Bridging the A-I-R

D3.2 Jointly Approved Manual for Open Call and Selection Criteria

A Practical Guide for Residency Providers

Project Title: **Bridging the A-I-R**

Acronym: BtAIR

Grant Agreement No.: 101255130

Coordinator: Nová síť z.s.

Beneficiaries: Nová síť z.s., ASSOCIAZIONE IDRA TEATRO ETS, TEATRO DE LO INESTABLE DE VALENCIA SL, Anténa - sieť pre nezávislú kultúru, schloss bröllin e.V., Swing Jazz Kultúráért Alapítvány

Project Start Date: February 01, 2026

Duration of the Project: 48 months

Authors: Daniela López Ramos (Inestable) and Adriana Světlíková (Nová síť)

Contributors: Gloria Pitarch (Inestable) and Jan Břeň (Nová síť)

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

Table of Contents

1. What this manual is for **3**
From D3.1 to this manual 3
Who should use it 3
Two levels: design first, publish second 4
The four models tested in BtAIR 4
Why these four models were selected 4
Three shared BtAIR principles 5
2. Common BtAIR open-call principles **6**
3. From residency idea to completed selection **8**
The nine-step workflow 8
Before you write a single line of the call 8
4. Standard BtAIR Open Call Template **9**
5. Partly pre-filled example: M2 Community-Based Residency **11**
6. Processing applications: from inbox to decision **15**
A. Application register 15
B. Eligibility check: Yes / No before scoring 15
7. Shared scoring framework **16**
Score meaning 17
Context-sensitive matching: the BtAIR lens 17
Project monitoring and priority groups 17
8. Adapting the call to M1, M2, M5 and M7 **18**
M1. Creation & Art Production 18
M2. Community-Based 18
M5. Cross-Disciplinary 18
M7. Organisational Development 19
9. Mediator, working conditions and financial clarity **19**
The mediator/facilitator 19
Financial conditions: what applicants must see 20
Welcome guide 21
10. After selection: turn the decision into a workable residency **21**
Documentation: collect what is useful 21
11. Evaluation: did the residency work as intended? **22**
Three perspectives 22
Core evaluation questions 22
Timing 23
12. Ready-to-publish checklist **23**
Annex A. One-page selection record **25**
Annex B. Final Residency Evaluation Form **26**

1. What this manual is for

Bridging the A-I-R (BtAIR) is a Creative Europe cooperation project focused on the infrastructure that makes artistic mobility possible: residency providers, their methods, local partnerships, care practices and organisational capacity. Rather than treating a residency only as a temporary stay for an artist, BtAIR tests how residency formats can be designed as context-sensitive, sustainable and inclusive structures. Six partner organisations will test four shared models through twelve pilot residencies in different European contexts.

Read this first

The document is not another description of residency theory. Its main job is to help a host organisation decide what it is offering, communicate it clearly, assess applications transparently, implement it and learn from the residency afterwards.

From D3.1 to this manual

This manual is the practical continuation of Deliverable D3.1, Proposal of 10 Model Scenarios for Residency Practice. D3.1 mapped European residency practices and formulated ten models responding to different organisational, artistic and territorial needs. Four of those models were then selected for pilot implementation: M1 Creation & Art Production, M2 Community-Based, M5 Cross-Disciplinary and M7 Organisational Development. Rather than repeating the full model descriptions, this document translates the selected models into practical procedures for open calls, participant selection, preparation and evaluation.

Who should use it

The primary users are BtAIR partner organisations, host organisations and cultural professionals responsible for designing and running residency calls. The manual is also intended as a transferable reference for other residency providers. Its purpose is simple: a reader should be able to move from a residency idea to a clear public call, process applications fairly, make a documented selection, prepare the residency well and evaluate what the pilot has taught us.

Two levels: design first, publish second

LEVEL 1 · DESIGN THE RESIDENCY	LEVEL 2 · TURN IT INTO A PUBLIC OPEN CALL
Define the need, model, context, target group, resources, support, budget and realistic outcomes.	Translate those decisions into clear public information, eligibility rules, application questions, selection criteria and a timeline.
Confirm what the host can actually provide.	Do not promise what is not confirmed.
Identify the local mediator/facilitator and relevant partners.	Explain what support applicants can expect and what will be expected from them.

