JANÁČEK ACADEMY OF MUSIC AND PERFORMING ARTS IN BRNO

FACULTY OF MUSIC

THE ANALYSES OF CONTEMPORARY CULTURAL POLICY IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC

Author: BcA. Barbora Štěpánková

1st year MA level, Music management program, Faculty of Music, Janáček Academy of Music and Performing Arts, Brno, Czech Republic

MgA. Lucie Šilerová, head of Music management program, Faculty of Music, Janáček Academy of Music and Performing Arts, Brno, Czech Republic

Contact: Janáček Academy of Music and Performing Arts, Komenského náměstí 6, 662 15, Brno, Czech Republic

barbora.stepankova@hf.jamu.cz, silerova@jamu.cz

+420 737 382 352

Brno 2012

Abstract

This work describes the situation in the area of cultural policy in main Czech cities and regions. It is hypothesized, that most of the cities and regions have prepared some kind of cultural policy document. Also it is hypothesized that cultural policy documents shall be in accordance with regional and national cultural policy documents. The aim of our research is to describe current situation, point out the main pitfalls and give a feedback for development of up-to-date professional documents of cultural policy for departments of culture.

Methodology: The interest is in the quality of the documents (by objectively measurable criteria) and its complexity. In this work we describe a set of criteria and new evaluation methodology (chapter number 3.3.).

Our results shows that most of the regions and municipalities in our study don't have some cultural policy document (only four regions and four cities). Our evaluation also shows that most of the documents are still in development. They do not reflect all possible areas of cultural interest and they do not use instruments for development of cultural policy and subsequent documents.

Keywords:

Culture, policy, cultural policy, municipal cultural policy, regional cultural policy, strategic document, concept of cultural policy

Introduction

Cultural policy is very important as a common theme for many municipalities; it is connected with new cultural concepts e.g. creative economy (ref: British Council – Creative and Cultural Economy) and related concepts of creative cities. Cultural policy is also connected with many international projects such as The European Capital of Culture. To get involved in such programs, municipalities are asked to prepare strategic document concerning cultural policy.

1. Brief presentation of cultural potential of the Czech Republic

There are many cultural institutions as well as relatively large cultural heritage in the Czech Republic. According to the statistics from The National Information and Consulting Centre for Culture (NIPOS) and National Heritage Institute from the year 2010 (latest available) there were:

- 40 258 immovable cultural sights, from which 12 properties are inscribed on The UNESCO World Heritage List and 269 are registered as National Cultural Heritage. About 62 % of these cultural sights are in state, regional or municipal administration.
- 151 theatres (without stagione) with 36 648 seats, 157 steady ensembles and 5 805 000 visitors per year. Only 42 theatres are established by state, regions or municipalities (that's about 28 %).
- 30 professional music ensembles (includes big orchestras, chamber orchestras and choirs) with 2 166 concerts per year. 12 ensembles are established by state, regions or municipalities (it makes 40 %).
- 477 museums, galleries and memorials with 9 308 000 visitors per year. 381 museums, galleries and memorials from these 477 are established by state, regions or municipalities and that is almost 80 %.
- in the field of fine art it is 411 exhibition halls with 2 719 expositions. 136 exhibition halls are in state, regional or municipal administration, which is about 33 %.
- 5 432 (figure from the year 2009) public libraries (just for imagination The Czech Republic has 6 249 (figure from the year 2007) municipalities) with 1 397 948 registered readers. All of them are established by law and are in state, regional or

municipal administration. As well there were 77 specialized libraries (many of them established by universities) and 246 libraries belonged to museums and galleries in the Czech Republic.

- 17 598 non-periodical publications issued in 2009 and 5 481 titles of periodical publications in 2009 with 889 publishers.

- 348 festivals per year of all genres from which 104 festivals were organized by regions, municipalities or organizations funded by regions or municipalities or universities (it comprises about 30 %).

- Also there is a special phenomenon of "cultural houses" in the Czech Republic. It is something like cultural centre in most cases with multi-purpose hall; also it could include a cinema or some other spaces. These "cultural houses" are in every bigger city. Statistical survey from the year 2010 noticed 454 such entities (389 established by municipalities).

The conclusion from these figures is that about 65 % of main cultural entities and about 30 % of cultural festivals are established by state, regions or municipalities in the Czech Republic. This could be one of the reasons why concept of cultural policy is needed to be prepared.

2. Cultural Policy of the Czech Republic

Generally, cultural policy is kind of the idea of how the culture should be organized, which tasks should be done by the state and which should be done by other authorities and which priorities in the field of culture are. This could be affected by many factors, which could be divided into external (such as global political situation or connection of the country to a certain cultural region) and internal. These are short-term (e.g. national political climate and program, the aims of government, economic situation etc.) or long-term (e.g. level of the cultural education of the population, cultural interests and needs of the population, strength of cultural tradition, etc.)[1]

There are many factors which could influence a form of cultural management and implicate many models of cultural policy. The first description of this area was in the year 1987 Cumming and Katz characterized four basic approaches to the cultural policy:

1. Strongly centralized cultural system – most of the competencies are directed to the single central authority (ministry of culture) which is responsible for the development of the national cultural policy (e.g. France).
2. Responsibility for culture is divided into the several administrations / ministries (e.g. Italy – responsibility is divided into the four ministries).
3. Model with a quasi-autonomous authority – culture decisions are separated from politics (e.g. Great Britain – decisions are made by independent expert commissions)
4. Impresario model – model with the most significant state interventions to the culture (e.g. former Soviet Union)[2]

The Ministry of culture of the Czech Republic is the central authority responsible for culture. It prepares the national cultural policy which distributes to the regions and municipalities. And these subjects should based their own cultural policies on the state one. According to this first approach seems to be most suitable for the Czech Republic.

