

CONFIDENTIAL

Minutes of the 54th Meeting of the Artists' Film and Video Sub-Committee, held on Monday 26th September at 10.30 am in the first floor Committee Room, 105 Piccadilly, London W1.

---

Present:	A.L. Rees	Chairperson
	Stuart Marshall	
	Anne Rees-Mogg	
	David Parsons	
	Mary Pat Leece	
	Tina Keane	
	Joanna Drew	Director of Art
	Rodney Wilson	Film Officer
	David Curtis	Assistant Film Officer
	Anna Kruger	Assistant Subsidy Officer
	Trisha Anderson	Secretary

---

- 1 Apologies for absence were received from John Bradshaw and Roger Wilson. Sue Barrowclough was absent. The Chairman welcomed Tina Keane to the Committee.
- 2 Minutes of the Meetings of the 11th, 18th April, and the 13th and 20th June.  
Anne Rees-Mogg regretted the lateness of the minutes of the Policy Meeting and considered this might have affected the discussion at subsequent meetings.  
The Minutes of the 11th April were approved  
The Minutes of the 18th April were approved.  
Mary-Pat Leece reminded Committee that a report by Anne Bean on her bursary period at Reading had been promised at this meeting (18th). The Film Officer said that he had written to remind her but as yet there had been no reply. He agreed to write again.  
The Minutes of 13th June were approved  
Mary Pat Leece reported to Committee that she had been unable to see the film by Paul Steen and Susan McLenachan which she had undertaken to see by September 26, due to its unavailability. The Chairman reported to Committee that he had met with Michael Mazière and passed on Committee's comments regarding his application.  
The Minutes of 20th June were approved.

3 Financial Report

The Chairman reported to Committee that he had written formally to the Film Officer to request that the 1% cut should not be applied to the Artists' Film and Video Allocation as it was impossible for the money to be made up in any other way. The Film Officer would be submitting this request to the Advisory Committee on Arts Films on October 7. The Chairman mentioned that the Assistant Film Officer would be submitting a paper to Arts Films Committee on the financial plight of the Artists' Film/Video Sub-Committee. This paper would be circulated to Sub-Committee members.

The Assistant Subsidy Officer pointed out that the balance of funds available in the 1983/4 allocation now stood at £4008 and requests for funds in today's meeting totalled £10000.

The Chairman suggested that Committee expressed its strong disapproval of the cut and should stress the problems facing the Film Section. The Assistant Subsidy Officer informed Committee that so far no application had been received from B2 Gallery to justify claiming the £500 which was earmarked at the meeting of April 18. It was agreed that this amount should be reallocated.

4 Film Officers' Notes on Procedures

The Chairman reminded Committee that it was more than a year since its procedures for dealing with awards and bursaries had been changed to allow for the separate consideration of large and small amounts. On the whole that division appeared to be working well, but the revision of a decision at a recent meeting was, he felt, irregular and this had prompted the Film Officer's proposed procedural clarification. The forwarding of recommendations for small amounts from the 'large' bursaries meeting to the 'small' did not mean that decisions were open to reinterpretation at the subsequent meetings; the Chairman apologised for having allowed this to happen. The dangers were that the composition of the Committee might be different at each meeting and decisions might become known to applicants then subsequently changed. The Film Officer's proposal was that at any meeting, once a decision was made it should be considered final, and only in the most compelling external circumstances could it be re-opened for discussion. Several Committee members were concerned that this might reduce the opportunity for comparisons between applications. Anne Rees-Mogg and Mary Pat Leece said they had welcomed the chance to reconsider difficult decisions. Stuart Marshall thought that the division of applications into small/large awards and bursaries was inevitably arbitrary and designed for administrative reasons, and would therefore always be problematic. He suggested however that Committee reverse the order in which it considered the applications, the small awards and bursaries being considered first. There was general support for this proposal. Anne Rees-Mogg pointed out that this might leave Committee in a situation where it had allocated its funds entirely on small applications and made no provision for large applications which Committee might feel were exceptional and warranted funding. The Assistant Film Officer reminded Committee that the applications for both small and large awards and bursaries were received simultaneously so this problem shouldn't arise. IT WAS AGREED to reverse the orders of the next pair of meetings in November on a trial basis and that all decisions were final. The Chairman clarified that "compelling external reasons" would have to be as exceptional as the arrival of new material which had been unavoidably delayed.

