

‘NATIONAL COLLECTIONS OF CONTEMPORARY ART’ PROGRAMME. PART TWO: APPLICANTS/ COLLECTIONS AND RESULTS/EVALUATION

Wojciech Szafrński

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań
ORCID 0000-0001-8420-4673

The ‘National Collections of Contemporary Art’ Programme was in its initial format addressed to four museums of contemporary art: Museum of Art in Łódź (MSŁ), Museum of Modern Art in Warsaw (MSN), MOCAK Museum of Contemporary Art in Kraków, Wrocław Contemporary Museum (MWW), of which the last three were then being established,¹ and it provided a systemic solution to the financing of collection extension (financing allocated through competition). The present paper analyses the praxis of application processing, applicants’ moves, basic strategy elements of collection formation, and it identifies the turning points in the Programme evaluation and the evaluation direction after 2019.

Application processing: applicants’ moves

The ‘National Collections of Contemporary Art’ Programme was generally perceived as seen against other programmes of the Minister of Culture and National Heritage as ‘exclusive’: addressed to four entities only (in the last edition three more entities were allowed to join in: the Ujazdowski Castle Centre of Contemporary Art, Zachęta – National Gallery of Art, and

the Centre for Polish Sculpture in Orońsko; actually, only the latter took advantage of applying and was granted some financing). The rational justification for covering so few entities with the possibility to apply can be found in the necessity to quickly consolidate mainly the collections of the newly-established museums² whose statutory goal was collecting contemporary art, the point included in the first Programme regulations (that edition run at the time by Zachęta – National Gallery of Art as operator), defining the goals and the kind of eligible activities.

Goals:

Creation and development of international strategic collections of contemporary art as a tool for dialogue and social education.

1. *Extension of contemporary art collections.*
2. *Effective use of contemporary art collections as the basis of generally available educational programmes.*
3. *Use of contemporary art collections as an element of advertising meant to shape a modern image of the regions.*

Types of eligible tasks:

Purchase of art works for strategic collections of contemporary art:

- *Purchase of art works of contemporary art to complement the so-far collection of the institution and creation of the additional possibilities for statutory activities as based on the collection.*
- *Purchase of pieces of contemporary art meant to engender a collection based on the presented concept and strategy of building a collection and means of its use.³*

In the course of the Programme's subsequent editions the criteria of applications' evaluation (together with the score) were specified in more detail, however, the main assumptions did not depart from the genuine model (this illustrated in the table below). It was the fact that the evaluation was classified in two categories that was of key importance for the overall evaluation of the application: the score assessing the factual quality (up to 60 points) by the Steering Team, namely experts appointed for each Programme edition, and the strategic and organizational value (up to 40 points) rated by the competition's operator (in principle, the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, MKiDN). Therefore, without a high score awarded by the Steering Team it was practically impossible to receive financing based on the score given by MKiDN. Furthermore, the sequence in which those ratings were assigned was crucial: the factual evaluation should follow the organizational and strategic ones, and not vice versa (which was the case as of 2016), since this allowed to 'arrange' the applications in the final list, thus decisive for the financing percentage, according to the order as wished by MKiDN.⁴

Within the factual evaluation what was assessed particularly highly were the genuine character/unique character of the collection and the convincing justification of the choice of the works planned for purchase. In practice, however, the first of those points was only copied in applications in subsequent editions; this can be easily understood, since the applicants worked thoroughly on the direction of their collection at the initial stage, possibly later only slightly modifying it. It was different as for the evaluation of the justification of the choice of the works for purchase. In this respect the applied format essentially differed among the applicants: from the best evaluated applications of MSN and MSŁ (MSN: applications worked out integrally by a team and coordinated justification of respective purchases with elements of the collection programme and pricings; MSŁ: applications as an 'assembled' whole from respective departments, with less precise referencing to respective collection concepts), up to more critically assessed by the Steering Teams applications submitted by MOCAK and MWW (in the case of both institutions the submitted applications usually referred to a much bigger number of works planned for purchase: at times, over 150 pieces, with a problematic justification for individual works as truly matching the collection programme and really consolidating it). In later Programme editions attention was also paid to market pricing and questions of conservation, which unfortunately were included under the same point (representing meagre score) as often the key element not only for the overall evaluation of the application, but also for comments to the applicants formulated by the Steering Team.

