpreting the current context in which we live" (Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs 2013). She also provided examples of museum programs that explore immigrant experiences, arguing museums show Ontarians how they can participate in their new community. These examples complimented statistics-based arguments about museums' contributions as employers, tourism operators, and educators with curriculum linked programs. In this context, advocacy becomes about raising awareness of museum work in its variety to argue for operational funding or facilitate better relationships between community museums and those outside the community.

Historically, the advisors played a key role in raising museums' profile and arguing for their legitimacy within government. With the advisors' declining capacity, the OMA developed new means of doing this work with Ontario Museums at Queen's Park in 2009. During this

event, they meet with MPPs⁹⁶ and representatives from a cross section of Ministries to emphasize museums varied contributions. For example, in 2017, they aimed to “emphasize the contribution of museums to Ontario’s economy and quality of life in our diverse communities concentrating on our role in cultural tourism, education, and providing meaningful youth employment” (Ontario Museum Association 2017c).

The OMA also has a key and distinctive role legitimizing museum work publicly. As an OMA past president argued, “I think the OMA serves as our collective voice in terms of government policy and advocacy as well the profile of the museum sector in the province” (Interview, Adkin 2018). Another OMA Past President stated, “The OMA’s role is constantly letting the public know... Letting folks know what we are and what we do” (Interview, Furness 2018). To raise museums’ profile in Ontario, the OMA developed May is Museum Month in 2000, which overlaps with the International Council of Museums’ Museum day on May 18th.⁹⁷ As part of the campaign, the OMA provides materials and public relations support for members to adapt for their regional needs and activities (Ontario Museum Association 2002). More recently, the campaign has involved a hashtag and social media, encouraging museums to promote their activities online. Working to promote these events, the OMA amplifies and mobilizes museums’ voices to help make a public case for their value.

Importantly, raising museums’ public profile is a relatively new role for the OMA, emerging in 2000 following drastic cuts to the cultural sector in the 1990s. The redefined role is

⁹⁶ Members of Provincial Parliament.

⁹⁷ International museum day was announced in 1977 and takes place on or around May 18th annually. The OMA began discussing a provincial museums day in the 1980s (See documents available in: Rg47-51 B310102. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.) The OMA developed May is Museum Month to build on the international day and create public interest in museums prior to the start of the summer tourist season (see: Rg47-51 b875990 PHO grants OMA. Archives of Ontario, Toronto).

related to arguments that greater local involvement will lead to greater sustainability as greater awareness of museums' contributions will ideally lead to increased community support. Since museums' contributions are varied and the audience is everyone outside the museum community, legitimization efforts involve sharing examples of museums meeting diverse goals. In this context, museums are valuable because of their diverse contributions to the province and their communities.

In short, differences in legitimization efforts across actors and territory necessitate differences in how museums are legitimized, and their support is rationalized across time. There has been a shifting logic within governments, which place less value on museums' contributions. In order to argue for their support and justify their work, the advisors and associations emphasize the various objectives museums can meet and use data to support their assumptions. However, legitimizing museum work according to diverse objectives does not necessarily reflect deliberate policy attachment. There have been changes in the museum community and greater reflection on the role of museums. In particular, museums' role in social change is largely community (not government) led. Further, participating in social change is not an easily quantifiable objective. As such, the associations continue to make arguments using anecdotal evidence despite funders' affinity for statistical data. The OMA, in particular, is a key actor engaged in this work. Responding to government disinterest in museums in the 1990s, they now engage in ongoing and concerted efforts to legitimize museum work and, in extension, rationalize their support.

6.4 Conclusion: Shifting Perspectives

In conclusion, as the advisors and associations engage in service delivery and advocacy, they legitimize museum work, rationalizing support according to assumptions about museums' value. I found five general arguments most prevalent within Ontario museum governance – that is, museums as educational, local action, tourism operators, agents of social change, and inherently valuable collecting institutions. These arguments have led to distinct configurations of actors to support museums and concern with various government policies. While the arguments are evident in multiple periods of governance, they are not static. They have changed across actors, territory, and time, contributing to and reflecting both ongoing and moments of change in governance. Of particular significance, it has become more difficult to argue for museums value as collecting institutions to those outside the museum community. As the advisors and associations work to legitimize museum work to possible supporters, they now rely on multiple arguments and statistical data in addition to the anecdotal, which is often perceived as less valuable. However, the shift also reflects discussions from within the museum community provincially, nationally, and internationally on their own value and possible contributions to society.

The provincial, national, and international museum associations, which circulate ideas about museums' roles, are part of the complex environment within which community museums operate. These associations and the provincial museum advisors aim to reduce complexity for community museums and create the conditions within which museums can form the relationships they need to operate. The multiplicity of actors supporting and regulating different areas of action necessitates a significant time and resource commitment to demonstrate the value of museums' work. Due to the advisor(s)' increasingly reduced capacity, associations are

key to legitimizing museum work with government actors and the public more broadly. The OMA, in particular, advocates for museums and assembles the resources they need through the Association's relationships with similar organizations. As an OMA Past President noted, the OMA has a "role in communicating and liaising with different groups, promoting something that's good for everyone" (Interview, Furness 2018).

While the associations' legitimization work can be good for everyone, community museums engage in their own work to assemble the relationships needed to support their operations. Museums' work is of particular importance because arguments for community museums' value most often rely on the existence of local level relationships. Those with the capacity to build these relationships then serve as examples to legitimize museum work provincially. As such, rationalizations for museums support can reflect the work of well-resourced museums that have the staff to develop programs with objectives related to different policy areas, such curriculum linked programs or tourism initiatives. These museums are able to develop these programs due to the historic assistance of advisors and/or associations, which helped them assemble the relationships needed to build capacity from the 1950s to the 1990s due to museums' value as collecting institutions.

Chapters Four and Five demonstrated the municipal and other CMOG supported museums developed capacity largely through support relating to a perceived inherent value of museums with general educational, community, and tourism benefits. Importantly, the museum advisors and associations argued for standards in the 1970s due to the perceived poor quality of Ontario's community museums. Museums were able to develop capacity due to increases in the operating grant during the 1970s, the availability of government project grants for museums, the implementation of standards, the creation of resources related to the Standards, and professional development opportunities offered through the associations. These institutions

benefited from advisors engaged in service delivery and advocacy, emphasizing different aspects of museum work related to their expertise while also supporting museum operations.

As seen in the 1970s, the advisors and some association representatives continue to define smaller nonprofit museums as needing assistance to legitimize their work, rationalize support, and navigate the existing requirements. An OMA Past President observed,

you have a lot of sites that are smaller sites that have maybe one staff or they are run by volunteers who are very insular. They may look at their communities, but they don't have that perspective ... to bring what it is they do to the forefront and let people know about it. (Interview, Bachmann 2018)

Discussing the difficulties some museums have accessing project grants, another Past President stated, they probably meet the requirements for funding, but struggle because they only have “the bare bones [that they] need to get their stuff documented in databases and all that type of thing” (Interview, Bernat 2018). Small nonprofit museums that have not received CMOG do not have the capacity and experience built through years of relationships to demonstrate their value and position themselves as actors making contributions that should be supported.

The advisors and associations work is, therefore, of particular benefit to those with less capacity to engage in their own legitimization – that is, nonprofit museums and those that do not receive the provincial operating grant. The OMA has taken on a service and advocacy role on behalf of these institutions, advocating on a variety of issues. However, the service delivery supporting museums due to a perceived inherent value as well as different legitimizations has become more limited without the work of the advisors. Compounding these limitations, the Association does not have the same access the advisors once did to push for museums' inclusion in different policy areas. Further, the diverse policy objectives of relevance led to the dispersment of advocacy efforts as the OMA works to legitimize museums to a variety of government actors and the public at large.

Within this context, arguments and resources to build local support and sustainability displace assumptions about small nonprofit museums' value as collecting institutions. There is a focus on sustainability for these institutions because, in the 1990s, it became more challenging for small nonprofit museums to develop the capacity they need to work on multiple objectives and form the wide range of relationships now needed to support museum work. For example, an OMA Past President, volunteering with a nonprofit museum, noted they were attracting tons of people but did not have "somebody to guide the way for them." She argued, they would "benefit from somebody who could advise them on the right moves to make in terms of governance, museum practice, and the Standards" (Interview, Adkin 2018). Since the 1990s, these museums lacked easy access to an actor designated to support their efforts as a community museum for the sake of being a community museum. In particular, the advisor can no longer do this work, the OMA's efforts are dispersed to reflect museums' diverse objectives, and the OHS has a broader mandate related to heritage, which limits their activities for museums.

Arguably, the lack of support for small, nonprofit museums to develop capacity relating to their role as collecting institutions is not an issue because there is saturation and an unsustainable number of community museums in the province.⁹⁸ However, museums established during or before the 1970s disproportionately focused on the histories of white, European settlers. For example, the museum advisor files from 1985 list 204 museums seeking the community museum operating grant. With a few notable exceptions,⁹⁹ these museums are

⁹⁸ This position was expressed in four of the 30 interviews.

⁹⁹ In particular, the Joseph Brant Museum focuses on Joseph Brant who is a Mohawk military and political leader. The Raleigh Township Centennial Museum (now the Buxton National Historic Site & Museum) is a municipal museum telling the story of the Elgin Settlement, which was an organized Black settlement.

pioneer villages, historic houses, or local history museums. While these institutions often preserve and interpret Indigenous artefacts or natural history, they have the historic tendency to focus on more recent narratives of settlement and industry. Reflecting the orientation of the majority of the collections in the Province, an OMA survey found racialized people and persons born outside of Canada are underrepresented in the Ontario museum workforce when compared to the workforce more broadly (Canadian Centre for Diversity and Inclusion 2019). The reasons behind this discrepancy are not articulated. However, the lack of support for museums addressing gaps in museum collections – that is, support for social change activities and for capacity building with organizations that address existing gaps - may reinforce this dynamic.

The North American Black historical museum was not on the list but was established in 1975 and would begin receiving funding as a community museum later in the 1980s. The Woodland Cultural Centre is also not listed. They were established in 1972 and would also begin receiving operating funding as a museum in the late 1980s.

Conclusion

Although most museums in Canada are community museums, research on museum policy has focused on the policies of relevance to national and provincial institutions. As a result, community museums' relationships with governments are not well documented in policy research. However, all three levels of government are involved in their governance with supportive and/or regulatory activities. In response to this complex policy environment, provincial museum advisors and museum associations emerged in most provinces by the 1970s to establish norms for the sector and facilitate better relationships between community museums and other actors. This thesis considered the advisors' and associations' practices in Ontario, asking: how are community museum policies (re)created, (re)assembled, and coordinated?

This concluding chapter summarizes responses to the research question. First, I outline my findings from Chapters Four, Five, and Six. Chapter Four translated interview and archival data into a timeline, documenting the evolution of community museum governance. Looking at the work of governing as advocacy and service delivery, Chapters Five and Six explained change and consistency in governance, which resulted from the (re)definition of the advisors' and associations' work. Second, I discuss three implications of my research, which reflect on the advisors' and associations' changing practices, the structuring function of policy instruments, as well as a hierarchy of community museums reflected in and reinforced by the work of governing. Finally, this chapter concludes with implications for future research, considering the differences between nonprofit and municipal museums highlighted in the findings.

Summary

My research demonstrates Ontario community museum governance was (re)established and (re)defined from the late 1880s, leading to the creation of provincial museum advisors and associations that have governed community museums into the 21st century. Initially, community museums emerged in Ontario with encouragement from the Ontario Historical Society, which received provincial funding, and support from their municipalities. In an effort to encourage locally initiated recreational activities, the Province of Ontario established an operating grant for community museums in 1953, including museums within existing policies. The same year, museum workers formed a section within the OHS devoted to helping museums with a newsletter and provincially supported annual workshop. The federal government also became involved in community museum governance during the 1950s, working with provinces to encourage local actors to develop centennial projects like museums. The Province hired a museum advisor in 1959 who enthusiastically enacted an unwritten museum policy and served as a clearing house for information, aiming to increase tourists' access to museums and museums' access to the information or resources they needed. The number of museum advisors then increased in the 1960s and 1970s, responding to the increasing number of community museums. These advisors facilitated access to the operating grant and provided advice or assistance to museums across the province. Government policy also became more expansive with the introduction of lottery-based project grants for culture in Ontario, an increase in the size of the provincial community museum operating grant, a provincial conservation program, the release of a federal museum policy with relevant support programs, and the development of the Ontario Museum Association, which received federal and provincial funding. From the 1970s, the advisors, the OMA, and the OHS' Museum Section have provided advocacy for and

services to community museums, distinguishing community museum governance from national or provincial museums' governance.

Community museum governance relies on the advisors' and associations' overlapping and intersection practices. They both do the work of governing – that is, advocacy and service delivery. However, their different relationships with community museums and government lead to distinct practices as they collaborate and work separately, reflecting and shaping the evolution of community museum governance in different ways.

In order to advocate for community museums, the advisors and associations construct a collective – that is, the museum community or sector - and push for the (re)development of actors supporting museum work. They work toward more favorable policies and programs on an ongoing basis through relationship building and in response to their definitions of the community's needs or role in society, contributing to change and consistency in governance. In addition to their own activities, the advisors and associations have identified other factors of significance, such as changes in government, the effects of multi-level governance, and economic realities. Historically, the advisors' distinct position within government was also significant, allowing for access and the authority to write policy.

In addition to (re)assembling actors on behalf of the museum community, the advisors and associations have a role in the community. They have responded to need(s) in moments of time, providing community museums with information and connecting them to resources. In particular, the advisors have had a key role providing advice, the OMA more notably offers training, and the OHS can be critical to capacity building in small museums. When considering constructions of the museum community or sector, these relationships with the community museums themselves are critical.

Historically, the advisors had an important role listening to and including small, nonprofit museums' voices in the museum community because of their advisory activities, which necessitated relationship building with institutions of all sizes across the province. Due to their reliance on member participation, the OMA would often privilege the voices of municipal and other well-resourced museums, which had greater capacity to participate in the collective's construction, mobilization, and service. Following reductions in government support during the 1990s and 2000s, the advisor no longer has the capacity to engage with small museums across the province and the OMA has more actively engaged in a concerted effort to listen to those voices. However, without appropriate funding, their ability to do so on an ongoing basis is limited. While the OHS has a role listening to and serving these small museums, their capacity is perhaps even more limited due to their broader focus and cuts to funding in the 1990s.

The reliance on provincial funding means the advisors' and associations' relationship to the provincial government has shaped their ability to construct a museum community, advocate for its interests, and support its needs. For example, the advisors' roles were redefined when the Province introduced new actors concerned with regional governance, departments become more siloed, and the Province moved away from direct service provision. The Province of Ontario enables and restricts the advisors and associations activities through funding, limiting both service delivery and advocacy.