The four models tested in BtAIR

MODEL	USE IT WHEN THE MAIN NEED IS...	TYPICAL FOCUS OF THE CALL
M1 Creation & Art Production	time, space and professional support for artistic development	stage of the artistic process, resources, artistic relevance, realistic outputs
M2 Community-Based	meaningful artistic work with a specific community or local context	local question, voluntary participation, mediation, relationship-building
M5 Cross-Disciplinary	collaboration between artistic practice and another field of knowledge	interdisciplinary rationale, partners/expertise, research conditions, shared learning
M7 Organisational Development	strategic development of cultural professionals, teams or organisations	development challenge, mentoring/job shadowing, practical organisational outcome

Why these four models were selected

The four pilot models are not presented as a hierarchy or as the only valuable forms of residency. They were selected as a test set that can respond to different host capacities and contexts. Building on D3.1 and Task T3.1 of the Grant Agreement, five evaluation values guided the selection:

SELECTION VALUE	WHAT IT MEANS IN PRACTICE
CONTEXT SENSITIVITY	The model can respond to the specific characteristics, knowledge, relationships and environmental or cultural qualities of a place rather than operating as a generic format.
LOW-IMPACT MOBILITY	The model can support geographic proximity, lower-impact travel and proportionate use of resources, while keeping accessibility and participation in view.
PARTICIPATORY STRUCTURE	Where participation or co-creation is relevant, roles are clear, involvement is voluntary and the process supports reciprocal rather than extractive relationships.
INCLUSION	The model can reduce avoidable barriers and create supportive conditions for people who may otherwise face obstacles to participation, including caregivers, families and people with access needs.
TRANSFERABILITY	The model can be adapted to different organisations and territories and can generate learning that is useful beyond one individual residency.

Two layers to keep distinct: these five values explain how the four pilot models were selected. The open call, selection and final evaluation in this manual then use three shared working principles - inclusion, sustainability and artistic relevance - together with context-sensitive matching, low-impact mobility, mediation/facilitation and transferability as practical lenses.

Three shared BtAIR principles

Across the open call, selection and final evaluation, BtAIR follows three shared principles: inclusion, sustainability and artistic relevance. They should be visible throughout the process, while their practical expression will differ according to the selected residency model.

INCLUSION	SUSTAINABILITY	ARTISTIC RELEVANCE
Who can participate, which barriers exist, and what access or care conditions make	Are mobility, production, resource use, working rhythms and relationships	Does the residency create meaningful conditions for artistic/professional development and

meaningful participation possible?	planned responsibly and realistically?	respond to the purpose of the selected model?

Context-sensitive matching, low-impact mobility, mediation/facilitation and transferability are practical lenses that help put these principles into practice.

BtAIR partners have already selected their pilot models. The comparison above is therefore mainly a practical orientation tool and supports future transferability of the methodology.

2. Common BtAIR open-call principles

Every call may look different because every host and territory is different. The process, however, should rest on a shared set of principles. These principles should be visible in the public call rather than hidden in internal project language.

TRANSPARENCY	Applicants can quickly understand who can apply, what is offered, what is expected, how selection works and when decisions will be communicated.
CONTEXT SENSITIVITY	The call explains the host, territory and concrete opportunity. Selection considers the relationship between the proposal, the host and the local context.
INCLUSION AND ACCESSIBILITY	The call removes unnecessary barriers, communicates available access conditions and provides a contact for individual needs. Project monitoring of priority groups should be voluntary and handled separately from artistic/professional assessment where possible.
SUSTAINABILITY AND LOW-IMPACT MOBILITY	Travel, production and resource use are planned responsibly. Proximity and lower-impact travel are encouraged without turning environmental criteria into a barrier to participation.
ARTISTIC RELEVANCE	The residency has a clear purpose and creates meaningful conditions for artistic or professional development appropriate to the selected model. It does not require a finished work where research, experimentation or organisational development is the intended outcome.

FAIR WORKING CONDITIONS	Fees, travel, accommodation, production support, working rhythms and responsibilities are stated clearly before an applicant commits.

MEDIATION AND CARE	A named mediator/facilitator helps connect the resident, host, local partners and territory and supports communication, orientation and problem prevention.

TRANSFERABILITY AND LEARNING	The residency should create knowledge or learning that can be documented and shared appropriately, without forcing all projects into the same output format.

