

Results of Creative New Zealand consultation on guidelines for funding applications from Tertiary Education Organisations (TEOs) and their staff.

Earlier this year Creative New Zealand consulted about guidelines for funding applications from Tertiary Education Organisations (TEOs) and their staff.

As a result of that consultation the Senior Leadership Team have agreed that Creative New Zealand will:

- Remove the existing requirement that all applicants from TEO staff 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.
- Require all funding applications from TEO staff or from a TEO to provide full disclosure of the extent of the support that a TEO may provide for the project.
- Maintain the policy that funding is not available to support the core business of organisations funded by a government agency, tertiary education organisation (TEO) or local authority, unless the proposed activity goes beyond the core activity for which the organisation receives public funding.

In addition it has been agreed that where equivalent, compelling funding applications are being considered by Creative New Zealand, priority will be given to project applications from freelance practitioners that are not contracted to, or associated with, a TEO.

These funding and assessment guidelines will apply from 1 January 2016.

Please note that:

- the term TEO also includes wholly owned TEO subsidiaries such as, for example, a university-owned art gallery
- disclosure requirements will apply to members of staff of a TEO applying for any Creative New Zealand managed special opportunity.

Background

This work arose from the 2014 visual arts review when 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 Visual Arts 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.

On 22 April 2015 the Arts Policy team circulated a paper to 35 people, including those who made submissions to the visual arts review on this topic, staff at a range of TEOs and external peer assessors with experience of assessing the projects of TEO staff. The circulated paper was developed in consultation with staff of the Tertiary Education Commission.

People were invited to respond to the paper via an online survey and/or by emailing Arts Policy staff. The deadline for submission was 2 June 2015.

Feedback

Feedback showed there is support within the tertiary sector for the removal of the existing requirement for a written statement from a Head of Department. This requirement is seen as open to misunderstanding, the supply of incorrect information and inconsistent funding decisions.

Respondents agreed that a better approach would be to require full disclosure by applicants of the extent of project support being provided by a TEO. Transparency was seen as paramount and full disclosure of support received would enable Creative New Zealand to make informed decisions that took account of the circumstances of any given project.

Some respondents noted that individuals may not apply to potential TEO funding sources in expectation that Creative New Zealand is a better bet, or applying to Creative New Zealand could relieve pressure on TEO funds. 'Full disclosure' of support provided by a TEO may not always identify the potential sources of funding that were, or are, available within a TEO.

From the responses received, and our own discussions with the Tertiary Education Commission, it seems clear there is little consistency as to level or types of TEO support available to artists employed by TEOs.

Not all TEOs access Performance Based Research Funding (PBRF) and, where they do, funding is not allocated in a direct way to individuals. In such an environment it is difficult for Creative New Zealand to apply a hard and fast, one size fits all, criteria for the support of arts projects of TEO staff or TEOs.

Requiring all TEO related applications to make full disclosure

Creative New Zealand staff and external assessors need to take a case by case approach that first and foremost considers the quality of a proposed project and how well it will achieve Creative New Zealand outcomes (New Zealanders participate in the arts, High-quality art is developed, New Zealanders experience high-quality arts and New Zealand arts gain international success).

Recommendations about the level of funding should be a secondary consideration that takes account of the levels of support available from other sources. Full disclosure of required information will be more useful than a letter from a head of department.

Full disclosure will require applicants to provide details of any support to be provided for a project by a TEO including:

- in the form of grants or other financial contributions by a TEO
- any technical, resource or production support and/or
- any support through the allocation of a staff member's research time to a project.

Other Factors

Creative New Zealand will not contribute to the core business costs of a TEO. These core business costs include, but are not limited to, administration and management costs, teaching time and equipment, the costs of hiring TEO venues and facilities; security; and the costs of establishing, operating, maintaining or developing the institution's website.

Creative New Zealand will not usually contribute towards the professional development of TEO staff. This would include attending symposia and seminars and undertaking research related to a course of study being taught at a TEO.

Applicants should be clear about who will own any created work. Creative New Zealand will continue to expect that an individual artist (or artists) will retain ownership and intellectual property rights to work created with support from Creative New Zealand funding. Creative New Zealand funding will be unlikely to contribute towards work or research that would be owned by a TEO.