---

[1] Taken from the „white book" published by the Ministry of culture: in ŠKARABELOVÁ. Simona, NESHYBOVÁ. Jarmila, REKTOŘÍK. Jaroslav. *Ekonomika kultury a masmédií*, Brno : Masarykova univerzita, 2007. 210 s. ISBN 978-80-210-4267.
[2] Taken from CUMMINGS, M. C., Katz, R. S. The Patron state, 1987: in ŠKARABELOVÁ. Simona, NESHYBOVÁ. Jarmila, REKTOŘÍK. Jaroslav. *Ekonomika kultury a masmédií*, Brno : Masarykova univerzita, 2007. 210 s. ISBN 978-80-210-4267.

2.1. Organizational Structure of Ensuring Culture in the Public Sector in the Czech Republic

There are three levels which ensure culture in the Czech Republic: state level, regional level and municipal level. There are certain areas where local level has to comply ministry suggestions (cultural heritage and preservation). But also the local level keeps certain independence which may arise from regional and local budget.

2.1.1. State level

State level is the highest and it is represented mostly by the Ministry of Culture, which is according to the Czech law the central authority for:

- Arts
- Educational activities in culture
- Cultural heritage
- Church and religious communities
- Print, including non-periodical publications and other information means
- Preparations of draft laws and other regulations in the area of radio and television broadcasting
- Implementation of Copyright Act
- Manufacturing and trade in the area of culture[3]

2.1.2. Regional Level

Regional level is represented by 14 regions (NUTS 3[4]) which have existed since the year 2001. There were only 7 regions in previous geopolitical lay-out. It means that there were some regions with previous governance experience for preparing legislative, conceptual, methodical, institutional etc. scope in all areas including culture. State also delegates some tasks to the regions in the field of culture as well as they are acting according to self-governing scope.

Regions are listed in Tab. 1

---

[3] Competence of ministry from the web of the Ministry of Culture
Působnost ministerstva. *Ministerstvo kultury ČR* [online]. 2007 [cit. 2012-04-10]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.mkcr.cz/scripts/detail.php?id=36>
[4] The classification of Eurostat available from:
http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/nuts_nomenclature/introduction

Tab.1: Regions of the Czech Republic

Region	Basic description	Capital city
Capital city of Praha	Metropolis has also status of a region	Praha
Středočeský	region of central Bohemia	Praha – as administrative center
Jihočeský	region of south Bohemia	České Budějovice
Plzeňský	region around the city of Pilsen	Plzeň
Karlovarský	region around the city of Karlovy Vary	Karlovy Vary
Ústecký	region around the city of Ústí nad Labem	Ústí nad Labem
Liberecký	region around the city of Liberec	Liberec
Královehradecký	region around the city of Hradec Králové	Hradec Králové
Pardubický	region around the city of Pardubice	Pardubice
Vysočina	region situated at Bohemian-Moravian Highlands	Jihlava
Jihomoravský	region of south Moravia	Brno
Olomoucký	region around the city of Olomouc	Omomouc
Zlínský	region around the city of Zlín	Zlín
Moravskoslezský	region of Silesia and North part of Moravia	Ostrava

Source: author, according to Czech Statistical Office

2.1.3. Municipal Level

Municipal level comprises 6 249 (figure from the year 2007 according to Czech Statistical Office) municipalities. Municipalities as well as regions fulfill some tasks delegated by the state and other tasks according to self-governing scope. This work is interested in 13 cities (the capital cities of aforementioned regions – Tab.:1.)

2.2. National Cultural Policy of the Czech Republic 2009 - 2014

National Cultural Policy of the Czech Republic 2009 – 2014 is the main and the most important actual document in this area. This concept was created in response to a

previous document dedicated to cultural policy from the year 2001. The first concept of cultural policy was created in 2001, although culture has been a stable element of the policy statements ever since Czech and Slovak separation in 1993. „. New legislation was set after the Czech - Slovak separation, the area of culture was not well described in the beginning. But the necessity of establishing a political governmental program in the field of culture grew in connection with the accession of the Czech Republic to the European Union in 2004.[5]

2.2.1. Vision and objectives of "National Cultural Policy of the Czech Republic 2009 – 2014"

The vision of culture in this document contains following points:

- Culture is a sector, which can play a fundamental role in the years to come in the development of Czech society and which can be considered one of the basic elements of an economic, environmental and social development of the state.
- The Czech Republic can make use of contacts with European and global influences because of its geographical location and its tradition.
- The space for cultural production and for making use of the cultural values created in the past must remain open and accessible.
- The task of the state, regions and municipalities and its institutions is not only to support the culture itself but to connect it with other realms of life in a society, particularly to make its values accessible – the cultural heritage as well as the freedom and creativity important for cultural production – so people can make use of it in their various activities.
- The future competitiveness of the state should be based on these principles.[6]

This vision is elaborated to the four objectives which are developed to the 43 detailed tasks. The objectives are:

---

[5] Czech Republic EU treaty, available from:
http://www.europarl.europa.eu/enlargement_new/treaty/default_en.htm.
[6] National Cultural Policy of the Czech Republic 2009 – 2014
Státní kulturní politika České republiky 2009 – 2014 (english version). *Ministerstvo kultury ČR*[online]. 2007 [cit. 2011-04-05]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.mkcr.cz/assets/kulturni-politika/cultural-policy_EN.pdf>

- Objective 1 – Economic and social dimensions: To use the benefits of the arts and cultural heritage and associated creativity to increase competitive strength in other areas and activities.

- Objective 2 – The civic dimension – personal development: To emphasize the role of culture in individual professional and personal development of citizens, especially with regard to creativity, the cultivation of democratic values and individual attitudes and thus increasing general responsibility for the inherited values as well as the newly created ones.

- Objective 3 – The role of state, regions and municipalities to support maintenance and formation of cultural values: To provide direct and indirect support to maintain existing cultural values and create new values as well.