BtAIR project-level requirements

Calls must be published widely and remain open for at least two months, in line with EU transparency and equal-treatment standards. BtAIR recommends releasing calls early enough to allow approximately six months between publication and the residency where feasible. Every individual participant must meet Creative Europe country eligibility; where a team, group or collective applies, this applies to each person who will take part in the residency. Any additional eligibility rule for an organisation or legal entity should be stated separately in the specific call. Selection should consider proposal quality, relevance to the project's cross-sectoral goals and European dimension. Results are to be published on partners' websites, including project descriptions and recipient details. Across the 12 pilot residencies, BtAIR will involve at least 50 artists and cultural professionals. The number of participants in an individual residency may vary according to the selected model, host capacity and residency design. At least 30% of participants across project activities should come from the defined priority groups; this is a project-level monitoring target, not an automatic quota for each individual call.

3. From residency idea to completed selection

A good open call begins before the text is written. The following workflow separates the decisions the host must make internally from the information that applicants need publicly.

The nine-step workflow

1. Define the residency Choose the model; identify the need, context, target participants, resources, dates, budget and realistic outcomes.

2. Confirm the offer Lock the fee, travel rules, accommodation, workspace, access conditions, production/technical resources and mediation capacity.

3. Draft the public call Use the standard BtAIR template in Section 4. Write for a first-time applicant, not for people who already know the project.

4. Publish and communicate Publish widely, keep the call open for at least two months, provide one clear contact point and answer questions consistently.

5. Register applications Acknowledge receipt, assign an application ID, store documents in one place and keep a simple application log.

6. Check eligibility Use a yes/no eligibility check before scoring. Do not mix basic eligibility with qualitative assessment.

7. Assess and match Score eligible applications using the shared framework and consider the relevant model-specific assessment focus described in Section 8. Then discuss fit with the host and local context.

8. Decide and communicate Record the panel decision and reasoning, manage conflicts of interest, notify applicants and publish results as required.

9. Prepare, host and evaluate Agree conditions in writing, prepare travel/access/support, implement the residency, collect feedback and document learning.

Before you write a single line of the call

DECISION	HOST MUST KNOW	IF NOT CONFIRMED...
Purpose	What concrete need or opportunity does the residency respond to?	Do not publish yet.

Model	M1, M2, M5 or M7 and what that means in practice.	Clarify the model first.
Context	What can only happen here: people, place, expertise, facilities, network?	The call will become generic.
Offer	Fee, travel, accommodation, workspace, production/technical support, mediator.	Mark as TBD internally, not in the public call.
Access	Physical access, communication, schedule flexibility, care-related support where available.	Name what is known and provide a contact.
Outcome	What must happen, what may happen, and what is explicitly not required?	Avoid forcing a final work by default.
Selection	Panel, criteria, scoring, conflict-of-interest process, timeline.	Selection cannot be transparent.

4. Standard BtAIR Open Call Template

Complete this template before publication. Once filled in, it should contain almost all the information required for the public call. Partners may adapt the language and order, but the required information should remain easy to find and the final call should read as a coherent invitation, not as an internal project form.

1. Title and programme identification	Organisation, residency title, model, location and dates. Keep the title short enough to scan.
2. Purpose of the residency	Explain in 3–6 sentences why the residency exists, what need/opportunity it responds to and what kind of development it supports.
3. Host, territory and local context	Describe the host, place, community or professional ecosystem, relevant local partners and the context that applicants are invited to respond to.
4. Who can apply / eligibility	State eligible countries/status, applicant type, professional profile, availability, language and model-specific conditions. Eligibility is assessed at applicant level. An applying organisation or legal entity must be legally established in a

