



W02-2 Vetted AI Lecture Summary

1 Short Summary

The central distinction in this Week 2 lecture is between *what a designer does* and *what happens to the design because of those actions*. Designers sketch, prototype, interview, model, calculate, test, compare, and refine. Those activities are not progress by themselves. They create value only when they cause the design to become more desirable, more clearly defined, more transferable to production, or otherwise more mature.

This distinction changes how design methods should be understood. Process diagrams commonly list activities such as empathizing, defining, ideating, prototyping, testing, and implementing. These are useful prompts, especially when someone does not know how to begin, but they should not be treated as a universal fixed sequence. Prototyping may support empathy near the beginning, testing occurs throughout, and sketching can contribute at nearly any point. The order and intensity of activities must be customized to the uncertainties and needs of the particular project.

The lecture connected this idea to problem framing. A strong frame is human-centered, includes who, what, where, when, and why, and is validated through engagement with people outside the designer's own perspective. It is also selected from many candidate frames rather than accepted merely because it was the first one generated. A promising frame should be meaningful enough that the designer and relevant people see value in pursuing it.

Rapid prototypes were presented as conversation starters. A rough mock-up of an emergency-use device revealed confusion, physical awkwardness, ambiguous placement, and the chaos of real use that a picture alone would have concealed. The prototype did not need to function technically or look polished. Its value came from making assumptions tangible and provoking observations, questions, and discussion.

The lecture then organized design evolution around four principles:

1. The designer's job is to create a clear and complete product definition that is both desirable and transferable.
2. The design must evolve from an incomplete idea toward a mature definition containing the information needed for production and quality testing.
3. The activities selected by the designer cause—or fail to cause—that evolution.
4. Effective evolution requires design activities to be customized and coordinated for the particular product, stakeholders, uncertainties, and production system.

Desirability means that the product offers value to the people or market for whom it is intended. Transferability means that the product definition communicates enough correct information for another part of the system to manufacture and verify it reliably. An appealing idea that cannot be produced from its documentation is not yet a successful design.

The sketching activity reinforced both geometric and developmental thinking. A complex product form can begin as a cuboid, be divided into smaller volumes, and then be refined through consistent vanishing points, construction lines, rounded edges, line weight, shading, and shadows. The sketch is not merely a drawing exercise: it helps the design move from an internal idea toward a shareable and increasingly precise definition.

The final developmental model separated iterative designer actions from product-development stages. Actions may repeat in any order, but stages describe the characteristics or maturity that the design has

achieved. The designer may cycle repeatedly through sketching, prototyping, analysis, and testing while the product progresses toward clearer developmental milestones.

The most important questions to carry forward are:

- What am I doing as a designer, and what is that action causing to change in the design?
- What evidence shows that the design is becoming more desirable or transferable?
- Does the problem frame include who, what, where, when, and why?
- Has the frame been validated with people outside the design team?
- Have enough alternative frames been generated to support meaningful selection?
- What assumption could a quick mock-up turn into a productive conversation?
- Is this activity being performed because a process diagram names it, or because it addresses a real uncertainty?
- What product information is still missing before production and quality verification are possible?
- Which design actions should be repeated, coordinated, delayed, or omitted for this project?
- What developmental milestone should the next activity help the design reach?

The lecture's broader message is that competent design is not measured by how many recognizable activities were completed. It is measured by whether those activities were chosen purposefully and caused the design to mature toward something people value and a production system can realize reliably.

2 Detailed Summary

This lecture develops a distinction between design activity and design evolution. It begins with evaluating problem frames, uses rapid prototypes and critique to show how activities produce learning, examines the limitations of familiar process diagrams, states four principles of product development, and closes by distinguishing iterative actions from developmental milestones. The timestamps below are navigation markers, and each question links to the corresponding section.

Several participant responses are only partially represented in the transcript. The summary therefore relies on instructor statements and explicitly captured ideas rather than reconstructing missing comments. An isolated fragment with a much later timestamp appears after the lecture has ended; it contains no substantive lecture content and is not included in the map.

