

Movement Research

Strategic Plan FY08-FY10

prepared in conjunction with

CALLAHAN CONSULTING *for the arts*

**Movement Research
Strategic Plan, FY08-FY10**

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	3
II.	Executive Summary	5
III.	About Movement Research Programs and Accomplishments Mission, Values and Vision	11
IV.	Overview of the Strategic Planning Process Goals Key Questions Timeline and Methodology	14
V.	The Context for Movement Research The Broader Environment Implications for Movement Research	16
VI.	The Perspective of Stakeholders SWOT Analysis Target Audiences Artist Feedback	20
VII.	The Plan Goals, Outcomes, Strategies, Action Steps, Timeline	26
VIII.	Financial Picture History FY04-FY07, Projected FY08-FY10, Pro-Forma Operating Assumptions	46
IX.	Conclusion Endnote on Terminology	49
X.	Roles, Responsibilities and Timeline	51
XI.	Appendices 1. List of Board of Directors During Planning Process 2. Participants in Artist Focus Groups 3. Average Rating of Strategies in Artist Focus Groups	60
XII.	History of Programs, Artists, Key Events, and Publications 1. Historical List of Board of Directors 2. Artist-in-Residence Program History 3. <i>Performance Journal</i> History 4. Movement Research Timeline	64

I. Introduction

On behalf of board, staff and artists, we are pleased to complete the first-ever Strategic Plan for Movement Research. This Strategic Plan covers three fiscal years, from 2008 to 2010. In many ways, the planning process was fueled by the extraordinary artistic community served by Movement Research and by the organization's long history of accomplishment, a history that reflects the social, political and aesthetic discourse that have engaged contemporary artists over the past three decades.

Movement Research (MR) encourages and facilitates experimentation in and development of movement-based performance work. Founded in 1978, MR is one of the world's leading laboratories for the investigation of dance and movement-based forms. Valuing the individual artist, their creative process and their vital role in society, MR is dedicated to creating and implementing free and low-cost programs that nurture and instigate discourse and experimentation. MR strives to reflect the cultural, political and economic diversity of its community, including both artists and audiences alike.¹

Movement Research accomplishes its mission through a range of programs that serve an average of 10,000 artists, students and audience annually. Ongoing classes and workshops are taught by artist educators and innovators; creative residencies are offered for choreographers and movement-based artists; an annual festival brings together leaders in the field; and publications and public events provide artists with forums for discourse on a broad range of issues.

Central to all of Movement Research's programs is a fundamental belief that experimentation is key to innovation. Through experimentation, artists discover different ways of seeing the world as well as new ways of thinking and developing ideas. (In contrast, mainstream culture tends to encourage emulation and homogeneity.) With greater abandon and freedom, artists can take risks that lead to new ways of working, and eventually to the development of their own unique identity. As a result, the artist's chosen art form can move forward as a whole in new directions.

In many ways, the history and challenges of Movement Research reflect the challenges of the contemporary arts field over the past decade. For years, the organization had stretched its small budget in order to have considerable and ongoing impact. But dwindling funding and the increasing difficulty of managing an under-staffed, under-capitalized grassroots organization in real estate hungry New York City pushed the organization to the point of crisis. Major funding cuts at the national and local levels exacerbated the situation. Furthermore, over the past ten years the organization has gone through three changes in executive leadership and its board became temporarily inactive. The organization lost its space at Context Studios, which had allowed it to offer classes in two studios. Competition intensified; Dance Space Center moved to a larger facility and offered higher salaries to teachers, which became a draw for some of MR's own faculty. Since all of this occurred prior to the advent of the internet, it became difficult for potential students to find out about classes and events. Through it all, MR remaining focused on process, experimentation and invention and chose not to formalize as a presenting organization. After Carla Peterson joined the organization as Executive Director in 2002, an assessment of its financial shortfalls led to serious questions about the organization's future, and a commitment to developing strategies that would ensure the survival of Movement Research.

Since FY02, Movement Research has made remarkable progress in pulling itself back from the brink of closing its doors. As one indication of its renewed momentum, MR retired its accumulated deficit in FY07. There are many to thank for this whirlwind of accomplishment: A re-energized and growing board and staff saw the organization through its day-to-day operations and struggles with a view toward the bigger picture. The focused work of artists reminded us of why we need to exist, and how our mission was vital and being fulfilled through their art, and the ripple effects of that art across the country. The support of the artist community itself, in the form of the relationships and feedback spoke

¹ Movement Research uses terminology about artists, aesthetics, and experimentation in specific ways, which are described in the Endnote on page 50.

volumes as to the necessity for the organization. As one artist said: "I love Movement Research...If there's one organization that can't bite the dust, it's Movement Research." Another artist commented, "I'm totally invested in Movement Research...Every time I engage with the community there, [the] repercussions [are] positive. It has been my home base...I've grown up inside the organization." Finally, a revitalized Movement Research has caught the attention of the funding field, with several renewing their support.

This plan would not have been possible without the diligent work of the board, staff and authors of the plan over the past three years (Board list, Appendix 1, page 61). Both board and staff, many of whom are active artist practitioners, met regularly. Input from the artist community was solicited through town meetings and focus groups. Peterson also sought advice from consultants MK Wegmann, Suzanne Callahan and Janice Shapiro.

This Strategic Plan was written over the summer of 2006 by staff under the direction of Carla Peterson, with input from the board and other colleagues, and then finalized in FY08 under the new directorship of Barbara Bryan and Kim Doelger. The following five goals were agreed upon:

1. Evaluate and modify programs to increase their relevance to and effectiveness for artists.
2. Secure unified space for programs and administration.
3. Increase board effectiveness, in order to meet current and future organizational challenges.
4. Strengthen administration by improving capacity of technological systems and procedures, as well as the capacity and conditions for staff.
5. Increase annual operating budget from \$355,000 in FY07 to \$500,000 by FY10, in accordance with the Mission and this Plan.

Within this Plan, a review of Movement Research's Programs and Accomplishments gives a sense of the breadth of activity. The Mission, Goals and Values section orients the reader to the framework for the plan. The Overview of the Strategic Planning Process describes the steps that the organization completed to gather information and make decisions about its future. The Context for MR illustrates the ways in which the arts world has changed since the founding of the organization, outlines the unique circumstances that face the organization today and makes the case for the importance of re-examination and planning. The Perspectives of Stakeholders shares the feedback provided by board, staff and artists/faculty in shaping the Plan. Then, the Plan forms the bulk of the document and relates the five goals to the strategies and action steps that will be taken over the next three years to meet these goals. The Financial Picture provides an overview of MR's financial history (FY05-07) and projections (FY08-10). The Roles, Responsibilities and Timeline grid is a tool to guide Movement Research's board, staff and committees through accomplishing the goals laid out in the Plan. Finally, the Appendices provide more detail on several aspects of the planning process and the History section profiles key MR programs over time, including the hundreds of artists served. While developing the Plan, it became apparent that presenting MR's 30-year history in a detailed chronology was essential, leading to the development of the comprehensive Timeline (History of Programs, pages 71-75).

One thing has been reaffirmed by this process and reflected throughout this document: Movement Research's artist-driven experimentation must continue. This plan charts the course for the survival of this vital organization.

Respectfully,



Ishmael Houston-Jones
President, Board of Directors



Barbara Bryan
Executive Director



Carla Peterson
Board member and
Past Executive Director

Board of Directors (during Planning Process): Barbara Bryan, Mary Lou D'Auray, P. Shane Elenbaas, Levi Gonzalez, Paul Langland, Jeremy Nelson, Janice Shapiro, Steve Staso, Guy Yarden. Staff: Barbara Bryan, Executive Director; Kim Doelger, Managing Director; Amanda Loulaki, Programming; Brooke Belott, Development Associate and Assistant Writer on the Plan; Rebecca Wender, Operations Manager; Trajal Harrell, Director of Special Projects.

II. Executive Summary

In summer 2007, Movement Research completed its first-ever Strategic Plan. This Plan covers three fiscal years, from 2008 to 2010. In many ways, the planning process was fueled by the extraordinary artistic community served by Movement Research and by the organization's long history of accomplishment, a history that reflects the social, political and aesthetic discourse that have engaged contemporary artists over the past three decades.

Movement Research (MR) encourages and facilitates experimentation in and development of movement-based performance work. Founded in 1978, MR is one of the world's leading laboratories for the investigation of dance and movement-based forms. Valuing the individual artist, their creative process and their vital role in society, MR is dedicated to creating and implementing free and low-cost programs that nurture and instigate discourse and experimentation. MR strives to reflect the cultural, political and economic diversity of its community, including both artists and audiences alike.

Movement Research accomplishes its mission through a range of programs that serve an average of 10,000 artists, students and audience annually. Ongoing classes and workshops are taught by artist educators and innovators; creative residencies are offered for choreographers and movement-based artists; an annual festival brings together leaders in the field; and publications and public events provide artists with forums for discourse on a broad range of issues. As compared to other organizations, which may focus on presenting, commissioning artists or offering classes, MR has always nurtured the development of the artist's creative process, from the inception of an idea onward. MR provides a safe environment that encourages risk, innovation, discourse, critical feedback and even debate, and it supports artists throughout the arc of their artistic lives.

Highlights of some of its most prominent programs are as follows: Movement Research at the Judson Church is a free, highly visible, low-tech forum held at the historic Judson Church on Monday nights for exploring new ideas- and works-in-progress, since 1991. The Artist-in-Residence (A.I.R.) Program provides commissioning funds, subsidized rehearsal space, and other opportunities for an intergenerational group of 6-10 emerging to established artists every year. MR/Publishing includes the well-known *Performance Journal (PJ)*, produced in print (and now, online) since 1991 as well as a new online interactive forum called *Critical Correspondence (CC)* that encourages critical dialogue about dance amongst its readership. Classes and Workshops, including month-long MELT Intensives, offer ongoing adult education taught by established, progressive dance artists and attract local, national, and international students.

The Context for Planning

The planning process emerged when Movement Research's leadership posed critical questions about its own survival, and what it would take to sustain and even grow the organization in contemporary times. In many ways, the history and challenges of MR reflect the challenges of the contemporary arts field over the past decade. For years, the organization had stretched its small budget in order to have considerable and ongoing impact. But dwindling funding and the increasing difficulty of managing an under-staffed, under-capitalized grassroots organization in real estate hungry New York City pushed the organization to the point of crisis. Over the past ten years the organization went through three changes in executive leadership and competition for funding intensified. After Carla Peterson joined the organization as Executive Director in 2002, an assessment of its financial shortfalls led to serious questions about the organization's future, and a commitment to developing strategies that would ensure Movement Research's survival.

Over its history, Movement Research has remained artist-centric in its programs, board and administration. Yet, MR exists in an utterly altered landscape today than when it was founded in 1978. Changes in funding, the economy, the needs of the younger generation, and New York real estate impinge more harshly now than ever before on artists and their ability to create and sustain their artistic practice. When the culture wars of the mid-1990s arrived and the U.S. Congress cut federal funding for the arts, the hardest hit were individual artists and experimental work – MR’s main constituency. The term “established artist” implies a level of stability that is often not there; in fact, long-time veterans currently struggle to make work *and* a living wage, now unable to sustain a livelihood off of teaching and performance in a way that was once possible. Yet, there is a community in New York, unlike anywhere else, that entices artists to stay rooted here. In addition, the needs and expectations of one of MR’s major target markets – college graduates – have changed significantly over the past two decades. Having experienced a broader curriculum than in a previous era, recent graduates now arrive in New York seeking classes at Movement Research, but also find similar offerings at competing studios. Unlike more mainstream studios, MR nurtures a community among artists interested in experimentation. However, sustaining this sense of community in an ever-intensifying real estate market in New York is a growing challenge. Organizations struggle to maintain their operations without permanent space. Some have moved to the periphery of the city, and the dance community has decentralized. In summary, given these pressures, MR had to look with fresh eyes at the artists it serves, the programs it offers, the fees it charges, and how all of the above would be marketed and administered.

The Planning Process

The planning process occurred over a three-year period. Former Executive Director Carla Peterson began preliminary research, seeking the guidance of consultants MK Wegmann, Suzanne Callahan, and Janice Shapiro. MR hosted its first Town Hall Meetings for Artists to obtain artist and faculty input. Over the next year and a half, board and staff examined programs, operations and governance, and revised MR’s vision statement (Shapiro had joined the board and facilitated these early planning sessions). Board and staff identified strategies and action steps, developed program histories, and created the Movement Research timeline. With input from the board, consultants and the artist community, Peterson, with Assistant Writer Brooke Belott, wrote a draft of the plan. In December 2006, Barbara Bryan began as Executive Director and Kim Doelger as Managing Director. At that time, with the support of Altria Group, Inc., the staff and board finalized the plan. Two focus groups comprised of artists were convened to review this plan and provide their feedback. Callahan Consulting for the Arts was engaged to facilitate the final planning meetings and artist focus groups as well as edit the plan.

Two Faculty Town Hall Meetings (October 2004 and March 2006) were led by Jeremy Nelson (MR faculty and board member) and Peterson to seek out faculty feedback and incorporate it into this plan. Faculty candidly expressed concerns around contracts, policies, and teacher selection, as well as class configurations. They also made recommendations for programs (all of which are incorporated into this plan’s details).

Two Artist Focus Groups (April 2007) were enthusiastically attended by 16 artists who had been involved with the organization at various points in their careers for a wide range of time periods. Clearly artists have deep loyalty to Movement Research and are interested in helping shape its future. Artists were asked to comment on and rate the goals and strategies in this plan in two ways: a) according to how useful the strategy would be to *their own needs as artists*, and b) how useful they perceived the same strategy would be *for other artists* in the community. It is notable that the ratings overall were quite high. While it is important to note that the ratings represent a small sample of the hundreds of artists that MR serves, they appear to indicate a close meshing of this plan with artists’ own needs. One artist in the focus group spoke for many others in describing

MR's distinct approach in serving artists in saying, "*Unlike most institutions that get more rigid, it responds to where organic need emerges...[Movement Research] is fluid enough that it can... meet artists halfway. That's what is so unique about it.*"

The Plan: An Intentional Redirection

The plan focuses on three major areas: programs, space and infrastructure.

Programs. Movement Research is modifying its approach to programs in order to respond to the needs of artists as stated above, with the goal of creating a closer sense of community. Serving artists at any stage of their career, MR is focusing on new opportunities for artists to interact by making stronger connections between its programs.

Space. Combining space for administration and programs will be key to the success of efficient operations, especially as Movement Research expands programs that require space.

Infrastructure. Movement Research can claim its place as an institution while it continues to operate in a grassroots manner. Since FY02, Movement Research has made remarkable progress in pulling itself back from the brink of closing its doors, having completely retired its debt in FY07. A re-energized and growing board and staff have seen the organization through its day-to-day operations with a view toward the bigger picture. Movement Research will always remain close to the ground in the way in which it works with artists and supports experimentation, but it must have an adequate level of staff and board support, along with the systems and technology, to support its vision. This shift began years ago and has been formalized more recently as its finances have improved and with the creation of this Plan.

Vision

- Movement Research will continue to expand and deepen its singular contribution to the history and evolution of dance and performance exploration.
- Movement Research will deepen its commitment to meeting the needs of artists, by both sustaining existing and developing new programs, as specified in its mission.
- Movement Research will enhance its long-term viability by both acquiring physical space and bolstering its organizational structure, which supports staff while engaging artists at all levels of programming and governance.

Goals and Strategies

Movement Research will achieve this vision through realizing the following five goals:

Goal 1. Evaluate and modify programs to increase their relevance and effectiveness.

[Movement Research is] an original place of freedom. In the Artist-in-Residence Program, there are no strict boundaries. This is unique. [Elsewhere] even if someone gives you a \$5 space grant, they want to know what you are going to do with that money... You have to have a product. [With MR] there are no rubrics for success. It puts the responsibility on me to build my own rubric [and] define my own space. [They] make that space available for the freedom of creation.
—An artist in the focus groups

The measured growth in MR's infrastructure over the next three to five years as guided by this Strategic Plan will increase its capacity to support its mission. This direction calls for a clear-eyed evaluation of all programs, the majority of which were initiated during the late 1980s and early 1990s, to ensure that they vigorously address the current needs of experimental artists and

anticipate future needs. The evaluative process will drive decisions. Because this goal is the most complex of all five, its strategies are presented in some detail:

- Develop an Artist Advisory Committee (AAC) and structure for gathering information about programs from artists, including criteria and definitions for experimentation. This Committee will meet numerous times annually and will include faculty, artists-in-residence, artists who serve as board members, and possibly performers from the Judson Church series.
- Develop support mechanisms for teachers. The city's growing economic challenges for artists strengthen MR's resolve to keep class and workshop fees low and affordable, yet guarantee a minimum fee to teachers. Phased-in support that consists of first a subsidy and later a guaranteed fee will provide a necessary cushion for teachers as they develop both their own teaching abilities and a student base.
- Expand opportunities for artists through partnerships with dance presenters, arts organizations, and/or colleges/universities. This includes exchanges between out of town artists and artists-in-residence where they can perform, teach, and dialogue with other artists.
- Extend the Artist-in-Residence (A.I.R.) Program to two years to provide artists with the necessary time, space, funds and community base to evolve more substantially.
- Revamp marketing strategies to enhance the profile of programs, in order to increase their visibility and utilization. A two-phased marketing plan would include a more interactive website that would more deeply engage the community in aesthetic concerns and would target a growing constituency, including colleges and universities. A first phase, implemented in the near future, would increase visibility for MR's existing programs, reach constituents more consistently and expand its base. A second phase would coincide with securing new space (should this happen), which is addressed in Goal 2.
- Building on its success, consider making modifications to adapt the Judson Church program to current artist needs, to ensure that the series stays true to its intention of fostering experimentation, while also maintaining its high visibility.
- Utilize MR/Publishing to encourage discourse among movement-based artists as well as with artists of other disciplines. Both the online *Critical Correspondence* and hard copy *Performance Journal* will intentionally encourage more interdisciplinary discourse and incorporate MR faculty.
- Create options for Student Residencies that involve long-term, in-depth study, in a manner that would serve artists with a variety of needs. This may eventually include an accredited program for international students.

Goal 2. Secure unified space for programs and administration.

Over the years, Movement Research has identified partnerships with other organizations and individuals to create access to space. The organization has always rented its administrative and studio facilities, and thus been subject to the challenges of New York City real estate and tenant-landlord relationships. As MR expands its Artist-in-Residence Program and increases its class and workshop offerings, it will need to pursue spaces that can both enable these programs to continue and, in the long-run, reunite programs and administration under one roof. In both focus groups, artists were unanimous about how important it is for MR to have a physical home. By establishing a committee to address this important question and conducting research, the board would position itself to make an informed decision about the best option for space with a higher degree of confidence.

Goal 3. Increase board effectiveness, in order to meet current and future organizational challenges.

MR will increase the number of board members from 8 to 16 and increase its committees' effectiveness by more equitably sharing workload. In addition to expanding the board, working committees are needed. The Artist Advisory Board would be renamed as the Artist Legacy Board and anchor the organization in its history. To ensure more effective board/staff relations, the board will more clearly articulate its roles and responsibilities and delineate what work and projects the board may take on in a volunteer capacity and what is expected from staff. Lastly, the board will utilize its existing board expectations document to encourage full participation; this document will be used to evaluate current members and recruit new ones.

Goal 4. Strengthen administration by improving capacity of technological systems and procedures, as well as the capacity and conditions for staff.

MR's level of activity, remarkable given a modest general operating budget that averaged \$270,000 from FY04-FY06, is largely due to a deeply dedicated, albeit under-compensated and overextended, staff, and a strong work-study and internship program. However, the staff structure and salaries remain inadequate to effectively manage these necessary, but time-intensive, programs and services. The organization's success in the creation of a healthy, sustainable administrative structure will determine its future capability to meet its mission, maintain and grow its services, and provide an efficient and supportive working environment. In both focus groups, this strategy for improving administration was rated the highest of all strategies, indicating that artists clearly recognize this as a high priority.

MR will improve the capacity of personnel, by revamping its structure, pay rates and benefits. Creating new positions will strengthen the organization by supplanting its over-reliance on interns while also increasing its earned income capacity. In addition, MR will improve the capacity of technological systems to enable more efficient administration in a wide variety of ways. Lastly, MR will improve its administrative policies and procedures. MR will enhance its organizational systems by creating a central contact database that houses mailing, e-blast, press, advertisers, students and donor lists; obtaining the software and equipment to produce marketing materials in-house; developing a plan for its archives, storage systems and inventory; and updating its computer network and web design capabilities.

Goal 5. Increase annual operating budget from \$355,000 in FY07 to \$500,000 by FY10 in accordance with the goals of the Strategic Plan and mission statement.

In budget projections, capacity building funds will need to be secured to support administration, facility planning, and program expansion. Funds will be expensed over a three-year period, while the organization continues board expansion and strategic, contributed income growth.

MR will develop short- and long-term strategies to increase earned income. Building on growth of income from classes, MELT intensives, a public school program, and a space rental program, MR will increase journal ads and subscriptions, festival attendance, and class attendance. In addition, staff will re-evaluate the class and workshop fee structure. Similarly, it will develop strategies to increase contributed income. MR will create a fundraising committee, a case statement, and an annual fundraising plan. It will expand on its current strategies for cultivating individual donors by increasing board giving, enhancing its annual appeal, expanding its contact database, and by creating a membership program. MR will also revisit its board 'give/get' contribution levels annually. MR will take steps to stabilize the organization's financial base, taking into consideration positioning the organization as a viable capital campaign candidate. MR will seek the advice of outside counsel with expertise in this area.

Conclusion

The planning process has reaffirmed Movement Research's vital role in the development of contemporary artists and art forms. This Plan has laid out a direction, and specified a course of action, that fits the organization's mission and vision while attempting to remain reasonable and feasible. Creating and approving this Plan has strengthened the resolve on the part of the board and staff to fulfill that vision.

Movement Research is deeply grateful to its supporters – the funding community, independent artists, individuals and peer organizations – and looks forward to continuing these partnerships. Such support has been instrumental in enabling this community-based organization to begin to strengthen its administrative infrastructure and more fully nurture, support and sustain the creative work of experimental artists in New York City as they, over time, inform the evolution of dance itself.

Finally, Movement Research is most grateful to the artists, their art and their experimentation, which drives its very existence.

III. About Movement Research

Programs and Accomplishments

Movement Research, over time, has influenced the evolution of contemporary dance languages through both the programs it has initiated and the community of artists that it serves. Work by national and international choreographers seen on main stages throughout the world today has been informed by the ongoing rigorous investigations that have taken place under the aegis of MR over the past three decades. MR plays this critical role by giving artists the time (sometimes years) to conceive of, and grow, their ideas in a safe and open environment that is accepting of work in its early stages and not focused on a final product. As compared to other organizations, which may focus on presenting, commissioning artists or offering classes, MR has always nurtured the development of the artist's creative process, from the inception of an idea onwards. MR provides a safe environment that encourages risk, innovation, discourse, critical feedback and even debate, and it supports artists throughout the arc of their artistic lives.

Such experimentalists as DD Dorvillier, Lucy Guerin, Miguel Gutierrez, Deborah Hay, Ishmael Houston-Jones, John Jasperse, Yvonne Meier, Sarah Michelson, Jennifer Monson, Tere O'Connor, Donna Uchizono, Cathy Weis, and Yasuko Yokoshi, among many others, have used Movement Research as a base for their explorations over the years. In turn, these artists, many of whom are former Movement Research Artists-in-Residence, have influenced the next generation of movement-based artists – such artists as Luciana Achugar, Jeremy Wade, and Ann Liv Young, among others – by teaching, performing new investigations at Judson Church, and advancing the critical discourse in MR public forums and publications.

Artists play a primary role in shaping programs by serving as panelists (for the Artist-in-Residence Program and Movement Research at the Judson Church), editors and writers for publications (such as the *Performance Journal* and *Critical Correspondence*), and curators (for the Movement Research Festival).

