

NAFAE steering group minutes
16 September 2016
London Metropolitan University

Chair: Linden Riley
Present: Paul Haywood (via Skype), Howard Riley, Sheila Gaffney, Jenny Walden, Catherine Maffioletti, Joe Woodhouse, Michael Marshall, Chris Smith, Dean Hughes
Apologies: Andy Sheridan, Lisa Stansbie, Maggie Ayliffe, Jane Ball, Chris McHugh, Robert Williams

1.0 Previous minutes

13 May 2015

1.1 Minutes were approved.

2.0 Matters Arising

2.1 Research Practice Practice Research symposium

CS and JW suggested the success of the event should be noted. In particular, the input of Andy and Claire should be acknowledged and Robert Williams congratulated on the initiative.

2.1. It was pointed out that the presentations at conference and subsequently on the website needed checking for typos/errors. SG suggested some sort of quality control in place for Coventry. It was felt that, as subject association, we need to ensure that we convey the overall quality of the presentations and discussions at the events.

3.0 Foundation and the Creative Curriculum

Joe Woodhouse

3.1 Joe outlined the proposed conference and sought feedback which was lively and constructive. HR, PH and others broadly supported the need for a review of the value of Foundation in the current climate. PH expanded on related issues and challenges for widening participation, related to it's withdrawal. SG was unsure

about Fine Art and its direct relationship to the diagnostic course (subsequently focused on the helpfulness of the prevalence of Basic Design over other alternatives). MM and CS felt the ambitions could be clarified. HR felt it might draw a focus on the academic credibility of the work done on Foundation and PH echoed this, identifying a discussion on the skills, methodologies, behaviours and range of experiences we would want. Generally, it seemed that there was a need for the conference proposal/format to articulate the critical position and more fully reflect the politics involved in any changes. JWo to consider these fully.

3.2 LR asked Joe to clarify what NAFAE could do, this was to help with the call for papers, promote and endorse the event. It was also thought that NAFAE could help articulate this critical position and take the overall considerations of the event forward by disseminating somehow.

4.0 Support for an ‘Alternative Fine Art Education’, Islington Mill Studios, Salford *Jenny Walden*

4.1 Jenny was present as an advocate for the distinctive provision at Islington Mill and described a print initiative by Maurice Carlin that aimed to raise funds for the project. JWa wondered if NAFAE could spread the word and it was felt that an event or related activity could be included on the website and disseminated via a mailout. The unique offer of residency spaces might also be offered to members and whilst SG noted the difficulties in member subscriptions being used to directly support these initiatives, promoting the activities and opportunities was felt worthwhile. The visit to Schwitters’ Merz Barn was mentioned as an example.

4.2 Michael had submitted an account of or article based on this visit which Andy was due to put on the website.

5.0 Standing Items

6.1 Subscription update: A steady rise was reported

6.2 Treasurers update: LR suggested finances were not exceptional but reasonable

6.3 Website: All looking good.

6.0 AOB

6.1 The conference to run alongside the AGM on the 24th of March ‘The Artist as

Superconductor' needed a call out with themes and questions as soon as possible.

6.2 The rooms were known to be booked and Jane was due to be at the next meeting but this may need sending out before this.

6.3 PH discussed the thread of events NAFAE were involved with and reflected on the possibility of extending discussions between these – e.g. Paradox

6.4 DH outlined Paradox theme as broad interpretations on 'Diversity'. CHEAD also had a working title of 'Continental Drift' for a 2 day conference on the 16th and 17th of March(?).

6.5 LR raised the need to respond to: the Head Trust, All Party Parliamentary Group and the White Paper. PH suggested that discussions with the Head Trust/Ravensbourne were taking place and considering the type of advocacy that was relevant. CHEAD had already responded to the White Paper and DH/JW suggested utilising the infrastructure. CS suggested that CHEAD response was globalized and National Associations may want to define their perspective differently.

7.0 Next meeting

7.1 At Ravensbourne on the 25th of November, KM to book the space.

7.2 The January date was also suggested to be on Friday the 13th in London.