

“Remuneration Policy for Artists and Arts Practitioners”

(CNZ)

Survey feedback discussion from hui



Document link:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ILvz5mnl-8qG0OUQgaMaP4LBmnMQUoYA2No_FZrv-gg/edit?usp=sharing

“You will find the online submission form [here](#)

- It will take you around 10 minutes to complete your submission.*
- The survey will close on 22 August 2021*

If you have any questions about the CNZ document or the questionnaire, or want to provide feedback to CNZ directly, you can:

Email: Strategy@creativenz.govt.nz

Phone: 0800 CREATIVE (273 284)

*Post: Creative New Zealand PO Box 3806 Wellington 6014***

The points in this document are adapted from a hui that happened through Equity NZ on the 11th August, 2021, 6pm. All contributors have been kept anonymous for privacy purposes. Feedback has been kept to simple, bulleted points. The more feedback CNZ gets from artists, the more they will understand the need for major structural shifts.

For your own feedback to CNZ, feel free to:

- Copy and paste the points you agree with,
- Adapt the points you think need rewording, and/or;
- Leave out any you don't feel align with your personal values.

If you have any questions about or additions to the following feedback discussed at the Equity NZ hui, you can Email: amberlibertyofficial@gmail.com

**Italic indent content from CNZ's [document](#)*

**It is acknowledged that facilitator of this document is from a theatre and dance background, so some of the notations may not be applicable or directly applicable to other art forms*

CONCERNS/THOUGHTS ON ARTS SECTOR ADVOCACY

- We want a more centralised contract system with standardised rates of pay (that has the ability to be adapted based on a projects requirements/contexts) that CNZ require to be in place for CNZ funded projects - this is so that artists aren't competing and will help prevent pay rates from being driven down (the 'race to the bottom' mentality)
- We want criteria which require projects to ensure a certain percentage of people working on projects MUST be from marginalised/minority and/or historically (and continually) oppressed groups. This to ensure space, energy and finances are going towards non-pakeha artists and arts practitioners. CNZ have the ability and power to come up with some kind of model to encourage this and to advocate for marginalised and minority groups and individuals
- Restrictions of CNZ categories can marginalise people e.g. Pasifika people wanting to make work about something that is not to do with their direct identity (e.g. ancestors, whakapapa etc.) but about something else. Some feel are expected by CNZ to make something about being Pasifika in order to be considered 'fundable'
- Idea of getting CNZ to encourage more patrons of the arts to support the bigger business arts (e.g. ATC, NZDC). The money from CNZ that goes towards them would then be free to go towards more freelance artists. Obviously this needs to be dealt with carefully as historically patrons of the arts can have negative expectations and agreements between artists and the funders - but it was discussed that in a way, CNZ has much the same power as some patrons. They have a certain set of criteria/tick boxes, and bias' that artists must meet in order to be considered 'appropriate' enough to be funded by CNZ
- If not the above point, then CNZ needs to be working alongside artists to advocate for them and help MCH realise that artists are severely underpaid, that the sector is not sustainable and that MCH need to be investing more
- Arts funding needs to be more people focussed as opposed to 'project' focussed. Careers with longevity in the arts are almost non-existent
- CNZ needs to focus on pools of funding for 'emerging' 'mid-career' and 'established' artists so that there are groups getting missed (e.g. especially recent graduates). The distinction also needs to be made that an artist may be a 'mid-career' dance artist, while also being an 'emerging' producer
- IP & royalties/residuals etc. is a big issue and hardly anyone gets them - however IP is still extremely controversial

- Projects should be required to have a focus on sustainability and environment
- CNZ should start to encourage and eventually require artists, if possible, to be members of unions and alliances. Unions can then become stronger and advocate for fairer treatment of artists - on a systematic level. Currently arts - especially dance - has little to no protection of workers rights
- Intellectual Property should be carefully considered. The idea of 'ownership' of creative ideas can sometimes create issues. Firstly, the idea that something is 'original' is no longer applicable to arts - most ideas have been adapted, manipulated or developed based on something the artist(s) have seen before. When it comes to situations of artists going to court for IP, often the winner of court cases are the artists with more money, who can afford to take time out to dispute. Processes around this need to be carefully thought about and put in place to be fair, understand the complexity of IP, and take into account the idea of 'ownership'

