

## **Funding of arts projects undertaken by staff at tertiary education organisations (TEOs)**

**April 2015**

### **Introduction**

During our 2014 review of Creative New Zealand's support for the visual arts there was discussion of the effectiveness of our current policy that: *employees of tertiary or other educational institutions may not seek support for arts activity that is part of their job.*

The review concluded that Creative New Zealand should work with the tertiary education sector to develop guidelines for our funding of arts research projects undertaken by staff at tertiary institutions.

This paper proposes new Creative New Zealand guidelines which would draw a distinction between

- funding applications received from a tertiary education organisation (TEO)

and

- funding applications that are not from a TEO, but which involve a member of the teaching staff of a TEO.

The paper is being circulated to a range of staff at TEOs for comment as well as to Creative New Zealand's external peer assessors. Following an analysis of the feedback we receive, we will develop a final set of Creative New Zealand guidelines.

### **Background**

Creative New Zealand's policy across all arts disciplines is that we do not support organisations funded by a government agency, a TEO or local authority (for example, a public art gallery) unless the proposed activity goes beyond the core activity for which the organisation already receives public funding.

This helps to ensure that arts funders have clear mandates and responsibilities and helps to provide the arts sector with clear rulings on issues of funding eligibility. It is important that there is no ambiguity around eligibility, as this can lead to inconsistent funding decisions.

It is difficult for many artists, writers and independent practitioners to sustain a professional career. Some are able to do this through paid positions in TEOs where, through their employment, they may have access to physical resources and research funds that can support artistic projects.

Our current policy is that employees of TEOs may not seek support for an arts activity that is part of their job. We currently require all applicants from TEOs to submit a written statement from a Head of Department stating that the activity for which they are seeking funding is not part of their job.

External peer assessors used by Creative New Zealand have expressed concerns about the generality of some of the letters provided, making it difficult to identify the extent and nature of research funding available to individual applicants.

### **General Points**

- Creative New Zealand's general funding programme criteria and any guidelines relating to particular types of arts activity apply to all funding applications, be they from a TEO, individual artists, arts groups or arts organisations.
- All of our funding programmes are highly contested, with the amount of funds available rarely sufficient to meet the levels of funding requested. This means that, in many funding rounds, we are unable to support valuable arts projects and/or highly regarded applicants.
- From time to time Creative New Zealand receives funding applications from third parties, who are neither a TEO, nor an individual employed by a TEO, but seek funding support to involve a TEO staff member in an arts project. For example, such an application could be from an orchestra seeking support to commission a work from a composer who is a member of a TEO's staff or a theatre company wanting to retain a director who is a member of a TEO's staff.
- Creative New Zealand guidelines have implications for all areas of arts practice – for example, composers, choreographers and writers, as well as visual artists. Guidelines therefore need to avoid unintended consequences across all forms of arts practice.

### **Proposed guidelines**

It is proposed that Creative New Zealand remove the requirement for a letter from a Head of Department confirming that a TEO related project is not "part of the applicant's job".

Instead we would introduce two new sets of guidelines: one set of guidelines for funding applications received from a TEO, and a second set of guidelines for funding applications that are not from a TEO, but which involve a member of a TEO's teaching staff.

In developing these guidelines we are seeking to:

- support individual New Zealand artists and practitioners to develop high-quality arts.
- have clear and consistent funding guidelines for the ways in which the staff of a TEO can access funding support for researching and developing high-quality arts projects.
- avoid circumstances where Creative New Zealand's funds are contributing to the costs of a project or activity that is already being supported by another agency of government (sometimes referred to as "double-dipping").
- take account of the support provided by TEOs for arts projects when making Creative New Zealand funding decisions.

### **Proposed guidelines for funding applications received from a TEO**

- The term “Tertiary Education Organisation” (TEO) refers to educational organisations defined under the Education Act 1989 (Section 159B(1)). TEOs include Universities, Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics, Wānanga and Private Training Establishments.
- The term TEO also includes wholly owned TEO subsidiaries such as, for example, a university-owned art gallery.
- In addition to providing required budget information, a funding application to Creative New Zealand from a TEO will also need to identify:
  - the name and position within the TEO of the artist(s) or practitioner(s) who are to be involved in the proposed project
  - how much, if any, of the artist(s) or practitioner(s) TEO research time is to be allocated to the project
  - what, if any, financial or other forms of support the TEO concerned will provide for the project.
- For applications from a TEO, Creative New Zealand can consider contributing to production costs directly related to the arts project that is the focus of the funding application. Examples of production costs are the costs of materials, studio hire, or the typesetting of a musical score and parts.
- For applications from a TEO, Creative New Zealand will not usually provide stipends or fees for staff employed or contracted full-time by the TEO to work on an arts project of the TEO.
- For part-time TEO employees or contractors (i.e. those employed/contracted by the TEO for less than 20 hours per week during the period of the arts project), Creative New Zealand may contribute up to a maximum of 50% of the artist(s) or practitioner(s) stipend or fees required during the period of the arts project.

### **Proposed guidelines for funding applications that are not from a TEO, but which involve a member of a TEO’s teaching staff**

- The following guidelines would apply to applications that involve a member of the teaching staff of a TEO who is contracted or employed by a TEO for more than 20 hours a week during the period of the arts project for which Creative New Zealand funding is being sought.
- Creative New Zealand can consider funding applications for arts projects that will involve teaching staff of a TEO. The term TEO includes a wholly owned TEO subsidiary such as a university owned art gallery.

