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Abstract
This presentation describes and analyzes three innovations in teaching and learning strategies for architectural, environmental and physical design disciplines. A principal method for assessment in design curricula is the ‘jury’: a public student presentation of design work to visiting faculty, practicing professionals and peers – often an audience of 20+. The design studio and jury have been much examined (1). The review process fosters oral and visual communication skills, and enables direct assessment and feedback to students on their design work, but it can also be a setting for abusive attacks on student performance, or the students themselves. A single strong jury member can sway and direct discussion, limiting feedback to the student, often leading to ‘tuning out’. The “jury” can be an intimidating environment, yielding much stress and little learning. Strategies for enriched learning through three innovations in formal design presentations have been developed to ameliorate the negative while retaining positive aspects of the design ‘jury’.

Disciplines
Architecture

Comments
This is a proceedings published as G. Palermo; International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (IS-SOTL) inaugural meeting proceedings, Bloomington, Indiana, October 21-24, 2004, p. 34 and p. 126. Posted with permission.
Notes from a Naïf: The Design Salon and Other ‘Jury’ Innovations

GREGORY S. PALERMO
Iowa State University

Abstract:

This presentation describes and analyzes three innovations in teaching and learning strategies for architectural, environmental and physical design disciplines. A principal method for assessment in design curricula is the ‘jury’: a public student presentation of design work to visiting faculty, practicing professionals and peers – often an audience of 20+. The design studio and jury have been much examined (1). The review process fosters oral and visual communication skills, and enables direct assessment and feedback to students on their design work, but it can also be a setting for abusive attacks on student performance, or the students themselves. A single strong jury member can sway and direct discussion, limiting feedback to the student, often leading to ‘tuning out”. The “jury” can be an intimidating environment, yielding much stress and little learning. Strategies for enriched learning through three innovations in formal design presentations have been developed to ameliorate the negative while retaining positive aspects of the design ‘jury’.

Architectural design reviews typically include oral, graphic and physical model representations prepared by each student. The first strategy employed to enrich the ‘jury’ as a learning environment is the addition of a written component: a 250-word abstract for distribution during the review that includes a statement regarding design concepts, a list of precedents and a bibliography. The abstract not only helps improve students’ discipline specific writing skills in a manner that makes their ideas publicly accessible, it provides an outline of the main ideas they wish to convey orally. As a result, oral presentations are delivered with more precision and confidence, and it provides a reference base for the visiting critics. The net impact has been lowered stress, less meandering during the oral presentation, and enhanced critical feedback because the visiting critics are more fully informed of student intent than is typical.

After each review, students write a self-critique of the review: what they learned, where they succeeded, what failed, and a plan with outcomes for subsequent design development. These written critiques become the basis for one-on-one follow-up with the professor to jointly assess design progress and determine ‘next steps’. This exercise develops critical reflection and judgment skills.

The third new feature is the salon type review. The work of all students is posted exhibition style. There is a collective satisfaction in seeing all of their work at once that changes the mood from trepidation to celebration! The review panel is divided into teams of two people. They circulate to the students for 30-minute reviews in a round-robin fashion. Each student will present two or three times in an afternoon, to different teams of faculty critics. The results have yielded nearly universal positive feedback on the process from students and critics. The ability to present more than once enables on the spot corrections by the students. Each review is fresh – demanding rigorous attention by the reviewers, often eliciting quite different responses and new critical perspective and learning. Students tend to watch several reviews, critique each other privately since all of the work is posted, and stay more alert than in the typical review format.
Analysis of excerpts from undergraduate and graduate student abstracts, self-critiques, design presentation material, and salon scenes illustrates the cumulative learning benefits.

