

# 2. Common documentation methodology

**EU4ART Alliance WP3**

Methodological Renewal of Training Courses  
Work Package



## CONTRIBUTORS

EU4ART Alliance WP3 – Methodological Renewal of Training Courses Work Package  
WP3 Leader: Christiane OERTEL (HfBK Dresden)

WP3 Coordinators: Till Ansgar BAUMHAUER (HfBK Dresden), József MÉLYI (HUFA Budapest), Beatrice PERIA (ABARoma), Andris VITOLINS (LMA Riga)

Further contributors: Elise BEUTNER (HfBK Dresden), Margit KOLLER, Andrea SZILÁK and Patrick Nicholas TAYLER (HUFA, Budapest), Marco RINALDI (ABARoma), Janis GAILITIS (LMA Riga)

© • 2021 • EU4ART Alliance

All rights reserved. Licenced to the European Union under conditions.

The beneficiaries retain ownership of the results of the action, including industrial and intellectual property rights, and of the reports and other documents relating to it unless stipulated otherwise in the Agency.

The EU4ART Alliance is co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union.

<https://eu4art.eu>



Hochschule für Bildende Künste



# Table of Contents

<b>II.</b>	<b>COMMON DOCUMENTATION METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>II.1</b>	<b>Strategies in deeper Investigation.....</b>	<b>4</b>
II.1.a	Regional-level questionnaires and interviews .....	4
II.1.b	Questionnaire for professors .....	5
II.1.c	Questionnaire for the workshops .....	8
II.1.d	Additional material to be produced on teaching methodology .....	11
II.1.e	Concise Comparison of the Questionnaires' Results .....	12
II.1.f	Conclusions.....	12
<b>II.2.</b>	<b>Professional Cooperation .....</b>	<b>12</b>
II.2.a	Online Lectures.....	12
II.2.b	Plan of Open Calls, Exhibitions, Mini Projects.....	13
<b>II.3.</b>	<b>Online Meetings.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>II.4</b>	<b>Regional exhibitions .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>II.5</b>	<b>List of attached documents: .....</b>	<b>16</b>

## II. Common Documentation Methodology

### II.1 Strategies in deeper Investigation

#### II.1.a Regional-level questionnaires and interviews

Due to the pandemic, the EU4ART partners were not able to realize the intensive on-site exchange that had been planned originally; all joint conferences, courses, overarching projects and working meetings had to be cancelled.

Only a two-day working meeting in Budapest in January 2020 with a tour of the studios, workshops and exhibition spaces housed in various buildings provided a first impression. Another working meeting in Riga in March 2020 gave a few colleagues and students an insight into the study opportunities at the LMA and the cultural links in the city of Riga as well as with various partner institutions.(attached travel reports).

ABAROMA was already closed from March 2020 and colleagues had experienced travel restrictions before. As a result, the colleagues and especially the students of the Roman academies lack EU4ART exchange experience. Likewise, the partners in Budapest, Riga and Dresden only have information about ABAROMA only from visual and audio material sources.

The planned partners' visit to Dresden in connection with the 1st **Symposium "The Thing About Teaching Art"** had to be suspended as well and the symposium was converted into a digital symposium format : the "**NON-SYMPIOSIUM: The Thing About Teaching Art**".

Therefore, not only a real impression of the given study conditions, structures and teaching methodology in the partner academies is missing. The crucial personal and direct verbal exchange in joint workshop and studio work, the participation in teaching events in the academies of the alliance partners and the exchange of experiences of the entire teaching staff on different levels could not take place as well. In consequence, we used our weekly digital meetings and developed questionnaires for different group areas in the respective academy.

The alliance partners adjusted the timeline for the common schedule several times in the constant hope of finally being able to fulfil the plans connected to the initial concepts of mobility.

#### II.1.a Regional-level questionnaires and interviews

The intense discussion of the WP members and an into depth research/analysis of the teaching work of the professors, the work in the workshops and the survey of the students in the respective academy resulted in the drafting special quantitative as well as qualitative questionnaires for every part of the studies and educational program in the universities association. An qualitative research and overview that is as complete and differentiated as possible of the range of courses offered, the didactic methods

and the local, different circumstances in artistic teaching forms the central prerequisite for the development of a didactic-methodological concept for the university network EU4ART. Only against the background of the most comprehensive knowledge possible a concept for cooperation can be developed that does justice to all partners, makes efficient and adequate use of the available possibilities, and at the same time takes into account the regional needs.

