This course is designed to help graduate-level students develop and learn to effectively utilize an eclectically informed array of knowledge bolstered by a set of critical writing skills, especially as they affect the creation of argumentative, analytical and expository prose, or, as necessary, combinations of these. This amalgam of knowledge and skills will allow them to think, discuss and write more reflectively and innovatively about design, design processes and issues related to design, and the complex blend of social, technological, economic, environmental and political factors that affect and are affected by design decision-making. The use of the term “innovatively” in the last sentence is indicative of one of the primary philosophical tenets that guide how the processes of generating and disseminating criticism will be taught this semester in this course. Students will be challenged to operate a select array of four to six critical methods in their writing over the course of the semester to:

a. inspire critical inquiry among particular audiences as a means to motivate them to specific types of responses and actions;
b. instigate and then sustain the types of creative activity that lead to new ideas that can then themselves be re-interpreted and criticized.

The learning experiences that constitute the coursework of this course have been designed to challenge students to engage in eclectically informed, critically rigorous and logically structured argumentation so that the critical analyses they write and deploy have the potential to affect some form of positive social, cultural, technological, economic, environmental or political change. To help facilitate this process, the instructor will begin each scheduled section of the course by leading a discussion(s) centered around a specific critical method or methodology. This discussion will be supported by assigned readings that either address or effectively utilize the method or methodology in question. What students learn from these discussions and readings will then inform their development of critically informed arguments that will be articulated in critical essays they write to address particular designed responses—manifest as artifacts, systems of communication, human habitation, transport, ways of facilitating education, healthcare or public safety, processes for designing, manufacturing and engaging in the increasingly inter- and trans-disciplinary practices of design, etc.—that could eventually be broadly distributed.

Each scheduled section of this course will require students to work on an editorial board comprised of at least two of their peers. This will help them learn editorial skills as it simultaneously bolsters their respective abilities to formulate their own critical ideas and critique those developed by others. Each student will also be exposed to—and will hopefully learn to appreciate and then cultivate—divergent viewpoints as the writing processes evolve during each of the scheduled sections of this course.

1. An examination of the “course schedule in brief” (it begins on page 12 of this document) will reveal that there are six of these that will occur over the course of the long semester.

Course Ethos

It is the express intent of the instructor of ADES 5515 to maintain a broadly informed, objectively facilitated teaching and learning environment. All involved with the evolution of the learning experiences being facilitated during this course should endeavor to allow and encourage each other to develop and exercise the critical skill sets necessary to analyze literature, arguments, and scientific, subjective and designerly assumptions related to the formulation and development of critical inquiry and its intentions and outcomes. The more nuanced skill sets that participants in this course must
Course Ethos (continued)

explore and adroitly deploy as they critically yet respectfully assess the thoughts of their classmates and their instructor are crucial to its successful day-to-day operations. This mutuality of support and respectfully exercised criticism will make the classroom environment of ADES 5515 one in which a wide variety of ideas may be developed, explored, and brought to maturity.

Prerequisites

MA and MFA candidates enrolled in the Design with Concentrations in Design Research and Design for Sustainability programs within UNT CVAD must have passed ADES 5520 prior to enrolling in this course; Master’s- and Doctoral-level students from outside UNT CVAD’s Department of Design must receive special written permission from the instructor to gain admittance into this course. This written permission may be granted only after the instructor has either 1. reviewed two to three recent examples of scholarly writing from the applicant, or 2. the instructor has received written support on behalf of the applicant from a full-time UNT faculty member who possesses experiential knowledge of the applicant’s scholarly ability.

Required Texts

*The Elements of Style (Fourth Edition; most of you should already own and be familiar with this)*
William Strunk, Jr. and E.B. White
Longman Publishers

*Stylish Academic Writing (if you don’t wish to purchase the ink-on-paper version, try downloading the free e-book .pdf at http://www.scribd.com/doc/179545316/Stylish-Academic-Writing-Helen-Sword#scribd)*
Helen Sword
Harvard University Press

*Critical Thinking: A Concise Guide (Second Edition; Save yourself money and get the Kindle Edition)*
Gary Kemp and Tracy Bowell
T & F Books, UK

*The Philosopher’s Toolkit: A Compendium of Philosophical Concepts and Methods*
Julian Baggini and Peter S. Fosl

Recommended Texts

2. Please note that there are “lots” of these due to the very unique nature of the learning experience that has been planned for you this semester in ADES 5515. These texts will expose you to a wide variety of approaches to criticism in and around design, design thinking, design research and design practice. I don’t expect you to read them all over the course of the coming semester but I do strongly encourage you to become at least “passably familiar” with the viewpoints and general critical approaches of those who have written them as the next two to 25 years of your life evolves...

(Continued on next page.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The Design of Future Things</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald A. Norman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Design of Everyday Things</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald A. Norman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Design Issues: How Graphic Design Informs Society</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edited by DK Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allworth Press</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With that stated, know that as the semester progresses, it is my intent to create opportunities for each of you to discover, learn about and, ultimately, construct knowledge from the broad spectrum of critical arenas, “critical voices,” argumentative structures and rhetorical styles you’ll become familiar with as you “peruse and skim” the contents of this list. You will likely utilize material from some of these resources to bolster your own critical writing between now and Thursday, May 12 (the date of the deadline for the final paper/final exam due in this course).

### Recommended Texts (Continued)

**Design Discourse: History, Theory, Criticism**  
Victor Margolin  
The University of Chicago Press

**Interaction Design: Beyond Human-Computer Interaction**  
Yvonne Rogers, Jenny Sharp, Heather Preece  
Wiley & Sons

**Cradle to Cradle: Re-Thinking the Way We Make Things**  
Michael Braungart  
North Point Press

**Design Disasters: Great Designers, Fabulous Failures & Lessons Learned**  
Edited by Steven Heller  
Allworth Press

**Cracking the Whip: Essays on Design and Its Side Effects**  
Ralph Caplan  
Fairchild Publications

**Design for the Other 90%**  
Cynthia E. Smith  
Editions Assouline

**The Death and Life of Great American Cities**  
Jane Jacobs  
Vintage Press

**The Third Teacher: 79 Ways You Can Use Design to Transform Teaching & Learning**  
OWP Architects, VS Furniture, Bruce Mau  
Abrams Publishing

**Design Like You Give A Damn: Architectural Responses To Humanitarian Crises**  
Architecture for Humanity, K. Stohr, C. Sinclair  
Metropolis Books

**Design Revolution: 100 Products That Empower People**  
Emily Pillotan and Allan Chochinov  
Metropolis Books

**Designing Design**  
Kenya Hara  
Lars Müller Publishers

**A Rulebook for Arguments (Fourth Edition)**  
Anthony Weston  
Hackett Publishing Company

**By Design: Why There Are No Locks on the Bathroom Doors of the Hotel Louis XIV and Other Object Lessons (Second Edition)**  
Ralph Caplan  
Fairchild Publications

**Design, Writing, Research: Writing on Graphic Design**  
Ellen Lupton  
Phaidon Press

**How to Be a Graphic Designer Without Losing Your Soul**  
Adrian Shaughnessy  
Princeton Architectural Press

**Massive Change**  
Bruce Mau and the Institute Without Boundaries  
Phaidon Press

**Design for the Real World: Human Ecology and Social Change**  
Victor Papanek  
Academy Chicago Publishers

A. Steffen, B. McKibben, V. Jones, S. Sagmeister  
Abrams Publishing

**Expanding Architecture: Design as Activism**  
B. Bell, K. Wakeford, S. Badanes, R. Feldman, S. Palleroni, K. Swenson, T. Fisher, J. Peterson  
Metropolis Books

