Here is some advice on preparing for the April 13\textsuperscript{th} Design Review. There is no template for an ideal review. Keep in mind that, even though you should prepare for it, the review is not scripted like a research talk. Instead, it’s collaborative (among the team) and interactive (with the reviewers).

1. **Make a deliberate plan, which is understood by all team members, as to how you will present your toy concept to reviewers.**

You can designate team members as owners of different parts of your team’s remarks. For example, one person could start the review by clearly describing and giving the name of the toy concept and conveying the play experience. Another person could present one of your models, state the critical question, describe what you explored/investigated, and share results of what you learned from that model. And so on. Before the event itself, a walk-through of what you’ve planned can help with organization and readiness.

2. **With each set of reviewers, begin your remarks with a clear description of the toy and its name, and also convey the play experience.**

Plan ahead to what you’ll say, so that you don’t search for words, ramble, and repeat yourself. The name and description could be communicated in one or two sentences. For the play experience, plan to use vivid language, and especially informative and engaging verbs – launch, explore, throw, crash, attack, terrify, etc. – to get reviewers to imagine the specific play associated with your toy.

Tools that help convey the play experience may include (a) role play by members of the team and/or reviewers, (b) a nice drawing on big paper that shows your vision for the toy + play, and/or (c) a digital drawing or photoshopped image that you display on a laptop.

3. **As you introduce each model, be specific about the critical question the model addresses that shows your design thinking behind the question.**

Reviewers need to understand the question to evaluate whether your model addressed it and offer you feedback that will be relevant to toy development.

Here are three examples, somewhat embellished by me, based on toys that 2.00b teams are currently designing. The “Okay” version of the critical question only identifies the model; the “Better” version shows how a question specifically motivated the model and connects the model to the toy’s actual play experience. As you prepare for the Design Review, think hard about how you will communicate the purpose of your design explorations.

**Infect It**

Okay: "This is our looks-like model; we wanted to get feedback on the game board."

Better: "This is our looks-like model; we wanted to explore different sizes for the game board, how it would fold, and how users would interact with the different sized boards."
We want to see also if we could determine which age group preferred which size board, and try to make sure our overall design is geared to a specific age group.”

-----

**Magnitude X**

Okay: "This is a works-like model, for the platform."

Better: "This is a works-like model, for the vibrating platform and its interchangeable surfaces. We wanted to see if we could control vibration in the platform, so that we could simulate different magnitudes of an earthquake. We’re also thinking of including different playing surfaces for the platform, like sandpaper, metal, and grass. We want to see if users like them, and how they each affect how the blocks behave on the surface."

-----

**FrisBall**

Okay: "These are some different materials we are considering for the frisbee." 

Better: "These are some different stretch fabrics we are considering for the frisbee’s trampoline element. We want it to have some stretch and see how different-sized balls bounce off it and how far they go. We also want to calculate how much weight each fabric might add to the Frisbee. We implemented two of the fabrics in a ring and tested them."

4. **The Design Review is most effective when it is interactive, and a back-and-forth develops between teams and reviewers.**

It's good to think of how you will display the models on the desk or table so that users will feel welcome to examine and handle them. If a model is sturdy enough, just pass it around after you’ve described it, or ask for a volunteer to try it out. Furthermore, show reviewers different options you’ve tried for a critical question, even if you think you know which option you’re leaning toward. This will display your thoroughness in testing and yet also prompt the reviewers’ design thinking and feedback.

5. **Keep in mind that you can control the use of review time.**

If reviewers are quite talkative about one of your models, and you know that you still have material to cover, you can politely tell reviewers you want to move on to the next model. One person on the team can be designated to help other team members stay on track.

6. **One person on the team could serve as note-taker during the review.**

Even though you will be receiving the review forms later on, taking notes does two things: (a) it signals your engagement and seriousness to reviewers, and (b) it helps you capture feedback that you sense is immediately relevant to your continued development of the toy.