ABSTRACT/PAPER REVIEW FORM
2018 DCA CONFERENCE

Abstract Number: 001

Abstract/Paper Title: Learning Through Prototype

Please mark the appropriate column and add mandatory written feedback below. The right hand column is for ranking by numeric number (1 being lowest and 10 being highest) for each row. Please add total.

	YES	Needs Work	NO	Please rank by a numeric number below for each row, 10 being highest 1 being lowest
1. Proposed abstract/paper addresses the conference theme or sub-themes	v			10
2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice.	v			8
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.	v			9
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.	v			9
5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.		v		7
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.	v			9
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.	v			9
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.			v	0
9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	v			10
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees	v			9
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 80				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):
- Missing references and in-text citations
- Need brief explanation about the project/figure
- Need more explanation about the relationship between prototyping and student learning
- design thinking through process and prototyping OR only prototyping → double-check the title
- is there any plan to ask about students' experiences and opinions, in addition to the observation?

Reviewer Recommendation:
Please indicate which of the following actions you recommend.
(v) 1. **Recommended** (no significant changes suggested)

( ) 2. **Recommended with Reservation** (suggest changes to the manuscript as specified in this review)

( ) 3. **Not Recommended**

ABSTRACT/PAPER REVIEW FORM
2018 DCA CONFERENCE

Abstract Number: 001

Abstract/Paper Title: Learning through Prototyping

Please mark the appropriate column and add mandatory written feedback below. The right hand column is for ranking by numeric number (1 being lowest and 10 being highest) for each row. Please add total.

	YES	Needs Work	NO	Please rank by a numeric number below for each row, 10 being highest 1 being lowest
1. Proposed abstract/paper addresses the conference theme or sub-themes	x			7
2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice.	x			7
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.		x		6
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.		x		6
5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.	x			7
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.		x		6
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.		x		6
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.	x			7
9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.		x		6
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees	x			7
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 6,5				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

The theme of design education on the level of adaptive design programming and prototyping is interesting and the illustrations suggest a stimulating teaching application.

However, some of the themes, particularly the 'logical' process in relation to future adaptability and the references (notably to Da Vinci) are not clearly articulated.

Needs some work…

Reviewer Recommendation:
Please indicate which of the following actions you recommend.
( ) 1. **Recommended** (no significant changes suggested)

(X) 2. **Recommended with Reservation** (suggest changes to the manuscript as specified in this review)

( ) 3. **Not Recommended**

Abstract Number: 001

Abstract/Paper Title: Learning through prototyping

Please mark the appropriate column and add mandatory written feedback below. The right hand column is for ranking by numeric number (1 being lowest and 10 being highest) for each row. Please add total.

	YES	Needs Work	NO	Please rank by a numeric number below for each row, 10 being highest 1 being lowest
1. Proposed abstract/paper addresses the conference theme or sub-themes		X		5
2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice.		X		5
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.		X		5
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.			X	2
5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.			X	2
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.			X	2
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.			X	2
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.			X	2
9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.			X	2
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees			X	2
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 29				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

The abstract is vague, poorly written and needs more sufficient clarification to be accepted. References are made very generally, methods are not well described, and the conclusions are ambiguous. Recommend reject unless the author can more specifically reference how prototyping is performed, with specific methods and with some indication of originality. Rewrite the abstract with a clearly traced trajectory through the process of ideation and making, describing how students work, individually? In teams? For how long? With what instruction? In what context and conditions? Etc. The images are helpful, but the project appears dated.

Reviewer Recommendation:
Please indicate which of the following actions you recommend.
( ) 1. **Recommended** (no significant changes suggested)

( ) 2. **Recommended with Reservation** (suggest changes to the manuscript as specified in this review)

(X) 3. **Not Recommended**