- Objective 4 – The role of state to formulate the rules: To create a transparent and non-discriminating environment for cultural activities and their support at the levels of state, regions and municipalities.[7]

2.3. Other Concepts in the Field of Cultural Policy in the Czech Republic

National Cultural Policy of the Czech Republic 2009 – 2014 is – as it was stated – the most important and general document in the area of cultural policy but not the only one. The Ministry of Culture also issued some other more specialized documents in this area, such as:

- Concept of Effective Support of Art 2007–2013
- Library Development Concept in the Czech Republic 2011 – 2015
- Concept of Cultural Heritage Care 2011 – 2016
- Concept of Effective Care for Movable Cultural Heritage of the Czech Republic 2010 – 2014 (Concept of Development of Galleries)
- Concept of Effective Care for Traditional Folk Culture 2011 – 2015

Another important document which includes culture is Strategy of Regional Development of the Czech Republic 2007 – 2013 issued by Ministry of Regional Development.

---

[7] National Cultural Policy of the Czech Republic 2009 – 2014
Státní kulturní politika České republiky 2009 – 2014 (english version). *Ministerstvo kultury ČR*[online]. 2007 [cit. 2011-04-05]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.mkcr.cz/assets/kulturni-politika/cultural-policy_EN.pdf>

3. Practical Cultural Policy of Regions of the Czech Republic

This chapter is dedicated to research of practical cultural policy at regional level. This work looked at 14 regions of the Czech Republic which were aforementioned.

According to National Cultural Policy of the Czech Republic regions support the cultural development from their budgets and fulfill objectives following from the special regulations. They establish regional libraries, museums and galleries, often also regional theatres and stages, orchestras and institutes of archaeological monumental care. Regions help creating financial, conceptual and legislative grounds for the development of regional culture and react at actual requirements in accordance with the Czech government concepts and recommendations of the Ministry of Culture.

This could be also one of the reasons why concept of cultural policy is too important for regions as well.

3.1. Approach to the Cultural Policy by the Regions before 2009

Approach to the cultural policy by the regions shows the Tab.2. There were only five regions with concept of cultural policy in the Czech Republic in 2009. Four other regions had at least partial concept in relation to culture. Each region had regional development program where culture were mentioned. The main themes of these programs were (according to National Cultural Policy of the Czech Republic):

- A universal feature is a stress on economic utilization of the cultural heritage, and almost exclusively for tourism;
- Cultural services support as well as cultural infrastructure support are common in country areas;
- There are different other cultural aspects in individual documents (more on a declarative level) for example minorities and traditional culture or subculture (for example youth), places of interest and environment, identification of inhabitants with the region, quality of life, human resource development, intellectual capital of a society and a cultural climate.

Tab.2: Regional Approach to the Cultural Policy before 2009

Region	Concept of Cultural Policy	Other Concept
Praha	Concept of Cultural Development	Regional Development Program
Středočeský		Regional Development Program + Concept of museums and galleries
Jihočeský	No document prepared	Regional Development Program
Plzeňský		Regional Development Program + Monument Heritage Concept
Karlovarský	No document prepared	Regional Development Program
Ústecký	Concept of Cultural Development	Regional Development Program
Liberecký	Concept of Cultural Development	Regional Development Program
Královehradecký	No document prepared	Regional Development Program
Pardubický		Regional Development Program + Concept of State Monumental Care Support
Vysočina	Draft of concept	Regional Development Program
Jihomoravský		Regional Development Program + Concept of preservation and cultivation of cultural monuments
Olomoucký	Concept of Cultural Development	Regional Development Program
Zlínský	Concept of Cultural Development	Regional Development Program
Moravskoslezský	No document prepared	Regional Development Program

Source: Author according to information from National Cultural Policy of the Czech Republic

3.2. Approach to the Cultural Policy by the Regions in 2012

Current approach to the regional cultural policy is described in Tab.3. Each region has some program of regional development but not documents of cultural policy. Firstly the number of concepts of cultural development has decreased from five to four and the names of regions preparing these documents were partially changed. Jihomoravský region didn't have a concept of cultural policy and now it has, on the other hand Ústecký and Liberecký region had some concept of cultural policy and now they haven't. Vysočina region is still in progress in working out its strategical documents in the area of culture.

Situation is better in area of partial document of cultural policy. Regions worked out at least some concept including some part of the cultural area. The number of regions which have these partial documents has increased from four to seven. Two regions even worked out two concepts for two areas of culture and one region worked out even three

areas. Two regions have concept of cultural policy and some other specialized document for some area. Generally the number of regions which have at least partial concept of cultural policy hasn't changed but the number of cultural policy concepts has increased from nine to fifteen.

Tab.3: Regional Approach to the Cultural Policy in 2012

Region	Concept of Cultural Policy	Other Concept
Praha	Concept of Cultural Development	Regional Development Program
Středočeský		Regional Development Program + Library Development Concept + Concepnt of Museums and Galleries
Jihočeský	No document prepared	Regional Development Program
Plzeňský		Regional Development Program + Concept of Culural Heritage Care + Concept of Museums
Karlovarský	Concept is in progress	Regional Development Program
Ústecký		Regional Development Program
Liberecký		Regional Development Program + Concept of Museums
Královehradecký	Concept is in progress	Regional Development Program
Pardubický		Regional Development Program + Concept of State Monumental Care Support + Concept of Museums + Concept of Culural Heritage Care
Vysočina	Concept is in progress	Regional Development Program
Jihomoravský	Concept of Cultural Development	Regional Development Program + Concept of Preservation and Cultivation of Cultural Monuments
Olomoucký	Concept of Development of Culture and Cultural Heritage Care	Regional Development Program
Zlínský	Concept of Cultural Development	Regional Development Program + Concept of Development of Local Culture
Moravskoslezský		Regional Development Program + Concept of Culural Heritage Care

Source: author's own research and questionnaire survey

3.3. Appraisal of the Regional Documents Concerning Culture

The next step in this research after the mapping the situation in 2009 and 2012 was appraisal of regional documents concerning culture. Each document has been studied according to the set criteria which was:

- if the documents are up-to-date
- period for which they were valid
- if there is a hierarchy using: vision – objectives – tasks
- if vision – objectives – tasks complies with the National Cultural Policy of the Czech Republic 2009 – 2014
- if there is set responsibility (who, when, costs and financial sources)
- existence of analytical and strategic part
- resolving other problems or innovative areas
- dividing of mentioned cultural sector according to areas in % tried to be determined in the case of general documents of cultural policy (dividing of cultural sector by European Commission were used).