The evolution of community museum governance in Ontario can, therefore, be explained by examining the construction of a museum community / sector within the context of the advisors and associations changing relationships with the Province and community museums. There is ongoing change as they work with museums, responding to opportunity and need. Key moments of change occur through the (re)creation of governing entities as the advisors and associations advocate for their definition(s) of the sector within changing contexts that provide

opportunities and threats to the continued development of relationships between government and museums.

Two moments, in particular, caused a sustained (re)definition of museum governance in Ontario. First, with a growing number of community museums seeking provincial support and pressure to eliminate the museum grant to municipal museums in the 1970s, the advisors and associations constructed and enacted a museum community that needed provincial assistance to improve. The community had grown too rapidly due to provincial and federal initiatives, leading to museums that did not adhere to the unwritten and ill-defined best practices of the day. In order to rationalize the existing support program and increase accountability for funding, the Province listened to the museum advisors' and associations' call for standards, releasing a community museum policy (1981) that made new standards (1984) a requirement for those accessing the pre-existing operating grant. The Standards aimed to both increase the quality of museums across the province and restrict access to provincial support while also providing a rationalization for provincial involvement. The advisors and associations then assisted museums as they worked to meet the new requirements, providing training, producing resourcing, circulating information, and assembling support. The Standards focused their activities, defining the direction for the future of the museum community.

Second, the support available for community museums, the advisors, and the associations began to decrease in the 1990s as governments responded to economic downturns with reduced funding for culture at both the provincial and federal levels. Within this context, a redefinition of the Standards allowed for the grant program's continued rationalization despite reduced funding due to a government interest in accountability mechanisms. Community museums continued to seek help from associations for training, advice from their peers, information, and advocacy. However, the number of advisors decreased as they retired and now

there is only one, reflecting a government disinterest in serving community museums. While continuing some of the existing funding programs to museums with insufficient budgets, the federal and provincial governments have (re)focused their attention to cultural or tourism policies within which museums are a small component. In this context, the associations use their limited resources to provide the guidance museums need and advocate for greater attention to the sector. The OMA, in particular, has engaged in the construction of a museum sector, which defines museums' contribution to society and needs related to those contributions.

In Ontario, support for community museums is often justified due to their objectives as educational institutions, sites of local action, tourism operators, agents of social change, and inherently valuable collecting institutions. These arguments are not distinct to an Ontario context or even community museum governance. They reflect the rationalization of support to both museums and culture seen in other jurisdictions municipally, provincially, nationally, and internationally (e.g., Gibson 2008, Gray 2015b, McGuigan 2004). However, due to the variety of policy objectives, the number of community museums, and community museums' lack of capacity in comparison to national or provincial institutions, the advisors and associations have an important role as mediators, which is distinct to community museum governance.

The advisors' and associations' legitimization efforts both reflect and lead to multiple overlapping and relating configurations of actors that regulate and support museum activity. For example, due to community museums' perceived role in education, the advisors and associations provide training, facilitate connections, and circulate resources to help museums make public programs. They also advocate for curriculum documents that acknowledge the role of museums in education and encourage museum visits. In comparison, when considering museums and local action, resources assembled relate to relationship development and funding for sustainability work becomes more significant.

While the five constructions of legitimacy co-exist, community museums benefit from different legitimization work across actors, territory, and time, emphasizing particular objectives. Importantly, changes in governance over time reflect and are shaped by changing legitimization work. As noted above, it has become more difficult to rationalize support to actors outside the museum community with arguments that assume museums' value. Instead, support is tied to specific objectives, such as increasing tourism. Within this context, data has become increasingly important in order to demonstrate museums' ability to contribute to those areas of action. Further, the Ontario Museum Association has (re)focused attention from simply advocating for an outcome. They work to raise the profile of museums as actors capable of contributing to diverse government objectives and society more broadly.

While the OMA works to promote museums and advocate for specific objectives, the loss of the advisors is a significant loss for the museum community. The advisors provided a tapestry of service delivery and advocacy that relied on distinct expertise, helping museums achieve different objectives. When they had permission and authority, these advisors were able to work with the relevant government actors to address museums' needs related to specific areas, such as conservation or exhibit design. However, their work was predicated on a government accepting community museums have value as collecting institutions. As a result, community museums that have developed since the 1990s or that had limited capacity at that time, are working to understand restrictions and access support with less assistance than the now established museums once had. Community museum governance is now even more reliant on the community museums themselves to translate their own museum policies, working through the OMA or OHS to advocate for their interests and meet their needs.

In short, Ontario community museum governance includes some persistent funding programs, but has changed due to evolving contexts and multi-level governance. Provincial

museum advisors and associations have had a key role advocating for the museum community and assisting community museums. To that end, they legitimize museum activity and rationalize support according to different museum objectives, contributing to overlapping and intersecting actor-networks that support or regulate specific aspects of museum work. However, due to increasing provincial disinterest and changing economic conditions, the advisor(s)' role has diminished since the 1990s. As a result, the OMA, in particular, has played an increased role in advocacy, working to promote community museums broadly. Its work focuses on a museum sector that contributes to society in multiple ways. Some of those contributions can then be demonstrated with statistical data.

Research Implications

Within this section, I consider my findings in relation to the theoretical propositions outlined in Chapter Three, discussing the implications of my research. First, I have found a shift in the work of governing, moving from an emphasis on the museum community's need to the sector's contributions to society and distinct policy objectives, in response to growing government disinterest in community museums. Second, I argue the establishment of government instruments targeting museums with a clear rationalization and legitimizing museum work have enabled continued support within unfriendly contexts. Third, a consideration of the museum advisors' and associations' relationships, which distinguishes community museum governance from the governance of national or provincial institutions, demonstrates particular museums have privileged access to the work of governing. As a result, there is a hierarchy of museums in community museum governance.

A Complex Web of Action, A Weak Base of Support

Actors, such as cultural organizations, can interact with multiple policy instruments with diverse objectives in which they occupy multiple roles. As such, there are a multiplicity of instruments with distinct objectives of relevance to community museums, legitimizing museum work differently. In particular, this thesis found community museum governance involves policy instruments and museum roles related to education, local governance, tourism, social change, and collections or nonprofit management.

The multiple possible roles for museums complicate community museum governance. Within this context, the advisors and associations distinguish community museum governance from national or provincial institutions' governance. They do the work of governing, assembling and disseminating information about the various funding opportunities, regulatory requirements, and other resources. They advocate for favorable regulatory legislation or funding with a variety of potentially relevant actors, relating to museums' multiple roles. This multiplicity both strengthens and weakens the legitimacy of community museums as tools and targets of government support. However, it has become necessary because, since the 1990s, governments are more willing to partner with a sector that contributes to diverse policy objectives than support a museum community with specific needs.

Importantly, Chapter Six demonstrates the advisors and associations have always rationalized museum support with reference to multiple objectives, such as tourism and education. To that end, they legitimize museum work in multiple ways, appealing to broad audiences and facilitating relationships with different ministries. Distinct legitimizations of museum work have, therefore, rationalized the (re)development of funding programs, resources, or other instruments to sustain community museums. However, advocacy for

support relating to diverse policy objectives has become more central to the OMA's activities since the 1990s because the provincial and federal governments have moved away from direct support for culture and museums as museums. Within this context, museums' contributions to diverse policy objectives is a strength that enables the rationalization of support through the construction of a sector, contributing to society and the economy despite disinterest in museums as collecting institutions.

While the diversity of possible museum roles can help sustain community museums in an era of government disinterest, it also limits the capacity of those legitimizing museum work and rationalizing their support. Engaging with a larger number of actors requires resources, such as time and pre-existing relationships. Despite the significance of a variety of departments and instruments to community museums, museums are not generally seen as significant to those actors. Interview participants frequently noted museums are not well integrated in the work of the ministries or sections responsible for education, tourism, and municipalities. As a result, the associations, advisors, and museums themselves necessarily engage in ongoing translation to position themselves as relevant to areas of action that fall outside a ministry of culture.

Reinforcing the emphasis on museums' contributions to diverse policy objectives, there has also been a (re)definition of museums roles' from within the museum community, which does not always align with government attention and resources. In particular, community museums and their associations are seeking support and advocating for their work on social justice issues despite a lack of government funding. As such, community museums' connections to various policy objectives are not simple examples of policy attachment. Instead, there has been a redefinition of community museums' roles in relation to both government funders' objectives and changing understandings within the museum community as to appropriate museum priorities.

While building relationships with a variety of actors reflects both funding need and (re)definitions of museums' role, the work has become more challenging due to a reduced role in community museum governance for the advisor(s). Since the 1990s, the advisors have had limited capacity and authority within government. The OHS has a broad scope and limited budget, which has similarly limited their advocacy work for community museums. As such, the OMA most notably engages in concerted and ongoing work to develop opportunities for museums and advocate for a consideration of museums in policy instruments related to different areas of government action. To that end, they rely on provincial funding to support their activities and their members' labor. Their human resources are finite, and their access is, in some ways, more limited than the advisors in the past, restricting their capacity. In the absence of one department or government actor responsible for museums, their efforts become more dispersed. The dispersement of effort may weaken the sector's ability to form the relationships they now need and want.

In short, my research has shown community museums have multiple roles and interact with diverse government instruments. Responding to growing government disinterest in museums, the primary museum association has (re)focused their advocacy efforts to defining a sector that contributes to society and a variety of policy objectives, legitimizing museums' incorporation in and use of the different policy instruments. This diversity strengthens the legitimization of museum work as museums help governments meet policy objectives and engage in work seen as relevant to larger museum communities. At the same time, rationalizing support is more difficult with a large number of relevant actors and limited attention to museums within the department responsible for culture, necessitating a dispersion of resources devoted to advocacy work and training on those issues.

Standards, Museums and Other Instruments

Policy instruments, including those mobilizing and targeting community museums, (re)define relationships in museum governance. In particular, across different jurisdictions, support for museum associations, project funding, and the development of standards have (re)structured relationships between government and community museums. Within the Ontario case, provincial funding and legislation for the OHS gave the association the capacity to encourage museum development and organize museum workers who then pushed for policy change. Provincial and federal project funding, including funding for employment, had the unintended but not unforeseeable effect of increasing the number of community museums. Ontario's growing number of community museums were then able to organize through the federally and provincially funded OMA, which helped professionalize the sector and push for changes in the instruments targeting community museums. Most notably, the Province has provincial museum advisors and standards that have facilitated access to funding and guided community museums' development, establishing best practices. Within a changing context of provincial disinterest in community museums, this thesis found the Standards and grant program have maintained direct provincial involvement in museum governance, rationalizing ongoing support and articulating a need for at least one advisor despite community museums' deprioritization in government. Standards and/or forms of accreditation have similarly rationalized provincial support to museums in Alberta (Alberta Museum Association 2017), Manitoba (Manitoba 2020), Nova Scotia (Kierstead 2011), and Quebec (Culture et Communications 2020).

The *Standards for Community Museums in Ontario* rationalized provincial support to community museums when the operating grant was threatened due to an increased budget and calls to deconditionalize grants to municipalities in the 1970s. They helped (re)define

relationships in community museum governance during the 1980s. The Province provided project support through existing programs and continued operational funding, which was not increased to expected levels or redistributed to address historic inequities. The project funding often involved a matching component and, as a result, museums also sought funding through federal project grants. The associations and advisors provided professional development, advice, and guided museums as they worked to meet the requirements. Some museums, many of which were municipal and/or already receiving provincial funding, used the Standards and the threat of reduced provincial support to convince their local governments and/or boards to support improvement projects. The advisors, associations, and museums also engaged with government instruments of relevance to the Standards. For example, the curriculum was and is relevant to meeting the interpretation standard. Following cuts to the grant program, the Standards were (re)defined, reiterating a provincial commitment related to community museums' ongoing improvement with an accountability mechanism. To that end, the OMA collaborated with the advisors to provide training.

While the Standards have had a key role (re)defining relationships in museum governance, they no longer function to improve museum practice. Best practices have changed, and the Standards now represent a minimum requirement. However, within the context of government disinterest, the *Standards for Community Museums in Ontario* have rationalized the advisors' and operational grant's existence, providing the parameters to their role. The existence of a regulatory grant with a clear rationalization has assured continued provincial support for community museums' operations mediated through an advisor despite a decrease in the number of advisors and provincial withdraw from a service role. The grant formula means museums usually receive the same grant amount each year so long as they continue to apply and meet changing expectations. When arguing for support to community museum operations,

the advisors and associations are then able to argue for increases, changes to the process, and/or the continued existence of the program. Despite ongoing government disinterest, translation takes place in an environment with some consensus that the Province has a role supporting museum operations due to the existence of a well-defined program with a relatively long history.

The Standards also legitimize museums' relationships with other policy areas, such as education and accessibility. Museums have been included in some policy instruments within these areas. Most notably, museums were included in curriculum documents, which legitimized claims that museums are educational institutions and rationalizes the continued inclusion in the curriculum. Other examples include informational resources the Province produced during municipal amalgamation, tourism sign policy, and TRC's final report. Like the Standards, these documents and instruments have legitimized community museums' consideration in policy areas that are not explicitly cultural and museum activities that target specific objectives.

In short, this thesis found the *Standards for Community Museums in Ontario* have (re)structured relationships amongst actors involved in governance. The document rationalizes government support and legitimates the work of museums, their associations, as well as the advisors. Within a changing context that is less friendly to community museums, the pre-existence consensus has helped the advisors, associations, and museums resist a provincial withdraw from operational support and advocate for additional investment. However, since the 1990s, the Standards have also restricted access to the operating grant. Museums already in the program that did not meet the standards received help from the advisors, support from provincial and federal project grants, a ten-year period to meet the requirements, and flexibility in the assessment. After the standards were established, museums that sought funding did not have the same opportunities and/or were not given funding because the standards were closed

to new museums. Notably, the Review in the late 1990s, resulted in updated standards with additional requirements and additional museums' inclusion in the program but did not address the historic inequities in the grant formula. As such, the Standards reinforce a hierarchy of capacity in community museums, reflecting historic funding inequities.

Power and Community Museums

The advisors' and associations' translation activities, such as policy attachment, result in relationships that influence power dynamics between actors. They have defined the needs of the museum community or sector, addressing those needs through relationship building. The relationships that develop reflect, reinforce, and result in specific power dynamics. Community museums are involved in their own governance through their relationships with the museum advisors and associations. However, the role of the advisor has become limited. The associations, which also do the work of governing, are not independent from the museums they represent. The OMA's work, in particular, is enacted and defined by its members who respond to surveys, participate on committees, and sit on council. As a result, some museums have a privileged position within governance as they define the museum community and advocate for its interests in key moments.

