

**Establishing *TRUST*: a patrons' group  
dedicated to the expansion of  
Scotland's contemporary art collections**

**Research initiated and undertaken by  
Kirstie Skinner and funded by SAC**

**I am indebted to all those individuals and institutions who have supported and participated in this research since May 2009. Sincere thanks are due to all the people who are named in this report – their generosity and openness have been crucial to the research process, and will be fundamental to *Trust's* future success.**

## **Report**

1) Blueprint.....	3
1.1.Aims	
1.2 Objectives	
1.3 Identity	
1.4 Mechanisms for Donations and Purchasing	
1.5 Structure	
1.6 Relationships	
2) Development Plan.....	8
2.1 Developing a Business Plan	
2.2 Seeking Funding and Support	
2.3 Recruitment – Board and Mentors	
2.4 Further Research – Partners and Associates	
2.5 Design and Communication	
2.6 Patrons	
3) Research Questions.....	12
3.1 Research Phase One – June to November 2009	
3.2 Research Phase Two – January to March 2010	
3.2.1 Interviews with Collecting Institutions	
3.2.2 Interviews with Exhibiting Institutions that Support Production	
3.2.3 Patrons Group Buying Emerging Art	

## **Appendices**

Appendix A: Summary of proceedings - research meeting.....	19
Appendix B: Summary of papers and proceedings - international symposium.....	27
Appendix C: Summary of interviews with collecting institutions.....	42
Appendix D: Summary of interviews with exhibiting organisations.....	52

# 1 **TRUST: Blueprint**

## 1.1 **AIMS**

To effect the adventurous and ambitious expansion of Scotland's contemporary art collections through the gifting of art works to its major collections.

## 1.2 **OBJECTIVES**

To buy and gift art works to institutions in Scotland that are actively collecting contemporary art (currently including one national collection and seven museums located across Scotland that each hold Recognised Collections).

To establish a patrons' group that is motivated by a shared philanthropic commitment to the vitality of cultural life in Scotland, and desire to engage with contemporary art on a deeper level.

To fulfill a strategic role in Scotland by introducing the concept of patronage to new audiences, and evolving an accessible and innovative mechanism for giving.

To offer patrons a raft of opportunities to explore the production, curation, collection, and critical discussion of contemporary art; to promote a thorough and more extensive understanding of the distinct character of each of Scotland's collections of contemporary art.

To enhance Scotland's cultural holdings for the benefit of our own and future generations: choosing local, national and international artists who represent the most exciting and significant of today's artistic practices, and whose works respond to, and build on, the existing collecting priorities of each institution.

To advocate for Scotland's collections of contemporary art, and to initiate collaborations and partnerships that might enhance those collections.

## 1.3 **IDENTITY**

As an autonomous patrons' group, *Trust* would project confidence, vigour and critical ambition. *Trust* would not simply reflect the excitement of the current scene - it would aim to enhance the profile and prestige of Scottish collecting in the wider art world by becoming a highly regarded entity in itself. *Trust* recognises the importance of establishing a reputation quickly, and would seek to do so through the calibre of its representatives and associates, and through some striking early purchases.

By clearly communicating its aims and objectives to prospective patrons, *Trust* would attract those excited by the prospect of engaging with contemporary art in more profound ways. Through its activities and related

events, *Trust* would offer various opportunities for gratification: philanthropic investment, association with a dynamic cultural group, individual personal development, participation in a communal enterprise, and/or involvement in collective conversations.

From the outset, *Trust* would seek to locate its activities in an international context. At the same time as carving out an indispensable role as an embedded and dedicated private supporter of contemporary art at home, *Trust* would signal its commitment to exploring the national and international breadth of contemporary art. In the process of researching and selecting works to buy, *Trust* would establish a presence in the wider art world by attending art fairs, dealing with galleries outside Scotland, engaging with the art press and art blogosphere, and linking with other like-minded patrons groups.

It is of prime importance to the identity and credibility of *Trust* that it operates as a lynchpin in the eco-system of art collecting in Scotland. Firstly, its aim to fulfill a strategic role in developing patrons for contemporary art is best served if *Trust* is in a position to work productively with other patrons' initiatives and to support collecting activity at every level. Secondly, in place of a strong bond of loyalty to one institution, *Trust* must be able to promote a strong sense of ownership across the nation's institutions as a whole.

The initial research phase has enabled the founder to introduce the concept of *Trust* to the entire sector - securing support from, and establishing relationships with, all the significant commercial galleries, collecting institutions and organisations involved in exhibition and production in Scotland, as well as many of the local authorities and funding bodies. *Trust* would aim to consolidate its position as a respected interlocutor and valued associate within the sector by continuing to engage with sector-wide initiatives in the field of collecting, by contributing to any shared research agendas that may be developed in the future, and by further cultivating the one-to-one relationships established in the research phase.

#### **1.4 MECHANISMS FOR DONATION AND PURCHASING**

##### *Donations*

Rather than buying a subscription to a raft of benefits, or being asked for tiered payments in return for a hierarchy of access, *Trust* patrons would contribute a *minimum* philanthropic donation of £1000 annually. As participants in the group, they would be invited to some free events linked to the purchasing activity of the group, and some events, such as international trips, that would be costed and charged separately.

##### *Funds*

An innovative 'fund' mechanism would be central to *Trust's* patron development strategy and would constitute an important part of its distinctive identity. By offering a small range of funds, each one dedicated to a different purchasing theme, *Trust* could offer patrons a certain amount of engagement with the purchasing activity of the group, without handing over the final decision-making. In allocating their money to specific funds, patrons would

be able to signal what kinds of acquisitions they wanted to support – they would also be able to follow the progress of that fund and participate in the activities related to it if they so wished.

One campaign-style fund might close after a target amount is raised; another could close after a specified amount of time has elapsed, only then revealing the amount of money that would be available for its stated theme. Some funds would be spent on purchases identified and selected by the director (who would work with the beneficiary curators, and draw on informal advice from other curators and associates); some funds might raise enough money to employ consultant buyers acclaimed in their field. This variety of possible approaches would enable *Trust* to start purchasing with a relatively small number of patrons, and yet allow for rapid expansion if a particular high-profile opportunity were to arise.

#### *Trust (Emerging)*

Related to, but distinct from the main patrons' group, would be a smaller group dedicated to the purchase of work by emerging artists. The minimum donation for participation in this group would be £250, and patrons would be much more involved in researching, short-listing and voting for an artwork to gift, and identifying a collection to offer it to. As a more focused way of introducing people to both curating and collecting through patronage, this second group would appeal to an energetic, possibly young (or at least youthful) contingent.

Each year, parties within the group acting individually or perhaps in pairs, would nominate, and undertake to research, the work of a particular artist. They would deal with the artist's gallerist, finding out about prices and available works; they would research the participating museums' collecting policies, deciding which one represented the most appropriate home for their proposed artist, and discussing with the curator the feasibility of accepting the gift. They would build a strong case for their choice, and present this case to the other members, who would then vote for which of the shortlisted works they wished to acquire as a group.

All this would, of course, require a great deal of openness and commitment on the part of the gallerists and the museum curators, who would have to undertake not only to work with these patrons as they would any other patrons, but also to support their developmental journey – a commitment of capacity that would be likely to have indirect, rather than direct returns, at least initially. It would also require the participation of a number of mentors that could provide education and advice to the patrons, as well as ensuring that good practices were maintained throughout, and that valuable relationships within the sector were protected and nurtured.

## **1.5 STRUCTURE**

### *Company Status*

Although there may be scope in the future to retain ownership of the group's purchases, in its first incarnation *Trust* would buy works and gift them to

established museum collections. A company limited by guarantee is thus the most suitable company structure, and as a registered charity *Trust* would also be able to claim gift aid on patrons' donations.

#### *Management*

Aiming for as slim and flexible a management structure as possible, *Trust* would be managed primarily by founder and director Kirstie Skinner, with some part-time administrative assistance, and freelance support for trips and events arranged on a project-by-project basis.

#### *Board of Trustees*

*Trust* would recruit a board of trustees that would be involved in issues of governance and tasked with advocacy. Criteria for board recruitment would be based on a skills audit, and the need to deliver effective advocacy nationally and internationally. While established patrons, private collectors, educators and curators of exhibiting organisations would be suitable candidates; individuals with a possible interest in the purchasing activities of *Trust* (such as commercial gallerists, curators of contemporary art collections, artists) would be better avoided.

#### *Reference Group*

Developing relationships would be one of the director's prime responsibilities. In addition to nurturing personal contacts with key individuals and organisations, it would be valuable to continue the sector-wide consultation that has occurred in the research phase - either in the form of a dedicated reference group, or else as part of a wider initiative: the regular forum that is currently being proposed by the NCSS Research Associate Dr Tina Fiske (which would reflect and address a new shared research agenda on contemporary collecting) envisages an integral role for *Trust* in promoting and supporting collaboration between institutions.

#### *Funding*

Part of the development phase of *Trust* in 2011 (see *Trust: Development Plan*) would focus on securing pockets of public funding and significant private support for the set-up and running of the group, in order to ensure that as much of the patrons' donations as possible could be spent on acquisitions. Public funding would be sought for *Trust (Emerging)* in particular, as a potentially significant audience development initiative.

## **1.6 RELATIONSHIPS**

#### *With collecting institutions*

Through their involvement with the NCSS, seven institutions in Scotland have already devised collecting policies, amassed significant micro-collections of contemporary art, and demonstrated the value of participating in such a network to their audiences and managers/local authorities. Engaging with *Trust* would allow these museums to build on their current network activity, expand their partnership working, and establish new relationships with private patrons, both as a group and as individuals (relationships that *Trust* would be willing to broker).

*Trust* would work closely with the 7 NCSS institutions, and the SNGMA, to ensure that participation would be as easy as possible. Although *Trust* would rely on participating institutions hosting talks and tours, and curators making themselves available to attend *Trust* events and articulate their collecting activities to patrons, these calls on the curators' time would be carefully managed and paced.

In developing an understanding of each institution's particular context, the *Trust* director would also be mindful of, and sensitive to, any existing patrons' initiatives. This would involve developing strategies to clarify the distinctions between different patrons' groups, and finding ways to work with a museum's existing patrons, perhaps on joint purchases.

*With commercial galleries*

The commercial galleries in Scotland recognise the value of initiatives that develop and promote Scottish patronage and collecting. They have already expressed enthusiasm for the group, and have said they would support it in a variety of ways: including referring potential patrons, hosting studio and gallery visits, and offering advice. It is *Trust's* implicit intention to inspire individuals to consider personal collecting if they haven't already.

*With exhibiting and producing organisations*

There is a great deal of scope to develop collaborations between collecting and exhibiting/commissioning institutions, but identifying and pursuing such opportunities tends to be beyond the capacities of either party. As a respected, and more importantly, autonomous entity, *Trust* would be in an excellent position to instigate and enable link-ups that are focused on the acquisition of particular art works.

## 2 **TRUST: Development Plan**

Following research undertaken from June 2009 to March 2010 (supported by SAC through the NCSS), and a period of maternity leave from April to December 2010, a further development phase is planned for 2011. The transition to Creative Scotland will be completed in the interim, and further support will be sought from them for the development of *Trust*, which (as far as it is possible to tell at present) will correspond with a number of Creative Scotland's priorities.

The development phase will include the following:

### 2.1 **DEVELOPING A BUSINESS PLAN**

The Business Plan will expand on the blueprint offered here, giving a detailed account of:

- Aims and objectives
- Company status
- Board and management structure
- Projected budgets and funding requirements
- Fund structure – donations and purchases
- Website and graphic identity
- Internal and external relationships

It will be used to communicate the groups' aims and brand, to instigate and consolidate useful relationships, and to secure public and private funding for set-up and running costs.

### 2.2 **SEEKING FUNDING AND SUPPORT**

Having finalised budgets and capital requirements for the business plan, it will be necessary to find significant financial and in-kind support, and a number of sources will be investigated:

Public funding bodies with an interest in supporting:

- Audience development
- Entrepreneurial approaches to fund-raising
- Leverage for acquisitions

Private individuals - established patrons and philanthropists who, as well as acting as advocates, mentors and trustees, might wish to:

- Finance the start-up of *Trust*
- Contribute to the running costs of *Trust*
- Host the launch of *Trust* and other exclusive *Trust* events

Although at this point we are not planning to ask beneficiary museums to subscribe to *Trust*, this option should not be ruled out - money may be

diverted from other subscriptions in the future, or become available through MGS or other sources.

### **2.3 RECRUITMENT – BOARD AND MENTORS**

With the *Trust* identity and business plan in place, and management and advocacy roles clearly articulated, the next task would be identify and approach potential trustees and mentors. Through personal referrals and recommendations, *Trust* would make contact with selected individuals and arrange to meet and discuss *Trust* and its ambitions. We may find that some individuals, though they do not wish to be involved as Trustees, are nevertheless supportive of the aims of *Trust* and would be happy to act as informal mentors, advocates and funders of the scheme – so although it may be delicate and potentially drawn-out, this process would be key to *Trust's* development.

The Board of Trustees would have responsibility for governance and compliance, and to this extent recruitment would be guided partly by a skills audit. A second, more strategic role for Trustees would be as advocates for *Trust* nationally and internationally. In the regard, it would be imperative that *Trust* attracts individuals who are well connected and well disposed to its aims. As mentioned in the blueprint, established patrons, private collectors, educators and curators of exhibiting organisations would all be suitable candidates; but it might be best to avoid approaching individuals with a potential interest in the purchasing activities of *Trust* (such as commercial gallerists, curators of contemporary art collections, artists) - as well as creating challenges in terms of charitable regulations, any external perceptions of self-interest, however unjustified, would be unhelpful.

### **2.4 FURTHER RESEARCH – PARTNERS AND ASSOCIATES**

Scope for relationships and joint ventures identified during the research phase (notably with the National Fund for Acquisitions, Arts and Business, MGS, Outset and The Art Newspaper) should be explored during the development phase; and indeed, such investigation in relation to museum associations, funding bodies and publications/blogs, and other patrons' groups ought to be ongoing.

### **2.5 DESIGN AND COMMUNICATION**

A design brief will be developed for inclusion in the business plan and this will form the basis of discussions with prospective designers during the development phase. Design development will be a priority, as it will serve a crucial role in establishing and reinforcing the identity of *Trust* from the outset.

There will also be an opportunity to discuss a designers' possible corporate involvement as patrons - such members of the creative industries would be obvious targets for *Trust*.

### *Graphic Device*

Designed to be used in promotional material and to appear every time *Trust* gifts a work, a striking and distinctive graphic device will help communicate *Trust's* values, promote identity awareness, offer consistency, and confer credibility.