The general assumptions for collection creating/development presented by respective applicants slightly altered

over the years. What proved more challenging, however, was the implementation of those programmes with respect to the works proposed for purchase, particularly in the MWW and MOCAK applications: with those in mind the Steering Team spoke of 'omniism' of the purchases, lack of focus on outstanding works which the discussed Programme was to a high degree focused on.⁷

The issues related to the applicants' actions within the discussed Programme are interesting, since the sessions of the Steering Teams generally are not made public; the only part available for public information are just the general remarks within the summary report,⁹ or single comments as well as those given to respective applicants. While there were no meetings in the format: potential applicants – MKiDN – Steering Team members (after the end of a given edition of the Programme)¹⁰ many of specific comments or general comments on the Programme as such never reached the public domain. However, it is worth showing, if only partially, various actions of the applicants (positive and negative), all the more so as when the discussed Programme is no longer in place many comments may prove applicable to the currently run 'National Collection of Contemporary Art' Programme.

In my understanding what was of key importance in the applications' evaluation by the Steering Teams in various Programme editions was the respect for the autonomy of the institution, understood as respect for the choices made in art works submitted by the applicants. In the first Programme editions there was no regulation permitting the 'rejection' of the works; however, when it appeared in later editions, it was exceptionally rarely practiced: applied only in the event of works overpriced so highly that eliminating any margin for negotiation or for conservation reasons, or when the work selected turned out to be a fake. In the latest edition (and already in the new Programme following evaluation) such elements (without the above-mentioned mechanisms) began to appear. Interestingly, also the question of limiting financing level for respective applicants appeared: when managing a smaller programme, and first of all the analogical at the time 'Regional Collections of Contemporary Art' Programme, respective Steering Teams were always faced with the dilemma whether the best applications should be subsidized in 100% and the remaining (eligible ones) in a proportionally smaller percentage (e.g., 80% or 60%), or whether in this case, owing to the scarcity of financing, the Steering Team should recommend particularly the works that are worth purchasing or point to those whose purchase should not be the priority. The above-mentioned issue of respect for the choices made as for the works by museum curators led to the decrease in grants for the applicants' with less valuable applications (Programme's first editions) or to the recommendation as for the purchase priority (later Programme's editions) which, regrettably, did not correlate with the resources available in the Programme (see part 1 of the paper). At times, less financing was used than that assumed for the Programme.

Evaluation: turning points in the 'National Collections of Contemporary Art' Programme

The conducted analysis allowed to distinguish turning points in the Programme. They have been presented in the

Table 1. Evaluation criteria together with score in the Programme's first (2011) and last (2019) editions

	FIRST PROGRAMME'S EDITION (2011)		LAST PROGRAMME'S EDITION (2019)	
	Description	Score	Description	Score
Factual evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> genuine quality of the collection development concept in the context of the already existing collections in Poland and Europe collection cohesion possibility to implement the concept in both short- and long-term options⁵ 	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> uniqueness of the collection and its development concept in the context of the already existing collections in Poland and Europe justification of the choice of the works for purchase with respect to the collection's factual programme preservation of the most outstanding accomplishments of Polish and international contemporary art presence of the most valuable works of outstanding artists in the collection contributing to building the canon of contemporary art 	30
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> preservation and promotion of the most outstanding accomplishments of Polish and international contemporary art innovatory character and range of the research conducted into the collection co-creating and application of the 'good practice code' as for purchase, storing, and conserving works of contemporary art 	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> professionalism and experience of the individuals involved in the factual implementation of the task, including formation of a purchase committee/counselling college by the applicant submitting expert's opinion on the pricing of the objects planned for purchase, demonstrating updated knowledge of current market prices taking into account the programme of protection and preservation of the objects planned for purchase 	20
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> selection of the most valuable works of outstanding artists professionalism and experience of individuals involved in the factual implementation of the project 	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> connection between works proposed for purchase with research programmes conducted by the applicants use of the created collections in educational programmes 	10
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> strategic importance of the international collection of contemporary art for shaping the identity of the institution, town, region, and country 	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> genuine and valuable strategy for building and developing the collection of contemporary art 	10
Strategic evaluation ⁶	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> availability of the collection, possibly of works from the collection and their images, and the means to use them for educational and artistic purposes targeted at different age and social background groups of the public 	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> contributing to and application of good practices in purchase, storing, cataloguing, conserving, and digitizing collections of contemporary art, taking into account the works planned for purchase availability of the amassed collection, including the purchased works and of their reproductions in digital circulation means to use the collection including the works planned for purchase in educational activity targeted at the public of different age and social background groups, including the groups of impaired access to culture 	10
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> importance of the collection as a stable educational base for developing social competences and opening to experiment and innovation 	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> advertising strategy for the promotion of the applicant's collection of contemporary art in Poland and internationally 	5
Evaluation of organizational values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> professionalism of the submitted application organizer's experience in implementing cultural projects, particularly in view of their efficiency in submitting final reporting on previous MKiDN's subsidies 	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> professionalism of preparing the application and cohesion in presenting it, including details and transparency of the timetable, cost estimates, and task financing sources 	6
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> level of guaranteed financing 	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> evaluation of the budget presented in the application, in particular the relation between the financing applied for and the remaining financing sources 	4