Documents were divided to the three groups: programs of development culture (general documents of cultural policy), specialized documents concerning certain area of the culture and programs of regional development.

3.3.1. General Documents of Cultural Policy

There are four documents in this group. Results according to set criteria are following:

- three from four documents are currently valid – the valid period has not expired yet. Validity couldn't be determined in one of the documents (from 2005), because validity isn't mentioned.
- average period of validity of these document is 5,5 years (determinate from two documents, two others didn't mentioned the validity period)
- 50 %, two from four documents have hierarchy "vision – objectives – tasks". One document has mixture of everything without hierarchy and the last one has objectives more likely following up the previous document.

- All of studied general documents follow National Cultural Policy (has similar objectives)

- Responsibility: responsible person or position is set in two from four documents, "when" – timelines and deadlines are not set in any of documents. Costs are figured in one document, in one other partially, in one generally for all objectives and one document doesn't mentions costs. Financial sources for funding are set in one document, in two are mentioned generally for all objectives and one document doesn't mention financial sources.

- Each document has strategic part; three from four has also analytical part. One document doesn't have the analytical part, as it is structured much more like updating the previous concept.

- The biggest problem is very non-specific and general objectives, without establishing competences and that the period of validity isn't stated

- Innovative area could be find in Zlín region – there are objectives very specifically defined and also measurable indicators are mentioned

- Percentage of the documents' orientation on specific cultural areas shows Tab.4.

Tab.4: Percentage of the Documents' Orientation on Specific Cultural Areas

Performing arts	16,70%
Visual arts	2%
Cultural heritage	16, 7%
Film and video	0%
Books and press	0%
Radio and TV	0%
Videogames	0%
Others*	64,60%

* this category was added by author and includes operational objections, legislation, financing and other objections of this character

Source: author according to regional concepts of cultural policy

3.3.2. Specialized Concepts Concerning Certain Area of the Culture

There are 11 concepts in this group. Most of them are specialized on the area of cultural heritage (five) and museums and galleries development (four). There is also one concept dedicated to libraries and one to local culture. Results according to set criteria are following:

- Five of eleven concepts are currently valid, two aren't and there are three concepts without validity, so it couldn't be determined

- Average period of validity of these concepts is 5,5 years (determined from six concepts, five others didn't mentioned the validity)

- 54,5 % have hierarchy vision – objectives – tasks (six from eleven)

- Only seven concepts from eleven follows the National Cultural Policy (has similar objectives). Two concepts follows National Cultural Policy just partially and have better connection to some other concept e.g. Concept of Cultural Heritage Care.

- Responsibility: who is set in six from eleven concepts, when is set in four concepts (twice were mentioned a start of objectives but not the end), costs are figured in three concepts (in one generally – high/low), financial sources are in four concepts but just in general form for all objectives.

- Each concept has strategic part, but three from eleven have problems with analytical part, which doesn't include some analyses but only some description of the area situation.

- The biggest problem as well as in the previous group of concepts is very non-specific and general objectives, without establishing competences, the period of validity isn't stated and in addition some concepts weren't valid.

- Innovative area – on the other hand there were some concepts with objectives very specifically defined and also with measurable indicators.

3.3.3. Programs of Regional Development

There are 14 programs in this group because each region has some program of regional development. About these programs could be said:

- Twelve of fourteen programs are currently valid, two programs are without validity, so it couldn't be determined

- Average period of validity of these programs is 6 years (determined from 11 programs, three others didn't mentioned the validity)

- Each program has hierarchy vision – objectives – tasks and almost all of them follows the National Cultural Policy (has similar objectives). But the biggest problem of these programs is that there are very few goals devoted to culture and few objectives are mostly focused on narrow topics and discuss just one or two

areas of culture. Also most of the time they are non-specific and general, without establishing competences but with some exceptions.

3.4. Questionnaire Survey

To support author's research from the previous chapters a questionnaire survey was carried out among the regions. Except the questions confirming which documents regions have etc. there were also some other supplementary questions as:

- If your region doesn't have any concept of cultural policy, please, write down the reason.
- Please specify sources of your cultural policy concept
- Autoevaluation of the quality of concept with considering its useful
- Are you planning the concept of cultural policy in future? (for those who doesn't have one)

Results of these questions were following:

- As a reasons why some regions don't have a cultural policy document were given low amount of finances, lack of staff and disinterest in using such a concept
- As sources were given National Cultural Policy of the Czech Republic and other conception documents issued by state, analysis (e.g. SWOT), public discussions, experience, cooperation with cultural entities, universities or public
- Average of autoevaluation is 4,5 points in the scale from 1 to 5 (5 is the best). The average is made from 9 regions which have a concept of cultural policy or some other specialized document concerning some area of culture (not the regional development programs)
- Each region without concept answered that they planned to create a cultural policy document in future.

3.5. Financial Support of Culture by Regions

This chapter briefly outlines the financial support of culture by regions and searches if there is some connection between worked-out concept of cultural policy and amount of financial support of culture.

The real situation is described in the Table 3. Data used in this table are from the regional accounts from the year 2010 (the latest available data) from department of culture and subsidies to cultural organization if it is stated extra (investment and non-investment spendings). Regions with stronger financial support is Prague (but it is also a city), Karlovarský region, Plzeňský region, Liberecký region and Jihočeský region. Only one region from these (Prague) has a cultural policy concept, two regions (Plzeňský and Jihočeský) has concept just for certain area of culture and two regions (Karlovarský and Liberecký) hasn't got any concept (excepting regional development program). On the other hand Pardubický region which has the smallest support to culture has some conceptions. So connection between worked-out concept of cultural policy and amount of financial support of culture isn't evident here.