### *Prospectus*

A key aspect of the promotional material for *Trust* would be its prospectus. It might be best to develop an adaptable folder idea, with a view to producing substantial tabbed pages as inserts. As well as incorporating introductions to the group and acknowledgement of partners (which will need regular revising), a folder would give scope to include details of several funds over the years, issuing one page describing the proposed theme of a fund, and one giving accounts and illustrations of the works eventually bought, and crediting the supporters of each fund. The prospectus would thus function not just as publicity, but also as documentation and souvenir.

### *Website*

A web presence would be essential in communicating the identity, recording the activity and re-enforcing the significance of *Trust*. Given that any works purchased by *Trust* are destined to be dispersed throughout Scotland, it would be important to have a virtual space in which they could be seen together as a micro-collection.

It would make sense in the first instance to harmonise the pages on this website with those produced for the prospectus. The possibilities for web 2.0 applications should also be explored for deployment in the future – *Trust (Emerging)* in particular, may want to exploit social networking/blogging/podcasting facilities.

It would make sense to link this with the NCSS website, currently being re-developed by the University of Glasgow, as both will serve as valuable resources for research into curating and collecting.

## **2.6 PATRONS**

Towards the end of the development phase, a strategy for patron recruitment will be developed in consultation with new Trustees, mentors and associates. The process of approaching patrons, like that of recruiting Trustees, will rely on personal introductions and networks. With a clear set of aims and a distinctive identity established, *Trust* will either appeal to an individual or it won't. Strategically placed individuals will be identified, and if they are enthusiastic, their help enlisted to target others who they think might want to participate. Efforts to cultivate new patrons should be steady and ongoing, and based on individual, tailored approaches. *Trust* needs only a small core group to begin purchasing, and a slow and steady momentum of growth may

prove more sustainable in the long term than a rapid expansion which could drop off after a year.

Although a high-profile launch of *Trust* is undoubtedly called for, the nature of this event – whether it would be best as recruitment drive, a press launch or an exclusive welcome party, and whether it should coincide with another high-profile international event such as Gi – ought to be determined later.

### 3 TRUST: Research Questions

#### 3.1 RESEARCH PHASE ONE - June to November 2009

This research phase culminated in a meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> November 2009, in which about 25 representatives from the sector came together to consider my proposals. The comments below arise from the discussion at that meeting.

##### *Patrons*

Who is enthused by the idea of philanthropic involvement in the nation's collections? To what extent are they motivated by a wish to engage with contemporary art? How much are they willing to give, and what do they expect in return?

Is there scope in Scotland for an alternative model that galvanises commitment to a common cause through a shared interest, rather than offering social exclusivity? Will this also appeal to people who have not perhaps considered patronage before?

Reassuringly, there was widespread confidence within the group that this 'alternative' model is a very attractive one that would certainly find supporters, probably from a variety of different groups (i.e. the appeal may be quite an individual thing). At the meeting it was suggested that it would be best to devise a strong concept first, and then seek people's commitment to it, rather than consult potential participants on a theoretical basis.

There was some deliberation about working with individual patrons on the one hand, and orchestrating a group dynamic on the other. Most people agreed that it was important to offer varying levels of involvement. Individual attention may lead to a major investment, but it is labour intensive. Group activities are desirable, effective, and efficient, but may not appeal to some participants. For some, the satisfaction of philanthropic gifting will be incentive enough, so although engagement/involvement is crucial to our offer, perhaps such group activity should be presented as a bonus.

##### *Current models of collecting and giving*

What can we learn from existing models of collecting and giving? How does Scotland's context compare and contrast with other contexts?

We are seeking to move beyond current fundraising orthodoxy. There was firm support for a more informal approach, particularly as it recognizes, and aims to be responsive to, the way collective activity is changing more broadly. The success of the Fruitmarket patrons in Scotland illustrates the advantages that the philanthropic offer may have over the more traditional subscription offer.

### *Collecting policy*

What are the gaps in current institutional collecting, that a patrons' group might feasibly aim to fill?

The strong record of production in Scotland could, and should, take a central role in the acquisition activity of the group (e.g. acquiring straight from the studio, commissioning, etc.). Apart from anything else, it was felt that this would heighten the excitement and engagement for patrons.

In order that artists are better represented both within individual museums, and across Scotland's national holdings, we might play a distinctive role in not just extending, but also deepening, existing collections (i.e. by adding to existing holdings by a particular artist).

### *Sector relationships*

In what ways can interested parties in the sector be most usefully involved in the group? How should the relationships between patrons, trustees, advisors, supporters, beneficiaries be constructed?

There was a palpable appetite for enhancing the relationships between institutions involved in production, exhibition and collection, respectively. Because our patrons group would be keen to work at the precisely the point where these activities intersect, many felt the group might provide a focus for, and help consolidate, such relationships. Exploring the possibilities and parameters of such a strategic role will form part of the next phase of this research.

### *Mechanisms for making acquisitions*

What are the challenges and practical considerations involved in gifting? What do curators think of the 'fund' idea? Is there scope to use it to motivate patrons?

It is abundantly clear that the museums and their collections would be a crucial asset to the patrons group: a vital part of the offer. We need to work closely with these museums from the outset. Meetings with curators (and importantly, their managers) will give me the opportunity to advocate for their involvement on the one hand, and to quantify the commitment they are able to make, on the other.

## **3.2 RESEARCH PHASE TWO - January to March 2010**

Following the meeting in November, I conceived a more detailed set of questions to put to the eight collecting institutions (potential beneficiaries), and four exhibiting organisations that currently support production. I also organised a symposium addressing the potential for a smaller group of patrons to focus on the work of emerging artists.

### 3.2.1 INTERVIEWS WITH COLLECTING INSTITUTIONS

What are the procedures (and challenges) related to accepting gifts?

Most would find it easy to accept gifts as long as they fit with the existing collections and adhere demonstrably to the curatorial collecting policy (several institutions are in the process of reviewing these policies). Concerns about scale, storage, installation, conservation, insurance and so on would be considered and weighed up on a case-by-case basis (either by committee or by the responsible curator/manager) – challenges can sometimes be overcome if the work is strong enough. Even where the gallery's dimensions would appear to limit their scope to accept a work, exceptions can be made where other display opportunities are available (at sister institutions etc). It would be up to the museum to decide if expenses likely to be incurred in relation to conservation or exhibition were going to prove prohibitive or not. Such expenditure has to come from exhibitions budgets and other sources, but this is a calculation that the curators need to make for themselves - it is probably not a good idea to try and fund this, as the requirement is pretty much bottomless. All the collections recognise the importance of showing acquisitions, regardless of how they have been acquired.

Are there any barriers to showing works such as film and installation? Is there anything we can do to address those barriers?

Storage of new media can be more straightforward than other works, although there are always conservation questions – it would be good to know in advance, for instance, what the artist would like to do in the event of future obsolescence, and what their views are on digitising works on film, and also showing works online. There are often additional technical and financial constraints when it comes to building rooms, ensuring blackouts, hiring or maintaining specialist equipment, etc., but again, most institutions will consider these on a case-by-case basis, and depending on the institution there can be scope for creative solutions to these issues. Might the NCSS partners share specialist equipment?

Is there scope for setting up some expedited loaning scheme with other beneficiary institutions, giving both curators and audiences wider access to gifted works?

Loaning works can be time-consuming (with condition checking, insurance evaluations and so on). But generally, NCSS curators are very keen to loan, and will do what they can to make sure the works are seen in interesting exhibitions elsewhere. Some institutions have a separate department dealing with requests (this is very difficult to bypass), while others leave this work to the curators. Borrowing is a more complicated issue, because the borrower must normally meet transport and packing costs. Even where works are shared, some institutions charge their partner for transport!

To what extent does the institution currently work with curators from exhibiting organisations? Is there any way we could usefully enhance/facilitate this relationship?

There are no close links at present (even between Culture and Sport Glasgow organisations) - these relationships take a lot of time to maintain. There is a palpable appetite for closer links across the sector, although it was felt that the

best collaborations arise out of informal and personal connections rather than any formalised relationship.

Some curators feel constrained by embargoes on travel and restrictions on their research time, and would value the input of other curators who are doing this all the time. This would be more likely to happen if they knew the parameters of each NCSS collecting policy, which they do not at present.

Many collecting institutions feel that they are offered the opportunity to buy work long after it has been commissioned, and regardless of its suitability for the collection. This would work better if they were given much more warning and could have a dialogue about the work in advance - a wider understanding of NCSS policies in general might also help. Such strategic link-ups rely on information being shared effectively, and there are discussions about how best to do this in the light of SAC's transition into Creative Scotland. Currently SAC offer precisely this kind of information but often it is not acted on – this is a problem of capacity as such link-ups are always additional to the main business of commissioning, exhibition making and maintaining collections.

A patrons' group has scope to nurture and maintain informal connections, to articulate NCSS collections' policies, and to pursue the most promising link-ups focussed on acquisition.

To what extent would you like to work to acquire commissions? What are the challenges and benefits of acquiring commissions?

There is undoubted excitement around commissions, and it can be easier to justify a commission when there is private rather than public funding for it. But acquiring commissions is challenging, as there is no knowing how good the final piece will be (and of course this is more complicated if it is another institution's commission in the first place). Even in-house commissions usually have an option to buy, rather than an obligation.

What relationship would your institution want with a national patrons group? How would you enable/ support that relationship?

There is universal enthusiasm for engagement with a group such as this, through events, introductions, and so on, given certain conditions. It would need to be a carefully managed process, with events planned in advance, and capacity issues taken into consideration; but the opportunity to articulate collecting activity to a group that is enthusiastic about contemporary art, is very welcome. It would also be in everyone's interest to make clear the distinctions between any museum friends' or patrons' activity, and this group's activity.

What about with a sub-group dedicated to buying the work of emerging artists? (This might involve extra commitment and engagement with patrons, who would be tasked with researching, shortlisting and voting for an artwork to gift, and deciding which collection to offer it to.)

There is a universal appetite for considering and collecting emerging artists' work, although some were more hopeful than others about being able to engage on this more intensive level. Paisley, Pier, City Art Centre and SNGMA really responded to the focus on emerging artists, and Aberdeen and

GoMA were keen on developing close relationships with young patrons. On the other hand, McManus had concerns about capacity – worrying that they would be forced to delegate negotiations about artworks and their suitability to unsupervised and inexperienced patrons. Hunterian’s collecting policy entails such involved and specific dialogues with artists it would be difficult to accommodate this within the group’s approach.

In what ways might we interact with and/or support other existing or proposed patrons initiatives?

Most museums are quite happy to identify potential patrons for this group, and do not anticipate a clash with their own Friends’ schemes or similar. Others with more established patrons initiatives, such as SNGMA and Hunterian, would rather that their contacts engage with their own groups first. At the very least they need us to make the distinction between the two as clear as possible – as neither scheme is specifically geared to contemporary art, this should be viable. There may also be opportunities for joint acquisitions. CSG is in the process of researching a patrons’ initiative and would welcome ongoing dialogue on the subject.

It was suggested that we talk to the National Fund for Acquisitions about the potential for collaboration and match funding.

### **3.2.2 INTERVIEWS WITH EXHIBITING INSTITUTIONS THAT SUPPORT PRODUCTION**

What are the procedures and logistics for commissioning?

Commissions take a number of different forms. They take a lot of time and effort to organise, and although there are moments when a possible tie-in with a collection might occur to the curators, they are rarely able to suggest these, or act on them, in time. Such tie-ins could result in preferential contractual terms with the artist’s gallery (in terms of projected recoupment etc.), they could generate greater excitement, help build profile for the project and ensure a longer-term and more rooted legacy for the work locally; but they require significant forward planning, investment, and staff capacity (that hasn’t been allocated in advance); and an approach made by the authoring organisation can sometimes appear tainted by self-interest. Such approaches might also impinge on any direct discussions with collecting institutions that are being held on behalf of the artist.

In what ways could we support the acquisition of commissions, and/or new works being exhibited by Scotland’s permanent collections?

If a patrons’ group was widely trusted, well-informed and responsive to suggestions, and it was willing to take on the burden of negotiating and organising (as well as funding) such tie-ins, this could benefit everyone – it would justify/necessitate its central role in any programming forum that might be set up in the future (alongside strategic funding bodies).

There may also be scope to work with business/corporate patrons, and leverage Arts and Business money in for certain projects.

There was some suggestion that we should consider retaining ownership of the works we buy, and offering them on loan to the permanent collections. This would involve a more onerous legal structure, and would change some of the arguments for participation, but perhaps shouldn't be ruled out altogether.

To what extent would you be willing to introduce prospective patrons (interested individuals, the wider group) to an artist? How would that best be managed?

Where there are other patrons that have a prior claim to such introductions (at the Fruitmarket, for instance), introductions would be best effected through the convenor of the group as a recognised figure in the sector. Elsewhere, intimate, informal settings like dinners are the best method of bringing people together without pressure or expectation.

### **3.2.3 PATRONS GROUP BUYING EMERGING ART**

Who has an interest in supporting, and feeding into, a young patrons' scheme or patrons' scheme for emerging art?

Tramway and DCA are working on young critics' initiatives, and there is scope for a tie-in here – perhaps as a way of piloting this scheme in 'action research' terms.

Many institutions want to work with younger 'Friends' but do not have the capacity, and also encounter resistance from established Friends groups. An autonomous entity would overcome these issues. At the same time, there is a lot to be said for avoiding an exclusively 'young' group – developing a cross-generational group instead that projects a youthful, energetic identity would be more inclusive and have additional benefits for all participants. There is a generosity and openness in Scotland that makes this more viable than in London, say.

On balance, then, it may be more productive to focus on emerging artists rather than young patrons. All the institutions are open to collecting the work of emerging artists (that is, artists who have a good exhibiting record but perhaps no major solo show to their name.) This work is exciting because it is not yet 'safe' in establishment terms. Emerging approaches are often new and directional, which has the potential to refresh museum collections and keep them responsive.

How can we attract young participants?

Although this research question pre-dates the above-discussed shift of emphasis towards emerging artists rather than young patrons, it is nevertheless still relevant, as the young continue to be a target demographic. Subsidy is key to leveraging extra value for these participants. While participating patrons' should be able to see their own contributions channelled directly into their acquisition fund, there also needs to be a wide-ranging programme of events, visits and discussions to support the participants' development as patrons – an aspect that would be particularly appealing to students and recent graduates in search of new experiences and networks. The subscription/

benefit element of this group would therefore be more prominent than in the main patrons' group, where the primary appeal is philanthropic.

It should be noted that any marketing activity needs to be flexible enough to secure the cross-generational make-up of such a group, and this would be an important task within the development phase: how to create and articulate an identity that targets young participants without at the same time marginalising potential older participants. It will be a key challenge to find a way of *including*, rather than *not excluding*, the latter group.

#### What European models exist?

The Young Patrons group at the Museum Ludwig in Cologne is an exemplary model of empowered engagement, founded on critical discussion and the enthusiastic support of the Director. The participants are members of the wider Gesellschaft first, and pay an additional 500 euro to join the Young Patrons programme. Although some begin as novices, many members are experienced collectors in their own right, and as a group they have set a particular agenda for buying that challenges even the museum's own orthodoxies.

