

## Feedback Report

### ***Preliminary remarks***

With 44 participants feedback (18.5 %) out of 238 participants the number of survey feedbacks was quite modest. In addition, about 40% of the participants delivering a feedback participated the first time in a SAR conference. Therefore, generalizing the answers is critical. Nevertheless together with the feedback session at the closing round of the conference the answers allow to draw at least a picture of some effects of the conference.

### ***A strong sign and a significant step forward for Artistic Research - Positive aspects***

A vast majority of the participants strongly praised the conference as an outperforming conference. A conference that advanced Artistic Research and the international Artistic Research Community a significant step forward. The repeatedly invoked reason for this assessment was:

- *The setting of the topics* (Inspiring Failures, Productive Gaps, Enhanced Dissemination Formats). Most of the contributions engaged with the topic and it was interesting especially to see and compare the different approaches to deal with these topics.
- *The setting of the focus, to put artistic research practices and the discussion* about concrete projects in the foreground. It was especially stressed that insights in concrete artistic research practices really took place, artistic research practices were made haptic, audible etc., and were not only talked about. As well as the idea was welcomed that the contributors had to deliver the questions to be discussed and that this worked very nicely. There was very often real interaction between the presenters and the audience.
- *The decision to offer two different formats (long and short)*. It allowed to get short information and deepening discussions.
- *The mix of concentrated spaces and times and the undefined free space time*. The amount of informal time was highly appreciated, well used for talks and networking, and noticed to be very specific for a conference.
- *The perfect organization of the conference*. It was mentioned both, the beautiful venue (including the cosy lounge, the vegetarian food, the roof terrace) and the competence and friendliness of the staff and coordination team.

## ***Critical aspects***

Several of the participants

- missed that there were no informal events like concerts, exhibitions parallel to the conference or dinner possibilities in the evening for networking,
- were very critical about the quality of some of the contributions (especially in the short format) and discussions (responsibilizing also the moderators)
- missed diversity (especially related to black communities).

The reception of the *keynotes* was highly split. Some of the participants were very critical about all them, some about some of the keynotes, and some participants were enthusiastic about all of the three of them.

## ***Suggestions for improvements***

Most of the suggestions for improvement were individual statements, there were no clear tendencies. In the following we list those suggestions that should be thought about for the SAR conferences to come:

- In addition to the conference there should be a programme of artistic research projects that accompanies the conference
- The selection of the contributors should include more colleagues from outside of Europe
- The discussion time of 10 minutes in the short format was experienced as often too short. Suggestions were to have only 3 inputs in one session for the short format (instead of 4 inputs)
- To actively propose facilities for networking (online resources, networking social media, e.g. livetweeting)
- To go on with emphasizing the conference's focus on artistic research practice and discussion