


DART 262|4 A : EXPLORING DESIGN STUDIES

SESSION: Winter 2021
INSTRUCTOR: Christopher Moore
Associate Professor
Design + Computation Arts
E-MAIL: christopher.moore@concordia.ca
WEB: www.learnmegood.ca
OFFICE: EV—6.751
TELEPHONE: 514.848.2424 x—4256
T.A.: William Couture
EMAIL T.A.: ta@learnmegood.ca

DATE RANGE: 19|01|21—20|04|21
LECTURE: Tuesdays 09:30—11:30
TUTORIAL: Tuesdays 11:45—12:45
OFFICE HOURS: Email for an appointment
ZOOM: <https://concordia-ca.zoom.us/j/5774917555>



“Culture is ordinary: that is the first fact. Every human society has its own shape, its own purposes, its own meanings. Every human society expresses these, in institutions, and in arts and learning. The making of a society is the finding of common meanings and directions, and in its growth is an active debate and amendment under the pressures of experience, contact, and discovery, writing themselves into the land. The growing society is there, yet it is also made and remade in every individual mind.”

—Raymond Williams, “Culture is Ordinary” (1958)

As Raymond Williams expresses in his seminal essay on cultural studies, the interactions between people, objects, and imagery form the basis of personal and social identity. The clothes that we wear, the products we select in the grocery store, and even our morning rituals become codified representations of our values and systems of belief. Design artifacts and experiences weave complex narratives that connect politics, religion, ethics, and cultural histories into aesthetic concerns.

“We need to become hunter-gatherers of ideas and tools.”

—John Thackara, *In the Bubble: Designing in a Complex World* (2005)

“A space can only be made into a place by its occupants. The best that the designer can do is put the tools into their hands.”

—Steve Harrison and Paul Dourish, “Re-place-ing space”

“Hear and forget. See and remember. Do and understand.”

—Confucius

"I don't really call design problem-solving anymore because I think that we've solved all of the problems. It's beyond that. You could always argue that there are "problems." But if you make a chair that's uncomfortable, you should be shut down. Ever since the advent of computer-aided machinery, we're not making that many advances in the physical production world. There are no excuses to put out a bad product anymore."

—Karim Rashid

As multidisciplinary designer Karim Rashid notes, there is little functional need to continually produce new objects for a consumer market. So, what purpose does design serve if all "practical" problems have already been solved? In this course we will reconsider design as the conception, creation, production and utilization of cultural artifacts, that both reflect and activate the society to which they belong. To this end, the goals and strategies of material culture studies are useful: the multidisciplinary focus; the acknowledgment that all things designed by humans are worthy of attention and not just monumental or canonical design; and the potential of the artifact as a pivotal basis for discovery and interpretation.

"The tricky part of design is that we're perpetually revisiting the archetype. Sometimes we need to do away with the archetype. Or ask, "Do we need to add that product category?" Originality is also a way to change the product landscape, to become the catalyst for change and inspiration."

—Karim Rashid

CALENDAR DESCRIPTION:	Prerequisite: DART 261; enrolment in the Major in Design or written permission of the Department. This theory course introduces students to innovative and creative ways of thinking about design, and offers means of organizing their ideas effectively and convincingly. Referring to both historic and current examples of design theory and practice, coursework and assignments explore existing frameworks or models for design studies, enabling students to investigate critical aspects of visual communication and the built environment.
OBJECTIVES:	There will be two main laboratories for studying design issues: 1. <u>The classroom</u> : Included here are the lectures and contact time with the instructor and teaching assistant, as well as the preparations you make for class, including reviewing the weekly materials. 2. <u>The world around you</u> : Design is everywhere. One of the most important goals for prospective designers is to become sensitive to existing design, to the cultural circumstances that will inevitably govern your own designs, and to the human interactions that continually take place with the objects of everyday life and with the built environment. The only way to gain this sensitivity is to strive to improve your ability to perceive design with all your senses, as well as with your intellect.
TEACHING ASSISTANT:	Your T.A. is your first line of contact should you have any general questions regarding the course content, expectations, deliverables, or need to address an administrative issue. If your concern pertains to grading or other confidential matters, they will be able to refer you to me, in order to follow-up on the matter. Given that there are many students registered in this course, I ask that you make liberal use of the tutorial sessions and office hours to pose questions and seek out additional assistance.
TEXTBOOKS:	There are no required texts for this course. However, weekly presentations, texts and additional online resources will be provided by the instructor (http://www.learnmegood.ca).

All of the course readings are available on the web, the course website, or on reserve at the Concordia Library. You will be shown how to access this material during the first meeting. It is expected that you will have read the texts assigned for each class (or watched the videos, perused websites, etc.) prior to attending the lecture on that date. It is also recommended that you review the weekly presentation ahead of time to become familiar with the materials and subject matter. Failing to do so will affect your participation grade for the course.

You are also required to have a notebook/sketchbook and writing implements during each lecture or online video presentation. It is expected that you will take notes during the lectures to assist you in preparing your assignments.

TUTORIALS: You are required to virtually attend a mandatory tutorial led by the Teaching Assistant each week following the lecture session. If you are unable to attend synchronously, please ensure that you follow up with the presentations and activities. These sessions are designed to provide you with fundamental writing and research skills to effectively complete your course assignments and article summaries. The tutorials are also an ideal occasion to seek clarification on project expectations, ask questions, and solicit advice on proposed topics of inquiry. Active participation will be factored into your grade for the course.

All tutorials will take place on Zoom, unless otherwise specified. See schedule of dates at the end of this document for further details.

MOODLE: A Moodle forum for DART 262 has been created for information sharing/exchange and submission of assignments and tutorial activities. The weekly video recordings from the lectures will be uploaded to this space, but the bulk of the course materials will be available on the LearnMeGood site.

Details on how to connect and utilize Moodle are located online at:
<https://moodle.concordia.ca/moodle/>.

OPTIONAL EQUIPMENT: While limited personal storage space exists on the network, it is subject to down-time and routine maintenance. For this reason, you should always backup data on a portable drive.

PARTICIPATION: What and how much you learn in this course is directly related to your participation in the lecture and tutorial sessions. The virtual classroom environment is an important tool for learning about methodologies and processes, and for developing critical and creative skills. Your most important contribution to this learning environment is your interest and active attention. Engage—use all your experience, knowledge and natural creativity to develop your skills and those of your peers. Your engagement will be directly proportional to your learning and success in this course.

I recognize that with remote delivery attendance may be challenging for some students. However, it is preferred that you join synchronously, if possible, but video recordings will be made available after the sessions. Since there are many students in this class, I have to find ways to keep the class running smoothly. Consequently, you will be assigned small exercises to assess your participation. At the end of the semester, you will receive a grade based on your active engagement, mature and considerate conduct, questions and comments made during class, etc.

