# ArT 3rd semester 2011 final assessment
Associate Professor Dan Overholt, and student Kaylee Wesley Pearson

## Art Installation Design I

- This course ended in an exhibition 1 month into the semester. Even though this created some stressful work schedules, it was appreciated to get the ball rolling right away. However, students did feel that not enough time was left to prepare the exhibition (only one day for setup). The students felt that Lars Graugaard's teaching was very good in this course. The Art Installation Design I exhibition was a good way to implement the newly learned knowledge of electronics and kinetics. As part of this course, a guest lecturer was brought in from Aarhus, Wayne Siegel. His was viewed as extremely inspirational by most of the students.

## Drawing and Sketching Techniques III

Students learned structural design techniques - overall, the content of this course was not at a high enough level, but it was still interesting to some students. While the results of this course were shown together in the exhibition for Art Installation Design I (at Platform 4), it did not have a thematic connection to the 'Objet Trouve' works shown for AID1. The primary output from students in the course were a set of kinetic pendulum-based drawing machines. The course ended well, but due to the scheduling attendance was not as good as it should have been. To avoid the scheduling problem in the future, the final event for Drawing and Sketching Techniques should not happen at the same time as Art Installation Design I.

## Art History and Science 2

- Art History & Science 2 was useful to have students get a better understanding of how the works they make fit in the context of the overall discourse in the field. The literature used and the assignments given were both appropriate, and the overall relevance in relation to the semester theme was good.

## Sensors and Actuators I

- This year the Sensors and Actuators was run in the form of an extended workshop. This is in response to the previous year's experience, but some students felt still that it needed more hands-on exercises. Overall, it would be good to keep the workshop format, but split it up into 2 workshops, one near the beginning of the semester, and another (final) one closer to the middle of the semester, helping with problems that arise once students have attempted working on their own a bit more.

    o The intention of the 'Knock Clock* project was very good – to get hands-on at a simple technical project. It did take quite a bit of time beyond the course, however. However, this is something the new format of the course required.
    o The oscilloscope lecture was good, and the collected video examples (posted online via Moodle) was considered a very good idea. Students used them to review ideas presented during the course, and even could use them in some cases in groups to solve problems related to their semester projects.

## Creative Sensor Networks

- The course was well received, but some students felt frustrated that the hardware described and used during the course was not necessarily available to use during the rest of the semester. Nonetheless, the course only partially focused on the hardware. In fact, the primary learning outcomes of the course were understanding and utilizing computer networks for interactive purposes, and included many examples and exercises that did not use the custom hardware (only the student's laptops and software). So, in the future this course could be taught without the hardware elements.

## Programming

- The Programming course was good, teaching the programming language Processing. While some felt it is good to know both MaxMSP and Processing, others would like to learn only one or the other. This is always an issue when it comes to teaching multiple programming languages, it seems. In the 'real world', however, there is no way to get around having to learn multiple languages.

## Visual Programming

- Lars Graugaard taught this course in the form of a workshop. Students agreed that he did a good job, and they enjoyed the links between this course, the Art Installation Design 1 course, and the Sensors and Actuators course. These links were facilitated by Lars and Dan together (explicitly working to make sure the content was linked). The students noted that this level of integration made it possible to pull together an exhibition only 1 month into the semester, a very short time, and that the help given towards the exhibition in these courses was very useful.

## DAM III

- Design and Artistic Methodology 3 was an extremely useful course for concept design, and methods for doing user studies. For example, body storming to generate project ideas and focus. Students felt that it was a highly relevant course for their main semester projects. It was appreciated that methods such as ethno methodology were also introduced.

## Digital representation

- Digital representation was a very good course in terms of documenting the work of both the semester projects and smaller projects (like the initial AID1 exhibition) in the form of online websites. The content of the course was very useful.

## General comments to semester

- Overall, the semester functioned well.

  - At the beginning of the semester, a choice of options (before or after the Christmas break) was given to the students. Even though it was difficult the pervious year to have the exhibition after Christmas, they chose to have more time to work on their projects and hold it on January 6th. This ended up working out fine, actually. The previous year there were some complaints. However, this year (since the students chose it themselves), there were no serious issues that arose, and everything worked out OK in terms of the schedule.

o It was a very good idea to exhibit at Utzon Center – this made the students feel that their projects were taken seriously, and that they had a responsibility in order to make these projects work, since it is a very nice space. The local (in-house) proximity of the Utzon Værksted also was extremely useful. This was in fact used even during some last-minute preparations, with help from Poul Lund, who runs the workshop there.

## Students planning groups

It is now standard to form 3 planning-groups- PR, Curation, and Industrial Relations. These are a very good idea to continue using in the future. It was a shame, though, that even though students signed up for these groups, some did not seem to engage in them actively enough. In the end, a lot of work was divided to a very few people. (This is the students own responsibility to figure out, but the same thing unfortunately happened during the prior year as well.)

o PR group – Did a good job promoting the final exhibition by organizing advertising (posters, etc..)

o Curator group - helped organize the overall use of the space in Utzon and resolve any issues that came up when one group's desire for lighting or use of sound might interfere with another group's project.

o Industrial relations group – This group was a bit dysfunctional and was not contributing to the load as much as they should in terms of looking for sponsorship (materials and/or money). This should be pushed harder in future years.

## Comments for the ArT-studienævnet

This time the 3$^{rd}$ semester seemed to be function efficiently in most regards. Getting students inspired to do the work in all of the courses can always be a challenge, though. Some of the courses work well as a series of lectures, while others work better asworkshop-style student projects. The workshop seem best suited if occurring at the beginning of the semester, for example in the Art Installation Design course. As in the previous year, some of the technology-oriented courses suffer from a lack of student engagement, unfortunately. This shows in the final reports, in that the documentation of the semester projects focuses mostly on the humanistic side of the project. Students need to document the technical side of their work as well. That said, however, the projects and the students' final documentation were improved greatly from the previous year. It benefits the program greatly to incorporate the different elements – both humanistic and technological – in the semester projects. This was a greater success than the previous year.

Document written by:
Assoc. Professor Dan Overholt
Students Kaylee Wesley Pearson and Stine Lund