Tab.5: Financial support of Culture by Regions in 2010

in thousand Czech crowns

Region	Culture spendings	Total spendings	%
Praha	2885051,01	68212036,90	4,23
Středočeský	291150,61	16568989,64	1,76
Jihočeský	263597,90	9892531,10	2,66
Plzeňský	319466,78	8748654,45	3,65
Karlovarský	221331,00	5727083,00	3,86
Ústecký	240716,00	13139105,00	1,83
Liberecký	129044,00	4011924,94	3,22
Královehradecký	159173,20	9048920,80	1,76
Pardubický	107426,20	7831949,87	1,37
Vysočina	138885,00	10011193,77	1,39
Jihomoravský	213907,10	15331165,14	1,40
Olomoucký	213915,00	10408418,00	2,06
Zlínský	203214,00	8981215,00	2,26
Moravskoslezský	260507,00	16710870,00	1,56

Source: Author according to regional accounts from the year 2010.

4. Practical Cultural Policy of Municipalities of the Czech Republic

This chapter is dedicated to research of practical cultural policy at municipal level. This work looked at 13 cities of the Czech Republic which were aforementioned. All of these cities are the capital cities of Czech regions.

According to National Cultural Policy municipalities provide an overall development of the regional area and care for citizens needs; to fulfill the stated objectives and to protect the public interest is one of the main priorities. Municipality budgets support the cultural development; some of them also establish cultural institutions, mainly town and local libraries, galleries, local museums, theatres, orchestras and other specialized cultural institutions.

4.1. Approach to the Cultural Policy by Municipalities in 2012

Data which describes previous situation in this area don't exist so there is no comparison in the municipal level. Current situation is shown in the Tab.6 but as long as the questionnaire survey in this level is still caring on, these results are preliminary and may vary slightly.

So far it is sure that each city with exception of Zlín has some strategical plan of city development where the culture is most of the times mentioned. Only four cities have prepared a cultural policy document and four cities are working on it.

Tab.6: Approach to the Cultural Policy by Municipalities in 2012

Cities	Concept of Cultural Policy	Other Concept
Praha	Concept of Cultural Development	Strategical Plan of City Development
České Budějovice	Concept is in progress	Strategical Plan of City Development
Plzeň	Concept of Cultural Development	Strategical Plan of City Development
Karlovy Vary	Concept is in progress	Strategical Plan of City Development
Ústí nad Labem		Strategical Plan of City Development
Liberec		Strategical Plan of City Development
Hradec Králové		Strategical Plan of City Development
Pardubice		Strategical Plan of City Development
Jihlava	Concept of Cultural Development	Strategical Plan of City Development
Brno	Concept is in progress	Strategical Plan of City Development
Olomouc	Concept is in progress	Strategical Plan of City Development

Zlín		Strategical Plan of City Development in progress
Ostrava	Concept of Cultural Development	Strategical Plan of City Development

Source: author's own research and questionnaire survey (not finished yet)

4.2. Appraisal of the Municipal Documents Concerning Culture

As in the regional level each document has been studied according to the set criteria (the same as in chapter 3.3.)

This time documents were divided into the two groups: programs of cultural development (documents of cultural policy) and strategical plans of city development.

4.2.1. Documents of Cultural Policy

There are four documents in this group. Results according to set criteria are following:

- All from four documents are currently valid
- Average period of validity of these documents is 8 years.
- 75 % (three from four documents) have hierarchy "vision – objections – tasks". One document has mixture of everything without hierarchy.
- Each document follows National Cultural Policy (has similar objections). Continuity to regional concept of cultural policy cannot be found as long as these regions don't have this concept.
- Responsibility: category who is set just in one from these four documents, when is set in three documents, costs are figured in two documents and financial sources are in two document; in one are mentioned generally for all objections and the last document doesn't mention financial sources.
- Each document has strategical part; one from four has also analytical part. One document is structured much more like updating the previous concept, one document has only SWOT analysis and the last one doesn't have the analytical part.
- The biggest problem is absence of analytical part and in one document very non-specific and general objections, without establishing competences.

- Innovative area – concept of Ostrava and Plzeň are very well prepared. Objections are very specifically defined with competences including the measurable indicators.
- Percentage of the documents' orientation on specific cultural areas is stated in the Tab.7.

Tab.7: Percentage of the Documents' Orientation on Specific Cultural Areas (municipalities)

Performing arts	27,6%
Visual arts	6,3%
Cultural heritage	14,4%
Film and video	5,2%
Books and press	1,7%
Radio and TV	0%
Videogames	0%
Others*	44,8%

* this category was added by author and includes operational objections, legislation, financing and other objections of this character

Source: author according to regional concepts of cultural policy

4.2.2. Strategical Plans of City Development

There are 12 documents in this group because each city with the exception of Zlín has some strategical plan on city development. Similarly as in regional development programs about these documents could be said following:

- Nine documents from twelve are currently valid
- Average period of validity of these documents is about 10 years.
- Most of the document has hierarchy vision – objections – tasks and almost all of them follows the National Cultural Policy (has similar objections). But the biggest problem of these documents is that there are very few goals devoted to culture and these few objections are mostly focused very narrowly and discuss just one or two areas of culture in these concepts. Also most of the time they are non-specific and general, without establishing the competences.

4.3. Financial Support of Culture by Cities

Also in the municipal level there is an outline of financial support by cities.

The real situation is described in the Tab.8. Data used in this table are from the regional accounts from the year 2010 (the latest available data) from department of culture (subsidies to cultural organization if they are stated extra were including); investment and non-investment spendings. There were some problems with getting the data: some data weren't available or there were high investment spendings in some cities which may misrepresent the final data. Because of these problems the only conclusion in this area is that average spendings to culture from cities was from all available data about 8,5 % of all city spendings.

Tab.8: Financial Support of Culture by Cities 2010

in thousand Czech crowns			
City	**Culture spendings**	**Total spendings**	**%**
Praha	2885051,01	68212036,90	4,23
České Budějovice	84198,00	2381782,99	3,54
Plzeň	not mentioned	5630299,00	11,70
Karlovy Vary	data weren't avaible	data weren't avaible	
Ústí nad Labem	87342,11	2481830,00	3,52
Liberec	data weren't avaible	data weren't avaible	
Hradec Králové	151559,70	2256616,00	6,72
Pardubice	data weren't avaible	data weren't avaible	
Jihlava	27516,20	1332169,00	2,07
Brno	1109686,00	12214745,00	9,08
Olomouc	data weren't avaible	2396067,98	
Zlín	587591,84	2134054,35	27,53
Ostrava	602036,00	6366953,00	9,46

Source: Author according to municipal accounts from the year 2010.