I realize that not all students are as comfortable as others in speaking regularly during group situations (especially in a video conference environment), therefore, I will accept other activities as evidence of participation. For example, you can post an interesting

link on Moodle, provide a critique, design review, or media sample to share with your colleagues. I am always looking for new resources to update and refine the course delivery in subsequent iterations.

Attendance will not be taken, but it is still expected that you will make efforts to attend real-time activities. If you have questions or concerns, please contact me directly. For further information, please review the official Syllabus for the Department of Design and Computation Arts.

E-MAILS: In order for me to efficiently respond to questions, proper e-mail formatting is necessary. Please use appropriate subject titles, and indicate the course number when sending messages. For example, "DART 262: Assignment 2, Draft Text."

ASSIGNMENTS: As a key component of class participation, you will be asked to respond to various prompts over the course of the semester. These responses will test your comprehension of the fundamental concepts explored each week.

Assignments are to be completed on the dates when they are due—which always corresponds to our scheduled class sessions. All students must be prepared to present projects during the face-to-face sessions. Completed assignments are to be submitted to the appropriate Moodle link.

Assignments must be submitted in a single file/folder containing all project files, and labeled using the following syntax: *lastname.firstname_x* (substitute "x" for the relevant assignment number/part). Individual submission folders for each assignment have been created on Moodle. Assignment-specific requirements will be presented in the project descriptions and in-class sessions.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY: You must correctly document in your assignments all ideas and media that have been incorporated in your projects, but have been borrowed from outside sources or from your colleagues. Failure to do so is considered as academic dishonesty and treated accordingly. For written papers, all sources used in the development of your work must be cited as references. Where text is borrowed from another source, quotation marks must indicate the citation and the source must be acknowledged appropriately. A useful overview and relevant links are available online via the Concordia Library site: <http://library.concordia.ca/help/citing>.

LATE POLICY: Projects submitted late will receive an automatic deduction of 5% per day, unless prior arrangements have been negotiated. If you are struggling with the content, or having difficulties managing your time, please advise me. I am a compassionate individual, and am most often able to accommodate requests, if you provide a reasonable alternative.

You may also find it useful to schedule an appointment with the Student Success Centre. An advisor can work directly with you to improve your writing skills, review draft texts, and provide advice on time management or study skills: <http://www.concordia.ca/students/success/learning-support/writing-assistance.html>.

PERSONAL SECURITY: This course will strive for consistency with the University's policy on personal security and conduct, where it is acknowledged that freedom of expression and frank discussion of controversial issues are kept in balance with an individual's rights not to be subject to discrimination based on gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation or other forms of intolerance.

Harassment is a serious offence that includes but is not limited to sexual advances, unwanted requests for sexual favours, and other unwanted verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature. Behaviour need not be intentional to constitute harassment. Harassment occurs when an objective person in the position of an individual claiming harassment would find the conduct or comments would have the impact of creating a hostile environment. For further information, please consult section 17.30 of the Concordia University Calendar. Information and resources are also available through Concordia's Counseling Services and the University Chaplain.

DEPARTMENT SYLLABUS:

The Department of Design + Computation Arts has established a standardized Syllabus, addressing codes of conduct and academic regulations applicable to all DART and CART courses. You are expected to become familiar with this document, which supersedes all other regulations identified in this course outline.

To view this document, visit:

<https://www.concordia.ca/content/dam/finearts/design/docs/dcart-undergraduate-syllabus-2020-2021.pdf>

SUSTAINABLE PRINCIPLES

All the projects developed in class must integrate the fundamental notions of sustainability: favouring local materials and production, reducing parts and costs, designing for disassembly, designing for repair and longevity, avoiding the use of toxic materials, glues, paints and finishes. These principles must be integrated in all the aspects of the design process: limiting the printing, using eco-friendly materials for the construction of preliminary maquettes and prototypes, and leaving the studio clean after class.

Students are expected to consider some of these principles in their final proposals. These principles are not mutually exclusive. They are intended to help you re-orient some of your design decisions.

1. Principle of Efficiency: reduce impacts (a life cycle approach)
2. Principle of Effectiveness: waste = food or principle of industrial ecology—don't use anything that cannot be metabolized back into the earth
3. Principle of Sufficiency: frugality, voluntary simplicity, etc.
4. Principle of Human Vitality: respect for people, and their skills
5. Principle of Cultural Vitality: respect for creativity and beauty
6. Principle of Holistic Thinking: whole systems thinking of the complex/interrelated implications of design
7. Equitable Accessibility: design for impaired, etc.
8. 4R's: rethink, reduce, reuse, recycle
9. Clean or at Least Renewable Energy Sources
10. Renewable Resources Only
11. Preservation: ensure there is a plan to preserve and maintain what you impact—requires an clear understanding of repercussions
12. Conservation: principle of using sparingly
13. Durability (long-life): second life design, emotional, interaction, attachment
14. Biomimicry or Nature Inspired Design: learn from the systems and constructions of nature, as this is inherently sustainable – but how to make the transformations sustainable?
15. Addressing Obsolescence: planned, economic, emotional or otherwise

TERRITORIAL ACKN'MENT

I/We would like to begin by acknowledging that Concordia University is located on unceded Indigenous lands. The Kanien'kehá:ka Nation is recognized as the custodians of the lands and waters on which we gather today. Tiohtiá:ke/Montreal is historically known as a gathering place for many First Nations. Today, it is home to a diverse

population of Indigenous and other peoples. We respect the continued connections with the past, present and future in our ongoing relationships with Indigenous and other peoples within the Montreal community.

For further information, visit:

<https://www.concordia.ca/about/indigenous/territorial-acknowledgement.html>

EVALUATION: 10% Readings / Participation / Attendance
30% Moodle Responses
05% *Show and Tell (a Lie)*
05% Exhibition Review
50% Major Assignment: *Je me souviens* (Three Parts)
20% Part 1
20% Part 2 (Groups of 3)
10% Part 3 (Groups of 3)

CLASS SCHEDULE:

Please note that this is a tentative schedule of class activities—current information and syllabus updates may be viewed on the course website at <http://www.learnmegood.ca>. A more detailed bibliography and list of weekly resources appears at the end of this document. Please refer to this table for class preparation, due dates, homework, and supplementary resources.

DART 262 is roughly divided into four modules: *Process, Experience, Systems, and Enactment*. While abundant thematic crossover exists between these categories, we will extrapolate specific concerns in each section and build upon understandings as the course progresses.