Building on its venerable legacy, MR is dedicated to the creation and implementation of **free and low-cost programs** that:

- 1) Bring a diverse, intergenerational community of artists and audiences together in an ongoing exploration of new dance and movement-based ideas-in-progress;
- 2) Encourage and inform artists' innovative work that is later produced on presenting organizations' stages and in non-traditional venues, here and abroad; and
- 3) Stimulate dialogue and interactions within and across dance, other art forms and the civic community.

Performance and Related Dialogue

- **Movement Research at the Judson Church** is a free, highly visible series held at the historic Judson Church on Monday nights. The low-tech form has allowed artists to explore new ideas and works-in-progress since 1991. It annually features the work of 50-70 progressive movement artists at all stages of their careers.
- **Open Performance** is a regular series of non-curated shared showings, for artists at all stages of their development. Held twice a month, it includes a moderated audience discussion. Over the course of the year, it shows 75 artists' works-in-progress.
- **MRX/Movement Research Exchange** spurs interaction and exchange among independent choreographers and their peers from within and outside the US. It enables artists to travel outside of their home environment through intensive residencies and tours.

- **Studies Project** is an artist-curated series of panel discussions. Instigated by the dance and performance community, proposals are accepted on an ongoing basis. An average of 26 artists and 350 audience members participate each year.
- **The Movement Research Festivals** bring together nationally and internationally acclaimed improvisers and dance artists. The Festivals explore contemporary dance forms through performances, classes, workshops, contact jams, multimedia installations and forums. Performance formats utilize different sites and offer alternatives to more traditional proscenium presentations. In FY07, a new two-part structure with activity in both the fall and spring was launched, which involves both artists and programming staff as curators. Festivals have an average annual attendance of 1,400 and feature more than 145 artists each year.

Ongoing Artist Residencies

- **The Artist-in-Residence (A.I.R.) Program** provides commissioning funds, subsidized rehearsal space, and other opportunities for investigative discourse to 6-10 emerging and intergenerational artists.

Publishing and Discourse

- **MR/Publishing** includes the *Performance Journal (PJ)*, a print and online publication produced since 1991, and the online *Critical Correspondence (CC)*, an accessible web log which develops critical discourse about dance, launched in 2006.

Education and Mentorship

- The **Classes and Workshops series** offers low-cost, ongoing adult education taught by established, progressive dance artists, frequently those seminal in the discipline, attracting local, national, and international students. Offerings reflect a teaching philosophy that values the individual experience of each student and encourages a rigorous questioning of traditional class models to arrive at new approaches to movement. With 40-60 artists teaching annually, MR's classes and workshops attract an average of approximately 5,200 students per year.
- **MELT Intensives** are a series of daily workshops in technique, somatics, contact improvisation, composition and other areas offered for a total of eight weeks each summer and winter. Taught by 25 of Movement Research's internationally recognized faculty as well as acclaimed guest artists, these workshops provide an introduction to the range of practices and to the artists who work within MR's programs.
- **Dance Makers in Schools** matches artists with strong teaching skills and innovative methodologies with children through weekly dance classes.
- **The Work-Study Program** enables 15-20 artists annually to assist Movement Research staff in exchange for free classes and workshops. The Summer Intern Program, launched in 2007, is designed to provide college credit and experience in non-profit administration to talented students.

A snapshot over a single year gives a sense of the level of annual activity and the ways in which artists are served. In FY07, over **40 artist/teachers**, many considered seminal in the field, led workshops and classes at Movement Research for over **5,400 students** from the U.S. and around the world; over **400 artists presented new performance work** and works-in-progress to diverse public audiences of over **4,800**; **10 experimental choreographers were selected for the Artist-in-Residence Program**; one Belgian artist took three weeks of free classes with MR as part of a new MRX/Movement Research Exchange relationship with P.A.R.T.S. in Brussels; **52 artists participated in 16 interviews and 5 special projects for *Critical Correspondence***; **5,000 copies of *Performance Journal #30*** were published, featuring the work of **27 contributors and five editors**; one choreographer provided inventive dance classes throughout the year to over **250 public school children**; and **29 work-study students and interns** assisted MR and in exchange for the chance to learn administration skills and gain free access to workshops and classes.

Mission, Values and Vision

As part of the planning process, the board revamped the mission, values, and vision as follows:

Mission

Movement Research (MR) encourages and facilitates experimentation in and development of movement-based performance work. Founded in 1978, MR is one of the world's leading laboratories for the investigation of dance and movement-based forms. Valuing the individual artist, their creative process and vital role within society, MR is dedicated to the creation and implementation of free and low-cost programs that nurture and instigate discourse and experimentation. MR strives to reflect the cultural, political and economic diversity of its community, including artists and audiences alike.

Movement Research accomplishes its mission through a range of programs that serve an average of 10,000 artists, students and audience annually. Ongoing classes and workshops are taught by artist educators and innovators; creative residencies are offered for choreographers and movement-based artists; an annual festival brings together leaders in the field; and publications and public events provide artists with forums for discourse on a broad range of issues.

Movement Research's programs are served by an infrastructure that is ready to adapt and respond to artists' needs; a dynamic, interactive home base for experimentation and the development of new work; a creative community hub for critical dialogue; and a launch point for artist-driven initiatives. We invite artist participation throughout the organization, helping to build leadership in dance and culture, and ensuring that MR maintains an ongoing connection with the perspectives of artists.

Values

1. Movement Research values artists as a vital force in the world.
2. Movement Research appreciates a wide range of approaches to expression through movement.
3. Movement Research values the research process as an important part of creating work.
4. Discourse is crucial to Movement Research's operations, both in regards to creative work and administrative oversight.
5. Movement Research honors today's practitioners at the same time that it recognizes the work of experimental artists that have come before.

Vision

- Movement Research will continue to expand and deepen its singular contribution to the history and evolution of dance and performance exploration.
- Movement Research will deepen its commitment to meeting the needs of artists, by both sustaining existing programs and developing new ones, as specified in its mission.
- Movement Research will enhance its long-term viability by both acquiring physical space and bolstering its organizational structure, which is designed to support staff while engaging artists at all levels of programming and governance.

IV. Overview of the Strategic Planning Process

In spring 2004, the Movement Research board and staff identified the goals and key questions to be addressed during the strategic planning process.

Goals for the Planning Process

- Examine the organization's current status (programs, operations, governance, and finance).
- Determine strategies to stabilize the organization and ensure its continued vitality.
- Move the organization closer to realizing its full potential as a creative laboratory for artists.

Key Questions

The questions below were asked throughout the process in order to direct MR's activities over the next several years:

- How do we envision better serving Movement Research's key constituents?
- How is Movement Research currently perceived by the artist community?
- Based on the above information, what is the range and amount of activity that Movement Research can plan to accomplish in Year 1, Year 2 and Year 3 of implementing this Strategic Plan?

Timeline and Methodology

The planning process took place in three phases, as follows:

▪ **Phase 1: Initial Research (2003) and Exploratory Meetings (May 2004 – September 2004)**

Assessing the need for organizational planning at this juncture in MR's history, Peterson began preliminary research for a strategic planning process soon after assuming the position of Executive Director, seeking the guidance of consultants MK Wegmann (CEO, National Performance Network) and Suzanne Callahan (Founder and CFRE, Callahan Consulting for the Arts), both of whom she had worked with on creating the National Performance Network's FY02-FY04 Strategic Plan. Shortly thereafter, Janice Shapiro (former Program Associate, Culture, The Pew Charitable Trusts and then Managing Officer, New York Foundation for the Arts) agreed to join the board and facilitated most of the planning meetings (from May 2004 to June 2006). MR hosted its first Town Hall Meetings for Artists (February 2004) and Faculty (June 2004) to obtain artist and faculty input.

▪ **Phase 2: Continued Dialogue and Assessment (October 2004 – March 2006)**

Over the next year and a half, board and staff examined current programs, operations and governance, in ongoing dialogue. During this time, six Strategic Planning Meetings were held, in addition to three Board Meetings at which planning was part of the agenda. During this phase, specific elements of the Plan were developed and revised via group feedback including the mission statement, vision statement, goals and strategies.

▪ **Phase 3: Writing, Review and Finalizing the Plan (April '06 – April '07)**

At the planning meeting on May 5, 2006, the board approved the Mission, Programs, Values, Vision and SWOT Analysis; they then refined the goals and developed strategies and action steps for achieving each goal. A timeline for completing the Plan was agreed upon. The Strategic Plan

was written over the summer of 2006 under the direction of Carla Peterson with Brooke Belott as Assistant Writer and input from the board, colleagues and artists.

In early 2007, Barbara Bryan began serving as Executive Director with Kim Doelger as Managing Director. At that time, with the support of Altria Group, Inc., staff and board updated the internal and external circumstances and recapped its mission and values in order to finalize this plan.

Two focus groups comprised of artists were convened with the express purpose of reviewing this plan, and providing their feedback. (An honorarium of \$150 was offered in appreciation for their time.) The artists who were invited to the focus groups included young, mid-career and more established artists, who had been in New York for a wide range of amounts of time, from one to 31 years. They had interacted with Movement Research in a variety of ways: through A.I.R., Judson, *Performance Journal* (both editing and contributing), *Critical Correspondence*, Open Performance, and the MR Festival. They had participated in classes and workshops as both students and teachers. Several had served as panelists for various programs and one had been on staff. Four had served on the boards of other nonprofits. The names of the 16 artists who participated appear in Appendix 2 on page 62.

Each focus group was led through a discussion of the plan, goal by goal, and asked to respond to other questions of interest to Movement Research. In addition, artists assigned numerical ratings to each strategy in the plan. The artists spoke to the plan's relevance to their needs, and its appropriateness for the community of artists who MR serves. Their feedback has been incorporated, and individual comments – including endorsements and caveats – appear within the plan. MR is grateful for their involvement.

Callahan Consulting for the Arts was engaged to facilitate the May 5, 2006 meeting and subsequent planning meetings to allow Shapiro to participate as a board member. Callahan's firm also edited the plan, facilitated the artist focus groups, and developed the Context section.

The Movement Research Timeline (History of Programs, page 71-75), which provides a broad stroke delineation of the organization's history, underwent substantial community review by individuals including founders, former Executive Directors, former staff, and artists active in the MR community at various points in its 30-year evolution.

▪ **Phase 4: Dissemination**

As agreed in the final planning meeting, the FY08-FY10 Strategic Plan will be distributed to past, current and prospective funders. The Plan will also be sent to leaders in the contemporary dance field and copies will be made available to the artist community on Movement Research's website. This plan will be used at each annual meeting when staff and board will review and update goals and strategies, and evaluate its progress. Updating it will ensure that it reflects and responds to the constantly shifting landscape of priorities, opportunities and challenges.

V. The Context for Movement Research²

“If artists believe Movement Research can still serve their investigative processes and the development of the form, I intend to see that it does. With these artists, the staff and board can re-envision its structure. Till the soil, light some fires. That is, if the artists and this moment in history will have it, want it, guide it and participate in it.”

Carla Peterson, Former Executive Director, (June '02-September '06),
Adapted from *Performance Journal #26: The Model?*, published March 2003

As this comment states, at the onset of the planning process, and with the organization's future uncertain, Peterson affirmed her confidence in Movement Research's mission, but questioned what form the organization should take to best meet this mission. In the past decade, MR has operated in a difficult external environment, which exacerbated a number of internal challenges. In the end, its revitalization has grown out of its adherence to its mission and vision; its strong relationships with artists; and its board and other loyal supporters, including funders, who are committed to the organization's future. Movement Research exists in an utterly altered landscape today, than when it was founded in 1978. Changes in funding, the economy, the needs of the younger generation, and New York real estate impinge more harshly now on artists and their ability to create and sustain their artistic practice than ever before.

The Broader Environment: Funding, Training, and Working within New York City

Funding. When culture wars of the mid-1990s and Congressional mandates brought subsequent funding cuts, the hardest hit were individual artists and experimental work, MR's main constituency. In 1995, the NEA stopped funding individual dance artists, as a recent report details: “When cuts in support crippled the ecosystem for dance, the loss of support...placed less value on the creative process and new work...as emphasis shifted away from the artist and his or her work, and toward the effect of their projects on the community.”³

Although some funding programs do support artists, most require nonprofit status or a fiscal sponsor.⁴ Attracting an ever larger pool of applicants, they have become even more competitive; the ratio of applications to grants is as low as two percent.⁵ Allocations from government funding sources like the NEA and NYSCA remain flat; adjusting for inflation and higher overhead costs, government support has actually decreased. The aftershocks of these reductions have major implications for why service organizations such as MR have struggled. In a national study⁶ conducted in 2000, Sally Sommer writes:

The most devastating effect of the NEA cuts...was the strain on the service organizations and the infrastructure of feeder systems. The loss of these systems caused the array of opportunities that allowed artists to develop, self-produce and be presented—the very

² Developed by Callahan Consulting for the Arts, with input from the MR Board.

³ Callahan, Suzanne and Brooke Belott. *Artist-College Collaboration: Issues, Trends and Vision*. National College Choreography Initiative, Dance/USA, 2003. page 4.

⁴ Such programs include the National Dance Project, Creative Capital, and The MAP Fund.

⁵ For example, in the past four rounds of Creative Capital (one of the few funding opportunities available to individual artists without a fiscal sponsor) the percent of applications funded has averaged 1.6%. According to Creative Capital's report *At the Intersection*, this percentage varied from 1.2% to 1.9%. When the first grant cycle was launched in 1999, 1,810 proposals in four disciplines were received—more than double the number expected. In its most recent cycles (2004 and 2005) which focus on two disciplines each, they received a total of 5,491 proposals, representing an increase of 303% from 1999.

⁶ Sommer, Sally and Suzanne Callahan. *National Comparative Study of Dance Communities*, part of a larger unpublished report commissioned by the Pew Charitable Trusts. This section was published in Dance/USA's *Dance in the San Francisco Bay Area: A Needs Assessment*. Page 70.

aspects that allow their art to mature and be recognized—to largely fall away....Without those alternative spaces, there are no environments where stuff can evolve, where the relationship between the artists and producers, who are, in the best of circumstances in direct conversation, can grow.

The result was conflicting expectations: The pressure grew for service organizations to ramp up their “subsidized” programs, to provide what artists could no longer afford to pay for on their own, at a time when funding for services itself was also being cut. This tension between what service organizations were expected to do, versus how they would pay for it, usually went unstated; well-intentioned arts administrators and meager boards were determined to help their artistic community survive, by cutting budgets, unintentionally incurring debt, and making dramatic personal sacrifices (often in the form of salary) to hold things together.

Life as an Artist in New York. Movement Research came of age during a time when artist collectives were taking over spaces, including churches, schools and lofts. But, the ever-intensifying real estate market in New York, and in particular the boom of the past several years, has made it even more difficult for organizations to sustain their operations without permanent space. In recent years, organizations (particularly the newer ones) that are without permanent space have moved to the outer boroughs. The dance community has decentralized, with spaces and organizations setting up shop in Brooklyn as well as Queens and the Bronx. Although MR historically was tied to downtown New York, the artists it serves are increasingly dispersed throughout the outer boroughs. As one artist explained, maybe at one time “downtown dance,” or experimentalism, took place in lower Manhattan neighborhoods, but now it is ephemeral: “Downtown dance is wherever you can pay rent.” Movement Research is considering locations outside of Manhattan, if the right space and circumstances come along.

New York City remains the site of choice for many artists to live and make work, even as it becomes more difficult to balance creative needs and economic survival, requiring a bigger commitment than ever before. As well, the term “established artist” implies a level of stability that is often not there; in fact, long-time veterans now struggle to sustain a livelihood through teaching and performance careers, as what was once possible becomes less viable. Increasingly, artists use New York as a “home base,” leaving for residencies, touring, or rehearsal residencies for part of the year, or taking flexible positions at colleges. Yet, only a small number of artists receive these types of opportunities. The community in New York – the density of like-minded artists exploring similar ideas – entices artists to stay rooted there. Organizations like Movement Research provide an unparalleled meeting place where they can teach, train, and/or rehearse.

Training and the Interplay with Higher Education. The needs and expectations of one of MR’s major target markets—college graduates—has changed significantly over the past two decades. Historically, many dancers, particularly those who gravitate toward contemporary forms, have come to New York after graduating from college. These days they are not only studying technique, but also approaches to choreography and critical thinking about art-making. Once leaving the campus, they seek out classes at Movement Research, but they may also find similar offerings at competing studios. However, unlike more mainstream studios, MR nurtures a community that encourages experimentation in artistic practice.

Implications for Movement Research: Subsidy, Community, and Ownership

Movement Research's path to stability has involved a re-examination of mission in light of the above circumstances; a tough look at its internal finances; and ultimately a resolve to shift some of its practices and modify its programs.

Internal Assessment. The financial challenges of MR reflect the challenges of the contemporary arts field described above. In 2002, Movement Research had reached a "tipping point." For years, it had stretched its small budget in order to have considerable and ongoing impact. But dwindling funding for an under-staffed, undercapitalized grassroots organization in New York City pushed the organization to the point of crisis. As one telling indication of the stress the organization faced, MR moved its administrative offices six times in the period from 1997-2001. Beginning then, in the late 90s, there was little active board oversight of the organization. And then, in 2000, MR lost access to space at Context Studios, where the two available studio spaces allowed for more consistent class offerings. It became difficult for potential students to find out about MR's workshops and classes; they could no longer just drop by and take the class on offer. (At this time, it's important to note, most students did not have access to the less-developed internet.) This was compounded by the fact that a competitor, Dance Space Center moved to a new and larger facility on Broadway and was able to offer higher teacher salaries. After Peterson joined the organization as Executive Director in 2002, an assessment of its financial shortfalls led to serious questions about the organization's future, and a commitment to developing strategies that would ensure Movement Research's survival.

In 2003, with the clear intention to sustain the organization, staff and board chose to continue an almost full schedule, despite the fact that programs were not fully funded. Though this deliberate choice was risky, MR staff had to take a hard look at what would have been sacrificed if programming were reduced. Artists have come to depend on the rare "ground level" support which MR provides. Many would have lost teaching opportunities and others would have lost a place to train in a non-commercial studio environment. Artists would have lost the well-known and increasingly rare forum provided by the *Performance Journal* to discuss their craft. Monday nights at Judson Church would have disappeared.

As a result of this choice, the board and staff aggressively sought individual contributions, thereby raising the amount to an average of \$47,286 annually for FY04-FY07 from an historic average of \$8,650 for FY97-FY03. Strategies included initiation of an annual benefit, increased focus on the annual appeal, requests for donations at the Judson series, board cultivation of individual donors and increasing the board give/get policy. The ability of MR to not only sustain programs but also thrive in a creative sense during this difficult financial period generated a great momentum of support. Starting in 2003, staff and board worked to eliminate the accumulated deficit and generate increased program funds. Dramatic progress was made, cash flow was markedly improved and the accumulated deficit, which had reached over \$60,000 in 2001, was eliminated in FY07. In addition to increases in individual giving, former funders have returned – Altria Group, Inc., Foundation for Contemporary Arts, Mertz Gilmore Foundation, and Jerome Foundation. Six new funders were secured: the Danish Arts Council, the Leonard and Sophie Davis Fund, Greenwich Collection Limited, Rockefeller MAP Fund, the Marshall Frankel Foundation, and the Starry Night Fund of the Tides Foundation. Government support has also been fairly consistent.

An Intentional Redirection. Responding to the desire on the part of artists for a closer sense of community, as well as other needs stated above, MR has intentionally modified its approach to programs.

Movement Research has intentionally deepened its relationship to its constituents. Historically, the organization has had strong relationships with artists. In the late 90s, its primary services shifted to rentals and one-off classes; constituents came and went. But over the past five years, MR has returned to supporting artists in deeper ways, and deliberately creating more well-rounded relationships with artists.

Artists now find more holistic connections among Movement Research's programs. Rather than solely offering classes and training, MR is able to provide artists with a whole range of interactions that supports them over the life cycle of the creation of a project. For example, AIRs are offered the opportunity for one-on-one consultation with MR's directors; faculty interact through bi-annual meetings of MR faculty members; and artists are invited to participate as writers, bloggers and interviewees in *Critical Correspondence* and the *Performance Journal*.

Movement Research continues to attract certain artists because of its founders' connection to artists of the seminal Judson Dance Theater and to the workshop teachings of Robert Dunn, Anna Halprin and others whose work encouraged a new direction away from established dance practices. Unlike other for-profit studios and teaching centers, which have more of a transaction-based relationship with their students, MR's environment strives to more closely mirror the impetus of its founders.

Movement Research serves artists at any stage in their career. Many find returning to the series at Judson Church extremely valuable as they develop new work. Other established artists teach through MELT, ongoing classes, and occasional workshops. Providing important income-generating work, the faculty affiliation also can assist some in gaining other teaching opportunities, even internationally. Still others glean ideas and build interest in their future performances by writing for the *Performance Journal* or through interview features.

Movement Research has provided artists more opportunities to influence programs, which has increased their collaboration with Movement Research. The annual Movement Research Festival and the *Performance Journal* have shifted in recent years to team-based curation, which has created more of a sense of ownership on the part of artists. The Festivals no longer reflect only a single curator's distillation or interpretation, but now create more of a sense of dialogue through representing a broader range of interests.

Movement Research can claim its place as an institution, but continue to operate in a grassroots manner. Movement Research will always remain close to the ground in the manner in which it works with artists, and supports experimentation. But it must have an adequate level of staff and board support, along with the systems and technology, to support its vision. This shift began years ago, but has become more formalized recently as its finances have improved, and with the creation of this Plan.

In the end, MR's major assets in its revival have been the deepening of relationships with its constituents, and its commitment to mission and vision. Having completely retired its debt, the board and staff look optimistically to the future. MR has recently changed leadership: in September 2006, Carla Peterson stepped down as MR's Executive Director to accept the position of Artistic Director of Dance Theater Workshop; she remains on MR's board. In December 2006, Barbara Bryan took office as Executive Director and Kim Doelger as Managing Director. In the spring of 2007, in order to finalize this plan, staff and board updated the internal and external circumstances, and reflected on its target audiences and other factors that might affect programs. These details are presented in the next section.

VI. The Perspective of Stakeholders

This section explores the perspectives of stakeholders, including board, staff, and faculty whose viewpoints were gathered at a series of meetings that took place from 2004-2007.

SWOT Analysis

At the onset of the planning process, the board and staff looked at the organization's external and internal circumstances in order to determine its primary Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. They are as follows:

Strengths

1. **Mission and legacy.** MR is driven by a unique mission that evolved out of a legacy of dance experimentation dating back to the 1960s and before.
2. **Staffing and governance, relative to commitment to mission.** Staff and board are committed to ensuring that the mission drives the management and oversight of existing and new programs.
3. **Programs/faculty.** Core programs develop in conjunction with artists. Directly responding to the mission, and the evolving needs/concerns of MR's constituency, programs are designed to further engage, educate, and generate discourse.
4. **Constituency/artists served.** The artist constituency bases their work in research and experimentation as well as the development of new forms. Artists are loyal to MR. The diversity of programs allows them to enter, interact, and stay involved in different ways over the full span of their careers.
5. **Name.** The intention and focus of Movement Research's programs are clearly stated in the name itself.

Weaknesses

1. **Limited human and technical resources.** All staff is part-time, overtaxed, and paid below market value. MR does not have all of the necessary technical and office equipment to run programs most effectively. Additional staff is needed, particularly in marketing.
2. **Lack of stable facilities (both administration and program).** MR rents space on a yearly basis and does not have secure long-term or permanent space for its offices or programs.
3. **Need to attract new constituents.** MR's market is a niche, rather than a broad constituency. The question is how to expand beyond that niche without diluting the mission. The challenge is to address new trends and engage young artists and new teachers, while maintaining the aesthetic legacy that identifies MR.
4. **Cash flow.** Cash flow has improved considerably and the accumulated deficit was eliminated in FY07. However, MR must still remain diligent about maintaining a balance of contributed and earned income. Fundraising opportunities should be pursued based on cash flow and program needs rather than as staff workload allows. Earned income

opportunities should be increased through journal ad sales, advance subscriptions, and class cards.

