

## **Progress Report for CETLD Projects (Interim Report)**

<http://www.brighton.ac.uk/design/cetld>

### **Living Legend Masterclass**

**Qona Rankin**

**Royal College of Art**

### **Stakeholders**

Qona Rankin, Dyslexia Co-ordinator

Felicity Aylieff, Senior Tutor Ceramics Department

Taelim Rhee, was replaced by Billy Campbell who is a final year student on the film course at the Surrey Institute of Art and Design. Billy was able to shoot all the videos over two days using highly professional equipment.

### **Aims and Objectives**

The aims of this project are to enhance the learning experience of students being taught through demonstration. This is particularly important for students who have difficulty with learning at the pace set by the course. This could include overseas students, students with family commitments, and students with disabilities such as dyslexia.

The objectives are to produce 3 videos with accompanying printouts. The videos will demonstrate key techniques within the field of, in the first instance, the Ceramics and Glass Department at the Royal College of Art (RCA). The materials will be evaluated by students both at the RCA and at Brighton. If successful this project could lead to the development of additional videos in other disciplines.

### **Targets**

It was anticipated that filming would be completed by the end of December. Editing would take place during the early part of 2008 with a view to evaluating and testing the project in the later half of the Spring term. Amendments would then be carried out, the material prepared for electronic dissemination and a report written, with a view to completing the project by September 2008. The filming went entirely according to plan with all participants being extremely cooperative and generous with their time. We decided to only use two students as three made the film look rather crowded. The only difficulties have been technical ones concerning the quality of sound on the video, ( the workshop was very noisy and it was difficult to cut out the background noise. Perhaps in future those speaking, should be miked-up.) In addition the bullet points to run smoothly across the bottom of the video took more time than anticipated. The date for the seminar had to be postponed from May 7<sup>th</sup> to 25<sup>th</sup> of June. This was due to examinations and graduation shows being earlier than usual.

### **Project Outputs**

The editing and addition of the bullet points to the film, has taken slightly longer than anticipated and because of this, and because the summer term finishes earlier than usual it is unlikely that the evaluation will be completed by Brighton students until next term. The videos and print-out will be available from the middle of May 08

### **Dissemination**

It is intended that this 'living legend masterclasses' archive would be accessible through both the CETLD and RCA Web sites. We would also hope to publicise the archive through an RCA

initiative called 'ReachOut RCA' which co-ordinates a programme of educational workshops in liaison with London schools. In addition having recently seen a presentation of 'Virtual Environments' I am now wondering about the possibility of placing it within 'Second Life'

## Budget

			Amount claimed
Project Manager 7 days	@ £159.00 per day	1113.00	1050.00
Ceramics consultant 5 days	@ £188.00 per day	940.00	
Filming and editing 10 days	@ £165.00 per day	1650.00	1650.00
Technician's time 3 days	@ £102.00 per day	306.00	102.00
2 Students' time 1.5 days	@ £50.00 per day	150.00	100.00
Digital technician for preparation of electronic Material 4 days	@ £125.00 per day	500.00	
Student feedback group	£200.00	200.00	
Materials & consumables	£100.00		
<b>Total</b>	<b>£4959.00</b>	<b>Total amount claimed to date</b>	<b>£2902.00</b>
<b>Outstanding balance £2057.00</b>			

## Suggestions for future CETLD projects in terms of bidding, guidelines or project support?

When I bid for the funding I did not fully appreciate the implications about being included in part of the CELTD wider community. By this I mean receiving regular correspondence about events taking place in Brighton. Interesting as many of these seminars sounded, I do not have time away from teaching duties at College to be able to engage in these seminars. Perhaps I should have included funding for replacement teaching and travel expenses in my bid but firstly, I didn't realise this was expected, and secondly I really just wanted to get on and make the videos.

As an art student in the 70s and then as a design tutor, the expectation was that each project would culminate with a crit. During the crit the product produced in response to the brief, was scrutinised. Questions were asked about how it functioned, how it might be manufactured, its form, how it could be developed etc,etc. This discussion was a great vehicle for getting students to articulate thoughts, ideas, doubts, and misgivings about various designed objects and thus acquire knowledge about design. Nobody was particularly interested in the post-rationalisation of how the student had arrived at that particular solution. Although perhaps some of the more abstract disciplines such as painting and sculpture were.

This preoccupation with evaluating the process as against the product. (which seems to be standard practice, and accepted by all levels of the educational establishment in the UK today,) can, I think be considered as excluding for those people who are chiefly concerned with the product. So far I have been sent the 'CETLD Project Evaluation Summary' document and 'Progress Report for Projects (Interim Report,)' along with guideline paper work. No doubt I will also be expected to produce a final report as well.

The 'Progress Report Form' is a rather confusing document, for example I couldn't work out what the difference was between points 4 and 5 which are both titled 'project outcomes.' In addition on the 17.3.08 I was sent 3 templates for Research Ethics. As I began the project in the Autumn term I had to try and locate the participants and persuade them to sign the form after they had been filmed.

In the light of this I question the validity of CETLD paper-work. Many of the project leaders I would imagine are makers, people who think perhaps visually before articulating their thoughts and many of them will be dyslexic. This quantity and density of paperwork will deter many such people from applying for funding. I think the process needs to be much more 'inclusive.'

The Learning and Teaching Project Fund at the RCA has to my mind a much clearer and straight-forward Report Form. So I have written my own evaluation form, (outlined below) for the product, (in this case videos and supporting material,) which I shall be using as the basis for feed-back discussions. It will also form the structure to my final report.

Explanation of the brief

Does the solution fulfil the brief's criteria elegantly?

Does the solution fall within the financial restraints?

Is the solution sustainable?

How might the solution be improved?