PROCESS [RESPONSIBILITY]

- *Agents of change / Design for debate*

WEEK ONE—January 19

Rhetoric, Ethos and Responsibility

Introduction: Course structure, philosophy, expectations, policies

Topics: Personal design ethos, responsibility, assumptions, discourse, voice, manifestoes

Assignment Overview: *Je me Souviens* (Major Project); semester assessment criteria

Activity: Define a 25-word personal design ethos statement and emblematic artifact

WEEK TWO—January 26

Design 1:1: Human Scale, Capacity and Amplification

Topics: Effects of technology on perception, negation of space and time, return to human-centered experience and world-view

Assignment Introduction: *Show and Tell (A Lie)*

WEEK THREE—February 2

Affirmative Design vs. Critical Design / Fast Knowledge vs. Slow Knowledge

Topics: Slow design, production-oriented processes versus discursive design, perception, expectations of objects, challenging archetypes

Assignment Due: *Show and Tell (A Lie)*

Assignment Introduction: Exhibition Review

WEEK FOUR—February 9

Social Design and User-Centred Processes

Topics: Involving users in the development process, social media as a research tool, collaborative development

Assignment Introduction: *Je me souviens: Part 1*

EXPERIENCE [EMPATHY]

- *Cognitive meaning + arousal = emotion*

WEEK FIVE—February 16

Design Experiences I: Cultivating Empathy

Topics: Artifact empathy, emotional attachments to objects, dehumanization of product experiences, creating “personality”, beyond functionalism—from use to incorporation, rationalism versus empiricism

WEEK SIX—February 23

Design Experiences 2: The “Common” Object

Topics: Attachments and personal investment, the role of aesthetics, rethinking relationships to the everyday, failure and frustration as forms of endearment

Assignment Due: *Je me souviens: Part 1*

READING BREAK—March 1-7

No Classes

SYSTEMS [COMPLEXITY]

- *Heterarchical and self-evolving systems*

WEEK SEVEN—March 9

Stakeholders: Complexity and Collaboration

Topics: Design trajectory, networks of responsibility and control, designing with and for people

Assignment Introduction: *Je me souviens: Parts 2 & 3*

WEEK EIGHT—March 16

Flow: Participatory Design and Pleasure

Topics: Collaboration, user-centred processes, mass customization, product semantics versus use value

Assignment Due: *Exhibition Review*

ENACTMENT [PERFORMANCE]

- *Act lightly, sense the feedback, act again*

WEEK NINE—March 23

Homo Ludens: Play-Based Methodologies

Topics: Curiosity and wonder as design processes and objectives, developing attachments, gaming versus play

WEEK TEN—March 30

Actions: Design for the Common Good

Topics: “Problem solving” at the human scale, social change and progress, design in domestic and collective environments

WEEK ELEVEN—April 6

Team Presentations and Peer Evaluation: Session 1

Assignment Due: *Je me souviens*: **Part 2** [Random team selection—all must be prepared to present and evaluate fellow teams]

WEEK TWELVE—April 13

Team Presentations and Peer Evaluation: Session 2

Assignment Due: *Je me souviens*: **Part 2** [Random team selection—all must be prepared to present and evaluate fellow teams]

WEEK THIRTEEN—April 20

Team Presentations and Peer Evaluation: Session 3

Assignment Due: *Je me souviens*: **Part 3** [Random presentation order—all must be prepared to present and evaluate fellow teams]

ASSESSMENT:

READING AND COMPREHENSION ASSESSMENT: Moodle Responses

Value: 30% (Ten, Each Worth 3%)

Due: Weekly, from January 26—April 13

Overview:

You are asked to respond to weekly questions or prompts posted to the class Moodle. These posts will demonstrate your comprehension of the assigned readings and discussions, putting into practice the higher-level theoretical concepts. Many of these responses will be derived from in-class play sessions and “thought experiments.” These short reflections will allow you to receive some early feedback on your progress in this course, and help you to plan for the major assignment.

In general, these questions will be assigned in the weekly tutorial sessions. Prompts will typically involve selecting an artifact, experience, or scenario to use as a case study analysis. Based on the materials assigned during the course, you will examine the selected artifact, assessing its characteristics—both positive and negative. These exercises are also meant to help you develop as a designer and understand your own ethos as a creator and thinker. Due to the nature and variety of the weekly prompts, it is difficult to provide a standard marking rubric. However, your post should reflect upon the following:

- An overview of the specific qualities, characteristics, and connotations that connect it to the readings/resources;
- A summary of how the artifact relates to the general themes of the lecture that week;
- An indication of key historical and political influences from the era of the artifact’s production;
- A statement on how it activates/reflects the culture of its time and place.

Each summary should be 250 words in length (maximum), and demonstrate a clear understanding of the weekly subject(s). Since you will be working in small teams, **only one post per group is necessary, but be sure to indicate the names of all contributors**. You may consider these responses as small practice papers exploring themes and evaluative processes that will inform the major assignment.

Deliverables:

- 250-word Moodle post.
- Responses are due before the next class session (date stamped).

- Late submissions will only be accepted in the case of extenuating circumstances.

Assessment Criteria:

- Have the students demonstrated a clear understanding of the selected article/lecture?
- Does the summary clearly express the team's thesis in an organized fashion?
- Does the selected artifact demonstrate a strong correlation to the subject of the article/lecture? Is it innovate/creative?
- Is the summary free from major grammatical errors and typos?

ASSIGNMENT: *Show and Tell (a Lie)*

Value: 5%

Due: February 2

Introduction: The Rhetoric and Discourse of Design

How can you verify the truth about something?

For your first formal exercise, you are asked to cultivate an ethos around a single artifact. By invoking the language and discourse of the museum, you will craft a false history that should appear to be fully researched, documented and air-tight. In order to do so, you will need to adopt the role of a professional historian or critic, lending authority and validity to your didactic text. You *ARE* the expert. Make liberal use of names, dates, organizations, provenance and ownership, as well as contemporary socio-political phenomena. You might even include quotations from other "experts" naming "important" works of scholarship that support your story. To be taken seriously, you should also include some credible facts—it helps to create a sense of instability and uncertainty.

The purpose of this exercise is to explore how words can be deceiving and things are not always as they seem. Design is often centered around creating "product mythologies." How far can you take this concept and what are the ethical considerations involved in this process?

If you are unsure about where to begin, review a classical art history textbook or visit the Musée des beaux-arts website. The didactic panels that accompany works of art possess the correct tone and sense of authority that we are seeking. The Musée has an excellent collection of furnishings and industrial design objects that will serve as a great prototype for your piece. Alternatively, you could watch an episode of the Antiques Roadshow!

