1. PROJECT DETAILS

1.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY IN PLAIN ENGLISH: Provide a brief summary of the project outlining the broad aims, background, key questions, research design/approach, the participants in the study and what they will be asked to do, and the importance or relevance of the project. [This description must be in everyday language, free from jargon, technical terms or discipline-specific phrases. (No more than 300 words).]

Broad Aims
This research investigates how unexpected and challenging public art experiences can be realised with community participation.

Background
While many proponents of community-engaged art seek consensus-driven, socially ameliorative outcomes, this project investigates public and participatory art's ability to agitate and offer new, destabilising insights. Informed by philosopher Jacques Rancière's idea of dissensus (a notion that challenges the normal roles assigned to people and places, with the aim of disrupting the status quo) this study aims to rethink what a valuable artistic social engagement could constitute.

Key questions
How do artists responsibly make unusual and destabilising experiences with communities which provoke questions about the present social order? What possibilities and challenges are encountered when working with people to make participatory and public art? How does an artist negotiate the myriad wishes for a community or place, while making an artwork of aesthetic and social resonance?

Research design/approach
I am interested in the methods and approaches used by other artists to create challenging public art experiences with community participation. I will interview artists and curators about their methods and approaches to making community-engaged public art work, with the intention of producing a series of written case studies that will form part of my PhD thesis.

Participants and what they will be asked to do
I will identify two to four public artworks that are relevant to the study and then interview (in person or via email) the artists and curators who created them about their methodology and the principles that drive their approach to community-engaged art. In-person interviews will be audio recorded and transcribed.

Importance or relevance of the project
This study is significant as it seeks to articulate a methodology of community-engaged art practice, with a particular focus on Australian participatory artworks that responsibly and sophisticatedly generate an experience of dissensus.
1.2 AIMS OF AND JUSTIFICATION FOR THE RESEARCH: State the aims and significance of the project. Where relevant, state the specific hypothesis to be tested. Also provide a brief description of current research/literature review, a justification as to why this research should proceed and an explanation of any expected benefits to the community. [No more than 500 words]

Aims and significance of the project
The aim of this research is to examine the social, political and aesthetic capabilities of socially-engaged, participatory and public art practice, with an emphasis on Australian art projects. This research is significant for two key reasons. Firstly, while there is much international discourse about this burgeoning field of art, there is little that focuses on Australian artists and work that responds to an Australian political and social context. Secondly, while there have been important shifts in the theoretical discourse around participatory arts which have problematized models of community-engaged practice which have socially ameliorative goals, there has been little discussion of how more disruptive and disensual approaches to social engagement work in practice. This project is significant as it seeks to articulate disruptive, disensual models of community engagement currently in practice via case studies of public art projects, with a focus on Australian artists.

Research question
If artists working in the field of participatory art accept that an important role of art in society is to agitate and disrupt (to provoke questions about the social order, destabilise categories and unsettle habits of thinking), then how do artists (in Australia and internationally) create such unexpected and challenging artistic experiences with the participation of communities?

Brief description of current research and literature
Art historian Claire Bishop has compellingly critiqued the model of participatory art that seeks to marshal art as a tool in the aid of social cohesion and consensus. In her book Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship (2012) Bishop, informed by the ideas of French philosopher Jacques Rancière, instead advocates a disruptive approach to participatory art and describes how such art might generate “the destabilising action that produces dissensus about what is sayable and thinkable in the world”. Consequently, an increasing number of socially-engaged and participatory artists are turning to the theories of Rancière and his conception of art’s relationship to politics, namely his notion of political dissensus, to rethink what a valuable social engagement could constitute.

Why should this study proceed?
While there has been plenty of literature produced by art historians, philosophers and cultural critics advocating a destabilising approach to participatory art, there is little written on how these theories impact the methods and approaches of participatory artists. Indeed there is a gap in the literature that describes artists’ processes and methodologies in disensual participatory practice, such as how communities are recruited and relationships managed during projects. There is also very little literature on the approaches and methods of Australian socially-engaged artists.