FINANCIAL CONCERNS

- There is a general feel of unease about minimum pay rates - having an impact on people who are producing their own work and aren't funded enough to pay everyone e.g. profit share shows. CNZ needs to work alongside the arts community, unions, and business to come up with a sector-wide suggested rates - taking into account the different kinds of projects that are getting made
- Issue of higher pay to CE's and higher up arts admin roles at CNZ. These amounts should be redistributed back into the arts/artists pay. If the CE is earning \$310-319,999k per year in comparison to artists' average annual income (of approx \$17.5k-\$35.8k according to CNZ poll in 2018) then something is wrong and is a system built on hypocrisy and privilege. Studies also show that people need to be earning between \$80-103k to be living comfortably in Aotearoa.
- There is mass unease about if hourly rates for personnel increases, it will erase a lot of artists from being able to make work. For example, the higher the rate of pay, the least money there is to go around. CNZ needs to put steps in place to try and support as many artists as possible. This could include leading serious discussions with the government and MCH about the need for more funds. CNZ could lead lobbying (perhaps alongside organisations like Equity, Art Makers Aotearoa etc.) to demand fairer allocated funding for artists
- In regards to the above point, the CE and higher paid roles at CNZ are out of touch with the reality of living like an artist, so may lack some of the empathy needed to understand the weight on artists hauora/well-being
- Funding caps - CNZ have not kept up with inflation. 75k max. The max you can get is 2 of those. That's \$150k for the annual arts grant. This is limiting the amount of time people can work/the amount of people on projects
- There is overall concern around max amount of money (unless 3-4 successful applications). Hard to progress if you're a small company/collective/practitioner. Not allowed to resubmit applications for projects
- CNZ needs to make it very clear in the funding process whether companies/collective/producers are engaging artists as contractors OR employees. Contractors should be entitled to a higher rate of pay than employees, as contractors must cover their own: ACC, Kiwisaver, Annual Leave, Sick Pay etc.
- Ideally artists should be on a living wage (at minimum) + any costs on top of that for ACC/Sick Leave/Annual pay etc.

- Labour govt. Put some money into CNZ for something like PACE - but this went into the wrong areas and didn't filter down to the artist. Rather than supporting artists in their practical development, it went into strategizing to be a 'good' business-person. However, most artists by necessity have relatively good business acumen (within the arts sector). What would ACTUALLY be beneficial to them is having money that supports them developing projects
- CNZ sometimes frames artists 'work' as if everyone has a 9-5 job and operates as if that's the norm. E.g. arts admin is a 'normal.' This is problematic in that it's not often true, and is quite out of touch with how many artists survive
- CNZ's system of a 'business' focussed model needs to start shifting to a more 'people' focussed model. This can include fairer rates, but also could include CNZ helping source reduced and/or subsidised cost rehearsal/creative spaces, reduced and/or subsidised venue-hire costs, reduced and/or subsidised technological costs. For example in Tāmaki, there are lots of empty building spaces that could be being utilised by artists and arts-makers
- CNZ needs to take into account the inflation that has occurred - e.g. house prices going up by 25.2% in the last year. The \$10k, \$75k & \$150k amounts is not good enough to support paying personnel properly
- CNZ talk a lot about the well-being of artists - changing pay rates, and lobbying for more investment into the arts from govt & patrons would massively shift artists well-being
- CNZ could be part of a movement lobbying for a universal basic income - this would help not just artists but other low socio-economic earners
- If 'all creative work' is to be 'paid-work' there is a concern about how that will impact projects which are not funded by CNZ and do not have the privilege of personal investment. This point leads to the possibility of creative work becoming even more elitist - so thorough policy around unfunded work which is unpaid needs to be considered
- Sectors rates should be across all sectors approximately. Otherwise sectors with strong union or alliance presence (e.g. composers rates guide) will be gaining more funding than dancers (as dancers don't have a guideline of rates). Also, it risks some sector being more financially valued than others, which is problematic. No arts role should be worth more or less than another (except when advised by experience and level of skill).
- All funded projects (and by extension all creative work) should be required to be working with an open-budget policy - so that artists can review where money is going and have autonomy over whether they think the remuneration is fair or not