Author's own study.

Table 2. Basic elements of collection construction and development programme as presented by MSŁ, MSN, MWW, MOCAK (based on the descriptions in Programme applications)⁸

STRATEGY: BASIC ELEMENT/CHARACTERISTIC	
MSŁ	Extension of the 'International Collection of Art of the 20 th and 21 st Century' with a <i>particular emphasis on the areas of its development, such as: global art, processing the tradition of modern art in contemporary art, relocation of the canon of modern art</i> . Focus on how in global art Avant-garde art is transformed, developed, and updated, bearing in mind not only factual, but societal goals as well.
MSN	<i>Constructing the collection with reference to changes that have occurred in the status and materiality of a work of art, in the institution-the public relation, as well as in the very function of a museum (not only of 'storage' of a work of art, but the place for its study, information dissemination, interdisciplinary experiment)</i> . Giving testimony to different artistic practices or media in the collection. Focus on the works emphasizing the importance of the Neo-avant-garde tradition, connected with new formats, e.g., registering of beyond-gallery artists' actions or experimental videos, and the emerging new forms of artistic expression which together with the developing Neo-avant-garde have impact on forms of traditional expression. The collection serving to <i>shape space for dialogue, building meanings, and analysis of phenomena both within the area of art, and other disciplines connected with contemporary culture, mainly social sciences</i> .
MWW	Building an international collection of contemporary art based on the native traditions of institutional criticism founded in the theory and curatorial praxis of Jerzy Ludwiński, thus aiming to create such an institution of contemporary art which is to operate as a <i>sensitive seismograph of changes occurring both within the domain of art, and in society</i> , while remaining open to an interdisciplinary dialogue.
MOCAK	Creating a problem-focussed landscape of contemporaneity. <i>Collection as an important tool of making friends with art. A collection of ideas which should contain criticism of the current world view and anticipation of the future one. Museum's task: to 'project' art, show to the public what art is and what it is for. Collection as a presentation of the artist-created commentaries on and objections to the surrounding world.</i>

Author's own study.

table, qualified either as positive or negative. It is important to add that some of the negative elements were not corrected or eliminated as a result of the Programme evaluation, although they were often emphasized; this particularly applies to the lack of the database of museum purchases conducted as part of this and other programmes, lack of a new programme for intervention purchases, or subsequent evaluations (so-called organizational and strategic) after the factual ones made by the Steering Team.

Final conclusions: Programme's evaluation

The many-years' operating of MKiDN's Programmes within the Collections system, namely the 'National Collections of Contemporary Art', 'Regional Collections of Contemporary Art', and 'Museum Collections' (later as Development of Museum Collections operated by the National Institute for Museums and Art Collections, NIMOZ) has been calling for evaluation (despite the introduction of the 'National Collections of Contemporary Art' Programme as of 2020). Although the introduction of the new programme beginning as of 2020 had been preceded by the assessment of the so-far operations of the two programmes, it did not lead, however, to eliminating the numerous negative experiences of the applicants, Steering Teams, and even MKiDN themselves. Additionally, this coincided with the change of the conditions of the operation of the entities eligible for financing within the highest financing section. Continuing the evaluation is not merely recommendable, but essential (bearing in mind the experience from the last years of the operation of the already new Programme). The new evaluation must not cause the entire ceasing of financing of the purchases for the collections of contemporary art not just for the reasons as obvious as the 'loss of the continuity of museum

