

and Anne Rees-Mogg for their work on the exhibition. Mary Pat Leece said she thought the juxtaposition of certain films in programme 4 was insensitive. The Chairman reminded her that the intention of the exhibition was to show work, not create exemplary programmes.

Anne Rees-Mogg pointed out that one concern of the programmes was to display the wide variety of work funded by the AC and thus dispel the idea of an 'Arts Council product'. She suggested this might be discussed more fully at the Forum.

4.3 Film/Video Umbrella

The broadsheet for Cubism and the Cinema was tabled. The AFO reported that the Robert Breer tour was still running and was scheduled to stop before Christmas when it would have shown at 8-10 venues. Cubism and the Cinema had four venues but Recent British Video had been less active due to difficulties that had arisen between London Video Arts and the AC programmer, Mike O'Pray. These were now resolved and progress was being made.

4.4 Report on the Outreach of Artists' Film and Video

The AFO had been asked by the Advisory Committee for Arts Films to produce a report on the visibility of this medium and the effectiveness of the exhibition work of the Artists' Film and Video Sub-Committee. The AFO informed Committee that he would be asking members for their help in compiling this report. The Chairman said he thought this would be a very useful report there being a great deal of interest in the work done by Committee. He told Committee that they had been asked to organise a short programme of work for the benefit of the Advisory Committee. This might be concurrent with the NFT funded work show in January.

4.5 LVA: curtailment of Autumn exhibition plans.

A report from LVA was tabled. The AFO explained to Committee that LVA's screenings had recently been disappointing and time was being taken for reassessment. The ASO told Committee that although LVA's overspending only amounted to approximately £400, their income was very low. They had not budgeted for the full rent of Air Gallery basement which they had hoped to cover with income from workshop courses. Both the AFO and ASO thought that LVA's grant should not be used to pay this rent deficit.

The AFO told Committee that he had had a request from LVA to use Video Artists on Tour to subsidise shows which LVA had planned for the Spring. He thought that Committee should resist this request. Committee decided that a fuller discussion was necessary on the state of LVA's finances which could possibly take place in the January policy meeting. The Film Officer pointed out that this would coincide with discussion he thought necessary on the possibility of revising Committee's method of funding LVA. Committee agreed.

5 Placement Bursaries

5.1 Report by Steve Hawley on his year at NELP.

The report was read with interest and accepted.

5.2 NELP 83-4. Report on selection by the Film Officer.

5.2/5 The Film Officer told Committee that the standard of applications for all the placement bursaries had been

unusually low this year. He thought that serious discussion was necessary on this issue. He told Committee that Jayne Parker had been awarded the NELP bursary from a short-list of 3. The Sheffield bursary had been awarded to Kerry Trengrove from a short-list of 4. Two applicants had been short-listed for Reading but the FO did not think the standard of either of them particularly high. The Maidstone and Brighton bursaries had not yet been short-listed.

5.5 LVA: Proposal for ACGB/LVA production bursary (3x£1000 84/5)

The Chairman reminded Committee that this proposal resulted from a request first presented to Committee by LVA at the September meeting. Doubts were expressed regarding the wisdom of making decisions to spend extra money at a time when funds were so short, particularly in view of LVA's obvious revenue problem. The Assistant Film Officer pointed out that the money would not be awarded to LVA directly but to the video artists and the problems that LVA faced were not concerned with the workshops, which were thriving, but with exhibition policy. Additionally the proposed bursaries would come from the 84/5 budget, and a provisional decision only was necessary at this time in order that LVA might prepare a full application detailing proposed methods of administering the bursary. This decision would have to be made now in order that LVA might apply for all 3 intended bursaries. Committee supported this view and it was agreed to write to LVA expressing interest and requesting a statement on how LVA intended to administer the bursary and operate selection procedures, with a view to earmarking funds from the 84/5 budget.

6

6.1 Video Bursaries

6.1.1 Jon Bewley £500

Committee viewed the support material, but thought the work was unclear and lacked a particular theme. It was noted that this applicant had been awarded £500 last year, and an account of how this money was spent was thought necessary.

REJECT

6.1.2 Peter Davies £1500

This application was deferred until November 14.

DEFERRED

6.1.3 Ken Gill £500

Support material was viewed. Committee found it difficult to judge the work of applicants from the Basement Group as it was unclear how much of the applicants time and funds awarded were used for individual projects or for collective work at the Basement Group. It thought an account of individual activities was necessary. The Film Officer reminded Committee that a condition of the grant offered was that after 12 months, the applicant submitted a report on the work produced.

Stuart Marshall volunteered to communicate to Ken Gill and Jon Bewley, Committee's difficulties in dealing with applicants from the Basement Group. Committee agreed

REJECT

/...

6.1.4 Peter Savage £1000

Committee viewed support material, Back After the Break and Love Stories. Committee was supportive of the new direction it detected in this artist's work, but was unable to support this application to the amount requested.

AGREED: £500 Film Bursary from the 1983/4 Artists' Film and Video Allocation.

6.1.5 Belinda Williams £500

Committee viewed support material, which it noted had been submitted to Committee in support of her previous successful application. The Film Officer was anxious that Committee should be informed of the work completed as a result of her earlier bursary before it recommended further funding. It agreed to request a report.

REJECT

6.2 Film Awards - Re-submissions6.2.1 Kate Richards £1040

Committee viewed support material. It was noted that this applicant had not produced a large body of work but thought she was active academically, and the work produced of a high standard. As a consequence the application was supported although not to the full amount requested. It was thought the issues raised in the support material, though produced some time ago were still relevant.