Deliverables:

- 250-500-word paper, double-spaced and clearly indicating your name and I.D. number.
- Include an image of your artifact.
- Upload a digital pdf copy to the Moodle.
- Late submissions will only be accepted in the case of extenuating circumstances.

Assessment Criteria:

- Has the student appropriated a convincing tone of voice?
- Is there an appropriate level of detail and specificity in the provenance of the artifact?
- Is the summary free from major grammatical errors and typos?

ASSIGNMENT: Exhibition Review

Due: March 3

You are required to view an online exhibition—either current or archived. The Canadian Centre for Architecture is a good starting point, as they have a lot of robust web content and microsites that accompany their main programming.

To ensure that all students visit an exhibition, you are asked to prepare a written review. This paper will highlight a few key projects and/or ideas that inspired you or challenged your way of thinking about the design process. Reflect on your own evolving design ethos and comment on how the exhibition themes relate (or not) to your personal philosophy.

Deliverables:

- 500-word paper, double-spaced and clearly indicating your name and I.D. number.
- Include a link and screenshot.
- Upload a digital copy to the Moodle.
- Late submissions will only be accepted in the case of extenuating circumstances.

Assessment Criteria:

- Has the student demonstrated an appropriate level of engagement with the exhibition and lecture?
- Is there a personal reflection on process and design ethos?
- Is the review free from major grammatical errors and typos?

MAJOR ASSIGNMENT: *Je me souviens*

Value: 50% (Three Parts: Part 1—20% / Part 2—20% / Part 3: Poster—10%)

Due: February 23, April 6 or April 13, April 20 (Poster)

Format: Individual (Part 1); Groups of 3 (Parts 2 & 3)

Introduction:

In 2004, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) launched the *Creative Cities Network*. The purpose of this program, as described in their literature is “to promote the social, economic and cultural development of cities in both the developed and the developing world [... and to] share interest in UNESCO’s mission towards cultural diversity.”¹ Amongst the other categories (Literature, Film, Music, Crafts and Folk Art, Media Arts and Gastronomy) lies the most populated category, *City of Design*, which launched in 2007. Cities are designated by application and must demonstrate adherence to the following criteria: established design industry; cultural landscape fuelled by design and the built environment; design schools and research centres; creators with continuous activity at a local and/or national level; experience in hosting fairs, events and exhibits; opportunities for designers to use local materials and urban/natural conditions; design-driven creative industries, etc.²

The *Cities of Design* program is relatively new, and has not yet been studied or challenged to any great extent. The pervasiveness of design demands the establishment of a focused discursive exploration aimed at understanding the cross-disciplinary influence and manifestation of the field within everyday life. Through case study analysis we will seek to define a common language and philosophical approach to applying design practice in all aspects of the urban environment.

As the only North American city to be awarded the UNESCO honour (until 2015 when Detroit was inaugurated), Montréal is a logical place to initiate a study of effective design practices in the urban landscape. The inaugural speech from UNESCO Director-General Koichiro Matsuura summarizes Montréal’s attributes as such:

Even the city itself acknowledges that 'design in Montreal is not simply for show but a source of daily wellbeing.' Not only has Montreal demonstrated that design can be a powerful tool in promoting inclusion and plurality of values, but the city has also called upon its citizens to play a critical and active part in mobilizing design to inspire more innovative living environments that enhance daily life and existence.³

Much has been written about Montréal's arts and cultural attractions, but little has been explored in terms of the design and infrastructure that support the more showy aspects of city life. The integration of public art, design, and innovative public systems make Montreal a rich, multicultural community to investigate what makes a city livable.

^{1 2 3} UNESCO. The Creative Cities Network. *United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization*. Retrieved December 29, 2021, from http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=31163&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html. Web.

Purpose:

This applied research project is not simply an exercise in valorizing the achievements of Montréal as a UNESCO city; its ultimate aim is to provide a manifesto for global change, improving lives through design. Through analysis of successful (and less-than-successful) instances of design in the built environment, advocacy on behalf of the discipline will be a cornerstone of the research outcomes. Design has long been a ubiquitous, but invisible part of the everyday lived experience, and this project will serve as a key document to propel further urban design studies as a major part of public discourse.

A precedent was set in 1964 when designer Ken Garland (1964) published the "First Things First" manifesto⁴. Signed by over 400 influential leaders, Garland attempted to reposition the field of design, which he felt had become uncritical, and detrimental to the welfare of citizens. This project has a parallel purpose, in reaffirming that design is not a neutral, value-free process of creation. Challenging archetypes, placing users before products, redesigning systems from the bottom-up, connecting with complementary disciplines of scholarship, and understanding the interconnected cycle of design-production-consumption-disposal-afterlife are all very timely topics.

Cognitive scientist and design theorist Donald Norman has written extensively about the necessity for restoring human-centred approaches to the design process. In his seminal 1990 text, *The Design of Everyday Things*, Norman⁵ describes the psychology behind effective and ineffective design practices, providing cautionary examples of the negative consequences resulting from bad design decisions. Favouring the needs of individuals over secondary issues like aesthetics can have significant impacts on daily life, reducing alienation and improving upon encumbrances that have been tacitly accepted as a result of lazy thinking. Similarly, designer Bruce Mau's exclamatory book and touring exhibition, *Massive Change*, presents the value proposition of design as an all-encompassing lens on the world. Mau describes the project as thus:

Massive Change explores paradigm-shifting events, ideas, and people, investigating the capacities and ethical dilemmas of design in manufacturing, transportation, urbanism, warfare, health, living, energy, markets, materials, the image and information. We need to evolve a global society that has the capacity to direct and control the emerging forces in order to achieve the most positive outcome⁶.

As a polemical statement, its strength lies in the numerous concrete instantiations of effective design thinking applied to the medical industry, education, as well as housing and infrastructure systems for rural or developing regions⁷. This research assignment will build upon these foundational examples, by applying analogous critical interpretation to urban spaces, as opposed to discrete objects.

⁴ Garland, K. "First Things First." 1964. Retrieved December 29, 2021, from <http://kengarland.co.uk/KG-published-writing/first-things-first/>. Web.

⁵ Norman, Donald. *The Design of Everyday Things*. New York: Doubleday, 1990. Print.

⁶ Mau, B. *Massive Change*. Retrieved December 29, 2021, from <http://www.massivechange.com/about>. Web.

⁷ Mau, B. *Massive Change*. London: Phaidon Press, 2004. Print.