Opportunities

1. **Potential for MR to be a strong partner in a shared facility.** MR is in discussion with at least one other organization as a permanent partner in a new facility.
2. **Seeking new sources of income.** MR could increase its earned income dramatically. A marketing plan would play a key role in increasing attendance at classes, workshops (such as MELT), ad sales in the journal, and even building a membership program.
3. **Global reputation/strength of mission.** Historically, MR has enjoyed a stronger international profile than it has been able to exploit. Provided with adequate support, MR could elevate this reputation and increase international participation. Drawing on leadership's existing relationships with international organizations, it could attract more foreign students to intensive workshops and classes, and more foreign artists to perform or teach during its annual festival. MR could draw from two messages that are sure to increase visibility: its history with Judson Church and its relationship to improvisational forms.
4. **Increasing visibility through marketing.** This would entail developing better systems (distribution, database maintenance, schedule) to support our current marketing strategies including the season calendar, e-blasts, advertising trades and publishing.
5. **Programs occupy a niche in the field.** MR is known nationally for being artist-driven, through its peer selection, artist-produced publications, opportunities for artist curation and general responsiveness to artists' ideas and concerns.

Threats

1. **Losing administrative and studio space.** MR does not have secure long-term or permanent administrative and studio space. Currently, it operates under year-to-year leases. It would be beneficial to join both functions under one roof.
2. **Loss of current constituency to NYC competitors.** Due to its diminished profile and coupled with limits in marketing, MR primarily reaches current constituents, rather than new individuals.
3. **Economy and how it affects artists' cash flow and salaries.** Fees for teaching, artists-in-residence, performance as well as staff salaries are all well below market value. As the cost of living increases in NYC, MR has not been able to increase its fees. The increased cost of living also now makes NYC a less desirable place for artists to study or live than it was in the past.
4. **Trend of decreased funding from foundations/government in the dance field.** Although MR is in the process of building its funding base, and has had success in recent years, national trends that continue to affect its success are: 1) the dramatic loss of foundation and corporate funders that support dance; and 2) and the reduction or flat funding allocations from other sources despite inflation (NEA and NYSCA).

Target Audiences

Movement Research serves a range of overlapping constituent groups. Defining those groups illuminates the services that the organization provides, and the ways in which it reaches artists at various stages of their work and careers.

- **Faculty** – younger and established teachers leading either MELT intensive workshops or ongoing classes. It includes some who have been artists-in-residence but also other performers and dance makers. The criteria for what artists can teach is intentionally broad, and is often a fusion of forms drawing from such techniques as Contact Improvisation, Release Technique, various somatic practices (like Body Mind Centering®, Alexander Technique™, Mahler-Klein Technique, and the work of Irene Dowd), as well as others such as Chi Gong. Other teachers address composition and tools for performance. All teaching is aligned with MR's mission of exploration and experimentation, and many teach forms they have honed over a long period of time.
- **Artists-in-Residence** – emerging and established artists that are selected by a panel. These artists are ripe to benefit from a period of rehearsal time and are in a place where ongoing support will advance their goals substantially.
- **Choreographers and Performers** – those who show works-in-progress at Judson and Open Performance. It serves both younger and established artists and draws different segments of the community together both as performers and audience members. For younger artists it may provide a rare performance opportunity.
- **Regular Students** – recent college graduates as well as dancers who aspire to be, or are in, small and mid-size companies, or who perform on a pick-up basis.
- **Performance Journal Contributors** – artists, scholars, administrators and curators.
- **MELT Participants** – artists who live in and outside of NYC who are motivated to set aside one to four weeks of time for intensive training.
- **Board Members and Artist Advisors** – in keeping with its commitment to involving artists at all levels, board and staff come from all of the above categories.
- **Less Frequent Students** – those who visit NYC and might seek out the occasional class, or are on tour with a company and may stop in, or more established artists residing in New York with busy schedules who come on a less frequent basis.
- **Audience Members** – intergenerational, including artists of all ages and levels as well as the general public who is interested in contemporary art, older people from the surrounding neighborhood, members of the Judson Church congregation, and professionals in the field. Presenters, academics, critics and writers, administrators, funders, and choreographers who have their own companies come to check out the next generation of artists and keep their eye on established artists' new pieces.
- **Readership of MR/Publishing** – in addition to artists, academics/scholars, students, consultants, funders and arts administrators from New York, the *Performance Journal* has institutional subscribers from 22 U.S. cities and 6 foreign countries and individual subscribers from 16 U.S. cities. In recent months, hundreds of readers in Brazil, Australia, Canada, Japan, U.K., and Germany, among other countries, have visited *Critical Correspondence*.

Artist Feedback

Feedback from Faculty Meetings

Two Faculty Town Hall Meetings (October 2004 and March 2006) were held during Phase 2 of this plan. They were led by Jeremy Nelson, MR faculty and board member, and Peterson, to continue the dialogue begun on the faculty's short- and long-term concerns, and to incorporate community feedback into the strategic plan. The following is an overview of specific issues addressed in these meetings:

Short-term Issues

Contracts, Policies and Selection Criteria. Artists commented on the timeliness of payment and low rates, and wanted a more efficient invoicing system. Though policies for substitutes and cancellation exist in their contracts, faculty wanted more clarity and to renew discussion about them. Artists asked for more formalized criteria for teacher selection.

Class models, levels and configurations. In general, classes are offered on a drop-in basis and are open level; students take class at many places, not just MR. Faculty can feel frustrated about low attendance and the drop-in class format; this means re-introducing class material everyday for the newcomers, or being unable to introduce advanced material or in-depth exploration. Faculty wished to strategize about new models, keeping in mind typical offerings such as beginning & advanced levels, or multi-week sessions.

Teaching philosophy, including range of forms taught. Some hope that a broader range of movement styles and methods might be offered, particularly those reflective of cross cultural influences. However, the approach to these forms would need to still be directed by a teaching style that is consistent with MR's vision. MR does not have a written philosophy, but relies on a broad interpretation of its mission and language in marketing materials, which read: "Workshops assist the pursuit of deeper levels of exploration into new dance processes, techniques, and ways of thinking and working, for faculty and students alike."

Increased Involvement with *Critical Correspondence*. In addition to existing mechanisms faculty requested some dedicated web space to discuss classes, performances, work, etc. This would provide a way to showcase faculty, draw more people to their classes and give students a way to learn more about their work.

Long-term Issues

Faculty offered the following recommendations for programs, all of which are incorporated into the plan.

Supporting the next generation of teachers (mentorship and financial). The Teacher Subsidy program was proposed and it was hoped that a pilot version of this program could be developed.

Student-in-residence program. Faculty wondered if some more intensive period of training along with a performance opportunity and/or involvement in other MR programs (such as Studies Project, or *Critical Correspondence*, etc.) might be established.

Faculty vision for Movement Research, and their own role in the organization, in the next five years. Faculty strongly desire regular and continued dialogue. Increased communication with and support of the faculty could help them play a larger role in shaping MR's future.

Feedback from Artist Focus Groups

[Movement Research] is about process, investigation, and experimentation. That's the reason I ended up teaching [at Movement Research], because what I was teaching didn't belong anywhere else.

—An artist in one of the focus groups

MR convened two focus groups of artists on April 14-15, 2007. A total of 16 artists participated, having been involved with the organization for a wide range of time periods and at various points in their careers.⁷

Artists were enthusiastic about attending the focus groups. Their motivation for participating stemmed from their love for Movement Research as well as their concern about its future. Artists were already committed to helping the organization survive, and their desire to support MR is even stronger in this time of transition to new leadership. Artists were happy to receive a fee, even in advance, and saw it as a sign that MR was doing better financially. The artist participants came with priorities hoping to see the values from past leadership reflected in the plan. They also brought a number of concerns and constructive suggestions that they hoped would be incorporated.

The overarching reason for their thoughtful participation was clearly their deep loyalty to Movement Research and their interest in helping shape its future. This is perhaps most evident in their overall impressions about MR. Artists struggled to find the right words to describe MR, and tended to define it by what it is *not*. Their strong impressions of MR centered on its distinctiveness from other dance organizations, primarily in its philosophy and artist-centered approach:

- It's not a traditional dance environment, particularly since there is less pressure to produce and more encouragement of individuality.
- It reflects what artists are actually doing now in New York City.
- It is a philosophy, in addition to an organization, that feeds a specific sector within the dance community.
- It serves a niche community in a unique way.
- It provides programs tied together by an educational approach.

In the words of artists:

It's very porous compared to other dance organizations. There are a lot of different places to enter into it...Unlike most institutions that get more rigid, it responds to where organic need emerges...[MR] is fluid enough that it can... meet artists halfway. That's what is so unique about it.

I think of it as an organization furthering the art [and] downtown postmodern [dance]. [It supports] process, theory and discourse – feeding a particular community.

⁷ The number of different ways in which participants had interacted with MR ranged from one to nine; the average number was four ways.

[Movement Research] creates dialogue with other aspects of performing [through] Judson, the Performance Journal and Critical Correspondence. That conversation about downtown modern dance happens at Movement Research...more than [at] any other organization.

Focus group artists were also asked to rate a total of 15 strategies included in this Plan for their usefulness by assigning each two numbers, on a scale of 1 to 5: a) according to how useful the strategy would be to their own needs as artists, and b) how useful they perceived the same strategy would be for other artists in the community. It is notable that the ratings overall were quite high; eight of the strategies received an average rating of 4.5 or higher, for their usefulness to artists themselves. And the ratings were even higher when participants considered how the strategies might impact other artists; 11 strategies had average ratings of 4.5 or higher. (The ratings for all strategies can be found in Appendix 3 on page 63.) These high ratings appear to indicate a close meshing of this plan with artists own needs; however, it is important to note that the ratings represents a small sample of the hundreds of artists that MR serves.⁸

Illuminating comments from artists have been woven throughout the Plan, so that the voices of the community that MR serves can be heard, in both their endorsements and caveats. Their specific feedback on the goals and strategies has been integrated into the following Plan, which synthesizes the viewpoints of MR's board, staff and artist community.

⁸ In order to obtain ratings that are representative of the hundreds of artists served by MR, it would be necessary to conduct a quantitative survey that is based on a much larger sample.

VII. The Plan

Goals

As the planning process commenced, board and staff decided on the following goals:

1. Evaluate and modify programs to increase their relevance to and effectiveness for artists.
2. Secure unified space for programs and administration.
3. Increase board effectiveness, in order to meet current and future organizational challenges.
4. Strengthen administration by improving capacity of technological systems and procedures, as well as the capacity and conditions for staff.
5. Increase annual operating budget from \$355,000 in FY07 to \$500,000 by FY10, in accordance with the Mission and this Plan.

Outcomes

If Movement Research were fully successful, it would make measurable progress toward the following long-term outcomes:

- Movement Research has visibility and influence in the contemporary dance and performance field, as evidenced through its increased attendance rates, online traffic and publishing distribution.
- Movement Research is widely recognized as a leading international laboratory for dance and movement-based work.
- A synergistic relationship between artist community and staff, board informs program choices.
- A sufficiently resourced administration advances Movement Research's mission and vision.
- Strategies to increase earned and contributed income are mindful of the organization's commitment to free and low-cost programs and services.

GOAL #1: Evaluate and modify programs to increase their relevance and effectiveness.

[Movement Research is] an original place of freedom. In the Artist-in-Residence Program, there are no strict boundaries. This is unique. [Elsewhere] even if someone gives you a \$5 space grant, they want to know what you are going to do with that money... You have to have a product. [With MR] there are no rubrics for success. It puts the responsibility on me to build my own rubric [and] define my own space. [They] make that space available for the freedom of creation.
—An artist in the focus groups

Background

Since its inception, Movement Research has played an inimitable role in support of the research and development of dance, in an overall environment historically more focused on 'product.' Many notable experimenters have called MR 'home' throughout the years. Artists utilize MR and its experimental community at critical junctures in their own development. In modest yet influential ways, its core programs continue to assist dance and movement-based artists in advancing their careers. Those artists who are invested in performance careers move on to larger presentation venues when ready to realize their vision with full production values. These artists may still return to MR when their process again demands a supportive yet rigorous research environment. Other artists utilize programs to deepen their practice and hone their teaching or pedagogical approach.

The measured growth in MR's infrastructure over the next three to five years as guided by this

Strategic Plan will increase its capacity to support its mission. This direction calls for a clear-eyed evaluation of all current programs, the majority of which were initiated during the late 1980s and early 1990s, in order to develop programs that both vigorously address the current needs of experimental artists and anticipate needs that may arise in the future. The evaluative process will drive program decisions; certain programs may need to be brought to a close, others may need to be expanded, and new ones may need to be initiated.

Strategies

1a. Develop a committee and structure for gathering information about programs from artists, including criteria and definitions for experimentation.

Context: Given the changes in dance aesthetics since the founding of Movement Research in 1978, the board recognizes the need for broader ongoing discussion and debate informed by artists in order to develop more vital and diverse programs.

To assist in this evaluation process, an Artist Advisory Committee (AAC) will be formed and will meet numerous times annually. It is critical that the AAC include faculty, as well as artists in residence, possibly performers from the Judson Church series, and artists who currently serve as board members.⁹

Artists in the focus groups valued this idea, and stressed the importance of clarifying the specific roles of the AAC and the Artist Legacy Board, including length of term, selection process, rotation policy, overlap from year to year, and level of commitment required. “Hands on” participation by members, as well as diversity and the incorporation of new voices, were considered necessary to make the AAC successful. Artists advised that the AAC stay fluid. Artists emphasized that MR needs to remain “porous” and continue to interact with the artist community. They advised staff that the AAC not be seen as a substitute for that interaction; rather, MR’s staff should view close, visible contact with the field as part of their responsibility.

Rationale: An Artist Advisory Committee would provide a mechanism for artists, including class participants and faculty, to give feedback to staff and board. The AAC would potentially suggest faculty, panelists and curators, as well as give input on the state of the field. This input could include how the definitions of experimentation may have changed relative to contemporary culture.

- Action Steps/Timeline:
 - Form Artist Advisory Committee (AAC) and identify its roles and a chair (Year 1) as well as the number of members.
 - Continue to hold Town Hall meetings with the artist community at least once per year, with agendas developed by the AAC (Year 1, 2, 3).
 - Establish blog space on Movement Research website for program feedback, suggestions and comments, working with an intern who would cull and disseminate feedback to board, staff and AAC (Year 1, 2, 3).
 - Continue to hold meetings of Movement Research faculty, working with a volunteer coordinator (Year 1, 2, 3).
 - Conduct surveys of artists as needed to augment Town Hall meetings (Year 2, 3).
 - Hold an annual meeting between the AAC and board/staff to review information and make decisions for subsequent year (Year 2, 3).

⁹ Historically, MR has also had an Artist Advisory Board, which will continue under the name Artist Legacy Board, and is discussed in depth under Goal 3.

1b. Develop support mechanisms for teachers.

I travel a lot and students ask about coming to NYC, where to go. I always say Movement Research because there are other teachers where, by being exposed to them, students find out about themselves.

The idea of mentorship... [and] teacher subsidy is great. These are not mainstream ideas. They are creative solutions to very real issues.

—Artists in the focus groups

Context: An important component of MR's contribution to the wider field of dance and movement-based practice continues to be its strong teaching within experimental forms. Faculty are selected less for their ability to draw a large student body than for their commitment to offering a rigorous learning environment—one that nurtures the development of artists' own voices. Faculty share several characteristics: a deep physical practice; informed teaching methodologies; and an interest in teaching within an environment that supports research. Many are also internationally acclaimed choreographers and performers. A crucial aspect of teaching at MR is a non-hierarchical approach that honors the teacher's body of knowledge and supplants the dance field's older, and more hierarchical master class model. In the same week, an artist may teach, as well as take, class.

Movement Research's faculty currently range in age from 30s to 50s and includes emerging choreographers as well as older practitioners. In the focus groups, some valued MR's intergenerational nature. As one said, "People I'm inspired by, people I turn to...MR can and should be a place for that." Over half of the teachers at MR have an established reputation and draw students. However, it is difficult for a new teacher to get a start in NYC if they do not have an affiliation with a professional school or company. Some are not yet established as teachers and are unable to sustain a livelihood in New York City as teachers. Those who visit from other places may not generate enough revenue from teaching to make their trip to New York City economically feasible. (The current fee structure is a 50/50 split of class revenue between teacher and organization.) Certain new approaches to teaching and investigation of experimental dance are unlikely to attract a sufficient student base, yet are vital to the evolution of dance as an art form and movement-based practice. As such, they are highly valued by MR.

In the focus groups, there was general agreement about the concept of teacher subsidy and mentorship; teachers need to be better paid and supported, and due to the low pay and varying attendance, some teachers feel they are almost donating their time. At the same time, artists felt that it may be a higher priority for MR to focus on what classes it offers, how teachers are selected, and the clarification of its identity. A number had questions about mentoring, including how it would work and if it should be a high priority at this time.

Rationale: The city's growing economic challenges for artists strengthen MR's resolve to keep class and workshop fees low and affordable while still guaranteeing a minimum fee to teachers. Phased-in support, in the form of first a subsidy and perhaps later a guaranteed fee, will provide a necessary cushion as new teachers develop both their own teaching abilities and a student base. This subsidy program would help new teachers cultivate their skills and gain a following. Mentorship by MR's stable of experienced faculty would provide less-experienced teachers with support and guidance so as to nurture this next generation of teachers.

• Action Steps/Timeline:

- Develop a core teacher list (Year 2).
- Identify case and funding source(s) for Teacher Subsidy Fund (Year 2, 3).
- Develop criteria for selection of faculty for Teacher Subsidy Fund, probably in conjunction with AAC and staff (Year 2, 3).

- o Set up faculty-managed mentorships that pair younger teachers with more seasoned teachers to provide feedback on classes and answer questions or worries that arise (Year 2, 3).
- o Formalize teaching opportunities in Artist-in-Residence Program (Year 2, 3).
- o Obtain funding and select artists for first round of Subsidy (Year 3).

1c. Expand opportunities for artists through partnerships with dance presenters, arts organizations, and/or colleges/universities.

Context: Artists need to travel periodically outside of their local environment in order to test out their ideas and reveal their aesthetic choices, in dialogue with artists and audiences from other communities. MR, through its MRX program (first initiated in 1993) has collaborated/partnered with like-minded partners to provide exchange opportunities for artists that support such self-examination and shared learning. Previous partners have included Bennington College, VT; DiverseWorks, Houston, TX; The Wagon Train Project, Lincoln, NE; Painted Bride Arts Center, Philadelphia, PA; Dance Umbrella, Austin, TX; Tigertail Productions, Inc., Miami, FL; and Danspace Project, NYC.

Rationale: Partnerships marshal more resources (both financial and non-financial) to support travel and exchanges for artists, regardless of where they are based. MR is committed to exploring and developing additional partnerships nationally and internationally that will continue to maximize support to and creative opportunities for artists, working in particular through the Artist-in-Residence Program. These partnerships may take the form of an exchange where an out of town artist comes to NYC for several weeks and participates in MR programs such as MELT, ongoing classes, Judson, and Open Performance, or teaches a workshop and performs at MR Festival. A New York artist would reciprocate at a partner venue with performance, teaching, rehearsal space, dialogues with peer artists, etc.

Artists participating in the focus groups predicted that these partnerships could provide exciting new opportunities, shake up the 'sameness' around MR and expose new groups of dancers, particularly at universities, to MR. As one artist said, "When I saw this, I thought 'Wow, the chance to maybe take a class with someone from Miami or a PJ contributor from Berlin.' That would be exciting – it could open my eyes up to things I may be missing." While artists were supportive of the idea in general, they viewed it as serving a smaller number of people and felt it would require considerable staff time. Ultimately, there was a divide in opinions among artists, due in large part to the lack of detail in how such arrangements would work. Artists couldn't really envision how it would happen, who would get supported, and who would not. MR will need to clarify the ways in which partnerships would be developed and the process by which artists would be selected.

Although MRX is the program that will have the most direct benefit, the opportunities also relate directly to the *Performance Journal* and to *Critical Correspondence*, expanding dialogue through these formats and broadening content, writers and readership. In addition, there is an expectation that exchanges will broaden the profile of MR, drawing new students outside of New York to its programs. The exchanges will not focus on presentation, but on developing relationships and dialogue with artistic peers, increasing exposure to programs in other cities and countries, and accessing resources such as space and teaching opportunities.

• Action Steps/Timeline:

- o Identify the goals and criteria for the MRX partnership initiative (Year 1, 2, 3; review annually).

- o Identify NYC-based artist participants for current and expanded partnerships, using A.I.R. program (current and recent artists-in-residence) (Year 2, 3).
- o Match artists with partners/venues, considering available resources, opportunities, artists' level of readiness and interests (Year 2, 3).
- o Identify potential partners based on both staff's network of professional relationships and recommendations from the artist community (Year 2, 3).
- o Develop a longer-term plan with timeline on how to build local, national and international opportunities through MRX program and manage its growth, drawing on existing models from presenters, festivals and other organizations in New York, as well as other cities and countries (Year 2, 3).

1d. Extend Artist-in-Residence (A.I.R.) Program to two years.

If you have two years, you can move away from being product-oriented, [and] thinking 'Well, somehow this has to turn into a show.' ... Two years makes you think 'this is about my development as an artist.' It's rare that you get that.

—An artist in the focus groups

Context: Giving artists the resources of time, space and money can foster experimentation, deepen an artist's creative voice, and advance a critical cultural dialogue. MR expanded its Artist-in-Residence Program to better match the current working environment for dance artists in New York City. A one-year residency currently provides direct dollars, rehearsal space subsidy, multiple opportunities for work-in-progress showings, time for dialogue with peer artists, and exchange opportunities with other artist-centered venues nationally and internationally to support creative process, among other offerings. Moreover, the imprimatur of an MR residency can often leverage opportunities with other organizations, venues, funders, and even other artists. Yet, one year is quickly over, perhaps just as an artist's in-depth research is starting to take root.

In FY07, MR began offering a second year of residency, in which artists can take advantage of non-financial resources, including performances, opportunities for dialogue, contributing to the *Journal* or *Critical Correspondence*, consultations with staff, and meetings with peer artists. In the focus groups, artists cited A.I.R. as an extremely valuable program, and hoped that direct financial resources, such as commissioning funds and subsidized or free rehearsal, could be put toward the second year of residency. As one artist said, "I loved [A.I.R.], but would love two years for sure...I would have had more space, more time, and all these things you just want more of...You have the organization behind you."

Rationale: A fully funded two-year residency would, at the onset, provide artists with the assurance that their ideas- and works-in-development would have the necessary time, space, funds and community base to evolve more substantially. MR could draw from its successes: for a period in the mid- to late 1990s, specific funding supported four artists over two-year cycles; including such strong experimentalists as Luciana Achugar, DD Dorvillier, Miguel Gutierrez, and Yasuko Yokoshi, among others. The impact of such longer-term support, as seen in these artists' increased visibility and acclaim, strengthens the argument for two-year residency terms.

• Action Steps/Timeline:

- o Increase stipend for A.I.R. panelists, due to increase in application pool (Year 1).
- o Create web space for A.I.R. usage (Year 1).
- o Hold meetings with artists-in-residence at start of each year, and then regularly throughout the year, to discuss and clarify program's opportunities and artists'

- intentions for residency, culminating in an end-of-year evaluative meeting (Year 1, 2, 3).
- o Fundraise for an expanded Artist-in-Residence Program from current (Davis), new (Jerome), and past (Greenwall) sources (Year 1, 2, 3).
 - o Develop framework for two-year program, incorporating suggestions from recent artists-in-residence (Year 1, 2).
 - o Develop clear-cut framework, timeline and criteria for selection of artists-in-residence. Criteria would address their: 1) strong track record as experimental artists and/or informed knowledge of experimentation and new forms; and 2) diversity in aesthetic approaches (Year 1).
 - Expand fee support and other subsidized opportunities for artists (Year 2, 3). Increase annual fees/commissions to artists-in-residence; commission amounts might be matched with NYSCA commission awards. [NYSCA awards are \$2,500 to the two A.I.R.s selected for NYSCA support. Other A.I.R.s receive \$2,000.]
 - o Expand rehearsal space allotment from 50 to 100 hours (half are offered for free; half @\$5/hr) (Year 2, 3).
 - o Explore increasing public and invitation-only work-in-progress showings with structures for feedback (Year 2, 3).