	country participating in the Creative Europe Programme. An individual applicant must be a citizen or legal/permanent resident of a participating country. Where an eligible organisation applies with or on behalf of a wider team, additional participants may come from other countries unless the specific open call states otherwise. Keep mandatory eligibility distinct from desirable qualities.
5. What we are looking for	Describe the type of proposal sought. Applicants should be able to understand what would fit this particular residency and what would not.
6. What the residency provides	Fee, travel support, accommodation, workspace, production/technical support, local transport/subsistence if applicable, mediator/facilitator, mentoring and access support.
7. Duration, timeline and working rhythm	Residency dates, number of days, typical working rhythm, fixed/negotiable elements and any public or community moments.
8. Mediation, accessibility and care	Name the support available, the mediator/facilitator role and a contact for access needs. Avoid asking applicants to disclose unnecessary sensitive information in the artistic application.
9. Sustainability and mobility	Explain the project's low-impact mobility approach, travel expectations and any relevant production/resource commitments.
10. Language of communication	State the working language(s) of the residency. The host organisation and the applicant must share a common working language that allows effective communication throughout the preparation and residency period. Within BtAIR, English should normally serve as the common working language. Where another language is used, this must be agreed in advance and clearly communicated in the open call. Relevant BtAIR

	documentation, evaluation and final project outputs must be available in English.
11. Resident commitments and outcomes	State participation, documentation and evaluation responsibilities. Define an appropriate public sharing for artistic residencies without requiring a finished work by default.
12. How to apply	Application form/materials, format, word/page limits, deadline, time zone, language, submission method and technical contact.
13. Selection process and criteria	Explain eligibility check, assessment stages, panel, scoring criteria, decision date, possible interview, conflict-of-interest handling and publication of results.
14. Contact and practical questions	One contact for content/questions and, where useful, one access contact. Add a short FAQ only if it prevents repeated confusion.

5. Partly pre-filled example: M2 Community-Based Residency

Illustrative example

The text below is fictional and is designed to show how a BtAIR open call can read when the template is turned into a public document. Replace all bracketed information with confirmed local information.

M2 Community-Based Residency [Residency Title]

[Host Organisation] invites an artist or artistic team working in performing and live arts to take part in a 10–14-day community-based residency in [Town / Region / Country] between [dates].

Why this residency

This residency creates time and space for an artistic process developed in dialogue with a clearly identified local context. The selected proposal should respond to [local question / place / community / theme] and should be open to reciprocal learning with local participants. We are interested in the quality of relationships and artistic enquiry, not in the number of public activities produced.

The host and local context

[2–3 short paragraphs: who the host is; what is specific about the place; which community, local partners or networks are relevant; what knowledge and relationships the host can realistically provide.]

Who can apply

- Artists or artistic teams working in performing and live arts whose practice is relevant to the proposed context.
- Every individual who will take part in the residency, including each member of an applying group, team or collective, must be a citizen or permanent resident of a country participating in the Creative Europe programme.
- Where an organisation or collective applies, any additional eligibility condition applying to the organisation or legal entity itself must be stated separately in the call.
- Applicants available for the full residency dates and able to work in [working language / language conditions].
- Applicants who can demonstrate a genuine interest in context-responsive or participatory practice. Previous community-based experience may be required or preferred depending on the host.

What we are looking for

We are looking for a proposal that cannot simply be transferred unchanged from one place to another. The application should explain why this context matters to the artistic process, how the artist intends to listen and learn before proposing activities, and how participation will remain voluntary and appropriate for the people involved.

What the residency provides

ITEM	CONFIRMED OFFER TO PUBLISH
Fee	[insert confirmed artist/manager fee and payment terms]
Travel	[eligible costs, booking/reimbursement method, green travel conditions]
Accommodation	[type, room arrangement, access information, accompanying persons if applicable]
Workspace	[studio/rehearsal/community/outdoor spaces and basic specifications]

Production/ technical support	[amount or resources available; state clearly if none]
Local support	Named mediator/facilitator; introductions to confirmed local partners; local orientation.
Subsistence/local transport	[state what is and is not covered]

Working rhythm, access and care

The residency schedule will combine protected artistic time, meetings agreed with local partners and reflection with the mediator. [Host Organisation] will discuss reasonable access needs with the selected resident before arrival. The public call should list confirmed physical-access conditions and any schedule flexibility or care-related support that can actually be provided.

Sustainability and travel

BtAIR encourages lower-impact mobility. Train and bus travel should be preferred where reasonably possible, unnecessary travel should be reduced, and local resources should be used where practical. Environmental considerations will be applied proportionately and should not become a barrier to accessibility or inclusion.

Working language(s)
Common communication language between host and resident: [English / specify agreed language]

What we expect from the resident

- Active participation throughout the agreed residency period and communication with the host and mediator.
- Respectful engagement with the local context and voluntary participation of community partners.
- One appropriate public sharing of the process, such as an open studio, discussion, workshop or presentation. A finished performance is not required unless the specific call states otherwise.
- Participation in BtAIR documentation and evaluation under the agreed consent and usage conditions.