When working independently to assemble resources, community museums necessarily rely on opportunities in moments of time. The development of museum associations and the existence of a museum professional within government allowed community museums in Ontario to plan for their governance over the long term. The museum associations provide a locus for the museum community, defining their needs, history, and a way forward. As a collective, working alongside the museum advisors who were both government actors and part

of the community, community museums advocated for a grant, museum advisors, project funding, and changes to or the development of other government actions. Their work contributed to the inclusion of museums in the operational grants for recreational activities in the 1950s, the development of a museum advisor position, as well as the creation and content of the Standards. More broadly, they have also contributed to government instruments' processes and content related to project funding, tourism, education, and nonprofits. However, their capacity to engage in this work is both enabled and limited through their government funders.

Community museums do not all have the same capacity to engage with their associations. Municipal museums, which often have greater resources than their nonprofit counterparts, and other CMOG supported museums have historically been more active in the OMA, which is the primary museum association engaged in advocacy for community museums. As a result, the collective consensus on community museums' need has historically reflected the consensus of municipal museums. In particular, while pushing for standards, the voices of small historic house museums that opposed their development were silenced. However, once the Standards were adopted, the OMA stopped working for consensus and allowed for more vocal dissent through their publications. Consensus was no longer required as the creation of the Standards provided the structure for governance in Ontario, rationalizing government funding and legitimizing museum work. However, they also introduced a barrier to new museums seeking funding, reinforcing discrepancies in museums' capacities.

In short, museum governance has resulted from the coproduction of actors. It is not the compliance of community museums to government action, nor is it a rejection of government action. Community museums shape their own governance through their relationships with both museum advisors with government and the associations. However, this thesis has found not all

community museums have the same capacity to engage in the work of governing through their associations. Instead, municipal museums have a privileged position. The advisors, historically, worked to include small community museums through their advisory work. The loss of the museum advisor's advisory role, therefore, contributes to and reinforces inequities in museum governance. The advisors' role processing the grant, in particular, reinforces inequities, restricting access based on the museums' historic relationship to the grant. While the OMA is engaging in ongoing work to serve and include all museums' voices, as a membership organization their capacity to speak for all museums is limited.

Future Research

While nonprofit and municipal museums often belong to the same category for funding purposes, their relationships to governments are distinct. In some ways, my research suggests municipal and nonprofit museum governance are as different as the governance of national or provincial institutions in comparison to community museums. In particular, community museums' relationships to their municipalities offer long term security and sustainability that nonprofit museums do not have. Additional research providing a comparative analysis would improve understanding of community museum governance.

This thesis demonstrated municipal museums have a key role in the evolution of community museum governance due to their operational capacity in comparison to their nonprofit counterparts. There are additional differences at the local level. For instance, municipal support can determine a museum's ability to access support from other levels of government. Municipal museums also have distinct relationships to provincial legislation, such as employment equity, due to their access to municipal departments. Further, municipal

museums have relationships with other municipal collecting institutions, which may be of relevance.

Nonprofit museums' policy environment is distinct from municipal museums'. Most notably, support from their municipalities is not guaranteed, they pay municipal property taxes, and they do not have access to municipal actors to assist in areas like information technology. Most importantly, they face a distinct set of regulatory measures from the provincial or federal governments due to their nonprofit status. Some of these institutions have relationships with the OHS rather than the OMA and do not receive the provincial operating grant.

The nonprofit community museums warrant study because they are disproportionately influenced by the advisors' reduced role. Further, municipal museums have historically focused on the foundation of the municipality or regions, often privileging the narratives of white European settlers that formed these governments. Within Ontario, there are a number of nonprofit community museums addressing gaps in these narratives. Considering increasing government disinterest, to what extent has community museum governance supported capacity building in these institutions?

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Acts and Regulations

Ontario

Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005, S.O. 2005, c. 11

An Act to incorporate The Ontario Historical Society, 1899

An Act to provide for the Establishment of a Provincial Museum, 1912, c.80

Art Gallery of Ontario Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. A.28

Department of Education Act, R.S.O. 1957
Reg. 57/57: Programmes of Recreation

Human Rights Code, R.S.O. 1990, c. H.19

Ministry of Citizenship and Culture Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. M.18

Ministry of Colleges and Universities Act, 1971
Reg. 720/73: Grants for Museums

Ministry of Culture and Recreation Act, 1974, SO 1974, c. 120

Ministry of Tourism and Recreation Act, R.S.O. 1990

Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25

Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18
Reg. 877: GRANTS FOR MUSEUMS

Pay Equity Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.7

Royal Ontario Museum Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. R.35

Social Contract Act, 1993, S.O. 1993, c. 5

The Department of Education Act, 1954
Reg. 57/57: Programmes of Recreation, Museum Programmes

The Department of Tourism and Information Act

Reg. 293/61: Grants for (Historical) Museums
 Reg. 81/69: Grants for Museums

The Department of Travel and Publicity Act, 1960

The Ontario Heritage Act, 1974, SO 1974, c 122

Reg. 837/74: Grants for Museums
 Reg. 709/75: Grants for Museums
 Reg. 187/77: Grants for Museums
 Reg. 398/81: Grants to Museums
 Reg. 877: Grants for Museums

The Ontario Lottery Corporation Act, 1974, SO 1974, c 126

Other Government Publications

Canada

Bachmann, Karen. Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. 2016. *Evidence*. 42nd Parliament, 1st session, meeting no. 22. Accessed:

<https://www.ourcommons.ca/DocumentViewer/en/42-1/CHPC/meeting-22/evidence>

Canadian Heritage Information Network. 2017. "Digital Preservation – Best Practices for Museums." Accessed: <https://www.canada.ca/en/heritage-information-network/services/digital-preservation/best-practices-museums/abstract.html>

Cole, Catherine. Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. 2016. *Evidence*. 42nd Parliament, 1st session, meeting no. 22. Accessed:

<https://www.ourcommons.ca/DocumentViewer/en/42-1/CHPC/meeting-22/evidence>

Dabrusin, Julie. 2018. *Moving Forward: Towards a Stronger Canadian Museum Sector*. Ottawa: Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. Accessed:

<https://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/Committee/421/CHPC/Reports/RP10011476/chpcrp12/chpcrp12-e.pdf>

Government of Canada. 2011. "Canada's Federal Tourism Strategy: Welcoming the World." Ottawa. Accessed:

https://www.otec.org/Files/pdf/resources/Canadas_Federal_Tourism_Strategy-eng.aspx

———. 2017. "RE-ORG: Canada." Advanced Professional Development Workshops. Accessed:

<https://www.canada.ca/en/conservation-institute/services/workshops-conferences/advanced-professional-development-workshops/re-org-canada.html>

Innovation Science and Economic Development. 2019a. "Creating Middle Class Jobs: A Federal Tourism Growth Strategy." Tourism in Canada. Accessed:

<https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/134.nsf/eng/00003.html>

———. 2019b. "Government of Canada's New Federal Tourism Growth Strategy Empowers Communities Across Canada to Create Jobs for the Middle Class." News Release. Accessed:

<https://www.canada.ca/en/innovation-science-economic-development/news/2019/05/government-of-canadas-new-federal-tourism-growth-strategy-empowers-communities-across-canada-to-create-jobs-for-the-middle-class.html>

Langlois, Marie-Claude. 2013. "Canada's National Museums." Research Publications. Accessed:

https://lop.parl.ca/sites/PublicWebsite/default/en_CA/ResearchPublications/201306E

Massey, Vincent, et al. 1951. *Report: Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, 1949-1951*. Ottawa: King's Printer.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. 2015. *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action*. Winnipeg. Accessed:

http://trc.ca/assets/pdf/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf

Watkins, Joanne. Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. 2016. *Evidence*. 42nd Parliament, 1st session, meeting no. 22. Accessed:

<https://www.ourcommons.ca/DocumentViewer/en/42-1/CHPC/meeting-22/evidence>

Ontario

Citizenship, Culture, and Recreation, Ministry of. 1997. *Ontario Government Business Plans 1997-98: Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation*. Toronto.

———. 2000. *Standards for Community Museums in Ontario [Revised Edition: August 2000]*. Toronto.

Community Museums and Heritage Organizations Unit. 1992. *A Report on Standards and Community Museums: 1991 Survey Results*. Toronto.

Culture and Communications, Ministry of. 1990a. *A Strategy for Conserving Ontario's Heritage: The Report of the Ontario Heritage Policy Review*. Toronto.

———. 1990b. *A Vision of Heritage: Heritage Goals for Ontario*. Toronto.

Culture and Recreation, Ministry of. 1980. *Places to Grow: A Report on Capital Investment Made by the Ontario Ministry of Culture and Recreation, 1975-1979*. Toronto.

Education and Training, Ministry of. 1999a. *The Ontario Curriculum Grades 9 and 10: Classical and International Languages*. Toronto: Government of Ontario.

———. 1999b. *The Ontario Curriculum Grades 9 and 10: Native Studies*. Toronto: Government of Ontario. Accessed: <https://collections.ola.org/mon/14000/206300.pdf>.

———. 1999c. *The Ontario Curriculum Grades 9 and 10: The Arts*. Toronto: Government of Ontario. Accessed: <https://collections.ola.org/mon/14000/206284.pdf>.

———. 1999d. *The Ontario Curriculum Grades 9 to 12: English as a Second Language and English Literacy Development*. Toronto: Government of Ontario. Accessed: <https://collections.ola.org/mon/10000/206286.pdf>.

Education, Ministry of. 1975. *The Formative Years*. Toronto: Government of Ontario.

———. 2013. *The Ontario Curriculum Grades 9 to 12: Social Studies and Humanities*. Toronto: Government of Ontario.

Fisher, Douglas. 1980. *The Policy and Programs of the Ontario Government for Recreation, Sport and Fitness*. Toronto: Ministry of Culture and Recreation.

Government, Ontario. 2016. "The Journey Together: Ontario's Commitment to Reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples." Toronto. Accessed: <https://www.ontario.ca/page/journey-together-ontarios-commitment-reconciliation-indigenous-peoples>

Heritage Administration Branch. 1979. *A Redefinition of the Ministry's Support Role for Ontario's Local Museums, 1979*. Toronto.

Heritage and Libraries Branch. 2001. "Analysis of the 1999 Community Museum Operating Grant." *Currently* 24 (2): 10–11.

Heritage Branch. 1984. *Standards for Community Museums in Ontario*. Toronto.

Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture Industries, Ministry of. 2017. "Tourism Regions." Accessed: <http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/regions/regions.shtml>

———. 2018a. "Ontario's Government for the People Strengthening Tourism Sector." News

- Release. Accessed: <https://news.ontario.ca/mtc/en/2018/10/ontarios-government-for-the-people-strengthening-tourism-sector.html>
- — —. 2018b. "Respecting Ontario's Tourism Businesses." News Release. <https://news.ontario.ca/mtc/en/2018/12/respecting-ontarios-tourism-businesses.html>.
- — —. 2019. "Cultural Planning." Accessed: http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/culture/cul_planning.shtml
- Historical and Museums Branch. 1973. *Suggested Programme for the Development of Local Museums in Ontario*. Toronto.
- Lalonde, Marie. Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs. 2017. *Official Report of Debates (Hansard) F-42*. 38th Parliament, second session.
- McMeekin, Kemp. 1980. *A Survey of the Conservation Requirements of the Museum Community in Ontario (Draft)*. Toronto.
- Museums Section. 1977. *Establishing a Museum?*. Toronto.
- — —. 1981. *Community Museums Policy for Ontario*. Toronto.
- Ontario Trillium Foundation. 2020. "Grants Search Tool. Keyword: Museum." *Our Impact*. Accessed: <https://otf.ca/our-impact/grants-search-tool>
- Office of the Auditor General of Ontario. 1997. "Follow-up of Recommendations in the 1995 Annual Report." In *1997 Annual Report*, 235–66. Toronto.
- Ontario, Government of. 2016. *The Ontario Cultural Strategy: Telling Our Stories, Growing Our Economy*. Toronto. Accessed: <https://www.ontario.ca/page/ontario-culture-strategy-telling-our-stories-growing-our-economy>
- — —. 2017. "2017-2018 Tourism Industry Partners Program Frequently Asked Questions." Grants Portal. Accessed: http://www.grants.gov.on.ca/prodconsum/groups/grants_web_contents/documents/grants_web_contents/prdr016381.pdf
- — —. 2019. "Community Museum Operating and Pay Equity Grants." Grants Portal. Accessed: https://www.grants.gov.on.ca/prodconsum/groups/grants_web_contents/documents/grants_web_contents/prdr018577.pdf
- Ontario Cultural Attractions Fund. 2019. "About OCAF." Ontario Cultural Attractions Fund. Accessed: <https://www.ocaf.on.ca/about/>.
- Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario. 1968. *Living and Learning: Report*. Toronto: Newton Pub. Co.
- Salter, Eva, Jerry Corriveau, Jane Holland, Carol Oitment, and Steve Rockel. 2001. *Sustaining Our Facility Investment: SOFI III Final Report*. Toronto.
- Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs. 2015. "Tuesday 29 January." Accessed: http://www.ontla.on.ca/web/committee-proceedings/committee_transcripts_details.do?locale=en&Date=2015-01-29&ParlCommID=8997&DocumentID=28602#P193_49635
- Task Force on the Ontario Museum Association Brief. 1975. *Final Report and Recommendations*. Toronto.
- Tourism and Culture, Ministry of. c. 2011. "Governance: Municipal Museums." *Museum Note*. Accessed: <http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/museums/notes/Museum%20Note%20Governance%20Municipal%20Museums.pdf>
- Tourism, Culture, and Recreation, Ministry of. 2001. *2001-2002 Business Plan*. Toronto.
- Tourism, Culture, and Sport, Ministry of. 2012. *Welcoming Investors: A Tourism Investment Attraction Strategy for Ontario*. Toronto: Government of Ontario. Accessed: http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/publications/welcoming_investors.pdf

- . 2015. *Telling Our Stories, Growing Our Economy: Developing a Cultural Strategy for Ontario, Discussion Paper*. Toronto. Accessed: http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/publications/Culture_Strategy_Discussion_Paper.pdf
- . 2016a. Culture Talks: A Summary of What We Heard from Ontarians. Toronto. Accessed: <https://www.ontario.ca/page/culture-talks-summary-what-we-heard-ontarians>
- . 2016b. *Growing Tourism Together: Strategic Framework for Tourism in Ontario*. Toronto: Government of Ontario. Accessed: <http://centralcounties.ca/wp-content/uploads/Strategic-Framework-for-Tourism-in-Ontario.pdf>
- . 2017. "Standards for Community Museums in Ontario." Accessed: http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/museums/museums_standards.shtml

Municipal

- Municipal Cultural Planning Incorporated. 2011. *Municipal Cultural Planning : A Toolkit for Ontario Municipalities*. Accessed: https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/dcculturalplan/pages/81/attachments/original/1473983236/MunicipalCulturalPlanning_AToolkitForOntarioMunicipalities_digital.pdf?1473983236
- Town of Markham. 2010. "Everyone Welcome: Markham Diversity Action Plan." Markham. Accessed: https://www.markham.ca/wps/wcm/connect/markham/d9def2b1-32f9-4ed2-984e-a39d5482455e/Markham-DAP-FINAL.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CONVERT_TO=url&CACHEID=ROOTWORKSPACE.Z182QD4H901OGV160QC8BLCRJ1001-d9def2b1-32f9-4ed2-984e-a39d5482455e-msYKPSY

Other

- Culture et Communications. 2020. "Guide des exigences." Quebec. Accessed: https://aim.formulaires.mcc.gouv.qc.ca/guide/#guide_24026
- Manitoba. 2020. *Community Museum Grants Program Guidelines*. Accessed: https://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/grants/pdf/cmgp_guidelines_2014-06-03.pdf
- Ministère de la culture, France. 2020. "Service des Musées de France." Accessed: <http://traduction.culture.gouv.fr/url/Result.aspx?to=en&url=https://www.culture.gouv.fr/Nous-connaître/Organisation/La-direction-generale-des-patrimoines/Service-des-Musees-de-France>

Museum, Association, and Related Publications

- Alberta Museum Association. 2017. "Operational Staffing Grants." Accessed: https://www.museums.ab.ca/media/81993/operational_staffing_grant_overview_and_guidelines.pdf
- Avedon, Elliot. 1984. "The Waterloo-Wellington Museum Management Cooperative: A Progress Report January 1984." *Museum Quarterly* 13(2): 25–26.
- Baeker, Greg. 1985. "Focus: Consultation '85." *Museum Quarterly* 14 (3): 4–5.
- Billich, Dorie. 2004. "OHS Museums Committee Report." *OHS Bulletin*, no. 144.
- BMGA Association. 2020. "About Us." BMGA. Accessed: <https://bmga.ca/about.asp+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ca&client=safari>
- Brent, Marty. 1984. "The Standards for Community Museums in Ontario." *Museum Quarterly* 13

(3): 7–8.