1e. Revamp marketing strategies to enhance the profile of programs, in order to increase their visibility and utilization.

What would make a huge difference is to be organized administratively. The face of that is marketing. It is how we perceive how organized your administration is. That way of connecting to the community would be huge.

—An artist in the focus groups

Context: Movement Research's strongest marketing ally throughout its lifespan in reaching core artist constituencies continues to be word of mouth among local, national and international experimental dance communities. Yet the organization needs to move from a possible over-reliance on word of mouth, which mainly targets those who already know about the organization and tends to keep participation levels flat, to writing and implementing a marketing plan, which would broaden and increase its constituency.

In the focus groups, artists agreed that marketing is a top priority. They advised that MR put substantial resources toward its website, which was viewed as difficult to use and in need of improvement. The website should be user-friendly and include diverse images that give a sense of MR's programs and artist community. However, artists were very positive about *Critical Correspondence*, and suggested better integrating *CC* into MR's website with enhanced blog functions (which is also referenced in Strategy 1g. below). Artists stressed that the appearance of MR's print materials needs to be updated. Citing MELT and the MR Festival as examples, they felt that all marketing needs to get out earlier in order to be effective.

Rationale: A visually consistent marketing program with more widely targeted dissemination procedures will better promote the organization. Moreover, developing a more interactive website, which engages the community through dialogue and debate about aesthetic concerns, will move it beyond its chief function as publicity tool to one that enhances programs and engages a growing constituency. Colleges and universities can become an important market for MR programs. Marketing would happen in two phases. A first phase would be implemented in the near future, in order to increase visibility for MR's existing programs, reach constituents more consistently and expand its base. A second phase would coincide with securing new space (should this happen) and is addressed in Goal 2.

- Action Steps/Timeline:
 - o Develop a comprehensive press list (Year 1).
 - o Research and identify funding for a web designer who will implement enhancements (Year 1, 2).
 - o Explore possibilities of increased marketing to colleges/universities (Year 1, 2, 3).
 - o Identify position (workstudy/intern/volunteer) for quarterly distribution of printed materials/brochures and the *Performance Journal*, in New York City, nationally and internationally (Year 1, 2, 3).
 - o Create marketing plan for web, email and print materials, including a timeline for creation and distribution (Year 1, 2).
 - o Update the appearance of print materials and widen dissemination to include other local arts organizations to reach more diversified demographics and disciplines (Year 2).
 - o Develop a part-time marketing position that would implement the plan (Year 2).
 - o Enhance website to encompass other mechanisms for discourse (Year 2, 3).
 - o Add full faculty bios and links to teachers' own websites to MR website (Year 2, 3).

1f. Building on its success, consider making modifications to adapt the Judson Church program to current artist needs.

Context: Judson, as one of MR's core programs, is working well, in terms of its operations, high volume of applicants, and strong audience attendance. Yet after 15 years of running this series with virtually no changes¹⁰ and mixed feedback from the focus groups, MR acknowledges that this is an apt time to evaluate the program and clarify its goals. Comments from the focus groups suggested that the nature of Judson may have shifted subtly, over time.

- Where once Judson was among a handful of process-oriented performance series, the idea has proliferated and similar formats can be found at venues across the city.
- Many felt that the phrase "works-in-progress" used to describe the series is a loaded term that implies the eventual creation of a product. Some questioned if, in fact, Judson may have become product-driven; a tendency to focus on the end-result "creeps into the way Judson is used." Another adds, "When I show there, I treat it as substantial. Maybe the end product wouldn't be at DTW, but it does feel product-oriented."
- Artists are aware of, and take into account, Judson's diverse audience, which includes presenters, who may make impressions of artists based on what they see there.
- Especially for emerging artists, it may be one of the rare opportunities to perform, sometimes alongside more seasoned artists, which may give it more weight.

Rationale: Artists wondered if the language should be changed to reflect the true nature of a process-oriented performance series and if doing so would encourage artists to treat it as such. As one said, "It's not the lab or place for experimentation that it wants to be, or was. I have a sense that it should be that." Another added, "It's more important to say Judson is the place to go for an idea, experiment, don't worry about how [the dance] works, [or] people's perception of it." Another artist said, "I don't see anything wrong with that. What it says is low tech, high visibility – that gets at what Judson is to me." Artists also shared their concerns about broadening the representation of artists on the series. They advised that MR should be rigorous in its definition of experimentation in panels, rather than let it become too insular. As one focus group participant explained, "If [Judson is about an] aesthetic, say it. [But] if [it's a] concept, go out, do the work, bring people in to broaden it."

¹⁰ Additionally, the church has just started charging rent, which is currently \$100/night, but will likely increase.

Based on these comments, the staff, board and AAC will review the Judson series in order to ensure that the program stays true to its intention of fostering experimentation and exploration. MR staff and board will need to address how to balance the process-oriented nature of the series while also maintaining it as a highly visible program.

- Action Steps/Timeline:
 - Convene a discussion to solicit feedback from artists as to the degree to which Judson is serving their needs, specifically any ideas that might restore Judson's process-oriented focus, through the Studies Project, Faculty Meetings, Town Hall Meetings and/or A.I.R. meetings (Year 2).
 - Based on community feedback, consider modifications to the curation process and goals for the Judson series, including language used to describe the program as well as application and panel process (Year 2).
 - Secure funding for rent of Judson Meeting Hall (Year 1, 2).
 - Consider increases in artist fees for Judson, as well as for panelists on the selection committee (Year 1, 2).
 - Broaden representation of the forms at Judson, by marketing the application to a broader base of artists, and examine the process of inviting artists of color, possibly involving past participants (Year 2).

1g. Utilize MR/Publishing to encourage discourse among movement-based artists as well as with artists of other disciplines.

Critical Correspondence has revolutionized how people are talking... and interacting about dance.
—An artist in the focus groups

Context: MR/Publishing, which includes the *Performance Journal*, initiated in 1990, and the recently launched online *Critical Correspondence*, is driven by and for artists in ways that can serve the wider field of dance and performance, including critics, arts administrators and the public, as well as the MR community. Both vehicles serve as public spaces for thinking and writing on dance and performance, offering language that can inform a deeper critical discourse. The *Performance Journal* is seen as an academic source of writing on dance by current practitioners – combining theory and practice. Writings on dance and related forms in more mainstream publications serve a marketing imperative, which, coupled with limited text space, typically constrain writers in their ability to more fully investigate a line of inquiry.

In the focus groups, artists strongly endorsed the value of MR/Publishing. There was complete support for further developing *Critical Correspondence*, which was cited as evidence of MR's strength. As one artist said, "I haven't been asked the kind of questions I've been asked in the interview for CC [before, which focused on] the rhetoric behind the work, [rather than] such a tight PR format." In particular, continuing to develop the blog function of CC to provide an open, timely forum for the community was thought to be very important. Some artists noted that the PJ is still a relevant publication, and preferred that it remain in print, rather than go entirely online. As one said, "There's something about the *Performance Journal* – it feels homemade. It's evocative and unique. If you go to Vienna, to the library, there are stacks of *Performance Journals* and people are reading them. That's great. Having something tactile you can look at...will continue to be important."

Rationale: Both the online *Critical Correspondence* and hard copy *Performance Journal* are designed to be dynamic, generative and participatory artistic environments that reveal and examine a range of areas including, but not limited to, process, intent, production, product, and perception. Because MR is interested in dance and performance as forms that both evolve

from and inform wider cultural practice, these forums for dialogue will intentionally encourage more multi-disciplinary discourse. Incorporating teachers into *Critical Correspondence* would respond to a request for online discussion that would go deeper than normal class time usually allows, benefiting both faculty and students.

· Action Steps/Timeline:

- Incorporate A.I.R. program into *Critical Correspondence* (see also Strategy 1d) (Year 1).
- Establish and confirm publication schedule of *Performance Journal* (Year 1, 2, 3).
- Research and identify ongoing funding for MR/Publishing, including the *Performance Journal* and *Critical Correspondence* (Year 1, 2, 3).
- Assess local, national and international relevance of the publications and how to expand reach of both formats beyond the New York dance community (Year 1, 2, 3).
- Review advertising structure addressing goals of targeting a larger base of advertisers in order to increase budget/revenue for publication with the goal of increasing writers' fees as well as bringing new advertisers on to address visibility of publications (Year 1, 2).
- Incorporate faculty into *Critical Correspondence* (Year 2, 3).

1h. Create options for student residencies that involve long-term, in-depth study, in a manner that would serve artists with a variety of needs. This may eventually include an accredited program for international students.

Context: MR currently offers daily drop-in classes and periodic workshops that vary in length from one-half day to one week, and rarely, to two weeks. Such flexibility supports artists' busy and changing schedules, but limits opportunities to engage in an extended course of study with a consistent teacher and group of peer students. Historically in New York City, when the company model was still viable, dancers would often choose to study with a particular choreographer. This model is much less prevalent and less pertinent to MR's constituency. At the same time, MR's focus has always been on the development of a dancer as a thinker, rather than as an expressive tool for a particular choreographer.

In addition, MR has always attracted highly motivated international students, based on its strong reputation as a center for experimentation. However, the lack of an accredited visa program continues to impact the numbers of international students who might study at MR. MR has periodically explored the idea of offering a visa program, but has not yet been in a position to satisfy the stringent facilities and curriculum requirements since it does not have permanent space. This is of growing concern, as some key competitors (such as Dance New Amsterdam, aka DNA) are currently able to offer visa sponsorship programs for international students.

Regardless of the format of programs, it would be important to bear in mind the range of artists' needs, as expressed in the focus groups. Some artists, particularly faculty, were interested in offering more consistent training and being able to work in-depth with a group. As one explained, "I am really excited about...the ability to get to know someone, dig into one thing, rather than [just] surf different people's ideas." There were questions, though, about the structure, how the program would work, and who would participate, including whether it would be directed at local dancers or out of town students.

Rationale: In keeping with this spirit of developing the "creative voice," MR sees the need to provide class models, levels, and configurations for more in-depth rigorous study that go beyond its current offerings. These might include:

- a) Beginning and advanced level classes, multi-week sessions, or other formats.

- b) Classes with an artist for a period of intense study over a number of months. Invited choreographers could work with a group of students to try out ideas and workshop new pieces, possibly culminating in a performance at the end of the process.
- c) A visa program could increase student population and raise the profile of the organization internationally. It has the potential to mutually benefit teachers and students from abroad, who could then return home to invite NYC-based teachers to their countries.

- Action Steps/Timeline:

- Discuss ideas around student residencies with A.I.R.s, AAC and in Faculty Meetings (Year 2).
- Explore possibility of identifying and paying a planning fee to a faculty member or core committee of artists to spearhead initiative, working in tandem with staff (Year 3).
- Identify and research national and international models for student residencies, including Lower Left Performance Collective (based at Sushi in San Diego) and others (Year 3).
- Identify funding to support implementation of viable model(s) (Year 3).
- Develop and implement pilot project for long-term student residency (Year 3).
 - Create clear framework and articulation of goals.
 - Evaluate pilot project with participants at end of study.
- Identify a Visa Program Committee to investigate current visa requirements (Year 2), including a Chair. This committee could be the same committee that looks at student residency.
 - Consider how such a program will impact MR's administration as well as its teaching approach and curriculum.

GOAL #2: Secure unified space for programs and administration.

For a lot of us, Movement Research feels like a home, but having an actual home would intensify that.
—An artist in the focus groups

Background

Over the years, Movement Research has identified partnerships with other organizations and individuals to gain access to space for administration and programming. The organization has always rented its administrative and studio facilities, and thus been subject to the challenges of New York City real estate and tenant-landlord relationships. Currently, MR leases Eden's Expressway, which is located in a combination residential/commercial loft building at 537 Broadway in NYC's SoHo district, on an annual basis. This space is used for classes, workshops and rehearsal space for both its Artist-in-Residence Program and the dance community at large. The organization rents other facilities by the hour for classes and workshops, including Danspace Project, Panetta Movement Center and Cathy Weis Studio.

Each rental relationship presents challenges:

- The administrative office is located at Dance Theater Workshop, which is at least 10 minutes away from these facilities by subway or bike (or longer depending on the time of day). This arrangement began in March 2004 and is mutually beneficial to both organizations. (MR was able to continue its Movement Research at the Judson Church series at Dance Theater Workshop during the Judson Church's renovation, and it continues to hold Open Performance in DTW's studio.) Together with other strategies, sharing space at Dance Theater Workshop enables MR to aggressively reduce its

inherited accumulated deficit. However, this physical separation of administration from programs burdens staff. The long-term goal is to reunite administrative and studio functions under one roof in order to streamline staff duties and create a hub of activity.

- Eden's Expressway presents a particularly difficult challenge of access as the Co-op Board policy of 537 Broadway limits the number of building keys each Co-op member may possess. Artists in both focus groups who had taught and/or rehearsed at Eden's said MR's current space situation is a nightmare – literally using that same word – in reference to the key situation. This policy has drastically reduced MR's ability to offer artists access to the facilities; it deters renters and even A.I.R.s from using their free space. This difficulty with access meant that MR did not reapply for NYSCA rehearsal space funding for FY07 and FY08 due to an inability to fully meet this funder's service requirements.
- Space for some programs is accessed through partnerships. For example, the Movement Research Festival performances and events occur at Danspace Project (which has served as a longstanding Festival host) and at multiple alternative venues (artists' lofts, storefronts, outdoor spaces) throughout the five boroughs of NYC. These alternative venues provide free or low-cost space, often made possible through relationships with the Festival Curatorial Team members.
- Starting in FY07, MR is being charged a subsidized fee to utilize the Judson Church's Meeting Hall for the Movement Research at the Judson Church free Monday night series, due to the Church's changing finances as a result of its major renovations.

Potential long-term partners for space may exist. As of the time of this writing, in negotiating its own options for long-term space, Danspace Project is naming Movement Research as a potential core tenant.

Strategies

2a. Explore options for, and eventually procure, space to house both programs and administration. This may include undertaking a feasibility study.

Context: As clearly stated in the Context section of this Plan, the success of the lion's share of Movement Research's activities and programs are contingent on adequate space. MR's short-term space needs are driven by two conflicting circumstances: 1) the organization needs to increase earned income and 2) Eden's Expressway confirms its availability annually, leaving MR unable to plan more than a year in advance. However, the longer-term goal of reuniting administration, studios and archives will be a major undertaking for MR, requiring careful assessment prior to any decision.

Rationale: As MR expands its Artist-in-Residence Program and increases its class and workshop offerings, it will need to pursue spaces that could both enable these programs to continue and, in the long run, reunite programs and administration under one roof. In both focus groups, artists were unanimous about how important it is for MR to have a physical home. It would increase artist interaction with staff, give people a sense of the organization as a whole, and allow for more organic sharing of ideas and conversation within the community. As one artist said, "Solving that would be good for the stability of Movement Research."

By establishing a committee to focus on this important question, and conduct research (and possibly work with outside consultants with expertise in this area), the board would position

itself to make an informed decision about the best option for space with a higher degree of confidence. It would learn of the pros and cons through feasibility studies and consider the long-term implications of this decision.

· Action Steps/Timeline:

- Form Space/Facilities Committee, appoint a Chair, and invite non-board members who are knowledgeable in NYC real estate to serve as advisors (Year 1).
- Meet with DTW about options, obligations and needs for continued rental (Year 1).
- Formalize relationship with new ministry at Judson Memorial Church, and negotiate rental rate under their new policy. As of FY07, a \$100/night rate is secured. Build on short-term negotiation to establish a long-term contract (Year 1).
- Set a timeline for space-related discussions and subsequent presentations to board (Year 1, 2).
- Have initial discussions about feasibility study with potential funders (Year 1, 2).
- Formalize all space arrangements in writing (Year 1, 2, 3).
- Meet with Danspace Project to discuss all options for space usage, including any future arrangements that might be made possible by their collaboration in the BAM Cultural District, should this new project be realized (Year 1, 2, 3).
- Expand on options for relationships with affordable spaces for classes and workshops (Year 1, 2, 3).
- Work with the Space/Facilities Committee to research nature of feasibility studies and meet with other similar organizations who have been involved in recent feasibility studies (Year 2).
- Board will vote on undertaking a feasibility study (Year 2 or 3).
- Pending board approval, finalize timeline and action steps for feasibility study (Year 2, 3).
- Contingent upon decisions about space, MR would undertake a new marketing campaign (Year 3).

GOAL #3: Increase board effectiveness, in order to meet current and future organizational challenges.

Background

Movement Research was founded by artists to support their work, and those historical roots continue today, albeit to a greatly expanded artist community. A collaborative approach between staff and a working board (i.e., an approach that is more egalitarian than the traditional non-profit model) enables MR, with modest financial and human resources, to produce extensive programming. Today, the Executive Director and board assume final responsibility for decision-making, but intentionally do so with strong input from staff and the artist community. In particular, artist board members participate in programs as faculty, co-directors, and participants. Staff attends all board meetings (though the board has the option to hold closed sessions).

Movement Research has a committed eight-person Board of Directors, comprised of professionals whose careers require substantial travel. As MR works to increase its operating budget and to expand and enhance its programs, increased volunteer involvement is a necessity. In order to adequately address its fundraising and policy expectations, and staff to accomplish the daily workload, MR will need more board members who are able to actively participate on a regular basis. Enhancing the board's fundraising capacity will be important to increasing individual contributions, both through board members' personal donations and their connections in the community.

Finally, this Plan is ambitious for the organization, based on current capacity and the need to address internal issues related to its capacity. Therefore, it would be expected that the board would play a significant role in its implementation.

In the focus groups, artists felt that expanding the board could increase resources and better distribute workload. Some artists stressed that close interaction between MR staff, board and artists should continue. They wondered if the fact that the new leadership's positions are part-time would mean that the directors will be less able to directly and continuously engage with artists. Focus group participants suggested that board members stay approachable and in dialogue with artists, as well as visible within the community.

Strategies

3a. Increase board from 8 to 16 members.

Rationale: In order to enable it to achieve the goals and aspirations in this Plan, Movement Research is committed to developing a Board of Directors with a strong complement of skills, resources and connections. However, MR should be realistic with all prospective members about the time commitment and expectations, as well as roles and responsibilities.

- Action Steps/Timeline:
 - Create Board Development Committee, including a Chair, at FY08 first quarterly board meeting (Year 1).
 - Full board to approve timeline for board development at FY08 second quarterly board meeting (Year 1)
 - Board Development Committee to create board matrix/profile and submit to full board for approval at FY08 second quarterly meeting (Year 1).
 - Board Development Committee to identify and propose new board members for full board consideration (Year 1, 2, 3).
 - Full board to invite proposed members to join board (Year 1, 2, 3).
 - Current board members meet individually with proposed board members to inform them about MR and to clarify roles and expectations.
 - Invite proposed board members to attend a board meeting prior to agreeing to join board.

3b. Increase board committees' effectiveness.

Rationale: The full board has been actively involved in programs and operations to date, given the restrictions of its relatively small size. In addition to expanding the board, working committees are needed to more equitably and strategically share workload. Committees can also increase effectiveness while reducing board and staff burnout. The Artist Advisory Board (which has existed for years) would be renamed as the Artist Legacy Board and anchor the organization in its history. Members would continue to lend their names to the organization; attend gala fundraisers and events; and advocate on behalf of Movement Research. (As described in Goal 1 above, the newly formed Artist Advisory Committee would be a standing committee that reports to, and advises, the board.

- Action Steps/Timeline:
 - Evaluate existing standing committees (Executive, Finance) (Year 1).
 - Create new board committees (Space/Facilities, Board Development, Fundraising, etc.) (Year 1).
 - Restructure Artist Advisory Board into Legacy Board (Year 1).

- Artist Advisory Committee to serve as a working committee and identify: 1) function of committee, 2) potential members, 3) chair, 4) responsibilities, and 5) first meeting. (See Strategy 1a.) (Year 2).
- Set timeline for first Artist Advisory Committee meeting and hold meetings two times a year, in fall and spring (Year 2).

3c. Ensure effective board/staff relations with clearly articulated roles and responsibilities.

Rationale: As the organization grows, clarity in the roles and responsibilities of the board and of staff is essential. This would include delineating what work and projects the board may take on in a volunteer capacity and what is expected from staff.

- Action Steps/Timeline:
 - Research other organizations' models for board/staff relations and roles (Year 2).
 - Report results of research, with recommendations, to full board for vote at FY08 annual meeting (Year 2).
 - Recommendations should include a conflict of interest policy.
 - Implement board-approved recommendations (Year 3).

3d. Identify ways to utilize existing board expectations document to encourage full participation.

Rationale: Written expectations could be used to articulate to the board its responsibilities; such a document can be used to evaluate current members and recruit new ones.

- Action Steps/Timeline:
 - Board Development Committee to review the existing board expectations document, including financial ('give/get' policy) and non-financial participation and, if necessary, propose changes to be voted on by full board at annual board meetings (Year 1, 2, 3).
 - Engage an attorney (pro bono) to review new by-laws, for approval by the board (Year 1).

GOAL #4: Strengthen administration by improving capacity of technological systems and procedures, as well as the capacity and conditions for staff.

Background

Movement Research continues to implement ten programs that support the experimental processes of movement-based artists. This level of activity, remarkable given a modest general operating budget that has historically averaged below \$300,000, is largely due to a deeply dedicated, albeit under-compensated and over-extended, staff, and a strong work-study and internship program.

The ability of MR to not only sustain its programs, but also thrive in a creative sense during this difficult financial period has re-engaged artists and gained the attention of the funding field. The organization is at a clear crossroads now – the programs are stable financially and relationships have been re-established with artists. However, the staff structure and salaries remain inadequate to continue these necessary, but time-intensive, programs and services. All of its six ongoing staff are part time. The executive director and managing director are on salary for 25 hours per week and have benefits in the form of health insurance and paid vacation. The remaining three positions – the development associate, program director and

operations manager – all work 15-25 hours per week for an hourly wage with no benefits. (Other ongoing, part-time staff coordinates the Judson series and the Open Performance program.)

A strong work-study and internship program plays a dual role: it augments the small staff in providing office assistance and class and workshop registration, as it mentors young dance artists in the workings of non-profit management and introduces them to a creative community. At the same time, frequent turnover, characteristic of unpaid positions, requires constant retraining and staff time. The organization's success in the creation of a healthy, sustainable administrative structure will determine its future capacity to meet its mission, maintain and grow its services, and provide an efficient and supportive working environment.

In both focus groups, all artists were not only supportive but emphatic about the need to strengthen MR's administration. They understood the long-term implications of shoring up systems, compensating staff and obtaining the resources that the organization needs to do business effectively. Artists were savvy and realized that administration affects the quality of their experience with MR in all other areas. It is interesting to note that this strategy for administration was rated the highest of all strategies by artists and received an almost perfect score; clearly, they recognize this as a high priority.

Strategies

4a. Improve capacity of personnel by revamping staff structure, pay rates and benefits.

It would be so great if staff could work more hours, and they could only afford to do that if they were paid more per hour. That would do so much [to address] marketing issues, approachability, all of it...As an artist calling in, I wouldn't feel so apologetic every time I pick up the phone...It shifts everything...It would be great to lift that burden off of everybody.

—An artist in the focus groups

Context: As an under-resourced organization, MR has historically vacillated between adequate day-to-day implementation and crisis management, depending on its financial status. As the organization increases its budget and programs, the personnel structure needs to be strengthened accordingly to accommodate this growth.