narrative' accompanied by the lack of public purchases, but also, among others, for the effects stemming from the character of the market of contemporary art, 'speeding up' in building the market position of a substantial part of artists whose works should be of interest to public institutions; the justification for the purchase of art works of substantial artistic value with the awareness that the financing environments determined by the development of the art market change (the majority of really outstanding works shall never be available for purchase at a lower price, while the value of the purchased works increases); the continuously weak private sector in order to incur the majority of costs of financing culture in general (including the purchase of collections), which means that the role of the state in this respect continues really important; indirect support to the artists active 'here and now'.

The proposals for change in the so-far programmes, including the current one (since 2020) result from the so-far experience: lack of the earlier planned evaluation, with the Programme goals having been fulfilled to a substantial degree (namely, in particular the consolidation of the collections of the newly-established museums, created practically exclusively with contemporary art in mind); lack of their foreseen further development: as seen from the perspective of new financing sources for the collection and the target concept of acquiring and disbursement of these resources; competitive differences of the entities applying within the national and regional collections of contemporary art (today within the 'National Collection of Contemporary Art'); lack of the option of so-called intervention purchases (in-between Programme editions), both in view of the effect of so-called market deposit leakage and the appearance of objects in the art market (auction sale, but also gallery sale) of objects which may importantly complement collections; no access to the financing

Table 3. Operations of applicants in the ‘National Collections of Contemporary Art’ Programme

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
Entities prepared long-term collection strategies and abide by them with minor modifications only. This was helped by the stabilising factor that the institutions’ directors retained their posts, with the exception of MWW, which in the latter case had an impact on the selection of works, not so much on the very description of the collection strategy	The applicants were aware they would be allocated financing in the Programme regardless of the quality of the application, since the Programme budget was higher than the total sums applied for with collection purchase in mind (the exception: MOCAK was not awarded financing in 2018)
Applying for the purchase of works by artists both Polish and foreign (acknowledged or ‘on the rise’ in their artistic or often commercial career). As for the artists’ descent the percentage ratio was ca 82% to 18%.	Entities applied to purchase collections made up of a big number of objects (in some cases over 150).
Purchase of works by artists’ before their market pricing increase; justified lack of ‘chasing’ after works practically inaccessible due to exuberant prices; a much stronger focus on ‘here and now’.	Re-applying for the purchase of the same work in several Programme editions despite the doubts as for the purposefulness of the purchase raised by the Steering Teams.
Purchase of works which have untypical (or smaller) market potential, e.g., videos or installations (finally, purchases in those categories are financially helpful to the artists working e.g., exclusively in those media ¹¹	Use (less frequent with each edition) of the ‘copy paste’ format for the justification of the purchase of definite works
Professionalization of purchase committees in the institutions (participated by individuals who were not employees of the given institution). ¹² Providing identity of the individuals responsible for the pricing	Frequent overpricing of the proposed works without mentioning it in the application (2011–2014)
Justification of the selection of the works proposed for purchase improving with each subsequent edition	Unused opportunity to purchase objects in a multi-year programme available to the applicants in the first Programme editions (later editions did not provide such an opportunity)
Insisting on the correct valuation of works when the applicants notice the consecutive verification in this respect by the Steering Team (as of the 2015 edition)	Submitting purchase proposals connected to the collection only to an insignificant degree (‘forced’ justification)
Making more courageous decisions with Programme’s subsequent editions as for the purchase of works of substantial financial worth	Applying for a purchase of objects which were previously presented in temporary exhibitions of the applying institutions, assuming all the costs of prior transportation (although the work has already been transported)
Effective price negotiating with the artists, galleries (also using personal contacts) enabling so-called museum discounts, up to even over 20%	Listing as own contribution works which had earlier been purchased by the institution
Applying to purchase documenting artistic legacies	Failed care (often as a purposeful acting) to maintain an equal percentage of own contribution for all the purchased objects
Applying to purchase works by artists from outside the market circulation, yet important for Polish contemporary art (here also new discoveries owing to restored worth or a new narrative)	At times no information was provided who the works are purchased from. These, however, are infrequent cases due to the fact that they are easier to hide before the Steering Teams, yet not in the course of the overall procedure (hence the query during the Team’s meeting to MKIDN to explain these issues)
Professionalization of the programmes and activities in education and collection availability. Professionalization of the individuals employed at the institutions for price valuation (a wider market awareness).	On occasions, lack of criticism on the pricing carried out by entities ‘hired’ by the applicants, who even if they were prominent entities in the market, frequently unfamiliar with the gallery market, particularly the international one, they prepared poor valuation based merely on artinfo
Searching for so-called new names and thus ‘getting ahead’ of the art market	The Programme-financed purchase of works created in the year of the Programme’s edition, which have not joined the display circulation, have not been awarded any prizes, etc. (Such a purchase should be particularly thoroughly assessed by experts).