A Scottish group would have very different requirements, even if it borrowed from the structure and aims of the Cologne group: there would be a much greater focus on education and mentoring - developing patrons' confidence in critical discussion, art collecting, and dealing with the art market and public sector.

#### How should a Scottish scheme be structured?

A set of pilot procedures would be designed to enable the group to research, shortlist, and select a work for themselves (with guidance and mentoring); and a structure should be put in place (incorporating a committee of mentors, supporters and representative patrons), that would allow for self-determination and future evolution of those procedures.

An introductory phase is considered vitally important, as it is a lot to ask inexperienced patrons to engage with the conceptual discourse around collecting and enter into negotiations with gallerists and curators without any initial training.

Securing enthusiastic participation from museum curators and gallerists is essential to the success of this group, as they would be directly involved in the personal development of these patrons, as well as being instrumental in the buying and accepting of gifts. Nor could the group run effectively without subsidy – a strong audience development case should be made to funding bodies.

#### How would it relate to the rest of the patrons' group's activity?

The main group would offer support and encouragement to the emerging art group, and some members would belong to both. It is to be hoped that some participants might graduate from the emerging group to the main group later on.

## *Appendices*

### **Appendix A**

#### **Summary of Proceedings**

#### **Research Meeting, University of Glasgow, 12th November 2009**

#### **Patrons Group: aims, structure and sector relationships**

This meeting explored the following question:

**Is there potential in Scotland to devise a new mechanism for giving money where none currently exists: an autonomous patrons' group which, whilst buying works for Scotland's public contemporary art collections, would introduce philanthropy to a new constituency of people?**

We discussed:

##### *Current models of giving*

Private support for galleries in the regions – individual and business  
(Sporadic support, likely to fluctuate)

Collaboration between arts organisations  
(Important for galvanising private support)

Membership/patrons schemes  
(Subscriptions versus philanthropic giving)

##### *Potential shape of the group*

Targeting individuals  
(Is it best to target certain groups, or define our own group first?)

Identity and activity of the group  
(Importance of establishing the ambition, character, and clarity of our aims)

Pragmatic considerations  
(What the museums can receive, and what they can offer)

Collecting and working strategically within the sector  
(Highlighting a common strand of activity across different types of institution; advocating more adventurous contemporary collecting (persuading the powerful); forging closer links between the collecting institutions and those that support creation; providing a focus for co-operation between museums)

##### *Possible Structure*

Trustees  
(Board mainly involved in governance)

Reference/Research Group  
(Ensuring that we are responsive to sector needs)

Advisors  
(Scope for different advisors to work on different funds)

**N.B. Bold is used to indicate key questions and conclusions.**

## ***CURRENT MODELS OF GIVING***

### **PRIVATE SUPPORT FOR GALLERIES IN THE REGIONS**

Wendy Law, in research undertaken for ACE, discovered that private support in the regions exists in pockets, generally far removed from strategic agencies and structures. It grows from the ground up - initiated by an individual or group of enthusiasts, and usually develops into a 'friends' or membership scheme. Overall, there is a lack of sustained momentum and lack of strong identity – it may not survive if a crucial individual goes away, say.

For most regional arts organisations, obstacles to increasing their share of private investment included: low profile, lack of networking opportunities, poor advocacy.

### **BUSINESS SUPPORT**

In general there is a dearth of business involvement (often for reasons above).

One exception is in the NE Region: Business Collectors Network. Set up Sept 2007. Initiative between A & B and Arts Council NE. Accent was regional – focus on local artists (risks being parochial). Proposal that after a length of time circulating in the businesses (10 participating), the works would be donated. But no involvement from the museums themselves (no-one asked them). Costs: high (scheme had its own curator.) Impact: not measured.

Additional NE feature is the advocacy outside museums for public arts – classic way of business being involved, often through 'percent for art' schemes. Property developers wanted to signal 'we are not a cultural desert, we are intelligent, receptive etc.' Curators were able to offer association with international ambition. NE Regional Development Agency was an important driver.

Different regions have different approaches: NE, previously depressed area needs contemporary cultural link; whereas in Yorkshire, people might feel they cannot be seen to spend money on such things.

Scotland:

**Should we target individuals or businesses? Does one undermine/ distract from the other?** Individuals can be businesses, and vice versa. Indeed, re Scotland in Venice: one individual has said can't support it as a business at the moment, but believes in the work, and will support it personally.

Corporate activity in Scotland is now diminished – leadership from big corporate collections no longer evident – **should we approach individuals from smaller firms instead (i.e. without their main base in London)?**

### **COLLABORATION BETWEEN ORGANISATIONS**

The ACE study was England-wide. Wendy found that many organisations were considering strategic alliances (via Renaissance hubs, informal advocacy networks, etc). Visual arts find themselves slightly out on a limb as a specialism within the museum sector.

**Scope for sector to work collaboratively to attract patrons to contemporary visual art – using high profile events in the calendar, and using civic/national**

**pride, as motivators (c.f. CAN in Leeds). Also scope to encourage patrons to think of themselves as a community of donors, not just involved individuals.**

#### MEMBERSHIP / PATRONS SCHEMES FOR ACQUISITIONS

The Art Fund: £33 for normal membership and £1000 to join the Patrons Circle. CAS charges £55 for Blood, £275 for Members and £2500 for Collections Patrons. The more you pay, the members' benefits become more exclusive and intimate, but patrons have no say about where the funds are spent.

Outset: have supported and initiated a broad range of projects, as well as funding an impressive number of acquisitions for several galleries. This is not a subscription group, however. The money is raised from the super-wealthy approached personally by the directors.

Fruitmarket Gallery: patrons group established and run by Armida Taylor. Individuals pay £41.60 per month. In the past, patrons' money has gone towards general support for the gallery, but now Esmee Fairbairn commissioning money has coming to an end, so this year, patronage money will go towards commissions. Very open and personal relationship between the gallery and its patrons - ongoing conversations make it feasible to review allocation of funds. Patrons not giving out of an expectation that they will have dinner with the artist 5 times a year, say. Motivation is more altruistic. Small staff – cannot invest in managing more complex relationships. Quite sociable group – ‘offer’ is the association with the gallery, which they respect and trust.

**It makes sense to leave the amount open (subject to a minimum), and to offer indirect, rather than direct benefits. Motivation would be philanthropic and related to the enjoyment of buying contemporary art, and being involved in, and finding out about collections.**

#### ***POTENTIAL SHAPE OF THE GROUP***

**Existing research concentrates on wealthy (older) people who already give. What about cultivating ‘alternative’ patrons? Such patrons may be less interested in a subscription to an explicit ‘rosta’ of benefits, than to a looser, more informal offer based on cultural engagement and personal relationships. FMG is a successful example of this simpler, yet more dynamic, approach.**

**On the question of conducting research amongst individuals at this stage – it was felt that theoretical discussions with potential patrons would be counter-productive. We need to present a strong concept from the outset – this is what they will buy into.**

#### TARGETING INDIVIDUALS

**Important to identify what we are offering. What makes the group unique and desirable? Create a confident group, doing adventurous things with a number of exciting collections and curators - individuals will choose to attach themselves to this. These people don't necessarily have to come *from* an identifiable group, nor do they need to *become* an identifiable group.**

### *Collectors/donors*

There is, perhaps, a subtle distinction to be made between donors and patrons. Given the nature of our offer, we are particularly interested in the former.

A confident patrons group operating would make a difference to collectors thinking about donating works independently. Enhances profile of the museums working in this way (ie demonstrates that other people have donated works and they are safe, and well displayed) - this re-assures other donors. Say they already want to buy the work from Modern Institute (to support the artist) – gallery can offer them the opportunity of donating it, and build an argument for why it should come here. They will want to see that something will have a profile (don't want it to disappear). The good will around Artists Rooms is a great example to point to. 'We are trying to continue this for another generation.' 'These are the exciting projects the institution is involved in.'

Most collectors (even those who donate works) do not consider themselves wealthy – they have passion for art, and have the money to spend on it. They do not necessarily want to join a group, but would still be interested in philanthropic purchasing. We would aim to encourage people to give to museums as individuals, (as a group we could facilitate those introductions - we wouldn't be possessive about our patrons); but the group activity should be attractive enough that people want to take part in this also. By presenting particular works that everyone can get behind, and which can get news stories etc, we would provide a focus for a community of donors. This would be galvanising on lots of levels. National promotion is very helpful for regional profile.

Hitherto, substantial donations at Hunterian have come from collectors who are buying C20<sup>th</sup> work, but tend to stop short of contemporary art. These collectors understand the market, and speak knowledgeably to curators. Could they be encouraged think about contemporary art? Would be very productive - trying to turn a wealthy person into a proto-collector is unnecessarily complicated process, when there are experienced collectors who might find a new area of activity compelling. Probably should be done on an individual basis.

This could be a focus in Aberdeen too, where there is a lot of money, and enthusiasm for some accessible/popular contemporary art, but widespread suspicion of more adventurous work.

### *Young professionals*

This is where group activities could prove useful. Servicing of small givers can be prohibitive - the bigger money is often more hands-off, but many young professionals in Aberdeen, who have a lot of ready cash, and very few opportunities to meet each other, would welcome a sociable group, and may have less entrenched prejudices about challenging art. Very rich people are likely to be older, and need more cultivating.

In recent research, Sarah Munro found that younger more adventurous people are often interested in enabling commissioning, in contrast to older more wealthy people who prefer to be involved in prestigious, high profile collections and exhibitions. Younger people are less concerned about outcome, more attached to process.

Important to remember that people give to *people*. Outset so successful for this reason. Head person is philanthropist herself – out chatting to people the whole time. Individual relationships would allow individual needs to be taken into account. At the same time, the management of this could be very intensive. Some such cultivation may be undertaken through group activities.

**There are benefits to organising group interaction. Some might want the chance to meet others, and enjoy the joint endeavour. A group of confident contemporary art enthusiasts could offer an example to others who are newer to it. We should allow for different levels/kinds of involvement. The key is for the events to be focussed on the core activities of the group: collecting, purchasing, and interacting with artists and galleries. Commissioning offers a great deal of potential for engaging patrons (NB this should not be focussed on accessing the artist personally, but on having an evolving relationship with the work).**

#### IDENTITY OF THE GROUP

**Without a pre-existing track record or public identity (which one would rely on as a museum or gallery), this group needs to have something else that people will trust and want to invest in.**

An institutional track record is what attracts people initially and guarantees their trust. But NGS patrons scheme (established for 25 years) wouldn't work for contemporary art: the last thing one needs is a club for Edinburgh people to feel exclusive. It needs, instead, to feel open, dynamic and engaged.

**We need to offer a portal to ALL the contemporary collecting in Scotland.**

Great opportunity to be strategic across the country. On the one hand, with regional and cultural variations across Scotland - Glasgow's Dali belongs to the public in a way that Edinburgh's Titian does not - a single model cannot hope to appeal to all audiences. But if we can focus on a narrow strand of activity shared by a diverse range of institutions across Scotland, this would help to increase the profile of that strand within and outwith those institutions.

**Along with NGS, NCSS Museums are our major asset.** Being involved with the NCSS, museums have had to articulate what they are doing in terms of contemporary collecting. Ongoing refinement of these ideas will provide us with the means to promote the curators and their activities.

**The breadth and scope of NCSS collecting only really became visible (even to participants) with the advent of the website (replacement website on its way). Makes more sense as a national asset when it can be seen all together. Our group would build on, and extend this idea.**

#### PRAGMATIC CONSIDERATIONS

**Crucial that the model should not be so big and unwieldy that the organisations themselves cannot participate on their own terms.**

Often gifts and acquisitions have to be approved by a committee, and gifts are as likely to be turned down as anything else (on grounds of insurance and transport

costs, for instance). SAC is clear that they need to invest in infrastructure of exhibition as well as acquisition. (Jointly owned works need money to travel, loans are difficult to organise, new works are often more technically draining than paintings. etc) *Artists Rooms* is only as good as it is because of money for dissemination (but this due is to stop in three years time). **Could we facilitate easier loaning between museums somehow?**

Even travelling to meetings can be a problem. Establishment of this thing should help to influence the Local Authority's will and commitment. Important for the museum's profile. This is not a subscription, but museums are potentially beneficiaries - participation is needed because this engagement would be the success of the group. This could be a form of leverage. Important that people higher up understand what is being aimed for and what benefits are, as they can make things easier on the ground. Don't always listen to their own family!

Could we provide advocacy for the curators in dealing with people above them, and persuade them of the value of less well-known names? To have another organisation from outside endorsing more adventurous choices would be helpful.

Would maybe help the museums if we were to re-affirm the notion that the NCSS set out to be a national asset rather than in individual holdings, and we aim to build on this. Would underline to the masters and the curators the importance of that way of doing it nationally and as a shared thing.

Museums have huge amount of expertise to offer – guided tours of their collections, introductions to other private collections, etc. Need to bring all this to bear when new people are introduced (by galleries, by this group, etc). A big investment in terms of servicing.

NGS already services its patrons groups on a major scale, but this is a good way for other, less well-resourced, organisations to contribute and benefit from partnerships. Exciting that this hasn't been tried before – the way people form communities of interest is changing.

**Must be clear in advance about how important museums are, and to establish what museums can receive, and what they can offer.**

## COLLECTING AND WORKING STRATEGICALLY WITHIN THE SECTOR

### *Other patrons' schemes*

CSG is seeking to replace AFI funding with private support. A CSG wide patrons' scheme means more mouths to feed (Tramway, GoMA, Trongate etc), but with more organisations involved, there is an opportunity to articulate the whole story of contemporary art to one's patrons: from permanent collection, art students, production, commissions etc. **Our group would want to support a scheme like this, not compete with it. Would aim to make respective identities distinct, so that people could be involved in both if they wanted to be.**

Potential clash with CAS? They are currently supportive. They make a distinction between collector development in the regions, which they are be interested in pursuing, and patron development, which they want to avoid. In terms of the

museums, our relationship with them would differ from CAS's – no subscription, no guaranteed gift. Museums themselves, however, may find that they cannot service two lots of patrons groups...

One of the aims of the Collections and Collecting Group is to establish a standing group that would provide oversight and advocacy for issues like Peacock. Gathering info and representing the interests of the sector. We might feed into, and benefit from, the deliberations of such a group.

#### *Collecting strategically*

If a gallery wanted to build up an artist's room, our fund could offer to buy one of the pieces for it. Indeed, there are many cases when buying further works by an already-acquisitioned artist would serve to deepen the audience's understanding and perhaps increase the likelihood of regular display. Contemporary artists in particular are often weakened by buying only one work from within an installed exhibition. The beauty of an artist's room/ solo showing is that it allows more sustained scrutiny. If it is known that there is a strong body of work in one collection or another, people will travel to see it. This would provide an interesting shift of focus from London.