As a logical consequence, interviews and questionnaires were chosen as methods to develop a differentiated picture of the potentials and conditions available to the EU4ART project within a manageable time period. These questionnaires developed by the WP3 team lead in Dresden, made available to the partners and passed on by them to as many teaching staff members as possible became the basis of discourse on teaching methods and methodologies. Although the results do not claim to be exhaustive, they provide a clear picture of research, teaching and pedagogical practice at the four partner universities. All questionnaires used are included in this interim report. The questionnaires follow mostly the guidelines of qualitative investigation, as they try to reach the different professors and workshops with their specialized tasks and working areas and to give an overall idea of the complex field of teaching and learning. For the students, there is also a quantitative aspect included in questionnaires.

In general, the central points of the questionnaire structure were formed by the analysis of the teaching methodology from different points of view, which explains the different structure of the study program, and its conclusion, the partly different division into departments or faculties as well as the embedding in legally regulated requirements. The research included theoretical as well as artistic practical teaching and a comparison in structural and statistically comparable modules. Important aspects of the social and cultural integration of the university in the region, aspects of equality and inclusion, job security, funding and financing strategies were also taken into account.

After the multi-page questionnaires had been prepared, they were sent to the relevant professors, workshop leaders and students. Each academy produced its own summary evaluation, which was shared with the other partners. Detailed questions became the topic of discussion in detail in various digital meetings.

The detailed questionnaires as well as the reports of the participating universities can be found as attachments to the WP3 midterm report.

### **II.1.b Questionnaire for professors**

The questionnaire for professors and their teaching in subject classes examined various areas of teaching:

In the first section, information was asked about the subject / subject class / assignment within the study structure. This included information about the class size,

gender of the students, the internationality of the student group, the mixture or separation of different semester levels, and the work of student assistants or tutors and their areas of responsibility.

This is followed by the question of content-related focal points and how they are taught. This includes the analysis of the courses in terms of number of participants, analog / digital, but also on the level of student prior knowledge required for successful teaching for participation, etc. Also at this point, questions are asked about the connection of the teaching content with or the interweaving with traditional techniques / teaching concepts / ideals of craftsmanship. Professors are asked to provide insight into the work situation in which students find themselves in each teaching area, information about best practices, and the connection between art practice and everyday reality.

The following block of questions deals with the relevance of teaching for or preparation for final exams and the question of quality criteria. There is also a question about mentoring alumni or their professional perspectives; the teachers are explicitly asked date to develop ideas for this.

In addition, the questionnaire for professors asks about the use of English as a language in teaching and about the involvement of teachers in university administration and committees, as well as about the view of the teachers surveyed on the opportunities that the university offers them for their own practice or research work.

## **II.1.b\_1**

### **Questionnaire Professors**

#### ***Structure of the subject class/ basic studies/ orientation phase***

- How many students belong to the subject class? Class size
- What is the ratio of the number of females/males/divers?
- What is the number of students of different nationalities?
- Are the years/ semesters mixed?
- Are there assistants or tutors?
- What are their responsibilities?

#### ***Content + focus of teaching***

- short description of the teaching concept of the subject class/ basic studies/ orientation phase:
- Which specific teaching formats are used:

Class discussions / Individual discussions / Consultations / Excursions / Exhibition practice / Guest lectures / Interdisciplinary work with other subject classes/universities / other...

- What role do traditional skills and abilities play?
- What requirements should a student bring along?  
None / Graphic basics / Fundamentals of craftsmanship in general / Broad general knowledge / Knowledge of art history / Contemporary art knowledge
- Where is the balance between craftsmanship and theoretical reflection?
- Does the relationship to the current art market play a role in teaching?
- How is the decision for material/artistic working techniques influenced by the students or what criteria determine them?
- Is the skill to work with materials / dealing with material still contemporary?
- What are artistic skills in the digital world?
- What influence does the digital surface have in contrast to real materiality?
- Where is the emphasis on interdisciplinarity to be found?
- What is the relationship between theory and practice?
- What is the relationship between compulsory tasks and free artistic work in the studio for students?
- What is the best practice in providing enough liberty and limits for students?
- Which criteria/methods form the basis for best practice?
- What problems exist with regard to student motivation?
- Which problems complicate the students' everyday life?
- To what extent is/should the professor be the contact person?