- Brown, David. 2004. "At the Breaking Point." *Muse* (July/Augus): 16-20.
- Canadian Centre for Diversity and Inclusion. 2019. *Executive Summary*. Accessed: <https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/members/ExecutiveSummary.pdf>
- Canadian Conference of the Arts, Canadian Arts Coalition, and Saskatchewan Arts Alliance. 2015. "Budget 2015: Culture and Arts, Still a Low Priority for the Government." http://ccarts.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Budget_Analysis_2015_en-1.pdf
- Canadian Museums Association. 1972. "Canadian Museums Association Programs in Progress and Under Development 1972." *Gazette* 6 (2): 14-17.
- . 1977. *Annual Report*. Ottawa.
- . 1984. "New Standards for Ontario Museums." *Museogramme* 12 (7): 1-2.
- . 1992. "CMA Annual Report for 1991-1992." *Museogramme* 20 (9): 1–5.
- . 1994. *Cultural Diversity and Museums: Exploring Our Identities*. Ottawa: Canadian Museums Association.
- . 1995. *Annual Report 1994 - 1995*. Ottawa.
- . 1997. *Annual Report 1996-1997*. Ottawa.
- . 1999. *Ethics Guidelines*. Ottawa. Accessed: <https://www.museums.ca/uploaded/web/docs/ethicsguidelines.pdf>
- . 2001. *More than Willing Hands: A Report on Volunarism at Museums*. Ottawa. Accessed: <https://www.museums.ca/uploaded/web/docs/volunteers.pdf>
- . 2009. *Canadian Museums Day: September 29, 2009*. Accessed: <https://www.museums.ca/uploaded/web/docs/FactSheet.pdf>
- . 2016. *The State of Museums in Canada: Brief to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage*. Accessed: https://museums.in1touch.org/uploaded/web/docs/Advocacy/CMA_Recommendations_C_HPC_2016_EN.pdf
- . 2018a. *Submission for the Pre-Budget Consultations in Advance of the 2019 Budget*. Accessed: <https://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/Committee/421/FINA/Brief/BR10006755/br-external/CanadianMuseumsAssociation-e.pdf>
- . 2018b. *LGBTQ2+Inclusion in Canadian Museums [Draft]*. Accessed: http://museums.in1touch.org/uploaded/web/docs/Documents/LGBTQ2%2B_Inclusion_Canadian_Museums.pdf
- . 2020. "About the CMA." Accessed: <https://www.museums.ca/site/aboutthecma>
- Carter, John. 1981. "Museum Studies Programmes: The OMA Certificate Programme Comes of Age." *Quarterly* 10 (4): 14.
- . 1988. "Education in Museums: The Potential Impact of New Ministry of Education Guidelines on Interpretation and Education PProgrammes in Ontario Community Museums." *OMA Technical Leaflet* 7.
- . 1992. "The Evolution of Museums and Education in Ontario." *Ontario Museum Annual* 1: 29-34.
- . 1993. "Museums Across the Curriculum." In *Second Museum Education Colloquium*, 25-34. Toronto: Ontario Museum Association.
- . 1997. "Community Museums, Municipal Restructuring and Amalgamation." *OHS Bulletin*, 112: 1.
- Chandler, Graham. 2005. "Going Steady: Developing Committed Community Relationships." *Muse* (July/August): 18–23.
- Chessell, Janet. 1992. "The Development of the Certificate in Museum Studies." *Currently* 15 (5).

- Council of the Ontario Museum Association, The. 1978. *Deconditionalization of Museum Grants*. Presented to Hon. W. Darcy McKeough, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs. Toronto.
- Doxtator, Deborah. 1993. "First Peoples and Museums: Guest Editorial." *Ontario Museum Annual* 2: 2.
- Duncan, Dorothy. 1988. "Museums Committee Turns 35! Part 1: The Committee Forms." *OHS Bulletin* 56: 8.
- Fraser, Cheryl, and Elka Weinstein. 2015. *How to Create a Social Media Plan*. Conference 2015. Accessed: [https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/members/members/Conf2015/Social Media.pdf](https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/members/members/Conf2015/Social%20Media.pdf)
- Furness, Petal. 2018. "Letter." ENews Alert: Respond to the MTCS Discussion Paper. Accessed: <https://members.museumsontario.ca/resources/news/item/eneews-alert-respond-mtcs-discussion-paper>
- Gamble, Verna. 1983. "Announcements." *Museums Section Newsletter* (Spring): 1.
- Gerrard, Richard. 1994. "Evolution, Revolution and the Laundry List." *Ontario Museum Annual* 3: 40-45.
- Gooding, S. James. 1959. "The Work of Provincial Museum Advisors." *Ontario Historical Society Museums Section Workshop Report*, 7-10. Ontario Historical Society.
- . 1963. "Equipment and Material for Museums." In *The Ontario Historical Society Museums Section Workshop Report*, 9-12. Windsor: Ontario Historical Society.
- Grant, Laurence. 1992. "Cultural Pluralism in Three Ontario Community Museums." *Muse* 9 (3): 54-56.
- Hayes, Peter, and John Carter. 1980. "The Museum & the School Board: A Place for Co-Operative Curriculum Design." *Quarterly* 9 (1): 5.
- Heinrich, T. A. 1955. "Standards in a Small Museum." In *Museum Workshop*, 7-9. Ontario Historical Society.
- Hill Strategies Research Inc. 2016a. *Ontario's Museums 2014 Profile*. Toronto. Accessed: [https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/members/OntarioMuseums2014 Profile Online.pdf](https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/members/OntarioMuseums2014Profile%20Online.pdf)
- . 2016b. *Ontario's Museums 2014 Profile Highlights*. Toronto. Accessed: [https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/members/publications/ProfileHighlights OnlineView2.pdf](https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/members/publications/ProfileHighlights%20OnlineView2.pdf)
- Hough, Douglas. 1972. "Report from the Membership Committee." *Newsletter* 1 (1).
- Inglis, Robin, Margaret Machell, Olive Newcombe, David Young, Rodger McNicoll, Rory O'Donal, Martin Lewis, et al. 1975. *A Museum Policy for Ontario*. Toronto.
- Jolliffe, Lee and Gobson, Richard. 1976. "The Community Museum and the Curriculum-Related Museum Education Programme." *Newsletter* 5(1): 7-14.
- Jordan, Katherine. 1972. "O.M.A: Inaugural Meeting." *Newsletter* 1 (1).
- Key, Archibald F., and Marjorie E. Key. 1968. *Canadian Museums and Related Institutions*. Ottawa: Canadian Museums Association.
- Key, Archie F. 1973. *Beyond Four Walls: The Origins and Development of Canadian Museums*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited.
- Kierstead, Karin. 2011. "Community Museum Assistance Program." Museums Nova Scotia. Accessed: <http://passagemuseums.blogspot.com/2011/04/community-museums.html>
- Kurylo, Lynne. 1984. "The Ministry of Citizenship and Culture's Standards: Better Museums for Ontario or Re-Arranging the Deck Chairs on the Titanic." *Museum Quarterly* 13 (3): 9-13.
- Lalonde, Marie. 2016. *Ontario Museum Association Pre-Budget Submission 2016*. Ontario

- Museum Association. Accessed:
<https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/members/enews/Pre-Budget-Submission-OntarioMuseumAssociation.pdf>
- . 2018. *Letter to the Honourable Michael Tibollo*. OMA Website. Accessed:
<https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/%5BFinal%5D%20TODS%20signs%20letter%20to%20Min%20Tibollo.pdf>
- Leduc, SM. 2020. "Reconciliation Program Update." *Muse Magazine Online*. Accessed:
https://museums.ca/site/reportsandpublications/museonline/spring2020_reconciliation
- Leverly, Rob. 2015. "Executive Director's Report." *OHS Bulletin*, 194: 3.
- Leonard, Jim. 1991. "Automating the Small Museum Through Networking: Ontario's Trillium Project." *Muse* 9 (1): 74–78.
- Leonard, Meredith. 2012. "Community 'InReach': Adapting Principles from the Ecomuseum Model to Deliver Accessible Programming in a Rural Community." In *Proceedings of the Tenth Colloquium on Learning in Museums*, 56–68. St. Catharines: Ontario Museum Association.
- Liu, Dan, and Birgitta Macleod. n.d. "The Chinese Community in Markham." Cultural Diversity and Museums Publication. Accessed:
https://www.museums.ca/uploaded/web/docs/DLiu_BMacLeod_The_Chinese_Community_in_Markham.pdf
- Local Museums Committee. 1953. "No Title." *News Letter* 1 (1).
- Looking Ahead Task Force. 2015. *Ontario's Museums 2025: Looking Ahead - Towards a Strategic Vision and Action Plan*. Toronto.
- . 2016. *Ontario's Museums 2025: Strategic Vision & Action Plan*. Toronto. Accessed:
https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/members/publications/OntarioMuseums2025_OnlineView.pdf
- Machell, Margaret. 1978. "A Message from the President." *Newsletter* 3 (3): i–ii.
- May, Margaret L. 1993. "What the JobsOntario Community Action Grant Program Has to Offer the Museum Community." *Currently* 16 (6): 5.
- . 1994. "What the JobsOntario Community Action Grant Program Has to Offer to the Museum Community." *Currently* 16 (6): 5.
- McAvity, John G. 1981. "Canadian Museum Advisory Services: Role, Impact and Future." *Gazette* 14(3-2): 34-41.
- . 1994. "Preface." In *Cultural Diversity and Museums: Exploring Our Identities*, 3. Canadian Museums Association.
- McKeown, David E. 1976. "Museums and Education." *Newsletter* 5(1): 33.
- Miers, Sir Henry, and S.F. Markham. 1932. *A Report on the Museums of Canada*. Edinburgh: T. and A. Constable.
- Moore, Guy. 1994. "The Museum and the Tourist," in *Past Reflections: Museum Clippings*, edited by The Ontario Historical Society's Museums Committee. Willowdale: The Ontario Historical Society.
- Musée Bytown Museum. 2018. *Financial Statements*. Accessed:
<https://bytownmuseum.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/BYT03-20181231-Financial-Statements-ML-Electronic-signed-by-client.pdf>
- Museum Accessibility Inclusion and Engagement Collaborative. 2018. *Inclusion 2025: A Practitioner's Guide to Inclusive Museums*. Toronto. Accessed:
https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/UPLOADABLE_INCLUSION_2025_April_2018.pdf
- Nantais-Bourdeau, Sylvie. 1994. "The Marginalization of Ontario Museums in the Social Contract

- Years: The Importance of Being Important." *Museogramme* 22 (1): 1–6.
- Ontario Historical Society, The. 2008. *Accessible Heritage: An Accessibility Tool Kit for Ontario's Heritage Organizations and Institutions*. Toronto: Ontario Historical Society.
- Ontario Museum Association. 1986. *Towards Museums for a New Century in Ontario*. Toronto.
- . 1994. "Creating Our Future: Ontario Museum Association Five Year Strategic Plan 1994-1999." *Currently* 16 (6): Insert.
- . 1997. "Death by a Thousand Cuts: Ontario Budget Fine Print." *Currently* 20 (4): 5.
- . 1999. *1998-99 Annual Report of the Ontario Museum Association*. Toronto.
- . 2000. *OMA/AMO Annual Report 1999-2000*. Toronto.
- . 2002. *Annual Report 2001-2002*. Toronto.
- . 2005. *Ontario Museum Association Annual Report 04 | 05*. Toronto.
- . 2006. "Help Support Ontario's Museums! – Postcard Campaign." News. Accessed: <https://members.museumsontario.ca/resources/news/item/help-support-ontarios-museums-postcard-campaign>
- . 2007. "Provincial Budget 2007: Good News for Museums." News. Accessed: <https://members.museumsontario.ca/resources/news/item/provincial-budget-2007-good-news-for-museums>
- . 2008a. *Ontario Museum Association Annual Report 07/08*. Toronto. Accessed: <https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/members/AnnualReport0708.pdf>
- . 2008b. *Research into the Sustainability of Ontario's Community Museums: CMOG Snapshot 2000-2004*. Toronto. Accessed: <https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/members/CMOGsnapshot20002004.pdf>
- . 2010. *Reinforcing Relevance: The Strategic Plan of the OMA, 2010-2015 Summary Version*. Toronto. Accessed: <https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/StrategicPlanPresentation%20image%20update%20July%202018.pdf>
- . 2011. "OMA ENews Alert: Culture Ministry Updates." Accessed: <https://members.museumsontario.ca/resources/news/item/oma-eneews-alert-culture-ministry-updates>.
- . 2013a. *Annual Report 2012-2013*. Toronto. Accessed: https://issuu.com/museumsontario/docs/2012-2013_oma-annualreport
- . 2013b. "WOOT!! Connections and Reflections on the Canadian Museums Youth Diversity Project." 2013 Conference Program. Accessed: <https://members.museumsontario.ca/programs-events/conference/2013/program/connections-and-reflections-on-the-canadian-museums-youth-diversity-project>
- . 2015a. *Annual Report 2014-2015*. Toronto. Accessed: https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/members/members/AnnualReport/2015_Annual_Report_Dec-18-most-recent.pdf
- . 2015b. *Engaging Your Community: A Toolkit for Museums*. Toronto. Accessed: https://cdn2.hubspot.net/hubfs/316071/Tamarack_New_Website/A_CE_Museums_Engaging_your_Community_Toolkit.pdf?t=1450110266304&hstc=&hssc=&hsCtaTracking=b862e7e0-9f91-4074-a9ab-4686ee034bd8%7Cd82d2548-855c-4b14-a396-31c79614b6d9
- . 2015c. "Ontario Museums: A Vital Part of Ontario's Future." Key Messages. Accessed: https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/members/OMA_at_QP_KEY_Messages.pdf
- . 2016a. *Towards 2025: The Ontario Museum Association's Strategic Plan 2016 - 2021*.

