### Dinner with Ethics Board members Janet Marstine and Robin Boast

26/09/2017

*Minutes: Nora [no verbatim account – made from rough notes during the meeting]*

Robin: Sees need to **bring others players in** (beyond the project group), and to **be more radical** in the project

Janet: sees and overemphasis on the exhibitions in detriment of engagement. Need to think about scalability: an exhibition can be small, but programme and engagement big.

Robin: Exhibitions are invisible. He recommends:

* deep visitor studies
* to choose stakeholders and work with them intensively towards/ in exhibitions

Tal: That’s a good point: to shift the focus more to programming. In fact it is not the EU that obliges us to have exhibitions. If we have exhibitions, this is for the sake of our own career as artists, and to produce an outcome that we can stand behind. The deliverables are no pressure in that sense.

Janet: A way to go is the Co-production with publics. This development has been highlighted in the *Educational Turn*. [the turn to make learning and engagement a central concern in the art field in artistic and curatorial practices, instead of a task that is posterior and at the periphery]

Nora: A problem to set this to practice: In our project, in the CCPs there are no educators. These competences are brought in by artists/researchers if they have such experience, but there is no function for education/engagement in the teams.

What we have tried to emphasize in the collaboration of WP3 with the CCPs is the chance of the CCP model to build engagement with stakeholders and publics already into the research process. Not afterwards as consultation, but as part of the knowledge production. But I have to admit we talked about it a lot but in many cases it did not happen so much in practice.

Robin: There’s no use in trying to “fix roles” again, that only an educator can do engagement work. Just do it, no matter who.

\*\*\*

Janet: What is missing in the project for a joint work for change in the heritage field is to make transparent your values. You have a logo for the project, you have colours, but you don’t have values? Recommendation: **write down values of the project**, as something to communicate and to be able to draw on in the individual work, which serves to compare your practice to.

Arnd: But the danger is that values become to homogenizing.

Nora: Very different projects, being radical means something different in each context.

Klaus: The project is radical as such. In that it rejects a certain idea of European identity, and sees conflict as part of heritage…

Karin: This probably is the start of a manifesto as Janet recommends it.

Janet: yes. Such a set of values could also structure the book you are producing.

Janet: The ethics board [Robin and her] would have been available to facilitate a session to identify these values. Can we help in the future?

\*\*\*

Klaus: an ethical issue for me is how to **translate our project findings into political advice for the EU**. These are artist run projects, this is not compatible.

Janet/Robin: do not agree at all. There is a chance to influence cultural policies, this is important.

Robin: It might be a privileged position of the project: they know you are artists, and they expect you to be weird.

Janet: You do have ideas where there is need for change. Just translate that into policy advice.

Robin: If artists then moreover bring this as a data-driven argument, you blow them off the socks.

Janet: You need really rigorous visitor studies. Also failure is ok, 2 case studies may fail, but you still build a strong argument on the others.

Robin: make sure that visitor studies, focus groups take place IN the process, not afterwards in the exhibitions.

Tal: Then we have to search for additional funds for visitor studies.

Nora: No, no way. This cannot be the part that falls out of the budget.

Karin: we offer help. But we cannot do it all in all CCPs.

\*\*\*

Janet: Do you have any other advisory board?

Anna: No, not really.

Janet: we went beyond the ethics brief in our discussion.

\*\*\*

Anna: My concern is how to achieve sustainability, in practice.

Robin: Good research projects do their work subversively. In the end they [the funders] want success.

Karin: So what to do with failure?

Arnd: This is no scenario. I don’t see any failure in the projects, only different forms of challenges.

Tal: for me a value is: To say what we want to say about historical justice. But we don’t want to hurt people in the museum.

Janet: Here your research comes first, before friendship. But radicality is not just being confrontational. Recommendation: Literature on organizational change.

Nora: Please share references. [Nora emails her]

Janet/Robin: We are open for further consultations. Not everybody writing to them directly, but collecting questions and concerns, which are then sent to them.