Rationale: Ideally, the goal during this plan would be to raise both the number of hours, and the hourly wage for staff. Hours worked and pay rates would increase, and a benefits package would be instituted. An annual pay increase would be instituted for all staff. Also, new positions would strengthen the organization by supplanting its over-reliance on interns while increasing its earned income capacity.

• Action Steps/Timeline:

- Implement annual review process for Executive Director and Managing Director (Year 1).
 - Create board committee to spearhead review program.
 - Establish criteria, format, timetable and clear benchmarks.
 - Create framework to ensure open communication between board and Executive Director that informs organizational practice.
- Implement annual staff review by Executive Director, whereby Executive Director would create criteria and framework for salary determination (Year 1).
- Institute an annual review of staff structure and organizational chart by Executive Director (Year 2, 3).

- Develop a three-year budget that incorporates increased staff salaries (Year 1) and the establishment (or re-establishment) of benefits with clear criteria for staff eligibility (Year 1: health insurance, Year 3: 403(b)).
- Projected staff modifications are as follows, pending resources and further review:
 - Enhance Development Associate position by adding paid vacation and coverage for at least half of health insurance. Potentially enhance position to Development/Marketing Mgr, increasing hours to 25hr/wk, as well as pay rate (Year 1).
- Explore possible separate marketing position (Year 1).
- Provide benefits for Operations Manager and increase to about 30 hours per week (Year 2).
- Upgrade Journal Coordinator to Editor-in-Chief and raise pay rate (Year 1).
- Create Development Assistant position (Year 2).

4b. Improve capacity of technological systems.

Administrative equipment is really important to update – website, computers – that’s where the technology should hit first.

—An artist in the focus groups

Context: Historically, MR has operated with minimal technical capacity given its chronic economic constraints. In order to create a supportive environment for programs and administration, MR’s technology-based systems require an upgrade. Many of the systems are not efficient for use in daily administration or capable of supporting enhanced web design. In Spring 2006, MR began an upgrade process by replacing its computers and adding a laser printer. However, the organization still does not have enough desk space or computers for its needs. The organization owns only one voice recorder and no video or still cameras, and is limited in its ability to respond to artists’ technological needs relative to its program offerings. Artists in the focus groups strongly recommended putting administrative needs for equipment and technology first, rather than providing artists with a lot of equipment at this point. Most artists already have their own video cameras, but would like a TV monitor with VHS at Eden’s Expressway, as well as locked storage space in the studio for their own equipment. *Critical Correspondence* could benefit from having a video camera, so that snippets of artists’ work could be added to the website to enhance the interviews.

Rationale: Enhanced technology would enable more efficient administration in a wide variety of ways. It would allow marketing materials to be produced in-house, especially those relating to website, e-blasts, and *Critical Correspondence*. New software for a contact database would track individuals, as well as their interests/demographic, eg. classes, donor, press, funder. Long term, MR would benefit from purchasing software such as FileMaker to enhance such tracking, particularly of donors. Finally, new equipment would allow MR to document programs and to make them accessible to a broader public through web and resource room. MR may benefit from a comprehensive technical audit and plan, developed by a consultant that works with non-profits. Such a plan would outline not only operational needs (software, system back-ups, and networking) but also communication needs (website, databases, workflow), including tracking relationships with both constituents and funders. Importantly, the plan would assist in prioritizing these needs over a three-year time period; estimating costs; and establishing a work flow for implementation that would not overtax staff.

• Action Steps/Timeline:

- Replace server and upgrade operating system (Year 1).
- Draw up a wish list of software needs for purchase or to secure through donation (Year 1).

- o Upgrade software for all programmatic and operational systems (marketing, finances, communications, web) (Year 1, 2, 3).
- o Purchase digital still and video cameras, and audio recorder (iPod or other digital) for documentation and web usage (Year 1, 2).
- o Develop a technology plan, possibly through a tech audit by an outside consultant familiar with the needs of non-profits (Year 1).
- o Maintain and update databases and systems as prioritized by the technology assessment and plan, and on a regular basis (Year 1, 2, 3).
- o Enhance/expand computer capability to accept streaming of audio and video and still/video documentation (Year 2, 3).
- o Identify and bring on work-study or paid staff to serve as liaison between web designer and staff (Year 2, 3). Upload the following content:
 - Back issues of *Performance Journal*.
 - Faculty bios and links to their websites.
 - A.I.R. information (bios, press, activities) and links to their websites.
 - Town Hall minutes.
 - Additional program-based content and documentation on ongoing basis.
 - Identify and provide links to related resources and organizations.

4c. Improve administrative policies and procedures.

Context: The staff of MR operates under severe time constraints just implementing its extensive programs. Consequently, there is no breathing room to step back and incorporate more effective methods of working or to develop strong organizational systems. The organization is at a clear crossroads now – the programs are stable financially and relationships have been strengthened with artists. However, the administrative infrastructure does not work on the level of efficiency necessary to effectively implement programs and services.

As the organization recently changed leadership, it is in the process of reviewing internal systems and making recommendations for adjustments. For example, the organization is in the process of developing a functional staff and programming schedules in electronic form, which should be useful in monitoring programming and marketing deadlines.

Rationale: New leadership has made it a high priority to revamp systems and job descriptions, as described above. Movement Research proposes to build administrative capacity by revamping and creating more efficient and accessible systems. MR will create a central contact database that houses mailing, e-blast, press, advertisers, students and donor lists; obtain the software and equipment to produce marketing materials in-house; develop a plan for its archives, storage systems and inventory; and update its computer network and web design.

Action Steps/Timeline:

- o Streamline current filing systems (Year 1).
- o Streamline financial management systems to alleviate administration (Year 1, 2)
- o Create more time efficient methods of tracking individual contributions (Year 1).
- o Institute more efficient ways of tracking program activities and accomplishments (Year 1, 2).
- o Create efficient archival system for administrative records, video tapes, DVDs, and publications (Year 1, 2, 3).
- o Streamline the organization and utilization of office network system (Year 1, 2, 3).

GOAL #5: Increase annual operating budget from \$355,000 in FY07 to \$500,000 by FY10 in accordance with the goals of the Strategic Plan and mission statement.

When you address [the budget], you address everything else. It would be a trickle down effect. If the organization had more money and increased visibility in the field, it would become more valid for other artists. It would expand.

—An artist in the focus groups

Background

As detailed in the Financial Picture that follows (see next section), in FY04, Movement Research set out to eliminate a significant accumulated deficit and position the organization for carefully considered program expansion. In FY07, the organization successfully eliminated the deficit. Through the dedication of staff and board, new and increased sources of funding were secured. In addition, board members provided pro-bono services and more than doubled their personal contributions to the organization. A measured approach retained programs, while simultaneously eliminating the deficit and its accompanying, negative cash flow pressures.

In projections for future budgets, capacity building funds will need to be secured to support administration, facility planning, and program expansion. Funds will be expensed over a three-year period, while the organization continues board expansion and strategic, contributed income growth. The board recognizes that an increased reliance on contributed income must be approached carefully. Historically, 50% or less of total income has come from grants and contributions. Though recent developments in the field may indicate a greater awareness of the need for programs that support individual artists, in reality few actual dollars make their way to emerging artists. As a vanguard in such programming, MR is in a unique position to aid funders in reaching emerging artists. In addition, MR will plan annually to maximize its earned income while keeping to its mission of providing low-cost programs.

In both focus groups, artists understood the long-term impact of a budget increase. On the one hand, it was recognized that increased revenue would make this Plan possible; on the other hand, it implies that artists may have to pay more for classes, and that fundraising will become a strong focus for board and staff.

Strategies

5a. Develop short- and long-term strategies to increase earned income.

Context: For MR, the ratio of earned to contributed income has averaged 54% to 46% from FY02 – FY07, primarily due to ongoing class and workshop offerings, two MELT Intensives per year, a public school program, and a rehearsal space rental program. Remaining current earned income streams (advertising, box office, and publication sales) generate very modest revenues (\$15,956 out of a total earned income of \$152,500 in FY07).

While the topic of possible increases in class prices and teachers' fees was broached in the focus groups with artists, it would require more extensive discussions before any decisions can be made. Some were concerned about raising class prices at all; some felt that MELT fees were already a financial stretch. Yet others noted that class prices of \$18 elsewhere, as well as yoga studios that charged \$20 per class, still drew substantial numbers of students, some of whom also, they surmised, took class at MR.

Rationale: As MR continues to build its contributed income streams, it will be important to place equal attention on increasing earned income, in order to reduce exposure to fluctuations of foundation, corporate, government and individual support.

• **Action Steps/Timeline:**

- Assess ability to increase earned income with present facilities.
 - Look at ratio of earned income for rehearsal space vs. classes and workshops (Year 1).
 - Revisit class and workshop fee structure (Year 1, 2, 3).
 - Determine whether MR will return in FY09 to NYSCA Rehearsal Space Subsidy program, whereby NYSCA funds \$2,500 to support organizations that offer rehearsal space at \$10/hr (Year 2).
- Increase journal ads and look into web ad space (Year 1, 2, 3).
- Increase journal distribution and subscriptions (Year 1, 2, 3).
- Increase festival attendance (Year 1, 2, 3).
- Increase class attendance and consider class card sales (Year 1, 2, 3).

5b. Develop short- and long-term strategies to increase contributed income.

Context: Beginning in FY03, staff and board have focused resource development towards:

1) the elimination of an accumulated deficit that in FY01 was close to 30% of its operating budget; and 2) the generation of increased funds for program and infrastructure. Dramatic progress was made: at the end of FY07, the accumulated deficit has been eliminated, and cash flow has markedly improved.

Fundraising efforts in recent years have proven successful. Individual contribution strategies, including the annual Gala, have been implemented to good results; from an historical average of \$8,650 from FY97-FY03, individuals contributions have increased to an average of \$47,286 from FY04-FY07. From FY03 through FY07 four former funders have returned (Altria Group, Inc., Foundation for Contemporary Arts, Mertz Gilmore Foundation, Jerome Foundation), one current funder has increased support (New York City Department of Cultural Affairs), another has fluctuated (National Endowment for the Arts), and six new funders have been brought on board (the Danish Arts Council, the Leonard and Sophie Davis Fund, Greenwich Collection Limited, Rockefeller MAP Fund, the Marshall Frankel Foundation, the Starry Night Fund of the Tides Foundation).

Rationale: Building on this progress, which has enabled the organization to survive and to re-engage the artist community, MR now needs to expand its resource development efforts to achieve the next phase of its revitalization.

• **Action Steps/Timeline:**

- Create Fundraising Committee (Year 1).
- Create case statement (Year 1, 2).
- Create annual fundraising plan (Year 1, 2, 3), which would include general operating support, program support and possibly capital campaign (Year 3 only).
- Develop new and expand on current strategies for cultivation of individual donors, to include some or all of the following: (Year 2, 3).
 - Increase board giving.
 - Enhance annual appeal and ensure that it is mailed earlier.
 - Expand contact database.
- Continue to synchronize fundraising plan with budgeting process so that funding requests (and start/end dates) coincide more closely with the fiscal year cycle (Year 1, 2, 3).
- Revisit board 'give/get' contribution levels annually (Year 1, 2, 3).

- Resume discussion regarding creation of membership program (Year 2).

5c. Contingent on the results of its decision about space, take the initial steps to stabilize the organization's financial base, which would position Movement Research for capacity building and potentially as a viable capital campaign candidate.

Context: MR is to be applauded for uncovering and retiring its deficit in a few short years. It has made enormous strides in its financial procedures and accountability.

Rationale: Stabilizing MR's financial base will prepare the organization for the possibility of seeking capacity building funds and positioning itself as a viable candidate for campaign funding. This would begin by establishing stronger policies and procedures about cash flow and strengthening its financial base for operations. A stronger donor base would support its annual operations and better position it for capacity building and capital campaign consideration.

Action Steps/Timeline:

- Institute procedure of creating cash flow projections (Year 1).
- Create a plan and monetary goal (Year 2) and establish cash reserve (Year 3).
- Create and follow a capacity building plan that integrates a range of funding sources (Year 1, 2, 3).
- Take the steps to build and expand upon the individual donor base in order to cultivate these individuals for additional gifts for capacity building and capital projects (Year 2, 3).
- Evaluate capacity building and capital campaign goals, to build understanding on the part of the board and staff, and increase the likelihood of success. Products might include a feasibility study for capital campaigns, including a plan and case statement (Year 2, 3).

VIII. Financial Picture

**Movement Research Operating Budgets
History FY04-FY07**

	FY2004 audited	FY2005 audited	FY2006 audited	FY2007 audited
Income				
Tuition	112,167	112,030	119,875	109,736
Studio Rentals	25,695	22,584	20,343	25,733
Ticket Sales	892	5,751	3,351	3,781
Publishing	4,584	3,333	2,194	2,401
Public Schools	2,000	2,000	4,000	2,000
Other	300	2,730	1,100	6,685
Total Earned Income	145,638	148,428	150,862	150,337
Government	42,500	37,450	47,200	43,468
Foundation & Corporation	43,951	34,300	62,730	114,531
Individual	50,953	50,771	41,583	46,012
Total Contributed Income	137,404	122,521	151,513	204,012
Total Income	283,042	270,949	302,375	354,348
Expense				
Programs	86,070	81,726	93,198	107,924
Payroll	89,756	99,733	109,570	118,767
Professional Services	17,776	10,272	12,966	28,060
Marketing & Development	8,414	10,204	7,848	9,994
Administration	17,236	11,153	11,401	17,496
Occupancy	54,419	41,595	43,904	48,639
Total Expense	273,671	254,683	278,886	330,881
Surplus/(Deficit)	9,371	16,266	23,488	23,467
Accumulated Surplus/(Deficit)	(51,823)	(35,557)	(12,069)	11,399

**Movement Research Operating Budgets
Projected FY08-FY10**

	FY2008 projected	FY2009 projected	FY2010 projected
Income			
Tuition	135,346	132,530	138,476
Studio Rentals	21,280	22,000	23,000
Ticket Sales	5,321	5,200	5,330
Publishing	10,779	9,031	9,483
Public Schools	2,000	2,500	3,000
Other	13,106	6,000	6,300
Total Earned Income	187,832	177,261	185,589
Government	80,400	81,092	81,092
Foundation & Corporation	93,689	145,396	162,896
Individual	57,466	67,966	71,466
Other*	50,964		
Total Contributed Income	282,519	294,454	315,454
Total Income	470,351	471,715	501,043
Expense			
Programs	182,049	194,049	198,249
Payroll	145,513	157,549	162,269
Professional Services	6,224	8,224	11,224
Marketing & Development	15,645	21,645	22,511
Administration	14,655	15,388	16,157
Occupancy	61,363	69,760	73,248
Total Expense	425,449	466,615	483,658
Surplus/(Deficit)	44,903	5,100	17,385
Accumulated Surplus/(Deficit)	56,302	61,402	78,786

* FY08 total Other Earned Income in the amount of \$50,964 was a one time award from the Danish Arts Council supporting a New York/Danish artist exchange.

**Movement Research
Pro Forma Operating - Assumptions**

	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010
New Contributed Income Goals			
Capacity--Building Grants		20,000	30,000
Foundation		7,500	15,000
Individual		3,000	4,000
Board		6,000	7,500
Gala		1,500	2,500
Total Contributed Income Goals	-	38,000	59,000
Use of Capacity-Building Grant(s)			
Staff support		10,200	14,200
Increase AIR space subsidies		7,800	13,800
Facility Planning		2,000	5,000
Subtotal Capacity-Building	-	20,000	33,000
Use of Other New Funding			
Office Rent		6,000	10,000
Festival Fees		2,000	4,000
Increase AIR commissions		2,000	4,000
New Marketing Efforts (web and print)		6,000	6,000
Expand MRX program		2,000	2,000
Subtotal Use of Other New Funding	-	18,000	26,000
Total Use of New Funds	-	38,000	59,000

VIII. Conclusion

It's vital to the community. Without it there would be a huge vacuum.

One of the most valuable things is [Movement Research's] strong connection to the community...[it's what is] in this document and why we're here and [why we] signed up [for the focus groups so quickly]. That's the difference for me – I want to be involved. I want to go Town Hall meetings... I want to be part of this history and Judson Church, but also [what's going on] now.

—Two artists in the focus groups

The planning process has reaffirmed Movement Research's vital role in the development of contemporary artists and art forms. This document has laid out a direction, and specified a course of action, that fits the organization's mission and vision, yet attempts to be reasonable and feasible. Creating and approving this Plan has strengthened the resolve on the part of the board and staff to fulfill that vision.

This Plan is considered a living document. Part of MR's annual meeting will be dedicated to reviewing the progress toward implementation of the Plan during that year. During these meetings, staff and board will review and update goals and strategies, to ensure the Plan reflects and responds to the constantly shifting landscape of priorities, opportunities and challenges. Additionally, they will review the outcomes to determine the degree to which they have been met.

Movement Research is deeply grateful to its supporters – the funding community, independent artists, individuals and peer organizations – and looks forward to continuing these partnerships. Such support has been instrumental in enabling this community-based organization to begin to strengthen its administrative infrastructure and more fully nurture, support and sustain the creative work of experimental artists in New York City as they, over time, inform the evolution of dance itself.

Finally, we are most grateful to the artists, their art and their experimentation, which drives our very existence.

Endnote on Terminology

Movement Research uses language in a particular manner in order to reflect its mission and values, and be inclusive as possible of the artists, art forms and processes it embraces. In many ways, the basic definitions of these words apply. The following descriptions are meant to guide the reader in the nuances of language as it is applied to this Plan.

Art Forms and Artists — forms that are derived from or relate to contemporary art and movement, developed from a new rather than established vocabulary. They may include sound, video, visuals, and/or writing but always come from a base of movement. Artists may be at once a choreographer, dancer, student, advisor, and/or writer.

Collaborative — a horizontal structure, that supports and encourages an equal sharing of viewpoints, responsibility, and/or decision making among peers.

Ecosystem — the entire community of contemporary artists, together with its broader environment (both assets and challenges), that coexist and collaborate to explore movement. It also includes funders, service organizations, companies, media outlets, and others contributing to this community.

Movement — drawing from contemporary Western forms of movement, primarily including post-modern dance, improvisation, and Contact Improvisation as well as ways of thinking about movement, such as somatic studies, including Body-Mind Centering®, Alexander Technique™ and Authentic Movement, among many others.

Research — a careful investigation of the process of making movement, in a laboratory, metaphorically speaking, or an environment that encourages research, experimentation, and innovation.

Process — ways of generating movement (in both teaching and performance) that are centered in experimentation and investigation and reflective of the art forms above.

Teaching Philosophy — an open-ended “pedagogy” that supports teachers’ own identity, process and choices, over the curriculum itself. Based on the generation of ideas, experimentation, collaboration and dialogue, rather than emulation of the teacher or self-censoring of the student.

From The Merriam-Webster Dictionary and The Oxford Dictionary of Dance

Move v. Transitive: 1 To change the place or position of 2 to set or keep in motion 3 to cause (*to do, say, etc.*). 4 to arouse the emotions of 5 to propose formally, as in a meeting Intransitive: 1 to change place or position 2 to be active 3 to make progress 4 to take action 5 to be, or be set, in motion.

Movement n. A manner of moving.

Research n. Careful, systematic study and investigation in some field or knowledge.

Investigate v. To search, to inquire.

Experimentation n. A test or trial undertaken to discover or demonstrate something.

Innovation n. The process of making changes. A new method, custom, device, etc.

IX. Roles, Responsibilities and Timeline

Strategy	Action Step	Role/Responsibility				Timeline		
		Staff	Board	Committee	Consultant	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
GOAL #1: Evaluate and modify programs to increase their relevance and effectiveness.								
1a. Develop a committee and structure for gathering information about programs from artists, including criteria and definitions for experimentation.								
1a.1	Form Artist Advisory Committee (AAC) and identify its roles and a chair as well as the number of members.	Staff	Board	Artist Advisory		X		
1a.2	Continue to hold Town Hall meetings with artist community, at least once per year with agendas developed by the AAC.	Staff	Board	Artist Advisory		X	X	X
1a.3	Establish blog space on Movement Research website for program feedback, suggestions and comments, working with an intern who would cull and disseminate feedback to board, staff and AAC.	Staff				X	X	X
1a.4	Continue to hold meetings of Movement Research faculty, working with a volunteer coordinator.	Staff		Artist Advisory		X	X	X
1a.5	Conduct surveys of artists as needed to augment Town Hall meetings.	Staff					X	X
1a.6	Hold an annual meeting between the AAC and board/staff to review information and make decisions for subsequent year.	Staff	Board	Artist Advisory			X	X
1b. Develop support mechanisms for teachers.								
1b.1	Develop a core teacher list.	Staff		Artist Advisory			X	
1b.2	Identify case and funding source(s) for Teacher Subsidy Fund.	Staff					X	X
1b.3	Develop criteria for selection of faculty for Teacher Subsidy Fund, probably in conjunction with AAC and staff.	Staff		Artist Advisory			X	X
1b.4	Set up faculty-managed mentorships that pair younger teachers with more seasoned ones to provide them feedback on their classes and answer questions or worries that arise.	Staff					X	X
1b.5	Formalize teaching opportunities in Artist-in-Residence Program.	Staff					X	X
1b.6	Obtain funding and select artists for first round of Subsidy.	Staff	Board					X
1c. Expand opportunities for artists through partnerships with dance presenters, arts organizations, and/or colleges/universities.								
1c.1	Identify the goals and criteria for the MRX partnership initiative.	Staff	Board			X	X	X
1c.2	Identify NYC-based artist participants for current and expanded partnerships, using A.I.R. program (current and recent artists-in-residence).	Staff		Artist Advisory			X	X

Strategy	Action Step	Role/Responsibility				Timeline		
		Staff	Board	Committee	Consultant	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
1c.3	Match artists with partners/venues, considering available resources, opportunities, artists' level of readiness and interests.	Staff					X	X
1c.4	Identify potential partners based on both staff's network of professional relationships and recommendations from the artist community.	Staff					X	X
1c.5	Develop a longer-term plan with timeline on how to build local, national and international opportunities through MRX program and manage its growth, drawing on existing models from presenters, festivals and other organizations in New York, as well as other cities and countries.	Staff	Board				X	X
1d. Extend Artist-in-Residence (A.I.R.) Program to two years.								
1d.1	Increase stipend for A.I.R. panelists, due to increase in application pool.	Staff				X		
1d.2	Create web space for A.I.R. usage.	Staff			CC Consultant	X		
1d.3	Hold meetings with artists-in-residence at start of each year, and then regularly throughout the year, to discuss and clarify program's opportunities and artists' intentions for residency, culminating in an end-of-year evaluative meeting.	Staff				X	X	X
1d.4	Fundraise for an expanded Artist-in-Residence Program from current (Davis), new (Jerome), and past (Greenwall) sources.	Staff	Board			X	X	X
1d.5	Develop framework for two-year program, incorporating suggestions from recent artists-in-residence.	Staff	Board	Artist Advisory		X	X	
1d.6	Develop clear-cut framework, timeline and criteria for selection of artists-in-residence. Criteria would address their: 1) strong track record as experimental artists and/or informed knowledge of experimentation and new forms; and 2) diversity in aesthetic approaches.	Staff	Board	Artist Advisory		X		
1d.7	Expand fee support and other subsidized opportunities for artists. - Increase annual fees/commissions to artists-in-residence; commission amounts might be matched with NYSCA commission awards. [NYSCA awards are \$2,500 to the two A.I.R.s selected for NYSCA support. Other A.I.R.s receive \$2,000.]	Staff					X	X
1d.8	Expand rehearsal space allotment from 50 to 100 hours (half are offered for free; half @\$5/hr).	Staff					X	X
1d.9	Explore increasing public and invitation-only work-in-progress showings with structures for feedback.	Staff		Artist Advisory			X	X
1e. Revamp marketing strategies to enhance the profile of programs, in order to increase their visibility and utilization.								
1e.1	Develop a comprehensive press list.	Staff				X		

