

## Volume 14(2) Editorial

Sarah Healy, Kelly McConville and Toby Wilkins

Melbourne Graduate School of Education, University of Melbourne

In this second volume, we invite readers to consider how some of the insights presented within the articles might have shifted in these (post) COVID times. This year, we have witnessed tremendous change in our studio spaces and felt the effect of time, space and place. As a result, these two issues have taken us longer than we had hoped; as our busy got busier, so too did our wonderful reviewers who managed to get our reviews done and with generative and giving feedback. We thank our contributors, both authors and reviewers who make this journal such a great place to share discourse in artistic and creative education.

We start with a contribution from MacDonald entitled 'No longer here' which positions the studio as a state of being rather than site of production. The studio becomes a thing that is done and, in so doing, troubles the notion of the studio that exists a priori. Instead, it exists both in time and out of time as a non-site whereby a metaphor of ghosts as time travellers acts as a lens through which the author examines aspects of their studio practice. This sets the scene for the second article that examines 'Post studio methods' (Ward-Davies et al.), which similarly 'locates' the studio in a state (or site) of *scicuriousity*, which "emerges as a post-studio practice of (un)sited, lived research." What this brings about is another kind of time-space travel that lands us in the realm of pre-disciplinary practice of the post-studio.

Next, we embark on the search for the ideal studio space with Longden, who interrogates the tension between their latent beliefs about space, both imagined and delivered, and their sense of creativity. This has implications for drama pedagogy, especially in a (post) COVID world where physical space (and spacing) takes on a new significance. This brings us to the fourth article in this volume 'Visual Journals as post-studio practice' (Peck et al.). We position this alongside the dream studio article because it has a similar (but different) relevance to the (post) COVID studio since "By making creative practice mobile and portable, the visual journal subverts the need for a physical site". The mobility and portability of the 'site' opens endless opportunities for when and where creative practice can happen, stepping aside from the constraints of social spacing in a pandemic.

The collection then returns to notions of the studio (or atelier) as located in a (more) stable physical site with the contribution from Yanko et al. The authors bring together the Atelier studio, the Reggio Emilio movement and the maker movements to "examine the strengths and challenges of the pedagogies and practices that scaffold the learning that unfolds in this space—including hands-on, collaborative, experimental, and experiential learning". One of the implications for children's learning is that this type of studio can foster empowering student-centred experiences. In the final article in this volume, entitled "Towards an understanding of student stress and mental health in the studio classroom: A lecturer's changing role in a modern society". Of particular relevance to art educators today is Winters et al.'s exploration of how qualities of the studio classroom can contribute to and alleviate mental distress in students. It also draws attention to the already changing role of lecturers in tertiary educational settings and invites readers to consider how this change might have accelerated since the writing of this contribution.

This insightful collection of articles sits in juxtaposition with our collective experiences of months of ‘business as highly unusual’, where we have been forced to develop fresh skills, new tools, and creative approaches to creativity and siting studio practice. The alternative - stopping the work - was never an option. The new skills, the mastering of previously unheard-of technologies, the strategic approaches to generating and sharing works: these have opened up access to so much. Whether as live performances devised and delivered via Zoom (Zoom Theatre), digital tours of regional and international galleries (NGV), virtual conferences (Drama Victoria) or online delivery of classes previously considered impossible to teach in any way other than face-to-face - these have unveiled access to so much and so many. While not something to replace an ‘IRL’\* experience with, these adaptations have provided new ways of seeing, engaging and doing. Some are problematic and should be problematised, but it cannot be ignored that, in many instances, such creative solutions to the need to continue our work in these most challenging circumstances have brought possibility and promise. This collective, global experience has given us a new lens - one could argue many new lenses - to view how, when, where and with whom we can create. In some instances, there are new possibilities for *what* we can create.

This reflection has influenced our curation of the current journal edition. Whilst the focus on questioning the notion of the studio arose pre-COVID with the submission from Winters and Snook exactly a year ago, as did the papers that followed, our selection and subsequent ordering of them took place in Melbourne during one of the world’s longest and strictest lockdowns. We have, in our selection of articles and placement of them, endeavoured to position articles so that one offers a different lens through which to read the next. Embracing what can be learned by considering the work of the practitioner through the lens of the educator, or the artist through that of the researcher, holds the potential for us to see things afresh and anew. Without wanting to sound trite or Pollyanna, 2020 has forced us to hone this skill, so we figured we might as well use it.

\*IRL = ‘in real life’ in internet-speak