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Introduction

This semester was my Final Bachelor Project. For this semester I chose the project of City Vitality in the Out of Control space. Coming from my T+HUIS internship I was pleased to see a project aimed at social design. I have found my interest in design to come from this angle, perspective and responsibility as a designer.

The reason why I am attracted to these projects is because I as a designer I like the role of mediator. I create structures, systems and tools that enable people to create value themselves. I am merely there to stimulate, increase and elaborate these values, making them surface and then spread out among those involved. I believe in the capabilities of people and use a group or community as a form of decentralized intelligence. I believe that design should help these people to use their capabilities and intelligence to apply change themselves, making it more relevant and humanly interactive.

The process described throughout this report describes a qualitative explorative and iterative process. In social design projects the design problem is often highly complex and dynamix. For me to understand where I could contribute to the society I have used a series of activities to understand the project context. From here insights and values were abstracted that later on became part of the final design.

It is a co-evolving process.
**What is City Vitality**

**Project introduction**
The City Vitality project at the faculty of Industrial Design is a testcase for the bigger project of Smart Living 2020. This is a big BeNeLux project focused on the societal problems occurring in healthcare. A large network of caretakers, health insurance companies, municipalities, knowledge centers & universities have and will be working on the following statement until 2020.

"With the rise in aging, demand for health increases because people are living longer and the proportion of the chronically ill is also growing. Over the next ten years demand for quality, affordable and efficient care will become even greater while the number of people working in care shrinks..."

As a project for the TU/e ID faculty we were asked to run a project in the Coevering, Geldrop. A representative neighborhood for the SL2020 project because they have a relatively high, and rising, amount of elderly. In this neighborhood the 75+ are growing by 12% in the coming decennium and 1/3 of the community will consist of a group that is 65+.

**The design objective**
We as students were asked to create concrete research and (design) output for the client. The mission was to do explorative research on the physical activity of the elderly in the Coevering and use design thinking and practice to concretize insights into designs that stimulate a healthy lifestyle.

The vision of the project was to stimulate people their physical activity. This links to the societal problem by linking good physical activity, in general considered to be connected to a healthy lifestyle, to the prevention of illness. They envision to solve this societal problem by putting the responsibility with the people themselves. Our designs therefore needed to stimulate and engage these people towards taking matters in their own hands.

The results from a perspective of prevention is that (hopefully) the ask for qualitative care decreases, making it possible for people to live longer in an aging society.
Project approach

Approach introduction
For this project an approach was formed by combining two theories from two involved coaches, Vera Winthagen & Caroline Hummels.

Vera Winthagen used to coach projects in Changing Behavior, introducing the students to the methodology of Frame Creation. Frame Creation and its accompanying design methods help the designer to create frames from values that lay beneath the surface of the problem. It is an approach towards social design projects that allow designs to address deeper human values instead of designing counter measures for superficial problems.

Caroline Hummels is part of the Designing Quality in Interaction group and coaches in Out of Control. The theory she connects to is Phenomenology. A theory that believes true value isn’t in the human mind nor the object, but in the interaction between those two. People perceive the world in terms of what they can do with it and this theory implies that designers should design for value to be created in this interaction.

With the recent closing of Changing Behavior and this project being relocated in Out of Control, these two coaches were interested in what happened if these two methodologies were combined. They are opposite in perspective and differ how the designer places himself in the context. However, when combined, the designer has a continuous shifting perspective which may create interesting outcomes.

Project Approach
The approach that followed from the combination of these two theories was an explorative and iterative design process. Many design activities followed each other to deepen my understanding of both the design problem and design solution space. I involved myself actively in the neighborhood, designing engagement tools that addressed different values and used several contexts to see different outcomes.

In between these activities I convert this information into concrete insights and values. I put these into the bigger picture allowing myself to find the available and relevant design opportunities to continue the project.

This iterative process makes the selection of ideas an intuitive and explorative process. With the complexity and dynamic aspects of these social design projects it is necessary for me to keep a trial-error approach going because this is what develops the understanding of the project.

Detailed description of these activities follows in the next chapter.
Introduction to the project

Within the first weeks I was involved in a series of activities that stimulated and prepared me to do contextual explorative research in the Coevering. I will be discussing these in detail and will highlight the important insights that resulted from these activities.

To begin I would like to explain how we were introduced to the theory of Phenomenology and the design method of Designing in Skills (DiS).

Introduction to DiS
Designing in Skills is a design method linked to the methodology of Phenomenology and was used as an introduction to start thinking about the design objective topic, physical activity.

The design method is a mean to explore a personal skill. Looking at this personal skill from a first person perspective pushes the designer to reflect what this skills means to him/her. This reflection of values is then highlighted through mirroring skills in duos, each person performing the other’s skill. After seeing the difference in experience, the duo searches for similarities, combining values that address both experiences. These are then concretized into a physical object which goal is to enable and engage others to experience the same experience, otherwise known as an engagement tool.