How to apply

MATERIAL	KEEP IT PROPORTIONATE
Application form	Basic applicant data, eligibility, availability and contact details.
Proposal	Recommended: concise description of purpose, approach, relevance to context and expected development during the residency.
Motivation	Why this residency / host / context is relevant now.
CV / profile	Only information needed to understand the applicant's practice and experience.
Work samples	Links rather than large attachments where possible.
Access information	Collect separately where possible and only to organise participation, not to judge artistic quality.

Deadline: [date, time, time zone] Language: [language(s)] Submission: [form / platform] Questions: [email]

Selection process

1. Eligibility check against the published mandatory conditions.
2. Qualitative assessment using the shared BtAIR scoring framework.
3. Panel discussion focused on both proposal quality and context-sensitive matching with the host.
4. Final decision recorded with short reasons; applicants informed by [date]; results published as required.

Recommended: each eligible application should be read by at least two assessors before the panel discussion, and panel members should declare any conflict of interest.

6. Processing applications: from inbox to decision

The quality of an open call is also determined by what happens after the deadline. A simple, documented process protects applicants, hosts and the project.

A. Application register

FIELD	EXAMPLE / PURPOSE
Application ID	M2-CZ-001. Use IDs in internal scoring where practical.
Applicant	Name / organisation / team.
Received	Date and time.
Eligibility	Eligible / Ineligible + short reason.
Assessors	Initials / names of assigned readers.
Scores	Link or total from standard assessment form.
Conflict of interest	None / declared + action taken.
Decision	Selected / Reserve / Not selected.
Notification	Date sent.

B. Eligibility check: Yes / No before scoring

- Application received by the published deadline.
- Applicant meets the relevant Creative Europe country eligibility requirement: an applying organisation/legal entity is legally established in a participating country, or an individual applicant is a citizen or legal/permanent resident of a participating country. Additional participants involved through an eligible applying organisation are checked only against any further conditions stated in the specific open call.
- Applicant type and professional profile match the call.
- All mandatory application materials are present.
- Applicant is available for the residency dates and accepts the essential conditions.
- Proposal corresponds to the relevant residency model and the stated purpose of the call.

Important

An ineligible application should not receive a low qualitative score. It should be recorded as ineligible, with a short objective reason linked to a published condition.

C. Selection panel and conflicts of interest

The call should state who is responsible for selection or at least describe the composition of the panel. Before assessment, panel members should declare relationships or interests that could affect impartiality. The panel should agree how such cases are managed before discussing applications.

- Use the same published criteria for all eligible applicants.
- Keep short written reasons for the final decision.
- Do not introduce a new decisive criterion after the deadline.
- If an interview is used, state this possibility in the call and use a consistent question set.
- Use scores to structure judgement, not to replace professional discussion.

7. Shared scoring framework

BtAIR needs a common scoring language across different residency models. The framework below keeps the project's shared values visible while leaving room for model-specific professional judgement.

CRITERION	WHAT TO LOOK FOR	SCORE
1. Quality and relevance of the proposal	Clear purpose; coherent artistic/professional approach; relevance to the residency opportunity.	1–5
2. Fit with model, host and context	The proposal uses what this host/place can genuinely offer and responds to the selected model.	1–5
3. Feasibility and use of resources	Realistic within time, budget, facilities, support and production conditions.	1–5
4. Inclusion / participation	Appropriate and ethical approach to participation, accessibility and barriers, where relevant to the model.	1–5
5. Sustainability and responsible mobility	Proportionate approach to travel, resources, working conditions and environmental impact.	1–5
6. Learning / transferability / European dimension	Potential to generate useful learning, methods, relationships or outcomes that can continue, circulate across contexts or contribute to European exchange.	1–5

Score meaning

1	2	3	4	5
Insufficient	Weak	Good	Very good	Excellent

1 means the criterion is not demonstrated; 3 means it is clearly and adequately demonstrated; 5 means it is exceptionally strong and convincing. Panels should use the full scale and add a short qualitative note.

Context-sensitive matching: the BtAIR lens

Do not ask only "Which proposal is best?"