2.1 Lecture Map

01:10–03:49 [What is the difference between designer actions and design evolution?](#)

03:49–18:34 [How can a designer judge whether a problem frame is strong?](#)

18:34–26:50 [Why should prototypes be used as conversation starters?](#)

26:50–36:31 [What should critique and short design activities teach?](#)

36:31–43:10 [When is a human-centered design approach needed?](#)

43:10–51:29 [What do design-process models describe, and why should their activities not become rigid steps?](#)

51:52–55:39 [What do desirability and transferability require from a design?](#)

55:39–61:24 [What four principles govern the evolution of a product design?](#)

61:52–65:46 [How can a complex product sketch be constructed from a cuboid?](#)

65:57–69:21 [When do design activities create value?](#)

70:01–74:35 [How should construction, line weight, and presentation refine a sketch?](#)

75:00–78:24 [How do developmental stages differ from iterative designer actions?](#)

2.2 What Is the Difference Between Designer Actions and Design Evolution?

Location: 01:10–03:49

The lecture begins by separating a verb from a changing object. A designer performs actions: sketching, building prototypes, talking to people, modeling, calculating, and testing. The design itself is the evolving definition of a product or response. The important question is not only whether an action occurred, but what changed in the design because it occurred.

“There is a huge difference between what the designer does and what happens to the design when the designers do what they do.”

This distinction protects against activity without progress. A team may produce many sketches or prototypes yet leave the design no more useful, mature, or producible than before. Conversely, a small, inexpensive activity may create major progress if it reveals an assumption, clarifies a requirement, or changes the product definition.

The opening also encouraged attention to surprise. When an observation exposes something the designer had not considered, it identifies a boundary in current understanding and therefore an opportunity to grow.

Questions to Consider

- What design action am I performing?
- What specific change should this action cause in the design?
- What was learned that was genuinely surprising?
- Did the activity clarify, challenge, or merely decorate the current idea?
- How will I know whether the design is more mature afterward?

2.3 How Can a Designer Judge Whether a Problem Frame Is Strong?

Location: 03:49–18:34

The project was still in the early opportunity-development stage, where the priority was to focus and frame a problem rather than commit to a product. The lecture asked how a designer could judge the quality of two candidate frames.

Three tests emerged.

The Frame Must Be Human-Centered and Validated

Verification and validation were distinguished by what serves as evidence. Verification can compare a result with a technical measure or specification. Validation asks whether the problem or response makes sense to people outside the design team.

“Validation, another person is the instrument.”

The statement is intentionally compact: in human-centered work, the designer cannot remain inside a private interpretation of the problem. Observation, conversation, and participation are needed to learn whether the frame corresponds to other people’s experience.

The Frame Must Contain Enough of the Situation

The five framing questions provide a completeness check:

Who? Who experiences the problem or is affected by it?

What? What difficulty, need, or outcome defines the problem?

Where? In what setting does it occur?

When? Under what conditions or moments does it arise?

Why? Why is the problem important or worth solving?

The lecture placed particular emphasis on “who” and “why.” A statement such as “recycling is difficult” lacks a person and therefore conceals whose behavior, constraints, and goals matter. The same broad topic becomes a different problem when viewed by a household, food-service operator, school, event organizer, or another stakeholder. Likewise, engineers may describe the first four questions while failing to explain why resolving the issue matters.

Starting from an existing object can also distort the frame. A writing device intended for an unusual environment should not automatically define the problem as “design a better pen.” A broader frame might concern recording and recalling information, limiting contamination, controlling weight, or serving different people involved in the information system.

The Frame Must Be Selected from Alternatives

A single frame cannot demonstrate its own quality because it has not been compared with alternatives. Designers should generate many frames, discard weak ones, combine useful elements, and select from a meaningful set.

“There’s no way you’re gonna get a good frame unless you look at a lot of frames.”

Working well under ambiguity is part of the designer’s value. The goal is not to eliminate ambiguity immediately, but to organize it well enough to compare directions and make a reasoned commitment.

The section concludes with three practical quality criteria: generate many frames and select promising ones; include all five framing questions; and identify frames that both the designer and relevant people find worth pursuing.

Questions to Consider

- Who has validated the frame from outside the design team?
- Does the frame clearly answer who, what, where, when, and why?
- Is the problem stated around a person’s experience or around a presumed object?
- Which stakeholders would produce substantially different frames?
- How many alternatives were generated before selection?
- Which frames can be combined into a stronger candidate?
- Why is the selected problem worth solving?
- Are the designer and relevant stakeholders sufficiently interested to sustain the work?