Waitering as a physical activity
The first task was to create a movie about a personal physical skill and link values to this activity (see Fig. 1).

For this exercise, waitering was my topic. Instead of an physical activity that is performed for entertainment, fun or recreation, this was a work related activity. Performing and reflecting on this activity made four main values arise.

- Balance
- Anticipation
- Control
- Awareness

In this exercise these four values described what my waitering experience was. A continuous and constant balance of awareness. Focusing on two things, environment and tray, at the same time. Although these values don't address how this physical activity emotionally links to me, it was a preparation for what follows. The creation of an engagement tool.

Figure 1: A shot from the movie made for the physical skill of waitering
First Engagement tool

Engagement Tools their goal is to let others engage in a personal experience. By concretizing the values from the previous exercise into something experienceable.

In this exercise a duo was formed with Janneke van der Poel, combining the values of waitering and volleyball. When these values were put together we searched for similarities between these skills finding five new values describing both experiences. These values beneath were then used to create a first engagement tool.

- Anticipation
- Control
- Reacting
- Little body contact / movement
- Large effect

The engagement tool concept

This engagement tool was aimed a creating a game like experience about finding the right balance (see Fig. 2). The first iteration was a tube filled with sand, hanging like a hourglass. This was way too easy to balance. To improve this prototype we created a new one that consisted of 5 chambers. These 5 chambers differed in how they let the sand go through which increases the difficulty of finding the right distribution of sand. The user had to be in control of the tube, anticipate where the sand would flow, react if it did differently, use as little body movement as possible because otherwise the effects would be that the balance was ruined.

This was in our perception the right difficulty to really address those 5 values.
First Engagement tool

The results
When this engagement tool was presented to the others involved in this exercise, it was made clear that not everything is as obvious as it seems. When the engagement tool was created we were pleased with the way it addressed the values we decided to focus on. However, without any prior knowledge, the others were lost in finding its purpose, making it a totally different experience for them.

Observing this emphasized that experiences are not that easily translated or transferred to others. The main reason for this is that different people interact differently with the object, thus linking different values to it.

Why was this introduction exercise done?
The reason for this exercise was to prepare the students of City Vitality to create an engagement tool for the project context. We learned how to abstract values out of an experience or situation and quickly concretize those by creating an engagement tool. This allows for discussion to happen about the values that this engagement tool addresses, making it an useful tool to start exploring the project context.
**Beginning of exploratory research**

**First encounter in the Coevering**
The goal of our first exploration in the Coevering was to get insights how this community feels about physical activity. Our first observation was that it was a very closed community that was not that open towards strangers knocking on their door asking them questions. Many households had stickers on their front door saying „Geen gezeur aan mijn deur” which roughly translates to „No nonsense at my door”.

Nevertheless, one person was very eager to talk about the Coevering and its community. This person was Bert Gruijters (see Fig. 3), who was one of the main people in charge of the community center. He knew all the elderly people of the neighborhood and was able to give an insight about how this community works.

For the creation of an engagement tool for this community, values were abstracted from the observations in the neighborhood and the conversation with Bert Gruijters.
Second Engagement Tool

The reason to create an engagement tool for the project context was to create a deeper understanding how this community works. The idea is the same, creating a tool that engages people into an experience, but now the results contributed to our understanding of the design problem. This tool was therefore used to do explorative research in the neighborhood of the Coevering.

The values
The values addressed in this engagement tool were mainly three things.

- The community looks like it’s sleeping.
The people are passive in their behavior. They rather wait for you to come to them instead of taking initiative.

- The community is closed to the outside world.
The stickers on the door and blinded windows give a closed feeling to the neighborhood.

- The people are more self-obtained than in the past.
When they go out, e.g. for groceries, they don't observe or are open to what is happening around them.

The engagement tool concept
The goal for the concept of the engagement tool was to break this closed and passive behavior. Together with Stef Arends the Coevering Sandwich Engagement Tool was developed.

The concept is very simple. A table was set up centrally in the neighborhood and was filled with sandwiches and ingredients (see Fig. 4). The first sandwich was already prepared and offered to the passing people. If they wanted the sandwich, they only had to do one thing. After they finished their sandwich, they had to prepare a new one for the next person.

The intention behind this was to make people aware that they shouldn't only take, but also be active in giving. It is a very simple gesture that links to the values mentioned above because they are asked to create something for someone else and open up about how they feel about that. Instead of engaging people into a personal experience, this tool engaged people into a conversation, which led it to be a very useful tool for explorative and qualitative research.

Besides that, all this information was captured on film, summarizing most of the important information and insights taken from performing this experiment in the neighborhood.
Engagement tool sessions

This engagement tool has been used three times in different settings and set-ups to get relevant insights about the community. The tool has been used twice in the middle of the neighborhood and once in a fixed setting for a Co-Reflection session together with 4 elderly people and 2 designers from Van Berloo.

