



In the period the MA1 students worked on their T2 assignments, they worked in non-same QUAD groups. Result: more student concerns were voiced in the theory classes.

The written essay, that the students submit in Theory2/T2, does *not* emerge stepwise from the logbook, but emerges from the diary with the work of time. Moreover, the essay does not articulate a field search, but instead develops and articulates a topic. The relation between them is complex, rather than methodic. In this sense the essay features a *crystallisation* of the diary.

In the course, the essay aims at developing *precision* at three levels: **1)** the level of image-to-text [*adequacy*]; **2)** the level of text-to-topic [*cogency*]; **3)** the level of references [*accuracy*]. The logbooks also contain these three elements, though *extensive* (rather than *intensive* as in the essay). The relation between the essay and the *logbook* is as between *thought* and *extension*.

Which means that—depending on how the triangle of points 1-3 listed above turns out in the delivery—the essay will contribute in turning the logbook to precision: that is, *accuracy assigned* and *delivered* (1/7). We can indicate that this is an organic process, but cannot be content at this; since it is in the assignment and the delivery that differences between people will articulate.

These differences cannot be reduced to the given variety of opinion and taste, since what ultimately defines precision is the *individual*: the individual essay—with its three constituent components—and the yield of *individuation* it feeds forward to the logbook. So, the essay does not work in isolation. Nor does the logbook. Together they work at the individuation of *intention*.

That is, the professional individuation of each student. Critique and discussion—then—no longer unfold in a climate of rejection, but shift into generative constraints that further individuation. Here, the notion of the ‘individual’ is not an island, an isolate or an uncanny fragment; but rests on the premise that between individuals there is a deep ecological connectivity. They *assemble*.

The processes of assemblage and individuation are complementary. And, in actual practice, make up a class situation: these individuals, this assemblage. It varies from year to year. For instance, in 2021/22 the anthology of essays developed and published in a book-volume—made by students for several years—did not result in a student manufacture, on account of the salary.

Generally, this MA1 class has been more assertive on topics raised on their own account (not only in prepared discussions we have had in class). This change naturally is linked to the selection of individuals and the class situation as such. But it also correlates with an innovation in the organisation of the course this year: the double rotational principle of QUAD groups.

The QUAD-group are groups of 4 with a rotating task set sampled from Bruno Latour, and a structure inspired by Samuel Beckett’s piece (QUAD). Working in groups of 4 originated with the C19 pandemic and defining groups to a minimum—so called, ‘cohorts’—while keeping them functional. The tasks were designed to provide ‘fleeting statements’ (type Twitter) with *context*.

The groups worked in the sense of honing individual focus and creating bonds within the groups: this arrangement was made to make the final course T3 possible during the lockdown. The QUAD-groups were then transferred to MA1—T1 and T2—but without keeping the groups fixed (as with the ‘cohorts’). A shuffle was set up, so that the students were never in the same group.