Author’s own study.

(even at a minimum level) for the smallest entities, of poorer financial and structural standing, albeit with intriguing ideas for a collection of contemporary art (positive exceptions in this respect can be seen in the Regional Museum in Jarocin and

Lodz’s VLEP); no support available, thus no targeted programme available, for operations in two important domains: acquiring external financing and periodical ‘study’ of own collections by institutions; no feedback to the art market and other public

Table 4. Results of the analysis of the evolution of the ‘National Contemporary Art Collections’ Programme in 2011–2019

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
Preserving communication between programmes for national and regional collections of contemporary art by leaving at least 1 or 2 members in the Steering Teams of both Programmes	No mechanism for automatic shift of (unused) financing from the ‘National Collections of Contemporary Art’ Programme to the ‘Regional Collections of Contemporary Art’ Programme
Introduction of the submitted price valuation requirements (also comparative) for works that are the application subject (as of the 2015 edition, in detail from the 2017 edition)	Applying for the works to be created in the future; problem eliminated through amendments to the competition regulations
Repeated 2016 edition in the form of the ‘National Collections of Contemporary Art’ Programme	Steering Team’s activity: unprecedented underscoring of all the applicants (below 30 points), this leading to awarding no financing (2016 edition). This scoring could not even be ‘made up’ for with the Ministry’s points: the applicants did not reach the formally required 60 points. This was widely commented on among artistic circles and in the media. ¹³
Introduction of the requirement (tiresome to the applicants) of submitting photographic records to accompany the works’ description (as of the 2016 edition). Earlier such a solution had been planned, though it was technically challenging in the first editions.	MKIDN’s evaluation subsequent after Team’s factual evaluation, having impact on the rating list (particularly as of the 2018 edition), maintained in this order also in the new ‘National Collection of Contemporary Art’ Programme. This provided the Ministry with a bigger potential to introduce changes in the rating list in the situation when the factual evaluation, namely of the Steering Team, should be decisive.
Resources secured for appeals (as of the 2017 edition)	Major resources allocated to the budget unspent. In practice, experts’ evaluation not taken into consideration ¹⁴
Steering Teams’ members avoided potential conflicts of interest and stepped down if such should arise	No changes introduced to the Programme in either of the editions as for the possibility repeatedly proposed to introduce intervention purchases in-between the Programme editions ¹⁵
The entity managing the Programme (here the Department of National Cultural Institutions) maintained the autonomy of the experts’ evaluation, there were no pressures on or even suggestions to Steering Teams in the course of evaluation (in either edition). The change in evaluation sequence occurred at a later stage: by the influence of decision makers on the rating assigned by MKIDN (subsequent points)	Lack of a more detailed scoring division within the factual evaluation, certain elements repeated; lack of the separation of the score within the factual evaluation applied to the pricing valuation and programmes of objects’ protection and preservation (assumed total score: 20)
Working out procedures for the Steering Teams’ sessions, this providing the possibility to modify experts’ rating in the course of the Team’s meeting	Lack of a database of art works purchased within the Programme as helpful to consult the works and prices by other entities (mainly museums)
Leaving the formula open for the understanding of contemporary art, this also allowing the purchase of e.g. classics of the Avant-garde art from the 1920s or 1930s	The necessity to ‘reserve’ works by the applying entities with the artists or dealers, which in the long-lasting procedure from October of a given year (time of submitting applications) until the subsequent year causes that a part of the works worth purchasing cannot be presented in the applications
Programme’s budget increases: the top one in 2012 to 8 million and in and as of 2014: 7 million and 8,050,000; exemption from own contribution with respect to the situation of a particular applicant	Not using all the financing allocated to the Programme (particularly in the last edition). Exemption from own contribution should not be discretionary, but based on the fulfilment of definite premises specified beforehand (this would be a difficult change, since all the programmes share one core)
The Programme animated the primary gallery market. The relations between the applicants and representatives of the gallery market should not necessarily be evaluated as negative, but as ambivalent: it is a natural process	No cyclical meetings held of the individuals involved in applications’ evaluation (also factual) with representatives of the applicants; weakened feedback in the applicants – MKIDN relations