### ***Diploma degree / final examination***

- What are the concrete preparations?
- How does the professor assess the current diploma procedure and the existing set of rules?
- Which evaluation criteria are relevant?

### ***Alumni/...***

- What is the contact to graduates like?
- Is there a support system / scholarships?
- Where does the professor see opportunities after graduation / extended fields of activity? (please insert ideas)
- How is the work of the Academy's Careers Service to be evaluated?
- Where is the potential for better support for graduates?

### ***Mobility/Language skills***

- How important is mobility (real / virtual) for own work + for students?
- What opportunities are offered by the EU4ART project?

### ***Work in academic administration/ committees***

- What is the proportion of participation in committees / academic administration for teaching and own artistic work?
- Is there any activity outside the university in commissions/evaluation processes?

### ***Context University – own Artistic Activity***

- Does the university support the academic professor in his/her artistic career?
- What are the good practices?
- What should be developed?

### ***How does the university engage in developing the professors' researcher career?***

- The professor as researcher
- The role of the university in supporting the research activity  
(to be filled by those professors who have research activity)

## **II.1.c Questionnaire for the workshops**

The first focus of this questionnaire goes to the design and structure of each workshop. It raises the question how the workshop is connected to the university teaching, to whom it is subordinated and how it is structured with regard to its staff. Closely related to this is the question of how many students can work here at the same time or in the entire semester, how many foreign and exchange(ERASMUS) students can be accommodated, and what the gender proportion of users is. As well, the question is raised if relevant prior knowledge is required for use of the workshop and / or offered within the workshop.

Connected to this, it is important to discuss if the access to the workshop is limited to students belonging to a certain faculty, department or class or if it is open to every student. This aspect also includes estimated numbers of students regularly using the workshop, if they are allowed to work there unsupervised, if there is a barrier-free



access and to what extent waiting lists exist (that might indicate the need to develop the structures of the workshop further).

The part on content and focus of teaching in the workshop includes a reflection on the workshop content described and its interconnectedness to traditional skills and abilities play. This also includes questions on prior skills or expertise of the students.

What requirements should a student have?

Also additional offers of the workshop like excursions, guest lectures, exhibitions or other formats are relevant here.

As our focus is directed to students' needs and student motivation as well, these aspects are raised as well. The position of the workshop leader, as artist and craftsman, is additionally reflected in the questionnaire.

Another part of the workshop questionnaire deals with material, techniques and equipment / tools used for the workshop practice, on workshop safety, material costs and on health issues connected to the workshop work.

The relation between the alumni and accessibility of the workshops is one more point, as well as the need for mobility (be it virtual or real) as well for the workshop leader as for the students. In this context, the language skills are also a relevant point, as well as the interconnectedness of workshop and administration (in terms of personal participation in commissions and committees).

## **II.1.c\_1: Questionnaire for the workshops**

### ***Design + Structure***

- What is the assignment of the workshop ? faculty / department / free
- who runs the workshop?
- Is there an artistic director?
- Is there a technical/craft director?
- Is there any other staff?
- Are there assistants?
- What is the number of students per course / per semester ?
- What is the number of Erasmus students per semester ?
- What is the ratio of the number of females/males/divers?
- What is the number of students of different nationalities?
- How many students can work in the workshop at the same time?
- Is an introductory course necessary to work in your workshop?
- How many introductory courses do you offer per semester?
- From which semester on are students allowed to work in your workshop?
- Which students may use the workshop?

All / Faculty of Fine Arts / Department of Sculpture / Department of Painting / Department of Drawing /

- What are the admission requirements for students?
- How many people would you say attend your workshop?
- Are students able to work unsupervised in your workshop?
- Is a waiting list for students working in the workshop necessary?
- Is there a possibility for disabled students to use your workshop with an assistant if they are not able to meet the physical demands themselves?

### ***Content + focus of teaching***

- Description of the workshop offer/ course offer
- What is the relationship between course - free job opportunities?
- What role do traditional skills and abilities play?
- What requirements should a student have?

None / Fundamentals of craftsmanship in general / Broad general knowledge / Expertise / other

- What other offers are there in the workshop?

Excursions / Guest lectures / Group work / Exhibition projects / Consultations / other

- What are the problems regarding the motivation of students?
- Where do you see your role in the placement process?