Benefits to the community
This study is beneficial to the community of scholars in the field of participatory art, as well as artists, curators and arts organisations interested in producing public and participatory art. It will assist anyone thinking about working with a community to produce an unusual and challenging artwork that has both aesthetic and social resonance, as it will articulate a series of responsible approaches and methods to disensual community-engagement.

1.3 METHOD
(a) What data collection technique(s) will be used? [Tick as many as apply]
- Questionnaire (attach a copy)
- Interviews (attach a copy)
- Observation of participants without their knowledge
- Covert observation
- Audio- or video-taping interviewees or events (with consent)
- Other (Please give details. Use no more than 50 words): Interview via email

(b) What tasks will participants be asked to do? What is the estimated time commitment involved? How will data be analysed?

Participants will be asked about the experience of making a specific public artwork and their approaches and methods for creating community-engaged art. It will be an informal dialogue with the student researcher, and interviewees will have the opportunity to edit the transcripts that result from the interviews. Interviews should take no longer than two hours. Participants’ responses will be analysed as qualitative data and used to inform written case studies of public artworks that will form part of my PhD thesis.

1.4 USE OF INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS Will parts of this project be carried out by independent contractors? (e.g. interviewing, questionnaire design and analysis, sample testing, etc)

- [ ] YES
- [x] NO

If YES, confirm that the independent contractor will be engaged on the basis of relevant qualifications and experience and will receive from
1.5 MONITORING
(a) How will researchers monitor the conduct of the project to ensure that it complies with the protocols set out in this application, the University’s human ethics guidelines and the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research? [Address, in particular, cases where several people are involved in recruiting, interviewing or administering procedures, or when the research is being carried out at some distance from the Principal Researcher(s)]

All stages of this research project will be carried out in close consultation with the student researcher’s supervisor and responsible researcher, Dr. James Oliver. If at any point during the project, concerns are raised that the project might be breaching human ethics guidelines, or may be taking a different direction to what is outlined in this application, we will consult the appropriate people, including the head of department, postgraduate coordinators, research higher degrees staff, the HEAG and HREC, and re-submit a human ethics application, as required.

(b) For student research projects how will the student be supervised to ensure they comply with the protocols? If the student is working overseas, provide additional details of any local supervision arrangements.

The student researcher will be supervised by Dr. James Oliver in regular in-person meetings occurring fortnightly, to ensure compliance with protocols set out in this application. Dr. Oliver will regularly supervise and review the project and data collected, as required.

2. PARTICIPANT DETAILS

2.1 TARGET PARTICIPANT GROUP
Please indicate the targeted participant group by ticking all boxes that apply. Expand any responses necessary in the space provided at “Other”.

- Students or staff of this University
- Adults (over 18 years old and competent to give consent)
- Children/legal minors (under 18 years old) (with parental consent)
- Other (Please give details. Use no more than 50 words):
- People from non-English speaking backgrounds

2.2 NUMBER, AGE RANGE AND SOURCE OF PARTICIPANTS
Provide number, age range and source of participants.

The student researcher will interview 3 – 10 artists and curators, in an age range of 20 – 65 years of age. Participants will be sourced once the student researcher has determined 2 – 4 public artworks that are relevant to this study. She will contact the artists and curators who produced the relevant projects and invite them to participate in this study.

2.3 JUSTIFICATION OF PARTICIPANT NUMBERS [The quality and validity of research is an essential condition of its ethical acceptability (refer National Statement)]. Where applicable, provide a justification of sample size (including details of statistical power of the sample, where appropriate), explaining how this sample size will allow the aims of the study to be achieved.

Only 2 – 4 case studies of relevant art projects will be made as part of the student researcher’s PhD thesis. As a result only the artistic teams from up to 4 projects will be interviewed.

2.4 PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT
(a) Please indicate the method of recruitment by ticking the appropriate boxes. Tick all that apply.

- Mail out - see below
- Advertisement - see below
- Contact details obtained from public documents (eg. phone book)
- Participants from a previous study
- Email - see below
- Recruitment carried out by third party (eg. employer, doctor) – see below
- Contact details obtained from private sources (eg. employee list, membership database) – see below
- Snowball (participants suggest other potential participants)
- Telephone
- Recruitment carried out by researchers
- Personal contacts
- Other (Please explain in no more than 50 words):
• If using a mail or email who will be distributing it?