2.4 Why Should Prototypes Be Used as Conversation Starters?

Location: 18:34–26:50

The lecture identified four purposes for prototypes:

1. Demonstrate that product-development work is progressing.
2. Verify that a product or part functions as intended.
3. Validate that people or the market find the product desirable.

4. Facilitate conversations that expose, support, or disprove design assumptions.

The first purpose is common but limited: a prototype may prove that work occurred without producing useful knowledge. The stronger approach begins with a question or uncertainty.

"I didn't just make a prototype for prototype's sake; I made a prototype to test something, to learn something about my design that I don't know right now."

A rough mock-up of an emergency-use device demonstrated the fourth purpose. The model was made quickly from simple materials and could not perform the actual medical function. Even so, placing it in a simulated emergency revealed questions that a static image concealed: What should a bystander do first? How is the enclosure opened? Where should components be placed? What must be held? Do cables reach? Are instructions visible under stress? How much chaos surrounds the interaction?

"If we didn't have a prototype, we probably wouldn't have had that conversation in the same way."

The lesson is that fidelity should match the learning objective. A quick mock-up is sufficient when the goal is to provoke behavior, reveal confusion, or begin a conversation. Time spent polishing irrelevant details may reduce the number of assumptions that can be explored.

Questions to Consider

- What uncertainty is this prototype intended to reduce?
- Is the goal progress demonstration, verification, validation, or conversation?
- What behavior becomes observable only when people interact with something tangible?
- What level of fidelity is necessary for that learning objective?
- Which assumptions could be challenged with a mock-up made in minutes?
- What did the prototype reveal that a picture or verbal explanation would not?

2.5 What Should Critique and Short Design Activities Teach?

Location: 26:50–36:31

The studio-style review treated a short design activity as practice for deeper project work. One redesign explored an interchangeable interface so a single torque tool could cover more uses, then reconsidered whether printed maintenance instructions would actually protect the user or merely shift responsibility. The important learning was not the specific proposal. It was the willingness to examine an idea from both favorable and unfavorable perspectives.

The critique emphasized that designers should not assume an idea is good because they originated it. They should try to adopt the user's perspective while also recognizing that they may not possess the user's actual experience or lens.

The discussion also distinguished the "critical few" from the "mundane many." Some decisions can rely on standard components or established solutions because they contribute little to the product's distinctive value. Other decisions deserve deeper investigation because they dominate performance, safety, experience, or feasibility. Design effort should be concentrated accordingly.

Short activities allow learners to enter a problem more deeply than they may yet be able to enter their own projects. They provide a safe setting to practice observation, critique, trade-off reasoning, and iteration before those abilities are required under project uncertainty.

The lecture connected this preparation to professional work near the edge of feasibility. Engineers often add the most value when constraints eliminate easy answers. In such settings, the designer may need alternatives because an ideal safeguard, geometry, or behavior is not practically achievable.

Questions to Consider

- What is good about the current idea, and what could make it harmful or ineffective?
- Am I evaluating the idea or defending my ownership of it?
- Which decisions are critical and which can use established solutions?
- What did this short activity teach that transfers to the larger project?
- Which desired behavior may be infeasible under the actual constraints?
- What alternatives become necessary when the obvious solution is unavailable?

2.6 When Is a Human-Centered Design Approach Needed?

Location: 36:31–43:10

The lecture returned to the double-diamond model and separated problem definition from solution definition. Many engineering exercises begin after someone else has already defined the problem. A requirement, load case, or target is given, and the learner begins analysis or solution development. Human-centered projects require the designer to work earlier, where the problem itself is still being framed.

A familiar design-thinking model was summarized through activities such as empathizing, defining, ideating, prototyping, testing, and implementing. Its distinctive contribution is the deliberate attention it gives to people: discovering emotions, stories, workarounds, interpretations, and unmet needs before and during technical development.

The lecture also warned that human-centered design is not the correct primary strategy for every engineering problem. Some problems are predominantly technical and can be resolved through established engineering knowledge without extensive investigation of human experience. A structural component, for example, may be governed mainly by loads, materials, geometry, fatigue, and manufacturing.

Human-centered methods become essential when success depends on what people perceive, understand, value, remember, feel, or do. An aircraft subsystem may pose a primarily technical problem, while the usability of a tray, control, seat, service interaction, or maintenance task introduces human problems. The method should follow the nature of the uncertainty rather than a belief that one process fits everything.