5. Conclusion

There are many reasons for working out a cultural policy document for regions and cities. If we leave out the legislative regulations one of the good reasons is that about 65 % of main cultural entities and about 30 % of cultural festivals are established by state, regions or municipalities in the Czech Republic and managing them without any strategical concept might be difficult, aimless and problematical.

Although cultural policy seems to be important for regions and cities, very few number of regions and cities with concept of cultural policy were found out – four regions and four cities. Some regions have at least some specialized document in certain area of culture (e.g. Concept of Cultural Heritage Care etc.) – nine regions have some document, at least this one and three regions have the concept of cultural policy in progress. The situation is much worse in municipal level. Only four cities have a concept of cultural policy and four others have it in progress. No other specialized documents were found. As main reasons for not having such a concept were mentioned these: low amount of finances, lack of staff and disinterest in using such a concept. On the other hand regions which have concept of cultural policy or at least concept concerning some certain area of culture evaluate the quality of such concept with considering its useful very high (average 4,5 points from 5).

Most problematic areas of researched documents were very non-specific and general objectives, without establishing competences and period of validity.

According to these founding outs this research gives criteria of ideal document of cultural policy:

- Is up-to-date
- The period of validity is strictly given. After the end of this period the concept is evaluating and updating
- There is strong connection to local concept and national cultural policy in the document
- There is a "vision – objectives – tasks" hierarchy in the document
- Responsibility is strictly given, at least who, when (timelines and deadlines), costs and financial sources. Measurable indicators are also applicable and very useful.

- Worked out analytical (at least SWOT analysis and one other analysis describing local potentials) and strategical part with clearly defined concrete objectives and tasks
- Percentage of documents' specialization on specific cultural areas should be balanced.

Connection between worked-out concept of cultural policy and amount of financial support of culture wasn't confirmed.

List of References

ŠKARABELOVÁ. Simona, NESHYBOVÁ. Jarmila, REKTOŘÍK. Jaroslav: *Ekonomika kultury a masmédií*, Brno : Masarykova univerzita, 2007. 210 s. ISBN 978-80-210-4267.

Státní kulturní politika České republiky 2009 – 2014 (english version). *Ministerstvo kultury ČR*[online]. 2007 [cit. 2011-04-05]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.mkcr.cz/assets/kulturni-politika/cultural-policy_EN.pdf>

MORÁVKOVÁ. Lucie: *Finanční podpora muzeí v České republice a ve Francii.* Brno : Masarykova univerzita, 2012.

Působnost ministerstva. *Ministerstvo kultury ČR* [online]. 2007 [cit. 2012-04-10]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.mkcr.cz/scripts/detail.php?id=36>

Zákon č. 2/1969 Sb. o zřízení ministerstev a jiných ústředních orgánů státní správy. *Portál veřejné správy České republiky* [online]. 2003-2011 [cit. 2011-04-12]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://portal.gov.cz/wps/portal/_s.155/701/.cmd/ad/.c/313/.ce/10821/.p/8411/_s.155/701?PC_8411_p=8&PC_8411_name=o%20z%C5%99%C3%ADzen%C3%AD%20minister stev&PC_8411_l=2/1969&PC_8411_ps=10#10821>

Statistika kultury 2010 – Kulturní dědictví. *NIPOS MK ČR* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-10]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.nipos-mk.cz/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/Statistika_kultury_2010_Kulturni_dedictvi_web.pdf>

Statistika kultury 2010 – Umění. *NIPOS MK ČR* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-10]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.nipos-mk.cz/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/Statistika_kultury_2010_Umeni_web.pdf>

Statistika kultury 2009 – 3. díl. *NIPOS MK ČR* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-10]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.nipos-mk.cz/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/Statistika_2009_3dil_final_101128.pdf>

Statistika kultury 2010 – Edukace. *NIPOS MK ČR* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-10]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.nipos-mk.cz/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/Statistika_kultury_2010_Edukace_web.pdf>

Počet obcí v České republice v letech 1961-2007. *Statistický úřad ČR* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-12]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.czso.cz/csu/2007edicniplan.nsf/engt/9D00431C22/$File/okresy.pdf>

Program rozvoje města Plzně. *Město Plzeň* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://ukr.plzen.eu/cz/program-rozvoje-mesta-plzne/program-rozvoje-mesta-plzne-1/zakladni-dokumenty/zakladni-dokumenty.aspx>

Koncepce rozvoje kultury ve městě Plzni na léta 2009 – 2019. *Město Plzeň* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.plzen.eu/zivot-v-plzni/verejne-dokumenty/koncepcni-dokumenty/clanky-8/program-rozvoje-kultury-ve-meste-plzni-na-leta-2009-2019.aspx>

Strategie rozvoje Moravskoslezského kraje na léta 2009 - 2016. *Moravskoslezský kraj* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://verejna-sprava.kr-moravskoslezsky.cz/assets/rozvoj_kraje/rk_102_p04.pdf>

Koncepce rozvoje památkové péče v Moravskoslezském kraji. *Moravskoslezský kraj* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-moravskoslezsky.cz/zip/ppe_02.pdf>

Koncepce rozvoje místní kultury ve Zlínském kraje. *Zlínský kraj* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: < http://www.kr-zlinsky.cz/lstDoc.aspx?nid=8799>

Koncepce rozvoje místní kultury ve Zlínském kraje. *Zlínský kraj* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: < http://www.kr-zlinsky.cz/lstDoc.aspx?nid=8799>

Program rozvoje územního obvodu Zlínského kraje. *Zlínský kraj* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <https://www.kr-zlinsky.cz/docDetail.aspx?docid=135240&nid=9841&doctype=ART>