5 Matters Arising5.1 Video Access Libraries

The Assistant Film Officer reported to Committee on the progress of the Video Access Libraries; the Midland Group had now established its equipment and had two screening areas. Frank Abbott had been appointed as administrator, operating on a 6-monthly bursary from Channel 4, and he had set up a Committee to consider purchases for the library. The Assistant Film Officer also reported that the Midland Group was considering in conjunction with other Video Access Libraries, a pre-purchase plan; their proposal was that 20-24 tapes would be toured for one year between the three libraries, spending 4 months in each library, to test response. They would then be considered for purchase. The Assistant Film Officer pointed out that in the case of the Midland Group, deposits would automatically be made of any film/video material funded by the East Midlands Arts Association.

At Spectro, purchases had already been made, and an agreement had been reached with Northern Arts for automatic deposits. The equipment at Spectro was already installed.

The news from the Arnolfini was less encouraging. Rosemary Jackson, recently appointed administrator, had resigned and a reappointment was not certain. However the Arnolfini did have a full-time technician who was effectively maintaining the resource. The lack of an application to Committee, for purchase funds for the library reflected the situation at the Arnolfini.

Tina Keane said she understood that the Arnolfini did in fact have a list of purchases ready. She thought that the library was extremely well-used.

The Director of Art, Joanna Drew, told Committee that the particular problems facing the access library were part of a larger and more severe revenue problem facing the Gallery. The BFI was in the process of transferring its funding to Watershed. However the Council was very much aware of the value of the video access library at the Arnolfini. She did not think it was at risk. The Chairman suggested that Committee should consider the most effective way of supporting the Arnolfini in the absence of a library organiser, and suggested that the Arnolfini should be requested to provide a statement on the problems currently facing the Access Library.

The Film Officer supported the Chairman in this request but emphasised that it should not be in any way alarmist, but should very clearly express the Committee's support.

The Assistant Film Officer pointed out that one of the problems was that the Committee could not fill the vacuum left by the BFI withdrawal, or support the library through film exhibition subsidy because of the Arnolfini's existing funding from Art Department. All Committee could offer were the Film-Makers and Video Artists on Tour Schemes. He suggested the need for discussion within the Council. IT WAS AGREED to write to the Arnolfini expressing support and requesting a statement from them itemising their particular problems.

5.2 Funded Work Programmes

The Assistant Film Officer reported to Committee on the activities of the 'umbrella' scheme during the last few months. A great deal of activity had been generated by the current tour of Robert Breer

which had its beginning at the Cambridge Animation Festival. The tour had been successful, with the film-maker visiting Nottingham, Cardiff, Watershed and the ICA, attracting good audiences at each venue, approximately 2/3 capacity. The tour would continue to Luton, Portsmouth, Northampton and Edinburgh. The second tour in the 'umbrella' scheme, the Cubist Cinema programme which had originated at the Tate, was being toured to Edinburgh, ICA, Watershed and other venues. The third tour 'Recent British Video', which had formed part of the Great Britain Salutes New York festivities (organised by Stuart Marshall) had now 3 or 4 bookings but was not yet fully active due to difficulties with the catalogue, which were now solved. Mary Pat Leece asked Committee if it were possible to have a comparison between the Modular Scheme packages and the 'umbrella' scheme, regarding their success rates. Committee could then judge whether its decision to replace the Modular Scheme with 'umbrella' had been successful. The Assistant Film Officer pointed out that there would be some discrepancy as the 'umbrella' had had national press coverage unlike the Modular Scheme. The Film Officer suggested that it would be useful to have an updated list of venues and audience figures, for each exhibition meeting in the future. IT WAS AGREED that a report be produced for the next exhibition meeting.

#### 5.4 Modular Scheme

Copies of the broadsheets for the Modular Scheme packages (Her Image Fades/Working Frame by Frame) were tabled. The Assistant Film Officer apologised that the broadsheet for Image /Sound had been delayed as the designer was on holiday.

