USING A VARIETY OF CRITIQUE FORMATS FOR SUCCESSFUL LEARNING OUTCOMES

These examples of how critiques may be or are conducted were compiled from graduate student and faculty discussions. Different formats and different styles of critiques respond to students with a range of learning styles. How can a faculty member enrich a critique environment by diversifying formats, pacing, outcomes and clarifying competency levels? What is a generatively changing critique environment and can this advance student learning more substantially and lasting?

Single long critique of one person's work with a group.

Group critiques of a group of works from many students.

Rotating small-group critiques, alone with one faculty or several faculty.

Individual desk critiques; individual informal reviews.

Walk-through critiques, informal and optional, studio-to-studio, desk-to desk critiques.

Faculty going studio to studio visiting and critiquing only one student at a time.

Faculty and students moving studio-to-studio for solo individual critiques.

Guest critic visiting each studio for solo individual critiques

Guest critic and faculty and students are merged and discuss equally in a group critique situation.

Group critiques preceded by a group reading assignment used as a prompt for discussion in the critique.

Group critiques where the discussion identifies areas of strength and areas of weakness regarding an individual's pieces or a collection of pieces by a variety of students.

Critiques where two students lead a discussion about one piece, followed by two subsequent students until teams of two discuss all work.

Written and silent critiques of each individual's studio work or projects by each member of the group, collated and given to each student at the end of the session.

Critiques using metaphor, analogy and comparison as means of discussion.

Critiques where discussion of ideas and concepts is a priority over medium or technique.

Critiques where parameters and criteria of criticism are explained before an open discussion.

Critiques where goals of criticism are clearly stated at the outset and these goals grow and change during the duration of the class.

Critiques where a project's basic and advanced competency levels or levels of attainment are clearly stated at the outset of the critique and the discussions are based on these qualities.

Students arrange the critique pieces in order of resolution and the group begins the discussion from this starting point.

Critiques that consider different topics or themes: technical and/or conceptual growth, project-based goals, collaborative success, with team or external guidelines.

Critiques with a guest panel of faculty and external artists or designers discussing the student work in front of the group.

Critiques where the student asks three questions to the group about his/her work and remains silent during the group discussion.

Critiques where one student describes and talks about the work of another student to the group and then asks the maker to speak about his/her work to the group.

Critiques where all the students look at all of the work and write anonymous questions about any work or works he/she would like, then these are collected and used as discussion points for the group.

Critiques where the qualities of surprise and difference are addressed first and then the areas of commonality are discussed secondly.

Critiques where the intellectual structure of the course moves in tandem with the questions posed in the ongoing critiques.