Many museums have bought work by the same artist, but each usually seizes on a different aspect of that artist's practice. We should aim to deepen without duplicating. and provide a focus for co-operation between museums, by gifting works to co-owners, or considering exhibition opportunities in more than one collection. Would be interesting, say, for other organisations to add to *Artists Rooms* (owned by Tate and SNGMA) with their own acquisitions (which they could then lend to *Artists Rooms* shows).

Could be very useful to have partnerships with commissioning organisations – and bring in the collecting institutions early on. Also a great way of bringing in people who don't 'get it', as well as those who are enthused by making something new happen. There is also potential gratification in seeing the work in exhibition before it goes to a museum.

Equally – close relationships with gallerists are important – new work coming out of the studio is also exciting. Scotland is so involved in production, it would be a shame to miss this opportunity to enthuse people.

Museums are very keen to have relationships with other organisations. Can offer homes for work that curators from exhibiting institutions have seen and loved.

**The good thing about the proposed diversity of funds, is that they allow flexibility, so that we don't establish one way of doing things that we then cannot diverge from.**

#### *Current Collecting Policies*

City Art Centre - continuing theme of architecture and built environment. Buying quite big pieces. Challenge is in how the work will be shown in the new building (always in the shadow of SNGMA and FMG).

Aberdeen Art Gallery – continuing with ‘Child of Our Time’ – excuse to be as broad as possible. 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary next year of the MacDonald Bequest. Just announced first stage of a new expansion for gallery (might yield more storage etc – could be good for collecting.) Process of approval for acquisition is very slow, though.

GoMA – as well as Art Fund International, buying emerging artists in Glasgow. Have £40,000 a year to spend. The original budget of £70k a year (disappeared in 2006/7 with transition to CSG), but AFI money was made dependent on CSG guaranteeing a budget for collecting. Just hope that after 2012, they will enable continuation of both international and local collecting (not guaranteed). Working directly with artists is very important. Meeting them and asking them about what would best represent them. Relationship with gallerists is also very important. Don’t want to use auctions (which is being recommended by AFI) as this can actually antagonise artists.

Hunterian – has continued to collect work that ties in with the breadth of the collections of the Hunterian. In parallel with a rediscovery of the core collections. (Artists often approached the Hunterian not through the gallery, but museum). Increasingly interested in the way that artists have wanted to engage with the curators in creating the work. Interested in the uncollectibility of work that stems from research. Auctions may be good for dead artists and for filling gaps, but Mungo didn’t want to do this – storerooms full of work that has no real connection to the collection beyond the point of purchase. No history of engagement with the collection.

Museums’ advice:

Historical gaps are there, but perhaps should not be a focus for this group. Important to be buying very new/ cutting edge work. Even NCSS has got a bit institutional and safe. We need a policy that leaves us free to commission a work and then decide which collection it should go into, given what they have already.

### ***POSSIBLE STRUCTURE***

*Trustees:*

Would act as a board, dealing with governance of the group. They would help recruit patrons and would be representative of them. They would be drawn from contemporary art sector, from business, from founding patrons etc. My instinct is that they would need to be mostly impartial in relation to any purchasing or distribution of works.

*The reference or research group:*

Would be made up of museum beneficiaries, gallerists, artists and others (a smaller outgrowth of the group in this meeting, in other words). It would play a central, vital role, firstly, in helping guide policy in the first place; and secondly, in working with the trustees in the long term, in order to keep the group responsive to the sector. Meeting perhaps once or twice a year, possibly for an event with guest speakers.

*The advisors:*

My idea is that each fund would require different advisor expertise and would put in place a tailored set of relationships each time. Just to be clear, I have been imagining maybe two or three different themed funds running alongside each other. One might take on a campaign feel – raising money to buy a major work for one institution, or to

be shared amongst two or three. Another might aim to buy several moving image works, say, for several different institutions. One might be open to young patrons, who contribute a lot less financially, but are more involved in the purchasing decisions. As the character of each fund would be determined separately, so could the way it is structured.

The old historical ways of doing things needs to change. This is about building relationships as much as bringing in money. Relationships can go in all sorts of directions that are positive without money. If we bring in a whole new generation of collectors in, who knows what some of them might do in 40 years time?

## **Appendix B**

### **Summary of Papers and Proceedings International Symposium, University of Glasgow, 4<sup>th</sup> March 2010**

#### **Patrons Group: the work of emerging artists and museum collections**

##### ***CONVENOR'S INTRODUCTION***

*At the first patrons research meeting in November, we explored the conceptual and logistical possibilities of a new kind of patrons' group that would come together to buy contemporary art and gift it to the 8 collecting institutions in Scotland. I am proposing to set up two groups: the main group of patrons, contributing a minimum of around £1500 each, would be engaged in this process without being directly involved in making purchasing decisions.*

*The second group, which I would like to focus on today, would contribute less money per head (£250, say), but would be more involved in researching, shortlisting and voting for an artwork to gift, and a collection to offer it to. As a way of introducing people to both curating and collecting through patronage, I hope this second group would appeal to an energetic, possibly young (or at least youthful) contingent, whose growing commitment to, and knowledge of, contemporary collecting would enhance the sector now and in the future.*

*Should this be considered a young patrons group, an emerging patrons group, or a group that focuses on emerging artists? This is one of the key questions I want to tackle today. And I am delighted to have speakers who bring valuable experience to the proceedings, albeit accumulated in different ways.*

##### **PAPERS**

##### **ROBERT MÜLLER-GRÜNOW AND THORSTEN KOCH, YOUNG PATRONS GROUP, MUSEUM LUDWIG, COLOGNE**

*Robert Müller-Grünow and Thorsten Koch are active members of the Young Patrons' Group at Museum Ludwig. Robert is founder and Managing Director of Scentcommunication, a company that customises and diffuses scents for a range of*

*clients. He trained in business in Cologne and Massachusetts, and has worked in both banking and design sectors. He is also a member of the board of the Gesellschaft für Moderne Kunst, the wider patrons' association at the Ludwig. Thorsten is a lawyer who studied in Cologne and Bristol. He advises a range of galleries and art institutions in contract and commercial law, his professional area of expertise. Thorsten and Robert are going to talk about their activities as patrons at the Museum Ludwig – it will become clear that my own proposals are very much indebted to their model.*

## CONTEXT

Museum Ludwig in Cologne was founded on basis of the Ludwig gift in 1970s – which consisted of, amongst other things, an important Pop Art collection, and, later, an impressive Picasso collection.

Rhineland (Cologne, Dusseldorf, Munich, etc) has a long history of private collecting and donating. Stems from a wish to own art and also to support artists, institutions, and create a cultural atmosphere. There are many entrepreneurial families whose collections span generations – this makes you want to go ahead and make your own contribution to collecting and support.

Things have evolved a lot since Kaspar Koenig's arrival. His inaugural exhibition at the Ludwig - 'museum of wishes' - took individual pieces from different private collections, hoping to encourage donations. This approach was controversial, and Cologne has lost collections to Munich because the owners wanted to keep their life's work intact, whereas Koenig is only interested in what is good for the collection at Ludwig, not all the rest. This is a good rigorous approach, even if it means losing out sometimes. He does not like to enter into the art market too much.

## MUSEUM LUDWIG'S SUPPORT ASSOCIATIONS

In Cologne, there are a number of groups that support Museum Ludwig:

- Gesellschaft für Moderne Kunst (est. 1985, 600 members, minimum 500 euro per year, or 150 euro if you are a student or under 30)
- Freunde of Museum Ludwig and Wallraf Richartz Museum (est. 1872, 5000 members, 50 euro per year)
- Curatorium (est. 1959, high profile group of business families, raise 1 million Euro for one work per year – suggestions come from the museum's wish list.)
- Freunde of Art Cologne (Raise 150,000 euro per year to buy a work from the fair and donate it to the museum – like the Tate/Frieze group but not as well known. Koenig goes through the fair and selects a list of 20 or so, then the Friends decide which they will buy.)
- Individual tax-exempt support (a new government scheme allows deduction of gifts of up to the value of 1 million euro over 10 years).
- Joint acquisitions. In the past, some of these groups have collaborated to buy, for instance, a major Polke work.

For the Friends (Freunde), the focus is on education – through lectures, publications and so on (there are lots of student members). For the Society (Gesellschaft), the main focus is on acquisitions. Tax laws have had an impact on how these schemes are priced – the max income deductible (5%) was raised to 20% two years ago.

## GESELLSCHAFT

There are lots of ways to relate to the museum through the Gesellschaft: Special meetings, art-related journeys, art collection visits, studio visits, guided tours with Director, etc. These formats are similar to many museums, and need no elaboration.

In addition, there is the Wolfgang Hahn Prize, which is awarded annually by the Gesellschaft (with a special event and dinner). First awarded in 1994 to James Lee Byars. The acquisition award is 100,000 euro, but the museum gets an artwork for that, and artists are often willing to give a higher value piece. Members are *involved* – they all have the opportunity to nominate an artist. A different curator selects the winner each year (for 2010 this was Heike Munde from Migros Museum in Zurich), along with the Gesellschaft Board (which always includes Koenig). The Hahn Prize Association is a legal entity which retains ownership of the works, though these are in some cases donated to the museum - Koenig has negotiated with the town that for every euro he raises in acquisitions, they will match 50% of it (up to 2 million euro); so with a larger body of work (like the current winners Fischli and Weiss) it is better to give the 100,000 euro and have it matched by the city, and then acquire a number of extra pieces...

Rosemarie Trockel gave two extra pieces as well as the piece bought; Isa Genzken gave a suite of works from her Venice participation in 2002; Raymond Pettibon offered a whole bunch of drawings; etc. This is an excellent way to collect, even though the prize is not as well known as the Turner Prize, say.

## YOUNG PATRONS

Very enthusiastic about the Hahn Prize, but there is also a younger generation of patrons who have a different focus, and want to bring younger artists into the museums, who maybe even Kaspar Koenig and the other curators don't know. A sub group of 'young collectors' (up to 40 years old at the time) was established 6 years ago, to define new and alternative positions, and then home in on particular art works. These are members of the Gesellschaft as a whole, but who have a particular interest in more contemporary, young art.

A structure was formed, that requires a minimum (additional) donation of 500 euro. (There is also a special offer for young art professionals, who pay a fee of 150 Euro to join in with the Young Patrons - their involvement brings a different dimension inside the group.) The 15 members (the group is growing – there will be 20 this year) sit together and discuss works that each person thinks would be fitting for the museum's collection – by an artist who is known, and has had some institutional exhibitions, but has not already been acquired by Museum Ludwig. At several rounds of meetings together over a few months, with Koenig and Barbara Engelbach, chief curator, the group discusses each piece – very controversial discussions, very democratic process. This is not a homogeneous group – various levels of familiarity with art. Members have to justify their selections, explaining why it is the best piece available (at a max cost of 15,000 euro), and why it fits well with the collection. After the discussions, there is a vote, although Koenig retains a right of refusal at all times. Throughout discussions, one gets a sense of what he likes and does not like, but even then, he can be persuaded if the piece is so difficult it is interesting! Very important for patrons to be emotionally invested in the works they are buying, to be involved in the process of

selection, but also to know when to step back, because the people associated with the museum really know what they want.

Negotiations with artists and galleries are therefore relatively lengthy, works are on reserve, and if they are rejected by the group or by the museum curators, they will not be bought. This is explained to the gallerist right from the beginning.

Every year, the young members' gift is presented in Open Space at Art Cologne (this is a section set apart from the commercial side of the fair). This is a vital arrangement for profile for the group - good press coverage, can make an event out of it. Koenig speaks, and someone from the group speaks (NB – there is no 'leader' in the group.) Also have a dinner, for which a sponsor is sought (so that the group's own funds can be concentrated on acquisition). The gallerist from whom the work is bought, is also invited to have a space next to the installation in Open Space.

There has only been one commission, and this should remain exceptional. The group identified 2 or 3 different Roman Ondak performances, but it was not clear that the Museum offered the right architectural setting for them. In discussion with the artist's gallery in Vienna, the group decided to buy one of the pieces, but had to go round the museum with Ondak to find the appropriate spot and adapt the performance.

#### ACQUISITIONS

Even if a work is sourced through documentation, it is important to see it in the flesh. Galleries have organised for the group to see a work set up in storage.

Doesn't have to be a new piece.

No requirements as to how often it is shown. These are given to the museum outright (unlike most of the Hahn prize pieces that remain the property of the Gesellschaft).

Up to now, each piece has been shown for a year and a half in the permanent collection. Each month at least one room changes – new connections and dialogues.

2005 first acquisition: Peter Pillar. Group of 6 people - fund: 3,500 Euro

Susan Philipz sang all over the gallery looking for a room to place 'Lowlands' – eventually found a beautiful place to instal it.

Roman Ondak – 2 people from the group will perform Ondak's piece at the Open Space 2010, twice a day.

As it happens, all the works bought have been proposed by different people. Often there are two or three great pieces amongst the selection that are obvious front-runners. The spirit of the group is such that people will step back to let someone else have their choice, as long as the piece merits it.

Interestingly, people often suggest works that they wouldn't/couldn't buy themselves. Conversations are wide-ranging – taking in issues about the group's collecting, what statement they are making, what they are trying to achieve for the future, and so on.

Discussions about media, for instance: there is no painting or photography so far.

Although the shortlists have been divided 50/50 along gender lines, only one woman's work has been collected so far.

Some people think about the works as forming a group or line, whereas others fall in love with a particular work that has nothing to do with what has gone before.

Generally, the group choose works that are unexpected, perhaps more conceptual than other acquisitions by the Gesellschaft.