© G. Palermo. The abstract for this paper was published in the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (IS-SOTL) inaugural meeting proceedings, Bloomington, Indiana, October 21-24, 2004, p. 34 and p. 126. KEY WORDS: “architectural pedagogy” “design reviews” “design juries” “writing in curriculum”

A Naïf in Other Lands

Colleagues insist that 15 minutes is merely warm-up time for me! Why ‘Notes from a Naïf’? I am an architect and educator – like most of us teaching at the university level – I dare say we come at teaching and learning with little formal knowledge of applicable theory in those areas. Yet, I trust that my modest experiments in active learning will prove to be useful in the design disciplines and perhaps beyond. After a brief introduction of the typical design jury process of public presentation and critical review, I will outline three strategies that I have put in place to enhance presentation skills, enrich feedback/learning discourse, and instigate self-reflection capabilities: i) the written design abstract, ii) the salon review coupled with multiple presentations, and iii) the written self-critique.

The ‘Jury’ Setting

Students proceed in architecture and other design studies by ‘doing’ – that is by practicing designing: the art of problem definition, problem analysis and research, and developing alternative solutions or design proposals in multiple iterations. The media used in representing those proposals are typically simulations: drawings, models, and digital imagery. Beginning in their first year of study, students learn to combine oral and visual communication strategies to present their ideas.

The method of critical feedback and a principal mode of learning is not an examination, but a public presentation of their work to professors, peers and visiting professionals in the ‘jury’ or ‘review.’ In a scenario undoubtedly familiar to all faculty in the design disciplines, after the student presents, the review panel offers observations, analytical insights, and suggestions for development – engaging the student in discourse when things are working well. The students take notes themselves, or have classmates record the panel’s commentary. Think of it – a whole academic career of oral comprehensives!

For students with self-confidence this method can be invigorating; for those less so – it can be withering. Others have explored the positive and negative aspects of the studio and review process (i), which while often being quite rich in feedback content to the students, can also be abusive: tears from both men and women are still not uncommon at least a few times a year when commentary crosses the line to extremely hard-hitting negativity or assumptions about the student’s performance.

Despite its flaws, the design ‘jury’ or ‘review’ continues to be a significant and effective venue for critical feedback and learning for students. To ameliorate some of the downside, variations on the type of review have been tried. The innovation presented here is that of a salon posting combined with presenting more than once. Beyond reshaping jury organization and tone, writing both before and after the review has proved to be effective in enhanced design results, presentation performance, and reflective learning.

i) Writing Design

The matter of architectural design, as with landscape architecture, interior design, graphic design and other design fields is the design proposal – the conjectured place, environment or object. The studio method I employ stresses presentation materials emanating from daily design process. All work ‘product’ is both design process and representation. Thoroughness and precision suffi-
sient to enable others to ‘inhabit’ the project mentally is expected in graphic, model and digital media. Into this I have inserted a new demand: writing.

Writing has proven to be a highly effective means to focus design direction, enhance oral presentation, and invigorate review discussion. A few days prior to a formal review, I request a written narrative from the students. These written narratives typically include the following elements:

~ A 200 word abstract describing the conceptual content/position of their project (analytic and synthetic, not descriptive)
~ A bibliography of applicable research they have undertaken
~ A listing of precedent projects they explored to inform their approach
~ Extracted from their abstract, a lead sentence or two that articulates the basic approach taken in their project
~ Five key words that they expect to address in their presentation to the reviewers

Submitted to me electronically, I prepare an edited document with their names and abstract text. Each student and reviewer receives a copy of the collection at the beginning of the review session. The review process includes the reviewers reading the statement before the oral presentation begins. Students are guided to not repeat anything they wrote in the abstract or noted in the precedents and bibliography, but to pursue their lead sentence and the 5 key words during their five-minute presentation. This typically leaves 15-30 minutes for feedback and discussion with the critics.

Abstracts are initially written for preliminary reviews before mid-semester. There is a second iteration for mid-reviews at the ten-week point in the semester, and a third edition is requested for the final review. The earlier drafts tend to have a more descriptive tone – the exercise of using writing to complement design media is new to them; drawings and models are conceptual rather than complete; and just as their schemes need development, so do their reflections about it. As the semester progresses students are requested to hold fast to the 150 to 200 word limit and to be more concept rather than descriptive oriented. By the end of the semester, as might be expected, graphics and models are fairly complete presentations of ‘what the project is’, freeing the abstract to be complementary, stressing underlying concepts.