Koncepce rozvoje kultury a památkové péče v Olomouckém kraji. *Olomoucký kraj* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-olomoucky.cz/clanky/dokumenty/147/koncepce-rozvoje-kultury-a-pamatkove-pece-v-olomouckem-kraji.pdf>

Program rozvoje Olomouckého kraje. *Olomoucký kraj* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-olomoucky.cz/publikace-program-rozvoje-olomouckeho-kraje-aktuality-653.html>

Koncepce podpory kultury v Jihomoravském kraji. *Jihomoravský kraj* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-jihomoravsky.cz/Default.aspx?ID=39406&TypeID=12>

Program rozvoje Jihomoravského kraje. *Jihomoravský kraj* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-jihomoravsky.cz/Default.aspx?ID=118768&TypeID=2>

Program rozvoje Pardubického kraje. *Pardubický kraj* [online]. 2011 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.pardubickykraj.cz/rozvoj-kraje>

Koncepce muzejnictví Pardubického kraje. *Pardubický kraj* [online]. 2011 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.pardubickykraj.cz/dokumenty-pk-kultura-a-pamatkova-pece/32002/koncepce-muzejnictvi-pardubickeho-kraje-v-letech-2003-2008?previev=archiv>

Koncepce péče o památkový fond v Pardubickém kraji. *Pardubický kraj* [online]. 2011 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.pardubickykraj.cz/dokumenty-pk-kultura-a-pamatkova-pece/32965>

Koncepce podpory státní památkové péče v Pardubickém kraji. *Pardubický kraj* [online]. 2011 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.pardubickykraj.cz/dokumenty-pk-kultura-a-pamatkova-pece/38099>

Koncepce rozvoje Královehradeckého kraje. *Královehradecký kraj* [online]. 2011 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-kralovehradecky.cz/cz/rozvoj-kraje/rozvojove-dokumenty/program-rozvoje-kralovehradeckeho-kraje-2011---2013-39601/>

Program rozvoje Libereckého kraje. *Liberecký kraj* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://regionalni-rozvoj.kraj-lbc.cz/page1884>

Koncepce sbírkotvorné činnosti muzeí Libereckého kraje. *Liberecký kraj* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://kultura.kraj-lbc.cz/page411/Koncepce-sbirkotvorne-cinnosti-muzei>

Program rozvoje Ústeckého kraje. *Ústecký kraj* [online]. 2002 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-ustecky.cz/vismo/dokumenty2.asp?id_org=450018&id=68289&p1=84858>

Program rozvoje Karlovarského kraje. *Karlovarský kraj* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-karlovarsky.cz/kraj_cz/karlov_kraj/dokumenty/koncepce/seznam/PRKK.htm>

Program rozvoje Plzeňského kraje. *Plzeňský kraj* [online]. 2008 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-plzensky.cz/cs/article/aktualizace-programu-rozvoje-plzenskeho-kraje>

Koncepce rozvoje muzeí v Plzeňském kraji. *Plzeňský kraj* [online]. 2008 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-plzensky.cz/cs/clanek/koncepce-rozvoje-muzei-v-plzenskem-kraji-na-leta-2012-2017?sekce=all>

Koncepce památkové péče v Plzeňském kraji. *Plzeňský kraj* [online]. 2008 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-plzensky.cz/cs/clanek/schvalena-koncepce-pamatkove-pece-plzenskeho-kraje?sekce=all>

Program rozvoje kraje Vysočina. *Kraj Vysočina* [online]. 2011 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-vysocina.cz/program-rozvoje-kraje-vysocina/ds-300352/p1=4786>

Program rozvoje Jihočeského kraje. *Jihočeský kraj* [online]. 2011 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kraj-jihocesky.cz/index.php?par%5Bid_v%5D=710&par%5Blang%5D=>

Program rozvoje územního obvodu Středočeského kraje. *Středočeský kraj* [online]. 2008 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-stredocesky.cz/portal/odbory/regionalni-rozvoj/program-rozvoje-kraje/>

Koncepce muzeí a galerií zřizovaných Středočeským krajem. *Středočeský kraj* [online]. 2008 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-stredocesky.cz/portal/odbory/kultura-a-kulturni-dedictvi/koncepce-muzei-a-galerii-zrizovanych-stredoceskym-krajem.htm>

Koncepce podpory knihoven z rozpočtu Středočeského kraje. *Středočeský kraj* [online]. 2008 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-stredocesky.cz/portal/odbory/kultura-a-kulturni-dedictvi/koncepce-podpory-knihoven-z-rozpoctu-stredoceskeho-kraje.htm?pg=1>

Koncepce kulturní politiky hlavního města Prahy. *Hlavní město Praha* [online]. 2006 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://kultura.praha-mesto.cz/68946_Koncepce-kulturni-politiky-hl-m-Prahy>

Strategický plán hlavního města Prahy. *Hlavní město Praha* [online]. 2006 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.urm.cz/cs/strategie-rozvoje>

Strategický plán města České Budějovice. *Město České Budějovice* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.c-budejovice.cz/cz/rozvoj-mesta/strategicky-plan/stranky/strategicky-plan-mesta-ceske-budejovice-2007.aspx>

Strategický plán udržitelného rozvoje města Karlovy Vary. *Město Karlovy Vary* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.mmkv.cz/index.asp?menu=222>

Strategie rozvoje města Ústí nad Labem. *Město Ústí nad Labem* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.usti-nad-labem.cz/cz/zivot-mesta/rozvoj-mesta/strategie-rozvoje-mesta-usti-nad-labem-do-roku-2015.html>

Strategický plán města Liberec. *Město Liberec* [online]. 2009 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://dspace.upce.cz/handle/10195/18009>

Strategický plán rozvoje města Hradec Králové. *Město Hradec Králové* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.hradeckralove.org/urad/strategicky-plan>

Strategický plán města Pardubice. *Město Pardubice* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.pardubice.eu/mesto/strategicky-plan.html>

