

7 responses

Accepting responses

Summary Question Individual

Which of the events did you attend? (Tick all that apply)

Copy

7 responses



What did you enjoy and/or take from the event?

7 responses

I found the second workshop/conversation interesting, but was a bit too spaced out to remember details. I do remember that I found it helpful for my teaching on archival methods, in terms of expanding them. The third workshop was very useful in terms of the relation between a relatively simple intervention and the expansion to a wider dimension - as wide as you want to take it - that it allowed. I also liked the sharing of the experiments/process.

Always with these events the boys is the disparity of perspective

I enjoyed the conversation, the view points of the practitioners, the range of backgrounds of the attendees

The making sessions were good. The conversation opened up ideas for me regarding 'containment' in archives.

The activities to do and the opportunities for the group to participate

This is the first time I've attended this type of event so I enjoyed hearing and learning about art from diverse practitioners

What could have been different, what didn't work well?

6 responses

I think I would have preferred slightly better preparation for the talk

Perhaps having an independent moderator to keep the conversation going when it slowed?

Because of the technical hitch on the first session, I was totally at sea regarding the content - I had no idea at all what was going on or that I was supposed to have printed a sheet for the session. I know that this was not something that Gesa could have anticipated but perhaps, if the material had gone out earlier the spam box mishap could have been resolved.

Some repetition of the proposed activities in the 3rd workshop - touch drawing made it less engaging for people who attended workshop 1

The schedule didn't work too well for me as it clashed with my classes so I don't think I was able to engage as fully as I would have liked - I still enjoyed it though

I am not at my best in the evening - having then during the day would have worked better for me but appreciate you can't please everyone.

The events were designed as practice explorations: to offer some of my methods and themes for shared engagement. What are your thoughts on how moving-with, contextual distance and participation (in) archiving featured in the respective sessions? Do they resonate with your own work/practice (if so how)? Do you have any thoughts on the relationship between showing and exploring in the sessions?

7 responses

I think I do not often think of my practice(s) as 'archiving' or any of the other terms, but I did find it helpful to think of things that I do through these terms and processes. What I found interesting was that it related less to my writing practice and more to my textile based art practice that I have been neglecting for some years - I was surprised that I still think through a lot of issues through textiles! I think I was more comfortable showing the less personal stuff - I had some other ideas, which I did not show, regarding relationships, for example. I think it depends on how comfortable you are with sharing really personal stuff.

I wonder about the focus of the frame, whether a greater distance from the lens to the work might help?

N/A

Because I was not au fait at all about your practices, I really struggled to know what you were proposing or reflecting on. I understand and appreciate the 'moving with' idea and could use it in my practice. Contextual distance I will have to investigate further because, at the moment, I am not sure that I fully grasp what it is. Regarding participation in archiving, I feel that that is a very valid field of exploration, particularly in light of what you showed us - your cyanotypes for example - because I came away thinking that all the practices you used need to be archived but how and where, and by and for whom are questions that need to be addressed.

the two making sessions (moving-with and contextual distance)

If you attended a making session (which one): how did the activities work for you? (think about timing, instruction, interest in making, exploration and discussion)

6 responses

would have been great

I attended both sessions. The first, for reasons already explained, left me at sea but I will try to reproduce it in my practice & see if I understand it better. The last session, making the tube with the holes in the sides was an excellent experiment although how it related to the main theme escapes me for the moment. Who will be able to access the archived images on the padlet? I did not feel that it was a kaleidoscope because there were no mirrors / reflective interiors involved.

In terms of originality the instructions were not exciting or challenging. Aesthetically there was no value in the outcomes produced but it was interesting experiment to perform as a group in this digital space together. The first 2 sessions seemed enough, the third session was tiring. Though the kaleidoscope exploration made the event worthwhile.

The 3rd one. Instructions were clear. I liked how it was accessible because it did not require much prep and it was something I can take part in.

The instructions were very clear and Gesa gave plenty of space/time for us to engage in the activities. I don't know if it was tiredness or the virtual dimension (or a both) but I noticed I was less engaged than I expected to be. I love making and exploring and in F2F workshops am usually right in there.

Again for the making sessions: can you comment on the camera setup: did it alter your perspective, experience (of your own setup; that of the others?). Did this affect your participation and experience of the session? If so, how?

6 responses

I think me being a bit spaced out made the camera stuff really clumsy, but that was actually quite an interesting thing, in combination with looking at the different ways in which other participants had positioned their cameras. There was an interesting diversity that also reflected in the discussion.

Yes, I thought the use of another lens was a great idea, it helped me to make some decisions on the making

I have an iMac and my phone could not host the zoom platform so I could not participate in that regard but I felt it was a super idea to have the 'making' the focus of the session and to record it as such.

Yes. It animated the session, allowed the audience to participate and was fascinating to watch

I enjoyed seeing people work on their stuff from the camera setup/angle. It was relaxing and also less intimidating for me.

I wonder if a larger screen would have made the camera setup more impactful for me as I really liked the idea of looking at our hands as we 'made'. Rather than being 'pulled in', I found myself zoning, but I had spent the day looking at a Zoom screen of people's faces before the workshops - so was a bit 'screened out'.

Each session was accompanied by a PDF zine to print - an A/Folder. Could you tell me a little if that registered, if you engaged with it (how? how not?), and any thoughts about this process?

5 responses

Being spaced out, the PDF was really helpful - I think it added another dimension beyond mere instruction, as it was both direct and had room for ambiguity.

Yes, it seemed straight forward - perhaps more so on the second time.

No, it did not register with me and I could not engage with it.

Yes I was aware that there were PDFs to print but I didn't engage with them visually. I couldn't see the value in printing them off. I completed the workshops without them.

I loved the PDF zine to print - they really worked for me as a process. They have a simplicity that belies the level of thought that has gone into them. I have started using the pocket one in own practice - it has added another layer to the project - Thank you Gesa

Concluding comments

Are there any other thoughts, comments, feedback you would like to share? Many thanks!

0 responses

No responses yet for this question.