

Evaluation ArT2 - 2010

Summary (Falk Heinrich)

1. Recommends for the study board:

The study board should together with the semester coordinator reassess platform4 as venue for the semester project, since the venue is cold and moldy even in May and can bring about allergic reaction.

There should be enough toolboxes for each group (remark: the study board has bought tool boxes).

The study board should work towards establishing a technical position that could support the students and administer the ArT lab.

The study board should select supervisors who share similar pedagogical and artistic values.

2. Recommends for the semester planners:

Every semester project has its framework and restrictions, discussed and agreed on by all the supervisors. These conceptual and material restrictions should be enforced and respected by all supervisors ('good' reasons are needed to grant an exemption).

The semester coordinator should continue the process of course integration in regards to each module's objective, learning outcome and assessment requirements.

A major challenge seems to be the integration of the programming course. Realistic objectives should be set, securing firstly knowledge transmission and, secondly, the implementations of the semester project. The semester planner could think in terms of programming workshop (this was actually done in ArT2-2009, the criticism was that the timely distance between the workshop and the project was too big.)

3. Recommends for the secretary and technical staff:

No recommendation.

4. Recommends for the responsible course holders.

See item 2:

Each course holder should try to align the content the course with the overall theme of the semester project without neglecting the courses' generic content and applicability to various knowledge domains.

Each course holder should beforehand inform the students about the needed

materials and literature.

Semester evaluation 2. semester (students)

Installation Technology and Design I

1. Introduction to node based programming

- a. *It was fine to be introduced to VVVV. The program is free and easy to access. The program is very useful according to our projects. The course, though, went a little fast. The beginning was nice and slow, in order to understand the program. But at one point it went really fast, and for some of us, it was hard to understand. Somehow it seemed like we should know the program in total after 5 days. This is not possible. The teacher had an expectation for us to be at the course to the evening every day. It seems like this would have been nice to know before the course. We needed more time than 5 days to learn this program. It should have been like our course with xx. (ArT3- 14 days workshop including a mini-project, which was obligatory to make!) A mini-project is a good way to learn the program and make something work. The mini project could be made in small groups.*

2. Space and Stages in the Experience City

- a. *This project was fine. We learned different aspects of dealing with public spaces. There was some literature to be inspired by. There were both lectures and practical work.*
- b. *We learned a lot of useful terms and ways of thinking, which some of us are still using.*
- c. *We want to know before the course what we have to buy to the course, so we have it in advance. (Do not say a lot of things we need to buy, if we do not need it.)*

3. Scenographic models and installation spaces

- a. *This course was fine. We heard about different theory and history of stages and scenographic models.*

Perception II

1. *It seemed like the course was not very well planned. There was no real structure and it was not as useful as the earlier perception course. Something needs to be planned in advance, so we do not end up sitting and just talking. Our first perception course was very good. So take inspiration in this. (there also was a mini-project in this which was very good)*

Morphology and Topology II

1. *This course was useful in the sense that we learned a lot of new terms when talking about shapes and relations between different shapes and figures. We had lots of small presentations, which was very useful. The supervisors were good at going round and giving comments. Towards the semester project we could use some of these different discussions when we were decorating our spaces.*

Design and Artistic Methodology II

1. *The very first day about forming groups was very good. Many people could use this to get a better understanding of group work. Some of the course was maybe a bit to alternative. We had to make a coat of arms (våbenskjold) and go round and explain it to each other. But otherwise it was a very useful and good day!*
2. *The part of the course, where we had to play games, and be blindfolded and by that generating ideas was way to alternative. This belongs in a theatrical study. It is okay to push the idea of what creativity is, and how we are able to generate ideas, but all these games were too much. (There was a lot of talk about this at our study).*
3. *There also was a part where we had to be small groups and keep on developing our ideas, then picking one, and develop this. We also for example got a random word, which we then had to put in our idea. This was very useful and a great way of simulation group work and creative thinking of ideas. Very good!*

Digital Representation CAD and communication

1. *It was useful for us to learn Rhino. We can use it in almost all our projects. The teacher had prepared a mini-project to our portfolio, which was very good. In this way we have to make something specific and finish it up.*