## QUESTIONS

*Maeve Toal, City Art Centre: Do the nominating parties have to do all the research and negotiations related to a work before they present it to the group? Yes. It is very encouraging to see some people who have attended only twice, having the courage on their third time to present something. The group is very careful to support any person taking a leap like this.*

*Daniel Hermann, NGS: Interesting that you speak not just of the benefits to the institution in economic terms, but also to the members in terms of participation and involvement. What is the social make-up of this group? Very diverse – everyone from students in late 20s, to entrepreneurs, bankers, doctors, art historians etc, but no commercial arts people (from auction houses, galleries etc) are allowed to nominate or vote (for obvious reasons). A variety of incomes, very heterogenous, probably most have been in higher education. The group has grown through members inviting friends: they say, come and have a look first, join us on studio visits and so on (exciting, out of the ordinary events). Self-governed? Did you make the rules yourself, and then approach Kaspar with an offer? Yes. It is an interesting atmosphere, because he invites the group to his home, where they discuss until the early hours, smoking and drinking. Really makes you want to support the idea. It is not about money at all.*

*Jennifer Melville, Aberdeen Art Gallery: Do you ever negotiate discounts? This could be quite intimidating for someone who hasn't done it before. Yes, we are very strict about the maximum of 15,000 euro, so it is straightforward to say we cannot buy it unless you can give it for that price. Do you ever lose things because they are sold while you are still in discussion? Not so far. The group is quite well known in Berlin already. We were offered a piece worth 40,000 for 15,000 euro, although we did not take it.*

*Kirstie Skinner: Do the less experienced members look to other members for mentoring or coaching when it comes to making an approach to a gallery? Not as far as we know. And there is no pre-existing relationship with the galleries? No, there is no focus on Cologne, or Berlin, say – they can be anywhere in the world.*

*How many people are involved in the group? There are about 15 in the buyers' group, and there are about 100 young patrons, who participate in trips and events, (there was a trip to Glasgow in 2006). This is a great way of introducing people to the group and showing that everyone is quite approachable. They can join one year and not the next – there is no pressure.*

*JM: Who does your admin? For the Gesellschaft, there is a small office, with a paid managing director and a couple of volunteers, organising the money and the programme (2 or 3 events per week) for both Gesellschaft and Young Patrons group. Try to keep bureaucracy as lean as possible, but it is necessary, especially for trips. Young Patrons' trips (to Los Angeles, Brussels, Berlin, Glasgow) are fantastic - they include studio visits, private collections, tours with directors and curators of big museums, etc. This makes people want to give even more to the acquisitions. But this is only possible because of the support of Kaspar Koenig – his personal engagement with patrons is enthusiastic, unlike in some other places.*

## **LIZZIE CAREY-THOMAS, CURATOR, TATE BRITAIN**

*Lizzie Carey-Thomas joined Tate Britain in 1999 after three years in the Visual Arts Department of the British Council focussing on contemporary British art. She's been lead curator of the Turner Prize and co-curator of the Art Now programme the Tate's platform for new art, since 2003. She is currently curating this year's Duveen's Commission with Fiona Banner, which is due to open in June. Lizzie will discuss Art Now. Although she may touch on patron involvement, I really wanted to hear about how so-called emerging art is conceived and placed within an institution that has a permanent collection. This way, I hope we will have a broad set of comparatives to draw from in the ensuing discussion.*

### **ART NOW**

Art Now is a platform for 'emerging' artists – in Tate terms this means artists who have begun to exhibit widely in the last 5-10 years. Not straight out of art college. Tate has a responsibility to show artists who have representation and have built up a track record elsewhere. There are no production budgets associated with Art Now, so although the work is usually new, it is not commissioned. (The exception is the Sculpture Court Commission, sited outside the Clore Gallery, next to the Millbank Steps).

Art Now was established in 1995, driven by Patrons of New Art, who were tasked with getting more contemporary art shown at Tate (this remit had been largely filled by Turner Prize). Tate committed publicly to the development of Tate Modern in 1992, so in 1995 Art Now served as a showcase of their new commitment to contemporary art. First shows were broad and international in focus: Matthew Barney, Mark Quinn, Mirosław Balka, Tacita Dean etc. The policy was reviewed in 2000 when Tate Modern opened. Now more focussed on emerging and UK work. Art Now expanded in 2003 with Light Box and Live Art, as well as Sculpture Court commission – extending the work outside the Art Now space. Sits alongside Turner Prize, Tate Triennial, solo exhibitions, annual Duveen's Commission, annual Christmas Tree (est. 1988 by Tate Patrons), as well as the contemporary collection displays. Tate Britain's identity has gone from strength to strength, even though there is overlap with Tate Modern, which has still to be resolved.

Art Now reflects current practice at a much faster pace than the rest of the programme – has been described as a 'micro-kunsthalle'. If artist cannot make new work and they want to show existing work, curators will endeavour to make sure that the work hasn't been seen in the UK before. Programming 6 months to a year ahead, it doesn't go through many layers of approval – there is quite a lot of curatorial freedom. The three curators select the programme together based on ongoing research: studio visits, conversations with artists, etc. They try to get a balance between different media and approaches to art-making, and are mindful of gender and ethnicity, although this won't ultimately influence the decision. Often looking for a timely moment to offer the artist an Art Now exhibition – the moment at which they can best take advantage of the broad audience that Tate can offer. Curators try to stay informed about what other galleries are doing: they keep dialogues going with Chisenhale, South London Gallery, ICA, Camden Arts Centre, etc. to avoid overlapping (Tate would usually back off if another show has been arranged – would come back a couple of years later

instead). They strive for variety, but not as varied geographically as they would like. Tend to favour artists from London and Glasgow.

The platform is also outside the commercial sector, which can free artists from certain constraints, although Art Now curators do usually work with artists that have representation because these tend to be more visible. There has been criticism in the past – Ian White, in a 2007 panel discussion complained that Tate were still reflecting an art market. This is valid, and they need to make more of an effort to find artists that are not coming through those channels.

Although outside commercial constraints, Health and Safety concerns are more of an issue due to sheer volume of visitors. Need to protect the audience, but also protect the works themselves.

Old Art Now space – different environment from the rest of Tate Britain – no windows, set apart from the other galleries, so sound pieces etc would not affect anything else. However, it was geographically challenging (tucked away at the back, difficult to find).

2007 moved the Art Now space to a more central location in the galleries, with double the floor space – there is now greater scope for group shows, pairings etc. Feels more integrated into the other displays. This has had an impact on Art Now's reputation – now less of an annexe. Exhibitions now more like museum shows than in the old space, which resembled a commercial space in that it invited a coherent approach to a whole installation. As part of a new refurbishment there will also be a hole in the wall into the other galleries.

Curators were slightly nervous about extra attention they might get from the management, once the programme was more visible (had been quite marginalised in the institution in the past). Thought that more people might want to influence the programme, but apart from on one occasion, this hasn't happened. Penelope Curtis is starting as the new director soon – and she may want to review things.

Sculpture Court Commission – artists enjoy the challenge of an outdoor work. Many Art Now artists are interested in engaging with the heritage of the site and the collection.

Light Box space in lower gallery in Manton Entrance originally adapted to show Delacroix Raft of the Medusa; customised for video. Started with programmes of 8 artists, now down to 3 or 4 at a time.

There is no expectation that Art Now artworks will be acquired by Tate's collection, although the attention of other Tate curators is obviously drawn to the practices shown at Art Now.

Nine *Art Now* artists have gone on to be nominated for Turner Prize (selected by independent jury, but charges of self-promotion are sometimes levelled at Tate, particularly if the artist has been nominated for their Tate show).

Funding: mostly Tate funds, with some sponsorship in the past - Haagen Dazs, and Diesel. Patrons of New Art funded first few years.

#### TATE PATRONS

Patrons of New Art established in 1982.

Initiated the Turner Prize in 1984 (funded by Oliver Prenz, Chair), and members were represented on the Turner Prize jury until 4 years ago, when they felt their job had been done, and they could bow out of direct involvement.

Patrons of New Art have been associated with Art Now since 1995 (helped to launch it) but haven't given consistent support over the years.

Patrons of New Art and Historic Art are now one group, with an Executive Committee of 10 - posts are held for 3 years, chair's post for 5 years (last chair was Penny Govett; current chair is Vicky Hughes). Tate selects the committee, and the Patrons approve their appointments.

Tate receives half of its money from government, and needs to raise £1.4 million a year. £1 million comes from Tate Membership, £300,000 from Tate Patrons. Members support British and Modern art; Patrons support more adventurous stuff.

All support (including support for Art Now) is now budget relieving – the Patrons' committee are given a list of acquisitions and exhibitions that have taken place, and they choose which ones they want to fund retrospectively. Members' money also goes to exhibitions and acquisitions, and they vote for what they want to fund.

There are currently 360 Patrons. In 2006, 3 categories were introduced: Silver Patrons give up to £1000, Gold Patrons £5000, and Platinum Patrons, £10,000 a year. Benefits vary according to the level. *Jennifer: Staffing for these groups?* Tate Development Department has responsibility for all these groups – there is a Patrons' wing which devises and co-ordinates their programme, as well as a Members' wing, an Individual Donations wing, etc. All the money comes into the general Tate pot. *Stephen Palmer, SAC: All the resources that go into managing these groups - it must be worth it financially?* Presumably, and it is necessary, as corporate sponsorship is becoming more difficult to secure.

*Tina Fiske, NCSS: How much contact do you have with Patrons and how much are you expected to do?* More and more – there are at least one or two events per exhibition, such as curator-led tours, special patrons' evenings with artists speaking. Lizzie is also asked to advise on events/studio visits/artist hosting dinners/activities around the programme. Lizzie will go along to interview artist if she has been involved in setting it up.

*KS: There has been a shift towards patrons learning rather than agitating for more new art and particular artists?* Yes. There is an increasing emphasis on learning as part of the offer – patrons also support education and conservation projects. *Do you miss patrons being involved in the programme and advocating for you?* Haven't experienced it any other way - it would be wonderful to have a close Ludwig-like relationship with patrons at Tate, but they are held at arm's length possibly for logistical reasons of numbers – perhaps need a filter to protect staff.

## OTHER SUPPORT

Tate also receives funds coming from anonymous sources and legacies: dedicated to themed acquisitions such as Artists under 30, Film and Video, and curators take every opportunity to leverage extra support – cultivating good relationships with artists and dealers (can direct to best work at best prices), and maintaining good knowledge of private collections (so that they can be approached for loans/gifts).

The Outset Frieze Fund was initiated by Frieze Art Fair (and is a collaboration between Tate, Frieze and Outset Patrons). With £100,000 to spend each year, works are selected the night before Frieze opens, by Tate curators and outside guest curators (and Nick Serota on hand to make quick decisions). Curators also do a lot of research beforehand. Fair is a useful research ground especially for emerging work, but often difficult to find work of museum quality. It is a strange situation, in that Tate curators are struggling to find money the rest of the time, but then have this huge pot that has to be spent at the Fair.

Also have £10,000 to spend at Pinta Art Fair (Modern and Contemporary Latin American Art Fair), but this is not compulsory.

## ACQUISITIONS PROCESS

4 step process, which considers:

- What is around/available,
- What is missing from the collection (difficult because many works that have been missed are now out of reach, so effort goes into researching donations and other ways of bringing these works into the collection),
- What fits with what Tate already has, and what can logistically be shown in collection displays (in some ways it helps to already have something in the collection by an artist – often looking to extend/deepen holdings)

First step – Monitoring Groups

Proposals are discussed by curatorial teams with responsibilities for:

Historical British (desirata list)

British Modern and Contemporary Art

International Contemporary Art

The programmes of Art Now and Tate Modern's equivalent platform, 'Level 2', tend to feed into contemporary acquisitions at this point.

These monitoring groups meet every 2 weeks to:

Consider unsolicited proposals (useful for keeping up to date)

Report on ongoing conversations with certain artists

Identify strategies for collecting (and how this filters into what Tate are doing more broadly):

- Adding to what is already in the collection
- Diversity of media
- Geographic areas
- Gender
- Filling gaps (the historical importance of something is not always evident at the time). Looking back all the time to see if things have been missed.

### Second step – Acquisition Group

Monitoring Group proposals are passed to the Acquisition Group, consisting of Nick Serota, Tate Britain director, Tate Modern director, Head of Collections, Heads of Finance. This group is involved in devising collecting strategies for the year, which they will present to the Trustees.

### Third step: Selection Committees

Particular areas of geographical focus each have their own committee:

- Latin American
- Asia Pacific
- Middle East and North Africa
- Photography (new area in its own right)

### New groups in the pipeline:

- Sub-Saharan Africa
- Indian sub-continent

Committees are made up of trustees and external experts (each member serves for 3 years). Meet 3 times a year; can approve expenditure up to £250,000 on behalf of the Trustees (anything costing under this does not need to go further). Nick Serota can also authorise any purchase under £100,000 without taking it to Board.

### Fourth step: Board of Trustees

The Trustees ratify decisions that Selection Committee makes, meeting every 2 months, with a break over the Summer.

### **CONVENOR'S COMMENTS**

*You will see that my proposal is very indebted to the model offered by the Young Patrons at Ludwig. It is important to be clear that no model works simply by being transposed to what is a completely different cultural context, and we are here to discuss how, and if, the model might be usefully adapted. For instance, dealing with younger people who may be inexperienced not only as patrons, but also as collectors, would necessitate a more didactic kind of support, a more formalised programme, with more in the way of mentoring. I am interested to see whether you think this would be desirable, or stifling.*

*For the sake of argument then, let's say that each year, five parties within the group, acting individually or perhaps in pairs, would nominate, and undertake to research, the work of a particular artist. They would deal with the artist's gallerist, finding out about prices and available works; they would research the participating museums' collecting policies, deciding which one represented the most appropriate home for their proposed artist, and discuss with the curator the feasibility of accepting the gift. They would build a strong case for their choice, and present this case to the other members, who would then vote for which of the five works they wished to acquire as a group.*

*All this would, of course, require a great deal of openness and commitment on the part of the gallerists and the museum curators, who would have to undertake not only to work with these patrons as they would any other patrons, but also to support their developmental journey as novices – a commitment of capacity that would be likely to*

*have only indirect returns, at least initially. It would also require the participation of a number of mentors, that could provide guidance and advice to the patrons, (as well as ensuring that good practices were maintained throughout, and that those valuable relationships within the sector were protected and nurtured.) A big commitment for all involved then, but I am hopeful that such an initiative would nevertheless find public funding and support from a variety of other quarters, which would make it more viable.*

*At first, I envisaged a group of 'young' patrons, but that seemed restrictive, and difficult to manage – when are you no longer young? I also considered the notion of emerging patrons, but that seemed quite an esoteric concept. Then, I asked myself what kinds of practice would we encourage the group to look at? What could they afford, given say, a fund of £2000-3000? Perhaps they would be working mainly to acquire emerging artists' work – and I wondered if that might provide the defining focus of the group?*

## **DISCUSSION**

### **DEFINING EMERGING ART**

It is rare that a museum would want to show someone straight out of art college – the public have an expectation that artists in public collections should have a track record. Although there are occasions when the work merits it – Paul Chiappe recently shown at SNGMA (in this case, perhaps, his sheer skill in drawing transcended his student status).

Generally though, emerging artists have already had something of a career behind them. Trajectory of that career is at a certain point on the 'up'. Perhaps they have had a number of group shows and small solos shows, but not a big solo show - artists who are on the cusp of gaining a bigger profile?

Perhaps it is more helpful to use the word 'emerging' without defining it too closely: you don't want to exclude a 60 year old you have discovered because he doesn't fit the criteria.

Emerging artists are ones who are not safe yet - that haven't been filtered through a critical establishment and art history. They are also unknown quantities in the art market, and that is why the prices are so reasonable. Even Alistair Gray is 'emerging' in terms of his recent exposure to the market, and his re-evaluation as a visual artist. Everyone has a different career trajectory, this process can happen quickly, or over years. Craig Mulholland was very established in one sense, but when his practice changed it brought him to a new audience. This is something Art Now looks for – a change in direction is interesting - focus is on *new* bodies of work, regardless of age or career moment. Similarly, the Collective is dedicated to 'emerging practice', which for them is about transition. Collective shows work by new graduates, but also seeks to highlight new directions in working, work for new audiences, and so on.