Part One (20%, Due February 23):

Using the familiar urban landscape of Montréal as a case study location, you will explore the complex relationship between culture, commerce, and wellbeing. What makes a “*design city*”? In this three-part assignment, you will compare and contrast two different examples of local design and then propose a solution for improvement. To create a benchmark “control” for good design practices, you will select what you feel to be a positive addition to the urban landscape. This can be a Metro station, a building, a public greenspace, street furniture, a highway, or any number of Montréal-specific systems (STM, BIXI, etc.). So long as your example is clearly positioned in Montréal, almost anything can be explored.

Using the design processes addressed in the class sessions, you will analyze and assess one example of successful design. Think about how spaces are occupied, their materials, the general mood or atmosphere—is this a workable environment/phenomenon, and how does it make you feel? The following is a general structure for how to explore the report, but feel free to deviate as you see fit.

- Section I: Observation (500 words)
 - Ia: Explain your choice of artifact/experience in approximately 100 words. Is it a familiar part of your everyday life, or a design/space that you simply enjoy? Identify the artifact’s designer, date, and provenance, if known.
 - Ib: Provide a brief history of the artifact or space (100 words). Are there any key dates or transitions in the lifespan of your selected subject?
 - Ic: Provide a description of its visual and physical characteristics (150 words), plus approximately 10 photos demonstrating different characteristics of the artifact and its geographic location. Provide a map with the location of your artifact clearly indicated (a screen capture from Google Maps will suffice). Include a short caption with each photo, to explain what it reveals about your artifact.
 - Id: Include a detailed description of the contextual environment where it exists (or is typically found/used). Try to identify the inherent qualities of the space, from both an architectural/environmental as well as aesthetic and sensorial perspectives and note your observations. Consider:
 - Surfaces: hard/soft; changing/static
 - Size or volume: interior/exterior; confined/walled/open; reverb/echo/flat
 - Variety: balance of natural/human/manufactured phenomena; contrasts/similarities
 - Qualities: loud/quiet; harsh/sharp/soft/gentle
 - Layers: multiple simultaneous/discrete; easily-distinguished/seamless blend

Ensure that the context is visible in at least one photograph, and provide captions that inform the reader about the information gleaned from seeing your artifact within its location. This requirement makes it necessary for you to verify that the location(s) and artifact can be photographed: confirm this immediately to avoid unpleasant discoveries later.

- Section II: Occupation (500 words)
 - 2a: How does the general public interact with your artifact or space? Consider the ways in which the artifact or space is utilized—by whom, how, when, and under what

circumstances? Does it have many different uses or populations? Is access freely available, or is it staunchly privatized and protected? Has the space been abandoned, has it transitioned over a period of weeks/months/years, and/or does it change from day to night (commuters versus nomadic populations)? Observe on several occasions, make notes and summarize your observations (250 words)

- 2b: Consider the functionality of the artifact. What are the perceived/purported practical functions? Is there a discrepancy between this and the experience of the user? Can this be quantified (research, testimonials, awards, etc.) (250 words).
- Section III: Analysis (500 words)

- 3a: We will build a toolkit for assessing design artifacts throughout the course. However, Dieter Rams' *Ten Principles of Good Design* (<http://www.vitsoe.com/en/gb/about/dieterams/gooddesign>) provides a general starting point:

- *Good design is innovative.*
- *Good design makes a product useful.*
- *Good design is aesthetic.*
- *Good design makes a product understandable.*
- *Good design is unobtrusive.*
- *Good design is honest.*
- *Good design is long-lasting.*
- *Good design is thorough, down to the last detail.*
- *Good design is environmentally-friendly.*
- *Good design is as little design as possible.*

Many things have changed since Rams wrote these “commandments” in the early 1980s, but the principles still ring true. We just need to augment them with additional concerns.

Consider the durability of your selected subject. Is it well-made and designed to last? Is it *emotionally* durable? Will you grow to love it more as time passes? Is your artifact healthy—physically, environmentally, and socially? Does it help the public in positive ways? Does it have a function beyond mere ornament? Is your artifact responsive to human scale? Does it evoke a positive sentiment?

In this section you need to integrate a *MINIMUM* of three (3) sources from the class or elsewhere.

- Section IV: Conclusion (100 words)
 - The final section of this assignment should summarize what you have discovered to date about your artifact. In approximately 100 words, succinctly describe how it activates and reflects the culture of its time and justify your selection as an example of successful design. If it is a historical artifact, how does it function today?

Deliverables:

- Approximate length: 1600 words, plus captions (PDF FORMAT)
- Photographs should be incorporated with the captions in the body of the presentation
- Upload project to the Moodle (labeled Lastname.Firstname_part: i.e. Moore.Christopher_1)

Assessment Criteria:

- How effectively has the student communicated the significance of the artifact as activating/reflecting the culture of its time?
- Has the student adopted an innovative/creative approach to selecting the artifact?
- Has the student provided proper citations, indicating the sources of the material used?
- Overall assessment of relevant research strategies, including materials from the library, e-journals, web, etc.
- Does the presentation clearly express the student's thesis in an organized fashion?
- Is the presentation free from major grammatical errors and typos?

Part Two (Groups of 3: 20%, Due April 6 or April 13):

For the second part of the major assignment, you will be working in teams of three to explore a second Montréal-based artifact or space. This time, your focus will be analyzing a less-than-successful example, which will form the basis of your critique.

Utilize the same process and format as in part 1, expanding your repertoire of evaluation criteria. What makes this example less "good" according to the lessons learned in the class sessions?

In addition, you must propose a solution to rectify the perceived faults of the selected artifact. This will take the form of sketches, diagrams and a 400-word description of the project. Since you will be working in teams, you may wish to delegate tasks to various members of the group. However, you will all receive the same mark for the work you have produced together. This will lead to the final part of the assignment, which entails a three-poster set illustrating your design concept.

In weeks 11/12, each team will make a 15-minute oral presentation of their project and proposed changes. In order to maintain fairness within the class, names will be chosen at random. This means that *EVERY* team must be prepared to present during week 11, if called upon. To ensure appropriate attendance at all presentations and to balance performance in the project, you will each evaluate your peers, as well as all other teams.

Deliverables:

- One submission per team; 15-minute oral presentations in weeks 11/12.
- Approximate length: 2000 words, plus captions (PDF FORMAT)
- Photographs should be incorporated with the captions in the body of the presentation
- Upload project to the Moodle (place in a folder labeled Lastname.Lastname.Lastname_part: i.e. Moore.Smith.Taylor_2)

Assessment Criteria:

- How effective was the oral presentation in communicating observations about the significance of the artifact as activating/reflecting the culture of its time?
- Has the team adopted an innovative/creative approach to selecting the comparative artifacts and contexts?
- How viable is the solution for correcting or reinventing the selected artifact/space??
- Has the team provided proper citations, indicating the sources of the material used?
- Overall assessment of relevant research strategies, including materials from the library, e-journals, web, etc.
- Does the presentation clearly express the team's thesis in an organized fashion?
- Is the presentation free from major grammatical errors and typos?