**Success Through Failure**  
Henry Petroski  
Princeton University Press
Recommended Texts
(Continued)

To Engineer Is Human: The Role of Failure in Successful Design
Henry Petroski
Vintage Press

Inviting Disaster: Lessons From the Edge of Technology
James R. Chiles
Harper Business Press

The Logic Of Failure: Recognizing And Avoiding Error In Complex Situations
Dietrich Dorner
Basic Books

Design History: Understanding Theory and Method
Kjetil Fallan
Berg Publishers

The Culture of Design
Guy Julier
Sage Publications

Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design
Gunther Kress, Theo van Leeuwen
Routledge Press

Introducing Social Semiotics: An Introductory Textbook
Theo van Leeuwen
Routledge Press

Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to the Interpretation of Visual Materials
Gillian Rose
Sage Publications

The Designed World: Images, Objects, Environments
Richard Buchanan, Victor Margolin, Dennis Doordan
Berg Publishers

Design Studies: A Reader
Edited by Hazel Clark and David Brody
Berg Publishers

No Logo: 10th Anniversary Edition
Naomi Klein
Picador Publishing

The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism
Naomi Klein
Picador Publishing

Design Thinking: Understanding How Designers Think and Work
Nigel Cross
Berg Publishers

The Design of Business: Why Design Thinking is the Next Competitive Advantage
Roger L. Martin
Harvard Business School Press

Writing Design: Words and Objects
Grace Lees-Maffei
Berg Publishers

The Industrial Design Reader
Carma Gorman
Allworth Press

History of Modern Design (2nd Edition)
David Raizman
Prentice Hall

An Introduction to Design and Culture: 1900 to the Present
Penny Sparke
Routledge Press

The DK Handbook (2nd Edition)
Anne Francis Wysocki, Dennis A. Lynch
Longman Press

Design and Cultural Responsibility: Ideas for Citizens & Decisionmakers in Communities, Business & Government
Jack Williamson
Cranbrook Academy of Art Press

3. This title might be a good one for all of you to purchase. It’s very handy to have around this semester and for the remainder of your graduate careers, as it accomplishes its purpose of helping university-level writers prepare to and then actually write effectively.
**Course Syllabus**

**Recommended Texts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Design in the Twentieth Century</td>
<td>Gregory Votolato</td>
<td>Manchester University Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amusing Ourselves to Death</td>
<td>Neil Postman</td>
<td>Penguin Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventing the Medium: Principles of Interaction</td>
<td>Janet H. Murray</td>
<td>MIT Press</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course Objectives**

Students enrolled in this course will be introduced to and then challenged to utilize a select group of distinct methodologies for engaging in intellectually rigorous, eclectically informed critical thinking and writing about design, designing and the social, technological, environmental, economic and political transformations that processes of design and design thinking affect throughout the world. The learning experiences that comprise the coursework will be facilitated by analytical reading, class discussions and iteratively structured writing assignments. Each of the scheduled sections of this course will afford students an opportunity to choose from a broad range of designed artifacts, systems, environments, services, experiences and processes to critically analyze and evaluate. Each of these learning experiences will present individual students with the means to suggest new ways to interpret, situate, examine or even completely re-envision that which they have chosen to critically analyze, or the contexts within which whatever they have chosen to analyze exists. Students may choose to focus the attentions of each of the challenges posed to them during their scheduled course experiences on web-based, interactive experiences, the design of networks, built environments, visual communications, manufactured products and experiences, transport systems, processes of design decision-making, professional practice issues, apparel and urban planning projects.

Between January 20 and May 5, students enrolled in this course will have been afforded several opportunities to develop the intellectual tools necessary to initially formulate, iteratively develop, craft argumentative structure and ultimately write cogent, actionable criticisms of a wide variety of designed endeavors. The operational rubric that will guide the activities of this course has been designed to satisfy the following objectives:

1. expand students’ understanding of the roles that design plays in contemporary society that affect manufacturing practices, socio-economic functionality, the cultivation, usage and decay of natural resources, societal organization, political agendas and initiatives and the development and degradation of technologies;

2. facilitate students’ abilities to utilize knowledge from philosophy, anthropology, sociology, history, ethics, economy and ecology to eclectically inform their thinking and their writing and, ultimately, their ability to critically champion new and innovative ideas about how the process of design should and should not affect the world;

3. sensitize students to the ever-increasing need for designers and those involved with designing or innovative transformative practices to broaden the scope of their criticism of designed endeavors beyond the analysis of aesthetics and functionality, so that they might begin to cultivate an understanding of how these endeavors shape and are simultaneously shaped by a broad range of social, technological, environmental, economic and political factors;
Course Objectives (continued)

4. present students with opportunities to effectively develop the critical thinking and communication skills necessary to integrate thinking from the array of perspectives described in aspirations 1, 2 and 3 into a specific array of written critical assessments of design and design decision-making;

5. allow graduate students enrolled in graduate-level design courses as well as from the broader array of disciplines fostered at UNT to employ criticism as a research tool to facilitate more insightful consideration of the initial design challenge by multiplying and deepening the perspectives from which these challenges are viewed;

6. enlighten students to the fact that criticism is not an activity that occurs exclusively after an artifact(s) or system(s) to which it has been applied has/have been created, but that it is also a process which can and should precede or parallel their development;

7. teach students to utilize the critical writing process as a framework and a rigorously disciplinary method for organizing, refining and sharing their thinking and problem-solving ideas with others.

Course Structure

The first three weeks of the semester will be devoted to the study and active analysis of selected methods for both analyzing and structuring written criticism as arguments (as will be addressed in students’ assigned readings from Kemp and Bowell, Sword, and Baggini and Fosi), as well as a brief introduction to visual research and the idea (from John Berger) that “we never look at only one thing; we are always looking at the relationship between things and ourselves.” This first exercise is designed to help students marry

1. their extant, “derived-from-their-experiences-of-living-in-the-world” skills that involve the evaluation of arguments with
2. their abilities to assess particular points of view to
3. the challenges inherent in doing this when they are presented with scholarly arguments presented in academic materials.

The goal of this experience is to have students complete its challenges with the knowledge that they entered ADES 5515 possessing some of the habits of mind necessary to engage in the effective evaluation of arguments and viewpoints, and that this course will enable them to expand and deepen their abilities to utilize these habits of mind to engage in fruitful critical analytical processes.

The four—perhaps five—critical approaches that will be successively explored and then employed throughout the remainder of the semester are:

1. genealogical criticism (analyzing the impact of historical design influences and origins),
2. zeitgeist criticism (understanding the symptomatology, etiology and design challenges inherent to a specific period and a specific socio-cultural “place”),
3. rhetorical criticism (this involves the analysis of how specific “artifacts” function as concrete manifestations of concrete rhetorical structures, such as persuasive ideas, attitudes, beliefs, assumptions, propaganda, etc., which the analysis then reveals and evaluates),
4. ethical criticism (examining the relationship between various value systems, design and cultural, economic, environmental and social responsibilities),
5. formal criticism (analyzing and assessing how the formal characteristics of a thing or an experience affect the perception of it among particular groups; this is a possibility, rather than a probability, a “we’ll see how things go” opportunity)
The course schedule calls for each student to utilize one of these approaches to inform his/her writing of a critical essay within a specified span of time (these are referred to previously in this document as the “scheduled sections of this course”). If time is available at semester’s end to allow the students to engage in writing a fifth paper as a “re-write” of one of the papers they wrote earlier in the semester, this opportunity will be operated as part of the course and will afford individual students an opportunity to replace the lowest grade they earned on an assigned critical essay with this re-write.