On the one hand, private galleries are doing an important job of filtering the graduate output; on the other, public spaces are producing/enabling things that would not be seen in other contexts. Interesting to consider whether these patrons want to/ought to

fund *collections* (supporting the work of curators) or *production* (supporting the development of artists).

Notable that the Young Patrons in Cologne are buying pieces that are markedly different from the main group – unlike Art Now, this is not about supporting the artist at a particular moment in their career, but making a statement about what work they think will be important in the future.

In terms of supporting the artist, would the gallerist weigh up the prestige of the group and the collection it was destined for? It is great for an artist to be part of a collection, but even better if that collection is an evolving and living, breathing thing – with the work often seen in changing displays, and available to be seen elsewhere and loaned readily (as is the case in Museum Ludwig). This is an important point to consider not just for the patrons' scheme, but also for curators and their management of collections.

### **SUPPORTING PATRONS' PARTICIPATION**

Patrons would have to make a case, then, not only to their colleagues, but also to the gallerist about why a particular collection would be the right one, and how the work would continue to thrive and evolve within it. They would develop such arguments through their discussions with the museum's curators – and indeed, this mutual dialogue with the institution might actually affect curatorial thinking as it does in Cologne.

But we would have a lot of educating to do. Pupils are coming out of school with no understanding of conceptual art. Young patrons will need help. Subsidy would be sought to fund frequent events, a tailored programme that would take young patrons to various collections and introduce them to curators, but also have curators accompany the group on other visits, so that they get to know each other in a variety of contexts.

Personal connections are very important to the spirit of the democratic model, where warmth and openness from quite senior people towards young people will help to boost their confidence (it's not just education that is lacking, but also a sense of self-worth). There is scope for regional centres that might cultivate even closer links to the local curator. Even in Cologne, the close relationship between patrons and their museum, their sense of access to, and ownership of, the Ludwig collection is dependent on the individuals that run it. Koenig is very open and happy to engage with patrons.

Cross-generational idea is something that thrives in culture of Scotland (an example is the SAC trips) in a way that it doesn't in London. In terms of building confidence in dealing with galleries and so on, the inter-generational generosity that exists here would work very well.

With a group that is youthful rather than young, we can make it clear that this spirit is going to be very open and democratic, and hopefully those older people who are resistant to giving up their prior claim to resources and access would not participate anyway (in Aberdeen the Friends group is resisting a young friends offshoot).

Would it make sense to subsidise membership for students? The programme would already be subsidised, and maybe the target members would be aspiring art professionals who would consider the £250 as a worthwhile investment in their own formation and training. Contacts and knowledge would be very useful, and cross-generational involvement would counter the divisions that are obvious at Edinburgh art openings (different generations tend to go to different venues).

Although the Cologne group has an informal origin and spirit, they are interested in engaging in highly rigorous ways with the work. This is not a passive experience, it is a critical engagement with a practical outcome (which then others can engage with critically), which is perhaps part of the cultural context of Germany – this critical group that wants to create a discourse comes from an intellectual class system created by the schooling there. Here, there are groups of people that might feel alienated by that. There are many who love art, but would be alarmed to have to talk about it. Young people in Scotland are not often invited to enter into a critical relationship with things. It would be important, then, and a great opportunity, to have a patrons group here that was conscious of this and sensitive to it, so that people might be supported to overcome such inhibitions.

In Cologne, everyone in the group is already a member of the Gesellschaft, so they are already interested in engaging with art, although there is no obligation to take part in the conversations – people can just listen and learn. Social events are crucial in promoting cohesion – there is a Christmas dinner, for instance, where members can meet. Any friends who are interested can come along to see what it is like, although they cannot attend the buying meetings. There is some cross over with main patrons events (such as studio visits), but the Young Patrons programme (with fewer events) is special. Many of the Young Patrons are not interested in going to the main events – partly because they don't know many people. The focus of the main group used to be being part of Cologne 'society', but this is changing – the younger folk don't care about this, they just want to support the museum.

Big Things on the Beach in Portobello was an interesting model in terms of its cross-generational make-up and its approach to educating the participants. They ran a course on commissioning public art before anyone had to get up and do it. Many people on the course went on to become trustees of BToB. It might be too onerous a responsibility to be learning about all these things at the same time as having to select work, enter into conversations about purchases, etc.

Certainly there could be an introductory first phase, but then once a core group was established, they (rather than the mentors) could continue to make the introductions to new members – there would be self-sufficiency and internal impetus thereafter. There would also be scope for participants of the main group of patrons to be involved in supporting this more focused group.

Tate's raison d'être was, and is, to popularize contemporary art, and battle skepticism and hostility. Tate can deliver this education and mediation around the work, but how could an unattached patrons' group achieve this? Would this be delivered by the institutions, or by someone involved in the group?

My own background in audience development and education would inform the spirit and ethos of the group, drawing on models that I have developed in the past based on informality and conversation around art. These have resulted in people developing confidence and becoming more adventurous, and shifting their expectations. The conversation model allows people to hang back or be more involved if and when they want. This only works once they are in, of course. How do we attract people who are not yet involved? Make sure the language is welcoming, and rely on friends telling them it is not intimidating. The question is how wide do we want to cast the net anyway? Probably looking for people who are already pre-disposed.

### **COURTING CELEBRITIES**

In Cologne, there are business families, big companies, but not really celebrities – some celebs ask to become members, but they are not courted, and they are not viewed differently from other members. It is nice not to have VIPs, or at least to have VIPs that are not especially important *within* the group.

At Tate, guest lists always include a few celebrities (some come because they know a patron, or an artist, etc). Celebrities are courted to attend events, but not necessarily to formally associate themselves with Patrons.

### **PERSONAL COLLECTING**

We would hope to inspire participants to collect for themselves. The proposed scheme breeds an eye not just for acquisition but also for placement within a collection. Young people are collecting on a small scale, buying from friends etc. This activity may be quite invisible, but it is happening, and is another possible basis for involvement.

Many of Cologne's young patrons collect. Those that didn't at the beginning usually start while they are members, but in general we don't talk about personal collections. Some have a few works, while others have many works in storage. This is not made obvious – want to avoid intimidating people on the basis of involvement in the art world, or resources.

It is intimidating to call yourself a collector, because of the commitment to something more than just buying individual works and the expectation around that. It is also self-appointed, and may seem a bit grandiose. But anyone who buys work is collecting, and exposure to other curatorial/collecting strategies can help self-awareness about one's own activities.

### **QUALITY CONTROL**

Quality control at Tate and Museum Ludwig is not necessarily replicated in some other collections in Scotland. It would be great if the works bought for this scheme were quite radical, directional, conceptual, and tough - works that would make a statement and signal a commitment not just in terms of what the patrons wanted to buy, but also what the institutions wanted to do with their collections.

It is an opportunity to revitalise the collections and make them much more contemporary than they are at the moment. Also about getting other people's input into some of the research that is so difficult for Local authority curators to do well.

## **BUYING NEW WORK**

Is there a natural affinity between a younger (or youthful) contingent and younger work, or is this potentially a restriction upon the group? If you are getting interested in art and getting to the point where you are thinking about posterity and collections, you will want to buy the best work available. It would be a shame to restrict it to the art of your peers, particularly as a young group might be more excited by a very established artist.

We might be restricted by budget at the beginning, but it is the quality of vision that determines what work should be bought – a directional challenge to current collecting might come from re-appraising an overlooked artist, or it might come from an emerging artist.

Perhaps the quality of the discussion that arises around a work would test/establish its quality? It would have to have contemporary relevance, and challenge and extend the collection without simply being controversial.

## **A SEPARATE COLLECTION OR A NATIONAL HOLDING?**

Should we consider keeping ownership of the works and offer them on loan (like Artists Pension Trust, for example). Certainly, as with APT collection, the website will be key for establishing the group's identity and publicising its 'collection' of works prior to gifting/dispersal.

There are a number of models for groups that retain ownership and lend: Cologne's Hahn Prize and Tate's American Patrons; the problem is that you need to establish a legal entity, storage, etc. We need to consider the pros and cons in more detail, but one of the premises for the patrons group is working with collections that are owned by the nation - enhancing Scotland's contemporary art holdings is a powerful incentive.

This may appear too abstract, and with 8 institutions, there is no pre-existing emotional personal link to draw on. It is not uncommon in Federal Germany that there is a powerful, strong immediate bond between the citizen and a city's museum, but that bond is less pronounced in Scotland (outside Glasgow), whereas there are certain emotional links with Scotland as a whole. But in any case, emotional links with both is what we would be trying to cultivate, by building the profile of the institutions and drawing people's attention to the collecting activity that they are unaware of. One's sense of ownership would stem from an engagement with each collection.

It is about looking to one's responsibility to future generations. We don't want them to look back and say where was the private support? What were they doing? There was all this amazing art production in Scotland and it was all being sold elsewhere and shown in museums elsewhere!

Although this is not to say that we would focus exclusively on art produced here. The focus would be international from the outset. Contemporary art is an international language. Want to build local collections, that art students and others can access, which represent this world as a whole. Some institutions are only permitted to buy

local work, and our current Nationalist government's agenda encourages this. There are restrictions on curators' travel too. We are lucky in that we have many artists here who are not indigenous, but we need to keep the perspectives opened out beyond Scotland. Not sure at what stage young patrons would be confident to approach international gallerists, but people like Sorcha (and Young Patrons in Cologne) might be able to help broker some of those relationships.

## **Appendix C**

### **Summary of interviews with collecting institutions**

***Paisley Art Gallery, Paisley – 1<sup>st</sup> February 2010***

Andrea Kusel, Keeper of Fine Art  
Susan Jeffrey, Museums Development Officer

***Pier Art Centre, Stromness – 5<sup>th</sup> February 2010***

Neil Firth, Director  
Andrew Parkinson, Curator  
Isla Holloway, Visitor Services and Communications Officer

***The Hunterian, Glasgow – 5<sup>th</sup> February 2010***

Mungo Campbell, Deputy Director

***Aberdeen Art Gallery, Aberdeen – 9<sup>th</sup> February 2010***

Jennifer Melville, Keeper (Fine Art)  
Christine Rew, Art Gallery and Museums Manager

***GoMA, Glasgow – 11<sup>th</sup> February 2010***

Ben Harman, Curator, Contemporary Art  
Sean McGlashan, Curator, Contemporary Art  
John Ferry, Acting Museum Manager  
Mark O'Neill, formerly Head of Arts and Museums

***City Art Centre, Edinburgh – 12<sup>th</sup> February 2010***

Ian O Riordan, Arts Centre Manager  
Frank Little, Museums Manager

***McManus Gallery, Dundee – 16<sup>th</sup> February 2010***

Anna Robertson, Senior Curator  
John Stewart-Young, Arts and Heritage Manager

***Scottish National Gallery of Modern Art, Edinburgh – 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2010***

Simon Groom, Director  
Sam Lagneau, Head of Major Gifts

As well as putting questions to these potential beneficiaries of the proposed patrons' group, I was able to explain the nature and aims of my research in detail to curators and their managers.

**What are the procedures (and challenges) related to accepting gifts?**

*Paisley:* While bequests are complicated internally (legal issues) and have to be accepted by Head of Service, gifts are assessed by AK and accepted by SJ. There are some storage and conservation limitations. Opportunities for exhibition are also limited, as certain times in the year are booked out in advance. Challenging installations and complicated transport would probably need extra support. Joint ownership would be difficult to manage.

*Pier:* Following step-change in Pier's organisation, and participation in NCSS, the Board have a keen interest in collecting. Currently addressing *how* they collect (balancing local and international opportunities and expectations). Need to show leadership locally (through their partnership with Local Authority) in order to take advantage of opportunities in relation to national and international contemporary work. Given that background, there are no barriers to participating openly and fully in the proposed patrons' group, which Pier sees as additional to activity with NCSS phase 3. Needs to be a close relationship between patron activity and Pier's collecting policy and current curatorial direction. What is achieved has to be what is wanted.

*Hunterian:* Developing the collection is a top priority but there is a prohibition on spending core funds on acquisition, and there are no funds for contemporary art. Being a higher education institution and museum, however, there are many offers of gifts, bequests, etc, and there is plenty of core money for travel and research. MC tries to discuss with/warn colleagues of large gifts, but generally empowered to accept gifts. American office - 501C3 status allows Hunterian to offer tax breaks to American donors.

*Aberdeen:* Without a board, the process is quite simple. The relevant curator and their manager will decide whether to accept a gift. It would have to fit with the collecting policy – this needs reinforcing internally, so that there is an audit trail to show this thinking has been done for each gift. The collecting policy will be reviewed in 2010 for the next 5 years.

Regarding the cost of installation: there is no fund to apply to a gift, so these costs have to be met by dipping into other budgets - conservation, acquisition, etc. Perhaps Aberdeen need to review their budget lines so that this doesn't happen - although an installation budget is easily cut in difficult times, it is important to be able to show work that has been purchased or gifted.

There are the usual challenges regarding size and longevity and display. Although there are size restrictions determined by the front door, it is important to avoid the situation that arose in the 1960s for the SNGMA at Inverleith (where they only bought works that would fit in the building). Aberdeen should seek to get the right works in the collection, even if they can only be seen in certain circumstances.

The current re-organisation will have an impact on departments and collecting policy review: things may become more fluid between fine art, craft, decorative art etc (which will actually reflect the current approaches to exhibition).

*GoMA*: The Board of CSG are committed to contemporary collecting, and are considering how they will continue a programme of acquisition after 2012, when the AFI money comes to an end. There are threats and opportunities – the economic climate means that there is pressure on funds, so the arguments for continuing to buy need to be strategic. At the same time, there is a lot of enthusiasm around Gi – and scope to tie-in there. A new themed collecting policy is being formulated at the moment that will take account of such factors.

Goes to a cross-service committee, Glasgow Museums Collections Meeting, which decides on acquisitions, gifts, and long-term loans, on the basis of their conservation, logistics, storage, insurance, ethical requirements etc, and whether these can be accommodated at a given time (across the 7 museums.)

*City Art Centre*: There has been a shift in the last few years towards more contemporary purchasing (galvanised by participation in the NCSS, but also looking back to the roots of the collection, when the Scottish Modern Group focussed on acquiring the work of the day). Jean F Watson continues to fund acquisitions and there are no complications in accepting gifts, as long as they conform to wider collecting policies, and are approved by the curators.

*Dundee*: Collection development remains a key focus for Dundee across the board. They are still riding a wave of enthusiasm for contemporary art that began in 1999, and continues to see ambitions raised. It is important to maintain momentum and look to the future (as well as taking stock and consolidating). Has been important for the city. Overall, ability to collect may become more difficult, as there are no dedicated budgets, but all public donations will now go to acquisitions.