The abstract not only helps improve students’ discipline specific writing skills in a manner that makes their ideas publicly accessible, the act of writing imposes a rigor on design thinking that has effects while they are designing – providing focus. Writing is not only reportage or analytic, but it has synthetic capacity as well when used in the studio in this manner. The abstract combined with the lead sentence(s) and key words provide an outline of the main ideas they wish to convey orally. As a result, oral presentations are delivered with more precision and confidence. The net impact has been lowered stress, less meandering during the oral presentation, and enhanced critical feedback because the visiting critics are more fully informed of student intent than is typical.

To some degree, the abstracts, concept statements and key words presented here are out of context: full descriptions of the project program, site conditions, and operating method of the studio are lacking. However, what is key, and what does come through, is how the students are struggling with their ideas in text form. To some degree program, context, precedent and ideological perspective come forward in the student statements. Also in evidence is the back and forth between description, analytic assessment, and synthetic impact.

The following are excerpts from initial abstracts prepared for preliminary reviews. The project is a 7000 m2 library and mediatheque in Montreal, Canada. It includes civic amenities not uncommon in new buildings of this type: a café, media gallery, cinema, and youth center.

A) The mediatheque brings together many diverse functions in the setting of a very diverse city. This program is unified through atrium spaces that connect the building elements both in plan and vertically.

Connection Alley Verticality Transparency Diversity

The mediatheque should address the issues of diversity and unity found within the city of Montreal. The push and pull of the French and English influences or of the separatist movement versus the promoters of Canadian unity both exemplify the type of restless vitality that powers this city. Though
French is dominant and English is widespread, there are neighborhoods that represent many heritages, even including Portuguese, Chinese, and Greek communities. Montreal is a city very proud of its individuality, and indeed, there is very little that is ordinary about this place. Even the city blocks defy the norm and run in a direction irrespective of true north. Both literally and figuratively, the city is an island, apart from the rest of Canada and North America. Any new construction must reflect this.

There is also an issue of understanding Montreal on multiple levels. Though it is a small segment of the city, the downtown is a very compact place and is truly the center of activity and business. Within the city center, scale and the perception of layers also begin to inform design. The contrast of the size and development of the downtown with other neighborhoods is important, as is the individual layout of blocks and streets. Alleys have historically been a critical component in residential and commercial districts, but as the buildings become larger, many alleys have been engulfed; but perhaps these alleys can still serve a purpose within the context of the building, not just the city block. The layers of Montreal are apparent in the transportation systems and their impact is dependent on the season. During the summer, throngs of pedestrians blanket the streets and sidewalks in all directions, but in winter, many begin to retreat to the underground level, a vast connection of buildings and malls within a tight radius of the densest areas of the city. Perception is key because one can be almost anywhere downtown and be unconscious of the looming mountain just to the northwest; but when one ascends that mountain and looks down across the city the view is expansive and compelling.

Aside from issues drawn directly from city conditions, there are other critical concepts. Any modern building should take into account green principles and should show a concern for accessibility and public spaces.

(T.B.)

B) The Mediatheque is designed to be an icon in the city; reminiscent of the history of Montréal while creating light-filled and cohesive spaces that encourage learning and activity.

C) The Mediatheque du Montreal is an expressive form of the contrasting city of Montreal that serves to unite the site and its architecture to the surrounding city and its inhabitants through its multi-functional character.

Direction Separation Presence Functionality Contrast

As an exploration of the history of Montréal, themes of river transportation and agrarian past are coincided with a modern grid of the city. The organic, yet geometric form representing the St. Lawrence River is oriented with a primary axis that follows the north/south axis of the earth. This angle is parallel to the angle the river takes through Montréal, hinting at the translation of an old wooden hull into the heart of the city. If the primary building axis speaks of the history of the river and water in Montreal, the secondary axis—east/west—forms a direct relationship with Mont Royal, directly to the northwest of the site; mountain is earth.