The development process for each of the four critical essays assigned in this course will transpire over the course of three class periods beginning the third week of the semester (February 4). They will all follow a similar series of iterative steps, which are outlined here:

1. a particular critical method will be introduced by the instructor, and then it merits for design study and practice will be discussed by the class—it will be the responsibility of each class member to “bring” (or present) a designed artifact, system, style, philosophy, theory, value system, issue, design phenomenon or process to the class on these “introduction days” (these will occur on February 4, February 25, March 24 and April 14, respectively).

2. selected readings will be assigned that will help students grasp the primary conceptual tenets which inform that particular critical method, as well as help students understand how and why that method can be employed so that new knowledge can be effectively synthesized, utilized and shared by operating it as a basis for critical inquiry;

3. two- to three-person editorial boards will be formed among the students so that individual viewpoints and conceptual directions for each student’s paper can be identified, assessed, augmented and then implemented first into an outline and then into an abstract—it will be extremely critical for each editorial board to selectively divide reading/information gathering and information analysis tasks among its members so that each of them can make an effective contribution to the others;⁴

4. the outlines and abstracts that will drive the formulation of each student’s paper will be presented and discussed in class by their respective editorial boards and by myself;

5. rough drafts of each student’s paper will be presented and discussed in class by their respective editorial boards and by myself;

6. final presentations of each student’s paper will be made in class so that the student’s peers and myself can discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each student’s ideas and writing—students may occasionally be encouraged to re-write and re-submit their papers following this discussion.

There will be one graded exercise that will transpire during the first two weeks of the course. This endeavor will be worth 50 course points. The four critical essays that each student must write that follow this exercise will each be worth a total of 100 course points. Time permitting, a re-written essay will be worth no more than 100 course points; the score earned on this “re-write” will replace the lowest score an individual student earned from among the four previous essays he/she will have already written over the course of the semester. The total number of course points available in ADES 5515.091/601 during the spring semester of 2016 is 450, which equates to a letter grade of “A+.”

⁴ An individual student’s participation on an editorial board will help him or her gain important editorial skills, as well as build confidence in his or her individual ability to formulate and critique ideas, and to help him or her learn to appreciate divergent viewpoints.
Each student will be evaluated not only on his or her ability to craft conceptually strong, readable, well-written papers, but on his or her ability to effectively engage in the process of structuring a primary argument or viewpoint (also known as primary or essential thesis) in each of them that they then effectively articulate and support. This articulation must be structured according to the parameters outlined in the brief that each student will receive prior to writing each essay for that student to earn enough grade points to pass, much less receive a letter grade of “B” or better.

Each essay will require the formulation of an outline, an abstract and a rough draft from each student, as well as his or her meaningful participation in class discussions and peer reviews as each of these papers progresses. All of these factors will affect the grade each student receives at the culmination of each writing assignment.

Throughout the duration of the course, a student’s assertive, articulate participation in and thoughtful contribution to our daily critical dialogue will be imperative to his/her success within it—participation and dialogic contribution will directly affect individual student’s grades. Individual students will also be evaluated on their ability to use the knowledge they will have gained from the assigned readings, class dialogues and their ability to utilize information from sources they will have identified and discovered on their own to effectively complete the assigned research assessment reports and their individual, self-guided research that will transpire over the course of the entire semester. Students enrolled in this course will also be evaluated on their ability to consistently craft conceptually strong and well-reasoned, well-written material in support of their respective research processes as the semester progresses. The ability of each student to effectively engage in the process of structuring and then effectively articulating a primary viewpoint that supports a larger, more comprehensive strategy as their individual research projects progress is essential to the receipt of high assessments as the semester evolves.

Good attendance and punctuality are expected throughout the duration of this course. An inability to maintain either or both of these will have a very detrimental effect your final course grade. Roll will be called at the beginning of every class period and again after the mid class-session break that will occur during every class period. You will be considered late if you arrive after roll has been called. If you are late, it is your responsibility during that class session to make sure that the instructor has not recorded you as being “absent” during that class session. Each student receives two (2) “free tardies” over the course of the entire semester. Beyond that, every two (2) tardies will equal one unexcused absence.

Only two (2) unexcused absences will be allowed over the course of the semester. The third unexcused absence will cause your final semester grade to be lowered by one full letter. The fourth unexcused absence will cause your final semester grade to be lowered by two full letters. The fifth unexcused absence will cause your final semester grade to be lowered by three full letters. A total of six absences, excused or unexcused, will result in you receiving a final letter grade of “F” for this course.

There are no excused absences for anything but a verifiable death in the immediate family or as corroborated by a doctor’s note on his/her stationery with a telephone number or an e-mail address. The doctor’s note must be presented at the beginning of the class session that immediately follows the one you missed. A receipt from a doctor will not be accepted as corroboration of an excused absence.

Note: No cell phone use in class is permitted without prior permission from instructor.

Please notify the instructor if you have a disability that requires accommodation. It is also required that you register with the UNT Office of Disability Accommodation, Student Union, Room 318. The College of Visual Arts and Design policy on accommodation is available upon request in the CVAD Advising offices, Room 111. Further questions and problems on accommodation may be addressed to CVAD’s Director of Advising Christine Sekerke, Art Building, Student Advising, Room 111 (940.565.2216; christine.sekerke@unt.edu).
### Course Syllabus

#### Course Risk Factor
This course has a Risk Rating of Level 2. This means that students may be exposed to some significant hazards but are not likely to suffer serious bodily injury. In this course, those risks are related to X-acto knife usage, the dangers inherent in accidentally inhaling adhesives and fumes, and repetitive stress injuries that can result from extended computer use. Students will be informed of any potential health hazards or potential bodily injury connected with the use of any materials and/or processes and will be instructed regarding how to proceed without danger to themselves or others.

Students who are pregnant or will become pregnant during the course of the semester are advised to check with their doctor immediately to determine if any additional risks are reason to postpone this course until a later semester. Upon request, the instructor of record will provide a list of chemicals and safety issues regarding your enrollment in the course for your doctor to review. Material Safety Data Sheets are available regarding all chemicals used in CVAD courses. It is your responsibility and the responsibility of your doctor to determine what course of action to take.

#### Building Emergency Procedures
In case of an emergency (an alarm will sound), please follow the building evacuation plans posted on each floor of your building and proceed to the nearest parking lot or public park. In the case of a tornado (campus sirens will sound) or other weather related threat, please go to the nearest hallway or room on your floor without exterior windows and remain there until an all-clear signal is sounded. Follow the instructions of your instructor(s) and act accordingly.

#### Center for Student Rights and Responsibilities
The following statement reminds students of their rights and responsibilities within the academic community: “Each University of North Texas student is entitled to certain rights associated with higher education institutions. See www.unt.edu/csrr for further information.”.

#### Additional Policies and Procedures
*Again*: No cell phone, smart phone or tablet computer use of any kind is allowed during any of the class sessions of this course, unless this use is approved by the instructor of record and supports an approved class activity. Laptops may occasionally be used during class (and will sometimes be necessary to engage in coursework/facilitate the learning experiences inherent in this course), but be aware that their use is subject to the permission of the instructor on a class-session by class-session basis.

#### The Possibility of Alterations to the Syllabus
The professor reserves the right to change this syllabus with or without notice at his discretion. Moreover, based on the fluid nature of the course, the potential for dynamic change as a result of the evolution of particular assigned coursework and the learning activities that support it, the professor may and will likely elect to change select projects, learning experiences, outcomes, scheduling, assessment methods and inside- and outside-classroom activities as the semester progresses. At his discretion, the professor will alert students to any changes if and when they are to occur.

#### Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPOT) Evaluations
Beginning on April 18, 2016 and ending on May 1, 2016, each student enrolled in ADES 5515.091/601 will have the opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of the instructor of this course according to a set of criteria that has been pre-determined by representatives of the UNT faculty, administration and student body. To complete the SPOT evaluations for the instructor of this course, please navigate your preferred web browser to https://spot.unt.edu/content/student-resources and follow the instructions that you’ll find there. Please complete this process as thoroughly and as judiciously as you can, as the feedback you provide will provide the instructor and his/her administrators with valuable information regarding steps that might be taken to improve various aspects of this course and how it is taught, as well as how the instructor might make overall improvements to his/her teaching methods.
1. **Grant of Permission.** I, the undersigned, am a student at the University of North Texas (UNT) and I am enrolled in one or more CVAD graduate or undergraduate courses. By the authority of my signature below, I hereby grant UNT permission to utilize, copy, reproduce, publish, distribute or display any and all works created to comply with the requirements of this course in accordance with the terms set forth below. Additionally, I consent to the disclosure of the work created in this class as may be accompanied by my name and other personally identifiable information for purposes as set forth below, as long as the personal information released does not violate UNT FERPA mandates.

2. **Scope of Permission.** This permission extends to the use of the work described as well as images of this work: (one) for academic purposes in order to demonstrate examples of student work to current and future UNT students; (two) for public display in the galleries or on the campus of the UNT or on one or more of the UNT or CVAD websites; (three) for promotional materials created by UNT in all forms of media now known or later developed, including but not limited to exhibitions, catalogues, direct-mail, websites, advertising and classroom presentations. My permission is on-going and will continue until such time as I revoke it by giving UNT three months written notice of revocation to the instructor of record for this course. UNT will have three months from the date of my notice to stop all use in accordance with this permission.

3. **Certificate of Ownership.** I am the owner of all work submitted in accordance with the requirements of the named course and the work is not subject to any grant or restriction that would prevent its use consistent with this permission. All aspects of the work are original to me and have not been copied. I understand that as owner of the work I have the right to control all reproduction, copying and use of the work in accordance with U.S. copyright laws.

4. **Privacy Release.** I hereby authorize and consent to the release, maintenance and display of my name if necessary and any other personally identifiable information that I have provided in connection with the work and its use in accordance with the terms of this Agreement.

5. **Signature.** By signing the attached Student Syllabus Agreement I hereby grant the permissions indicated above. I understand that this grant of permission relates only to the use of the described work. This is not an exclusive right and I may sell, give or otherwise transfer the rights to such work to others on a non-exclusive or exclusive basis. However, in the event that I do sell, give or otherwise transfer ownership or the exclusive right to use my work to another party, I will notify UNT immediately in writing through the instructor of record for this course. UNT will have three months from the date of my notice to stop all use in accordance with this permission.

1. ................................................................. (<< please print your name),

I acknowledge that I have read the course syllabus. I understand the course structure, grading and attendance policies, risk factor rating, and the Student Grant of Publication Permission. By signing this agreement, I acknowledge that I agree to the syllabus and all of its provisions.

Student name ....................................................................................................

Signature ...........................................................................................................
Student's Granting of Permission to Publish Work and Certification of Student's Understanding of the Syllabus (Continued)

Phone contact number ....................................................................................
e-mail ................................................................................................................
Date...................................................................................................................

(Sign and return this form—both the previous page and this page—to your instructor no later than 01.28.15.)
Course Schedule—In-Brief

Week 01 | January 21

Course Overview >>

Briefing re: Class Policies and Procedures >>

Launch of Exercise One (1.21-2.4) >>
Operationalizing Extant Habits of Mind to Evaluate and Construct Viable Arguments
You are to utilize the knowledge you’ll gain from the assigned readings and in-class lectures and discussions that will begin evolving on 1.21 and 1.28 to inform your answers to the set of questions that are posed in the first portion of the document “ADES 5515 Habits of Mind Exercise” in the ADES 5515 Assignment Materials folder in the ADES 5515, Blackboard-facilitated, course support website. These questions need to be answered in a document structured by each of you in MS Word that conforms to the “ADES 5515 student-authored documents template” that appears in the ADES 5515 Foundation Documents folder in the aforementioned course support website.

The questions need to be answered to satisfy the first portion of this exercise, and they must be answered in response to a piece of critical writing that each of you must choose from one of the following sources (listed here in no particular order of significance…) that we’ll begin to discuss on the first night of class, Wednesday, 1.21:

The Design Observer
Design Issues
Design Studies
The International Journal of Design
The Journal of Design History
Journal of Design Research
Design Philosophy Papers

Please be sure to choose an article that is not overlong (less than 2,000 words would be great…) and that states both a clear thesis and conclusion. In addition, please begin working on three different approaches to the “focused topic” portion of this exercise using the prompts that appear on the bottom portion of the “ADES 5515 Habits of Mind Exercise” document—you’ll need to be ready to discuss at least one these one week from this evening.

Readings >>
from Critical Thinking: A Concise Guide (Second Edition; Save yourself money and get the Kindle Edition, or pay between $19 and $25) by Gary Kemp and Tracy Bowell, Chapters 1–3. This material needs to be read, understood and effectively utilized between now and Thursday evening, January 28. These first three chapters are titled:

Ch. 1: Why should we become critical thinkers?
Ch. 2: Logic: deductive validity
Ch. 3: Logic: inductive logic

6. Some of these titles are available in the UNT Library System, either as actual, physical “you can sit down and hold the paper in your hands” readable entities, or in the Electronic Resources section of UNT’s Online holdings. You’ll likely need to access material from both resources. Some of this material is only available by navigating to particular websites and carefully hunting through their archives.

7. Each of you will need to meet with the other members of your respective editorial boards at least once for a couple of hours F-2-F (more likely twice…), and perhaps a few times online at set times this week and next as you prepare to complete this first exercise. You need to “run initial ideas by each other,” critique each other’s argumentative structure, main assumptions, key concepts, point-of-view (POV), etc. The editorial boards for this exercise are:

Zelaya, Roth, Morgan
Torpey, Bond, Wright, Himself
Wang, Huston, McLaughlin, Rivera
Course Schedule-in-Brief (Continued)

Week 02 | January 28

Continuation of Exercise One (1.21–2.4) >>

*Operationalizing Extant Habits of Mind to Evaluate and Construct Viable Arguments*

Be prepared to present and verbally defend/articulate rationales to support your “work-in-progress” materials in response to the questions that occur in the upper portion of the “ADES 5515 Habits of Mind Exercise” document AND be prepared to present and discuss at least one of your “focused topic” approaches in response to the prompts that comprise the bottom portion of this document.

If necessary, project your work-in-progress onto the south wall of the DRC or the large-screen monitor.

*Projecting Ahead >>*

Each of your completed responses to both portions of Exercise One are due for presentation and discussion and must be handed in to me one week from this evening on 2.4 (you can push digital files to me during our class session on one of the DRC computing setups which I’ll download and transfer to my computers later; we’ll hopefully be able to utilize “Turn-It-In” via the ADES 5515 Blackboard-facilitated course support website to allow you to deliver assignment materials to me as the semester progresses, or you can simply send me MS Word documents as e-mail attachments).

*Readings >>*

from the *The Philosopher’s Toolkit*, the following chapters:

1–Basic Tools for Argument” (pages 1–38);
2–More Advanced Tools” (pages 42–68);

To be completed between 2.3 and 2.10.

from the *The Design Observer Group website*, the following article:

“Design Criticism’s Winding Road” by Alice Twemlow:
http://observatory.designobserver.com/entry.html?entry=5887

“Changes in Design Criticism” by Peter Hall

Week 03 | February 4

Due >>

Each student must present and turn in their completed versions of both aspects of Exercise One.