Each new piece has to be justified, and the process for accepting gifts and bequests need to be more pro-active than it is at present. All works have to fit with the collecting policy (which has been ratified by the committee, and will be reviewed every 4 years). Curators will consider storage and conservation issues, alongside judgement of quality. There are usually work-around solutions: in the case of more fugitive work, for example, one might agree from outset that degradation will not be conserved.

*SNGMA*: There is first and foremost the question of fit with the collection, and then considerations of conservation, storage, preservation, display. The list of possible works is virtually endless (the bigger the collection, the more scope there is to justify a work's inclusion).

As the proposed group is non-partisan, and non-geographic, and is about increasing the visibility of contemporary art collecting (which is not high profile at the moment), it might be able to attract people who would not otherwise support NGS. Current NGS Patrons tend to be from East Lothian, Midlothian, Edinburgh, although there are others from London, Switzerland and so on. SNGMA would certainly welcome the offer of gifts.

**Are there any barriers to showing works such as film and installation? Is there anything we can do to address those barriers?**

*Paisley:* Film and installation are not normally a problem (AK has already collected a number of challenging works.) Questions of size and fragility are more usually where there might be a sticking point.

*Pier:* Technical restraints relating to showing video: blackouts and construction of walls (needed, for example, in the Viola exhibit). Sound works can be difficult to place. Some equipment difficulties could be overcome by pooling resources (recently bought a 16mm projector to show Margaret Tait films – this could be made available to others). Also technology is moving very quickly – 8/9 year old equipment was close to being condemned by Viola studio as too out of date.

Scale is an issue, both in terms of storage, and lineage (previous acquisitions are generally small in scale, although this has broadened out in more recent collecting and in relation to the new building). But if you could move things around the NCSS network, this might be tackled by sharing ownership of an object that resides somewhere else. Currently, as a recognised collection, Pier are reshuffling and looking to maximise their use of storage through partnership with local authority. Despite all these restrictions, important to remain open to the ‘right’ work.

*Hunterian:* There have been issues around allocating technical and storage resources to the NCSS acquisitions, but as they have been acquired for the Hunterian Museum rather than HAG, there is now a much better understanding across the institution of the role that the contemporary art collection plays, and more collaborations in-house that have emerged as a result. Will usually have a crack at anything technically, although there is sometimes need for compromise (speaking to certain artists about moving film to HD, for instance). Gallery spaces have certain inherent restrictions, but again, if the work is right, then these things are usually surmountable.

*Aberdeen:* Storage of new media is not a problem, although an installation can take up a whole room. Issues of longevity are obviously crucial, although this is less of a problem when the work is a gift, as the expenditure of public money (and audit accountability) does not come into it. In some cases, where Aberdeen own the right to show a wall-work, its re-staging comes out of the exhibition budget (thus, as these budgets get tighter, the work is likely to be seen less often).

Aberdeen avoid undertaking to show a work a particular number of times, instead committing to making the work available for research (they are expanding this service online). Virtual visitors are considered as important as visitors to the building (by the curators and by the council as a whole). Making work available on the new website (with stills, video, commentary etc) is as much an ambition as showing it in the gallery. Still need to talk to artists about showing whole film works online, and also need to explore logistics of weblinks to moving image sites.

*GoMA:* Open to different media. But every exhibition has to be planned and prepared in the same way. Glasgow is the largest Local Authority service in the UK. Audiences feel that GoMA displays don’t change enough, but for the departments across the collections, they change too much – there is pressure to scale back. GoMA

is an anomaly within Glasgow Museums, as most of them keep their displays static. Even things that are scheduled to come down end up staying up when other priorities prevail.

The Alison Watt acquisition went up for 3 months. But then Art Fund members complained they hadn't seen it. Eventually, they were able to show it in Kelvingrove. GoMA do not want to leave works (especially new acquisitions) in storage – would like to use other venues more.

*City Art Centre:* Good track record of accommodating installation and film, although resourcing the building and prep for showing such works is a constant challenge. Good news is that the refurbishment programme has given CAC the opportunity to design a space from scratch that will be much better suited to this kind of work.

*Dundee:* Moving image works pose a long-term challenge. It is not always appropriate to move from analogue to digital, but some artists are happier now to have their work technically updated. This tends to be done by keeping in touch with the artist – there have been few formal agreements that set this in place in advance. The ones that state very clearly their intentions for display are easier to deal with, even if they are more time-consuming in the short term.

**Is there scope for setting up some expedited loaning scheme with other beneficiary institutions, giving both curators and audiences wider access to the gifted works?**

*Paisley:* Loaning and lending are time-consuming (time spent on processing depends on the complexity of the works; may also need couriers to travel with works etc) and so staff capacity comes into play. At the moment they manage to loan widely, but on an ad hoc basis - this might be difficult if loaning was to become more onerous.

*Pier:* No particular problems with loaning and lending, except in relation to cost (shipping to and from Orkney). Would be very keen to pursue an NCSS touring exhibition that shows the national scope of the scheme.

*Hunterian:* One way of dealing with the problem of inter-availability of works acquired by the NCSS would be a one-off touring exhibition and/or publication (this could be funded from outside NCSS).

*Aberdeen:* There are plenty of loan requests to Aberdeen, and they try to agree to as many as possible, taking into consideration the academic worth of the loan (as against more obviously commercial motivations). It is also an opportunity for the city's collection to be seen elsewhere. There is usually a six month cut-off, although exceptions are made. Concept of joint ownership was piloted through NCSS commission, but to show Tatham and O'Sullivan, someone in the Exhibitions Department at Aberdeen would need to apply to SAC to fund transport and display. This is as distinct from a member of JM's team doing so. This hasn't been done, and now there are no more slots. There is a constant issue of staff capacity. NGS is very generous on this front, but in other cases even when ownership is shared, one museum can still charge another for transport!

*GoMA*: Loans are processed by the Museums Service, so there is a massive demand, and a long backlog. Very little GoMA can do to bypass this.

Shared acquisition would be great in principle. However, but can't use internal people to transport work, even to the Hunterian, so have ended up using Constantine in the past.

*City Art Centre*: No problems with loaning. CAC don't have anything like the bureaucracy and layers of consideration that other larger organisations like GoMA and NGS have to have.

*Dundee*: Try to make loaning as simple as possible, and are minded to loan as much as they can. Sometimes easier with recently-purchased contemporary art, because one already has an evaluation for insurance purposes. Because it is down to the (two) art curators to process loans, they can be quite flexible. Don't borrow much because this is where extra costs can be incurred, and there are no budgets for it. Have borrowed from artists, families and collectors in the past for solo retrospectives, but there is now not the capacity for finding and sourcing pieces such pieces. Focussing more on group shows for this reason.

**To what extent does the institution currently work with curators from exhibiting organisations? Is there any way we could usefully enhance/facilitate this relationship?**

*Paisley*: Don't feel the need for advice from these institutions, as Andrea does a lot of research in her own time.

*Pier*: Would be interested in doing more of it. No formal structure to date. There have been collaborations in relation to exhibitions (worked with DCA on Camilla Low show) without a collecting outcome in mind, although collecting opportunities have arisen. But would be very interested in a more strategic link up to work focussed on acquisition.

*Hunterian*: No formal link with exhibiting organisations at present, but a level of informal communication was a very valuable aspect of NCSS, where people like Tina can keep you informed of what others are doing. Wouldn't want more formal relationships, because you become too dependent on /too invested in an exhibition that might turn out to be lacklustre. SAC/Creative Scotland perhaps ought to be doing this – they are enabling and resourcing all this activity, and should be increasing value of their investment by co-ordinating information at an annual forum.

[SAC already feed such information to organisations, but often those connections are not taken up or pursued – perhaps because of lack of capacity. Patrons Group might facilitate those connections, and might also enhance the profile/funding of the projects along the way.]

*Aberdeen*: Problem is that Aberdeen's curators are forced by circumstances to be jacks-of-all-trades. Such a wide remit means that they cannot do the research and meet the artists that they would like to. Travel is vital, particularly as Aberdeen is out of the main circuit, but local authorities see this area as less invasive to cut. There is currently a moratorium on travel unless it is funded from outside. Curators of

contemporary exhibiting spaces are doing this all the time, and it makes sense for them to share the info, especially if it means some works they are bringing in to the country might end up staying. Foreknowledge of exhibitions would enable the purchase of work while it was in the country. Then travel could be more focussed.

If other parties could identify and suggest particular works that would be right for the collection, this would be even better than prior warning about exhibitions (still too broad and unfiltered to manage).

*GoMA*: Often seems as if GoMA are offered commissions long after they've been conceived and made – not a strategic placing of works in the GoMA collection, so much as a mopping up exercise. Would be better to be involved earlier.

Would love to have closer links with Tramway, NGS etc. Maintaining such relationships is a full time job, so someone central managing them on others' behalf, would be very welcome. A patrons group could identify opportunities and shared agendas. Any inter-CSG co-operation or patron initiatives would work in parallel, not in conflict, with such a role.

Regarding the current relationship between GoMA and Common Guild – the process is very informal: communication with Katrina Brown is crucial. The AFI purchasing criteria and the broad collecting theme are already in place (submitted as part of the application). Regarding the list of artists, priorities have evolved. Art Fund Committee is quite directive – have increasingly encouraged GoMA to focus more on big names and wow factor rather than emerging artists at £5k to £10k mark. GoMA finds and negotiates a particular work, takes it to the Glasgow Museums Collections Meeting, then makes the application to the Art Fund: within a few weeks, the Committee verdict comes through: it either approves, rejects, asks for more info, for further negotiations on price, or for a different work by the same artist.

KB is mentor with extensive experience and knowledge – can direct BH to look at particular works, and give him particular contacts. Committee have also appointed another mentor, Prue O Day, ex-gallerist and collector, very experienced in negotiations. She coaches and galvanises Ben in negotiating price.

*City Art Centre*: There is definitely scope here – current links are very informal, and usually depend on curators knowing each other very well.

*Dundee*: DCA is a critical part of the history of contemporary art in Dundee, and its activity should be captured, if appropriate, by the McManus collection. Closeness of relations has varied over the years – there have been capacity challenges as staffing has been reduced. Mutual trust and understanding is vital.

*SNGMA*: Do have regular conversation with curators about artists coming up, and what new work they are doing. SNGMA are regularly offered works once they are in the show, but they have to be the right work for the collection before they can be considered. It is often very fraught trying to negotiate with the artist's gallery, and a patron's group might even make this more, rather than less difficult. Perhaps need to consider where the group can have the most useful impact – big commissions are

perhaps not the place. There might be times where it is appropriate – good to be open to having and enabling those conversations – but should avoid being programmatic.

**To what extent would you like to work to acquire commissions? What are the challenges and benefits of acquiring commissions?**

*Paisley:* Being involved in a gifted commission offers an interesting opportunity, as it is difficult to get funding to commission.

*Pier:* Pier commissions a lot (they have a foot in both collection and production camps in that respect).

*Hunterian:* Hunterian collects pieces that respond in some way to the museum's collections – so some are commissions and some have been conceived independently.

*Aberdeen:* Commissions are problematic in the sense that you don't know what you are going to get.

*GoMA:* Commissioned Roddy Buchanan films, then bought them at a good price. Although they have bought works that they originally commissioned, there is no commitment to buy in advance. They may have an intention to buy, but would not generally signal this or commit to it until the show is up and running.

*City Art Centre:* Very challenging to collect commissions. You are never sure how they will turn out.

*Dundee:* Commissions are particularly successful when they bring artists into an engagement with Dundee, and with the MacManus collection. In the past, it has been suggested to artists showing at DCA that their work will be bought by the city, but this is not (and should not be) automatic. The work has to fit into the city's collecting policy, and this is not always the case. But for the most part, it is important to be able to see the work/the exhibition before agreeing to acquire it.

*SNGMA:* Have commissioned and bought: Karla Black is the most recent one. There is always a risk, but it is a fun risk, and you can protect yourself to a degree in case the work does not come off. Very attractive proposition for patrons. One can envisage getting a group engaged with, activity by, say, Gi, the outcome of which is promised to a gallery. This creates a perfect circle of support. Should seek to ensure that the money that goes into the commission is deducted from the acquisition.

**What relationship would your institution want with a national patrons group? How would you enable/ support that relationship?**

*Paisley:* SJ: would need to be a managed process – with engagement (events/talks at the gallery) planned well in advance. Do have a nice space for holding events. AK would be very interested in attending emerging group's tours etc.

*Pier:* Distance and contact are key issues. Keen to promote an intimate knowledge amongst patrons about Pier and also NCSS organisations – the different facets and drivers in each case. Advocacy on the part of the institution is crucial - need direct contact with people on site, which is then continued by other means/ in other environments (virtual contact, meeting on excursions etc). Travel is always

dependent on other events, commitments etc, but these should be seen as restraints rather than impossible obstacles.

*Hunterian:* Would we consider asking museums to subscribe to the group (£1200 a year goes to CAS, for example). Perhaps Creative Scotland is prepared to view a subscription and/or other supporting activity as ‘a demonstrable commitment to contemporary art collecting,’ which could count towards a museum’s participation in NCSS phase 3...

*Aberdeen:* JM has repeatedly expressed enthusiasm for this group, and is very keen to support it wherever possible – including introducing possible members, and giving guided tours. In pointing out the current loans from private collectors (Nathan Coley piece on loan at the moment), she would also be able to address the wider themes of the group – philanthropy, collecting etc.

*GoMA:* Would be happy to give tours, give access to the artists and so on – Ben and Sean can offer anything that comes within their own staff remits.

*Dundee:* Concerned that quite a bit of capacity is already committed to servicing Art Fund members and their regional groups. For another group to be justified, it would need to be quite different. Can see the benefit of talking to a group that is particularly interested in the contemporary (usually quite difficult to access and cultivate this group).

*City Art Centre:* Love the social/engagement aspect of it (Spin-type exchanges were always very productive), and are CAC are very enthusiastic about receiving works – would be thrilling to be offered things.

*SNGMA:* Any initiative that brings like-minded people together to support and grow a collecting ‘gene’ is fantastic, and would receive whole-hearted support from SNGMA. Only concern would be the potential conflict with NGS Patrons (see below) and the development of contemporary art activity there. Certainly room for pan-Scotland group, but the relationship with NGS should perhaps be an ad hoc one rather than a structural one – coming together at times, and then not at all at other times (while the group is busy working with others around the country).

**What about with a sub-group dedicated to buying the work of emerging artists? (This might involve extra commitment and engagement with patrons, who would be tasked with researching, shortlisting and voting for an artwork to gift and deciding which collection to offer it to).**

*Paisley:* AK very interested in this side of things.