### 6 Applications

The Chairman pointed out to Committee that in the applications for consideration at this meeting, the names of several Committee members appeared as participants in the events requesting funding. However he felt that the limited nature of their participation was unlikely to compromise Committee's decisions. Consequently, no member would be asked to leave during discussion, unless they wished to do so.

#### 6.1 Deferred Applications

##### 6.1.1 Open Eye

The Chairman reminded Committee that this application had been deferred from the meeting of April 18, when Committee had requested further information on the activities of the organisation in order to make a decision. This information had been circulated and publicity material was tabled. It was noted that the organisation received substantial funding from other sources. It was also noted that the amount of avant-garde work in their programme was minimal. Committee thought that it needed an assessment of the group's work from Merseyside Arts before it could consider any application. IT WAS AGREED that the film officers should discuss the applicants with Merseyside Arts, leaving open the option of a reapplication to another meeting.

REJECT

6.1.2 IFA East Midlands

The Assistant Film Officer tabled a further letter from the applicant for Committee's consideration.

It was noted by Committee that this application resulted from an overspending by the applicant, of which Committee had not been informed. The Film Officer told Committee that it was only reasonable to expect that Council be informed when an organisation exceeded its previously submitted budget. It was irresponsible for this group not to have done so.

The Chairman pointed out that the project had changed substantially in ambition from the original application. Committee had been impressed by the tape which had been produced to a high standard, but this was not an argument for retrospective funding.

Stuart Marshall suggested that in reply to the application Committee should make clear that they need a more accurate budget in future applications

REJECT

6.2 Equipment Applications6.2.1 Colchester Film Workshop

Anne Rees-Mogg informed Committee that she had recently visited the Minories and found the organisation very active and helpful to artists.

The Assistant Film Officer pointed out that Committee had received a letter from John Cannon in support of this application.

Mary-Pat Leece pointed out that Ipswich Film Workshop which is under the same RAA was experiencing severe difficulties and suggested a visit to that area was necessary. The Assistant Film Officer suggested that it was also important that work by the group should be viewed to ascertain whether or not they generally fell within the Committee's terms of reference. IT WAS AGREED that the Assistant Film Officer and a Committee member should visit the area and report back to Committee in November on the support from the RAA given to this organisation and how the organisation relates to other organisations in that area.

Mary Pat Leece said she could possibly go.

DEFERRED

6.2.2 London Video Arts

Committee welcomed the useful background information they had previously requested from LVA regarding the equipment available, its useage, the group's financial status etc.

The request for further funds was discussed first.

Mary Pat Leece suggested that Committee needed the advice of video-makers regarding the quality and life-span of the equipment listed.

Stuart Marshall reported that since Chris Rushton's appointment the equipment booking system was working well and was much used.

If equipment at LVA was wearing out he was sure that it was not through lack of care. Tina Keane said she thought that the application made was for much needed equipment. The Film Officer suggested that Committee needed to know how this additional equipment would relate

to existing equipment. Tina Keane said that KY cameras were very important and two was not a large quantity when considering their use. Stuart Marshall informed Committee that LVA was being very careful to ensure that the equipment was loaned only to those people able to demonstrate their ability to use it. He pointed out that the Trinitrons were very necessary as those existing were in disrepair. Committee noted that the amount requested was in excess of funds available but acknowledged the need for the three items discussed. The Assistant Subsidy Officer pointed out that this request suggested further growth in LVA, and Committee should be informed of Channel 4 and GLC commitments to LVA.