*Launch of Assignment One (2.4–2.25) >>*

Writing critically from a genealogical perspective: analyzing the impact of historical design influences and origins

Between now and 2.25, you will be challenged to write a criticism of a designed artifact or system of artifacts, visual vocabulary or style, functional design configuration, method or methodological approach, philosophy, experience, environment or service. In this context, the “genealogy” of whatever you choose to write about can refer to the ancestry, origin, historical precedents, metamorphosis, developmental or the evolutionary path of a thing (or an object, as long as you maintain your awareness of La Tour’s differentiation between the two...), a principle, an idea or a process.

You’ll need to avoid merely describing the development of whatever you’ve chosen to write about in and of itself. Rather, your primary challenge will be to critically evaluate the significance of a (preferably current) design phenomenon in relation to a single point of origin or a particular stage in a given developmental sequence You’ll need to compare the contexts and values of the
precursor so as to gain some significant insight regarding the current design opportunity and whatever phenomena frame/contextualize it.

Each of you must write your genealogical criticism according to the guidelines that are articulated in the document ADES_5515_Genealogical Criticism Parameters located in the ADES 5515 Assignment Materials folder in the ADES 5515 Blackboard-facilitated course support website.

Projecting Ahead >>

Each of your must begin the process of developing your respective genealogical criticisms by formulating three rough outlines that must be organized and written according to the document titled “ADES 5515 Writing an Effective Outline-revo” that you’ll find in the ADES 5515 Foundation Documents folder in the ADES 5515 Blackboard-facilitated course support website. The “rough beginnings” of all three of these must be presented for class discussion one week from this evening on 2.11 (be ready to tout one of these as your “most promising outline” during next week’s class discussion). Each of the rough outlines you’ll present next week should address a different topic for criticism. Plan on meeting with your editorial boards at least twice f-2-f and once online or via Skype or iChat between now and next week’s class session as a means to help you prepare for what must transpire that evening.

Readings >>

from the “Genealogical Criticism” folder inside the “ADES 5515 Assigned Readings” folder on the ADES 5515 Blackboard-facilitated course support website, the following essays/articles:

“The Cane: Historical and Contemporary Symbolism and Design as a Stimulus for Future Development” by Daniel Koester;

“Considering Design Genealogy” by Leslie Tergas;

“Genealogical Criticism of L’Enfant’s Plan for Washington, D.C.” by Peggy Re

“Eu(jean)ics: The New Fashion in Power” by Lee Quinby

from H. Sword’s Stylish Academic Writing:

“Chapter 1: Rules of Engagement”

Week 04 | February 11

Due >>

Each student must present “rough” versions of the three outlines they were challenged to begin developing to support their writing of a genealogical criticism during this evening’s class session.

Continuation of Assignment One (2.4–2.25) >>

Writing critically from a genealogical perspective: Analyzing the impact of historical design influences and origins

You must each be prepared to circulate copies of your rough outlines to the instructor and your classmates, or to present these to us as projections on the south wall of the DRC or on the large-screen monitor, so that we can critically analyze them as the initial iterations of what will become your final genealogical criticism. Think carefully about the best ways to utilize select ideas (re: the overall approach/"critical stance," use of language/tone, structure and extension of arguments, viability of key premises) that you will have gleaned from the readings you were assigned last week, or from “Critical Thinking: A Concise Guide” or “The Philosopher’s Toolkit,” to help you begin to craft an effective piece. Be prepared to discuss these ideas with the class as you make your presentation(s) to all of us.
**Course Syllabus**

**Projecting Ahead >>**

Each of you must draft a 300- to 500-word abstract based on whichever ONE of the three outlines you presented during this class session you feel will yield the most viable genealogical criticism, or—you must present a significant array of “rough/work-in-progress” aspects of your developing paper, or—you must present all of this material. It is up to each of you to determine exactly what you will present to the rest of us during next week’s class session; if you present a paucity of materials, you will not only hurt your progress, but you will deprive your classmates of what they might have learned from your progress.

Any form of an abstract should clearly and succinctly communicate how you plan to utilize genealogically informed approaches and methods to examine what you’ve chosen to address in your paper, and it should also establish and effectively qualify the over-arching and unifying themes that will make your paper not only understandable and relatable to your readership, but useful and useable to them as well. As you engage in this iterative process, allow your curiosity a good deal of “free reign;” keep hunting for material in the UNT library system and from online archives that you feel will support your contentions and viewpoints, or that will help you bolster your essential arguments. You’ll also need to rely on a consistent stream of critical interactions over the course of the coming week with your editorial board members to help you develop and simultaneously critique your ideas.

**Readings >>**

Each of you is responsible for finding at least six scholarly articles that support your developing genealogical criticism; these can be derived from journals, books, or credible online sources (be aware of the Gould quote re: material derived from blogs “they’re [often] graffiti embellished with punctuation...”). Use some of the resources from the “Recommended Textbooks” section of this document, which begins on p. 2, to supplement these materials.

**Week 05 | February 18**

**Due >>**

Each student must present a 300- to 500-word abstract based on whichever of the three outlines he/she presented during the last class session was evaluated to have the greatest potential for yielding a strong genealogical criticism. Please be prepared to project these so that they may be effectively viewed “at a large scale” by the instructor and all of your classmates. Part of this presentation will entail you having to justify how your chosen scholarly articles effectively bolster one or more aspects of the argument(s) you are trying to make. Students who wish to present “rough/work-in-progress” aspects of their final papers during this class session are heartily encouraged to do so: if you are more comfortable presenting the “rough/work-in-progress” aspects of your paper during this evening’s class session than you are presenting your abstract, you have the freedom to do this.

**Continuation of Assignment One (2.3−2.24) >>**

Writing critically from a genealogical perspective: Analyzing the impact of historical design influences and origins

Bear in mind that it is very often the reading of the abstract—in a conference proceedings or at the beginning of a book chapter or just beneath the title of a journal article—that determines whether or not a given reader will invest his or her “precious time” reading what you have written. Use the writing of your abstract as a means to check the viability of your entire approach, as well as the strength of your key arguments. It may help each of you to “walk back and forth” between working on your abstract and your final paper.

---

12. There’s a software program called “EndNote”—the current version is “X7”—that myself and many other researchers in academic and in various professions use to help us manage scholarly and other types of references as we utilize them in all different types of our writing. It’s available at a discount at the UNT Union bookstore if you show your student ID when making the purchase. Or (i)—if you’re not a big fan of “EndNote,” you might wish to try a Bibliographic organization software program known as “Book Ends,” which we purchased for use in the DRC about a year ago. Or (ii)—you may be more comfortable using citation software—also called bibliographic software—such as Mendeley or Zotero. For more useful and usable information about this stuff, please visit the following URL:
http://subjectguides.library.american.edu/c.php?g=175008&p=1153406
Course Schedule-in-Brief (Continued)

Projecting Ahead >>
Each of your must write a 1,200- to 1,600-word final version of your genealogical criticism; this paper is due for presentation and at least partial reading during our next class session, 2.25.

Readings >>
from the The Philosopher’s Toolkit, the following chapters:
“3–Tools for Assessment” (pages 71-139)
from H. Sword’s Stylish Academic Writing:
“Chapter 2: On Being Disciplined” and “Chapter 3: A Guide to the Style Guides”

Launch of Assignment Two (2.25–3.24) >>
Writing critically from a zeitgeist perspective: Understanding the symptomatology, etiology and design challenges inherent to a specific period and a specific socio-cultural “place”
Between now and 3.24, you will be challenged to write a criticism based on a theoretical framework intended to, according to Israeli philosopher Nathan Rotenstreich, “define the characteristic spirit of an historical era taken in its totality and bearing the mark of a preponderant feature which dominated its intellectual, political and social trends.” As was the case with your genealogical criticism, you’ll have the freedom to choose a specific designed artifact or system of artifacts, visual vocabulary or style, functional design configuration, method or methodological approach, philosophy, experience, environment or service to write about, but this time your approach must be guided by a "zeitgeist" perspective. Many historians and critics have abused or mis-used zeitgeist approaches, as it is all too easy to use them as a means to substitute enthusiasm or emotion for real scholarship, or to use them as a means to project present-day values and viewpoints onto and into particular chains of events that have occurred in the past.