*Pier:* Recent Board away-day included a provocation question: ‘should we be buying work by unknown/emerging artists?’ Looking for things that connect the lineage of the collection to contemporary art practice, but up until now this has involved collecting named artists. Has there been enough groundwork done to allow for acquisitions that are more of a gamble? This is, after all, how the collection originally started. Involvement in buying emerging artists is therefore part of Pier’s focus. Working with a young patrons’ group would certainly be a different kind/level of commitment, but important to keep up collecting of emerging work so that there are

not gaps in the future (as there was in the 1990s). Such a group might spur activity both in terms of collecting and production.

*Hunterian*: Not perhaps appropriate for Hunterian, as the current collecting remit necessitates a very close involvement with the museum collection on the part of the artist. Wouldn't rule it out, but not immediately obvious how it would work.

*Aberdeen*: JM definitely open to this. Also, there are a number of intelligent, dynamic young curators at Aberdeen who have been keen to start a young friends group, but have been unable to do so – perhaps they could get involved in this in some way?

In addition, I suggested that she might attend young patrons' gallery events in order to communicate her collecting vision not just to the group, but also to the gallerists and other curators that we are visiting. Jennifer agreed that personal contact is key.

*GoMA*: Very enthusiastic about accommodating these patrons, and getting to know them outside the institution.

*City Art Centre*: Really like the focus on emerging artists – very appropriate for CAC, and also think there is scope for Maeve Toal (Assistant Curator) or Alison Chisholm (Travelling Gallery) to get involved. Perhaps we could apply for matching funding? Speak to Hazel Williamson at National Museums Scotland, who is the manager of National Fund for Acquisitions, (which they run on behalf of the Scottish Executive).

*Dundee*: Although this is an appealing idea, Dundee may not be able to get involved straight away. Having to pace themselves in relation to the opportunities offered by CAS, NCSS and so on. Would worry that the risks involved might be quite onerous - even experienced curators can't always avoid misunderstandings (there have in the past been unexpected challenges when a work has arrived). It would produce extra anxiety when an inexperienced intermediary is managing an acquisition.

*SNGMA*: All institutions have to collect emerging artists work – certainly at the core of SNGMA collecting.

### **In what ways might we interact with and/or support other existing or proposed patrons initiatives?**

*Paisley*: A possible contact: Mike Adams funds Aspect Prize (introducing us might open up a new dimension in Paisley's relationship with him).

*Pier*: No clash anticipated, and indeed, the proposed activity might help to bring focus to Pier's relationship with patrons. There may well be some people that they can introduce to the group.

*Hunterian*: MC expressed scepticism about being able to get enough money out of a patrons' group to make the effort worthwhile, although he would love to be proved wrong. Love the idea of young people being encouraged to collect etc, but there are comparatively few in Scotland who are going to be able to 'get it' in museum terms, and commit to philanthropic investment. In Glasgow, there is a buzz, but perhaps it is

only in Edinburgh where people can be persuaded to sign cheques. Will have to build up over 10-15 years, and perhaps need to concentrate at this stage on what needs to go in, rather than what museums can get out of it.

Also need to ensure clarity and distinction in relation to other offers, from the Art Fund, say.

*Aberdeen:* There is an Arts and Business MLitt course at the University. Scope to get the patrons' group research to feed into this.

*GoMA:* CSG patron development will be happening over the next couple of years. A lot depends on what Art Fund International is planning for 2012. Also good to wait until Gi is over (and Katrina Brown is freed up) and Victoria Hollows returns from maternity leave.

*City Art Centre:* No patron initiative beyond the Friends, which is quite traditional – so there is no obvious clash.

*Dundee:* Recent capital fundraising appeal has had different levels of participation: stakeholders (minimum £10), benefactors (£100), 15 patrons (£1000) and five named honorary patrons (who have drawn others in). This, and future campaigns will be conceived and managed by JS. A number of agencies have expressed an interest in being involved, and are particularly attracted to contributing to collecting, but this has not yet resulted in revenue. There is also a small number of individuals known to McManus who might like to be involved in something like this – and would be particularly interested in the contemporary focus – but they are being courted by Dundee for specific projects, and one wouldn't want to detract from that.

*SNGMA:* Concerned about the potential confusion and possible undermining of the momentum being developed around the contemporary art activity of the NGS patrons. But as long as the identity of this group is distinctly articulated (and differentiated from NGS activity), this shouldn't be a problem.

[One option would be to work with the NGS Patrons on a contemporary acquisition – our fund structure allows us to identify different groups with a shared aim. This would have the added benefit of publicising NGS Patrons own involvement with contemporary art amongst people who were unaware of it.]

## **Appendix D**

### **Summary of interviews with exhibiting organisations that support production**

***TRAMWAY, GLASGOW – 17<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2010***

Sarah Munro, **Tramway**, Director

Judith Winter, **DCA**, Director

Katrina Brown, **Common Guild**, Director (joined later)

Bo Hanley, **Glasgow University**, PhD researcher: Commissioning to Collect

## **NCSS**

SM and JW not generally aware of institutions' collecting policies, although SM had started talking to Victoria Hollows about possible strategic connections before Victoria's maternity leave. If Tramway could have committed to a sale (option) in advance for the Duncan Campbell commission on behalf of GoMA, it might have saved them money on the contract.

JW has a bit of a sense of the collecting activity at McManus, although she is less clear about the actual policies and processes. DCA wouldn't want to look solely at working with McManus, of course.

## **ENTREPRENEURIAL APPROACHES**

JW is also interested in the entrepreneurial approaches to collecting (which she developed at MIMA). With capital projects (such as V&A), it is about getting City to buy into visual aspiration and literacy, and in Dundee in the last few years, this has been focused on contemporary art. At MIMA, the LA was working with a developer, John Orchard, in the town centre – they had tax and percent for art requirements – JW got to know John, and suggested that he did not need to make a gateway feature or a mural to fulfil such requirements, but could buy something for MIMA's collection (one has a responsibility to ensure that these funds don't go on mediocre art). Orchard bought Graham Gussin's *Someplace, Sometime*, (2002), and is credited for it every time it gets shown. How do you bring back the historical notion of philanthropy?

BH recently interviewed Franck Gautherot of Le Consortium in Dijon. Approached businesses for funds for a commission, which was managed and subsequently owned by Le Consortium, but the businesses had the opportunity to show the work (at functions and so on).

JW: you could go to Arts & Business for match funding if there was a business/corporate sub-group within the patrons.

## **MAKING CONNECTIONS BETWEEN INTERESTED PARTIES**

All these projects and benefits come from being able to cultivate close personal relationships, which is very difficult - both in terms of capacity (when there are so many other demands involved in a commission), and in terms of self-interest (it can be awkward if you are authoring the work in the first place).

Subodh Gupta show coming up – would be great to buy a work for Glasgow's collections. Bound to be Asian businessmen that are alienated at the moment by contemporary art, but might be interested in this – who in Scotland could SM work with, who could support the kind of development that this would need?

Sometimes so engrossed in what you're doing, that don't think about connections and wider possibilities. DCA are working on Chicks on Speed – the planned outcomes do not seem appropriate for collections, but perhaps there are broader possibilities there. Intense discussions within a forum, where the focus is provided by a patrons' group, could bring all sorts of ideas to light.

A patrons' group wouldn't just be about funding, then, but also about advocacy around commissions and production, arguing for (and arranging) acquisitions from exhibitions, generating word of mouth excitement and so on. KB: there would be also an opportunity to have artists involved as patrons. Would be interesting for the other members of the group.

For commissioning organizations, having some sense of where the work might go could also help in negotiations with the artists' galleries. DCA and Tramway recoupment clauses currently state that in the event of a sale (no time limit) they will recoup production costs only. This is, of course, difficult to monitor, and is premised on a relationship of trust. KB: galleries don't particularly like paying recoupment, and don't fancy the ongoing obligation (some galleries used to pay it up front instead, although that is happening less). Can try and protect the artist (some galleries will take recoupment out of their share) but really, that is between the artist and their gallery. All public institutions can do is try and ensure the return of public expenditure.

Need to argue strategically for an acquisition to a local collection: galleries and artists care about critical context, and also that the work will be looked after, and easily available for loan thereafter, (which might just count against Glasgow Museums, in the present instance). At the same time, all galleries are keen to make sales these days, so it is perhaps less of an issue, except in the case of major, sought after, one-off works.

Fact is that it is much harder to loan from Scottish collections than Tate. Should I meet with Ellen MacAdam (Acting Head of Glasgow Museums and Galleries)? She is aware of these difficulties.

### **ALTERNATIVE MODELS OF OWNERSHIP**

Is it worth thinking about a group that owns the works? MACBA participates in a multi-part partnership – the collection is owned by only one of the partners (which is not the building that houses them). A patrons' group that owned the works might potentially could free up bureaucracy, and enhance credibility. But it would have to negotiate a particular legal framework and enter into long-standing loan agreements with the galleries. Might be too difficult at first - all such organisations start small, but having a strong sense of where you want to go is very powerful. Many inspirational institutions such as MACBA and Van Abbemuseum have changes their structures to allow for these shifts. It's about having the will and energized/enlightened approach.

KB: NGS and Artists' Rooms should not be the only collecting in Scotland. Quite naturally NGS limits its purchases to things that work in its spaces (certain scale and character), which leaves out anything that Tramway might show, for instance. The merit of a non-building based group of patrons is that they might buy work regardless of such limitations. There is also the possibility of buying works for one museum (E.g. GoMA) that could be shown in another venue (Tramway, say). Even if we were buying to gift, some of the museums have other premises and other partners, which might allow for precisely this sort of flexibility.

## **SECTOR REPRESENTATION**

JW: would we also broker relationships between international collections and Scottish artists? Patrons' group wouldn't buy work for international collections, but would certainly cultivate links with other patrons' groups nationally and internationally (such as Cologne). This would allow us to introduce and promote not only Scottish collections, but also Scottish artists. MOMA Sydney patrons arriving 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> April 2010 during Gi.

Advocacy and knowledge role is very important – not clear if Amanda Catto will have the same remit in Creative Scotland as she did in SAC, where she was very effective conduit/disseminator of information, and obvious person to contact for specialist knowledge on the sector. But will those roles be more generalist in the future?

## **YOUNG PEOPLE**

Tramway are developing a young critics panel for Gi, investing in developing a critical language for contemporary art and ideas. Is there scope for a collaboration with DCA? DCA also talking about this as a priority across the new and existing venues in Dundee, including the V&A, Discovery, Museum of Childhood, etc. MIMA's Richter project: getting young people to visit Frieze magazine, and understand how the language gets constructed, etc. Tramway also thinking about getting young people to curate a youth theatre strand (mentored, sent to international forums etc). How could this link in with the young patrons' group? In applications to funding bodies, we could link with existing development projects at Tramway/DCA and so on. Could kick start the scheme quite quickly – mini action research projects. (Other aspects of the group will take longer to develop).

## **INTRODUCTIONS**

All happy to introduce visiting artists to patrons – a dinner would be a nice, informal way of doing it.

## ***FRUITMARKET GALLERY, EDINBURGH - 23<sup>RD</sup> FEBRUARY 2010***

Fiona Bradley, Director

Armida Taylor, Development Manager

## **CONTEXT OF THE FRUITMARKET**

General experience is that NGS are invited to consider works and they don't come, or they say they haven't the money.

Louise Hopkins (2005) was the last exhibition that an NCSS collection bought from. Fiona no longer up to date on NCSS partners' collecting policies, apart from City Art Centre.

As regards suggesting purchases to collections - wouldn't want to stand on toes of commercial galleries. Mungo came to see Skaer, for instance, and Fiona was happy to show it to him, because she'd heard from Doggerfisher that he was interested in buying it. Wouldn't necessarily happen the other way round.

Would be very interested to know more about NCSS policies, and would be more likely to get in touch with those curators if an appropriate show was coming up, and capitalizing on fortuitous connections.

### **COMMISSIONS**

Commissions follow a number of patterns. With the recent Esmee Fairbairn funding for 6 commissions over three years, the (few) parameters were in place from the outset (ie British, younger artists, had to help them move on in their career) so each commission followed a similar path. It was decided in advance how the money (£15,000) was to be divided between fee and production costs (studio time, paint, assistants, etc.), which made it very clear for the artists. Now seen as an exemplary model.

### **RECOUPMENT**

Within 2 years, FMG usually recoups 25% of the *selling* cost, and it is left up to the artist where that money comes from (i.e. from their cut, the gallerist's cut, or added to the price of the work).

The ACE guidance on recoupment is quite unclear, and very long-term; whereas 2 years seems to FMG to be the longest that a clause can usefully be applied (considering the difficulty of policing etc).

Couldn't build a commissioning fund based on recouping – it is a bonus at best. But enables FMG to safeguard VAT status.

EF funding has finished, so now the commissions are more ad hoc, and money has to come from other budgets. FMG have tried, in one case, to get gallerist to match funds, but that hasn't worked so far.

### **INTRODUCTIONS**

There are a number of patrons and collectors associated with FMG. So far, no gallerist has been anything but delighted at introductions that have been made (no commission is charged by FMG). FMG can pass on to the patron who to contact, and indicate a ball-park price (to avoid the patron's embarrassment if they can't afford it.)

This is a major part of the offer to FMG's own patrons. A valued benefit for them – would be difficult to offer that (and access to artists) to other people. Giving access to the *facilitator* of an autonomous patrons' group would be different - it would be expected that professionals should get introductions, and indeed it might be beneficial to the FMG patrons, rather than otherwise.

### **SHARING CONTACTS**

FMG knows how hard you have work to cultivate individuals up to the point where they will give money. Would be great to be generous with individual contacts, but there is a limit to how many projects each individual will want to support, and so there will be a certain amount of protecting one's investment in that person.

FMG's relationship with the group? They would ring us when something exciting is happening. FB likes the idea of FMG patrons paying for commission, and our patrons buying it!

## **FORUM/ FOCUS FOR INFORMATION**

Up to now, Amanda Catto is the person that knows everything that is going on, but will that be her remit in Creative Scotland? Forum could potentially fulfil this role instead. AT: if it isn't Amanda, perhaps it should be VAGA? KS: VAGA can't focus on contemporary collecting. AT: a lot of forums to feed in to! Fiona: A forum would require high-level participation to be of value. KS: don't often get commercial galleries in the room with exhibiting and collecting institutions. AT: Tina Fiske's forums have been effective because they have been part of time-limited research project, and everyone is eagerly awaiting the outcome. KS: the idea is that there would be a specific focus for each meeting etc. Quarterly would be too often – programmes and collecting don't change that often. AT: Dundee event was interesting, and there are cross-overs, but a lot was not relevant to FMG. Won't be relevant for everyone all the time. FB: also where in the country does one have the meetings? Fiona: maybe a single person could do this more effectively - someone that everyone trusts. AT: might be better if a Kirstie or Tina figure comes round for a coffee and finds out what is going on and shares their knowledge. FB: if they can build the confidence of an institution, staff are likely to say more in a one-to-one setting, particularly about projects that are not quite finalized. The minute a patrons' group has clout, the individual will be included in all the invitations etc. KS – enhancing their credibility would make it easier to attract more patrons.