The student researcher will be responsible for distributing all emails and communications.

• If using an advertisement:
  - explain where will it be placed? (e.g. on waiting room wall, in newspaper, in newsletter)
  - have you attached a copy?
    Yes ☐ No ☐ NA ☐ If "No" please explain (no more than 50 words):

• If recruitment is to be conducted by a third party, (eg employer, doctor) have you attached an approval letter?
  - requesting their assistance? (yes, no or not applicable)
    Yes ☐ No ☐ NA ☐ If "No" please explain (no more than 50 words):
  - confirming their willingness to assist?
    Yes ☐ No ☐ NA ☐ If "No" please explain (no more than 50 words):
  - that has been drafted for the third party to send to potential participants?
    Yes ☐ No ☐ NA ☐ If "No" please explain (no more than 50 words):

• If contact details are to be obtained from private sources, have you attached an approval letter?
  Yes ☐ No ☐ NA ☐ If "No" please explain (no more than 50 words):

(b) Describe how, by whom, where potential participants are to be identified or selected for this research.

Potential participants are selected for this research if they have created a public artwork that is relevant to the study. The student researcher will shortlist 2 – 4 art projects that she has encountered during research which illustrate an approach to participatory or public art that is worthy of an extended case study. She will then identify 3 – 10 key artists and curators who can be interviewed about the creative processes behind the projects.

(c) Describe how, by whom, where potential participants are to be approached or invited to take part in this research.

The student researcher will contact potential participants using publicly available contact information (i.e. contact details listed on the artists' or curators' websites). She will initially contact them via email, attaching the PLS with full details of the study and what is expected of the interviewees. If necessary she will follow-up the email with a phone call. Only consenting participants who have the time available to participate will be used in the study.

2.5 DEPENDENT RELATIONSHIPS

[The issue of research involving persons in dependent or unequal relationships (e.g. teacher/student, doctor/patient, student/lecturer, client/counsellor, warden/prisoner, and employer/employee) is discussed in Sections 2 and 4.3 of the National Statement. Such a relationship may compromise a participant’s ability to give consent which is free from any form of pressure (real or implied)]. Are any of the participants in a dependent relationship with any of the researchers, particularly those involved in recruiting for or conducting the project?

☐ YES ☒ NO (If YES, explain the dependent relationship and the steps to be taken by the researchers to ensure that participation is purely voluntary and not influenced by the relationship in any way)

2.6 PAYMENT OR INCENTIVES OFFERED TO PARTICIPANTS

Do you propose to pay, reimburse or reward participants?

☐ YES ☒ NO (If YES, how, how much and for what purpose? Please justify the approach)

3. INFORMATION FOR PARTICIPANTS AND INFORMED CONSENT
Before research is undertaken, the informed and voluntary consent of participants (and other properly interested parties) is generally required (refer Section 2 of the National Statement for more details). Information needs to be provided to participants at their level of comprehension about the purpose, methods, demands, risks, inconveniences, discomforts and possible outcomes of the research. Such information is often provided in a written Plain Language Statement. Each participant’s consent needs to be clearly established (e.g. by using a signed Consent Form, returning an anonymous survey or recording an agreement for interview).

3.1 PROVIDING INFORMATION FOR PARTICIPANTS

(a) Will you be providing participants with information in a written Plain Language Statement?

☐ YES  ☐ NO  

(If NO, provide details of the protocol you will use to explain the research project to participants and invite their participation?)

(b) Will arrangements be made to ensure that participants who have difficulty understanding English can comprehend the information provided about the research project?

☐ YES  ☒ NO  

(If YES, what arrangements have been made? If NO, give reasons.)

Only artists and curators who have a good understanding of English will be approached for this study.