Strategický plán rozvoje města Jihlava. *Město Jihlava* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://jihlava.cz/vismo/o_utvar.asp?id_org=5967&id_u=10&rd=0&p1=72155>

Koncepce rozvoje kultury v Jihlavě. *Město Jihlava* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <www.jihlava.cz/VismoOnline_ActionScripts/File.aspx?id_org...>

Strategie pro Brno. *Město Brno* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.brno.cz/sprava-mesta/dokumenty-mesta/koncepcni-dokumenty/rozvojove-dokumenty-strategie-pro-brno/>

Program rozvoje města Olomouc. *Město Olomouc* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.olomouc.eu/podnikatel/podnikatelske-zony-a-rozvojove-projekty>

Koncepce rozvoje cestovního ruchu v Ostravě. *Město Ostrava* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.ostrava.cz/cs/turista/strategicke-dokumenty/strategicke-dokumenty>

Koncepce rozvoje kultury statutárního města Ostrava. *Město Ostrava* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.ostrava.cz/cs/urad/magistrat/odbory-magistratu/odbor-kultury-a-zdravotnictvi/oblast-kultury/koncepce-rozvoje-kultury-statutarniho-mesta-ostravy>

Závěrečný účet Středočeského kraje. *Středočeský kraj* [online]. 2008 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-stredocesky.cz/portal/vyhledavani?cx=005185634881929426321%3Ahyjdqndrclm&cof=FORID%3A11&q=pln%C4%9Bn%C3%AD+rozpo%C4%8Dtu>

Zpráva o plnění rozpočetu hlavního města Prahy. *Hlavní město Praha* [online]. 2006 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.praha.eu/jnp/cz/home/magistrat/rozpocet/zpravy_o_plneni_rozpoctu/zprava_o_plneni_rozpoctu_za_rok_2010/index.html>

Závěrečný účet 2010. *Jihočeský kraj* [online]. 2011 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kraj-jihocesky.cz/index.php?par[id_v]=1520&par[lang]=>

Závěrečný účet 2010. *Plzeňský kraj* [online]. 2011 [cit. 2012-04-18]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-plzensky.cz/cs/article/zaverecny-ucet-plzenskeho-kraje-za-rok-2010?sekce=all>

Závěrečný účet 2010. *Ústecký kraj* [online]. 2002 [cit. 2012-04-20]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-ustecky.cz/vismo/zobraz_dok.asp?id_ktg=33394&id_org=450018&p1=92706>

Závěrečný účet 2010. *Karlovarský kraj* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-20]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-karlovarsky.cz/kraj_cz/karlov_kraj/dokumenty/zaver_ucet/zav_ucet_2010.htm>

Závěrečný účet 2010. *Liberecký kraj* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-20]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://ekonomicky-odbor.kraj-lbc.cz/page3435>

Závěrečný účet 2010. *Královehradecký kraj* [online]. 2011 [cit. 2012-04-20]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-kralovehradecky.cz/cz/krajsky-urad/povinne-informace/zaverecny-ucet-a-rozbor-hospodareni-kralovehradeckeho-kraje-za-rok-2010-45278/>

Závěrečný účet 2010. *Pardubický kraj* [online]. 2011 [cit. 2012-04-20]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.pardubickykraj.cz/rozpocet/67177/zaverecny-ucet-pardubickeho-kraje-za-rok-2010>

Závěrečný účet 2010. *Kraj Vysočina* [online]. 2011 [cit. 2012-04-20]. Dostupný z WWW: <www.kr-vysocina.cz/VismoOnline.../File.aspx?id_org...id... >

Závěrečný účet 2010. *Jihomoravský kraj* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-20]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-jihomoravsky.cz/Default.aspx?ID=164633&TypeID=2>

Závěrečný účet 2010. *Olomoucký kraj* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-20]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-olomoucky.cz/zaverecny-ucet-olomouckeho-kraje-cl-107.html>

Závěrečný účet 2010. *Moravskoslezský kraj* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-20]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://verejna-sprava.kr-moravskoslezsky.cz/fin_zu_2010_01.html#table15>

Závěrečný účet 2010. *Zlínský kraj* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-20]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.kr-zlinsky.cz/clanky/dokumenty/264/p01-zaverecny-ucet-zk-za-rok-2010.pdf>

Závěrečný účet 2010. *Město České Budějovice* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-20]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.c-

budejovice.cz/cz/magistrat/odbory/fo/Documents/Pln%C4%9Bn%C3%AD%20p%C5%99%C3%ADjm%C5%AF%20a%20v%C3%BDdaj%C5%AF%202010_12.pdf>

Závěrečný účet 2010. *Město Plzeň* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-20]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.plzen.eu/zivot-v-plzni/verejne-dokumenty/rozpocet/clanky-6/zaverecny-ucet-mesta-plzne-za-rok-2010.aspx>

Závěrečný účet 2010. *Město Jihlava* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-20]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.jihlava.cz/hospodareni-statutarniho-mesta-jihlavy-za-rok-2010/d-483244/query=z%C3%A1v%C4%9Bre%C4%8Dn%C3%BD+%C3%BA%C4%8Det>

Závěrečný účet 2010. *Město Ústí nad Labem* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-20]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.usti-nad-labem.cz/files/RM_13-11_222-11.pdf>

Závěrečný účet 2010. *Město Hradec Králové* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-20]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.hradeckralove.org/file/3357>

Závěrečný účet 2010. *Město Brno* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-20]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.brno.cz/sprava-mesta/dokumenty-mesta/rozpocet/plneni-rozpoctu-statutarniho-mesta-brna/zaverecny-ucet-statutarniho-mesta-brna-za-rok-2010-vyuctovani-hospodareni-a-financni-vyporadani/>

Závěrečný účet 2010. *Město Zlín* [online]. 2012 [cit. 2012-04-20]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.zlin.eu/page/78508.rozpocet-na-rok-2010/>

http://monumnet.npu.cz/monumnet.php
www.czso.cz
www.eurostat.cz
www.britishcouncil.org
www.ec.europa.eu