Staff and external assessors will need to build awareness of the extent and nature of support being provided by a given TEO, and to cross-reference the types of support available across a range of TEOs.

Creative New Zealand will monitor and track the effects of this change in order to assess if any unintended consequences arise.

October 2015

Appendix One

Responses to May 2015 survey on Creative New Zealand guidelines for funding applications from Tertiary Education Organisations (TEOs) and their staff.

Proposals

The paper circulated proposed that Creative New Zealand remove the existing requirement that all applicants from TEO staff 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.

This paper proposed that new funding guidelines be developed that drew 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 asked how strongly people agreed or disagreed with proposals for Creative New Zealand to:

- take account of the support to be provided by a TEO when making funding decisions
- distinguish between funding applications received from a TEO and funding applications that are not from a TEO, but which involve the teaching staff of a TEO
- ask all funding applications that involve a TEO or TEO staff to clearly identify how much, if any, of a TEO's research time will be allocated to the project.
- ask all funding applications that involve a TEO or TEO staff to clearly identify what, if any, financial or other forms of support the TEO concerned will provide for the arts project.
- focus funding support for applications from a TEO 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.

The paper also asked if people thought proposed guidelines will result in significant unintended consequences; what those unintended consequences might be; and how Creative New Zealand might reduce or avoid unintended consequences identified.

Survey participants

Nineteen people provided a response via the online survey and a further five sent an email direct to Creative New Zealand staff. Organisations that made a response were:

- Whitecliffe College of Arts and Design
- Dunedin School of Arts, Otago Polytechnic

- New Zealand School of Music at Victoria University of Wellington
- Illam School of Fine Arts, University of Canterbury
- National Institute of Creative Arts and Industries, University of Auckland Research Office
- College of Creative Arts , Massey University

Individual submissions were received from members of staff at Victoria University (Theatre and Film Department), Otago University (Theatre Studies and Music Departments), and the Canterbury University College of Art.

General comments

Several respondents commended Creative New Zealand for the consideration we had given to this issue and thanked us for the opportunity to provide comment and feedback.

Respondents noted that the eligibility/ineligibility of artists who are TEO staff has been a vexed area for many years and that greater transparency would be welcome, for example:

It is time these anomalies were addressed and any liaison between potential funders partners is better than none!

These changes . . . will go a long way to address issues of fairness and transparency.

One respondent observed that:

While there are many positives that can come from a more transparent relationship between TEOs (and its research staff) and CNZ, I think that the initial steps should be made with ability to learn from any unintended consequences. Basically any changes need to be bedded in with more direct consultation with TEOs and with some safe guards along the short to medium term, so that mistakes can be addressed as they arise and also with the chance for more term oversight.

Several respondents cautioned against a loosening of Creative New Zealand requirements for funding applications from TEO staff. Comments from these respondents included that:

. . . universities, as institutions, will start encouraging staff to apply to CNZ for funding rather than using their own

I don't need to apply to Creative New Zealand for (eg) my upcoming residency . . . This is a good thing, because it takes the pressure off CNZ by removing an applicant from the ever-growing pool. In the past I've noted various examples of writers with university jobs applying for travel funding from CNZ, or support to write a book. Given that most of us have substantial periods of paid leave every three years, and can receive support from our own TEOs to travel to conferences or festivals, this always seemed odd to me.

Because so many institutions have sprung up within the arts . . . I'm finding that more and more of the pie goes to them and less and less to a struggling artist If a more laissez faire attitude is adopted to TEO staff I fear they will potentially gobble up what scraps remain.

I think any loosening of the taboo on TEO funding will perforce see those institutions take advantage of it. I personally think CNZ's role should not be antagonistic to TEOs but should maintain a healthy tension between itself and them, if for no other reason than to underscore TEOs do not have a monopoly on "quality".

Strong consensus for full disclosure

The overwhelming majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the proposals that Creative New Zealand:

- take account of the support to be provided by a TEO when making funding decisions (75% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed)
- distinguish between funding applications received from a TEO and funding applications that are not from a TEO, but which involve the teaching staff of a TEO (75% agreed or strongly agreed)
- ask all funding applications that involve a TEO or TEO staff to clearly identify how much, if any, of a TEO's research time will be allocated to the project (84% agreed or strongly agreed)
- ask all funding applications that involve a TEO or TEO staff to clearly identify what, if any, financial or other forms of support the TEO concerned will provide for the arts project (94% agreed or strongly agreed)

Respondents felt that full disclosure by applicants of the extent of support being provided by a TEO was paramount. This will enable Creative New Zealand to make informed decisions and be more transparent and equitable than current requirements that were open to misunderstanding, the supply of incorrect information and inconsistent funding decisions.