AGREED to recommend a grant of £2885

The Chairman opened discussion of the possible LVA bursary, which the Committee would be considering formally in November, reminding Committee that in the past it had expressed interest in the possibility of having a bursary outside the college circuit. Tina Keane, the Film Officer and Stuart Marshall were in favour of this possibility. Tina Keane suggested that it should be tried for at least one term. The Chairman agreed in principle but was dubious as to whether LVA was the right placement. He thought that another venue might benefit more from the activity generated. Committee discussed the possibility of other venues. David Parsons said that this application was an indication of a growing organisation and he would support it on those grounds. The Assistant Film Officer said that it was a welcome indication that LVA's interests still lay in the artists' video sector despite their strong ties with Channel 4. The Film Officer said that the thought that LVA would be a very sympathetic environment for a placement bursary. The Assistant Film Officer pointed out that the bursary's value would be greatly increased by the free access promised by LVA to its equipment; much of a £1000 bursary could be spent simply on hiring that same equipment. Stuart Marshall said that it would be interesting to see which other organisations followed LVA's example. David Parsons pointed out that if the placement was for one term it might attract a wider range of applicants who did not feel able to commit themselves to a whole year. The Film Officer pointed out that if Committee felt committed to encouraging other organisations such as LVA to consider placement bursaries, it should do something such as advertising in Video News. The Chairman agreed. The Assistant Film Officer reminded Committee that the original intention of the placement bursaries was to cover film as well as video, but positive discrimination towards video had been felt necessary; this situation was possibly now reversing. The discrimination towards video need not be pursued so intensely. The Committee agreed.

### 6.3 Exhibitions

#### 6.3.1 "33" Guildford Street

The Chairman pointed out to Committee before discussion started that the people at Luton were under the impression that Sue Barrowclough had been contacted regarding this application and in fact she had not. There was general support for this application but it was noted that the events would not take place until the next financial year. However at this time Committee was being asked for funds for part 2 only. However it was thought appropriate that "33" should apply to Committee for preparation costs which would be incurred before the opening in April. The Assistant Film Officer considered it quite correct that Committee respond this

year for preparation for events next year. The Film Officer pointed out that this was problematic as Committee was unsure of its allocation next year. The Assistant Subsidy Officer said that Committee needed a letter of authorisation from the Director of Eastern Arts, Christopher Rye, before allocating the money. The Chairman suggested that perhaps a standard letter be drawn up for use in future applications similar to this, in order to avoid confusion.

IT WAS AGREED to recommend a grant of £250 for part 2 of the application, subject to receipt of a letter from Christopher Rye.

The Assistant Subsidy Officer agreed to speak to Luton when they made submission for part 1 in the first meeting of the next financial to clarify their application.

### 6.3.2 North by North West Film Society

The Chairman reminded Committee that this was one of the venues that had been assisted in programming in previous years by the 'animateur'. There was considerable discussion about whether the term 'Post-Modernism' could be applied to film as the applicants suggested. Even if it could, it was generally doubted whether it would make an attractive subject to a film society audience. The application was felt to be insubstantial, and was rejected. David Parsons was concerned that the group be sent an encouraging letter.

REJECT

### 6.3.3 Northampton Arts Centre

The Assistant Film Officer tabled a report on the previous year's activities at the centre, plus additional details of the weekend event forming part of their application. It was noted that the weekend event fell in the next financial year. The Chairman thought that the programme sounded interesting but that Committee should discuss the project as a whole. David Parsons thought that the project was ambitious but the linking themes were arbitrary. The Assistant Film Officer pointed out that they were not claiming that the programme is related but were merely making use of what was available and convenient to book.

Tina Keane told Committee that she had visited the centre and was encouraged by the level of enthusiasm and activity there, considering it was their first year. She thought that it was essential they be given further support to consolidate the level of activity which had built up. The workshops catered for many unemployed people. She supported the whole year's programme. Mary Pat Leece pointed out that the fees were not consistent with other applications.

Anne Rees-Mogg reminded Committee that it had subsidised Simon' Field to travel to this type of venue to encourage them to programme more ambitious work, and Committee should therefore support this application. Tina Keane agreed.