- Toronto. Accessed:
<https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/StrategicPlanPresentation%20image%20update%20July%202018.pdf>
- . 2016b. "Ontario Museums at Queen's Park." Press Release. Accessed:
<https://members.museumsontario.ca/resources/news/item/ontario-museums-queens-park>
- . 2017a. "Indigenous Collections Symposium Webinars." Current Initiatives. Accessed:
<https://members.museumsontario.ca/programs-events/current-initiatives/indigenous-collections-symposium/webinars>
- . 2017b. *Ontario's Museums: Key Messages*. Accessed:
https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/members/OMA_Ontarios%20museums%20and%20Action%20Plan%20Summary%20Sheet.pdf
- . 2017c. "Ontario Museums at Queen's Park." Advocacy. Accessed:
<https://members.museumsontario.ca/programs-events/advocacy/ontario-museums-at-queens-park>
- . 2017d. "Pre-Budget Submission 2017." *ONmuseums: ON Budget*. Accessed:
https://gallery.mailchimp.com/9a74d213d7e397025fc8b7b8e/files/65205493-893b-4565-99b4-f841685388d3/Pre_budget_submission.pdf
- . 2017e. "Re-Org: Canada (Ontario)." Accessed:
<https://members.museumsontario.ca/programs-events/past-initiatives/Re-Org-Canada-Ontario>
- . 2017f. "Reflecting on OMAConf2017." *ONmuseums*. Accessed:
<https://members.museumsontario.ca/resources/news/item/onmuseums-reflecting-omaconf2017>
- . 2018a. "Diversity Census Tool and Inclusion Survey." Accessed:
<https://members.museumsontario.ca/programs-events/current-initiatives/diversity-and-inclusion/dct>
- . 2018b. *Museums and Your Municipality*. Toronto. Accessed:
<https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/members/Museums%20and%20Your%20Municipality%20handout%202018%20FINAL.pdf>
- . 2018c. "Ontario Election and Your Museum." Accessed:
<https://members.museumsontario.ca/programs-events/advocacy/elections>
- . 2018d. *Ontario Museum Association 2017-2018 Annual Report*. Toronto. Accessed:
https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/OMA_Annual_Report_2017_2018.pdf
- . 2019a. "Museums Impact on Budget." *ONmuseums*. Accessed:
<https://members.museumsontario.ca/resources/news/item/onmuseums-museums-impact-budget>
- . 2019b. *Ontario Museums in Rural Communities*. Toronto. Accessed:
https://members.museumsontario.ca/sites/default/files/OMA_Museums_and_Rural_Communities.pdf
- . 2020. "About the OMA." About us. Accessed:
<https://members.museumsontario.ca/about-us>
- Ottawa Culture Research Group. 2017. "Counting on Culture: Impacts and Indicators in Ottawa." Social Planning Council of Ottawa: A Catalyst for Sustainable Social and Economic Development Since 1928. Accessed: <https://www.spcottawa.on.ca/Counting-on-Culture>
- Patterson, W. J. 1970. "Annual Report of the Training Committee for 1969-1970." *Gazette* 4 (3).
- Pelletier, Cathy. 2019. "Incorporation 'Breathes New Life' into Thorold's Museum." *Thorold*

- News. Accessed: <https://www.thoroldnews.com/local-news/incorporation-breathes-new-life-into-thorolds-museum-1691737>
- Pilon, Elmer. 1984. "Striving for Excellence." *Museum Quarterly* 13 (3): 14–15.
- Poulin, Steve. 1992. "The Evolution of a Provincial Conservation Policy." *Currently* 15 (5): 6.
- Roberts, Robbie. 1972. "Viewpoint." *Newsletter* 1 (1).
- SB. 1996. "Museum Advocacy Forum." *Currently* 19 (4): 5.
- Royal Ontario Museum. 1992. *The Forty-Second Annual Report July 1991-June 1992*. Accessed: <https://archive.org/details/annualrepor42roya/page/n1/mode/2up>
- . 2020. *Financial Statements of the Royal Ontario Museum*. Accessed: https://www.rom.on.ca/sites/default/files/imce/pdf/the_royal_ontario_museum_033020_20_final_fs.pdf
- SWOHC. 2016. "SWOHC: South West Ontario Heritage Council." Home. Accessed: <https://swohc.github.io>
- Taylor, Andrew W., and Donald A. Garvie. 1958. "Open Discussion: The Status of the Local Museum in Ontario Today." In *Ontario Historical Society Museums Section Workshop Report 1958*, 9–11. Toronto: Ontario Historical Society.
- Taylor, Verna B. 1962. "Our Aim and Basis." *Newsletter* 85: 2.
- Waterloo Historical Society. n.d. "Annual Reports." Accessed: <http://www.whs.ca/volume-search/>
- . n.d. "Our History." Accessed: <http://www.whs.ca/our-history/>.
- Withrow, William J. 1987. "Happy 40th - Canadian Museums Association Deserves Support." *Muse* 5 (3): 4.
- Willie, Crystal L. B. 2014. *Standard Practices Handbook for Museums*. Edmonton: Alberta Museums Association.
- Young, Katheryn. 1997. "A History of the CMA." *Muse* 14 (4): 25–31.
- Zaporzan, Christine. 1997. "Development Charges Act." *Currently* 20 (2): 4.

Secondary Sources

- Agranoff, Robert, and Beryl A. Radin. 2006. "The Comparative Case Study Approach in Public Administration." In *Case Study Research*, edited by Matthew David. London: Sage.
- Alasuutari, Pertti, and Anita Kangas. 2020. "The Global Spread of the Concept of Cultural Policy." *Poetics*. 82.
- Amicelle, Anthony, and Elida K U Jacobsen. 2016. "The Cross-Colonization of Finance and Security through Lists: Banking Policing in the UK and India." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 34 (1): 89–106.
- Aronczyk, Melissa, and Miranda J. Brady. 2015. "Branding History at the Canadian Museum of Civilization." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 40 (2): 165–84.
- Ashley, Susan. 2012. "Museum Volunteers: Between Precarious Labour and Democratic Knowledge Community." In *Cultural Policy, Work and Identity*, edited by Jonathan Paquette, 107–28. Burlington: Asgate Publishing.
- . 2014. "'Engage the World': Examining Conflicts of Engagement in Public Museums." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 20 (3): 261–80.
- Baeker, Greg. 2002. "Sharpening the Lens: Recent Research on Cultural Policy, Cultural Diversity, and Social Cohesion [CIRCLE-CCRN Round Table 2000]." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 27 (2/3): 179.

- Balen, Maria Elisa, and Cristian Leyton. 2016. "Policy Translation: An Invitation to Revisit the Work of Latour, Star and Marres." *Global Discourse* 6 (1–2): 101–15.
- Barbieri, Nicolás. 2012. "Why Does Cultural Policy Change? Policy Discourse and Policy Subsystem: A Case Study of the Evolution of Cultural Policy in Catalonia." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 18 (1): 13–30.
- Bashevkin, Sylvia. 1988. "Does Public Opinion Matter? The Adoption of Federal Royal Commission and Task Force Recommendations on the National Question, 1951–1987." *Canadian Public Administration* 31 (3): 390–407.
- Baudot, Pierre-Yves. 2011. "L'incertitude Des Instruments." *Revue Française De Science Politique* 61 (1): 176.
- . 2014. "Who's Counting? Institutional Autonomy and the Production of Activity Data for Disability Policy in France 2006-2014)." *Partecipazione E Conflitto* 7 (2).
- . 2015. "La Donnee et Le Systeme: Comment Socialiser Un Instrument d'action Publique ? Le Cas Du Système d'information Partagé-Personnes Handicapées (2006-2014)." *Gouvernement et Action Publique* 2 (2): 25–56.
- Baya-Laffite, Nicolas. 2016. "Black-Boxing Sustainable Development: Environmental Impact Assessment on the River Uruguay." In *Knowing Governance: The Epistemic Construction of Political Order*, edited by Jan-Peter Voß and Richard Freeman, 237–55. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Belfiore, Eleonora. 2002. "Art as a Means of Alleviating Social Exclusion: Does It Really Work? A Critique of Instrumental Cultural Policies and Social Impact Studies in the UK." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 8 (1): 91–106.
- . 2004. "Auditing Culture The Subsidised Cultural Sector in the New Public Management." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 10 (2): 183–202.
- Bell, Michael. 1987. "Museums and Federal Cultural Policy." *Michael Queen's Quarterly* 94 (3): 552–70.
- Belliger, Andrea and David J Krieger. 2016. *Organizing Networks: An Actory-Network Theory of Organizations*. Bielefeld: Transcript-Verlag.
- Bennett, Oliver. 1995. "Cultural Policy in the United Kingdom: Collapsing Rationales and the End of a Tradition." *Cultural Policy* 1 (2): 199–216.
- Bennett, Tony. 1995a. *The Birth of the Museum*. London and New York: Routledge.
- . 1995b. "The Multiplication of Culture's Utility." *Critical Inquiry* 21 (4): 861–89.
- . 2005. "Civic Laboratories: Museums, Cultural Objecthood and the Governance of the Social." *Cultural Studies* 19 (5): 521–47.
- Besch, Janice, and Jefferey Minson. 2001. "Participatory Policy Making, Ethics, and the Arts." In *Citizenship and Cultural Policy*, edited by Denise Meredyth and Jeffrey Minson, 52–68. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Bodenstein, Felicity, and Dominique Poulot. 2012. "From Politics to Policy: Two Decades of National Museum Development in France (1989-2012)." In *Museum Policies in Europe 1990-2010: Negotiating Professional and Political Utopia*, edited by Lill Eilertsen and Arne Bugge Amundsen, 12 – 42. Eunamus. Accessed: <http://liu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:557284/FULLTEXT01>
- Bordat, E M. 2013. "Institutionalization and Change in Cultural Policy: CONACULTA and Cultural Policy in Mexico (1988-2006)." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 19 (2): 221–47.
- Bourhis, J.P. Le, and Pierre Lascoumes. 2014. "Les Résistances Aux Instruments de Gouvernement. Essai d'inventaire et de Typologie Des Pratiques." In *L'instrumentation de l'action Publique. Controverses, Résistance, Effet*, edited by C. Halpern, Pierre Lascoumes, and P. Le Galès, 493–520. Paris: Presse de sciences Po.

- Brison, Jeffrey. 2005. *Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Canada: American Philanthropy and the Arts and Letters in Canada*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Bristow, Jason. 2003. "Symbolic Tokenism in Canada-U.S. Cultural Sector Trade Relations." *Canadian - American Public Policy*, no. 55: 1–57.
- Brooks-Joiner, Carrie. 1986. "Cultural Policy in Ontario: Provincial Funding for Public Museums and Art Galleries." University of Toronto.
- Callon, Michel. 1986a. "Some Elements of a Sociology of Translation." In *Power, Action and Belief. A New Sociology of Knowledge?*, edited by J. Law, 196–223. London: Routledge.
- . 1986b. "The Sociology of an Actor-Network: The Case of the Electric Vehicle." In *Mapping the Dynamics of Science and Technology*, 19–34. Palgrave MacMillan.
- . 1991. "Techno-Economic Networks and Irreversibility." In *A Sociology of Monsters: Essays on Power, Technology and Domination*, edited by John Law, 132–61. Routledge.
- Callon, Michel, and Bruno Latour. 1981. "Unscrewing the Big Leviathan : How Actors Macro-Structure Reality and How Sociologists Help Them to Do So." *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology: Toward an Integration of Micro and Macro-Sociologies*, edited by Karin Knoww Cetina and A.V. Cicourel, 277–303. Routledge.
- Cameron, Christina. 2000. "The Spirit of Place: The Physical Memory of Canada." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 35 (1): 77.
- Campbell, John. 2007. "The Rise and Transformation Of Institutional Analysis." Accessed: http://laisumedu.org/DESIN_lbarra/nuevoinst2007/borradores/Campbell.pdf.
- Carter, John. 2000. "The Evolution of Museums as Centres for Learning: Chapters in Canadian Museology." University of Leicester.
- Carter, J., and Macias-Valadez, K. (2016). "Changing realities, changing practices: Museums, training and professional development in Québec." *Museum International* 68 (1–2): 43–58.
- Certeau, Michel De. 1988. *The Practice of Everyday*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Clarke, John. 2012. "The Work of Governing." In *Governing Cultures: Anthropological Perspectives on Political Labor, Power, and Government*, edited by Kendra Coulter and William Schumann, 209–32. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Clarke, John. 2015. "The Managerialised University: Translating and Assembling the Right to Manage." In *Making Policy Move: Towards a Politics of Translation and Assemblage*, 95–150. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Clarke, John, Dave Bainton, Noémi Lendvai, and Paul Stubbs. 2015. *Making Policy Move: Towards a Politics of Translation and Assemblage*. Chicago: Policy Press.
- Cohnstaedt, Joy. 2007. "Cultural Policy in Canada: A Brief History." *Canadian Issues* Winter: 14–18.
- Craik, Jennifer. 2005. "Dilemmas in Policy Support for the Arts and Cultural Sector." *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 64 (4): 6-19.
- Crespin, Renaud. 2006. "Drogues et Sécurité Routière: Changement Politique Ou Nouvel Usage Des Instruments?" *Revue Française de Science Politique* 56 (5): 130.
- Creswell, John W. 2013. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design. Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- d'Ovidio, Marianna, and Alberto Cossu. 2016. "Culture Is Reclaiming the Creative City: The Case of Macao in Milan, Italy." *City, Culture and Society* 8: 7-12.
- Dickson, Lovat. 1991. *The Museum Makers: The Story of the Royal Ontario Museum*. Toronto: Royal Ontario Museum.
- Dorais, Léo A. 1987. "Musées Nationaux Du Canada: Une Politique Concrète." *Loisir et Société / Society and Leisure* 10 (1): 69–82.