One of the aspects of a zeitgeist approach to criticism that can make it extremely useful and useable for a variety of scholars is that is allows them to account for how and why a wide variety of changes (think "S.T.E.E.P." occurring within a particular socio-cultural “moment” in time and place, and how particular sets of changes affected each other. It’s important to bear in mind that several “zeitgeists” can and often have—and, in some cases, still are—operating simultaneously in given places in the world; it’s also important to bear in mind that the presence of one zeitgeist doesn’t rule out another. We live in a zeitgeist in the U.S. in the early portion of the 21st century that can be said to be host to several different zeitgeists, which are greatly affected by how given S.T.E.E.P.-based biases affect the perceptions of the different constituent groups who live, work and study here. This fact helps to bolster my final, over-arching point re: zeitgeist approaches to criticism—the most difficult period within which to utilize zeitgeist approaches to criticize decision-making is the one that you (and I) are living through right now.

Each of you must write your zeitgeist criticism according to the guidelines that are articulated in the document ADES_5515_Zeitgeist Criticism Parameters located in the ADES 5515 Assignment Materials folder in the ADES 5515 Blackboard-facilitated course support website.
Course Schedule-in-Brief (Continued)

Projecting Ahead >>
Each of you must begin the process of developing your respective zeitgeist criticisms by formulating three rough outlines that must be organized and written according to the document titled “ADES 5515 Writing an Effective Outline-revo” that you’ll find in the ADES 5515 Foundation Documents folder in the ADES 5515 Blackboard-facilitated course support website. The “rough beginnings” of all three of these must be presented to each student’s editorial board members during the week of 2.25–3.3. From the critical discussions that ensued among editorial board members re: the potential inherent in each of their classmate’s rough outlines, only one (perhaps two, at most…) may be chosen for presentation and discussion during our class session on the evening of 3.3. Each of the rough outlines you’ll present to your editorial board members over the course of the next week should address a different topic that you feel is suitable for analysis from a zeitgeist-informed perspective. Plan on meeting with your editorial boards at least twice face-to-face and again once online or via Skype or iChat between now and next week’s class session as a means to help you prepare for what must transpire re: the presentation of your outline for your zeitgeist-based criticism that evening.

Readings >>
from the “Zeitgeist Criticism” folder inside the “ADES 5515 Assigned Readings” folder on the ADES 5515 Blackboard-facilitated course support website, the following essays/articles:

“New Europe, New Spirit” by Rick Poynor
“The Citizen Designer” by Rick Poynor
“The World Is on Her Shoulders” by Tiuu Reuben
“Signifier, Signified, Sign” by Judith Williamson
“Zeitgeist Criticism of the Sony Walkman” by Daniel Koester
from H. Sword’s Stylish Academic Writing:
“Chapter 4: Voice and Echo”

Week 07 | March 3

Due >>
Each student must present at least one “rough” version of the three outlines they were challenged to begin developing to support their writing of a zeitgeist criticism during this evening’s class session. Each student should be prepared to not only present his/her “strongest” outline, based on criticism he/she will have received from their respective editorial board members over the course of the last week, but should also be prepared to provide rationales (two to four) gleaned from interactions with his/her editorial board members re: why the specific outline that has been chosen for further development has been so appointed.

Continuation of Assignment Two (2.25–3.24) >>
Writing critically from a zeitgeist perspective: Understanding the symptomatology, etiology and design challenges inherent to a specific period and a specific socio-cultural “place”
You must each be prepared to circulate copies of your rough outlines to the instructor and your classmates, and to be prepared to either project your “strongest” outline on the south wall of the DRC or on the large-screen monitor, so that we can critically analyze it as the initial iteration of what will evolve to be your final zeitgeist criticism. Think carefully about the best ways to utilize select ideas (re: the overall approach/“critical stance,” use of language/tone, structure and extension of arguments, viability of key premises) that you will have gleaned from the readings you were assigned last week, or from “Critical Thinking: A Concise Guide” or “The Philosopher’s Toolkit,” to help you begin to craft
Course Schedule-in-Brief (Continued)

15. It may help you to conduct your semiotic analysis within one of the following three rubrics: semantics (examining the relationships between signs and those things to which they refer; a more denotative approach); syntactics (examining the relationships between signs within the contexts of whatever systems they occupy/help constitute) and pragmatics (the effects that signs/signage systems have on those who use them).

an effective zeitgeist-based criticism. It may also prove useful to each of you to perform some form of “time and place” based semiotic analysis on whatever you choose to write about between this evening and March 24. Be prepared to discuss these ideas with the class as you make your presentation(s) to all of us.

Projecting Ahead >>

Each of your must draft a 300- to 500-word abstract OR a rough draft of your final paper as a work-in-progress based on whichever of the three outlines you presented during this evening’s class session that you feel has the potential to yield the most viable zeitgeist criticism. It is up to each of you to determine exactly what you will present to the rest of us during next week’s class session; if you present a paucity of materials, you will not only hurt your progress, but you will deprive your classmates of what they might have learned from your progress.

Any form of the abstract or the final paper as a work-in-progress you choose to present to the rest of us should clearly and succinctly communicate how you plan to utilize zeitgeist-informed approaches and methods to examine whatever you’ve chosen to critically examine in your paper, and it should also establish and effectively qualify the over-arching and unifying themes that will make your paper not only understandable and relatable to your readership, but useful and useable to them as well. As you engage in this iterative process, allow your curiosity a good deal of “free reign:” keep hunting for material in the UNT library system and from online archives that you feel will support your contentions and viewpoints, or that will help you bolster your essential arguments. You’ll also need to rely on a consistent stream of critical interactions over the course of the coming week with your editorial board members to help you develop and simultaneously critique your ideas.

Readings >>

from the “Zeitgeist Criticism” folder inside the “ADES 5515 Assigned Readings” folder on the ADES 5515 Blackboard-facilitated course support website, the following essays/articles:

“Sites Pacific: Critical Spaces for Graphic Design Dialogue” by Anne Bush

“The Case of Post-Modernism: A Late Century Movement” by Greg Votolato

“Art and Design as a Sign System” by Jon Bird

from H. Sword’s Stylish Academic Writing:

“Chapter 5: Smart Sentencing”

Week 08 | March 10

Due >>

Each student must present a 300- to 500-word abstract or some version of a work-in-progress rough draft of his her zeitgeist-based criticism based on whichever of the three outlines he/she presented as having the greatest potential to yield a well-crafted example of this foray into this particular critical tranche. Please be prepared to project these so that they may be effectively viewed “at a large scale” by the instructor and all of your classmates. Part of this presentation will entail you having to justify how your chosen scholarly articles effectively bolster one or more aspects of the argument(s) you are trying to make. Students who wish to present “rough/work-in-progress” aspects of their final papers during this class session are heartily encouraged to do so: if you are more comfortable presenting the “rough/work-in-progress” aspects of your paper during this evening’s class session than you are presenting your abstract, you have the freedom to do this.
Continuation of Assignment Two (2.25–3.24) >>

Writing critically from a zeitgeist-based perspective: Understanding the symptomatology, etiology and design challenges inherent to a specific period and a specific socio-cultural “place”

Bear in mind that it is very often the reading of the abstract—in a conference proceedings or at the beginning of a book chapter or just beneath the title of a journal article—that determines whether or not a given reader will invest his or her “precious time” reading what you have written. Use the writing of your abstract as a means to check the viability of your entire approach, as well as the strength of your key arguments. It may help each of you to “walk back and forth” between working on your abstract and your final paper.

