

1.1

I found the section “*c. Necessary design knowledge is distributed among many design participants.*” to be particularly interesting because in this section the design domains can be essentially compared to peer editing. An example would be a peer editing group or workshop for a paper or essay where group members critique each other’s work and make comments on what can be improved upon or added etc. Each person will have a different opinion on what a “correct” paper is and no one opinion is necessarily the best. It is at the author’s discretion on whether or not to use the gained knowledge from his colleagues. Any further discussion of the paper can be done and any negotiation on what a plausible solution will all be done within the group during that time. I just find making solutions from a group’s standpoint to be much more effective because you get other’s experience and input on the specific design. That being said, the end product will be better suited for more diverse environments. Whereas the latter could be susceptible to hidden obstacles not seen by the designer earlier in the process of assembly.

1.2

The only section that didn’t seem to interest me was *Applying Computer-Based Critiquing to Design*. It seems to me like although the user is gaining a confidence boost, they’re doing more work than necessary. In my mind, a computer program is a network of information that people get paid to compile and put into a program that runs different scripts to accomplish a goal. By using a program that only helps one to attain this goal seems to defeat the purpose of having a program in the first place. I would opt for an expert system design a solution for me rather than something that merely helps me find a solution.

1.3

I’d say that this does relate to my own work as a student in that most aspects of schooling require critiquing by the professor. When a paper is commented on or when a project is graded the instructor is critiquing your work to help you become more efficient in certain areas. This is true for most concepts of life. No one is perfect therefore there is always room for improvement. Which is essentially what this paper seeks to define in my opinion.

2.

This paper in my opinion justifies the idea that design environments with embedded critic mechanisms are superior to systems that do not incorporate these critic mechanisms.

3.

I would like to know more about *Applying Computer-Based Critiquing to Design*. I find this the most interesting aspect and I agree with it very strongly.

Corey Davis

4.

Until now I have never heard of the term DODE. I also have not come across any other systems other than peer editing etc. that illustrate different ideas of Critiquing.

5. I believe the article incorporates all three elements into the main idea. Without them there couldn't really be a system that works efficiently. In order to create a system you first have to design it. In order to get the system to run properly you must learn more about it, i.e. what works, and what doesn't work. To further improve on the system one must collaborate with others so that different viewpoints can be accounted for.

6.

I'm not really sure. Possibly take a poll from CU Boulder students on how they best solve their day to day problems?