Also ask: Which proposal can this host support well? Why does this place matter to the applicant? What can the residency offer that the applicant cannot obtain elsewhere? Are expectations compatible? Can the local mediator and available resources support the proposed process?

The final decision does not need to be a mechanical ranking by total points. Scores create transparency and a common reference. The panel may then consider the overall fit, the composition of selected participants and the specific host context, provided the reasoning is documented and remains consistent with the published criteria.

Project monitoring and priority groups

BtAIR monitors participation by priority groups across project activities. This monitoring should be distinguished from the qualitative assessment of an application. Where information such as disability, migration background or care responsibilities is collected for project monitoring, use a voluntary and appropriately separated mechanism rather than making sensitive personal information part of the artistic/professional score.

Across the project, the selection process should also support fair gender balance in the overall composition of participants, alongside the representation of disadvantaged and underrepresented groups.

8. Adapting the call to M1, M2, M5 and M7

The common template and scoring framework remain the same. What changes is the model-specific question: what exactly must the host explain, and what should the panel pay particular attention to?

M1. Creation & Art Production

OPEN CALL MUST MAKE CLEAR	ASSESS ESPECIALLY	APPROPRIATE OUTCOMES
State the stage of the artistic process; available space/technical/professional support; whether public sharing is required; keep outputs flexible.	Does the residency meaningfully advance this specific artistic process? Are the requested resources realistic?	Work in progress, open studio, discussion, workshop, performance/exhibition if appropriate.

M2. Community-Based

OPEN CALL MUST MAKE CLEAR	ASSESS ESPECIALLY	APPROPRIATE OUTCOMES
Describe the community/local question before asking artists to respond; name confirmed local partners; explain mediation and voluntary participation.	Is the proposal genuinely context-responsive rather than a generic participatory format? Does it demonstrate listening, reciprocity and ethical engagement?	Relational process, research, workshop, dialogue, open sharing, co-created activity where appropriate.

M5. Cross-Disciplinary

OPEN CALL MUST MAKE CLEAR	ASSESS ESPECIALLY	APPROPRIATE OUTCOMES
Define the other discipline(s), expertise, equipment and partners available; clarify whether collaborators are provided, proposed or expected from the applicant.	Is there a real reason for interdisciplinarity? Can methods and knowledge be exchanged in practice? Are required resources and partners available?	Research, prototype, methodology, artistic development, presentation, future collaboration.

M7. Organisational Development

OPEN CALL MUST MAKE CLEAR	ASSESS ESPECIALLY	APPROPRIATE OUTCOMES
Define eligible professional/organisational profiles, development challenge, host expertise, mentoring/job-shadowing possibilities and expected practical outcome.	Is the development need clear and actionable? Is there capacity to implement learning after the residency? Is the host a useful match?	Strategic/action plan, organisational roadmap, revised process, partnership plan, leadership or governance development.

Public sharing is not the same as a finished product

For M1, M2 and M5, the call can ask for an appropriate form of public sharing, but this may be an open studio, discussion, workshop, presentation or other process-based format. For M7, an internal or professional outcome such as an action plan may be more appropriate than a public event.

9. Mediator, working conditions and financial clarity

The mediator/facilitator

BtAIR treats the local cultural mediator as a core part of residency infrastructure, not as an optional logistical role. Each BtAIR pilot residency must involve a locally engaged mediator/facilitator who acts as an intermediary between the resident, the host organisation and the local context. The mediator helps the residency connect with the social, environmental and cultural fabric of the place rather than functioning as an isolated artistic visit.

Why this matters: even a strong proposal can fail if the resident and the host context are poorly connected. The mediator supports contextual research, stakeholder dialogue, local introductions, community anchoring and the inclusion of underrepresented voices. The role also helps translate expectations between resident and host, identify misunderstandings early and support respectful, reciprocal engagement with people and place.

The exact profile changes according to the residency model. In M2, community relationships and local knowledge are central; in M1 the role may focus more on orientation, professional connections and working conditions; in M5 it may connect artistic and non-artistic expertise; in M7 it may facilitate organisational learning, peer exchange and access to local professional networks. In all models, the mediator should be identified early enough to contribute to preparation, not only brought in after the resident arrives.