Basics of handicraft / Artistic basics / General knowledge / Knowledge of the art market / Basics for work after exams / other

- Is there the possibility to do your own artistic work in the workshop as well?
- What is the proportion between teaching and own artistic work?
- Where is the balance between craftsmanship and theoretical reflection?
- What materials can students work with in the workshop?
- To what extent is the decision for material/artistic working technique influenced by the students or which criteria determine this?
- Who bears the material costs?

### ***Equipment / work safety***

- Do you think that the equipment in your workshop is up to date?
- Does the university respond to your suggestions/needs to invest in new equipment within a reasonable time frame?
- Are the health and safety measures granted?

- Does the university respond to your concerns about the occupational safety measures?

### ***Alumni***

- What is the contact to alumni?
- Are graduates allowed to use the workshop after graduation?
- Where do you see potential for better support for graduates?

### ***Mobility/language skills***

- How important is mobility / real, virtual for own work + for students?
- What opportunities do you see in the EU4ART project?
- Which foreign languages do you use with students so far?

### ***Work in academic administration/ committees***

- Are you involved in activities in commissions/committees of the university?

## **II.1.d Additional material to be produced on teaching methodology**

### **Study on interrelatedness of theory and practice**

Beyond these questionnaires, there will be a concise study written by one theory professor per each university in which the interrelatedness between theoretical approaches and practice-based studies within each university system are outlined. These studies will be available until the end of the three-year phase of EU4ART.

### **Questionnaires for students**

Without any doubt, the questionnaires mentioned before have to be supplemented by a questionnaire developed for and with the students. This will be an integral part of the student involvement which plays a crucial role within the whole EU4ART project. Also this questionnaire and its results will be available at the end of the project. This will allow us to include the experiences of the students that take part in the test curriculum of EU4ART in winter semester 2021/22 and summer semester 2022. First questionnaires for students were already developed independently by ABAROMA and MKE.

### **II.1.e Concise Comparison of the Questionnaires' Results**

Although the questionnaires collected give a broad overview over the existing structures and a complex impression of the existing teaching methodologies, a concise comparison can be productive only when bringing the protagonists together to create direct discourse and dialogue. Although real life meetings were not possible due to the Covid pandemic, these meeting could be realized in form of digital symposia held on different core topics of the alliance. These symposiums are described in detail in Chapter VI.3.d.

The aim of these symposia was on one side to discuss the topics on a more general level and on the other side to bring together specialized subgroup discussions and exemplary case studies to be analyzed.

### **II.1.f Conclusions**

The results of this process of research, analysis, discourse and exchange on central issues of teaching methodology and focuses can be partly found in chapter IV where the different approaches of the partner academies are to be found and compared. Nevertheless, there are still open processes (see II.1.d) and topic orientated discussions between the partners that will be deepened during personal meetings to come soon when the vaccination process of the team members in over and first interpersonal exchange can take place. Therefore, this midterm report cannot outline final results. Material related to the process already undergone can be found as attached documents to this report (see the list II.5 at the end of this report part).

## **II.2. Professional Cooperation**

### **II.2.a Online Lectures**

The medium of online lectures does not only allow sharing expertise and teaching material, but in times of Covid-19 also makes it possible to get into discussion beyond the local networks. This became especially for the WP3 of EU4ART relevant in some aspects:

- Possibility to introduce teachers / professors and their work to the alliance partners
- Workshops related to relevant and up-to-date teaching topics that can be relevant for students from all partner universities

- Exploring the frameworks for regular and common online teaching models, but as well building up dialogue between not only teachers, but also students from different universities, enabling every participant to join also the discussion with the lecturer.
- Making the project of EU4ART visible beyond the university framework.

According to these bullet points, online lectures served for different tasks and were also designed for specific need, partially building up on each other.

### **II.2.b Plan of Open Calls, Exhibitions, Mini Projects**

From the originally planned portfolio of common activities, only very few could be performed relatively unimpressed by Covid-19:

- EU4ART Box at HfBK Dresden for EU4ART student works
- Online Lectures (international)
- Online workshops for digital/ virtual art
- Exhibition and Opening in newly acquired exhibition space “Pilot” in Riga in August (members from Budapest and Dresden visiting, Italy still severely impacted and not able to travel)

All of the other planned activities with students and staff were partly or completely compromised due to pandemic restrictions:

- live visits from workshop staff, professors and students (last planned: Meeting in ABAROMA on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2020)
- analogue symposia in spring and autumn in Dresden with live guests from all universities
- international student workshops e.g. on papermaking, etching, lithography, woodblock printing accompanying the symposium in autumn 2020 in Dresden
- exhibition projects in Dresden with Open Call to all partners

When the pandemic situation began to take form in early 2020, the project was only in its fourth month and the EU4ART teams were still in the process of identifying next steps and analyzing how to realize and implement EU4ART goals into their universities. Nearly all activities had to be revisited, transferred to digital methods or delayed.