There is a conjunction of water and earth, the two major things that birthed the city. However, because the n/s/e/w site organization is at odds with the nw/se city grid, there is a conflict of visual understanding. A secondary solid mass, based on the angles of the city grid, pierces through the main building and opens an entrance from the major thoroughfare. Other opaque masses on the residential side of the site speak of humanity in scale and utility in form.

The skin of the building reminisces of Montreal’s agrarian beginnings, imagining a world of granaries and corncribs.

Light is of incredible importance. The major corner of the site is opened up for viewing and leisure. On the west corner, this ensures that afternoon sun will provide a warm place for outdoor activities. Part of the building expands outward toward this warmness, making way for a direct connection between the restaurant and the plaza. (L.R.)
Looking around the site and city in general, the most apparent relationship seems to be quite the opposite of any relationship at all: a contrast. There is a sort of sectional / zoned characteristic of Montreal that divides the city into separate areas of operation, social atmosphere, architectural areas, and of course culture. Our site is situated right in the midst of much of this. There are physical and visual connections from our site to the old, modern, tall, and unsightly. My project seeks to address this contrast of the city and conceptually use the mediatheque and classic library as means to connect the different parts of this building (both the modern and classical uses). Using site lines and direction, this project attempts to tie many of these areas together, while keeping with the new generation of architecture that is being seen very close to our site in the international quarter, and the smaller scale three-story structures immediately adjacent.

The building is a multi-function facility that requires an in-depth look into connections and adjacencies, both within the building and around the site/city. Using materiality, scale, and direction, my project seeks to address both the idea of fitting into the site, as well as this idea of contrast with the city (interrupting the grid) and within the building (separately connected buildings). (E.S.)

This next group is examples from abstracts prepared for final reviews. The two projects are a mixed-use high-rise in Minneapolis; and a six-block urban design project in a medium sized American city. Example 'E' includes Precedent and Bibliographic content that is typical of the other abstracts.

D) My intent with the First International Headquarters is to create a dynamic social environment in which it is possible to interact with a diverse group of people on a daily basis. I wanted to depart from the usual corporate headquarters in which the work environments seem very sterile and uninspiring. My concept began to revolve around the idea of a vertical city in which the program is not separated into different sections of the building. Instead it is woven into the building much like residential, retail, parks, and business are woven into the city fabric. I separated the tower into 5 different vertical blocks with each one containing business, retail, residential, and public space that are then stacked one on top of another. By doing this I feel that I can provide a sense of community within each of these blocks. The public space in each of these blocks is a park within a large atrium. By organizing my building in this manner I am also able to provide inhabitants at every floor of the building readily accessible green space. My main elevator bank works like the subway by dropping people off at one of the five levels. From there you must take another elevator to the floor of your final destination within that block. I have worked on the initial concept of my building without precedent research, but have started to look at the work of Renzo Piano, Richard Rogers and, Norman Foster to put my ideas into a buildable form. (E.G.)

E) My challenge for this project is to create a green, sustainable, low-energy skyscraper for Minneapolis. I approached the project by a programmatic division of space and climatic issues, mostly involving sun angles and orientation.

The design lines the office tower with Hennepin and the residential tower with Nicollet Mall reaching both streets, both sides of the site. A full-size atrium and structural elements connects the two. By placing the residence on Nicollet (the southeast side) and the office on Hennepin (northwest), most of the south sun is hitting the residence and the office is getting the preferred north light, reducing the cooling load. Placing the sky gardens on the south and west ends of the office tower acts as a buffer from the sun. A double skin is used on the office tower to promote natural ventilation.