3.2 PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT (IF APPLICABLE)

CONFIRM THAT THE PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT WILL:

1. be printed on University of Melbourne letterhead  ☒ ☐ NOT APPLICABLE
2. include clear identification of the University, the Department(s) involved, the project title, the Principal and Other Researchers (including contact details), and the study level if it is a student research project.  ☒ ☐
3. provide details of the purpose of the research project  ☒ ☐
4. provide details of what involvement in the project will require (e.g., involvement in interviews, completion of questionnaire, audio/video-taping of events), and estimated time commitment  ☒ ☐
5. provide details of any risks involved and the procedures in place to minimise these.  ☐ ☒
6. advise that the project has received clearance by the HREC  ☒ ☐
7. (if the sample size is small), confirm that this may have implications for protecting the identity of the participants  ☒ ☐
8. include a clear statement that if participants are in a dependent relationship with any of the researchers that involvement in the project will not affect ongoing assessment/grades/management or treatment of health (if relevant)  ☒ ☐
9. state that involvement in the project is voluntary and that participants are free to withdraw consent at any time, and to withdraw any unprocessed data previously supplied  ☒ ☐
10. provide advice as to arrangements to be made to protect confidentiality of data, including that confidentiality of information provided is subject to legal limitations (see ** below)  ☒ ☐
11. provide advice as to whether or not data is to be destroyed after a minimum period (if relevant)  ☒ ☐
12. provide in the footer, the project HREC number, date and version of the PLS  ☒ ☐
13. provide advice that if participants have any concerns about the conduct of this research project that they can contact the Executive Officer, Human Research Ethics, The University of Melbourne, ph: 8344 2073; fax 9347 6739  ☒ ☐

[**Rq 10 – it is possible for data to be subject to subpoena, freedom of information request or mandated reporting by some professions. Depending on the research proposal you may need to specifically state these limitations]

PLEASE ATTACH A COPY OF THE PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT TO YOUR APPLICATION

3.3 OBTAINING CONSENT
(a) How will each participant's consent be established?

- By signing and returning a Consent Form – see 3.4 below
- Via a verbal agreement
- Via a recorded agreement for interview
- By returning an anonymous survey
- Via a person with lawful authority to consent (e.g. parent, doctor) – see 3.3(b) below
- Other (Please describe in no more than 50 words):

(b) If participants are unable to give informed consent, explain who will consent on their behalf and how such consent will be obtained.

3.4 CONSENT FORM (IF APPLICABLE)

CONFIRM THAT THE CONSENT FORM WILL:

1. be printed on University of Melbourne letterhead
2. include the title of the project and names of researchers
3. state that the project is for research purposes
4. state that involvement in the project is voluntary and that participants are free to withdraw at any time, and free to withdraw any unprocessed identifiable data previously supplied
5. outline particular requirements of participants, including, for example, whether interviews are to be audio and/or video-taped
6. include arrangements to protect the confidentiality of data
7. include advice that there are legal limitations to data confidentiality (see below)**
8. (If the sample size is small) confirm that this may have implications for protecting the identity of the participants
9. (once signed and returned) be retained by the researcher

[**Re 7 – it is possible for data to be subject to subpoena, freedom of information request or mandated reporting by some professions. Depending on the research proposal you may need to specifically state and explain these limitations]

PLEASE ATTACH A COPY OF THE CONSENT FORM TO YOUR APPLICATION

4. PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY

Privacy can be described as "...a complex concept that stems from a core idea that individuals have a sphere of life from which they should be able to exclude any intrusion." A major application of the concept of privacy is information privacy: the interest of a person in controlling access to and use of any information personal to that person. 'Confidentiality', a narrower more specific term than 'privacy' refers to the legal and ethical obligation that arises from a relationship in which a person receives information from or about another.

At the Commonwealth level, the collection, storage, use and disclosure of personal information by Commonwealth agencies is regulated by the Privacy Act 1988. Sections 93 and 95A of the Act are of particular relevance to researchers. There is regulation at State and Territory level in the form of legislation related to privacy generally or the administration of agencies, or administrative codes of practice. In Victoria, the Health Records Act 2001 regulates health information handled by the Victorian public sector and private sector, while the Information Privacy Act 2000 regulates the collection and handling of non-health-related personal information. The National Statement states that an HREC must be satisfied that a research proposal conforms to all relevant Commonwealth, State or Territory privacy legislation or codes of practice.