Human-centered attention must also continue during solution development. A product can pass technical tests and still fail when placed in the hands of real people. Non-engineers and intended users can expose assumptions that remain invisible to a technically homogeneous team.

Questions to Consider

- Is the central uncertainty technical, human, or inseparably both?
- Has the problem already been defined by someone else, or does it still need framing?
- What emotions, stories, behaviors, or workarounds are relevant?
- Which technical decisions affect human experience?
- Who should participate in ideation, prototyping, testing, and review?
- Could the design pass an engineering test yet fail in ordinary use?

- Which methods match the actual source of uncertainty?

2.7 What Do Design-Process Models Describe, and Why Should Their Activities Not Become Rigid Steps?

Location: 43:10–51:29

The lecture compared several representations of design: linear activity sequences, iterative cycles, repeated creation and evaluation, a try-again pattern, and a deliberately tangled early-stage sketch. Each helps a designer see something useful, but none should be mistaken for a literal universal schedule.

The key limitation is that these models mainly describe *things designers do*. Activities such as empathy, ideation, prototyping, and testing recur throughout a project and can serve several purposes. A quick prototype may build empathy before requirements are stable. Sketching may support problem discovery, concept comparison, manufacturing communication, or final refinement. Testing begins as soon as a designer judges one opportunity or frame against another.

"Prototype can't be a step in the design process. It can be something I do."

The statement does not mean that process diagrams are useless or that projects lack order. It means that an activity label should not be interpreted as a stage that occurs only once. A novice can use the diagrams as prompts: begin by engaging with people, clarify the need, generate possibilities, make ideas tangible, and evaluate them. As capability grows, the designer must coordinate these actions dynamically and recognize that they happen repeatedly and synergistically.

This section prepares the lecture's central transition. Knowing what designers commonly do is not enough. The designer also needs a model of why those actions are selected and what maturation they should cause in the design.

Questions to Consider

- What useful truth does the current process model communicate?
- What does the model hide or oversimplify?
- Which activities may occur throughout the project rather than once?
- How can prototyping support empathy or problem definition?
- How is testing already occurring during opportunity and frame selection?
- Am I following a label or addressing a current uncertainty?
- What should happen to the design because this activity is performed now?

2.8 What Do Desirability and Transferability Require from a Design?

Location: 51:52–55:39

The first product-development principle states the designer's destination: create a design that is both desirable and transferable.

"Your job as the designer is to create a design that is desirable and transferable."

Desirability means that the product provides value to the people or market for whom it is intended. Technical performance alone does not establish desirability; the design must respond to a need that matters and do so in a form people can understand, use, access, or adopt.

Transferability means that the product definition can move from the designer into a production system without losing essential intent. The design must be clear and complete enough that geometry, materials, manufacturing methods, interfaces, cost expectations, assembly, and quality criteria can be understood and executed reliably.

The lecture defined “design” in this context as a clear and complete product definition rather than a vague concept or attractive image. A historical project example concerned a complex cutting device that reached production without coherent digital models or engineering drawings. The idea could not be launched successfully because the production system lacked the information needed to manufacture it. Rebuilding the models and drawings was necessary before technical problems could be addressed systematically.

The example makes transferability a design responsibility, not a clerical task performed after creative work. If a design firm produces ideas that cannot be communicated well enough to manufacture, the design work remains incomplete.

Questions to Consider

- What evidence shows that intended users value the product?
- Is the design defined beyond an appealing concept or rendering?
- Could another team manufacture the product from the available information?
- Are geometry, materials, interfaces, processes, costs, and quality criteria sufficiently clear?
- Where could intent be lost during transfer to production?
- What information must be created before manufacturing can proceed reliably?

2.9 What Four Principles Govern the Evolution of a Product Design?

Location: 55:39–61:24

The lecture stated four connected principles.

1. The Job Is to Create the Design

The output is not simply a set of activities or artifacts. It is a desirable, transferable, clear, and sufficiently complete definition of the product.

2. The Design Must Evolve

An idea begins incomplete and poorly defined. It may move from a thought, to conversation, to rough visual description, to a formal definition, and through many revised definitions. Evolution should make it better and more mature until it contains what the production system needs to manufacture the product and test its quality.

The first formal definition should not be expected to succeed without revision. Iteration is not evidence that the original work failed; it is how the design acquires missing information and resolves contradictions.