The design grid comes from the edges of Hennepin and Nicollet. By connecting them in a radial form it creates a subtle curve on Washington and Third Avenue, the main entrances. This NW/SE axis is where the building begins to break away into an undulating form of slices. The result is this tall slender image upon entering downtown over the Hennepin Bridge, the gateway to the city.
I am focusing on 3 important green issues in this design: daylighting, green spaces (plantings), and cooling loads. The air cavity of the double skin can be heated by the sun to create a warm buffer zone to protect interior zones in winter, or can be configured to function as a thermal chimney in the summer utilizing the stack effect to remove excess heat. Solar panels will also be used to clad the building for extra renewable energy. I am allowing the maximal amount of natural light into the spaces and using sky gardens with trees and other greenery to help reduce and filter the direct sunlight that significantly affects the cooling load. Sky gardens also help ventilate, cool, shade, and provide pleasant atmospheres within.

Precedents:
Centre International Rogier, Brussels. Kohn Pederson Fox, 1999 (unbuilt).

Bibliography:


F) Kaplan Court Our overall conceptual design at this point lies in the collaborative processes that we have taken. Early developmental schemes that we applied to the site proved to be a challenge for our team. In order to clarify what the site was to become, we each set forth two parameters that the design for the entire site was to adhere to:

1) Green space and built space are to be interwoven
2) Structures should be mixed-use, with at least two floors of commercial space
3) Buildings at grade must not cross alleys as marked on the plat map for the site
4) There must be an active ground plane for the site, preferably concentrated in a specific area
5) Individual apartments must receive direct sunlight
6) The site must contain buildings with a relationship between one another

The present design reinforces the city grid and street system at the site by building to lot edges, locating entrances off of the sidewalks, and providing ample on-street parking. In the western portion of the site, a public space is provided to create outdoor seating for restaurants, access to two theaters, and an outdoor gallery for art.

Single-loaded residential towers above commercial buildings are situated to allow clear views, plenty of sunlight for residents, and cross-ventilation. Access to the towers is located directly off the streets. Space between the towers in the center of each block creates a semi-public recreational area. (J.D.; Y-N.L.; J.R.)

Writing design takes energy – but feedback from students is that it has helped focus their design direction and enabled much better discussion with the reviewers. Preparing it a few days ahead of the review while they are fresh has been a benefit as well – they do not flounder about trying to collect their thoughts at the beginning of the review, the more typical circumstance. The reviewers in turn, have indicated that it has really helped them to understand student design intents, and has enabled them to get into critical dialog with the students much more quickly and effectively.

ii) The Salon Review
To reduce the stress of presenting in public to 20 or so folks, and to enhance direct feedback – some time ago I started holding salon reviews. In
this procedure, instead of students pinning up and presenting one at a time, I have all the work posted exhibition style so that the production for the review is visible and can be viewed in a comparative manner. The diversity of design approaches taken, and media developed for presentation becomes immediately apparent. At the same time, since this is usually of high caliber, a celebratory atmosphere is created. The major innovation is splitting apart a group of 4-8 reviewers into teams of 2 to talk to the students, resulting in multiple reviews taking place at the same time. Students present 2 or 3 times, for longer periods of time than during the typical review. In between presentations, they observe the reviews of their colleagues, and prepare to make changes on the spot in their approach to presenting their own materials.

Again, feedback has been positive from both the students and reviewers. Their shared observation is the enhanced intensity of critical discussion. Also, the students become keenly aware of two lasting lessons: that while their second presentations are almost invariably better than their first (practice helps!), that the dynamics of a new team of reviewers has a great impact on what is observed (change the people, the chemistry of the event changes). The combined learning impact of a second shot refined from the first plus a second set of comments is received as quite positive from the student’s perspective. Reviewers have found that the intimate reviews have kept them sharp and they have enjoyed the more direct exchange with the students.

iii) Written Self-Critique

What remains after a review? How are the students’ capacities for judgment, reflection and self-direction affected by the design review process? What do they take away from what they heard at the review? Well – I ask them! After each formal review, I have students prepare written self-assessments. Three or four questions are posed to them. These are typical of the questions:

1) How strong were your ideas: “Strength of Project Thesis/Program Development and Research”? (A range of five is used: Very strong; Somewhat strong; Okay/Fair; Somewhat weak; Very weak. In addition to ‘scoring’ themselves, they are required to discuss the reasons for their judgment.)