4.1 ACCESSING PERSONAL INFORMATION

[‘Personal Information’ includes names, addresses, or information/opinion about an individual whose identity is apparent, or can reasonably be ascertained, from the information/opinion. It also includes Health Information (e.g. health opinions, organ donation or genetic information) and Sensitive Information (e.g. political views, sexual preferences, criminal records)]

Is there a requirement for the researchers to obtain Personal Information (either identifiable or potentially identifiable) about individuals without their consent?

- a) from Commonwealth departments or agencies?
- b) from State departments or agencies?
- c) from Other Third Parties, such as non-government organisations?

If you answered YES to (a), (b) or (c), you will need to complete Module P and attach it to this application

4.2 REPORTING PROJECT OUTCOMES
Will the project outcomes be made public at the end of the project?

☒ YES ☐ NO  
(If YES, give details of how the results will be made public (eg in journal articles book, conference paper, the media, working paper or other). If NO, explain why not.

Yes, outcomes will be made public in the student researchers PhD thesis, and subsequent conference papers and journal articles.

Will a report of the project outcomes be made available to participants at the end of the project?

☒ YES ☐ NO  
(If Yes, give details of the type of report and how it will be made available. If No, explain why not.

Yes, a copy of my PhD thesis will be made available to participants. They will be able to specify if they wish to receive it via the consent form.

4.3 WILL THE RESEARCH INVOLVE:

☒ YES ☐ NO

• complete anonymity of participants (i.e., researchers will not know the identity of participants as participants are part of a random sample and are required to return responses with no form of personal identification)?

• de-identified samples or data (i.e., an irreversible process whereby identifiers are removed from data and replaced by a code, with no record retained of how the code relates to the identifiers. It is then impossible to identify the individual to whom the sample of information relates)?

• potentially identifiable samples or data (i.e., a reversible process in which the identifiers are removed and replaced by a code. Those handling the data subsequently do so using the code. If necessary, it is possible to link the code to the original identifiers and identify the individual to whom the sample or information relates)?

• participants having the option of being identified in any publication arising from the research?

• participants being referred to by pseudonym in any publication arising from the research?

• any other method of protecting the privacy of participants? Please describe: Participants will be named.

Note that where the sample size is very small, it may be impossible to guarantee anonymity/confidentiality of participant identity. Participants involved in such projects need to be clearly advised of this limitation in the Plain Language Statement.

5 DATA STORAGE, SECURITY AND DISPOSAL

5.1 DATA STORAGE


☒ YES ☐ NO  
(If NO, please explain.)

5.2 DATA SECURITY

Will the Principal Researcher be responsible for security of data collected?

☒ YES ☐ NO  
(If NO, please provide further details. You may also use this space to explain any differences between arrangements in the field, and on return to campus.)

The student researcher will be responsible for all the security of data collected.

Will data be kept in locked facilities in the Department through which the project is being conducted?

☒ YES ☐ NO  
(If NO, please explain how and where data will be held, including any
arrangements for data security during fieldwork.)

(c) Which of the following methods will be used to ensure confidentiality of data? (select all options that are relevant)

- data and codes and all identifying information to be kept in separate locked filing cabinets ☐
- access to computer files to be available by password only ☒
- access by named researcher(s) only ☒
- other (please describe) ☐

(d) Will others besides the named researchers have access to the raw data?

☐ YES ☒ NO (If YES, please explain who and for what purpose? What is their connection to the project?)

5.3 DATA RETENTION AND DISPOSAL

[Research data and records should be maintained for as long as they are of continuing value to the researcher and as long as recordkeeping requirements such as patent requirements, legislative and other regulatory requirements exist. The minimum retention period for research data and records is five years after publication, or public release, of the work of the research as stated in the University of Melbourne Code of Conduct for Research. If the project involves clinical trial(s), the data should be kept for a minimum of 15 years (refer to Section 3.3 of the National Statement for further details)]

Specify how long materials (e.g. files, audiotapes, questionnaires, videotapes, photographs) collected during the study will be retained after the study and how they will ultimately be disposed of. Materials and data collected will be retained indefinitely by the student researcher as they are of continuing value to the field of participatory, public and socially-engaged art.

6. POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST

6.1 POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Is there any affiliation or financial interest for researchers in this research or its outcomes or any circumstances which might represent a perceived, potential or actual conflict of interest?

☐ YES ☒ NO (If YES, give brief details?)

[If you have declared a potential conflict of interest, you should include an appropriate comment on the Plain Language Statement and Consent Form]

6.2 COMPLIANCE WITH THE CODE OF CONDUCT FOR RESEARCH

[University researchers must disclose and manage Conflict of Interest in accord with the provisions of the University’s Code of Conduct for Research. See http://www.unimelb.edu.au/ExecServ/Statutes/i171-8.html]

Is the Conflict of Interest noted above in section 6.1 being managed in accordance with the Code of Conduct?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Not Applicable

7. DECLARATION BY RESEARCHERS

The information contained herein is, to the best of our knowledge and belief, accurate.

We have read the University’s current human ethics guidelines, and accept responsibility for the conduct of the procedures set out in the attached application in accordance with the guidelines, the University’s Code of Conduct for Research and any other condition laid down by the University of Melbourne’s Human Research Ethics Committee or its Sub-Committees. We have attempted to identify all risks related to the research that may arise in conducting this research and acknowledge our obligations and the rights of the participants. We have the appropriate qualifications, experience and facilities to conduct the research set out in the attached application and to deal with any emergencies and contingencies related to the research that may arise.

If approval is granted, the project will be undertaken in strict accordance with the approved protocol and relevant laws, regulations and guidelines.
We, the researcher(s) agree:

- To only start this research project after obtaining final approval from the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC);
- To only carry out this research project where adequate funding is available to enable the project to be carried out according to good research practice and in an ethical manner;
- To provide additional information as requested by the HREC;
- To provide progress reports to the HREC as requested, including annual and final reports;
- To maintain the confidentiality of all data collected from or about project participants, and maintain security procedures for the protection of privacy;
- To notify the HREC in writing immediately if any change to the project is proposed and await approval before proceeding with the proposed change;
- To notify the HREC in writing immediately if any adverse event occurs after the approval of the HREC has been obtained;
- To agree to an audit if requested by the HREC;
- To only use data and any tissue samples collected for the study for which approval has been given;

We have read the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research and agree to comply with its provisions.

All researchers associated with this project must sign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers' Name (please PRINt)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy Spiers</td>
<td></td>
<td>28/1/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. James Oliver</td>
<td></td>
<td>28/1/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. DECLARATION BY DEPARTMENTAL HUMAN ETHICS ADVISORY GROUP (HEAG)

DATE APPLICATION RECEIVED: / /  HEAG NO:

☐ TECHNICAL REVIEW COMPLETED  ☐ ETHICAL REVIEW COMPLETED

The HEAG has reviewed this project and considers the methodological/technical and ethical aspects of the proposal to be appropriate to the tasks proposed and recommends approval of the project. The HEAG considers that the researcher(s) has/have the necessary qualifications, experience and facilities to conduct the research set out in the attached application, and to deal with any emergencies and contingencies that may arise. [Note: If the HEAG Chair is also a principal researcher for this project, the declaration should be signed by another authorised member of the HEAG]

Comments/Provisos:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of HEAG Chair (in BLOCK LETTERS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. DECLARATION BY HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

DATE APPLICATION RECEIVED: / /  HEAG NO:

☐ TECHNICAL REVIEW COMPLETED  ☐ ETHICAL REVIEW COMPLETED

I have reviewed this project and consider the methodological, technical and ethical aspects of the proposal to be appropriate to the tasks proposed and recommend approval of the project. I consider that the researcher(s) has/have the necessary qualifications, experience and facilities to conduct the research set out in the attached application, and to deal with any emergencies and contingencies that may arise. [If the Head of Department is also a principal researcher for this project, the declaration should be signed by another authorised member of the Department]

This project has the approval and support of this Department/School/Centre.
10 WHEN COMPLETE

When this form has been completed and finalised it should be attached to the coversheet section of the application completed in Themis Research and then submitted to the nominated Human Ethics Advisory Group for review.