3. Designer Activities Cause Design Evolution

Sketching, prototyping, brainstorming, analysis, and testing are valuable when they move the design toward greater readiness. Performing an activity without a developmental purpose does not satisfy the principle.

"It doesn't really matter if I do these and the design is not evolving."

An example involved a fragile product feature that broke during early prototypes. The design team used analysis and geometric changes so the system would yield or tip under overload rather than break the feature. The engineering work mattered because it changed the product's failure behavior and maturity.

4. Activities Must Be Customized and Coordinated

Adequate evolution requires deciding which actions to perform, at what fidelity, with whom, and in what sequence. One project may need extensive prototypes; another may learn more from interviews, analysis, supplier engagement, or quality planning. Coordination across internal teams and external producers is itself a consequential design responsibility.

No universal activity sequence can substitute for judgment. The designer needs a broad toolbox and must assemble a project-specific path that efficiently advances the design.

Questions to Consider

- What is the intended product definition at the end of the work?
- How is the design more mature than it was before the latest activity?
- What information remains missing for production or quality testing?
- Which activity is most likely to resolve the present uncertainty?
- Does this project need heavy prototyping, lightweight mock-ups, interviews, analysis, or another method?
- Who must coordinate for design intent to survive across organizational boundaries?
- Is the sequence of activities appropriate for this product rather than borrowed mechanically from another process?

2.10 How Can a Complex Product Sketch Be Constructed from a Cuboid?

Location: 61:52–65:46

The sketching demonstration treated a complex office product as a set of related volumes rather than as an outline to be guessed. The process began with a cuboid and then divided that volume to locate the rear section, paper path, tray, handle, and other features.

The basic sequence was:

1. Draw the primary cuboid that establishes the overall proportion and view.
2. Subdivide the cuboid with light construction lines to locate major features.
3. Keep corresponding receding edges directed toward the same vanishing point.
4. Add smaller volumes and interfaces within the established geometry.
5. Round selected corners and clarify the intended form.

6. Darken the final visible edges so the object separates from its construction.
7. Add restrained surface shading and a cast shadow if they improve communication.

The method reduces a difficult object into manageable spatial decisions. Instead of trying to draw every feature at once, the designer creates a reference structure and progressively adds information. An inaccurate line can be corrected without forcing the remaining sketch to inherit the error.

This is also an example of design evolution. The initial cuboid is a low-information definition. Each subdivision and refinement adds a decision about proportion, placement, interface, or appearance until the idea becomes more communicable.

Questions to Consider

- What primary volume best establishes the object's proportion?
- Which features can be located by subdividing that volume?
- Are corresponding edges converging consistently?
- Which construction lines define meaningful product decisions?
- When has enough information been added for the sketch's purpose?
- How is the sketch causing the design to become clearer?

2.11 When Do Design Activities Create Value?

Location: 65:57–69:21

While participants sketched, the lecture restated its central distinction. Designers perform activities that are easy to recognize and celebrate: prototyping, machining, modeling, sketching, benchmarking, reverse engineering, calculation, structural analysis, and fluid analysis. These activities are essential, but their presence does not prove that the project is progressing.

"Those things are awesome. They're essential. But what really matters is what's happening to the design when you're doing all that stuff."

An analysis is worthwhile when its result changes a design decision and improves the product. It is wasteful when it is performed only to produce an impressive image, demonstrate that the software was used, or satisfy an activity label without affecting the design.

The relevant developmental directions were summarized as greater **desirability** and greater **transferability**. If the design is not advancing in at least one meaningful dimension, the activity consumes time and money without producing value for the client or stakeholders.

Evolution does not require every intermediate result to be good. Generating many poor concepts may still be valuable if the activity moves the project from having no alternatives toward a reasoned selection. The measure is the change in the design's state, not the isolated quality of every artifact produced along the way.

Questions to Consider

- What decision will this analysis, prototype, sketch, or interview inform?
- How should the design change if the result is positive, negative, or ambiguous?
- Is the activity increasing desirability, transferability, or both?

- Am I producing an artifact to demonstrate effort or to reduce uncertainty?
- Can an unsuccessful concept still advance selection or understanding?
- What value would be lost if this activity were omitted?

