Design Project #2: Hand-in procedure--and what happens next...

Your team's report on design project 2 is due in recitation on Thursday, April 29. Your group should hand in **two** almost-identical copies at your designated recitation. The difference is that one copy should contain a title page with the names of the group members, while the second copy will **omit** the names. Both copies should have on their title page a 6-digit code number (nonce) that you have chosen at random to identify your report.

The copy with your names on the title page will go to your recitation instructor for evaluation. The second ("blind") copy will be given a moment later to another team in your section, so that the other team can prepare a short critique of it for recitation one week later, on Thursday, May 6. You will thus get an opportunity to perform (and receive) what is called a *blind review;* a particular form of peer review in which the reviewer does not know the name of the authors, and therefore is (presumably) less likely to let personal biases influence any recommendations. Of course, if you do some sleuthing you can probably figure out whose paper you are reading, but that would not be in the spirit of blind reviewing, so restrain yourself.

Because of the constraints given by this schedule we cannot give extensions and all papers should be turned in on Thursday in recitation. (Tip: Start working on this project immediately.) Teams that consist of two people from one section and one from another should turn in the paper in the section to which the majority belong.

In preparation for the Thursday, May 6, recitation meeting, your design team should carefully read over the paper you have been given to review, prepare a 5-minute at-the-blackboard oral critique of it, and choose one of your members to deliver this critique. (If you wish, you can divide up the presentation among two or three members, but if you do that you will need to work skillfully to keep from tripping over each other in the short time available.) You can assume that your audience is *very* familiar with the problem to be solved, and even has a pretty good idea about the design space, so you do not need to spend much of your time giving background or explaining the design in detail. Instead, quickly sketch the high points of whatever makes the design unusual, and move on immediately to explain what your group thinks are its major strengths and weaknesses, and whether or not you would recommend to the Librarian (of Congress) that this design should be seriously considered, perhaps with some suggestions for improvement.

Peer review is a commonly practiced method of reviewing designs, proposals, and professional papers. The goal of peer review is to be constructive, not destructive. Comments along the lines of ''this design is trash'' are out of order. Instead you should try to come up with comments along the lines of ''this design is weak because it doesn't handle X, but by incorporating Y it would be more bullet proof'' or ''This design is excellent, because it meets all of the stated goals and manages to add two neat features, Y and Z.'' You should try to enhance this goal by maintaining a professional, even collegial attitude during the presentation and ensuing discussion.

Your group's grade on design project two will take into account *both* your design and your oral critique of the other group's design. And don't worry about negative recommendations and misunderstandings by the team that critiques your design; your instructor will make an effort to ensure that they do *not* affect your grade.