- An application may be from an individual artist or practitioner seeking to undertake their own project and/or from an arts group or arts organisation seeking support to involve a member of the teaching staff of a TEO in an arts project.
- In addition to providing required budget information, a funding application involving a member of a TEO's teaching staff will also need to clearly identify:
  - The name, position and TEO of the staff member who is to be involved in the proposed project.
  - How much, if any, of the artist(s) or practitioner(s) TEO research time is to be allocated to the project.
  - What, if any, financial or other forms of support the TEO concerned will provide for the project.
- Creative New Zealand can consider contributing to the production costs that are directly related to the arts project, as well as making a contribution to the stipend or fees of the TEO teaching staff during the period of the project.

#### **TEOs and funding received through the Performance-Based Research Fund**

Under the Education Act, staff teaching at a TEO at degree level or above are expected to undertake research. However, the actual research expectations of staff can vary from TEO to TEO.

A number of TEOs access funding from the Tertiary Education Commission through the Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF). The PBRF aims to increase the quality of research by rewarding and encouraging research excellence. The PBRF is a bulk fund which is allocated to a TEO, and it is the TEO's responsibility to determine how this is allocated internally. This means that there are no guarantees that an individual researcher or department will receive support through a given TEO's PBRF allocation.

The PBRF consists of three elements:

- The Quality Evaluation which assesses the research performance and funding of TEOs on the basis of past performance;
- Research Degree Completions (RDC) which reflects the number of successful research degree completions; and
- External Research Income (ERI) which reflect the amount of external research income received by a given TEO.

Not all eligible TEOs receive PBRF funding.

TEOs actively encourage academic staff to generate external research income and funding awarded by Creative New Zealand can count as part of the external research income received by a TEO for PBRF purposes. TEO staff members who generate external research income in their personal capaci-

ty (i.e. the income is received by them and not their employer) are not eligible for inclusion in the TEO's PBRF ERI return.

Although PBRF and external research income can increase the amount of funds available for high-quality arts projects undertaken by artists employed by TEOs, feedback received during our visual arts consultation indicated that existing TEO systems provide little support for production costs (for example, project materials, studio hire costs) incurred by artists employed by a TEO.

### **Commentary received during the visual arts review**

59% of respondents to our visual arts review questionnaire agreed, or strongly agreed, that Creative New Zealand funding should be more tightly targeted towards independent artists who do not have access to institutional resources.

However, the general consensus was that this was not an either/or situation and a range of factors may need to be taken into account – for example, part-time staff or those on short-term contracts will not necessarily have access to institutional resources, different institutions will have varying levels of access to research funding, and ambitious projects may require support from a variety of sources to be realised.

For examples of comments received during the visual arts review, please refer to pages 11 and 12 of the *Final Report* of our Visual Arts Review available on our website:

<http://www.creativenz.govt.nz/en/about-creative-new-zealand/corporate-and-strategy-documents/visual-arts-review-final-report-2014>

### **Questions for feedback**

The seven questions overleaf relating to our proposed guidelines can be answered via our online questionnaire:

[https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/CNZ\\_Funding\\_Guidelines](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/CNZ_Funding_Guidelines)

Alternatively you can forward your views by e-mail to the following address:

[calvin.scott@creativenz.govt.nz](mailto:calvin.scott@creativenz.govt.nz)

### **Closing date**

Whether you respond online or by e-mail, we need to receive your response by:

**9am on Tuesday, 2 June 2015**

If responding by email please include:

- your name
- the name of your organisation (if applicable)
- your postal address
- your e-mail address.

## Questions

1. How strongly do you agree or disagree with Creative New Zealand taking account of the support to be provided by a TEO when making funding decisions?

strongly agree / agree / neither agree nor disagree / disagree / strongly disagree

2. We are proposing to draw a distinction between funding applications received from a TEO and funding applications that are not received from a TEO, but which involve the teaching staff of a TEO.

How strongly do you agree or disagree with Creative New Zealand distinguishing between applications in this manner?

strongly agree / agree / neither agree nor disagree / disagree / strongly disagree

If you strongly agree or strongly disagree, what are the reasons for your response (maximum 500 words).

3. For all funding applications (be they from a TEO or another applicant) for arts projects that will involve teaching staff at a TEO, we are proposing that the applicant clearly identify how much, if any, of the TEO's research time will be allocated to the project.

How strongly do you agree or disagree with this approach?

strongly agree / agree / neither agree nor disagree / disagree.. / strongly disagree

If you strongly agree or strongly disagree, what are the reasons for your response (maximum 500 words).

4. For all funding applications (be they from a TEO or another applicant) for arts projects that will that involve teaching staff at a TEO, we are proposing that the applicant clearly identify what, if any, financial or other forms of support the TEO concerned will provide for the arts project.

How strongly do you agree or disagree with this approach?

strongly agree / agree / neither agree nor disagree / disagree / strongly disagree

If you strongly agree or strongly disagree, what are the reasons for your response (maximum 500 words).

5. For funding applications from a TEO we are proposing to focus Creative New Zealand's funding support on production costs associated with a project, rather than on providing for a stipend or fees for full-time employees or contractors of a given TEO.

How strongly do you agree or disagree with this approach?

strongly agree / agree / neither agree nor disagree / disagree / strongly disagree

If you strongly agree or strongly disagree, what are the reasons for your response (maximum 500 words).

6. Do you think that the guidelines proposed will result in significant unintended consequences? If so, what would these unintended consequences be? (Maximum 500 words)

7. How might we reduce or avoid the unintended consequences you have identified? (Maximum 750 words)