Author’s own study.

institutions (as a reference point), namely a database of purchases of art works with public financing (BaZaM Project).¹⁷

One of the most essential elements of the change of the two programmes, i.e., the national and regional collections of contemporary art and the current ‘National Collection of Contemporary Art’ Programme is the necessity to identify

the final goal: it should be the establishment of an organism (institution) or a special-purpose fund, so-called Polish Art Fund (PAF) which would not only absorb the budget financing allocated to the development of art collections, but would also absorb as revenues other financing sources which should either be identified or animated thanks to the introduction

of pilot projects and final legal amendments. PAF could also fulfil other tasks and create programmes targeted at collections or contemporary art in general. It should operate in the

Anglo-Saxon arm's length body format (ALB) so as not to turn into an agency/competence centre/ institution reporting directly to MKiDN.

Abstract: The 'National Collections of Contemporary Art' Programme of the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage constitutes an interesting case of a systemic solution to the question of financing museum collections' purchases. Its implementation demonstrated changeability of action (both from the point of view of the applicants, and Programme's evaluators and organizer), while at the same time the genuine assumptions were maintained, namely the support provided to the major museums, most often newly

established, whose statutory goal would be and is collecting contemporary art. Turning points in the Programme, as well as the observation of applicants' strategies while the Programme functioned served as the basis for the Programme's evaluation, and led to replacing it with the 'National Collections of Contemporary Art' Programme, these, however, demonstrated failures in consistency, in particular without pointing to the final systemic solution in this respect.

Keywords: National Collections of Contemporary Art', programmes of the Minister of Culture and National Heritage, financing, public collections, museums of contemporary art.