Strategy		Action Step		Role/Responsibility				Timeline		
				Staff	Board	Committee	Consultant	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
1e.2	Research and identify funding for a web designer who will implement enhancements.	Staff	Board			X	X			
1e.3	Explore possibilities of increased marketing to colleges/universities.	Staff				X	X	X		
1e.4	Identify position (workstudy/intern/volunteer) for quarterly distribution of printed materials/brochures and the <i>Performance Journal</i> , in New York City, nationally and internationally.	Staff/ Intern				X	X	X		
1e.5	Create marketing plan for web, email and print materials, including a timeline for creation and distribution.	Staff				X	X			
1e.6	Update the appearance of print materials and widen dissemination to include other local arts organizations to reach more diversified demographics and disciplines.	Staff					X			
1e.7	Develop a part-time marketing position that would implement the plan.	Staff					X			
1e.8	Enhance website to encompass other mechanisms for discourse.	Staff			Web Development		X	X		
1e.9	Add full faculty bios and links to teachers' own websites to MR website.	Staff/ Intern					X	X		
1f. Building on its success, consider making modifications to adapt the Judson Church program to current artist needs.										
1f.1	Convene a discussion to solicit feedback from artists as to the degree to which Judson is serving their needs, specifically any ideas that might restore Judson's process-oriented focus, through the Studies Project, Faculty Meetings, Town Hall Meetings and/or A.I.R. meetings.	Staff		Artist Advisory	Artist Consultant		X			
1f.2	Based on community feedback, consider modifications to the curation process and goals for the Judson series, including language used to describe the program as well as application and panel process		Board	Artist Advisory			X			
1f.3	Secure funding for rent of Judson Meeting Hall.	Staff	Board			X	X			
1f.4	Consider increases in artist fees for Judson, as well as for panelists on the selection committee.	Staff	Board			X	X			
1f.5	Broaden representation of the forms at Judson, by marketing the application to a broader base of artists, and examine the process of inviting artists of color, possibly involving past participants.	Staff		Artist Advisory			X			
1g. Utilize MR/Publishing to encourage discourse among movement-based artists as well as with artists of other disciplines.										
1g.1	Incorporate A.I.R. program into <i>Critical Correspondence</i> (see also Strategy 1d).	Staff			Artist Consultant	X				
1g.2	Establish and confirm publication schedule of <i>Performance Journal</i> .	Staff				X	X	X		

Strategy	Action Step	Role/Responsibility				Timeline		
		Staff	Board	Committee	Consultant	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
1g.3	Research and identify ongoing funding for MR/Publishing, including the <i>Performance Journal</i> and <i>Critical Correspondence</i> .	Staff	Board		Artist Consultant	X	X	X
1g.4	Assess local, national and international relevance of the publications and how to expand reach of both formats beyond the New York dance community.	Staff				X	X	X
1g.5	Review advertising structure addressing goals of targeting a larger base of advertisers in order to increase budget/revenue for publication with the goal of increasing writers' fees as well as bringing new advertisers on to address visibility of publications.	Staff	Board			X	X	
1g.6	Incorporate faculty into <i>Critical Correspondence</i> .	Staff/ Faculty			Web Development		X	X
1h. Create options for student residencies that involve long-term, in-depth study.								
1h.1	Discuss ideas around student residencies with A.I.R.s, AAC and in Faculty Meetings.	Staff	Board	Artist Advisory			X	
1h.2	Explore possibility of identifying and paying a planning fee to a faculty member or core committee of artists to spearhead initiative, working in tandem with staff.	Staff/ Faculty						X
1h.3	Identify and research national and international models for student residencies, including Lower Left Performance Collective (based at Sushi in San Diego) and others.	Staff		Artist Advisory				X
1h.4	Identify funding to support implementation of viable model(s).	Staff	Board					X
1h.5	Develop and implement pilot project for long-term student residency. - Create clear framework and articulation of goals. - Evaluate pilot project with participants at end of study.	Staff/ Faculty						X
1h.6	Identify a Visa Program Committee to investigate current visa requirements (Year 2), including a Chair. This committee should be the same committee that looks at student residency. - Consider how such a program will impact MR's current administration as well as its teaching approach and curriculum.		Board	Artist Advisory			X	
GOAL #2: Secure unified space for programs and administration.								
2a. Explore options for, and eventually procure, space to house both programs and administration. This may include undertaking a feasibility study.								
2a.1	Form Space/Facilities Committee, appoint a Chair, and invite non-board members who are knowledgeable in NYC real estate to serve as advisors.	Staff	Board	Facilities		X		
2a.2	Meet with DTW about options, obligations and needs for continued rental.	Staff				X		

Strategy	Action Step	Role/Responsibility				Timeline		
		Staff	Board	Committee	Consultant	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
2a.3	Formalize relationship with new ministry at Judson Memorial Church, and negotiate rental rate under their new policy. A \$100/night rate is secured for FY07 with a promised increase to at least \$125 for FY08. Build on short-term negotiation to establish a long-term contract.	Staff				X		
2a.4	Set a timeline for space-related discussions and subsequent presentations to board.	Staff		Facilities		X	X	
2a.5	Have initial discussions about feasibility study with potential funders.	Staff	Board	Facilities		X	X	
2a.6	Formalize all space arrangements in writing.	Staff				X	X	X
2a.7	Meet with Danspace Project to discuss all options for space usage, including any future arrangements that might be made possible by their collaboration in the BAM Cultural District, should this new project be realized.	Staff				X	X	X
2a.8	Expand on options for relationships with affordable spaces for classes and workshops.	Staff				X	X	X
2a.9	Work with the Space/Facilities Committee to research nature of feasibility studies and meet with other similar organizations who have been involved in recent feasibility studies.	Staff		Facilities			X	
2a.10	Board will vote on undertaking a feasibility study.		Board				X	X
2a.11	Pending board approval, finalize timeline and action steps for feasibility study.	Staff		Facilities			X	X
2a.12	Contingent upon decisions about space, MR would undertake a new marketing campaign.	Staff						X
GOAL# 3: Increase board effectiveness, in order to meet current and future organizational challenges.								
3a. Increase board from 8 to 16 members.								
3a.1	Create Board Development Committee, including a Chair, at FY08 first quarterly board meeting.	Staff	Board	Board Development		X		
3a.2	Full board to approve timeline for board development at FY08 second quarterly board meeting.		Board	Board Development		X		
3a.3	Board Development Committee to create board matrix/profile and submit to full board for approval at FY08 second quarterly board meeting.		Board	Board Development		X		
3a.4	Board Development Committee to identify and propose new board members for full board consideration.		Board	Board Development		X	X	X
3a.5	Full board to invite proposed members to join board. - Current board members meet individually with proposed board members to inform them about MR and to clarify roles and expectations. - Invite proposed board members to attend a board meeting prior to agreeing to join board.		Board			X	X	X

Strategy	Action Step	Role/Responsibility				Timeline		
		Staff	Board	Committee	Consultant	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
3b. Increase board committees' effectiveness.								
3b.1	Evaluate existing standing committees (Executive, Finance).	Staff	Board			X		
3b.2	Create new board committees (Space/Facilities, Board Development, Fundraising, etc.).	Staff	Board			X		
3b.3	Restructure Artist Advisory Board into Legacy Board.	Staff	Board			X		
3b.4	Artist Advisory Committee to serve as working committee and identify: 1) function of committee, 2) potential members, 3) chair, 4) responsibilities, and 5) first meeting. (See Strategy 1a.)		Board				X	
3b.5	Set timeline for first Artist Advisory Committee meeting and hold meetings two times a year, in fall and spring.		Board	Artist Advisory			X	
3c. Ensure effective board/staff relations with clearly articulated roles and responsibilities.								
3c.1	Research other organizations' models for board/staff relations and roles.	Staff	Board	Executive			X	
3c.2	Report results of research, with recommendations, to full board for vote at FY08 annual meeting. - Recommendations should include a conflict of interest policy.	Staff	Board				X	
3c.3	Implement board-approved recommendations.	Staff	Board					X
3d. Identify ways to utilize existing board expectations document to encourage full participation.								
3d.1	Board Development Committee to review the existing board expectations document, including financial ('give/get' policy) and non-financial participation and, if necessary, propose changes to be voted on by full board at annual board meetings.	Staff	Board	Board Development		X	X	X
3d.2	Engage an attorney (pro bono) to review new by-laws, for approval by the board.	Staff	Board			X		
GOAL #4: Strengthen administration by improving capacity of technological systems and procedures, as well as the capacity and conditions for staff.								
4a. Improve capacity of personnel, by revamping its staff structure, pay rates and benefits.								
4a.1	Implement annual review process for Executive Director and Managing Director. - Create board committee to spearhead review program. - Establish criteria, format, timetable and clear benchmarks. - Create framework to ensure open communication between board and Executive Director that informs organizational practice.		Board			X		

Strategy	Action Step	Role/Responsibility				Timeline		
		Staff	Board	Committee	Consultant	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
4a.2	Implement annual staff review by Executive Director, whereby Executive Director would create criteria, and framework, for salary determination.	Staff				X		
4a.3	Institute an annual review of staff structure and organizational chart by Executive Director.	Senior Staff					X	X
4a.4	Develop a three-year budget that incorporates increased staff salaries and the establishment (or re-establishment) of benefits with clear criteria for staff eligibility (Year 1: health insurance, Year 3: 403(b)).	Staff	Board			X		X
4a.5	Projected staff modifications are as follows, pending resources and further review: - Enhance Development Associate position by adding paid vacation and coverage for at least half of health insurance. Potentially enhance position to Development/Marketing Mgr, increasing hours to 25hr/wk, as well as pay rate.	Staff				X		
4a.6	Explore possibility of separate marketing position.	Staff				X		
4a.7	Provide benefits for Operations Manager and increase to about 30 hours per week.	Staff					X	
4a.8	Upgrade Journal Coordinator to Editor-in-Chief and raise pay rate.	Staff				X		
4a.9	Create development assistant position.	Staff					X	
4b. Improve capacity of technological systems.								
4b.1	Replace server and upgrade operating system.	Staff				X		
4b.2	Draw up a wish list of software needs for purchase or to secure through donation.	Staff				X		
4b.3	Upgrade software for all programmatic and operational systems (marketing, finances, communications, web).	Staff				X	X	X
4b.4	Purchase digital still and video cameras, and audio recorder (iPod or other digital) for documentation and web usage.	Staff	Board			X	X	
4b.5	Develop a technology plan, possibly through a tech audit by an outside consultant familiar with the needs of non-profits.	Staff	Board		Technical Consultant	X		
4b.6	Maintain and update databases and systems as prioritized by the technology assessment and plan, and on a regular basis.	Staff	Board			X	X	X
4b.7	Enhance/expand computer capability to accept streaming of audio and video and still/video.	Staff					X	X

Strategy	Action Step	Role/Responsibility				Timeline		
		Staff	Board	Committee	Consultant	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
4b.8	Identify and bring on work-study or paid staff to serve as liaison between web designer and staff. Upload the following content: - Back issues of <i>Performance Journal</i> . - Faculty bios and links to their websites. - A.I.R. information (bios, press, activities) and links to their websites. - Town Hall minutes. - Additional program-based content and documentation on ongoing basis. - Identify and provide links to related resources and organizations.	Staff/ Work study			Web Designer		X	X
4c. Improve administrative policies and procedures.								
4c.1	Streamline current filing systems.	Staff				X		
4c.2	Streamline financial management systems to alleviate administration.	Staff	Board			X	X	
4c.3	Create more time efficient methods of tracking individual contributions.	Staff				X		
4c.4	Institute more efficient ways of tracking program activities and accomplishments.	Staff				X	X	
4c.5	Create efficient archival system for administrative records, video tapes, DVDs, and publications.	Staff				X	X	X
4c.6	Streamline the organization and utilization of office network system.	Staff				X	X	X
GOAL #5: Increase annual operating budget from \$355,000 in FY07 to \$500,000 by FY10 in accordance with the goals of the Strategic Plan and mission statement.								
5a. Develop short- and long-term strategies to increase earned income.								
5a.1	Assess ability to increase earned income with present facilities. - Look at ratio of earned income for rehearsal space vs. classes and workshops (Year 1). - Revisit class and workshop fee structure (Year 1, 2, 3). - Determine whether MR will return in FY09 to NYSCA Rehearsal Space Subsidy program, whereby NYSCA funds \$2,500 to support organizations that offer rehearsal space at \$10/hr (Year 2).	Staff	Board			X	X	X
5a.2	Increase journal ads and look into web ad space.	Staff				X	X	X
5a.3	Increase journal distribution and subscriptions.	Staff				X	X	X
5a.4	Increase festival attendance.	Staff				X	X	X

Strategy	Action Step	Role/Responsibility				Timeline		
		Staff	Board	Committee	Consultant	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
5a.5	Increase class attendance and consider class card sales.	Staff				X	X	X
5b. Develop short- and long-term strategies to increase contributed income.								
5b.1	Create Fundraising Committee.	Staff	Board	Fundraising		X		
5b.2	Create case statement.	Staff	Board	Fundraising		X	X	
5b.3	Create annual fundraising plan (Year 1, 2, 3), which would include general operating support, program support and possibly capital campaign (Year 3 only).	Staff	Board	Fundraising		X	X	X
5b.4	Develop new and expand on current strategies for cultivation of individual donors, to include some or all of the following: -Increase board giving. -Enhance annual appeal and ensure that it is mailed earlier. -Expand contact database.	Staff	Board	Fundraising			X	X
5b.5	Continue to synchronize fundraising plan with budgeting process so that funding requests (and start/end dates) coincide more closely with the fiscal year cycle.	Staff	Board			X	X	X
5b.6	Revisit board 'give/get' contribution levels annually.		Board			X	X	X
5b.7	Resume discussion regarding creation of membership program.	Staff	Board				X	
5c. Contingent on the results of its decision about space, take the initial steps to stabilize the organization's financial base, which would eventually position Movement Research as a viable capital campaign candidate.								
5c.1	Institute procedure of creating cash flow projections.	Staff	Board			X		
5c.2	Create a plan and monetary goal, and establish cash reserve.	Staff	Board				X	X
5c.3	Create and follow a capacity building plan that integrates a range of funding sources.	Staff	Board	Fundraising		X	X	X
5c.4	Take the steps to build and expand upon the individual donor base in order to cultivate these individuals for additional gifts for capacity building and capital projects.	Staff	Board	Fundraising			X	X
5c.5	Evaluate capacity building and capital campaign goals, to build understanding on the part of the board and staff, and increase the likelihood of success. Products might include a feasibility study for capital campaigns, including a plan and case statement.	Staff	Board	Fundraising	Financial Consultant		X	X

X. Appendices

1. List of Board of Directors During Planning Process
2. Participants in Artist Focus Groups
3. Average Rating of Strategies in Artist Focus Groups

Appendix 1. Board of Directors

The following is a list of board members who served during the development of this plan:

Mary Lou D'Auray (March 2003-present)

Certified Interior Designer in California; Married to Alan Davis; Working artist.

Barbara Bryan (January 2000-present)

Performing Arts Producer, Manager and Curator

P. Shane Elenbaas (2002-2006, reinstated 2007)

Actuarial Manager, KPMG Actuarial Services

Levi Gonzalez (September 2007 – present)

Choreographer and Performer. Recipient NYFA Fellowship in Choreography 2006. Movement Research Artist-in-Residence 2003-2004. Co-editor of Critical Correspondence. Performed with Donna Uchizono Company, Michael Laub's Remote Control Productions and John Jasperse Company.

Ishmael Houston-Jones (July 2003-present)

Coordinator, Lament Fellowships in the Arts, a program of TIDES Foundation that awards multi-year, unrestricted grants to New York City visual and performing artists; Writer of fiction and essays; Curator of dance and performance; Performer and choreographer; Danspace Project Board of Directors 1984-present; Headlong Dance Theater Board of Directors 1994-present

Paul Laland (April 2002-June 2007)

Choreographer/Performer; Arts Professor, NYU Experimental Theatre Wing; Original member of Meredith Monk Vocal Ensemble; Contact improviser since 1972

Jeremy Nelson (September 2002-June 2007)

Choreographer, dancer, and teacher at Movement Research and internationally. 1991 "Bessie" Award winner and 2004 Guggenheim Fellow.

Carla Peterson (June 2002-present)

Artistic Director, Dance Theater Workshop, NYC, since October 2006; former Executive Director, Movement Research, Inc. June 2002-September 2006; Freelance writer, project manager, and fundraiser for independent artists, arts organizations and foundations 1996-2006; Director of Inter/National Projects, Dance Theater Workshop, 1993-'96; Assistant Director of Performing Arts, Wexner Center for the Arts 1988-'93.

Janice L. Shapiro (March 2004-present)

Director of Grants & Strategy, Foundation for Jewish Culture

Steve Staso (September 2005-present)

Filmmaker; Visual artist; Dance enthusiast

Guy Yarden (1989-1991; 1995-1997; October 2003-present)

Composer; Administrator

Appendix 2. Participants in Artist Focus Groups

1. Christal Brown
2. Alex Escalante
3. Beth Gill
4. Levi Gonzalez
5. Neil Greenberg
6. Erika Hand
7. K.J. Holmes
8. Melanie Maar
9. Juliette Mapp
10. Alejandra Martorell
11. Mina Nishimura
12. Mollie O'Brien
13. Margaret Paek
14. RoseAnne Spradlin
15. David Thomson
16. Sandy Tillett

Appendix 3. Average Rating of Strategies in Artist Focus Groups

Artists were asked to rate each strategy from 5 to 1, with 5 being extremely useful and 1 being not at all useful. They could also select "don't know" (D/N) or no answer (N/A).

Goals and Strategies	Average Rating	
	For Artists Themselves	For Other Artists
GOAL # 1: Evaluate and modify programs to increase their relevance and effectiveness.		
1a. Create Artist Advisory Committee and Evaluation Structure <i>To gather information about programs from artists</i>	4.6 1 D/N	4.9 2 D/N
1b. Develop Support Mechanisms for Teachers <i>Teacher Subsidy Fund and mentorship for new teachers</i>	3.9	4.6 1 D/N
1c. Expand Artist Opportunities Elsewhere <i>Through relationships with presenters, colleges & the MRX initiative</i>	4.5 2 D/N	4.2
1d. Extend Artist-in-Residence (A.I.R.) Program to Two Years	4.3 1 D/N	4.8
1e. Revamp and Increase Marketing <i>Increase the visibility and utilization of programs</i>	4.7 1 D/N	4.9 1 N/A
1f. Build on Success of Judson by Making Minor Modifications <i>Broaden representation of artists and increase fees</i>	4.3 1 D/N	4.5 1 N/A
1g. Use MR/Publishing to Encourage Discourse among Artists <i>Further develop Critical Correspondence, Journal and Web</i>	4.8	4.9
1h. Create Student Residencies <i>Longer-term options for in-depth study and performance</i>	3.1 1 D/N, 1 N/A	3.9 1 N/A
GOAL #2: Secure space and related technology and equipment for programs and administration.		
2a. Explore Options for Long-term Space <i>Ideally combine administrative and studio space</i>	4.8	4.9
2b. Visa Program <i>Consider accreditation for international students if space allows</i>	2.1 3 D/N	4.1 1 D/N
GOAL # 3: Increase board effectiveness, in order to meet current and future organizational challenges.		
3a. – 3d. Increase size of board and its effectiveness <i>Through more effective committees, through clarifying staff and board responsibilities, and through clear expectations</i>	4.4 2 D/N	4.1 1 D/N
GOAL #4: Strengthen administration by improving capacity of technological systems and procedures, as well as the capacity and conditions for staff.		
4a. & 4c. Improve Administration and Capacity of Personnel <i>Through revamping structure, pay and benefits as well as through better administrative policies and procedures</i>	4.8	5
*4b. Improve Capacity of Technological Systems <i>Through better software, database, website and media equipment (cameras, iPods, etc.)</i>	4.1	4.4
GOAL #5: Increase annual operating budget from \$355,000 in FY07 to \$500,000 by FY10 in accordance with the goals of the Strategic Plan and mission statement.		
*5a. Increase Earned Income <i>Look at class and workshop fee structure, consider class cards, journal advertising & distribution, festival attendance, in order to eventually increase artist fees.</i>	4.7 1 D/N 1 No Answer	4.9 1 D/N 1 No Answer
5b. & 5c. Increase Contributed Income & Stabilize Financial Base <i>Through more effective development plans and to position MR for a capital campaign</i>	4.9 1 D/N 1 No Answer	4.9 1 D/N 1 No Answer

XI. History of Programs, Artists, Key Events, and Publications, 1978 to 2008

The history of Movement Research tells the history of a vital segment of the contemporary dance scene in New York over three decades. This overview of the artists it has served, programs it has developed and issues it has explored through both panels such as the Studies Project and publications such as the *Performance Journal* reflect trends that were, and continue to be, important to dancers, critics, and historians.

A list of former board members and several program histories follow, to provide a closer look at Movement Research's activities, accomplishments and community of artists through time. These histories were culled from accessible records and archival projects already under way, though a wealth of information about Movement Research also exists both in physical documentation that has yet to be archived, and in the memories and ongoing work of generations of progressive artists.

1. Historical List of Board of Directors

This list of board members over Movement Research's 30-year history shows the sheer number of artists and arts-supporters who have played a key role in the organization's day-to-day survival and cumulative artistic impact. This is a non-comprehensive list of board members culled from mastheads in *Performance Journals #1-31* and archived board minutes.

2. Artist-in-Residence Program History

Former artists-in-residence throughout the history of this program (1991-2009) are listed, aptly illustrating the range of progressive dance and movement-based artists who have been an integral part of all Movement Research programs over the years.

3. Performance Journal History

Through 31 publications, the *Performance Journal* has brought together nearly 70 staff members and editors, and more than 800 contributors, fostering the exploration of written and graphic languages that engage current issues in dance and performance.

4. Movement Research Timeline

This Timeline has been pulled together based on existing records – files, proposals, *Performance Journals*, season calendars, programs and feedback solicited from artists who have been intimately familiar with Movement Research at different points in its history. We invite feedback, additions and corrections from the community in order to ensure this timeline is an accurate record, as Plans are best thought of as living documents. The Timeline, along with the Plan, will be posted on our website and will reflect ongoing feedback. As this is Movement Research's first-ever Strategic Plan, the board and staff think that addressing its 30 legacy years based in New York City is critical to understanding the organization's current progress and future direction.

1. Historical List of Board of Directors

Wendell Beavers
Johanna Boyce
Loris Bradley
Veronique Brossier
Cee Scott Brown
Barbara Bryan
Yoshiko Chuma
Mary Lou D'Auray
David Dorfman
Cathy Edwards
P. Shane Elenbaas
Richard Elovich
Susan Fait-Meyers
Robin Feld
Simone Forti
Terry Fox
Beth Goren
David Alan Harris
Aleta Hayes
Cynthia Hedstrom
Joan Hocky
Margaret Hoeffel
Patricia Hoffbauer
Cathy Hough
Jim Hough
Ishmael Houston-Jones
Paul Hunt
Bill T. Jones
Richard Kerry
Taihi Kim
Paul Langland
Daniel Lepkoff
Catherine Levine
Sondra Loring
Nina Martin
Sarah Michelson
Jennifer Monson
Susan Neiman
Jeremy Nelson
Terence O'Reilly
Eiko Otake
Mary Overlie
Jodi Peikoff
Carla Peterson
Stephen Petronio
Mouilly Pongnon
Renee Rockoff
George Emilio Sanchez
Janice Shapiro
Stephanie Skura
Janet Stapleton
Steve Staso
Earnie Stevenson
Christina Svane
Carol Swann
Laurie Uprichard
Janine Williams
Keith Wold
Stephanie Woodard
Guy Yarden
Yasuko Yokoshi

2. Artist-in-Residence Program History

1991-92

Ron Brown, Alexis Eupierre, Irene Hultman, Yvonne Meier, Dana Reitz, David Zambrano.