Art in Context 2 - Aesthetic Theory and Method

1. *This course was fine. We learned different theories and learned about philosophers and their connection to art. It was a good assignment to make a presentation on one of the texts. The second part of the course was also interesting and useful.*

General comments about the semester

Platform 4

At platform4 it was too cold! Even though we could take many layers of clothes on, it is very hard to work with gloves and big jackets on. Another thing was the mould on

the walls. We had to be there for 14 days, and some of the students are allergic to mould and had a hard time to breathe, and got a rush(udslet?). This really not acceptable! If we are going to work at a place through our university time it should not be with your health at risk.

It would have been nice to have access to platform4 a little earlier.

Materials and equipment

The semester project had some restrictions according to materials which he had to use. We had to use these materials – no more, no less. We were told this was very important. Some of the groups accepted these terms, even though it compromised the look of their installation. But some of the groups ignored these demands and got through anyway. There has to be a more clear line of what we can and not can. (if you set up materials restrictions.)

There were almost NO tools for building our installations. It is very hard to build with no tools. Of course we can bring our own, **but since this is a creative study it should be available**. (I believe tool boxes have been bought now?) We were borrowing tools from Platform4. But we should have our own.

Many of the groups had to go to the ceiling. There was a very poor scaffold, which could only be used in the middle rooms. If you used it at the rooms to the sides it was very dangerous. One group was up on it, and it was not stable. There should have been a meeting asking whether people wanted to go up under the ceiling or not, to order a lift and make a structure of how to divide the time with the lift. We had some very bad situations with the lift, because we got it like 4 days before we should finish. So suddenly everybody wanted to use the lift, and we could be waiting for over 4 hours to get the lift and get the installation done.

So a good advice: have some meetings during the process of developing the projects and find out whether people have to go up under the ceiling or not! (Students can of course arrange this, but help them arrange it since they are only at the 2. semester!)

The exhibition itself was okay the first evening, where supervisors, students and lots of visitors were there. But the second evening was kind of non-structured. Nothing was really happening this day. So some arrangement would maybe be a good idea, in order to keep it interesting to visit our exhibition.

Supervisors

We had some great supervisors. There was a conflict between two of them (not important who). These kinds of conflicts should not be brought to the students and go round like gossip. It should be handled like a situation which can be solved and be mature about it. The supervisors should not start talking about this to the students behind the other supervisor's back. You really have to take these conflicts up on a

meeting and deal with it. And make sure that these disagreements do not show at lectures, exams, way of judging our work etc.

Ninna Seerup (student representative)

Comments to [Design and Artistic Methodology II \(item 2\)](#) by Falk Heinrich

Physical games, simple body and perception exercises are well-established artistic methods in relation to creativity and idea generation. It was the course objective to present a very small number of those exercises (in fact, three small exercises during 3 hours aiming at provoking different modes of space perception). It is a shame that students cannot see the value and purpose of these well-known methods (used not only in the art but in many other fields). Maybe further explanations and clarifications from the teacher are needed. I would though caution against removing this kind of methodological approaches, but instead move them to a higher semester.

Comments to the [ArT2 2010 Evaluation](#) by Betty Li Meldgaard

First of all, I would like to recommend that there is a more formal method of evaluation. The model used at Hum. Inf. could be an inspiration for the form, since it involves the student's self evaluation in relation to their own engagement, participation and preparation as this form seems to secure a more balanced evaluation that take in to account the more nuanced picture of a semester succession. As there already exists ArT guidelines for the evaluation it may just be a case of getting it realized in praxis and implemented.

As the course holder of Perception 2, I would like to state that the course was never intended to be a workshop, but a more traditional series of lectures that introduced to the scientific paradigms of perceptual theories. There was, however, a practical workshop where some of the presented theories were applied to methods of drawing. This course was attended by 1/3 of the students. Since this is an academic education it must be expected that there will be scientific related content which due to the nature of the education is sought to be also applicable, that is, useful in praxis.