- Doustaly, Cecile, and Clive Gray. 2010. "Labour and the Arts: Managing Transformation?" *L'Observatoire de La Société Britannique* 8: 319–38.
- Etling, Larry. 2003. "O Canada, We Stand on Guard for Thee: Protecting the Canadian Music Industry." *The Journal of American Culture* 25 (1-2): 134-138/
- Fenwick, Tara, and Richard Edwards. 2005. *Actor-Network Theory in Education*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Files, James. 1991. "Smocks and Jocks: The Establishment of the Ontario Ministry of Culture and Recreation, 1974." *Ontario History* 83 (3): 207–23.
- Filewod, Alan. 2018. "A Confederation Minstrel Show: The Centennial Play of 1967." *Canadian Theatre Review* 174: 48–51.
- Finkel, Alvin. 2014. "Harper's Vision of the Future Requires Reshaping of the Past." *Labour* 73: 197-199.
- Flegel, Peter F. 2002. "Challenges to Canadian Multiculturalism : The Case of Black Montreal." *Canadian Issues* 3 (Feb): 39–41.
- Florida, Richard. 2003. "Cities and the Creative Class." *City & Community* 2 (March): 3–19.
- Foucault, Michel. 2009. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France, 1977-78*. Edited by Michel Senellart. Picador.
- Forsyth, J. and Leavens, J.K. (2010). "Learning with provincial museums associations: Exploring community-based museum studies." *Faculty of Information Quarterly* 3(1): 54-67.
- Franzosi, Roberto. 1998. "Narrative Analysis—Or Why (and How) Sociologists Should Be Interested In Narrative." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24 (1): 517–54.
- Freeman, Richard. 2009. "What Is 'Translation'?" *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice* 5 (4): 429–47.
- Galès, Patrick Le. 2001. "Urban Governance And Policy Networks: On The Urban Political Boundedness of Policy Networks. A French Case Study." *Public Administration* 79 (1): 167–84.
- . 2011. "Policy Instruments and Governance." In *The SAGE Handbook of Governance*, edited by Mark Bevir, 142–59. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Garson, G. David. 2002. "Case Study Research in Public Administration and Public Policy: Standards and Strategies." *Journal of Public Affairs Education* 8 (3): 209–16.
- Gattinger, Monica. 2011. "Ontario: From a Reactive to a Proactive Policy." In *Les Politiques Culturelles Provinciales et Territoriales Du Canada: Origines, Évolutions et Mises En Oeuvre*. Quebec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Gattinger, Monica, and Diane Saint-Pierre. 2010. "The 'Neoliberal Turn' in Provincial Cultural Policy and Administration in Québec and Ontario: The Emergence of 'Quasi-Neoliberal' Approaches." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 35 (2): 279–302.
- . 2011. *Les Politiques Culturelles Provinciales et Territoriales Du Canada: Origines, Évolutions et Mises En Oeuvre*. Quebec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Gattinger, Monica, Diane Saint-Pierre, and Alexandre Couture Gagnon. 2008. "Toward Subnational Comparative Cultural Policy Analysis: The Case of Provincial Cultural Policy and Administration in Canada." *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 38 (3): 167–86.
- Gibson, Lianne. 2008. "In Defence of Instrumentality." *Cultural Trends* 17 (4): 247–57.
- Girard, Muriel, Jean-François Polo, and Clémence Scalbert Yücel. 2018. *Turkish Cultural Policies in a Global World*. Springer International Publishing.
- Glow, Hilary, and Katya Johanson. 2009. "Instrumentalism and the 'Helping' Discourse: Australian Indigenous Performing Arts and Policy." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 15 (3): 315–28.

- Goldberg-Miller, Shoshanah B. D. 2017. *Planning for a City of Culture: Creative Urbanism in Toronto and New York*. New York: Routledge.
- Gray, Clive. 2002. "Local Government and the Arts." *Local Government Studies* 28 (1): 77–90.
- . 2007. "Commodification and Instrumentality in Cultural Policy." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 13 (2): 203–15.
- . 2008. "Part 1 : Intellectual and Political Landscape Instrumental Policies : Causes, Consequences, Museums and Galleries." *Cultural Trends* 17 (4): 209–22.
- . 2009. "Managing Cultural Policy: Pitfalls and Prospects." *Public Administration* 87 (3): 574–85.
- . 2014. "'Cabined, Cribbed, Confined, Bound in' or 'We Are Not a Government Poodle' : Structure and Agency in Museums and Galleries." *Public Policy and Administration* 29 (2): 185–203.
- . 2015a. "'My Name Is Legion For We Are Many': Cultural Policies, Sectoral Disaggregation and Differentiated Network Specificity." In *Paper to the International Conference on Public Policy*. Milan.
- . 2015b. *The Politics of Museums*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Grefe, Xavier. 2004. "Is Heritage an Asset or a Liability?" *Journal of Cultural Heritage* 5 (3): 301–9.
- . 2011. "The Economic Impact of the Louvre." *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 41 (2): 121–37.
- Griffin, Des. 2008. "Advancing Museums." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 23 (1): 43–61.
- Grodach, Carl. 2013. "Cultural Economy Planning in Creative Cities : Discourse and Practice." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37 (5): 1747–65.
- Grodach, Carl, and Anastasia Loukaitou-Sideris. 2007. "Cultural Development Strategies and Urban Revitalization." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 13 (4): 349–70.
- Grodach, Carl, and Daniel Silver. 2012. *The Politics of Urban Cultural Policy: Global Perspectives*. Routledge.
- Gunter, Christopher. 2017. "Ecomuseums: Challenging Temporality through Community Reappropriation." *Journal of Arts Management Law and Society* 47 (4): 259–73.
- Halpern, Charlotte, Pierre Lascombes, and Patrick Le Galès. 2014. *L'Instrumentation de l'action Publique: Controverses, Résistance, Effets*. Presses de sciences Po.
- Hamilton, Mary. 2011. "Unruly Practices: What a Sociology of Translations Can Offer to Educational Policy Analysis." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 43 (SUPPL. 1): 55–75.
- Handler, Richard. 1987. "Holistic Culture, Bureaucratic Fragmentation: Government Administration of Culture in Quebec." *Anthropology Today* 3 (6): 6–8.
- Harvey, F. 1998. "Cultural Policies in Canada and Quebec: Directions for Future Research." In *Cultural Policies and Cultural Practices: Exploring the Links between Culture and Social Change*, edited by C. Murray. Ottawa: Canadian Cultural research Network.
- Herbert-Cheshire, Lynda. 2003. "Translating Policy: Power and Action in Australia's Country Towns." *Sociologia Ruralis* 43 (4): 454–73.
- Hesmondhalgh, David, David Lee, Kate Oakley, and Melissa Nisbett. 2015. *Culture, Economy and Politics: The Case of New Labour*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Hill, Kate. 2016. *Culture and Class in English Public Museums, 1850-1914*. London: Routledge.
- Hutchison, Mary, and Lea Collins. 2009. "Translations: Experiments in Dialogic Representation of Cultural Diversity in Three Museum Sound Installations." *Museum and Society* 7 (2): 92–109.
- Jaffry, Shabbar, and Alexandros Apostolakis. 2011. "Evaluating Individual Preferences for the British Museum." *Journal of Cultural Economics* 35 (1): 49–75.

- Janes, Robert R. 2013. *Museums and the Paradox of Change. Museums and the Paradox of Change, Third Edition*. Third Edit. London: Routledge.
- Jeannotte, M. Sharon. 2010. "Going with the Flow: Neoliberalism and Cultural Policy in Manitoba and Saskatchewan." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 35 (2): 303–24.
- . 2013. "Digital Cultural Mapping in Ontario: Promises, Pitfalls, and Panaceas." *Municipal World*, 11–13.
- . 2016. "Story-Telling about Place: Engaging Citizens in Cultural Mapping." *City, Culture and Society* 7 (1): 35–41.
- Jenkins, Barbara. 2005. "Toronto's Cultural Renaissance." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 30: 169–86.
- . 2009. "Cultural Spending in Ontario, Canada: Trends in Public and Private Funding." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 15 (3): 329–42.
- Johnson, Björn, and Bo Hagström. 2005. "The Translation Perspective as an Alternative to the Policy Diffusion Paradigm: The Case of the Swedish Methadone Maintenance Treatment." *Journal of Social Policy* 34 (3): 365–88.
- Johnson, R. Burke. 1997. "Examining the Validity Structure of Qualitative Research." *Education* 118 (2): 282–92.
- Jreisat, Jamil E. 2005. "Comparative Public Administration Is Back In, Prudently." *Public Administration Review* 65 (2): 231–42.
- Kaluza, Karoline. 2011. "Reimagining the Nation in Museums: Poland's Old and New National Museums." In *National Museums: New Studies from Around the World*, edited by Simon Knell, Peter Aronsson, and Arne Bugge Amundsen, 151–162. London: Routledge.
- Kefi, Hajer, and Jessie Pallud. 2011. "The Role of Technologies in Cultural Mediation in Museums: An Actor-Network Theory View Applied in France." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 26 (3): 273–89.
- Kiwan, Nidia. 2007. "When the Cultural and the Social Meet: A Critical Perspective on Socially Embedded Cultural Policy in France." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 13 (2): 152–67.
- Knutsson, Benjamin. 2012. "The 'Making' of Knowledge Society in Rwanda? Translations, Tensions and Transformations." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 10 (2): 181–99.
- Kovacs, Jason F. 2010. "Cultural Plan Implementation and Outcomes in Ontario, Canada." *Cultural Trends* 19 (3): 209–24.
- . 2011. "Cultural Planning in Ontario, Canada: Arts Policy or More?" *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 17 (3): 321–40.
- Kredell, Brendan. 2012. "T.O. Live with Film: The Toronto International Film Festival and Municipal Cultural Policy in Contemporary Toronto." *Canadian Journal of Film Studies* 21 (1): 21–37.
- Larminat, Xavier. 2014. "L'informatisation Des Services de Probation. Une Mise En Abyme Des Réformes de Modernisation." In *L'instrumentation de l'action Publique. Controverses, Résistance, Effet.*, edited by C. Halpern, Pierre Lascoumes, and P. Le Galès, 445–64. Paris: Presse de sciences Po.
- Lascoumes, Pierre. 2004. "La Gouvernamentalité: De La Critique de l'Etat Aux Technologies de Pouvoir." *Le Portique*, no. 13–14: 13–14.
- . 2005. "De l'etat a La Gouvernamentalite." In *Gouvernement, Organisation et Gestion: L'héritage de Michel Foucault*, edited by Armand Hatchuel, Eric Pezet, Ken Starkey, and Oliver Lenay, 341–62. Saint-Nicolas: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.
- . 2008. "De l'Art Militaire À La Gouvernamentalité En Passant Par Les Disciplines." In *Michel Foucault: Savoirs, Dominations, Sujets*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

- Lascombes, Pierre, and Patrick Le Galès. 2007. "Understanding Public Policy Through Its Instruments: From the Nature of Instruments to the Sociology of Public Policy." *Governance* 20 (1): 1–21.
- Lascombes, Pierre, and Louis Simard. 2011. "L'action Publique Au Prisme de Ses Instruments." *Revue Française de Science Politique* 61 (1): 5.
- Latour, Bruno. 1987. "The Powers of Association." In *Power, Action and Belief. A New Sociology of Knowledge?*, edited by John Law, 262–80. London: Routledge.
- . 1988. *The Pasteurization of Franch*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London: Harvard University Press.
- . 1996. *Amaris, or, the Love of Technology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- . 1999. "On Recalling ANT." *The Sociological Review* 46 (S): 15–25.
- . 2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Law, John. 1992. "Notes on the Theory of the Actor-Network: Ordering, Strategy, and Heterogeneity." *Systems Practice* 5 (4): 379–93.
- . 2004. *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. London and New York: Routledge.
- . 2007. "Actor Network Theory and Material Semiotics." Lancaster. Accessed: <http://www.heterogeneities.net/publications/Law2007ANTandMaterialSemiotics.pdf>
- Law, John, and Marianne Elisabeth Lien. 2012. "Slippery: Field Notes in Empirical Ontology." *Social Studies of Science* 23 (3): 363–78.
- Law, John, and Vicky Singleton. 2014. "ANT, Multiplicity and Policy." *Critical Policy Studies* 8 (4): 379–96.
- Lawley, Ian. 2003. "Local Authority Museums and the Modernizing Government Agenda in England." *Museum and Society* 1 (2): 75–86.
- Lee, Minha. 2015. "Fostering Connectivity: A Social Network Analysis of Entrepreneurs in Creative Industries." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 21 (2): 139–52.
- Lehrer, Ute, and Thorben Wieditz. 2009. "Condominium Development and Gentrification: The Relationship between Policies, Building Activities and Socio-Economic Development in Toronto." *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 18 (1): 140.
- Leigh Star, Susan. 1990. "Power, Technology, and the Phenomenology of Conventions: On Being Allergic to Onions." *The Sociological Review* 38 (S1): 26–56.
- Lendvai, Noémi, and Paul Stubbs. 2007. "Policies as Translation: Situating Transnational Social Policies." In *Policy Reconsidered: Meanings, Politics and Practices*, edited by Susan M. Hodgson and Zoe Irving, 173–189. Policy Press.
- . 2009. "Assemblages, Translation, and Intermediaries in South East Europe." *European Societies* 11 (5): 673–95.
- Leslie, Deberah, and Norma Rantisi. 2012. "Creativity and Urban Regeneration: The Role of La Tohu and the Cirque Du Solei in the Saint-Michel Neighborhood in Montreal." In *The Politics of Urban Cultural Policy: Global Perspectives*, edited by Carl Grodach and Daniel Silver. Routledge.
- Linauskas, Karen. 2004. "Standardizing Museum Practice: The Development of Community Museum Policy in Ontario and Alberta." University of Toronto.
- Maddison, David. 2004. "Causality and Museum Subsidies." *Journal of Cultural Economics* 28 (2): 89–108.
- Mannell, Jenevieve. 2014. "Health & Place Adopting , Manipulating , Transforming : Tactics Used by Gender Practitioners in South African NGOs to Translate International Gender Policies into Local Practice." *Health & Place* 30: 4–12.
- Marontate, Jan, and Catherine Murray. 2010. "Neoliberalism in Provincial Cultural Policy