1992-93

Javier de Frutos, Lucy Guerin, Patricia Hoffbauer, Jennifer Lacey, Sondra Loring, David Rousseve, Vicky Shick.

1993-94

Susan Braham, John Jasperse, Clarinda Mac Low, Jaime Ortega, Sanghi Wagner, Marlies Yearby.

1994-95

James Adlesic, Evelyn Velez Aguayo, Eduardo Alegria, Danza sin Fronteras (Marcella Ortiz Broughton), Kyle De Camp, DD Dorvillier, Margarita Guergue, Deborah Hay, Scott Heron, Sarah East Johnson, Ivonne Munoz, Jeremy Nelson, Raul Parrao, Paz Tanjuaquio.

1995-96

Eduardo Alegria, Linda Austin, Grisha Coleman, Sean Curran, DD Dorvillier, Rebecca Hilton, Mia Lawrence, Jennifer Miller, Lisa Race, Paz Tanjuaquio, Valerie Vitale, Cathy Weis.

1996-97

Eduardo Alegria, Wally Cardona, DD Dorvillier, Maureen Ellenhorn, Paula Hunter, Annie Lobst, Andrew Marcus, Molly Rabinowitz, Hank Smith, Susana Sperling, Paz Tanjuaquio, Christalyn Wright, Yasuko Yokoshi.

1997-98

Karen Bernard, Amy Cox, David Figueroa, David Finkelstein, Trajal Harrell, Aleta Hayes, Merian Soto, Kathy Westwater, Cheng Chieh Yu.

1998-99

Zack Fuller, Guta Hedewig, Jonathan Kinzel, Andrea Kleine, Luis Lara, Fausto Matias, Andrea Mills, Dean Moss, Julie Atlas Muz, RoseAnne Spradlin.

1999-2000

Jennifer Allen, Sigal Bergman, Gerald Casel, Yasmeen Godder, Terry Hollis, Koosil-Ja Hwang, Alejandra Martorell, Tameica McCloud, Lisa Race, Antonio Ramos, Karen Sherman, Laura Staton,

2000-01

Paula Hunter, Barbara Mahler.

2001-02

Luciana Achugar, Nancy Bannon, Wendy Blum, Miguel Gutierrez, Curt Haworth, Amanda Loulaki, Sarah Michelson, Osmany Tellez, Nami Yamamoto, Yasuko Yokoshi.

2002-03

Luciana Achugar, Paul Benny, Miguel Gutierrez, Luis Lara, Osmany Tellez, Jeremy Wade, Yasuko Yokoshi, Chantal Yzermans.

2003-04

Levi Gonzalez, Judith Ruiz Sanchez.

2004-05

Ori Flomin, Kiyoko Kashiwagi, Sam Kim, Heather Kravas, Juliette Mapp, Yvonne Meier, Johanna Meyer.

2005-06

Kimberly Bartosik, Isabel Lewis, Melanie Maar, Melinda Ring, Deganit Shemy, Jill Sigman.

2006-07

Christal Brown, Gerald Casel, Milka Djordevich, DD Dorvillier, Vanessa Justice, Rebecca Lazier, Barbara Mahler, Mollie O'Brien, Anna Sperber, RoseAnne Spradlin.

2007-08

Alex Escalante, Beth Gill, Daniel Linehan, Yvonne Meier, Jimena Paz, Regina Rocke, Antonietta Vicario, Christopher Williams

2008-09

Karl Cronin, Daria Faïn, Charlotte Gibbons, Jennifer Nugent, Sakura Shimada, Stacy Spence, Arturo Vidich, Pavel Zuštiak

3. Performance Journal History

- #1 First Issue** **September 1990**
Editor: Richard Elovich; Associate Editor: Michael Sexton
Contributors: Jill Johnson, Jim Eigo, Caroline Palmer, Lenora Champagne, Michael Sexton, Holly Hughes, Simone Forti, Richard Schechner, Sarah Johnson
- #2 Second Issue** **January 1991**
Editor: Richard Elovich; Associate Editors: Cathy Edwards, Ira Sachs, Michael Sexton
Contributors: Joe E. Jeffreys, Jim Eigo, Caroline Palmer, Sarah Schulman, Ann Bogart, Hilton Als, Jeff Nunokawa, Douglas Crimp, Gregg Bordowitz, Kevin Duffy, Nina Martin
- #3 Gender Performance** **September 1991**
Guest Editor: Tom Kalin
Contributors: Peter Bowen, Critical Art Ensemble, Cheryl Clarke, Gang, Jill Johnston, Tom Kalin, John Kelly, John Lindell, Vivienne Maricevic, Chris Martin, Marlene McCarty, Donald Moffett, Caroline Palmer, Powers of Desire, Peggy Shaw, Lois Weaver, Annie Sprinkle, Donald Woods
- #4 The Identity Issue** **January 1992**
Guest Editor: Esther Kaplan
Contributors: Aziza, David Chan, Cheap Art, Peggy Myo-Young Choy, Yoshiko Chuma, Grisha Coleman, Celina Davis, Cheryl Dunye, Fierce Pussy, Coco Fusco, Edgar Heap of Birds, Fred Wei-han Ho, Jeannie Hutchins, Darius James, Joe E. Jeffreys, Suzanne Jones, Stephanie Jones, Gerard Little, Sondra Loring, Dona Ann McAdams, Robbie McCauley, Ed Morales, Caroline Palmer, Adrian Piper, Alyson Pou, Kate Ramsey, Arlene Raven, Renee Redding-Jones, Alva Rogers, David Rousseve, Alison Saar, Kalamu ya Salaam, Jayce Salloum, Judith Sloan, Merian Soto, Julie Tolentino, Edwin Torres, Jack Waters, Charmaine Warren
- #5 Environments** **September 1992**
Editors: Cathy Edwards, Kate Ramsey
Contributors: New York Public Interest Research Group, Lenora Champagne, Livia Daza-Paris, Elise Bernhardt, Simone Forti, Patricia Hoffbauer, Pauline Oliveros, Ione, Shu Lea Cheang, Jessica Hagedorn, Kalamu ya Salaam, Charles Uwiragiye, Marina Zurkow, Coco Fusco, Guillermo Gomez-Pena, Ella Shohat, George Bartenieff, Cathy Edwards, Rachel Rosenthal, Dona Ann McAdams, Clarinda Mac Low, Laurie Carlos, Jackie Apple, Jay Critchley, Laurie Weeks, Jenny Romaine, Mark Sussman, Audrey Kindred, Yves Musard, Jim Eigo, Elise Long
- #6 Heroes and Histories** **April 1993**
Editors: Cathy Edwards, Esther Kaplan, Guy Yarden
Contributors: Dona Ann McAdams, Louise Sunshine, Wendell Beavers, Ed Morales, Tere O'Connor, Patricia Hoffbauer, Sara Rudner, Fred Wei-Han Ho, Robby Barnett, Tamar Rogoff, Jon Weaver, Ishmael Houston-Jones, Harry Whittaker Sheppard, Annie Sprinke, Nicky Paraiso, Guy Yarden, Joe E. Jeffreys, Malkia Amala Cyril, Richard Elovich, Martha Wittman, Ruth Zaporah, Deborah Hay, Kate Ramsey, John Kelly, Yin Wong, Kenneth King, Julie Carr, Cathy Edwards, Scott deLahunta, Elizabeth Zimmer, Pauline Oliveros, Ione, Eve Rosahn, ACT UP
- #7 States of the Body** **September 1993**
Editors: Cathy Edwards, Guy Yarden
Contributors: Dona Ann McAdams, Scott Heron, Christopher Caines, Holly Hughes, Bill T. Jones, Peggy Gillespie, Gigi Kaeser, Jerri Allyn, Evelyn Velez, Ann Cooper Albright, John Malpede, Susan Klein, Sarah Jonson, Jim Eigo, Beatriz Schiller, Laurie Weeks, Judith Ren-Lay, Esther Kaplan, Wendell Beavers, Lance Gries, Elizabeth Streb, Jennifer Monson, Jack Waters, Andrew Serrano
- #8 A Travel Issue** **April 1994**
Editor: Cathy Edwards
Contributors: Caroline Palmer, Izeta Grandevic, Dena Davida, George Emilio Sanchez, Rebecca Hilton, Diane Torr, David Thomson, Leo Janks, Hope Clark, Diane Butler, Lisa Kraus, Barbara Dilley, Sondra Loring, Marshelle D. Jones, Fred Wei-han Ho, Wendell Beavers, Sarah Skaggs, Anja Hitzenberger, David Zambrano, Christopher Caines, Rivca Rubin, Ania Witkowska, Gwen Welliver, Dona Ann McAdams, Jaime Ortega, Linda Austin, Amy Gale, Rudy Engelder, K.J. Holmes, Yacov Sharir, Diane Gromala, Stephanie Basch, Yves Musard
- #9 Body of Language** **September 1994**
Editor: Cathy Edwards
Contributors: Eva Karczag, Simone Forti, Creative Time/Alyson Pou, Jenny Holzer, Algernon Miller, Karen Finley, Nancy Burson, Peggy Diggs, Hunter Reynolds, Danny Tisdale, Patricia Hoffbauer, Liz Lerman, Julie Carr, Annie

Lanzillotto, Gwen Welliver, John Kelly, Evelyn Velez Aguayo, Susan Galilea, Elizabeth Zimmer, Kenneth King, David Dorfman, George Emilio Sanchez, Jim Eigo, Marshelle Jones, Erin Fitzgerald, Clarinda Mac Low, Jessica Kindred

#10 performance/protest/resistance/activism

January 1995

Editor: Cathy Edwards

Contributors: Algernon Miller, Daniel Lepkoff, Neil Greenberg, Guillermo Gomez-Pena-Remy Charlip, Bread & Puppet Theater, Terry Galloway, Jon Weaver, Jennifer Monson, Esther Kaplan, China Jorin, Annie Lanzillotto, Cathy Edwards, Tom Brazil, Edwin Torres, Ted Byfield, Carolina Kroon, Janine Williams, David Alan Harris, Yalamu Ya Salaam, Peter Laarman, Michael Romanyshyn, Eileen Myles, Danny Tisdale, John Bell, Peter Schumann, Keith Hennessy, Jack Davis, Dona Ann McAdams

#11 Conversations

September 1995

Editor: Cathy Edwards

Contributors: Aat Hougee, Steve Paxton, Annie Lanzillotto, Sue Poulin, Wendy Perron, Cathy Weis, Patricia Hoffbauer, Marlies Yearby, Trisha Brown, Deborah Hay, Julie Carr, Itty Neuhaus, Jim Eigo, Madeline Olnek, Alice Naude, Andrea Mills, Charmaine Warren, David Rousseve, Neil Greenberg, Elizabeth Streb

#12 Dollars and Sensibility

January 1996

Guest Editor: Annie Rachelle Lanzillotto; Guest Associate Editor: Alice Naude

Contributors: Hattie Gossett, Andrew Perret, Bob Ajar, Freda Rosen, Martha Wittman, Andrew Marcus, Daria Fain, Audrey Kindred, E. Ira McCrudden, Neil Goldberg, Michelle Bennett, Guta Hedewig, Anja Hitzenberger, Bina Sharif, Dona Ann McAdams, Grisha Coleman, Asimina Chremos, K. Bernard, N. Rollings, Joan Hocky, Carolina Kroon, Christina Knight, Mark Robison, Heleri, Ronald K. Brown, Fred Ho, Sally Lee Stewart, John Kriedler, Madi Horstman, Dennis Reid, George Emilio Sanchez, Ed Boland

#13 Body and Belief

September 1996

Co-Editors: Peter Larose, Audrey Kindred

Contributors: Sally Hess, Howard Moody, Janet Clancy, Kristin Stewart, Julie Atlas Muz, Anya Pryor, Ze'eva Cohen, Kathy Westwater, Cydney Wilkes, Harvey Goldwasser, Ryan Gilliam, Ralph Lemon, Scott Heron, Peter Laarman, Gayle Greene Watkins, Jaime Ortega, Anja Hitzenberger, Peter Larose, Karen Sherman, Sarah Michelson, Susan T. Klein, Connie Voisine, Ezekiel, Masayoshi Kobayashi, Clarinda Mac Low, Kelly McDonald, Carol Mullins, Lindad Tarnay, Guta Hedewig, Louise Green Fausto Matias, Keith Hennessy, Daria Fain, Ruth Zaporah, Tamara Fulop, Wendy Kindred

#14 The Legacy of Robert Dunn

April 1997

Guest Editor: Wendy Perron

Contributors: Cate Deicher, Sally Gross, Nancy Zendora, Meredith Monk, Rudy Perez, Elaine Summers, Simone Forti, Anita Feldman, Paulus Berensohn, Pauline Tish, Al Carmines, Kenneth King, Jane Shapiro, Ruth Emerson, Irene Dowd, Remy Charlip, Deborah Hay, Yvonne Rainer, Steve Paxton, Jill Johnston, Debra Loewen, Leslie Satin, Nancy Topf, Mary Overlie, Mary E. Edsall, Oliver J. Cutshaw, Anastasia Lyra, Paul Langland, Gretchen MacLane, David Gordon, Martha Eddy, Jeni Frazee, Sally Silvers, Miranda Benedict, Martha Myers, Catherine Eliot

#15 Moving Communities

September 1997

Guest Co-Editors: Joan T. Hocky, George Emilio Sanchez

Contributors: Suzanne Lacey, Mierle Ukeles, Marty Pottenger, Merian Soto, Patricia Hoffbauer, Teri Carter, Peggy Pettit, Hope Clark, Lucy Fradkin, Ryan Gilliam, Jennifer Monson, Yves Musard, Grady Hillman, Terry Greiss, May Joseph, Amy Pivar, Joan T. Hocky, George Emilio Sanchez

#16 Fame

April 1998

Co-Editors: Linda Austin, Anya Pryor

Contributors: Linda Austin, Barbara Berg, Ananya Chatterjee, Maureen Ellenborn, Ann Farmer, Andrew Fearnside, Doris Green, Trajal Harrell, Keith Hennessy, Deborah Jowitt, Clarinda Mac Low, Kate G. Mattingly, Frank Moore, Julie Atlas Muz, Daniel Nagrin, Joanne Nerenberg, Mary Overlie, Chrysa Parkinson, Anya Pryor, Yvonne Rainer, Lucy Sexton, Deborah J. Slater, Dan Wagoner, Elizabeth Zimmer, Greg Zuccolo

#17 Memory/Place

September 1998

Editor: Anya Pryor; Danspace Co-Editor: Carol Mullins

Contributors: Catherine Levine, Laurie Uprichard, Christina Svane, Barbara Moore, Cynthia Hedstrom, Yoshiko Chuma, Anya Pryor, Daniel Lepkoff, Nancy Topf, Carol Swann, Wendell Beavers, Steve Paxton, Luis Lara, Laurel George, Jonathon Kinzel, Nancy Saint Paul, Linda Austin, Clarinda Mac Low, Ishmael Houston-Jones, Terry Fox, Douglas Dunn, Larry Fagin, Sara Rudner, Barbara Dilley, Carol Mullins, Stefa Zawerucha, koosil-ja hwang, Kenneth King, Wendy Perron, Myrna Packer, Simone Forti

18 Release Part I

January 1999

Editors: DD Dorvillier, Trajal Harrell, Sarah Michelson

Contributors: Alison Foley, Leslie Kaminoff, Katherine Profeta, Diane Moss, Mary Fulkerson, Erick Hawkins, Renta Celichowska, Richard Move, Kirsty Alexander, Susan T. Klein, Neil Greenberg, Mikhail Barishnikov, Mike Iveson, Sophia Cowing, Loraine Corfield, Dunya Dianne McPherson, Tania Appelbaum, Jon Gibson, Susan Osberg, Simone Forti, Anita Feldman, Hank Smith, Yvonne Meier, Jennifer Monson, Clarinda Mac Low, Joanne Weinrib, Richard Mar, SuLyn Silbar, Dona Ann McAdams, Ralph Lemon, Charles Erikson, David Harry Stewart

#19 Release Part II

September 1999

Editors: DD Dorvillier, Trajal Harrell, Sarah Michelson

Contributors: Laura Shapiro, Hiroko Ishimura, Brooke Berman, Diane Torr, Stephanie Skura, Daniel Lepkoff, Elaine Summers, Marcia Monroe, Brendan McCall, Vera Orlock, Sara Rudner, Julie Ludwick, Lance Gries, Andrew Marcus, Donna Ann McAdams, Sara Michelson, Clarinda Mac Low, Dr. Ninotchka Devorah Bennahum, Trajal Harrell, George Stamos, Sara Wookey, Pat Cremins, Christy Harris, Andre Lepecki, Peter Laarman

#20 Technology and the Body

January 2000

Editors: Sarah Michelson, Kathy Westwater

Contributors: Cydney Wilkes, Jeremy Wade, Aaron Lee Fineman, Dona Ann McAdams, Andy Clarke, Grethe Mitchell, Irina Danilova, Steven Ausbury, Charlotte Cullinin, Douglas Rosenberg, Merce Cunningham, Mark Coniglio, Dawn Stoppiello, Kathy Westwater, George Emilio Sanchez, Chris Van de Burght, Johannes Birringer, Kimberley Bartosik, Steve Reich, Laura Frost, Trajal Harrell, Elizabeth Streb, Yvonne Rainer, Mark Robinson, Meg Stuart, Sally Silvers, Geary Buxton, Cathy Weis, Merian Soto, Lucy Sexton, Kenneth King, Martha Wilson, Peggy Phelan, Charles Atlas, Dean Moss, Nora York, Toni Dove, Stelarc, Orlan

#21 Age and the Trajectory of the Body in Time

September 2000

Editors: Sarah Michelson, Bob Ajar

Contributors: Andrew Kromelowe, Dave Hickey, Paul Teeling, Remy Charlip, Wendy Perron, Tazewell Tompson, Tom Caraviglia, Dona Ann McAdams, Hope Clark, Marlon Barios Solano, Tere O'Connor, Frances Alenikoff, Diana C. Stoll, Dana Flynn, Edith Stephen, Cathy Weis, Francesca Mannoni, Marilyn Jackson, Ziji Beth Goren, Charlotte Cullinan, Nina Kathadourian, Runa Lindfors, Mark Russell, Antler, Mary Gearhart, Andrea Marks, Sondra Loring, Cynthia Oliver, Dana Salisbury, Miana Grafals, Eileen Travell, Elizabeth Barnes

#22 Ownership

January 2001

Editors: Sarah Michelson, Tere O'Connor, Julie Atlas Muz

Contributors: Zack Fuller, Richard Move, Maxine Sherman, Janet Elber, Keith Hennessy, Greg Zuccolo, Michael Kaniecki, Antler, Susan Rethorst, Janusz Jaworski, Julie Regan, Jo McKendry, Chrysa Parkinson, Brian McCormick, Juliana Francis, Gary Keenan, Gregore Paslawsky, Diane Vivona, Stephen Greco, Linda Martini, Jeff McMahan, Mark Russell, Dona Ann McAdams, Cornelia Hediger, Wendy S. Wiseman, Joseph Astor, Exum, John Mann, John Horne

#23 Now

September 2001

Editors: Sarah Michelson, Samuael Topiary, Contributing Advisory Editor: Jon Kinzel

Contributors: Fritz Welch, Mike Albo, Richard Foreman, Chris Bergman, Deborah Hay, Paul Ben-Itza, Sten Rudstrom, Peter Schmitz, Sarah Valdez, Charlotte Cullinan, Antler, Stanya Kahn, Janusz Jaworski, Margaret Tedesco, K.J. Holmes, Samuael Topiary, Dona Ann McAdams, Steve Hartman, Susan Jung, Paula Court, Elizabeth Gorelik, Youme Landowne, AnnaJoy Springer, Miguel Gutierrez, Keith Hennessy, Magu G., Kathryn Lyle

#24 Fragile

April 2002

Editor-in-Chief: Sarah Michelson; Guest Editor: Jill Sigman

Contributors: Ivan Lerner, Trisha Brown, Sally Hess, Maria Ramnath, Jean Steiner, Hope Clark, Pat Cremins, Julie Atlas Muz, Jennifer Monson, Roberta Morris, Lise Brenner, Fred Hatt, Bob Stein, Jill Szuchmacher, Layard Thompson, Susan Klein, Fiona Marcotty, Mollie O'Brien, Homer Avila, Dijana Milosevic, Yoshiko Chuma, Casey Ruble, Jane Comfort, Alessandra Gallone, Richard Paul Schmonsees, Keely Garfield, Donald Byrd, Elizabeth Streb, Laura Flanders

#25 Dance Writing

September 2002

Editor-in-Chief: Sarah Michelson; Guest Editor: Gia Kourlas

Contributors: Tere O'Connor, Levi Gonzalez, Sri Louise, Willa Carroll, Chris Dohse, Dean Moss, Wendy Perron, Kourtney Rutherford, Karen Graham, Miguel Gutierrez, David Neumann, Julie Atlas Muz, Janet Stapleton, Greg Zuccolo, Yasuko Yokoshi, Tobi Tobias, Kimberly Bartosik, Sally Silvers, Jack Anderson, Robert Greskovic, Deborah Jowitz

#26 The Model

March 2003

Guest Editors: Guy Yarden, Miguel Gutierrez; Contributing Editors: Clarinda Mac Low, Joyce S. Lim, George Emilio Sanchez

Contributors: Artists' Congress, Dancers Forum, Roberto Bedoya, Chrysa Parkinson, Loris Bradley, Kristy Edmunds, Tricia Pierson, Janice Shapiro, Sean Meehan, Bill T. Jones, Clarinda Mac Low, Keith Hennessy, Lucy Sexton, Ishmael Houston-Jones, Barbara Bryan, David Thomson, George Emilio Sanchez, Sarah Michelson, Miguel Gutierrez, Guy Yarden

#27/28 Then and Now

Spring 2004

Guest Editor: Clarinda Mac Low; Editorial Assistants: Arturo Vidich, Eleanor Dubinsky

Contributors: Mary Overlie, Diane Vivona, Cynthia Hedstrom, Alejandra Martorell, Levi Gonzalez, Brenda Dixon Gottschild, Kenneth King, Kathy Westwater, Wendell Beavers, Cynthia Oliver, Penny Dannenberg, Marilyn Lawrence, Wendy Blum, Ishmael Houston-Jones, Arturo Vidich, Yvonne Rainer, Maya Ciarocchi, Sally Silvers, Paul Langland, Anne Gadwa, Ursula Eagly, Frances Alenikoff, Ani Weinstein, Cathy Edwards, Guy Yarden, Juliette Mapp, Sondra Loring, Danny Lepkoff, Marion Ramirez, Merian Soto, Amanda Loulaki, Daria Fain, Jill Johnston, Jonah Bokaer, Karen Sherman, Marya Wethers, Eleanor Dubinsky, koosil-ja, Cathy Weis, Audrey Kindred, Joyce S. Lim, Amy Cox, Susan Foster, Anika Tromholt Kristensen, Simone Forti, Sarah East Johnson, Laurie Uprichard, RoseAnne Spradlin, Anja Hitzenberger, Catherine Levine, Ann Cooper Albright, Linda Austin, Joe Kinzel, Nami Yamamoto, Miguel Gutierrez, Carla Peterson, Jennifer Monson

#29 Improvisation is Dead; Long Live Improvisation

Spring 2005

Editorial Team: April Biggs, Kimberly Brandt, Levi Gonzalez, Isabel Lewis, Alejandra Martorell, Layard Thompson

Contributors: Isabel Lewis, Miguel Gutierrez, Simone Forti, Lara Hanson, Gillian Lipton, David Velasco, Jonah Bokaer, Maura Keefe, Glenn D. Kessler, Yves Musard, Jennifer Monson, April Biggs, K.J. Holmes, Ishmael Houston-Jones, Chris Peck, Beth Gill, Chase Granoff, Andrea Liu, Bebe Miller, Elissaveta Iordanova, Frances Alenikoff, Alejandra Martorell, Jon Kinzel, Keith Hennessy, Paul Benney, Sam Kim, Heather Kravas