BEFORE	DURING	AFTER
Prepare the context; contact local partners; brief the resident; identify practical/access needs; help align expectations.	Orientation; communication; local introductions; facilitation; support with context; wellbeing and conflict prevention where needed.	Support evaluation and follow-up; help capture learning; maintain relevant relationships and next steps.

The public open call should state what kind of mediation or facilitation the host can realistically provide. After selection, the mediator should take part in the preparation call with the resident and host so that context, expectations, access needs and local relationships can be discussed before arrival.

Financial conditions: what applicants must see

- Artist/manager fee and payment terms.
- Travel: eligible costs, booking/reimbursement method and any ceiling.
- Accommodation: what is provided, for whom, and any limitations.
- Production/technical budget or resources.
- Local transport and subsistence/per diem if applicable.
- Mediator/mentor support included in the residency.
- Any costs the participant is expected to cover personally.

Financial conditions
The financial conditions of each residency depend on the resources and arrangements of the host organisation and must be communicated transparently in the open call. The call should clearly state what is covered, including the participant fee where applicable, travel, accommodation, production or technical support, local transport, subsistence and any other relevant costs. Any expenses not covered by the host should also be stated clearly before applicants apply.

Welcome guide

The host should prepare a short welcome guide after selection rather than overloading the public call. It can include local contacts, maps, facilities, house

rules, emergency information, transport, local services, environmental guidance, working-space instructions and practical access information. Where useful, provide it in accessible and multilingual formats.

10. After selection: turn the decision into a workable residency

Selection is not the end of the open-call process. Poor preparation after a good selection can still undermine the residency. The following minimum sequence is recommended.

1. Notify the selected applicant and reserve applicant(s); communicate the next steps and deadline for acceptance.

2. Confirm the residency agreement in writing: dates, fee, travel, accommodation, production support, responsibilities, cancellation terms, documentation and usage rights.

3. Arrange a preparation call between resident, host and mediator/facilitator.

4. Confirm access requirements, travel arrangements, working rhythm and any accompanying persons/support needs that the host has agreed to provide.

5. Share the welcome guide and key local contacts.

6. Agree the purpose and realistic form of public sharing, if relevant to the model.

7. Agree documentation and consent before taking or publishing photos/video of participants or community members.

8. At the end, collect evaluation from the resident, host and mediator and close outstanding payments/reimbursements promptly.

Documentation: collect what is useful

DOCUMENT	PURPOSE
Application register + eligibility record	Audit trail of the call and transparent processing.
Assessment sheets + panel decision note	Evidence of consistent selection and reasons.
Residency agreement	Shared conditions and responsibilities.
Participant list	Project administration and reporting.

Voluntary anonymous monitoring questionnaire	Project-level monitoring of priority groups.
Photo/video documentation + permissions	Communication and dissemination where appropriate.
Resident/host/mediator evaluation	Learning and improvement of the models.

11. Evaluation: did the residency work as intended?

Evaluation should test the assumptions behind the model, not merely ask whether participants were "satisfied". Across all four models, the common reflection frame is inclusion, sustainability and artistic relevance. The evaluation should also capture context-sensitive matching, working conditions, mediation/facilitation, model-specific learning and what should be adapted next time.

Three perspectives

RESIDENT	HOST ORGANISATION	MEDIATOR/ FACILITATOR
Did the opportunity match the call? Were conditions and support clear? What developed artistically/professionally?	Was the model realistic for this host/context? What resources were sufficient or missing? What did the organisation learn?	How did relationships, communication and context work in practice? Where were expectations aligned or not?

Core evaluation questions

DIMENSION	QUESTION
Artistic relevance	Did the residency create meaningful conditions for artistic/professional development and fulfil the purpose of the selected model?
Match	Was the resident–host–context match meaningful and realistic?
Conditions	Were time, fee, accommodation, workspace, production and support adequate?

Mediation	Was the facilitator role clear and useful?
Inclusion / accessibility	Who was able to participate? Which avoidable barriers were identified or reduced? Were access and care conditions adequate?
Sustainability	Were mobility, resources, working rhythms and relationships handled responsibly and realistically?
Model-specific value	Did M1/M2/M5/M7 work in the way expected? What had to be adapted?
Outcome / learning	What changed, developed or became possible because of the residency?
Follow-up	What should continue, be changed, documented or transferred to future calls?