- Narratives: Perspectives from Two Coasts." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 35 (2): 325–43.
- Mattocks, Kate. 2018. "'Just Describing Is Not Enough': Policy Learning, Transfer, and the Limits of Best Practices." *Journal of Arts Management Law and Society* 48 (2): 85–97.
- McCabe, Louise. 2007. "Translating Policy and Practice." *Global Social Policy* 7 (2): 203–21.
- McCall, Vikki. 2009. "Social Policy and Cultural Services: A Study of Scottish Border Museums as Implementers of Social Inclusion." *Social Policy & Society* 8 (3): 319–31.
- McCall, Vikki, and Clive Gray. 2014. "Museums and the 'New Museology': Theory, Practice and Organisational Change." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 29(1): 19–35.
- McCann, Eugene, and Kevin Ward. 2013. "A Multi-Disciplinary Approach to Policy Transfer Research: Geographies, Assemblages, Mobilities and Mutations." *Policy Studies* 34 (1): 2–18.
- McCawley, J C, and Stone, T. G. 1983. "A Mobile Conservation Laboratory Service." *Studies in Conservation* 28 (3): 97–106.
- McDermont, Morag. 2013. "Acts of Translation: UK Advice Agencies and the Creation of Matters-of-Public-Concern." *Critical Policy Studies* 33 (2): 218–42.
- McDermott, Aoife M., Louise Fitzgerald, and David A. Buchanan. 2013. "Beyond Acceptance and Resistance: Entrepreneurial Change Agency Responses in Policy Implementation." *British Journal of Management* 24: 93–115.
- McGrath, Brian. 2015. "Reflecting on 'Evidence' and Documentation Devices in 'Translating' Community Interventions." *Community Development Journal* 51 (2): 179–94.
- McGuigan, Jim. 2004. *Rethinking Cultural Policy*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- McLean, Heather. 2017. "Hos in the Garden: Staging and Resisting Neoliberal Creativity." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 35 (1): 38–56.
- McTavish, Lianne. 2018. "Middle of Nowhere: Contesting Rural Heritage at the World Famous Gopher Hole Museum." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 24(7): 764–780.
- Meisel, John, and Jean Van Loon. 1987. "Cultivating the Bushgarden: Cultural Policy in Canada." In *The Patron State*, edited by Milton C. Cummings and Richard S. Katz, 276–310. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Menon, Anand, and Ulrich Sedelmeier. 2010. "Instruments and Intentionality: Civilian Crisis Management and Enlargement Conditionality in EU Security Policy." *West European Politics* 33 (1): 75–92.
- Merriam, Sharan B, and Elizabeth J Tisdell. 2015. *Qualitative Research : A Guide to Design and Implementation*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Michael Hall, C. 2011. "A Typology of Governance and Its Implications for Tourism Policy Analysis." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 19 (4–5): 437–57.
- Miller, P., and N. Rose. 2008. *Governing the Present*. Cambridge: Policy Press.
- Mol, Annemarie. 2002. *The Body Multiple Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Mulcahy, Kevin. 2006. "Cultural Policy," In *Handbook of Public Policy*, edited by B. G. Peters and J. Pierre, 265–279. London: Sage.
- . 2006b. "Cultural Policy: Definitions and Approaches." *The Journal of Arts Management Law and Society* 35(4): 319–330.
- Napoli, Philip M. 2008. "Bridging Cultural Policy and Media Policy." *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 37 (4): 311–32.
- Nauta, Wiebe. 2006. "Ethnographic Research in Non-Governmental Organization: Revealing Strategic Translations through an Embedded Tale." In *Development Brokers and Translators: The Ethnography of Aid and Agencies*, edited by David Lewis and David Moss,

- 149–72. Bloomfield: Kumarian Press, Inc.
- Nelson, Robin. 2015. "Museums and Money: The Influence of Provincial Cultural Policy." University of Toronto.
- . 2020a. "La politique de l'emploi comme instrument de politique Culturelle implicite : le cas des musées communautaires du Nouveau-Brunswick." *Culture and Local Governance / Culture et gouvernance locale* 6(2): 76 – 91.
- . 2020b. "The Museum Community and Community Museum Governance." *Governance Review* 17(1): 45-55.
- . 2021. "Quality Over Quantity: The Role of the Ontario Museum Association in Community Museum Governance." In *Canadian Cultural Policy in Transition*, edited by Devin Beauregard and Jonathan Paquette. London: Routledge.
- . In Press. "Turning the Light on: The Ontario Historical Society and Museum Governance." *Ontario History*. 00(0).
- Nimmo, Richie. 2011. "Actor-Network Theory and Methodology: Social Research in a More-Than-Human World." *Methodological Innovations Online* 6 (3): 108–19.
- Nisbett, Melissa. 2013a. "New Perspectives on Instrumentalism: An Empirical Study of Cultural Diplomacy." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 19 (5): 557–75.
- . 2013b. "Protection, Survival and Growth: An Analysis of International Policy Documents." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 19 (1): 84–102.
- O'Brien, Dave. 2010. "No Cultural Policy to Speak of - Liverpool 2008." *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events* 2 (2): 113–28.
- Oakley, Kate. 2009. "The Disappearing Arts: Creativity and Innovation after the Creative Industries." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 15 (4): 403–13.
- Oakley, Kate, David Hesmondhalgh, David Lee, and Melissa Nisbett. 2014. "The National Trust for Talent? NESTA and New Labour's Cultural Policy." *British Politics* 9 (3): 297–317.
- Ord, Douglas. 2003. *The National Gallery of Canada: Ideas, Art, Architecture*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press.
- Paquette, Jonathan. 2008. "Engineering the Northern Bohemian: Local Cultural Policies and Governance in the Creative City Era." *Space and Polity* 12 (3): 297–310.
- . 2010. "La Réforme Des Musées Nationaux Du Canada: Défis Professionnels et Managériaux de La Recherche." *Canadian Public Administration* 53 (3): 375–94.
- . 2011. "Science as Culture and Leisure: Cultural Policy, Industry and Scientific Culture in the Canadian Context." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 17 (1): 39–51.
- . 2019. *Cultural Policy and Federalism. New Directions in Cultural Policy Research*. Switzerland: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Paquette, Jonathan, Devin Beauregard, and Christopher Gunter. 2017. "Settler Colonialism and Cultural Policy : The Colonial Foundations and Refoundations of Canadian Cultural Policy." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 23 (3): 1–16.
- Paquette, Jonathan, and Elenora Redaelli. 2015. *Arts Management and Cultural Policy Research*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Phillips, Martin, Anna Woodham, and Eilean Hooper-Greenhill. 2015. "Foucault and Museum Geographies: A Case Study of the English 'Renaissance in the Regions.'" *Social and Cultural Geography* 16 (7): 730–63.
- Pichette, Robert. 2001. "Culture and Official Languages." In *The Robichaud Era, 1960- 70: Colloquium Proceedings*, 67–86. Moncton: The Canadian Institute for Research on Regional Development.
- Pierson, Paul. 2004. *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Ponzini, Davide. 2009. "Urban Implications of Cultural Policy Networks: The Case of the Mount Vernon Cultural District in Baltimore." *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 27 (3): 433–50.
- Poulard, Frederic. 2012. "Curators and the State, a Question of Interdependencies: The Case of France." In *Cultural Policy, Work and Identity. The Creation, Renewal and Negotiation of Professional Subjectivities.*, edited by Jonathan Paquette, 77–90. London: Routledge.
- Primorac, Jaka, Nina Obuljen Koržinek, and Aleksandra Uzelac. 2015. "Access to Culture in Croatian Cultural Policy: Moving towards Explicit Policies." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 23(5):1–19.
- Pyykkönen, Miikka. 2012. "UNESCO and Cultural Diversity: Democratisation, Commodification or Governmentalisation of Culture?" *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 18 (5): 545–62.
- Redaelli, Eleonora. 2018. "Understanding American Cultural Policy: The Multi-Level Governance of the Arts and Humanities." *Policy Studies* 0 (0): 1–18.
- Registrar, Gerrard, and Jim Leonard. 1992. "Trillium: An Information and Ideas Network for Ontario Museums." *Museum Informatics* 6 (2): 2–4.
- Rice, Louis. 2011. "Black-Boxing Sustainability." *Journal of Sustainable Development* 4 (4): 32–37.
- Ricœur, Paul. 1983. *Temps et Récit. 1. L'intrigue et Le Récit Historique*. Paris, Seuil.
- Rindzevičiūtė, Eglė, Jenny Svensson, and Klara Tomson. 2016. "The International Transfer of Creative Industries as a Policy Idea." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 22 (4): 594–610.
- Rouillard, Christian. 2002. "La Gestion Horizontale Dans La Fonction Publique Federale Du Canada: Le Cas de Museobus." In *Horizontalite et Gestion Publique*, edited by Jacques Bourgault, 153–168. Presses Universite Laval.
- Roy-Valex, Myrtille, and Guy Bellavance. 2015. *Arts et Territoires à l'ère Du Développement Durable : Vers Une Nouvelle Économie Culturelle?* Laval: Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Rutland, Ted, and Alex Aylett. 2008. "The Work of Policy: Actor Networks, Governmentality, and Local Action on Climate Change in Portland, Oregon." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26: 627–46.
- Salamon, Lester M. 2002. *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sandfort, J., S. C. Selden, and J. E. Sowa. 2008. "Do Government Tools Influence Organizational Performance?: Examining Their Implementation in Early Childhood Education." *The American Review of Public Administration* 38 (4): 412–38.
- Segger, Martin. 1987. "Canada: Great Distance Require Distance Training." *Museum International* 39 (40): 244–248.
- Silverman, Raymond. 2014. *Museum as Process: Translating Local and Global Knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Simard, Louis. 2014. "Effets et Evolution Des Instruments d'action Publique Participatifse: Le Cas de La Regie de l'energie." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 47 (1): 159–84.
- Soneryd, Linda, and Nina Amelung. 2016. "Translating Participation: Scenario Workshops and Citizens' Juries Across Situations and Contexts." In *Knowing Governance: The Epistemic Construction of Political Order*, edited by Jan-Peter Voß and Richard Freeman, 155–74. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Stam, Deirdre C. 1993. "The Informed Muse: The Implications of 'the New Museology' for Museum Practice." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 12(3): 267–283.
- Stem, Pamela, and Peter Hall. 2015. *The Proposal Economy: Neoliberal Citizenship in "Ontario's Most Historic Town."* UBC Press.
- Steorn, Patrik. 2012. "Curating Queer Heritage: Queer Knowledge and Museum Practice."

- Curator* 55 (3): 355–65.
- Stevenson, Deborah, David Rowe, and Kieryn McKay. 2010. "Convergence in British Cultural Policy: The Social, the Cultural, and the Economic." *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 40: 248–65.
- Stone, Diane. 2012. "Transfer and Translation of Policy." *Policy Studies* 33 (6): 483–99.
- Stupples, Polly. 2017. "Beyond the Predicted: Expanding Our Understanding of Creative Agency in International Development through Practice and Policy." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 23 (1): 52–67.
- Stylianou-Lambert, Theopisti, Nikolaos Boukas, and Marina Christodoulou-Yerali. 2014. "Museums and Cultural Sustainability: Stakeholders, Forces, and Cultural Policies." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 20 (5): 179–85.
- Teather, J Lynne. 1990. "The Museum Keepers The Museums Association and the Growth of Museum Professionalism." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 9: 25–41.
- Tivy, Mary. 1993. "Museums, Visitors and the Reconstruction of the Past in Ontario A Potent Legacy: The Pioneer Experience as Antidote to Modern Life." *Material Culture Review* 37 (Spring): 1–18.
- . 1994. "Ministering History to the Community: The Province of Ontario and the Management of the Past in Community History Museums." *Ontario History* 86 (2): 149–67.
- . 2006. "The Local History Museum in Ontario: An Intellectual History." University of Waterloo.
- Ulldemolins, Joaquim Rius, and Mariano Martín Zamorano. 2014. "Spain's Nation Branding Project Marca España and Its Cultural Policy: The Economic and Political Instrumentalization of a Homogeneous and Simplified Cultural Image." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 21(1): 20–40.
- Upchurch, Anna. 2007. "Linking Cultural Policy from Great Britain to Canada." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 13 (3): 239–54.
- Vlachou, Maria. 2019. "Dividing Issues and Mission-Driven Activism." In *Museum Activism*, edited by Robert Janes and Richard Sandell, 47 – 57. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Voß, Jan-Peter, and Richard Freeman. 2016. *Knowing Governance: The Epistemic Construction of Political Order*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Watson, Cate, and Maureen K. Michael. 2016. "Translations of Policy and Shifting Demands of Teacher Professionalism: From CPD to Professional Learning." *Journal of Education Policy* 31 (3): 259–74.
- Wyszomirski, Margaret Jane. 1995. "Policy Communities and Policy Influence: Securing a Government Role in Cultural Policy for the Twenty-First Century." *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 25 (3): 192–205.
- Yin, Robert K. 2003. *Case Study Research Design and Methods*. 3rd ed. Sage Publications Inc.
- Zapata Campos, María José, and Patrik Zapata. 2013. "Translating Development Aid into City Management: The Barrio Acahualinca Integrated Development Programme in Managua, Nicaragua." *Public Administration and Development* 33 (2): 101–12.
- Zimmer, Annette, and S Toepler. 1999. "The Subsidized Muse: Government and the Arts in Western Europe and the United States." *Journal of Cultural Economics* 23: 33–49.