Production costs and stipends

There was some disagreement with the proposal that Creative New Zealand focus funding support for applications from a TEO 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.

Whereas 57% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this proposal, 21% neither agreed nor disagreed and a further 21% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal.

One TEO strongly agreed stating:

. . . production costs be the focus of CNZs funding to projects involving TEO academic staff. . . . It should be noted that [our TEO] does not provide research (studio) space for staff . . . Many of these staff rent studios privately using their own money. [We] would like to recommend that staff in this position be allowed to list studio facility (rental and associated expenses) costs for the period of their project as part of their production costs. [We] will provide supplementary documentation to confirm that research space is not available on campus for these academic staff members if required.

Another suggested:

At our institution . . . we fund airfares, conference fees, publication contributions and so on - because these are integral to presentation and dissemination. But that also leaves ou[r] faculty in a tricky position - because they have to make the work in the first place to have it disseminated. So CNZ focusing on production costs is absolutely appropriate in this circumstance, as it would become complementary funding, rather than overlapping with the TEO's support.

Other TEOs strongly disagreed – for example:

We strongly disagree that this should be a hard and fast guideline as it does not allow the contextual flexibility for the make-up, scale of different projects, nor allow enough nuance with regards to different employment situations. We agree that in some cases what is proposed will be applicable, but not in all circumstances, and our recommendation would be that this was decided based on a more complex mapping of the project, its scale and constituent parts, the nature of the employment of the staff member and the amount of support (whether fiscal, technical or time-based) available.

And:

In the world that we currently live in a cost-sharing model is, and will increasingly be expected, by TEOs and I think this will not only benefit our staff but also a broad range of practitioners beyond. If we start to limit the funding opportunity for TEOs and its staff to simply production costs, then this will hamper investment in more experimental, speculative and collaborative opportunities. I expect this will have long-term consequences across the arts sector because TEOs will stop investing in projects that push beyond their core research activities.

Individual respondents expressed similar contradictory views – for example:

My experience is that TEOs definitely do fund production costs, much more than fees - I cannot think of exceptions to this amongst the universities. . . . I would therefore recommend the reverse, that CNZ consider funding fees and that production costs be sought from the TEO.

And:

It is reasonable that full-time TEO staff should not expect additional personal income for time spent on achieving goals which are expectations of their employment. It is important to separate personal gain and double-dipping from a need to cover expenses incurred which are not covered by the TEO – including payment to external collaborators, technicians, venues, travel accommodation, promotional materials, etc.

Other Matters

Funding partners

A number of respondents emphasised the opportunities for Creative New Zealand and TEOs to work together to realise high-quality arts projects and support projects of scale. For example:

For projects of a significant size, especially any major national or international exhibition/publication/commission/performance/symposia etc., no single funding source is likely to cover the costs of production, delivery, audience and market development, education activities,

documentation, evaluation and feedback mechanisms etc. Multiple funding sources and a consortium of partnering organisations and individuals come into play, and we strongly believe that if an aspect of this funding is from a TEO, that this needs to be taken in context, and not be seen as an opportunity to relegate a project to a lesser degree of eligibility.

Timing

A 'timing problem' was cited by a few applicants as shorthand for the differing funding round timetables of individual TEOs and the Creative New Zealand. For example:

We strongly agree with this mapping and transparency, but note depending on the time frame of the CNZ application in relation to other contestable internal funding opportunities, it may not be possible to confirm exact amounts of support. Applications may be pending at the time of application.

Variable levels of support

From the responses received, and our own discussions with the Tertiary Education Commission, it seems clear there is little consistency as to level or types of support available across all TEOs. Not all TEOs access PBRF support and, where they do, funding is not allocated in a direct way to individual researchers. In such an environment it will be difficult for Creative New Zealand to apply any hard and fast, one size fits all criteria for the support of arts projects of TEO staff or TEOs.