

Nelson The Sleuth...

has uncovered what he belatedly identifies as the possible culprit behind our disappointing toothpick critique. Although my initial hope was that the class would accept that it was all Holly's fault, I now believe there's a more plausible explanation. See if you agree.

My revelation came, not from reviewing the toothpick crit, but rather the critique for the ongoing explorations of what to do with "On-A-Roll". Each and every creative accomplishment presented had one built-in assumption, i.e., "I'm being very creative and thinking outside the box...PROVIDED it is related to a final objective." That objective might be a container, a wall hanging, lamp, flower arrangement, flower bed and even a musical instrument.

All very creative and in the spirit of reshaping a "given", but guided more by PRODUCT than PROCESS. Yes there were many inventive ideas which were part of the process, but let's redirect our thinking to one in which we have no design product in mind, but rather engage our time with more emphasis on Phase I and II for the first few weeks. This means that the period of play, trial and error is directed towards discoveries; not product. Let's first discover not only the inherent qualities of the tube, but the number of ways to vary its form, dimension, forming possibilities, etc. In short, we're too eager to jump to Phase III, or CONVERGENCE and closure.

Realizing what was happening with the "Roll", it dawned on me that this same mindset was brought to the Modular Programming assignment. (Well, that's not completely correct, for how could so late a revelation be associated with "dawned on me"? Sunsetting on me?) This same mindset seemed to guide much of the toothpick designs as a particular end result prompted imposition rather than the adherence to modular programming.

We can thank Karen for her insightful explanation of Modular Programming, and look forward to the second critique as a classic example of Phase VI!