Part Three: Poster (Groups of 3: 10%, Due April 20):

The final part of the major assignment represents an applied translation of the project proposal in serial poster form. The objective is to visually represent the redesigned artifact/space in a triptych of three posters.

There is no specific presentation format or specific set of information to be included on the posters. However, it should be clear and understandable to an audience who may or may not be familiar with your artifact. A good general approach is for the posters to represent 1) the history, 2) the problem, 3) and the proposed solution.

Deliverables:

- One submission per team
- Three 18"x24" poster layouts (PDF FORMAT)
- Upload project to the Moodle (place in a folder labeled Lastname.Lastname.Lastname_part: i.e. Moore.Smith.Taylor_3)

Assessment Criteria:

- How effective are the posters in portraying the need for and success of the redesigned solution?
- Has the team adopted an innovative/creative approach to selecting the comparative artifacts and contexts?
- What is the overall quality/clarity of the info-graphics?
- Does the presentation clearly express the team's thesis in an organized fashion?
- Is the presentation free from major grammatical errors and typos?

Selected Resources (Most of which are on reserve at the Webster Library under DART 262 Reserves):

- _____. *World Health Organization*. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [<http://www.who.int>]
- Bachelard, Gaston. *The Poetics of Space*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1994. Print.
- Bain, A. "Constructing contemporary artistic identities in Toronto neighborhoods." *Canadian Geographer* 47.3 (2003): 303-317.
- Bjorkegren, D. *The culture business*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Brown, Tim. "Serious Play: The Link Between Creativity and Play." *TED*. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://www.ted.com/talks/tim_brown_on_creativity_and_play?language=en]
- City of Montréal. "Framework, guiding principles and statement for a cultural policy." *Summary of the Report of the Advisory Group*. June 2, 2003.
- Busch, Akiko. *Geography of Home: Writings on Where We Live*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999. Print.
- Chapman, Jonathan and Nick Gant, eds. *Designers, Visionaries and Other Stories*. London: Earthscan, 2007. Print.
- de Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988. Print.
- Design Montréal. "Towards Designation as a UNESCO City of Design." *Réalisons Montréal*. 2006. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [https://designmontreal.com/sites/designmontreal.com/files/publications/candidature_montreal_ville_unesco_design_-_anglais.pdf]
- Dreyfuss, Henry. *Designing for People*. New York: Allworth Press, 2003 (First published in 1955). Print.
- Friends of the High Line. "The High Line." *The High Line*. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [<http://www.thehighline.org/>]
- IDEO. "Human-centered design toolkit." *IDEO*. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [<http://www.designkit.org/>]

- Kelley, David. "Human-Centered Design." *TED*. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://www.ted.com/talks/lang/eng/david_kelley_on_human_centered_design.html]
- TED. "Design Like you give a damn channel." *TED*. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://blog.ted.com/design_like_you/]
- Matsuura, K. À l'occasion de la remise du diplôme désignant la Ville de Montréal, Canada, « Ville de design, Membre du réseau des villes créatives de l'Alliance globale pour la diversité culturelle ». Address by the Director General of UNESCO given on June 6, 2006.
- Mau, B. *Massive Change*. London: Phaidon Press, 2004.
- Mau, B. "About." *Massive Change*. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [<http://www.massivechangenetwork.com>]
- Mercer Human Resource Consulting. "Mercer's 2010 Quality of Living Survey." *Mercer*. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [<https://www.imercer.com/content/mobility/quality-of-living-city-rankings.html>]
- Norman, Donald. *The Design of Everyday Things*. New York: Doubleday, 1990.
- UNESCO. "The Creative Cities Network." *United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization*. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [<http://en.unesco.org/creative-cities/home>]
- van Schaik, Leon ed. *Poetics in Architecture*. London: Wiley-Academy, 2002. Print.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

In creative disciplines, the evaluation process is not always transparent or clearly stated. Multiple-choice and automated tests are easy to administer, but they cannot replicate the qualitative assessment necessary to judge a work of art or design. It is the instructor's role to determine the relative merit based upon multiple factors—some technical, some ethical, and others, aesthetic:

- Does the project meet the requirements, as stated in Assignment criteria?
- How much effort or engagement was involved in completing the project?
- Does the final work thoughtfully or provocatively comment on the chosen subject?
- Has the student progressed technically or conceptually in the development process?
- Does the work demonstrate an understanding of the creative and compositional principles discussed in the class sessions?
- Did the student make incremental progress on a week-to-week basis?
- Does the project demonstrate innovation, challenge, or take risks?
- Has the student exceeded the instructor's expectations?
- How closely does the work mirror professional/industry standards?

Having considered these factors, among others, the instructor must determine where the project should be placed within a given range for each criteria. The cumulative assessment of these factors is translated into a letter grade. For further granularity, please review the following general grade range descriptions:

D-RANGE:
[MARGINAL PASS]
 The work is unsatisfactory. The student has unsuccessfully completed the project and/or has met only the most basic requirements. The work may exhibit only a passing resemblance to the criteria laid out for the project. The student may have diverged from the criteria without previous discussion with the instructor. The student may have submitted a project from another course or situation, and claimed it to be new work. The work is rife with mistakes, or is possibly unplayable/unreadable without expert technical intervention and/or a very forgiving eye. The work is incoherent or does not successfully or meaningfully communicate a concept or theme. The student is not progressing in their development. The work is below average in the opinion of the instructor.

C-RANGE: The work is acceptable. The student has made an earnest attempt to fulfill criteria

[SATISFACTORY] laid out for the project. The student is not progressing well in their development. The student has not taken sufficient time to internalize, understand, own, and interpret the criteria for the project. The student may be unclear on the criteria for the project and has not asked for clarification from colleagues or the instructor. The student may have diverged substantially from the criteria without previous consultation with the instructor. The student has not referenced secondary sources of information or experience outside the classroom. The work contains too many technical errors – i.e. poor transitions, inappropriate pacing or conceptual structure, failure to acknowledge quoted material, scripting errors, audio problems, grammatical or spelling mistakes, too short or substantially too long. The work is average and acceptable in the opinion of the instructor.

