



[Commons in Transit](#) (2015) reports on a trans-departmental corridor-week project focussing on the thoroughfares at KHiO (featuring the grey-room ≠ white cube and black box).

While the design of the interactive space of logbook presentations, as *learning theatres*, has been developed iteratively over the last years—the basic structure being one we have used for the final presentations in the final theory course (Theory 3/T3)—the collaboration with a 3rd sector organisation on a agreed topic and the public lineup of student works is a *novelty* of the year.

The task agreed about with the *Consumer Council* and the specialisation in clothing and fashion-design at KHiO, was to ask the students to make a pitch for the *Greenwashers of the year* (awarded by the Consumer Council). The task was to analyse the public face of an enterprise—whether in the private or public sector—and submit a flat visual element with a short text for the lineup.

Though experimental, the background for it was a sense of *urgency* in addressing readability to a 3rd party as an aspect of theory development in our design MA that has been weakly represented to this point; since the MAIs mainly have been guided by their own interest in their course deliveries, and have learned to research their field and topic to this end, for many years.

The purpose was to put the students into a situation where they would have to regroup their assets and priorities to this end: to engage communicatively with a 3rd party that is *not* visually literate in the sense of the art-school, but specialised with legal, political and communicative aspects of consumer rights in Norway (and internationally). Sharing the same *substantial* interest.

The objective with the students was thereby to *reverse* the regular hierarchy between “mesearch” and research, to place an emphasis on *research* (and thereby *backgrounding* the mesearch and letting it be directed by a shared communicative purpose). As in the logbook presentation the contributions are individual targeting a collective situation, but public conditions of readability.

The situation for the lineup was arrived at through a series of *contingencies*. From a series of alternative dates for the lineup—that we came up with the Consumer Council—mid June was eventually preferred by students and project group alike. The 17th June date was arrived at by suggestion from Peter Løchstør on account of a Fashion show that took place at that date.

This was intentionally to be able to offer a crowd to the event, and thereby to meet the Consumer Council half way. However, a couple of students objected that the lineup thereby would be poaching on a different event: someone else’s event, to be sure. Talking to the people involved with the show, I got the sense that it wasn’t that big an issue to them. So, it could be resistance.

Resistance is a regular guest in curricula where learning comes from work-experiences: process and delivery. It can manifest in confusion about dates, place and the nature of the tasks (which invariably postpones the learning outcomes, but appears difficult to avoid). Assigning the accuracy of the information given to the students, by the students in their own format is key.

A learning outcome at the course level therefore is to examine the possibility of giving the students an early practical experience to pitch and prompt learning out-comes that they will have at a *later* stage (planting the seed). For instance, the students always have had experiences of book and object/media presentations *before* they have their logbook presentations at the course-end.