

PROTOCOL
fourth meeting

The meeting took place at Mime Centrum.

Attendance:

Gabi Beier, Benjamin Pohlig, Karin Kirchhoff, Frank Schmid, Marie Henrion, Sabine Köhncke, Nik Haffner, Alisa Golonzina

1. Introduction

The meeting was led by Karin Kirchhoff, with a protocol by Benjamin Pohlig.

The previous two protocols were shortly discussed. Nothing was added to the third protocol. An amended version of the second protocol has been sent out to the group.

2. Symposium / Tanzhonorar

Gabi Beier has a proposition for the symposium coming up in September.

The idea is to put out an open call for the Tanzhonorar. To write a short application form and ask artists to fill it out. As this is for a hypothetical Tanzhonorar, the idea is to use it to collect testimonies from artists, collect what artists themselves say they would like to use something like that for. Furthermore this might be an opportunity to learn about the criteria for such a grant itself. What kind of applications are worthy to fund? , etc.

Questions such as who are you, what do you spend your time on and what would you spend your time on if you could receive such a grant, are of interest.

—

Benjamin Pohlig presents a model of the Tanzhonorar that Sunniva Vikor Egenes and him have modelled closely according to the model existing in Norway. It needs to be stressed that this scholarship is not allowed for production purposes and only to nurture and enable artistic practice.

TANZHONORAR MODEL 1 (Modeled after Norwegian Stipend Model)

In total 50 dance artist could hold a grant each year.
they would be allotted in the three following categories.

10 years for senior artists

3-5 years for mid career artists

1-3 years for young artists

to ensure both sustainability and circulation, the grants could be held only by a certain number of people each year.

10 years / 10 artists

3-5 years / 15 artists

1-3 years / 25 artists

looking at the median income in Germany we calculated 1500€ / month as a standard for the 3-5 year grants. For the 10 year grants we operated with 2000€ / month. with the 1-3 with 1000€/m. This implies that the grants are intended for young, mid career and senior artists. from this follows:

$1000\text{€}/\text{m} * 12 \text{ months} = 12000\text{€} / \text{year}$

$1500\text{€}/\text{m} * 12 \text{ months} = 18000\text{€} / \text{year}$

$2000\text{€}/\text{m} * 12 \text{ months} = 24000\text{€} / \text{year}$

this amounts to the following per year:

$25 * 12000\text{€} = 300.000\text{€}$

$15 * 18000\text{€} = 270.000\text{€}$

$10 * 24000\text{€} = 240.000\text{€}$

in total this would cost:

810.000€

The number of 50 artist was being criticised and it was proposed to fund just like in Norway about 10% of the entire application handed in. For this purpose it would be 10% of the roughly 3000 dance artists in Berlin.

This would then amount to:

300 scholarships / 4.860.000 € / a year

—

The question of a pilot model is raised. Would that be possible in any way?

Furthermore it is discussed that in order to argue for a Tanzhonorar it might be worth trying to argue / prove that this would have a positive effect not only on the artists but on cultural and public life as a whole. What does this give back to the city of Berlin? Perhaps this could be a question in the application form. What do you think you can give back to the city of Berlin by receiving this grant.

—

Sunniva Vikor Egenes will set up a contact with a Norwegian Dance Union representative for the possibility of inviting them to the symposium to speak about the value and necessity of their scholarship programme in Norway.

3. Jury and application process

Writing applications:

Can there be alternatives to written applications?

Could there be a model in which interviews, elevator pitches or presentations of 1-2mins could complement the written application? Maybe something like this could only happen in the last round and only if the application process / its rounds would be scheduled beforehand. Is this really feasible? Artists would have to keep time free.

An example of this exists in Switzerland but the numbers of applications are much less. What however is mentioned as positive is that it gives young artists the opportunity to introduce themselves and their work if they didn't have a chance to present yet. Allow questions to be asked and a dialogue to develop.

If there a possibility for an application model that allows for another way to presenting the project than just writing? Could this be tried and tested in a smaller pot of money, where the application number isn't too high?

As a side note: for Konzeptförderung it is standard to read the application, prepare questions, then hand in these questions before there is a meeting with the applicant / institution. This allows for questions, feedback, and dialogue.

—

Could writing in English be an option?

It is said from an administrative side that English will not be an option. The official language is German, official documents have to be written in this language, consequently applications in other language will be unlikely for the foreseeable future.

—

How could the jury provide feedback on applications?

It is stated, that the jury has a strong wish for more contact with artists before and after their applications, be they successful or not. However, this is very much a question of organisation, time and money. There will however always be days before a deadline where individual jury members offer to meet with applicants. This is already happening.

Further questions are, whether feedback should be given in a written form or through conversation?

Even though writing feedback is difficult due to time and work load, the wish and necessity for a form of minimal feedback is repeated. There are written examples of this in Belgium and Pankow.

(Comment K.Kirchhoff: in Pankow the representative of the administration takes notes concerning the reasons for the jury decisions. When the artists calls the admin after the decision making s/he can get her/his reason on the phone. Reasons are not given in written form - other than in Belgium).

How could this look like in Berlin? Would it already help if it is communicated in which round an application is removed from the selection?

If there was something like an appointed jury representative, this might offer an opportunity to meet and have conversations. However, the time and work load on the representative would be great and would require monetary compensation.

–

Composition and appointment of the jury:

Do we need a dance specific jury?

This question arose before when some organisations wanted to push for a separate pot of money for dance in Basis- and Konzeptförderung. If there was a separate fund then a separate dance jury would be needed. The idea behind separate funds was that it would help dance develop institutions equally strong as they have in theatre for example.

Is there a possibility to have artists involved in the jury work? How can an artistic view point be included next to the journalistic, academic, dramaturgical perspectives already represented in the juries.

The point is raised that the jury is actually set up in a way that artists are always involved.

–

Could there be audience members represented in juries?
How would that be fair and doable?

–

Workload, jury alternatives

Since the work load is very high for the individual jury members, what would be ways to limit their load?

Limiting the number of words / pages for an application is mentioned. This would limit the time each application would demand of the individual jury member.

Spreading the application process over a long time period, to allow the work to be done in smaller loads over longer time is another idea to diminish the work load.

Jury pools. How do they work in countries that use them (Holland for example)?

Pro: short term availability, less work for the individual jury member

con: less possibilities for the jury to grow together as a group

full-time jury. How long?

Pro: meeting of artists, developing dialogue amongst themselves and with the artists

con: concentration of power, where would the money come from?

Side note: the Verwaltung is currently working with lists given by LAFT or ZTB, amongst others. To find suitable candidates for the jury work. This works already a bit like a pool. As if some people can't do it, the list will be used.

4. Conclusion

Karin Kirchhoff collects some of the questions that might still be of interest for the group and could be addressed at next time's meeting:

Should funding go to the artists or to the houses?

Overlapping subjects with other workgroups

What about the suggestions made with „Feldforschung“, should and can they still be implemented?

Nik Haffner touches shortly upon an idea that he wants to develop further in next time's meeting. Something of a development grant, that would be aimed at helping people develop projects (or various kind, not artistic in nature) for the life of the dance scene and beyond.