B-RANGE:
[VERY GOOD] The work is good. The student has made an earnest attempt to fulfill the criteria laid out for the project. The student is progressing in their development. The student has taken sufficient time to internalize, understand, own, and interpret the criteria for the project, with notable success. The student may have referenced a few secondary sources of information or experience in an interesting way. The student's interpretation of the criteria may be somewhat lacking. The interpretation may lack sufficient personal voice or originality; it may be unsubtle. The work may experiment earnestly without huge success. The student may have diverged slightly from the criteria without previous consultation with the instructor. The work may contain a few technical errors – i.e. poor transitions, inappropriate pacing or conceptual structure, failure to acknowledge quoted material, scripting errors, audio problems, grammatical or spelling mistakes, too short or substantially too long. The work is generally good in the opinion of the instructor.

A-RANGE:
[OUTSTANDING] The work is excellent. The student has fulfilled the criteria laid out for the project through active engagement while demonstrating a personal voice. The student has referenced many secondary sources of information or experience in an interesting way. The student has internalized all project criteria and offers supplementary ideas that support the criteria, or skillfully deconstructs the established criteria in a creative way. The student is progressing at an above-average rate. The project is at least almost totally free of technical errors. The project probably demonstrates earnest and successful experimentation.

A+: The student has fulfilled all criteria worthy of an A mark and has excelled beyond the instructor's expectations. The work approaches or attains the capacity of a professional in the field. The work approaches suitability for publication or professional broadcast. The work represents substantial, innovative experimentation.

DART 262|4 A : EXPLORING DESIGN STUDIES: READINGS, RESOURCES & ACTIVITIES [WINTER 2021]

		LECTURE	TUTORIAL
WEEK 1	JANUARY 19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video Screenings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Gord's Gold</i>. Anonymous, c. 2004. Video. [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5S5r0PEeme4] ○ Topolsky, Joshua. "The Engadget Show: Inside the mind of designer Philippe Starck [interview]." <i>The Engadget Show</i>. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [https://www.engadget.com/video/55499b01e4b0f61941d8da2c/] • Websites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ "MUJI Global." <i>MUJI</i>, n.d. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://www.muji.com/] • Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Garland, Ken. "First Things First." London: Goodwin Press, 1964. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://www.kengarland.co.uk/KG-published-writing/first-things-first] ○ Barnbrook, Jonathan et al. "First Things First 2000." <i>Eye</i> 33.8 (1999). Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://www.eyemagazine.com/feature/article/first-things-first-manifesto-2000] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Respond to Moodle question/prompt <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 25-word statement of design ethos ▪ Emblematic artifact illustrating design ethos (with 100-word rationale)
WEEK 2	JANUARY 26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare for Class: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Antonelli, Paola. "Design 1:1." <i>Design and the Elastic Mind</i>. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2008. 19-25, Print. ▪ Antonelli, Paola. "@ at MoMA." <i>MoMA Inside Out</i>. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [https://www.moma.org/explore/inside_out/2010/03/22/at-moma/] ▪ Hess, Amanda. "Look Who's Smiley Now: MoMA Acquires Original Emoji." <i>The New York Times</i>. Web. 29 Dec. 2021. [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/27/arts/design/look-whos-smiley-now-moma-acquires-original-emoji.html?_r=0] ○ Websites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ "Design Playground." <i>IDEO</i>. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://designs-on.com/] • Video Screenings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Powers of 10</i>. Dir. Charles and Ray Eames. IBM, 1968. DVD. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0fKBhvDjuy0] ○ Kelley, David Kelley. "Human-Centered Design." <i>TED</i>. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://www.ted.com/talks/david_kelley_on_human_centered_design?language=en] • Websites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ "The Long Now Foundation." <i>The Long Now Foundation</i>. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://www.longnow.org/] ○ Cage, John. "As Slow as Possible." <i>The Long Now Foundation</i>. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://blog.longnow.org/2008/10/02/as-slow-as-possible/] ○ "Movatar." <i>Stelarc</i>. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://stelarc.org/?catID=20225] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video Screenings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Antonelli, Paola. "Design as Art." <i>TED</i>. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://www.ted.com/talks/paola_antonelli_treats_design_as_art.html] • Homework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Respond to Moodle question/prompt ○ <i>Show and Tell (a Lie)</i>
WEEK 3	FEBRUARY 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare for Class: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dunne, Anthony and Fiona Raby. <i>Design Noir: The Secret Life of Electronic Objects</i>. London: August/Birkhauser, 2001. 58-63. Print. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Respond to Moodle question/prompt

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fuad-Luke, Alastair. "Reflection, Consciousness, Progress: Creatively Slow Designing the Present." Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://www.learnmegood.ca/262/3/alastairfuad-luke.pdf] ○ Websites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ "About"; "Projects." <i>DROOG</i>. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://www.droog.com] ▪ "Projects." <i>Dunne & Raby</i>. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://www.dunneandraby.co.uk/content/projects] • Video Screenings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Objectified</i>. Dir. Gary Hustwit, 2008. DVD. [Dunne & Raby segment]. [https://documentaryheaven.com/objectified/] ○ <i>Technological Dream Series: No.1, Robots</i>. Dir. Dunne & Raby, 2008. Video. [http://vimeo.com/2611597] ○ Design Guide. "Dry Tech: Interview with DROOG." <i>Dutch Design Lab</i>. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1joYcaAmAhM] ○ "A Touch of Green." Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://www.vimeo.com/954784] ○ <i>Hotel DROOG</i>. Dir. Fendy Ekel Design, 2002. DVD. [http://www.droog.com/project/hotel-droog] ○ <i>DROOG: Go Slow</i>. Dir. Fendy Ekel Design, 2004. DVD. [http://www.droog.com/project/go-slow] • Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Honoré, Carl. <i>In Praise of Slowness</i>. New York: Harper San Francisco, 2004. Print ○ Thorpe, Ann. <i>The Designer's Atlas of Sustainability</i>. Washington: Island Press, 2007. Print. ○ van Hinte, Ed. <i>Eternally Yours: Time in Design: Product Value Sustenance</i>. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2004. Print. • Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Show and Tell (a Lie)</i> 	
WEEK 4	FEBRUARY 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare for Class: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fabricant, Robert. "Design with Intent." <i>Design Mind on GOOD</i>. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [https://www.good.is/articles/design-with-intent] ○ Kuutti, Kari. "HCI and Design – Uncomfortable Bedfellows?" (<i>Re</i>)searching the Digital Bauhaus, ed. Thomas Binder, Jonas Löwgren, and Lone Malmberg. London: Springer, 2009. 43-59. Print. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Respond to Moodle question/prompt
WEEK 5	FEBRUARY 16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare for Class: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Chapman, Jonathan. "Authors of Experience." <i>Emotionally Durable Design: Objects, Experiences & Empathy</i>. London: Earthscan, 2005. 83-109. Print. ▪ Krippendorff, Klaus. "Trajectory of artificiality"; "Products"; "Design"; "Functionalism." <i>The Semantic Turn: A New Foundation for Design</i>. Boca Raton: CRC/Taylor & Francis, 2006. 5-7, 25-32, & 285-288. Print. • Websites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Learnmonth, Michael. "The Cuddletech Revolution." <i>Metro</i>, 28 Jan.-3 Feb. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~kiesler/anthropomorphism-org/pdf/cuddletech-revolution.pdf] ▪ "Lists of Colors." <i>Wikipedia</i>. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lists_of_colors] • Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dunne, Anthony. <i>Hertzian Tales: Electronic Products, Aesthetic Experience, and Critical Design</i>. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005. Print. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Respond to Moodle question/prompt ○ <i>Je me souviens Part 1: complete paper</i>