Committee discussed the budget. Lecture fees itemised to the Assistant Film Officer were inadmissible. Their proposed expenditure on publicity was thought extravagant, a better model being the Slow Dancer poster, which covered a whole year. Having taken the income figure into account, it was decided to award £280, as a guarantee against loss, for the season's events. Part two of the application, the weekend event, was then discussed by Committee. The Assistant Film Officer pointed out that this

event had enthusiastic RAA support. Stuart Marshall thought that the Saturday/Sunday programmes were unrelated, and too ambitious. The Assistant Film Officer however, thought that this was a sincere attempt to broaden the debate around avant-garde film. Anne Rees-Mogg reminded Committee that the intention of the group was to invite an American critic or film-maker over to the weekend who would offer an informed overview to the event; there was a possibility of 'Guardian' lecture money to support this element. Stuart Marshall thought that as this application was no doubt encouraged by the 'animateur', Committee should support in some degree but not until the programme was sorted out more clearly. Mary Pat Leece thought that there were too many unknowns in the application for example poetry reading. There was no mention of who would read. Having reduced the publicity allocation, the Assistant Subsidy Officer pointed out, and Committee agreed, that as budgeted the event needed no subsidy at all. The required subsidy was £1070, and the estimated income would be sufficient to cover it. The Committee felt that the group should be written to with a revised budget for part 2: Film Hire - £300, Al Rees' fees - £100, David Muney's fees - £100, Panel (2 speakers) - £80, Technical - £100, Creche - £40, Weekend poster - £100, Documentation for weekend - £100, Advertisement for weekend - £100 (City Limits etc), Telephone - £50; Total - £1070

AGREED £280 guarantee against loss for the season's events.

#### 6.3.4 Diorama

There was discussion on the site of the application, and questions as to the continuing availability of the venue. The Assistant Film Officer thought the uncertainty was long term rather than immediate.

Committee examined the support material outlining the individual artists' proposals which was tabled. It was noted that an exceptionally large amount of equipment was needed. It was noted that no income figure was itemised in the budget. The Chairman suggested that the absent income figure could be used to cover the equipment-hire costs. Committee agreed. The Film Officer pointed out that the fees should be compared with Film-Makers on Tour fees, as these are thought to be acceptable. The Assistant Film Officer said they were roughly comparable. Committee approved of this application. It was noted that no indication was given regarding the person to whom the award should be paid. The Assistant Subsidy Officer agreed to sort out the method of payment, and to ascertain why no income had been budgeted.

AGREED £620 Guarantee against loss.

#### 6.3.5 10 Years of Mixed Media

The Chairman reminded Committee that this application began several months ago as a research project at the RCA. Today's application was the result of the research and development. The Assistant Film Officer tabled a considerable amount of research material. The Film Officer pointed out that this application was being submitted to two other Committees in the Arts Council - Special Applications and Art Department, and any support given should be seen to be unanimous.

Committee discussed the proposed project. The Assistant Film Officer



pointed out that the title suggested that this was a general survey not just of RCA work, and this would change the perspective from which Committee viewed this application. Anne Rees-Mogg agreed, but was none-the-less pleased to see an initiative that supported an RCA department that had been much undermined in recent years. The Chairman pointed out that the Committee had been very enthusiastic in the first instance because it was not RCA dominated but now it was. The Film Officer pointed out that the purpose of the exhibition was not clear but at cross purposes. The general feeling was that the direction of the exhibition would have to be clarified through discussion with Chrissie Iles before Committee could support it substantially. Also the support of other departments and funding bodies (particularly commercial sponsorship of equipment etc) would need to be ascertained.

IT WAS AGREED to award Chrissie Iles £320 grant to enable her to continue her research on this project.

## 7 Forward Plans

### 7.1 London Film-Makers' Co-operative Preview Facility

Committee expressed interest in the possibility of the Co-op having a preview facility but felt that the professional standard equipment (Transcan Flying Spot Telecine) itemised, was too expensive in view of the service it would give, and needs. The Film Officer pointed out that they would need an engineer to operate the equipment and this would add to their financial needs.

David Parsons suggested that more information was needed regarding the technical aspects of this application pointing out the objection that to some film-makers, transferring was actually devaluing the work. The Assistant Film Officer said that there was a great deal to be discussed regarding this application and research into the needs of the whole independent sector was needed. There was general support for the idea of awarding a small bursary for research into this project, which would be considered in the next financial year.

## 8 Any Other Business

The Chairman requested that the dates of the future meetings were amended. Committee agreed. The dates are as follows:

November 7 - small awards and bursaries  
November 14 - large awards and bursaries

The meeting ended at 4.40 pm.

(all recommendations are made from the 1983/4 Artists' Film and Video Allocation).