Jameson Thai
Karan Bhargava
Nityam Shrestha

Evaluation of our project using CC

For our final project, we created a system that analyzes any type of music form, that is provided by the user. Our system outputs a musical visualizer from extracted information and a cover art. Using Ritchie guidelines for evaluating the creative ability of a CC system, we can determine whether our system can be considered creative. In these guidelines, we will focus mainly on the artifacts rather than the process of how the artifacts were created.

Determining the framework our project is an essential step in evaluating a CC system. The system generates unique artifacts that follow the concept of visualizing music in an artistic form and fall in the genre of audio visualizers and drawing art. Additionally, our program is influenced by an inspiring set being that each input is a different song. Finally for frameworks, our system is built to not only be pleasing to the human eye but also, fun and cool to look at.

In analysing for creativity using the Ritchie system, we classified our object as an art type artifact and for a more specific classification, it would belong into the visualizer and drawing class. In conforming to the established norms of visualizers, our visualizer reacts to the input musical beat appropriately. It generates new “flashes” according to the beat times and moving across the field of view with the temp of the analyzed song. Similarly to the visualizer, the cover art artifact our system creates, is drawn with intent and a sense of motive. Although ours is done by a computer, we are able to implement sentiment analysis and synthesize a type a mood from the given song lyrics. Most of the time, the quality of the artefacts we produce is greater than the average threshold. It is not just specified for just one song but it is unique for every song for both the visualizer and the drawing. Additionally, the visualizer had fluid motion that corresponded to the tempo of the music. However, sometimes our artefacts are sometimes of lesser quality when faced with super fast paced songs or slow songs. This was especially true with the visualizer since it was nauseating to watch the artifact. When the song had a slow tempo, the visualization looked boring to the point where you quickly lose interest in it. Regarding the drawing generated artifacts, it was difficult for the process to draw a unique artifact when there were songs with no lyrics.

Overall, a large part of the artifacts subsets we created would score high in typicality and quality. Though it is also important to note, that the artifacts that didn’t score high in those qualities were barely adequate or just boring to watch. There were a few rare cases that were low in typicality but high in quality. The visualization from the song input produced a very appealing waveform and had good timing for the flashes in the background. They also produced an interesting cover-art as well that had high quality. Through the Ritchie guidelines, we conclude that our system is a create system because a large majority of the artifacts we produce are considered creative. They produce art that is different from the inspiring set and have a higher quality and typicality than the norm of visualizers and drawing cover art.