## II.3. Online Meetings

Due to the Covid pandemic and just short time after the beginning of the EU4ART project, it became obvious that regular work package meetings would not be possible.

Therefore, it was decided to install regular online meetings of the WP members as the only option to create a situation of common work on the task in the working groups. These online meetings also allowed at least to some part to get to know the partners and team members from the allied universities.

The team leaders of WP 2 and WP 3 early decided to hold joint meetings, as there were several overlaps in terms of focus points and as well staff. The related content of the work packages made it a reasonable decision to involve some team members as well in WP2 as WP3.

The online meeting program “Zoom” made regular joint meetings easily possible, and from spring of 2020 these were held weekly, every Wednesday from 10 AM to 12 AM. Although, through time, some of the staff change, the core team of WP2 / 3 included almost 15 members, sometimes even more.

The universities joined in team as follows:

HfBK Dresden team: 4 members (from September 2020, 5)

ABAROMA: 2 members

LMA Riga: 2 members, from autumn 2020: 4

MKE: 2 (WP2), 2 / later: 4 members (WP3)

The online meetings served to discuss the common topic in reference to the WP, the difficulties showing up in accordance to the Covid-19 pandemic and the tasks to be done within the upcoming week’s period. WP meetings served for collecting material and for gathering it in reports and documentation needed. Minutes were taken by a team member from Dresden, as the meetings usually were not recorded.

In early spring of 2021, the meetings were transferred to Thursday mornings only every two weeks.

## II.4 Regional exhibitions

The students' work is presented by the partners in two phases. In the first phase, regional exhibitions will take place, with each partner institution presenting the work of its own student body. In the second phase, the partners will organize a joint travelling exhibition at the end of the project. The organization of the four regional exhibitions started at the end of 2020. The duration of the presentations is between October and November 2021. The partners agreed on a common theme of *Aspects of Memory*, in the context of which the four partners' common past – in connection with the 20th century authoritarian systems – can be elaborated on. Each site has its own curatorial and selection procedure, coordinated by the organizers and project managers in regular international project meetings, which take place online due to the pandemic. Negotiations have been ongoing since the end of 2020.

In the same way, each institution has developed its methodology for the production of the works to be exhibited – the lessons and consequences of the various strategies are also constantly discussed by the partners. The preparation of student works takes place, among other things, in the framework of university courses and workshops. In Budapest, in the semester from January to May 2021, the planning was carried out with the help of research fellows, accompanied by weekly consultations and lectures.

The plans of the student work are mutually reviewed by the experts of the partner institutions in the form of consultations. The students submit their work plan, consisting of a description of the planned artwork/project, supplemented with visual material, a statement about their work in general and three further reproductions selected from the student's previous work. The work plans are then forwarded to the coordinators; after that, half-hour-long consultations take place between the students and the curators/professors (2 curators/professors from each university). Based on the consultation experiences, both the curators/professors and the students provide a brief, half-page long summary.

To prepare for the regional exhibitions, there will be a series of online lectures for several months aimed at students from the four partner institutions. Curators and artists will share their own experiences with the students. On the one hand, the documentation on the exhibitions travels to the other three partner institutions in a standard box format according to prior arrangements. On the other hand, the exhibitions are presented in person by the curators and art students by visiting the other three institutions. The partners will evaluate the lessons of the regional exhibitions and consultations at a joint event after the end of the projects.

## II.5 List of attached documents:

[The relevant files can be found under this weblink.](#)

It provides the following documents:

### **For Dresden:**

2\_ Questionnaire Professors.docx

3\_ Questionnaires Workshops.docx

Questionnaires Professors HFBK Summary.docx

### **For Rome:**

report\_questionnaires ROME.docx

Survey (Italian).docx

Riassuntivo\_questionari english.xls

### **For Riga:**

Riga\_Summary\_questionnaire\_Sculpture\_dpt

Riga\_Summary\_questionnaire\_Painting\_dpt

Riga\_Summary\_questionnaire\_DRAWINGdpt

Riga\_Summary\_questionnaire\_Graphic\_art\_dpt