Endnotes

- ¹ Programme of the Minister of Culture and National Heritage to finance purchase of contemporary art works in 2011-2019. The history of and the financing with the 'National Collections of Contemporary Art' Programme were analysed in the first part of the paper published in *Muzealnictwo*, 62 (2021), pp. 227-235.
- ² Therefore remarks of the Authors of Projekt autoewaluacji should be considered as little accurate: they claim that with respect to randomness even with a strong PCC for variables: factual assessment, organizational assessment, strategic assessment with the COLLECTIONS Minister's Programme (p. 82) and lack of the explanation in the Programme what a national collection of contemporary art is (p. 120). B. Fatyga, J.B. Bakulińska, *Projekt autoewaluacji i ewaluacji programów Ministra Kultury. Raport z badań. Propozycja metod i narzędzi*, Obserwatorium Żywej Kultury – Sieć Badawcza 2015, p. 37, <https://www.nck.pl/badania/raporty/projekt-autoewaluacji-i-ewaluacji-programow-ministra-kultury> [Accessed: 4 April 2022].
- ³ Programme of the Minister of Culture and National Heritage: 'Artistic Event- Priority 7 – National Collections of Contemporary Art' 2011, p. 1; no online access, available with the Programme-related documents (1st edition) at MKiDN's Department of National Cultural Institutions.
- ⁴ Such moves were particularly visible in the 'Regional Collections of Contemporary Art' Programmes and the currently ongoing 'National Collections of Contemporary Art' Programme in which in view of the large number of applicants financing is always insufficient, while differences in the factual assessment often only slight.
- ⁵ To possibility to apply for long-term projects was eliminated in the subsequent Programme editions, first of all for financial issues: MKiDN's financing planning and expenditures.
- ⁶ In the first Programme edition defined as 'Social value assessment'.
- ⁷ Analysis of the purchase of respective works is the study topic of the most experienced Programme's Steering Team member: Prof. Waldemar Baraniewski, and for this reason also for editing limitations excluded from the study.
- ⁸ Based on the descriptions made by applicants, with a particular regard for the applications submitted in the 2017 edition; documents available at MKiDN's Department of National Cultural Institutions. CRP Orońsko has not been included in the Table since it applied only once in the last Programme edition.
- ⁹ See e.g.: Minutes from the meeting of the Programme's Steering Team from 2012, http://www.mkidn.gov.pl/media/po2012/decyzje/20120613Protokol_z_posiedzenia_Zespołu.pdf [Accessed: 4 April 2022].
- ¹⁰ Earlier Team members' names had not been made public.
- ¹¹ The positive impact of the Ministry's programmes, beginning with the 'Signs of the Times' on the market, thus also on the artists, is also pointed to by M. Iwański, 'Jak świadomie obsługiwać fantazmy peryferyjnego rynku sztuki? Z Mikołajem Iwańskim rozmawia Tomasz Załuski', in: *Skuteczność sztuki*, ed. by T. Załuski, Łódź 2014, pp. 108-110.
- ¹² At times lack of the identity of the purchase committee with the committee evaluating deposit reception may in the future have impact on their repurchase.
- ¹³ See e.g., K. Sienkiewicz, 'Jaka sztuka jutro', *Dwutygodnik*, 2 (2016), <https://www.dwutygodnik.com/artukul/6465-jaka-sztuka-jutro.html> [Accessed: 28 May 2021].
- ¹⁴ At the same time it can be observed that expert's opinion (factual one) for that last competitions did not have any essential impact on the awarded the financing level; the applying institutions not just received financing lower than the applied for (admissible in the Programme), however without taking into consideration percentage differentiation, namely as subsidies of uniform value, regardless of the total value of the works assessed by the Steering Team and eligible for purchase (see Table for the 2019 Programme edition).
- ¹⁵ In this respect there is a constant need for a new programme which would complement the so-far ones. One of the worked out ideas is the already implemented 'COLLECTIONS-IMPRIMIS' Programme (authored by W. Szafrański).
- ¹⁶ This point as one of the goals of the Programme operation is evidently misunderstood by the Authors of the Report on the evaluation of the Minister's programmes. They mentioned (when tackling the issue of costs) that regulations should clearly specify that purchases should mainly be made directly from artists, and only in specifically defined cases from middlemen. B. Fatyga, J.B. Bakulińska, op. cit., p. 37.

¹⁷ For more see W. Szafrński, 'Jak prawidłowo wycenić dzieło sztuki współczesnej. Między praktyką a standardem wycen dokonywanych przez muzea', in: *(Ko)lekcja sztuki. Opieka nad zbiorami sztuki współczesnej*, ed. by M. Bogdańska-Krzyżanek, Warszawa 2021, pp. 18-25.

¹⁸ Different PAF models have been presented in the report commissioned by MKIDN's Department of National Cultural Institutions. W. Szafrński, *Finansowanie kolekcji sztuki współczesnej. Ewaluacja programów MKIDN – Koncepcje „PoWidoki Kolekcji” – „Polish Art Fund”*, Poznań-Warszawa 2019; documentation available at the Department of National Cultural Institutions at MKIDN.

Ass. Prof. Wojciech Szafrński (post-doctoral degree)

A lawyer; lecturer at the Faculty of Law and Administration at UAM in Poznan, University of Arts in Poznan, and the Jagiellonian University; Expert of the Minister of Culture and National Heritage for assessment and evaluation of heritage pieces; an adviser for art market in the programmes of the Minister of Culture and National Heritage; member of Team UNESCO Chair on Cultural Property Law (UO); e-mail: w.szafr@amu.edu.pl.

Word count: 4 827; **Tables:** 4; **Figures:** –; **References:** 18

Received: 05.2022; **Reviewed:** 06.2022; **Accepted:** 06.2022; **Published:** 08.2022

DOI: 10.5604/01.3001.0015.9451

Copyright©: Some rights reserved: National Institute for Museums and Public Collections. Published by Index Copernicus Sp. z o.o.



This material is available under the Creative Commons – Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0). The full terms of this license are available on: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

Competing interests: Authors have declared that no competing interest exists.

Cite this article as: Szafrński W.: 'NATIONAL COLLECTIONS OF CONTEMPORARY ART' PROGRAMME. PART TWO: APPLICANTS/COLLECTIONS AND RESULTS/EVALUATION. *Muz.*, 2022(63): 86-93

Table of contents 2022: <https://muzealnictworocznik.com/issue/14332>