- All projects/companies etc. should be required to report where CNZ funding actually ended up being spent so that the money is being used with accountability
- 'Status' of artists or arts practitioners is controversial - this needs to be better defined. Artists should be paid based on their years of experience and skill-level. Taking something like the Australian Live-Performance Award and adapting it to NZ rates and contractor rates (if that is how the artist is engaged in a project) would be beneficial

CONCERNS/THOUGHTS ON APPLICATIONS FOR CNZ FUNDING

- More transparency on how to write a good CNZ application - template/examples would be good. It has been noted that CNZ have mentioned that they intentionally don't want to do this so that applications remain 'original,' however the discussion led to a resounding agreement that having templates and examples would save massive amounts of time and energy. If the NCEA schooling system for exams can do it, why can't an arts funder?
- The limitations on the funding are difficult to get, are wieldy, and make it difficult for young artists and graduates to apply for funding. CNZ's recent change of the 'first 200 applications' for the arts grants rounds is elitist. Most artists are working excessive amounts to be able to sustain themselves between arts jobs. In the most recent CNZ round-close models, it means that the most likely people to get funded are the ones who can afford to take the time to write and get it in within the timeframe of the 200 max cap. It also means lots of artists are putting unpaid time into CNZ applications and may fall behind if the round closes before they've finished. This is unfair, as applications rely on more than just one person and sometimes things like LOS or quotes don't get sent back to CNZ applicants before the 200 cap closes.
- In regards to the above point, there is an issue of applying for funding from CNZ in that it is unpaid. Why is it fair that artists do hours of labour in the hope of getting money to go towards a project, while the core team at CNZ are on salaries that are 2x the amount of the average worker in Aotearoa
- There is also a concern that assessors are not getting paid properly - which CNZ have noted in this [document](#). We propose that assessors are paid PER HOUR as opposed to PER APPLICATION. There is a big issue in the current model, which directly impacts artists receiving or not receiving funding. Assessors are under pressure to mark things as quickly as possible - meaning they cannot put the necessary time and energy into marking applications thoroughly and with real thought
- Needs to be better consistency in messaging. Artists have experienced lots of contradictory feedback etc. from different assessors, and different people within CNZ
- Applications need to be updated so that they're appropriate for people with varied skills e.g. audio applications for people who can't write properly, video applications for more visual art-works (e.g. dance, painting etc.). CNZ currently allow these kinds of applications but artists have experience that more weight is put on the written component of applications

QUESTIONS / CONCERNS AROUND CURRENT SURVEY

- Is this CNZ is adopting for their own practice or are they expecting the various arts sectors to follow along?
- What's missing? In the current survey, there is no ability to see the *HOW* of what CNZ have proposed/are asking feedback on - currently there's a lot of great *WHAT* they're planning to do, but it needs to be broken down into practical, achievable steps for both CNZ's accountability and to help the artist know easy, clear procedures. Just like CNZ applications, the *WHAT* is easy to write about, but the *HOW* (for CNZ's proposed focuses) needs to be made transparent and needs to be advised by the different communities and/or sectors of artist and arts practitioners
- It's good CNZ acknowledges these things, but they shouldn't necessarily need to be making policy around - they're not an advocacy for artists - though this is important
- How can CNZ be helping/acting as advocates to get more govt money and demanding artists get better treatment?
- It would be helpful if CNZ can define 'Artist' vs "Arts Practitioner'