WEEK 6	FEBRUARY 23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare for Class: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Turkle, Sherry. "Introduction: The Things that Matter." <i>Evocative Objects: Things We Think With</i>. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007. 3-10. ▪ Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly. "Design and Order in Everyday Life." <i>Design Issues</i> 8.1 (Autumn 1991): 26-34. Print. ▪ Attfield, Judith. "The Meaning of Things: design in the lower case." <i>Wild Things: The Material Culture of Everyday Life</i>. Oxford: Berg Publishers, 2000. 75-95. Print. • Video Screenings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Objectified</i>. Dir. Gary Hustwit, 2008. DVD. [IDEO segment]. [https://documentaryheaven.com/objectified/] • Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Auslander, Leora. "Beyond Words." <i>The American Historical Review</i>, 110.4 (October 2005). Print. ○ Busch, Akiko. <i>The Uncommon Life of Common Objects</i>. New York: Metropolis, 2004. Print. • Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Je me souviens Part 1: submit hard copy</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Respond to Moodle question/prompt
READING BREAK	MARCH 1-7	Reading Break: No Classes	
WEEK 7	MARCH 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare for Class: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Krippendorff, Klaus. "Stakeholders in Design"; "Stakeholder Networks." <i>The Semantic Turn: A New Foundation for Design</i>. Boca Raton: CRC/Taylor & Francis, 2006. 63-65 & 181-183. Print. ▪ Moggridge, Bill. "Designing Interactions"; "People." <i>Designing Interactions</i>. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007. 647-681. Print. ○ Websites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Daily tous les jours. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://www.dailytouslesjours.com/] ▪ "About"; "Process." <i>Frog Design</i>. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://www.frogdesign.com] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video Screening: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Radiant City</i>. Dir. Gary Burns, 2007. DVD. [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pFNdQDBY2rY] • Homework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Respond to Moodle question/prompt ○ Complete Exhibition Review Over Break
WEEK 8	MARCH 16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare for Class: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Norman, Donald A. "We Are All Designers." <i>Emotional Design: Why We Love (or Hate) Everyday Things</i>. New York: Basic Books, 2004. 213-227. Print. ▪ Shove, Elizabeth et al. "Products, Processes and Practices." <i>The Design of Everyday Life</i>. Oxford: Berg Publishers, 2008. 139-152. Print. ▪ Thackara, John. "Flow." <i>In the Bubble: Designing in a Complex World</i>. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005. 211-226. Print. ▪ Thursfield, Paul et al. "Flow: The Emergence of Richness from Simplicity." <i>The New Everyday: Views on Ambient Intelligence</i>, ed. Emile Aarts and Stefano Marzano. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2003. 132-137. Print. [Google Books: http://books.google.ca/books?id=Xm7WGid-RWkC&printsec=frontcover&dq=the+new+everyday+views&hl=en&sa=X&ei=buXwTpKqGIng0QHiybGcAg&ved=0CDAQ6AEwAA-v=onepage&q=the+new+everyday+views&f=false] • Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Hekkert, Paul. "Design Aesthetics: Principles of Pleasure in Design." <i>Psychology Science</i>, 48.2 (2006): 157-172. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Respond to Moodle question/prompt

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Print. • Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Exhibition Review: submit hard copy 	
WEEK 9	MARCH 23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare for Class: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Gaver, Bill. "Designing for <i>Homo Ludens</i>." (Re)searching the Digital Bauhaus ed. Thomas Binder, Jonas Löwgren, and Lone Malmborg. London: Springer, 2009. 163-178. Print. • IDEO. "Human-centered design toolkit." <i>IDEO</i>. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://www.designkit.org/] • Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Huizinga, Johan. <i>Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play-Element in Culture</i>. Boston: Beacon Press, 1955. Print. ○ Dreyfuss, Henry. <i>Designing for People</i>. New York: Allworth Press, 2003 (First published in 1955). Print. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Respond to Moodle question/prompt
WEEK 10	MARCH 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare for Class: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Severs, Jason. "Design: A New Engine for Society." <i>Design Mind on GOOD</i>, December 10, 2009. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [https://www.good.is/articles/design-a-new-engine-for-society] ▪ Lawrie, Samantha. "Graphic Design: Can it be Something More? Report on research in progress." <i>Art, Design & Communication in Higher Education</i>, 6.3 (2008): 201-207. Print. ○ Websites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Canadian Centre for Architecture. "Actions: What You Can Do With the City." <i>CCA</i>. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [https://www.cca.qc.ca/en/events/2689/actions-what-you-can-do-with-the-city] • Video Screenings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Brown, Tim. "Serious Play: The Link Between Creativity and Play." <i>TED</i>. Web. 29 Dec. 2021 [http://www.ted.com/talks/tim_brown_on_creativity_and_play?language=en] • Readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Papanek, Victor J. <i>Design for the Real World: Human Ecology and Social Change</i>. London: Thames and Hudson, 1985. Print. ○ Press, Mike and Rachel Cooper. <i>The Design Experience</i>. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003. Print. ○ Kolarevic, Branko. "Towards the Performative in Architecture." <i>Performative Architecture: Beyond Instrumentality</i>, ed. Branko Kolarevic and Ali Malkawi. New York: Spon Press, 2004. 204-213. Print. ○ Busch, Akiko. <i>Geography of Home: Writings on Where We Live</i>. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999. Print. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Respond to Moodle question/prompt ○ <i>Je me souviens</i> Part 2: prepare for class presentation (random selection)
WEEK 11	APRIL 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Je me souviens</i> Part 2: class presentations (random selection) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Je me souviens</i> Part 2: prepare for class presentation (random selection)
WEEK 12	APRIL 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Je me souviens</i> Part 2: class presentations (random selection) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Je me souviens</i> Part 3: complete poster layouts

- Assessment:
 - *Je me souviens* **Part 3**: upload posters

**Note: Most print readings are available as PDFs through the course reserves for DART 262 on the Library website. Everything else is online and/or through the LearnMeGood course portal.*