2) How well did you develop them: “Development of Analysis and its Representation”? (Again, the range of five is used.)

3) How well did you present them: “Strength of Design Proposals and Their Representation”? (Five again.)

4) As a result of the feedback you received, what will you do between now and the next review: “Next Steps in Development”?

5) What did you learn? What would you do differently?

6) For teamwork projects: “Assess how you worked as a Team, and comment on Why – What worked, what didn’t, etc.?”

The responses are surprisingly candid: students give careful consideration to assessing themselves. During the course of the semester the precision and insight of their self-assessments improves. This capacity to reflect and act is essential in design, which is always an iterative process. Self-driven reflective iterative processes ultimately have the objective of strengthening design proposals. Students need to develop this capacity for critical judgment, not only for growth in their design skills, but also because demands for it endure long past the incidents of the studio.

As with the abstracts, there is a certain disassociation from the full context of the projects. Nonetheless, student reflections reveal their coming to terms with central issues:

- The thoroughness of research and representation of analysis.
- Where to head next: conceptual, pragmatic and constructional concerns.
- The match and sufficiency of representation to concept development.
- The nature of teamwork: cooperation and equitable contributions.

- Becoming aware of processes that will be applicable beyond the studio.

My concern is not that these are perfectly articulated, or that they are somehow newly discovered remarkable insights conveyed in beautifully constructed prose. Rather, that the students are...
reflective, that they have epiphanies that support their development as designers, that through writing they become more engaged in considering their work and are developing critical judgment skills.

The projects are the same as noted previously. Here are a few responses (they are keyed to the numbered questions above: 1), 2), etc.). Each bulleted item is from a different student:

1) Program/Research/Project thesis:
   • Somewhat strong - for me. I feel that I thought more about how the program actually works together, more than I had in the past. I feel that I really tried to be sensitive to the program and I really like using it as a starting point.

   • I think I reached a point where my program development on all three approaches was relatively good, maybe a somewhat strong. ... I think the adjacencies are coming together and I think separations are also working. Specifically, I think the library function is maintaining an autonomy that allows it security and a symbolic presence that signifies its importance.

   • I believe that the environmental design approach I have taken for this project and program is a strong one. I have found there is much involved in its design and is a very challenging direction. I am pleased so far with my program division of office and residence being separate entities woven together through the atrium and skyparks. Although research can be a never-ending task, I believe I have taken it to a reachable level for the aim of the project. I will continue with research and precedents to heighten its development.

   • Somewhat Strong. I felt that I developed my concept to bring light into the building very successfully. And while I am not sure about my program development I felt that I came away with a good understanding and control of the program and its diverse aspects.

   • I think our project came a long way in consolidating our key ideas forming a unified scheme that encapsulated the concepts of light, axis and orientation. Looking at the final realization of the scheme I think of it as a solid urban strategy that complemented the site and at the same time suggested linkages with the rest of the city.

2) Analysis & Representation:
   • Once again, I did the analysis; I just did a very poor job of representing it. At this point in my college career I should know better than to just stand up and say something without having proof of actually having done it. ... 

   • I think that I have a pretty good collection of models going right now, each one showing progression from the last. I also have a lot of good sketches that show my ideas as I have progressed through the design. ...

   • Somewhat well developed: Our analysis of Des Moines and the surroundings has played a big part in our design, however, most of our conclusions that have influenced our design are speculation rather than research. Can a grocery store survive on this site? "We suppose." Will there be enough program, people, and climate to support a 17,500 s.f. open plaza? "Sure."

3) Design Concepts & Representation:
   • Fair- I don’t think my concepts were extremely strong in graphic representation, although one of my schemes is more advanced than the other two. I have to work out my ideas more thoroughly. I feel I tried to attack this project as much as I could.