#30 Magazine

October 2006

Editorial Director: Trajal Harrell; Managing Director: Jill Sigman; Editor-at-Large: Darrah Carr; Editorial Intern: Reghan Sybrowsky; Contributing Editor: Chris Atamian

Contributors: Diane Vivona, Elizabeth Zimmer, Tanya Calamoneri, Darrah Carr, Melanie Maar, Jill Sigman, Chris Atamian, Ishmael Houston-Jones, Andrea Liu, RoseLee Goldberg, Abigail Levine, Sarah Maxfield, Sara Juli, Luciana Achugar, Kimberly Bartosik, Ellie Covan, Laura Diffenderfer, Candice Madey, Bryony Romer, Hui Neng Amos, Patricia Hoffbauer, Megan V. Nicely, Catherine Massey, DD Dorvillier, Walter Dundervill, Denise Uyehara, Allison Farrow

#31 Movement Research Performance Journal

August 2007

Editor-in-Chief: Trajal Harrell; Managing Editor: Jill Sigman; Editor-at-Large: Darrah Carr; Assistant Editor: Rachel Bernsen; Editorial Intern: Lindsey Rose; Contributing Editors: Eleanor Bauer, Alejandra Martorell, Levi Gonzalez; Production Manager: Brooke Belott

Contributors: Keith Hennessy, Constanza Macras, Dawn Springer, Anne Gough, Cristiane Bouger, Hooman Sharifi, Kimberly Bartosik, Susannah Sloat, Daria Fain, Jennifer Lacey, Sasha Rodriguez, Eleanor Bauer, Dana Salisbury, Wendy Blum, Maria Hassabi, Irit Rogoff, Chris Dohse, Linda Shapiro, Cynthia Hedstrom, Burt Supree, Abigail Levine, Chrysa Parkinson, Michael Helland

#32 Movement Research Performance Journal

November 2007

Editor-in-Chief: Trajal Harrell; Assistant Editor: Rachel Bernsen; Contributing Editors: Allison Farrow, Levi Gonzalez, Alejandra Martorell, Dana Salisbury, Jill Sigman; Production Manager: Brooke Belott

Contributors: Mary Armentrout, Alejandra Martorell, Jan Ritsema, Marjana Krajac, Jennifer Dunning, Jeroen Peters, Hugo Haeghens, Yasuko Yokoshi, Yves Musard, Eleanor Bauer, Tarek Halaby, Andros Zins-Browne, Elizabeth Zimmer

#33 Movement Research Performance Journal

August 2008

Editor-in-Chief: Trajal Harrell; Guest Co-Editor: Danielle Goldman; Managing Editor: Rachel Bernsen; Contributing Editors: Cristiane Bouger, Dana Salisbury, Jill Sigman

Contributors: Contact Quarterly editors, Jill Sigman, Peter Jacobs, Dean Moss, Victoria Anderson Davies, Cristiane Bouger, Susanna Sloat, Dana Salisbury, Anthony Allen, Katherine Profeta, Peggy Phelan, Anna Kisselgoff

4. Movement Research Timeline

Movement Research T I M E L I N E

Leadership and Initiation of Programs

1978

- **The School for Movement Research & Construction** is founded with a collective structure & is essentially a service organization for 20 artists. It originates during a time when a number of artist-founded organizations are springing up in the U.S. Initially, it provides its founders with informal environments for dialogue & dancing together, & it evolves into a structure that supports workshops in experimental movement investigations.
- Operating Budget: \$8,811

1979

- Periodic performance presentations begin.
- First performance in April 1979 features Trisha Brown, David Gordon, Valda Setterfield & Douglas Dunn. The press calls it the concert of the decade.

1980

- **Movement Research, Inc.** incorporates as a nonprofit organization.
- First Board of Directors: co-founders Wendell Beavers, Beth Goren, Richard Kerry, Daniel Lepkoff, Terence O'Reilly, Mary Overlie, Christina Svane & Board President Cynthia Hedstrom (all artist board).
- Statement of Purpose: *The School for Movement Research & Construction is conceived as a center for new ideas in movement training & composition. The School originates from a group of dancers & artists who teach & perform independently in New York & who have decided to pool their efforts. We all know & support each other's work, but more important, sense an underlying spirit. Although there is diversity in our backgrounds, we all work directly with the experience of physical sensation, & with improvisation both as exploration & as performance. The goal is to create an environment that will allow students & faculty to focus deeply on their study & develop their own resources through consistent feedback & exchange.*
- Operating Budget: \$20,500

1982

- First year of **Studies Project**, held at Danspace Project in St. Mark's Church. Series aims to *thresh out & clarify critical issues & to bring an audience closer to the process, intention & working vocabulary of choreographers & performance artists.*
- Throughout the 1980s, participants include such artists as Mark Morris, Senta Driver, Molissa Fenley, Bill T. Jones, Steve Paxton, Spalding Gray, Eric Bogosian, Bill Irwin, David Gordon, Rachel Rosenthal, Blondell Cummings, Ethyl Eichelberger, David Cale, Pooh Kaye, Robert Whitman, Kei Takei, Joan Jonas, Dana Reitz, Kenneth King, Jim Self, Ishmael Houston-Jones, Remy Charlip, Meredith Monk & such moderators as Paul Langland, William Harris, Sally Banes, Simone Forti, Mary Overlie & Stephanie Skura.
- Of the **Studies Project**, Elizabeth Zimmer writes, *...one of the most illuminating discussions I've ever been privileged to witness... You should have been there...* & Burt Supree writes, *...The Studies Project: Providing routes into the brains of the permanent avant-garde in its protean incarnations (The Village Voice, 1984).*
- Early project directors: Wendell Beavers, Renee Rockoff, K.J. Holmes & Carey Lovelace.

1983

- First year of **Open Performance**, a monthly series that offers an opportunity for artists & students to present works-in-progress to small audiences, followed by open discussion of the work by audience & artists.
- Carol Swann hired as first paid administrator.

1984

- Movement Research moves to Ethnic Folk Arts Center (after existing in Wendell Beavers' backpack & Cynthia Hedstrom's kitchen for the previous six years). This strengthens MR's capacity to deliver programs, through affiliation with another organization.
- Jennifer Miller is Technical Director for performance series at Ethnic Folk Arts Center.
- Movement Research receives Special Citation "Bessie" Award for the **Studies Project** for *enlightening inquiries & arguments on the how & why of dance*, presented by Simone Forti.
- Movement Research initiates the Presenting Series (precursor to **Movement Research at the Judson Church** series).

1985

- Shauna O'Donnell hired as Administrator.
- Operating Budget: \$25,414

1986

- **Studies Project** moves to The Triplex after first taking place for two years at St. Mark's Church & the following two years at Ethnic Folk Arts Center.

1987

- First Executive Director, Richard Elovich hired.
 - Elovich's watch is characterized by an activist's agency, urgency & passion, restructuring the organization so as to support the economics & expand its influence & mission by relating it to the current political climate of NYC. Over his tenure, he puts in place the **Performance Journal**, the **Artist-in-Residence Program** & an expanded schedule of workshops & performances.
- Elovich hires Bob Ajar as Managing Director.
- **Workshops** are offered on a more ongoing schedule.

1989

- Board restructuring takes place. Artist board structure becomes Artist Advisory Board. Recruitment for new board members begins with intention to more adequately address fundraising needs. Two artists remain on board.
- "Ear to the Ground," a collaborative series with music & dance, co-sponsored by Roulette & Movement Research. Roulette pays artist fees, MR provides space & both do PR. Jennifer Monson is MR curator for first year.
- "Red Herring," an improv collective formed by DD Dorvillier, Jennifer Lacey, Clarinda Mac Low, Connor McTeague & John Jasperse, receives a Movement Research space grant to rehearse at Middle Collegiate Church on 7th Street between 1st & 2nd Avenues & performs at Ethnic Folk Arts Center and PS 122.
- **Artist-in-Residence Program** launched.
 - Susan Rethorst is among the first artists-in-residence.

1990

- Richard Elovich hires Cathy Edwards as Managing Director, after the departure of Bob Ajar.
- First issue of the **Performance Journal** published. Editor: Richard Elovich, Associate Editor: Michael Sexton.
 - Editor's note: *With this first issue of Movement Research, we open a new public space for the New York performance community: a textual space in which artists can develop a critical relationship to the work being produced around us...Recognizing a real lack of opportunity for choreographers, dancers, writers, musicians, & performers to engage in each others' work analytically, we have created Movement Research as a slightly anarchic forum in which opposing ideas & aesthetics can be seriously developed & debated...In a time when the arts & artists are seriously under attack, a dialogue among artists develops both the rigorous introspection & the larger commitment of a community, creating a vision necessary for survival.*

1991

- Richard Elovich resigns as Executive Director, joins board, & serves as Chair from 1991-1995.
- Board of Directors: Cee Scott Brown, Yoshiko Chuma, Eiko & Koma, Terry Fox, Bill T. Jones, Jennifer Monson, Nina Martin, Laurie Uprichard, Guy Yarden, & Richard Elovich (Chair).
- Cathy Edwards & Guy Yarden hired as Co-Directors.
 - During their tenure, Edwards & Yarden continue momentum built under Elovich & work to expand on the critical role of the artist community in shaping programs. Office serves as meeting grounds for long conversations among artists about aesthetics, performances & classes, & a strong emphasis on multicultural programming begins to take shape, including the start of **Movement Research at the Judson Church** series, curated by Cathy Edwards & Guy Yarden, with subsequent years curated by panels in which Co-Directors participate.
- In 1991-1992, the **Artist-in-Residence Program** supports work of Irene Hultman, Dana Reitz, Yvonne Meier, Ron Brown, David Zambrano, Alexis Eupierre & the Full Moon Group (DANCENOISE, Alien Comic, Jo Andres, Mimi Goese).
- The **Workshop** series expands to include daily classes in the mornings and workshops that reach out beyond the artist community, including a new program for people living with AIDS.
- **Performance Journal #3, Gender Performance** published in August. U.S. Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC, retired) has journal delivered to each Senator's desk as he holds a copy above his head on the Senate floor & denounces the use of federal funds to produce "such filth." The following day, *The Washington Post* runs *Is it Art or is it Broccoli?* on its front page, a story that refers to a photograph of a woman's genital area in the context of a political art piece published in PJ #3 titled *Read My Lips*, created by the collective Critical Art Ensemble. Jerry Falwell, the conservative religious leader, threatens Philip Morris with a boycott & Philip Morris suspends funding of MR for years. The NEA, headed by Bush-appointee John Frohnmayer, seeks to recover funds previously granted to MR under the guise that said funds had been used to influence currently pending legislation. *Read My Lips* referred to the debate over the Supreme Court's ruling in *Rust vs. Sullivan* regarding the use of federal funds for abortion counseling. MR reaches a settlement with the NEA & returns approximately \$100 that is deemed to have been used to actually print the page on which the art piece was published. The NEA does not acknowledge that it is penalizing Movement Research in response to pressure from Helms & others who are trying to impose "decency" standards on the NEA.
- Operating Budget: \$149,193

1992

- The **Artist-in-Residence Program** evolves to include commissioning funds, work-in-progress showings on **Judson** series, co-production at other spaces, class & workshop opportunities, subsidized & free rehearsal space, fiscal agency, use of MR office & 'emotional bolstering'.
- **Improvisation Festival/New York** launched, initiated by Sondra Loring (MR artist-in-residence) & Julie Carr, with MR cooperation.
 - Over the years, the Festival draws artists working in a range of approaches to improvisation from throughout the U.S. & internationally (Spain, Ireland, Germany, Italy, Australia, Canada, Netherlands & France). The two-week long festival provides a stable structure for the exchange of ideas, & a meeting point for artists working with improvisation, teaching & performing.
- In 1992-1993, **Artist-in-Residence Program** supports work of Jennifer Lacey, Lucy Guerin, Javier De Frutos, Vicky Shick & David Rousseve.
- One of NYC's most beautiful studios is lost as MR is evicted from Ethnic Folk Arts Center, & the space is leased to a nightclub. On a tip from Bebe Miller, MR collaborates with Context Studios on Avenue A to establish an office & two studios, creating a 'home' for artists.

1993/1994

- Anja Hitzenberger begins documenting **Movement Research at the Judson Church** series. She remains the primary photographer through 2000 & photographs performances several times a year through 2003.
- Audrey Kindred is hired as Associate Director.
 - At Movement Research, Kindred formalizes a work-study program, develops Dance Makers in the Schools & Move to Heal, a free series of classes for people dealing with health struggles, such as AIDS & HIV, & their partners & care-givers.
- **MRX/the Movement Research Exchange** begins.
 - Over the years, domestic partners include Painted Bride, Philadelphia, PA; Diverse Works, Houston, TX; Dance Umbrella, Austin, TX; & The Wagon Train Project in Lincoln, NE. International partners include Dans Centrum, Stockholm, Sweden; Certamen Coreográfico, Madrid, Spain; Japan Society, New York, NY; Japanese Contemporary Dance Network, Kyoto, Japan; & Centro Nacional de las Artes, Mexico.
 - Highlights of **MRX** programs over the years: **Danza Sin Fronteras**, a **Studies Project**, co-produced with Dance Theater Workshop in October 1994, features Ivonne Munoz, Raul Parrao, Marcella Ortiz Broughton, Jaime Ortega, Merian Soto, Evelyn Velez Aguayo, Jeremy Nelson, Linda Austin, Luis Lara, Jennifer Monson & Patricia Hoffbauer, among others; **Improvising Across the Border: Movement Research Exchange/Mexico**, in which Linda Austin, Hank Smith, Sondra Loring, John Jasperse & Teri Carter travel to Mexico, collaborate with artists Vincente Silva, Ruby Gamez & Talia Leos, & work at the Centro Nacional de las Artes; & a two-week residency in Texas in November 1994, in which John Jasperse, Scott Heron, Sondra Loring & Sarah East Johnson lead group workshops & show work on shared performance programs.
- **Town Hall Meeting** on June 14, 1994 provides catalyst for discussion on authority, diversity & community in the context of the arts. Discussion focuses on role MR has in defining cultural exchanges, growing out of divergent opinions on the issue of cultural imperialism as manifested through international MRX exchanges.

1995

- Co-Directors Cathy Edwards & Guy Yarden resign, are then elected as board members, & remain on board until 1997 & 1998 respectively.
- Operating Budget: \$284,625
- Audrey Kindred serves as Acting Director for five months, then is hired as Co-Director. Search initiated for second Co-Director.
 - Kindred's tenure is marked by a great openness to working creatively with artists & by an intellectual engagement with pressing aesthetic, political & social issues. Kindred organizes dynamic panels around contemporary issues including those of diversity & cultural difference.
- George Emilio Sanchez elected Board President & serves through 1999.
- Board adds diversity policy to by-laws.

1996

- Anya Pryor hired as second Co-director.
- Peter Larose hired as Associate Director.

1997

- **Dance Makers in the Schools** begins to receive NYSCA funding.
- Audrey Kindred & Anya Pryor resign.
- Catherine Levine hired as Executive Director in October 1997.
 - Levine's tenure is characterized by the continuation of all MR programs & initiation of MELT Intensives, which have served both as key revenue generators & entry points by which student artists from around the country & abroad are introduced into various experimental approaches supported by MR.

1998

- 20th Anniversary issue of **Performance Journal** (Issue # 17) co-published with Danspace Project. Editor: Anya Pryor, with Carol Mullins, Danspace Co-Editor.
- First **MELT Summer Intensive** offers four weeks of workshops.

1999

- **Improvisation Festival / New York** becomes official MR program, curated by Amanda Loulaki from 1999 to 2003. Loulaki continues a vital festival approach that includes U.S.-based & international improvisers who perform, teach & exchange ideas.

2001

- Barbara Bryan elected Board President.
- Movement Research takes on annual lease of Eden's Expressway, which is owned by Frances Alenikoff, who over the next five years allows MR critical leeway in its rent payment schedule.
- Movement Research moves offices into 648 Broadway, after moving six times from 1997-2001.

2002

- First **MELT Winter Intensive** is held for one week.
- Operating Budget: \$293,493
- Carla Peterson hired as Executive Director in June 2002.
 - During her tenure, Peterson assesses the need for MR's continuation & its structure, re-engages the artist community around the mission of experimentation, expands artists' voices in programs & policies, rebuilds & revitalizes the board, institutes first ever Strategic Plan, & addresses serious financial challenges, including elimination of a substantial accumulated deficit that threatens the survival of the organization.

2004 - 25th Year!

- **Artist Town Hall Meeting** takes place on February 2, 2004. Purpose: To engage in peer discussion on MR, its programs, & short & longer-term strategies for survival & viability in advancing its mission in the current ecology.
- Movement Research begins administrative residency & moves its office to Dance Theater Workshop in March 2004.
- Publication of 25th Anniversary Celebration issue of **Performance Journal** (Issue #27/28). Editor-in-chief: Clarinda Mac Low.
 - As Mary Overlie, one of Movement Research's founding artists, writes in this Journal: *I am awed but not surprised that Movement Research has managed to make it to its twenty-fifth birthday. Awed because Movement Research is a maverick in the field of organizations & therefore difficult to find funding for, requiring by the nature of its objectives great donations of time & energy on the part of the dance community. Not surprised because Movement Research represents a small but necessary voice in support of a new perspective in art, philosophy, science & politics...Because Movement Research is designed to serve a community of artists who believe in non-exclusive art, particularizing the study of the body, non-hierarchical structures in choreography & the connection of movement to the earth, it has an implicit reason to survive.*
- **Performance Journal Online** project begins with issues #23-26 available online to date.
- **25th Anniversary Celebration GALA Benefit "MR@25"** honors longtime supporter Micki Wesson & MR's founders. Performances by Meredith Monk, Yvonne Rainer, Steve Paxton, Julie Atlas Muz, & Ann Liv Young, with Jennifer Miller of Circus Amok as MC.
- Launch of **Movement Research Festival** (evolved from IF/NY) entitled **Improvisation is Hard**, & implementation of Curatorial Team structure. First Curatorial Team: Jonah Bokaer, DD Dorvillier, Miguel Gutierrez, K.J. Holmes, Ishmael Houston-Jones, Isabel Lewis & Yvonne Meier. Over 150 artists participate in performances & discussions in 11 venues.
- First-ever **Strategic Planning Process** initiated.
- Three **Faculty Town Hall Meetings** held June 27 & October 16-17, 2004. Purpose: To create a dialogic space for discussing emerging dance & movement-based forms & teaching methodologies, & to foster a sense of community among teaching artists & enable community feedback to inform MR's future.
- Fifty-one videotapes documenting **Studies Projects** from 1983 to 1994 donated to the Jerome Robbins Dance Division of the New York Public Library for the Performing Arts at Lincoln Center.
- **Movement Research at the Judson Church** series takes place at Dance Theater Workshop while Judson Church is under renovation; **Open Performance** held in the DTW Studios.

2005

- Launch of Editorial Team structure with publication of **Performance Journal #29, Improvisation is Dead; Long Live Improvisation**. Editorial Team: April Biggs, Kimberly Brandt, Levi González, Isabel Lewis, Alejandra Martorell & intern Layard Thompson.
- Ishmael Houston-Jones elected Board President.
- **2005 GALA Benefit "Becoming"** honors Laurie Uprichard, Executive Director of Danspace Project. Performances by Ann Carlson, Philip Hamilton, Eleanor Bauer, Juliette Mapp, Yvonne Meier, Stephen Petronio & Reggie Wilson/Fist & Heel Performance Group, with Jennifer Miller of Circus Amok as MC.

- **Movement Research Festival 2005: Open Source** expands to three weeks featuring over 300 artists in 11 venues throughout the boroughs. Curatorial Team members DD Dorvillier, Margit Galanter, koosil-ja & Michelle Nagai bring together nationally & internationally acclaimed improvisers in a Festival that critiques presentational aspects of performance & festival formats, & offers alternative & emergent practices.

2006

- **Faculty Town Hall Meeting** is held. Purpose: To provide a forum for faculty/artist feedback on MR programs; short-, mid- & long-term concerns; & next steps prior to completion of the planning process.
- **2006 GALA Benefit "Saturn Returns"** honors Marion Koltun Dienstag, Executive Director of Dance Theater Workshop. Performances by LAVA, Susan Marshall & Company & David Parker with Marion Koltun Dienstag.
- Movement Research continues to rely on individuals in its **Work-study & Intern Program**, who learn & contribute skills in not-for-profit management in exchange for access to classes & workshops. In 2006, 26 work-studies & interns keep classes, workshops & MELT intensives running smoothly & provide critical support in office management, marketing/publicity, development, operations, archives & special events.
- With a grant from the Danish Arts Council, MR's Executive Director travels to Denmark to meet artists, see performances, and research possibilities for **MRX: NYC/Denmark**, an exchange between New York and Danish artists. The trip results in a partnership agreement with two Danish organizations, Dansens Hus and Dansescenen.
- Launch of two-year Artist-in-Residence Program as pilot project. MR expands its commitment in response to the critical need of artists for an ongoing base of support within a community of peers and a laboratory structure.
- After four years as Executive Director, Carla Peterson accepts post of Artistic Director at Dance Theater Workshop. Optimistic about the organization's current & future direction, board initiates a search process for her replacement.
- Launch of **Critical Correspondence** on MR's website, spearheaded by editors Alejandra Martorell & Guy Yarden.
- The **Critical Correspondence** website is re-launched in September with a new blog structure that allows users to participate in the site by posting comments and dialoguing. The first of several special projects is also launched, with writings from Hope Mohr and Michelle Nagai from their collaborative residency, "The Language of the Listening Body," at iLAND.
- The **Judson** series returns to the Judson Memorial Church, which has undergone renovations and now has a wood dance floor, with a celebratory Opening Night event featuring performances by Deborah Hay and Juliette Mapp, and a send-off party for Carla Peterson.
- Movement Research hires Barbara Bryan as Executive Director and Kim Doelger as Managing Director.
- With **Movement Research Festival 2006: Part One**, MR's annual festival returns to Danspace Project from December 8-10, 2006. Curated by Programming Director Amanda Loulaki, three nights of stellar performances bring together adventurous choreographers and improvisers from New York, Philadelphia, Montreal and Melbourne. This festival marks the implementation of a new split format, with the second part of the festival to follow in the spring.

2007

- Operating Budget: \$330,881
- In April 2007, Movement Research brings on arts consultant Suzanne Callahan, founder of Callahan Consulting for the Arts, to conduct gather feedback from artists via two focus groups, lead a final meeting with MR's Board of Directors, and produce the final version of the Strategic Plan.
- MR holds its **Spring 2007 Gala** on May 14th, honoring Yvonne Rainer and celebrating its 28th Season, at Judson Memorial Church. Featuring dinner prepared by celebrity chefs Tere O'Connor and Guy Yarden, and special performances curated by Pat Catterton and Patricia Hoffbauer, the evening is a huge success, raising \$21,500 for the organization.
- The annual festival continues with **Movement Research Spring Festival 2007: Reverence (Irreverence)**, from May 29-June 7, 2007, which offers various formats for critical dialogue and exchange that are both intellectually rigorous and playful. The four-artist Curation/Production Group (Rebecca Brooks, Beth Gill, Erika Hand, Isabel Lewis) in collaboration with MR staff, produced performances in alternative venues and in unusual public spaces, video screenings, classes and workshops, and Studies Projects.
- A **Summer Internship Program**, designed to provide college credit and experience in non-profit administration to talented students, is launched and from June to August 2007.
- As part of the New York City Department of Cultural Affairs' redesigned Cultural Development Fund process for FY08, Movement Research receives \$50,000 in program support, a huge increase from the \$7,500 MR was granted in FY07.
- At the close of Fiscal Year 2007, Movement Research successfully eliminates its accumulated deficit, and thus enters the first year of its Strategic Plan as a fiscally stable organization that is strongly rooted in the artistic community and is poised for a promising future.

2008-2009 - 30th Anniversary Season!