Timing

WHEN	WHAT
Before residency	Confirm objectives, expectations, access/support needs and what will count as a useful outcome.
End of residency	Short resident, host and mediator evaluation; documentation check; immediate learning.
Optional follow-up	For M2, M5 and especially M7, a later check can capture relationships, implementation or organisational change that only becomes visible after the residency.

12. Ready-to-publish checklist

A host should be able to answer YES to the following before the call goes live.

Purpose & Context

☐ The residency purpose and selected model are clear.

☐ The local/professional context is described concretely.

☐ The call explains what kind of proposal will fit this opportunity.

Conditions

☐ Dates, duration and location are confirmed.

☐ Fee, travel, accommodation and production/support conditions are clear.

☐ A mediator/facilitator is identified.

☐ Accessibility information is stated honestly and there is a contact for questions.

☐ Expected resident commitments and appropriate outputs are clear.

Application

☐ Eligibility is unambiguous and separated from qualitative criteria.

☐ We ask only for material that will actually be used in assessment.

☐ Deadline, language, submission route and contact are clear.

☐ The call will remain open for at least two months.

Selection

☐ Panel and assessment process are confirmed.

☐ The shared scoring framework and model-specific assessment focus are agreed.

☐ Conflict-of-interest handling is clear.

☐ Decision and publication dates are realistic.

After Selection

☐ Agreement, welcome/preparation process and payment route are ready.

☐ Documentation/consent requirements are understood.

☐ Resident, host and mediator evaluation is prepared.

If several boxes are still open

Delay publication rather than solve essential conditions after applicants have invested time in applying. Transparency begins before the call goes live.

Annex A. One-page selection record

APPLICATION ID	APPLICANT	ELIGIBLE?
		Yes / No

CRITERION	1	2	3	4	5	NOTE
Artistic / professional quality & relevance						
Fit: model / host / context						
Feasibility & resources						
Inclusion / participation						
Sustainability / mobility						
Learning / transferability / European dimension						

Model-specific note:

_____

Context-sensitive match:

_____

Recommendation: ☐ Select ☐ Reserve ☐ Do not select

Short reason:

_____

Conflict of interest declared? ☐ No ☐ Yes – action: _____

Assessor: _____ Date: _____

Annex B. Final Residency Evaluation Form

Complete one short form for each perspective: resident, host organisation and mediator/facilitator. A later follow-up may be added when organisational or community effects need more time to become visible.

ROLE	Resident	Host	Mediator/ facilitator
Tick one	☐	☐	☐

A. QUICK PULSE

1 = weak / unclear, 5 = very strong / clear

DIMENSION	1	2	3	4	5	NOTE

Clarity of the open call	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Resident-host-context match	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Working conditions and support	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Mediation / facilitation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Inclusion / accessibility	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Sustainability	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Artistic relevance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Overall usefulness	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	

B. THREE SHARED BtAIR PRINCIPLES

Use all three as a common reflection frame. Their practical expression will differ according to M1, M2, M5 or M7.

DIMENSION	WHAT CHANGED / DEVELOPED?
Inclusion	Who was able to participate? Which barriers were identified or reduced? Were access/care conditions adequate? Response: _____
Sustainability	Were mobility, resources, working rhythm and relationships handled responsibly and realistically? Response: _____

Artistic relevance	Did the residency create meaningful conditions for artistic/professional development and respond to the purpose of the selected model? Response: _____

C. CORE REFLECTION

1. Did the residency conditions match what was described in the open call? What differed? _____ _____
2. What was the most valuable development, learning or relationship created? _____ _____
3. Were there avoidable barriers related to access, care, communication or working conditions? _____ _____
4. What should be changed in the next open call or residency implementation? _____ _____
5. What should continue after the residency, and what can be transferred to other BtAIR partners? _____ _____
6. What was the most significant value or benefit of this residency for you? Please describe in your own words what the residency made possible, changed, strengthened or opened up for your artistic/professional practice, organisation or future work. _____ _____

Model: ☐ M1 ☐ M2 ☐ M5 ☐ M7 Country / host: _____
Date: _____

This project deliverable will serve as the basis for a further user-oriented version of the manual. This may take the form of a shorter and/or more visually accessible publication, focusing only on the information and practical tools needed by residency providers and applicants. Project-specific administrative information that is not relevant to external users may therefore be omitted from the public-facing version.