Projecting Ahead >>

Each of you must write a 1,200- to 1,600-word final version of your zeitgeist-based criticism; this paper is due for presentation and at least partial reading during our next class session, 3.24.

Readings >>
from the The Philosopher’s Toolkit, the following chapters:
“4–Tools for Conceptual Distinctions” (pages 140-189)
from H. Sword’s Stylish Academic Writing:
“Chapter 6: Tempting Titles”

Week 09 | March 24
Due >>
Each student must turn in their completed versions of their 1,200–1,600-word zeitgeist criticisms, and be prepared to read or present at least some major portions of these.

Launch of Assignment Three (3.24–4.14) >>

Writing critically from a rhetorical perspective: analyzing designed artifacts and systems as concrete manifestations of rhetorical structures (persuasive ideas, attitudes, beliefs, assumptions, propaganda, etc.)

Between now and 4.14, you will be challenged to write a criticism that addresses how a particular design artifact embodies or has been affected by a given belief system or paradigm, or a culturally or socially driven assumption or idea. The primary purpose of this type of critical endeavor is to construct and then use a critical, analytical process to reveal, explain and finally evaluate the principle motives and intentions inherent in the structure of the chosen artifact or system of artifacts. (As has been the case during the evolution of the last two projects), you will begin this process by completing a series of assigned readings, after which you’ll work with an editorial board to prepare an outline and then an abstract that will help you frame the conceptual and epistemological structure of your paper. Your abstract will drive the formulation of a rough draft, which will in turn drive the formulation of your final paper. Your final paper must be between 1,200 and 1,700 words long.

Projecting Ahead >>

Each of you must begin the process of developing your respective rhetorical criticisms by formulating three rough outlines that must be organized and written according to the document titled “ADES 5515 Writing an Effective Outline-revo” that you’ll find in the ADES 5515 Foundation Documents folder in the ADES 5515 Blackboard-facilitated course support website. You’ll need to discuss these outlines with your classmates during the week that begins today—March 24—and that culminates with your presentations of these three outlines (which could be delivered as concept/content maps, or as more linearly structured outlines, each of which should address a different topic that you feel is suitable for analysis from a rhetor-
Course Schedule- in-Brief (Continued)

ical perspective) on March 31. Once one of your outlines has been selected for “full pursuit” on that date, you’ll need to develop the “rough beginnings” of one of them with each of your particular editorial board members during the week of 3.31—4.7 so that you have a viable rough draft (and perhaps an abstract as well) to present to the class on 4.7. Plan on meeting with your editorial boards at least twice f-2-f and again once online or via Skype or iChat between now and the final due date for these rhetorical criticisms on 4.14 to help you iteratively and effectively develop a compellingly written, well-structured paper.

Readings >>
from the “Rhetorical Criticism” folder inside the “ADES 5515 Assigned Readings” folder on the ADES 5515 Blackboard-facilitated course support website, the following essays/articles:
“Urban Landscape: Post-Modernism” by Richard Bolton
“Always-Existent Symbolisms” by Marcy Grant
“A Rhetorical Criticism of Lester Beall’s Poster Series” by Nardell “Li’il Booger” Thadleprang, Jr.
“A Rhetorical Criticism of La Chaise” by Peggy Re from H. Sword’s Stylish Academic Writing:
“Chapter 7: Hooks and Sinkers”

Week 10 | March 31

Due >>
Each student must present three outlines (in whatever forms they deem will most effectively support and present their ideas) for possible rhetorical criticisms. Each student should be prepared to spend the bulk of his/her presentation time discussing the idea that they feel most inclined/compelled to develop further. Each student’s presentations this evening should be well-informed by dialogues that should have transpired between him/her and his/her editorial board members during the week of March 24–31. Each student should also be well-prepared to make a case for why and how a particular social belief/social belief system, cultural paradigm, societal assumption or idea has affected the design of a particular artifact, system, community, experience, style, or set of protocols or procedures for designing. In turn, each student should be well-prepared to discuss how whatever he/she has chosen to “champion” in his/her outlines affected a specific belief system, paradigm, or idea.

Continuation of Assignment Three (3.24—4.14) >>
Writing critically from a rhetorical perspective: analyzing designed artifacts and systems as concrete manifestations of rhetorical structures (persuasive ideas, attitudes, beliefs, assumptions, propaganda, etc.). As was the case during the thinking and writing processes that informed the development of your previous paper, the upcoming draft you must write should be thought of as a prototype of sorts, a means for you to test level of significance, or “compulsion,” if you like, of your core arguments and ideas. One of the essential challenges for each of you to confront as you write this next piece is to begin “tell the story” of the central rhetorical structure that underpins your criticism as you also “tell the story” of how whatever you have chosen to analyze was born out of, reflective of, or fueled by that structure, or some combination of all of these.

Projecting Ahead >>
Each of your must write a rough-draft version of your rhetorically informed criticism that contains approximately 1,000 to 1,300 words; this rough-draft is due for presentation and at least partial reading during our next class session, 4.7.
Week 11 | April 7
Due >>
Each student must present his/her rough draft of his/her rhetorically informed criticism. Each student should plan on reading at least a portion of this document aloud in class, so please bring either copies for everyone in the room, or be well-prepared to project what you will have written.

Projecting Ahead >>
Based on the critical feedback/constructive criticism each of you will have received regarding the state of your rough draft by the culmination of this evening’s class session, each of your must write a 1,500-to 2,000-word final version of your rhetorically informed criticism; this paper is due for presentation and a full reading by one of your classmates or myself during our next class session, 4.14.

Week 12 | April 14
Due >>
Each student must turn in their completed versions of their 1,500–2,000-word rhetorically informed criticisms, and be prepared to have a classmate or myself read their paper during this evening’s class session. Providing a copy of your paper to whomever you will have read it aloud this evening on your behalf well before class begins at 6:30 pm would be a wise thing for you to do.

Launch of Assignment Four (4.14–5.5) >>
Writing critically from an ethical or an empirical perspective: analyzing and assessing how the outcome of a particular design idea, process, or endeavor has affected the ethical or moral behavior or perception model among a particular user group or audience, or analyzing and assessing how the formal characteristics of a specific artifact, system of artifacts, environment, interaction or experience affect a viewer’s or user’s perception of it/them, and, ultimately, the viewer’s or user’s behavior as a result of having experienced or interacted with the formal attributes of the subject of this paper. (As has been the case during the evolution of the last three projects), you will begin this process by completing a series of assigned readings, after which you’ll work with an editorial board17 to prepare an outline and then an abstract that will help you frame the conceptual and epistomological structure of your paper. Your abstract will drive the formulation of a rough draft, which will in turn drive the formulation of your final paper. Your final paper must be between 1,200 and 1,700 words long.

Projecting Ahead >>
Each of your must begin the process of developing your respective ethical or formal/empirical criticisms by formulating three rough outlines that must be organized and written according to the document titled “ADES 5515 Writing an Effective Outline-revo” that you’ll find in the ADES 5515 Foundation Documents folder in the ADES 5515 Blackboard-facilitated course support website. You’ll need to discuss these outlines with your classmates during the week that begins today—April 14—and that culminates with your presentations of these three outlines (which could be delivered as concept/content maps, or as more linearly structured outlines, each of which should address a different topic that you feel is suitable for analysis from an ethical or formal perspective) on April 21. Once one of your outlines has been selected for “full pursuit” on that date, you’ll need to develop the “rough beginnings” of one of them with each of your particular editorial board members during the week of 4.21–4.28 so that you have a viable rough draft (and perhaps an abstract as well) to present to the class on 4.28. Plan on meeting with your editorial boards at least twice f-2-f and again once online or via Skype or iChat between now and the final
due date for these ethical or formal criticisms on 5.5 to help you iteratively and effectively develop a compellingly written, well-structured paper.

Readings >>
from the “Rhetorical Criticism” folder inside the “ADES 5515 Assigned Readings” folder on the ADES 5515 Blackboard-facilitated course support website, the following essays/articles:
“Writing Design Criticism into History” by Teal Triggs
“On Design Writing” by Ann Marie Willis
“Becoming a Discipline: Problems in the Emergence of Design Criticism as Field of Inquiry” by Deborah Littlejohn
“We must examine the human cost of objects, not just their semiotic resonances” by Kieran Long
“Ethic by Design or the Ethos of Things” by Cameron Tonkinwise
from H. Sword’s Stylish Academic Writing:
“Chapter 8: The Story Net”

Week 13 | April 21
Due >>
Each student must present three outlines (in whatever forms they deem will most effectively support and present their ideas) for possible ethical or formal/empirical criticisms. Each student should be prepared to spend the bulk of his/her presentation time discussing the idea that they feel most inclined/compelled to develop further. Each student’s presentations this evening should be well-informed by dialogues that should have transpired between him/her and his/her editorial board members during the week of April 14–21. Each student should also be well-prepared to make a case for why and how a particular social belief/social belief system, cultural paradigm, societal assumption or idea has affected the design of a particular artifact, system, community, experience, style, or set of protocols or procedures for designing. In turn, each student should be well-prepared to discuss how whatever he/she has chosen to “champion” in his/her outlines affected a specific belief system, paradigm, or idea.

Continuation of Assignment Four (4.14–5.5) >>
Writing critically from a an ethical or a formal/empirical perspective...
As was the case during the thinking and writing processes that informed the development of your previous papers in this course, the upcoming draft you must write should be thought of as a prototype of sorts, a means for you to test level of significance, or “compulsion,” if you like, of your core arguments and ideas. One of the essential challenges for each of you to confront as you write this next piece is to begin “tell the story” of the essential ethical or formal/empirical structure that underpins your criticism as you also “tell the story” of how whatever you have chosen to analyze was born out of, reflective of, or fueled by that structure, or some combination of all of these (hint: Chapter 8 in your text by Sword will help you with this).

Projecting Ahead >>
Each of you must write a rough-draft version of your ethically or formally/empirically informed criticism that contains approximately 1,000 to 1,300 words; this rough-draft is due for presentation and at least partial reading during our next class session, 4.28.
Course Schedule-
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Week 14  |  April 28
Due >>
Each student must present his/her rough draft of his/her ethically or formally/empirically informed criticism. Each student should plan on reading at least a portion of this document aloud in class, so please bring either copies for everyone in the room, or be well-prepared to project what you will have written.

Projecting Ahead >>
Based on the critical feedback/constructive criticism each of you will have received regarding the state of your rough draft by the culmination of this evening’s class session, each of your must write a 1,500-to 2,000-word final version of your ethically or formally/empirically informed criticism; this paper is due for presentation and a full reading by one of your classmates or myself during our next class session, 5.5.

Readings >>
from H. Sword’s Stylish Academic Writing:
“Chapter 9: Show and Tell” and Chapter 10 “Jargonitis”

Week 15  |  May 5
Due >>
Each student must turn in their completed versions of their 1,500-2,000-word ethically or formally/empirically informed criticisms, and be prepared to have a classmate or myself read their paper during this evening’s class session. Providing a copy of your paper to whomever you will have read it aloud this evening on your behalf well before class begins at 6:30 pm would be a wise thing for you to do.

Final paper preparation (in lieu of a final exam) >>
Each student enrolled in the spring 2015 section of this course will have an opportunity to re-write ONE of their papers from earlier this semester and turn that re-written paper in no later than 9:30 pm CST on Thursday, May 12 and have the grade for this re-written paper supplant the lowest grad they received on one of their papers earlier in the semester.

Readings >>
from H. Sword’s Stylish Academic Writing:
“Chapter 11: Structural Designs” and Chapter 12 “Points of Reference”
A Final Note re: the UNT Writing Lab

Something each student in this or any other grad-level course that requires writing should be aware of:

The UNT Writing Lab is funded in large part by YOUR TUITION AND FEES, and exists expressly to help graduate students who need help meeting the unique array of challenges that exist “when attempting to take one's writing to the next level.” Graduate tutoring in the writing lab can be obtained in UNT Denton’s Sage Hall, room 152: please use this resource as the spring semester of 2016 evolves even if you don’t think you need to!

This outstanding UNT facility is operated by Dr. Lisa Jackson and her colleagues. More information about how they do what they do and how they can help YOU is available at the following URL:

http://writinglab.unt.edu/graduate-tutoring

or by calling: 940.565.2563.
Active vs. Passive Voice

In most papers you’ll write for college, your professors will encourage you to write in active voice. Active voice means that you avoid passive verbs, which are any form of the verb “to be” (am, are, is, was, were, be, being, been). Writing in the passive voice tends to be wordy, and it’s often difficult to tell who is doing what.

When we read, we expect to find the subject at the beginning of the sentence. We expect the verb to come right after the subject. You’ll find writing much easier if you think of sentences as following this formula:

**Subject + verb = sentence**

“Subject + verb = sentence” is the writing equivalent of “2 + 2 = 4.” It works every time, without fail. In this formula, the subject is in the “subject position” and the verb is in the “verb position.”

Making People the Subjects of Sentences
Sentences are easier to understand when we write about someone doing something. Make people the subjects of sentences. We then call that subject an “actor.”

Put the “actor” in the “subject position.”

You can make people the subjects of sentences in four ways, including:

- Use a person’s name
- Use a pronoun
- Use a collective noun
- Use imperative voice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronouns</th>
<th>I, me, mine, you, yours, yourself, he, him, his, himself, her, hers, herself, she, ours, theirs, they, their, them, themselves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collective nouns</td>
<td>Collective nouns refer to a group of people like doctors, students, athletes, teachers, and so on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative voice</td>
<td>Imperative voice indicates a command, like • Sit • Stop • Stand • Listen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The implied subject in each of these sentences is you. Since you is a pronoun, it follows our rule. Technical writers frequently write directions, which always start with imperative statements.
Eliminating Passive Voice

Sentences written in active voice are shorter than sentences written in passive voice. Because of this, sentences written in active voice tend to be more clear.

In some disciplines, like the sciences, writers are encouraged to use passive voice because it places the emphasis on the experiment or the research rather than on the person doing the experiment or research.

Passive voice includes any form of the verb “to be”:

\textbf{Am, are, is, was, were, be, being, been}

Passive verbs need help from other words, which makes sentences longer. Passive voice isn’t necessarily bad. It’s just indirect and wordy in a written document.

We can use passive voice:

- If we’re describing something
  
  \textit{Lab samples are in green, yellow, and red glass tubes.}

- If we don’t care who performed the action
  
  \textit{Lab samples are collected at noon.}

In sentences written in passive voice, you’ll often find the actor in a prepositional phrase that starts with the word “by.”

\textit{The law was passed by the senators.}

Put the verb next to the actor (the subject of the sentence). Put the action in the verb. Follow the formula

\textbf{Subject + verb = sentence}

You’ll find that it’s almost impossible to use passive voice when you write sentences that start with a subject that is an actor closely followed by a verb.