

ArT4 Report 2012:

- A) The groups were generally very responsive, there was some confusion around the topic. I was trying to not be too specific as I really wanted them to think through their own ideas and responses to health, well-being and sustainable practices, rather than just respond to any material I have given them.
- B) There was the expected resistance to the touch sensor, and of course this was alpha technology so there were some flaws. I had expected there would be 1) more resistance (I was happy for this to happen—a limitation was put in so the students has something to 'fight' with) and 2) expansion, e.g., finding other sensors that provided the 'same' level of participation. However, if this did happen it never reached my ears. The point was to ensure people really did interact in a very specific way and that the teams had to instruct/demonstrate to people how to interact. Often we see some vague gestures or passing by and it is called embodied interaction, but I wanted the students to address this directly.
- C) So saying, despite some technical hiccups with the tech for one group (with a more extreme idea of drawing in blood), all the teams had working installation and all had taken on more or less 'brave' ideas. This is important at this point in their education, second year is a good time for them to be more experimental with their ideas.
- D) Guest lecture and forest day: While Dannie Druehyld was a little difficult for some to understand in English in a lecture format, the forest tour was fantastic. There was a small turnout (10), good for those who went as we had an excellent day but not good to find that our budding artists are not open to 'just listen' to other ways of thinking (or think they already know it). That was a bit disappointing and something that needs addressing in future (the attitude, not the event).

So saying these are minor details. Overall, I was very pleased with the students' progress and attention to their work. I would have liked to have more time with them to work through ideas (A and B) and intellectually thrash out aspects with them. Perhaps an earlier meeting designed to do just that would be a good addition to the semester schedule.

Their working relationship with P4 was good and I include this feedback in the report.

++++++

I have great feedback from Platform 4 on this semester exhibiting at P4:

"We have nothing but praise for the 4th semester students, they've been exemplary throughout the workshop - and all groups cleaned up perfectly afterwards. So we were very happy with the collab, and hope we can do much more of such projects together."

So thanks everybody for this. Also thanks for a very good exhibition. I have had a lot of feedback with praise for your work there as well and how the exhibition worked well as an overall. Some of you gave feedback on how the installations impacted on each other and how that might be taken into consideration in the future in a good way. For example, the participants became trained in how to use the sensor at the earlier installations, cutting down the need for info on use at the later installations or meaning that if the sensor was used differently, then the audience needed 're-training'.

As a whole group you worked well together and a goal for the future might be to make a large overall installation with each group contributing a component installation part. Just a thought anyway. The small party was a good one as well, so excellent all round.

Congratulations and thanks for the good work, exhibition and a great semester for this ArT4. Good luck with finishing cleaning up spaces and see you tomorrow at the ArT party.

August 24, 2012

Stine Lund and Ann Morrison.