2.12 How Should Construction, Line Weight, and Presentation Refine a Sketch?

Location: 70:01–74:35

The sketching discussion returned to the instruction to begin with cuboids and divide them into smaller cuboids. When a drawing becomes distorted, the likely cause is that features were added without maintaining the underlying volume or common vanishing directions.

Construction lines should remain light enough to guide the geometry while allowing the final object to dominate. A ballpoint pen was praised because pressure can produce both faint construction lines and darker final edges. A pen with less line-weight variation makes it harder to distinguish temporary geometry from the communicated product form.

The lecture also separated an effective working sketch from a portfolio-ready image. A rapid drawing may communicate well during development while still needing modest presentation cleanup before formal use. Cropping, contrast adjustment, background cleanup, restrained color, and clear image capture can make the work easier to read without disguising the underlying sketch.

Presentation refinement should serve communication rather than create a false impression of design maturity. The goal is to let the viewer perceive the intended form, sequence, or reasoning without being distracted by gray backgrounds, accidental shadows, weak contrast, or unnecessary detail.

Questions to Consider

- Is every added feature grounded in a coherent underlying volume?
- Do related edges share the correct vanishing direction?
- Can construction lines and final product lines be distinguished immediately?
- Does line weight communicate hierarchy and depth?
- What minimal cleanup would make the sketch easier to interpret?
- Does presentation quality support the idea without overstating its maturity?

2.13 How Do Developmental Stages Differ from Iterative Designer Actions?

Location: 75:00–78:24

The lecture concluded with an analogy between engineered-product development and biological development. The analogy was explicitly limited: two things can be similar in important respects without being similar in every respect.

The useful similarity is the distinction between **actions** and **developmental state**. Caregivers may repeatedly perform actions that influence development, while developmental milestones describe characteristics that have emerged. Likewise, designers repeatedly sketch, analyze, prototype, consult, and test, while the product progresses through states of increasing definition and maturity.

The developmental stages are therefore not a list of iterative tasks. They are a roadmap of expected product characteristics or milestones. Designer actions may loop, repeat, overlap, or change order as needed to help the product reach those milestones.

This section was largely read or closely paraphrased from supplied instructional material. In keeping with the quotation rules, its wording is summarized rather than presented as original instructor quotation.

The distinction resolves an apparent conflict. Design activity is highly iterative, but product maturity can still be assessed against a developmental direction. Repeating an action is useful when it helps the design acquire characteristics appropriate to the next milestone; repetition without developmental change is not progress.

Questions to Consider

- Am I naming an action the designer performs or a state the product has reached?
- What characteristics define the current developmental stage?
- Which milestones have been reached, and which remain absent?
- What iterative actions could help the design reach the next milestone?
- How will progress be assessed against expectations?
- Is repeated activity producing developmental change?
- Where does the analogy clarify the process, and where should it not be extended?

2.14 Central Synthesis

The lecture's overall argument is that design should be managed by developmental purpose rather than by activity completion.

Problem framing demonstrates the principle early. Generating many frames, checking who, what, where, when, and why, and validating with people are actions. Their intended developmental effect is a more defensible, human-centered opportunity definition. A rapid mock-up is another action. Its purpose may be to expose assumptions and create a conversation that makes the design more desirable. Digital modeling, engineering drawings, analysis, testing, and supplier coordination are actions whose purpose may be to make the design more transferable.

Process diagrams remain helpful as collections of possible actions and invitations to begin. They become misleading when treated as universal fixed sequences or evidence of progress by themselves. The designer must select, order, repeat, and coordinate activities according to what the particular design still lacks.

The four principles provide a coherent test:

1. Is the work producing a clear, complete, desirable, and transferable design?
2. Is the design becoming more mature?
3. Are the selected activities causing that evolution?
4. Are those activities customized and coordinated for this product and production system?

The distinction between iterative actions and developmental milestones makes progress assessable without pretending that design follows a simple linear script. Activities can remain flexible while the product is judged by increasingly demanding characteristics.

The most important continuing questions are:

- What is the current state of the design?
- What should be different after the next design activity?
- Which uncertainty is preventing greater desirability or transferability?

- What is the least costly activity capable of resolving that uncertainty?
- Who must participate for the result to be valid?
- What product information must be added, corrected, or communicated?
- How will the result change the design rather than merely document effort?
- Which developmental milestone is the work approaching?
- Are repeated actions coordinated into a purposeful path?
- If the design is not evolving, why is the activity being performed?