Appendices

Appendix A: Interview Participants

Interview Participant; Date	Interview Group	Multiple Memberships selected and non-exhaustive
Museum Advisors		
Carter, John June 28, 2017 Follow up: March 29, 2018	Museum Advisor (1980 - 2013)	Museum worker: John R. Park Homestead (1977 - 1980) OMA: Council (1980-1981) and Committees (1980s and 1990s) OHS: Editor (2000s) and Museums Committee (2010s)
Duncan, Dorothy July 18, 2017	Museum Advisor (1975 - 1982) OHS: Executive Director (1983 - 2001)	Museum worker: Black Creek Pioneer Village (1970s) OMA: Council (1978 - 1980) and Committees (1970s)
Graham, Fiona August 1, 2017	Conservation Coordinator / Advisor (1997 - 1998) Museum Advisor (1999 - 2000)	Government of Canada: Canadian Conservation Institute (1992 - 1998) OMA: Committee / Task Force (2000s)
Holland, Jane September 21, 2017	Conservation Coordinator / Advisor (1996 - 1998) Museum Advisor (1998 - 2001)	Government of Ontario: Policy advisor (2001-2016) OMA: Prepared the Indigenous Collections Symposium Report (2017)
Priamo, Carol August 28, 2017	Museum advisor (1985 - 1991)	
Pope, Felicity August 22, 2017	Museum Advisor (1992 - 1993)	Museum Worker: Museum of the History of Medicine (1983 - 1992), Canadian Museum of Health and Medicine (1993 - 1999), and Contracts (2000s)
Poulin, Steve July 20, 2017	Conservation Advisor (1982 - 1990s)	Government of Canada: Canadian Conservation Institute (1980s) Conservators employed through OMA

Styrmo, V.N. (Peter) August 24, 2017	Museum Advisor (1964 - 1981)	Museum Worker: Fort York (1956 - 1964) and Marine Museum of Upper Canada (1980s)
Watts, Gillian July 21, 2017	Conservation Advisor (1981 - 1988) Museum Advisor (Contracts 1980s and 1990s)	Museum Worker: ROM (1970s - 1980s) OMA: Committees (1990s) Government of Ontario: Ontario Heritage Foundation (1990s)
Weinstein, Elka June 27, 2017 Follow up: December 17, 2018	Museum Advisor (2007 - 2016; 2018 - current)	Museum Worker: Campbell House Museum (2004 - 2007) Government of Canada: Canadian Heritage (2016 - 2018) OMA: Committee (2007)
Participant A July 19, 2017	Museum Advisor (1980s - 1990s)	
Associations		
Adkin, Tammy January 12, 2018	OMA: President (2007-2008), Council (2004-2011), and Committees / Task Forces (2000s and 2010s)	Museum Worker: London Regional Children's Museum (1995 - 2010), Museum London (2011 - 2013), and Guelph Museums (2013 - present)
Anderson, Heather January 17, 2018	OHS: Executive Assistant (at time of interview) and Membership (2011 - current)	
Bachmann, Karen January 11, 2018	OMA: President (1994-1995), Council (1993 - 1997, 2009-2012), and Committees / Task Forces (1990s, 2000s, 2010s) CMA: President (2018 - current), Committees / Working Groups (2000s, 2010s), and Board (2014 - current)	Museum Worker: Timmins Museum (1986 - present)
Baeker, Greg October 2, 2017	OMA: Executive Director (1981 - 1986)	Government of Ontario: Heritage Policy Review Executive Coordinator (1980s - 1990s)
Bernat, Clark	OMA: President (2015-2017), Council (2007 - 2008, 2010 - 2018), and	Museum Worker: Niagara Historical Society Museum

February 5, 2018	Committees / Task Forces (2010s)	(2007 - 2010) and City of Niagara Falls Museums (2011 - 2018)
Brooks-Joiner, Carrie January 26, 2018	OMA: President (2004-2005), Council (1999 - 2007), Committees / Task Forces (1990s, 2000s) and Employee (1990)	Government of Canada: Museum Assistance Program (1990s) Museum Worker: Royal Botanical Garden (1999 - 2004)
Carter, Diana June 13, 2019	Ottawa Museum Network: Executive Director	
DiPietro, Lucy February 6, 2018	OMA: Project Manager (2014 - 2016)	
Doherty, Ken December 15, 2017	OMA: President (1989 - 1990), Counsel (1983 - 1984, 1988 - 1991), and Committees / Task Forces (1990s, 2000s)	Museum Worker: Timmins Museum (1980 - 1988) and Peterborough Centennial Museum & Archives (1988 - 2000)
Furness, Petal February 15, 2018	OMA: President (2017 - 2018), Council (2011 - 2018), and Committees (2000s, 2010s)	Museum Worker: Grey Roots Museum & Archives (2004 - current) Government of Canada: Parks Canada (1989 - 1997)
Havelka, Marilyn February 14, 2018	OMA: President (1998 - 2001), Council (1994 - 2004), Committees / Task Forces (1990s, 2000s, 2010s)	Museum Worker: Ruthven Park National Historic Site 2002 - current
Kerr-Wilson, Ian February 12, 2018	OMA: Council (2009 - 2013) and Committees / Task Forces (1980s, 1990s, 2010s)	Museum Worker: Hamilton Museum of Steam and Technology (1989 - 2005) and Dundurn National Historic Site (2005 - 2007)
Kurylo, Lynne January 19, 2019	OMA: Employee (1979) and Committee (1990s) OHS: Volunteer (1996)	Museum Worker: Enoch Turner Schoolhouse (1980s) and ROM (1980s)
Lalonde, Marie January 17, 2018	OMA: Executive Director	
Leverly, Rob January 17, 2018	OHS: Executive Director (2008 - current) and Employee (1988 - current)	OHS and the Multicultural History Society: History of Ontario People's Grant

		program (1988 – 1993)
McAvity, John November 10, 2018	OMA: Executive Director (1976 - 1980) CMA: Executive Director (1980 - 2018)	
Powell, Kathleen January 19, 2018	OMA, President (2009 - 2011), Council (2005 - 2013), and Committees / Task Forces (2000s, 2010s)	Museum Worker: City of Niagara Falls Museum (2005 - 2010) and St. Catherine's Museum and Wellands Canals Centre (2010 - 2013)
Participant B February 7, 2018	OMA, President & Committees (1970s-1980s)	
Other Contextual Interview		
Wilson,Carolynn September 28, 2019	OHS: member and participant Contextual interview: Highway signs	Sheffield Park Black History and Cultural Museum

Appendix B: Email Template

Good afternoon,

My name is Robin Nelson and I am a PhD candidate in Public Administration at the University of Ottawa. The research investigates how community museums negotiate diverse instruments from multiple levels of government to assemble the policy they experience.

There is a gap in our understanding regarding the active role museums can play in engaging with government policies. Your participation will contribute to scholarship on Canadian cultural policy and government responses to the needs of the cultural sector, leading to a better understanding of community museums' reality.

You are being asked to participate in this project because of your professional position and experiences with government policies; most notably, your experiences as _____. Participation in this project involves engaging in one or two interviews. The first interview will take no more than two hours of your time. With your permission, the interviews will be recorded in note and audio form.

As participation in this study is voluntary, you may decline to answer any of the interview questions. Further, you may decide to withdraw from the interview at any time without any negative impact. In the event that you wish to withdraw from the interview no information collected from you to that point will be used. You can participate anonymously or choose to be identified.

If you have any questions regarding this study, you can contact me at (###) ###-#### or by email at #####@uottawa.ca.

Thank you,

Robin Nelson

PhD Candidate in Public Administration / Doctorant en administration publique
School of Political Studies / École d'études politiques
University of Ottawa / Université d'Ottawa



uOttawa

Faculté des sciences sociales
Faculty of Social Sciences

École d'études politiques
School of Political Studies

Appendix C: Informed Consent

Unintended policies with intention: The translation of government instruments into an experienced cultural policy

Principal Investigator : Robin Nelson, PhD Candidate,
University of Ottawa Email : ####@uottawa.ca
Supervisor : Jonathan Paquette, 120 University,
University of Ottawa Email :
jonathan.paquette@uottawa.ca Tel : 613 562-5800
ext. 2970

Invitation to Participate: I am invited to participate in the above mentioned research study conducted by Robin Nelson as part of a Doctoral thesis project in Public Administration.

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of the study is to better understand how cultural institutions actors negotiate diverse instruments from multiple levels of government.

Participation: My participation will consist essentially of participating in an interview, which may last up to two hours, during which I will answer questions relating to my experiences with cultural policy. The interview has been scheduled for _____ (*date, time, location*). I may also be asked to briefly answer follow up questions.

Risks: My participation in this study will entail that I detail my professional activities and this may cause me to feel uncomfortable or embarrassed. Moreover, my responses may risk offending those who administer support programs to my institution. I have received assurance from the researcher that every effort will be made to minimize these risks. I can:

- choose the extent to which I am identifiable; full name and institution or institution only.
- decline to answer any question(s) without penalty
- stop the interview at any time
- withdraw consent at any time

Benefits: My participation in this study will contribute to scholarship on Canadian cultural policy and government responses to the needs of the cultural sector, leading to a better understanding of community museums' reality.

Confidentiality and anonymity: I have received assurance from the researcher that the information I will share will remain strictly confidential. I understand that the contents will be used only for research and publication related to Canadian cultural policy. My confidentiality will be protected as only information in the transcript I approve will be utilized in publication.



uOttawa

Faculté des sciences sociales
Faculty of Social Sciences

École d'études politiques
School of Political Studies

Anonymity is not guaranteed as my institutional affiliation is directly related to the research project. My anonymity can be partially protected through the use of a pseudonym if I choose to be identified only by my institutional affiliation. I choose to be identified by:

- Institution only
- Institution and title
- Institution, title, and name
- other _____

Conservation of data: The data collected (interview recordings and transcripts) will be kept in a secure manner will be encrypted and stored on the Investigator's personal, password protected, computer. In addition this data will be backed up on a portable USB device with Scandisk Cruzer Secure Access hardware. The supervisor will also keep a copy of the data in a locked file cabinet.

Voluntary Participation: I am under no obligation to participate and if I choose to participate, I can withdraw from the study at any time and/or refuse to answer any questions, without suffering any negative consequences. If I choose to withdraw, all data gathered until the time of withdrawal will be deleted.

Acceptance: I, _____, agree to participate in the above research study conducted by Robin Nelson of the School of Political Studies at the University of Ottawa, which research is under the supervision of Dr. Jonathan Paquette.

If I have any questions about the study, I may contact the researcher or her supervisor.

If I have any questions regarding the ethical conduct of this study, I may contact the Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research,
University of Ottawa,
Tabaret Hall, 550
Cumberland Street,
Room 154, Ottawa,
ON K1N 6N5
Tel.: (613) 562-5387
Email: ethics@uottawa.ca

There are two copies of the consent form, one of which is mine to keep.

Participant's signature:

Date:

Researcher's signature:

Date:

Pièce 7005 / Room 7005
7^e étage / 7th floor
120, rue Université / University Pwt.
Ottawa ON K1N 6N5

Appendix D: Question Guides

Question Guide for Advisors / Conservators

Personal

Can you tell me about yourself?
What was/is your relationship with museums?

Ontario

Broadly, what do/ did you see as government museum policy?
How do you define the role of the government?
What programs do you see as significant?
Are there interactions or intersections between departments as it relates to museums?
What are the significant departments or agencies?
How about levels of government?

Advisor or conservator

How do you define the role of the museum advisor/ conservator?
How did you _____?

Other

Within this context, what is a museum's role in seeking support?
What do you see as the role of the service organizations, such as the OMA or OHS?

To finish

If you had to draw a map of museum policy, what does it look like?
Is there anything I have not asked about that I should?
Is there anyone I should talk to?

Question Guide for Service Organizations

Personal

Can you tell me about yourself?
What was/is your relationship with museums?

Service Organization

What do you see as the role of your service organization?
What was your role?
How did you _____?
What is the role of other service organizations?
Are there interactions or intersections between them?

Gov.

Broadly, what do/ did you see as government museum policy? Federally? Provincially?

How do you define the role of the government?

What programs do you see as significant?

Are there interactions or intersections between levels as it relates to museums?

What are the significant departments or agencies?

Advisor or conservator

Provincially, how do you define the role of the museum advisor/ conservator?

Were there any other government advisors, provincially or municipally, I should consider?

Museum

Within this context, what is a museum's role in seeking support?

To finish

If you had to draw a map of museum policy, what does it look like?

Is there anything I have not asked about that I should?

Is there anyone I should talk to?

Appendix E: Document Collection

Finding Aid	Description	Document Types	Search *
Government / Advisors			
<i>Archives of Ontario</i>			
RG 2-74	Department of Education, Community Programs Branch: General correspondence files	Memorandums	T
RG 5-4	Minister of Tourism: Correspondence	Application, Letters, Memorandums, Regulations	T, K
RG 5-15	Deputy Minister of Travel and Publicity	Data, Letters, Memorandums, Papers, Press, Regulations	K
RG 47-18	Ministry of Culture and Recreation, Museum Section: Experience program records	Various, 90 centimetres of textual records.	E
RG 47-40	Ministry of Colleges and Universities, Cultural Affairs Division of the (later the Community Arts Development Branch of the Ministry of Culture and Recreation): administration of government funds and programs to arts communities and organizations in Ontario records	Various, 79 meters of textual records	E
RG 47-41	Heritage Branch: operating grants files.	Various, 75.8 meters of textual records	E
RG 47-43	Ministry of Citizenship and Culture: capital and program grants management files	Applications, Statements, discussion papers, memorandum, Letters	K
RG 47-44	Cultural Industries Branch (and successors): Lottery grants case files for heritage projects	Applications, letters	K

RG 47-45	Wintario capital grant case files.	Applications, letters	K
RG 47-46	Wintario grants programme administrative records	Memorandum, museum notes, letters, discussion papers	K
RG 47-49	Heritage Branch (and successors): Heritage Assistance Program files	Letters, memorandum, applications	K
RG 47-50	Museum Section (and successors): administrative files.	Various, 1.2 meters of textual records	E
RG 47-51	Museum Section (and predecessors/successors): correspondence	Various, 57.1 meters of textual records	E
RG 47-57	Historical and Museums Branch: Archaeological and Historic Sites Protection Act records	Submission to cabinet, memorandum	K
RG 47-58	Director, Heritage Administration Branch: administration	Letters, memorandum, papers, estimates	K
RG 47-61	Heritage organization support grant records.	Strategic directions, memorandum, applications, letters	K
RG 47-79	Museum Policy Development Reports	Reports, 12.5 cm of textual records	E
RG 47-106	Manager, Heritage Programs Section: administration.	Proposals, papers, questionnaires	K
RG 47-108	Director, Heritage Branch: administrative	Papers, memorandum, letters	K
RG 47-109	Director, Field Services Branch, Ministry of Culture and Recreation records: Administration	Memorandums	K
RG 47-112	Heritage policy development	Various, 26.9 meters of textual records	K, E
RG 47-129	Ministry of Culture and Citizenship: administration of arts and cultural activities	Applications	K
RG 47-159	Application for conservation treatment	Various, 30 cm of textual records	E
<i>Libraries</i>			

University of Ottawa	Annual reports from responsible Ministries	E
ROM	Resources	E
<i>Other</i>		
Internet	Application forms, presentations, resources	T
Personal correspondence	Application forms	
Service Organizations		
<i>Archives of Ontario</i>		
F 2091 5	Ontario Museum Association council meetings correspondence and reports files	Various, 1.6 m of textual records E
F 2091 6	Ontario Museum Association general correspondence files	Various, 20 cm of textual records E
F 2091 7	Ontario Museum Association committees correspondence, briefs and reports files	Various, 50 cm of textual records E
F 2091 15	Ontario Museum Association government liaison files	Various, 65 cm of textual records E
F 2091 16	Canadian Museums Association files	Various, 15 cm of textual records E
F2091 17	Ontario Museum Association Executive Director's files	Various, 10 cm of textual records E
F2091 22	Ontario Museum Association Trillium Regional Network files	Various, 15 cm of textual records E
F 1139 6	Ontario Historical Society, Museums Section circulars	Workshop Reports, 6.5 cm of textual records E
Period O	Ontario Historical Society, Museums Section	Newsletter E
Period C	Ontario Museum Association	Currently E
<i>Libraries</i>		
University of Ottawa	OHS Bulletins, OMA special publications, Ontario History	E
ROM	OMA Currently, OMA resources and special publications, OMA Annual, CMA annual reports, CMA special publications	E

York University	CMA Muse, CMA museogramme, CMA gazette, CMA special publications	E
<i>Other</i>		
Internet	Annual Reports, special publications, newsletters	E
Participant files	OHS special publications, various	T