AGREED: £500 Film Award from the 1983/4 Artists' Film and Video Allocation.

6.3 Film Completion6.3.1 Valerie Penn £770

Committee viewed the rough cut without sound track which was unavailable. It was suggested the amount of money requested for reshooting a damaged section could be saved if the applicant sent the film to the Film Clinic. Committee thought the budget provided was incomplete, no provision having been made for the sound track, however it recommended support of this application to the extent of £500 with the option left open that the film be returned for 'completion' funding.

AGREED: £500 Film Award from the 1983/4 Artists' Film and Video Allocation.

6.4 Film Awards6.4.1 Andrew Baines £200

Committee was unable to view support material, but were unable to recommend support of this application on the basis of the scripts submitted

REJECT

6.4.2 Steve Chivers £608

Committee viewed support material for this application but were unable to recommend support. It was thought the application lacked sufficient viewing material and it was thought necessary

/...

that the applicant be asked to supply more in future applications. The AFO pointed out that this applicant had an apparent inability to complete work.

REJECT

6.4.3 Mark Gaynor et al £1100

Committee viewed support material Reversal Film and written material but were unable to recommend support of this application.

REJECT

6.4.4 Arthur Howes £456

Committee viewed support material (for completion) Threatening Assassins. There was some interest in this application but as it was outside the Artists' Film and Video Sub-Committee's terms of reference, Committee was unable to support this application. It was thought that the project should be referred, with Committee's support to another funding body such as GLAA or the Production Board. It was also thought wise that the film-maker be advised to provide more information when re-applying to another organisation.

REJECT

6.4.5 Katharine Meynell £635

Committee viewed support material Belly and Moments, and was supportive of the application, but was unable to fund to the full amount requested.

AGREED: £500 Video Award from the 1983/4 Artists' Film and Video Allocation.

6.4.6 Tony Potts £1109

Committee viewed support material. It was noted that this film was different from the original project funded by Committee. It was not thought that it warranted further funding. Stuart Marshall thought the film was interesting but the theme was unclear. Susan Barrowclough thought the film-maker had been much influenced by the American underground film, but had failed to assimilate this.

REJECT

6.4.7 Brian Sharpe £692

Support material was viewed but there was no support for this application .

REJECT

6.4.8 Helen Sear £780

Committee viewed support material and the Chairman and others were enthusiastic, but were unable to support this application to the full amount requested.

AGREED: £500 Film Award from the 1983/4 Artists' Film and Video Allocation.

6.5 Film Bursaries6.5.1 B.E. Assinder £500

Committee viewed support material Covenant in Exile. Interest was shown in the work but Committee were unable to recommend support on the evidence of the material presented and thought the Film Office should write to the applicant suggesting reapplication next financial year with more support material.

REJECT

6.5.2 Stephen Binnion £500

Committee viewed support material Mediaevil but were unable to offer their support to this applicant. David Parsons thought his work casual and the Chairman and AFO thought it unrevealing.

REJECT

6.5.3 J.N. Blanks £500

Committee viewed support material but thought it was immature and were unable to recommend their support.

REJECT

6.5.4 Simon DuBosky £500

Committee viewed support material and noted there was little difference between this and his previous application. They were unable to recommend support.

REJECT

6.5.5 Keith Frake £1000

Committee viewed slides and a script which they found interesting. It was noted that the applicant had been working recently in tape-slide, but Committee welcomed the intended return to video and film. It recommended support of the application though not to the amount requested.

AGREED: £500 Film Bursary from the 1983/4 Artists' Film and Video Allocation.

6.5.6 Chris Hardinge £500

Committee viewed support material but found it uninteresting and were unable to support the application.

REJECT

6.5.7 Stuart Hicking £1000

Committee viewed support material which they found accomplished but rather academic. It was noted that some of the works submitted for completion had been supported by East Midlands Arts, and it was suggested that the applicant look to them for funds and also be encouraged to re-apply to the Arts Council with a new project.

REJECT

6.5.8 Nick Hunt £500

Committee viewed support material but were unenthusiastic and were unable to recommend support for this application.

REJECT

/...

6.5.9 Simon Robertshaw £500

Committee viewed the support material The New Blue Look, and Socialization. It was noted that the applicant was in the process of being considered for a place at the RCA in 1984/5. There was a considerable amount of support for this application although the Chairman thought the work clichéd and unquestioning though technically competent. David Parsons pointed out that the applicant was quite young and inexperienced and he preferred to see the work developed further before advancing funds. Anne Rees-Mogg was very supportive of this applicant and thought his technical 'slickness' was insufficient reason for rejecting his application. This she thought resulted from the applicant making full use of the equipment available to him. Tina Keane agreed. Roger Wilson and Stuart Marshall thought the work was very definitely within the Arts Council's terms of reference and thought it important that Committee supported young people who had not as yet established a reputation.

AGREED: £500 Film Bursary from 1983/4 Artists' Film and Video Allocation.

7 Any Other Business

Anna Kruger circulated a report on LVA's financial situation in order to give Committee time to consider thoroughly before the January/February Policy Meeting. The Chairman suggested that at the November 14 meeting, Committee consider the applications in two sections, each section consisting of viewing of support material, followed by discussion. Committee agreed. David Parsons informed Committee that Steve Hawley, the NELP bursary holder, was showing the last piece of work produced during the bursary period, at a private view on November 9. Committee members were welcome.

The meeting ended at 6.15 pm.