   • Not Very Strong. I put too much effort to manipulate one of the floor plans, so forgot to take one step back to take different approaches.

   • I believe my design proposals and their representations lie somewhere between very strong and pretty good. I feel that the many renditions of floor plans, structural plans, and sectional studies will be helpful in the following weeks ...

   • Incomplete. By far the one place I am having trouble keeping up in. I need sections, elevations, helpful study models. I need to take away the time I am spending on some other areas of the project and dive into this.

   • I feel like the design of my building is very good, the layout makes sense, unlike the last
time. I really like my shade/shelving idea, a model would be helpful with representing that. I had a lighting study drawing, but more are needed, one from each season, each time (morning, noon, evening), maybe plans [of the solar impacts] as well.

4) What’s Next?

- After contemplating minor changes in my scheme and making the design work as a whole, my next move would be to focus on the specific plans for the both towers, looking at the exterior of the buildings-like the skin of the building, what people see when they approach, and how it meets the sky. Prepare enough drawings such as plans, sections, elevations, and diagrams so that the building design and concepts will be understood. As well as images and models to give a feel of the urban context, site and building in a powerful way.

- After I figure out my base, I think the next most important design consideration is the façade, the building skin itself. I need to find a way to create the towering form without muddying it up with excess lines. Yet I still need to create a gesture of scale to the people interacting with the building since the entrances are most likely going to be “holes” in the building skin.

- Next Steps: a) I believe my design will become a green one by introducing many different devices; I need to figure out which ones will work for my design and which I can do without, i.e. sky gardens, wind generators, solar panels, storm water regeneration, etc.; b) Determining the skin and façade detail of my design; c) Building Materials.

5) What was learned?

- I enjoyed drawing full suites of plans, axons and a few sections for a very preliminary part of the design process... a phase I usually wouldn’t put much detail into sketches. After designing three versions of this project, I feel I have a firm grasp on the program... something which lets me create new concepts or make changes effortlessly.

- I feel I learned a lot in this exercise. I feel I learned a method; that I have obtained a tool for taking something on paper in words, to ideas in my head, to a general manipulation of space that deals with the program and circulation. It’s been extremely helpful, and I’m excited to use that method in the future.

- First of all, I learned that for several years I have been designing in an unnecessarily large scale. We were able to show all the detail needed at this point at 1/400. Also, this project forced me to jump into and begin to break down an overwhelmingly large program and project. Now, when I visit the site I will be able to better comprehend the scale of the building and picture how a building would work and sit on the site, without actually committing to one of my previous designs.

- For the three-concepts exercise, I have learned that I have to be more critical about applying the analysis of programming. Don’t be limited by the first setup of programs. In other words, there are many possibilities about the floor arrangement and spatial organization. Only through different propositions, can you realize what this program is about.

6) Team Assessment:

- Very well. Eric was an excellent partner. I felt that the work was equally split and even though we have different schedules we were able to make it work. Our strengths and weaknesses worked well together and we were happy with our final result.

- Did not work well. Probably due to the schedule conflicts. Our team work is not accomplished.

- Both of my teammates were very diligent and we all put in an equal amount of time in the production of the model and drawings. We work well together as a team, each of us bringing in our own unique design strategies.

- Not very strong. AB is doing more on another course. He has been doing some drawing. For the last review, I did the drawings; he was supposed to do the model but he didn’t.

- Worked well. Was good to have someone to bounce ideas off of.
• Working pretty well. We spend a lot of time contemplating and discussing options. Probably more than we should. As a result we have relatively little to show for how much consideration we have put in. ...

Summary
So there you have it -- three simple learning events – collectively aimed at:
~ Improving design thinking, oral and visual presentation capabilities via writing;
~ Reducing stress and enriching direct critical feedback through the salon review process;
~ Strengthening the capacity for judgment and critical reflection.

Working on it!

Note 1: Examinations of the Jury Process: