



**arts nb**

## **Summary of the Peer Jury Feedback from the October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024 Deadlines – Creation and Documentation**

### **Creation Program**

#### **General Information**

- 152 applications to the Creation program were evaluated by 7 peer juries, divided by artistic discipline.
  - Applications submitted in Multidisciplinary Arts were juried alongside the discipline closest aligned with each respective project, as determined by artsnb staff.
  - Applications submitted in Architecture were evaluated by the Visual Arts jury.
  - An additional 6 applications were disqualified due to their ineligibility for this program. Many of these applicants were directed to reapply for a different, more appropriate grant for their project.
- The 152 applications juried in this competition received the following results. Grant assessment is a competitive process and budgets are limited. Remember that each deadline receives a different set of applications and is evaluated by different groups of peer jurors.
  - 84 applications received a status of "Recommended," and received funding.
  - 15 additional applications received a status of "Merit." This status indicates that the jury wished to recommend these applications for funding, but that the program budget was insufficient to fund all meriting applications.
  - 53 applications received a status of "Not Recommended." This status indicates that the jury did not recommend these applications for funding. It does not necessarily mean that the work lacks merit, rather, that the applications themselves were less competitive in the application pool received for this deadline.
- Of 84 grants awarded, 22 were awarded to applicants receiving their first grants from artsnb.
- For more detailed information including success rates by Category and by artistic discipline, please consult [the news release](#) featuring the results of this deadline.
- For useful tips and recommendations on preparing an artsnb application, please consult the [Application Toolkit](#).

#### **General Feedback (all disciplines and juries)**

- The 7 peer juries were excited about the diversity of artistic styles and cultural art forms present in the applications submitted for this deadline. They especially wished to commend the number of artists who are attuned to the impact their work has on their community.
- The juries noted that several applications were written with a focus on the artist's business practice, with little or no detail on their artistic practice and vision. While they



appreciated seeing artists consider this side of their discipline, the jurors encouraged applicants to keep in mind how applications for artistic grants and business grants require different approaches and kinds of information.

## Project description

- The juries appreciated project descriptions that clearly and concisely laid out the following elements:
  - A clear description of the proposed work or works (e.g.: type, number, and scale or length of pieces to be created or performed; whether the goal is a performance, a script, an installation, a sculpture, a novel, etc.)
  - A feasible work plan (e.g.: estimated timeline of steps toward creating the final work; the roles to be carried out by the applicant and their collaborators; etc.)
  - A brief statement on the applicant's approach to relevant themes (e.g.: why this project, and why now? How do the proposed choices of form or technique relate to the topic of the work? Who is the desired audience for the work? What is the message or desired impact?)
  - A brief explanation of how the proposed project will progress the applicant's artistic practice. (e.g.: how will this project challenge your skills? Will this project allow you to make connections with new publics or collaborators? What are your ambitions for the completed artwork?)
- For projects which require the artist to work with a mentor or which are focused on marketing existing works rather than creating new works, the juries recommended that applicants refer to, respectively, artsnb's [Career Development—Professional Development and Career Development—Professionalization and Promotion](#) grants.

## Budget

- The juries recommended including detailed budget breakdowns whenever an application includes multiple types of expenses, e.g., multiple types of materials, many different services required, collaborator fees.
- The juries also recommended including detailed information to explain the relevance of all expenses requested, e.g. if you are requesting funds for travel, where are you travelling, and how is this essential to complete your project?
- The juries reminded applicants to consult the program guidelines to ensure they are not requesting funding for ineligible expenses.
- The juries recommended that the priority and majority of an application budget should be dedicated to paying artist fees for the applicant and any collaborating artists.

## Samples of work

- The juries wished to remind applicants that their samples of work should be relevant to the proposed project, demonstrating skills, techniques, or approaches that show the peer jury the applicant's capability to undertake the proposed project.
- The juries appreciated when applications using longer works for their samples indicated the appropriate excerpts to be viewed using time stamps or page ranges.



- For applicants who have already begun working on a draft or prototype of the proposed project, the juries recommended including samples from these preliminary works to give a better understanding of the applicant's approach to the project.
- The juries recommended that applications presenting photographs of their works should ensure that the photographs are of a consistent quality. While professional quality photos are not required and clear photos taken with a cell phone may suffice, applicants who wish to hire a professional photographer to document their works for this purpose are encouraged to apply for artsnb's [Career Development—Professionalization and Promotion](#) grant.

### **Collaborative projects**

- For applications that involve multiple co-creators, juries recommended explaining what makes these chosen collaborators important for the project at hand (e.g. they have previous experience working with the primary applicant, or they bring a new skill to the collaboration, etc.). This information could be included in the project description or in the collaborator agreement letters.
- The juries also appreciated collaborative applications that allocated clear and fair payment for all artistic collaborators. For applicants who are newer to collaborative work, the juries suggested seeking industry standards for artist fees via artists associations (e.g. [CARFAC](#), the [Canadian League of Composers](#), etc.).

### **Research, Consultation, and Cultural Relationships**

- For projects that include consulting with or interviewing people from specific communities or professions (e.g. sensitivity readers, interviews with people with specific lived experiences, etc.), the juries recommended that applicants clearly explain their method for approaching these people to ensure clear consent and respectful engagement. The juries especially recommended that applicants budget for appropriate payments to any consultants and interview subjects to acknowledge the services rendered.
- The juries advised keeping answers in the Cultural Relationships section specific to the ethical relationships directly related to the project. The purpose of this section is to make your approach to communities implicated in the project more transparent, which can include self-identification if relevant and/or explanations of the methods by which you will obtain consent and recognize the involvement of those communities.
- The juries wished to caution applicants about their approach to answering the Cultural Relationships section, as adding a general statement about diversity and inclusion that does not relate to the proposed project can be read as tokenizing.

### **Additional discipline-specific jury feedback**

#### **Craft**



**arts nb**

- The jury appreciated the number of applicants proposing projects that explore concepts and methods new to the artist's practice.
- The jury recommended budgeting only for materials required for this proposed project.
- For applicants who submit images of works-in-progress or concept sketches in their samples of work, the jury recommended using the description box to clearly explain the techniques, scale, and context for the image in relation to the proposed project.

### **Dance**

- The jury appreciated how the majority of applicants in Dance prioritized adequate payment for their collaborating artists and performers. They expressed that valuing the time and labour of fellow artists in this way demonstrates an essential degree of respect and professionalism.
- The jury was less favourable toward applications that focused on the commercial and tourism potential of the project, and recommended that applicants focus instead on the creative and cultural significance of their work.
- For choreography projects, the jury recommended that applicants explain their vision for the final piece, e.g. how many performers, length of the performance, desired audience, etc.

### **Literary Arts**

- The jury was excited about applications that were taking bold creative risks, especially when applicants demonstrated the clear progression between their existing work and their new ambitions.
- The jury appreciated the range of projects proposed in children's literature, as this field has been widely underrepresented in New Brunswick. However, the jury recommended that applicants who are proposing their first foray into writing children's literature should familiarize themselves with existing work and contexts in this genre, as well as common industry practices for children's literary publishing.
- The jury did wish to caution applicants against being too ambitious in the scale of their proposed projects; for example, instead of proposing an entire series, they recommended proposing one book in the series at a time.

### **Media Arts**

- The jury was excited to see a variety of artistic styles in this application pool, ranging from traditional documentary to short genre film to experimental video installation. They were less favourable toward proposals for "calling card" films.
- For applicants proposing larger-scale film projects with multiple collaborators and types of expenses, the jury especially recommended the inclusion of a detailed budget breakdown showing how much is allocated toward, e.g., collaborator fees, cast and crew fees, equipment rentals, etc.

### **Music**



**arts nb**

- The jury was enthusiastic about how many of the applications demonstrated a clear understanding of and connection to the artists' local communities.
- The jury recommended including a detailed collaboration letter for all active collaborators in the proposed project, explaining the roles and remuneration for each person.
- The jury wished to remind applicants that music recording is not eligible for artsnb Creation grants; rather, funds for recording are available through [Music NB](#), [Factor](#), [Musicaction](#), [Canada Council for the Arts](#), and more.

## **Theatre**

- The jury appreciated the representation of comedy and improvisation projects in this application pool and wished to encourage more comedians and improvisers to seek grant funding to support their work.
- The jury wished to emphasize the importance of paying all collaborators and participating artists involved in a project, including both cast and crew members. This should include factoring the time and labour required for rehearsal into artist fees.
- For performance-based projects, the jury recommended including video or audio samples of the applicant's previous performances. While stills from performances can be useful, they do not alone provide sufficient information for the jury to evaluate a project from a performing artist.

## **Visual Arts**

- The jury was excited about the representation of experimental and performance art forms in this application pool.
- In the samples of work section, the jury recommended submitting enough material for the jury to evaluate the artist's skill and range of work. They noted that many applications submitted under 5 images, which did not offer enough material to back up what were otherwise strong applications.
- The jury also wished to underline that photographs of an artwork should offer a clear and detailed presentation of the work. This means photographing the work alone rather than with the artist posed with it; clearly lit on a neutral background; and without obvious watermarks, which can obscure important details.

## **Documentation Program**

### **General Information**

- 14 applications to the Documentation program were evaluated by a multi-disciplinary jury of peers.
- The 14 applications juried for this deadline received the following results. Grant assessment is a competitive process and budgets are limited. Remember that each deadline receives a different set of applications and is evaluated by a different group of peer jurors.



**arts nb**

- 7 applications received a status of “Recommended,” and received funding.
- 7 applications received a status of “Not Recommended.” This status indicates that the jury did not recommend these applications for funding. This does not necessarily mean that the work lacks merit, rather, that the applications themselves were less competitive in the application pool received for this deadline.
- Of 7 grants awarded, 1 was awarded to an applicant receiving their first grant from artsnb.
- For more detailed information including success rates by artistic discipline, please consult the [news release](#) featuring the results of this competition.
- For useful tips and recommendations on preparing an artsnb application, please consult the [Application Toolkit](#).

### **General Feedback**

- The jury appreciated applications that offered a detailed explanation of the project’s goals and workplans, and that clearly defined all technical or theoretical terms for a multidisciplinary jury of peers.
- The jury felt that budgets should prioritize paying the artists involved (both the applicant and collaborators) and were less favourable to budgets that allocated the majority of funds to paying corporations for a service. The jury also recommended including a detailed budget breakdown explaining the rationale for all requested expenses, including which materials or services are required, collaborator fees, and explanation for any travel expenses requested.
- The jury advised applicants to use the Cultural Relationships question of the application to explain their ethical approaches to subject matter dealing with cultures or communities outside their own. They advised that this section could be useful to spell out the applicant’s personal relationships to those communities, rather than simply “ticking a box” for diversity.
- For projects that utilize artificial intelligence (AI), the jury cautioned against including only AI-generated images for the samples of work. The jury also recommended including notes on the ethics of the proposed AI technology to be used, as many generative AI models are trained using the work of artists without their consent.