In the third session a conversation was already happening making the tool more a lunch-break than actually a way to engage with those people. However, the insights from that session are relevant to the bigger picture of the project and therefore will be discussed as a separate part of the explorative research for this project.

Session 1 & 2: Engagement tool in the neighborhood
During two days this engagement tool was used from 11:00 - 17:00 in the middle of a parking place in the neighborhood of Coevering near the shopping mall and community centre.

During these days the set-up changed towards a more inviting and comfortable situation. Instead of a standing table, a dinner table was used. Although this seems like a small difference, the effect was noticeable. When sitting down, most people seemed to feel more open to tell a story and taking their time for it.

Session 1 & 2 Insights
The information that was obtained through these two sessions mainly focused on how those people felt about modern society. Coevering being a neighborhood with a lot of elderly, they all had a feeling that back in the days, referring to a timeframe between 1970-1980, people were more easy going.

During the last 30 years they had noticed a shift in people becoming more individualistic, focusing more on taking care of themselves by working hard to earn money. They believe that the upbringing of the children suffers from this and that people don’t take the time anymore to get to know their neighbors.

Parallel to the shift in people, the also noticed society changing towards what they call a ‘surveillance society’. They use this term to describe a society with a lot of rules and feel frightened by it. Even though some people want to take initiative they feel that they are kept under the governments thumb and a scared for the consequences that might follow (ranging from disapproval of the community to fines or jail time).

Session 3: Co-Reflection
The third session of the engagement tool was part of a Co-Reflection session. The usage of this tool was not considered an added contribution. There are several reasons why this tool didn't work in this context.

The session was held in a fixed closed location, the people were invited to join this session and the tool was used at the end of the session. What followed is that the food was more used as a lunch than as actually an engaging tool for a conversation. Also, the conversation and discussion already was taken place so there was no need for further engagement between us (the designers) and the elderly.

Showing the movie that was made of the previous sessions brought forth some good reactions on how they thought and felt about those topics.

Nevertheless, the session was an useful activity for research purposes so I will discuss this further as a separate part of the exploratory research done in the Coevering.
Co-Reflection Session

Introduction to Co-Reflection
A Co-Reflection session is a design method that is used to stimulate the participants of that session to give qualitative better feedback. This is done by inducing them through different tasks slowly making implicit information explicit.

The way these sessions are approached is by first asking them to think of a specific personal situation. Afterwards they are given a task linked to this personal situation. This gives them the ability to create an opinion how to improve this. Then they are confronted with a different opinion (in most design processes this is the designer's solution to this situation) which makes it possible to put their personal opinions opposite to the designer's opinion.

By first focusing on them personally the participants are pushed to make their thoughts, believes and opinions explicit regardless of any influence of the designer. In the last part they are more capable to give valuable feedback in because the have formed their own opinion on the situation rather than being confronted right away with the designer's opinion.

The co-reflection session
Although this session was not completely organized in such a way. In did focus on personal stories in order for important topics to arise and making the four participants discuss this with each other.

Part 1: Introduction talk
The first part of the session was an elaborate introduction round. Asking them where they came from and how they live nowadays, what they encounter in daily life etc. In this introduction round two of the participants already saw and made a connection with each other, promising each other they would meet up next week for a ladies club meeting in the community centre.

Example: Family Poot (See Fig. 5)
The information taken from this introduction talk, together with the rest of the session’s insights allowed for Van Berloo to create a Human Value Canvas. These visualize shortly what drives these people. The Fam. Poot is still very active in tennis & walking with other elderly. They do this because of the social contact they encounter there and have done so since there upbringing. Because of this their (social) network is quite big therefore they don't need a lot of facilities.

People Value Canvas /

Figure 5: An example of a People Value Canvas. It displays information regarding the feelings of the Fam. Poot towards physical activity. This document is taken from the research document of Van Berloo.
Co-Reflection Session

Part 2: Typical Day
The second task was to describe a day from last week that roughly represents a typical day for them. Making them talk about a typical day pushes them to find activities or situations they encounter on a general basis. As a follow up task these conversations gave information more information about their present life and what kind of activities they value for what reasons.

Example: Betsy
One of the participants named Betsy told us that she had a birthday of one of her friends. She went for coffee and cake and afterwards a couple glasses of wine in a nearby cafe.

This wouldn’t seem like anything of importance on first hand. However, she is a diabetic and needs to measure her insulin levels. The day after this party she noticed that she had ‘sinned’. Making this into a negative experience. She also has home care twice a day for measuring, confining her to her home on specific set of times.

Betsy / Maandag
“Thuiszorg komt 2 maal per dag langs.”

![Figure 6: An visualization of a day in the life of Betsy. This document is taken from the research document of Van Berloo.]

Part 3: Engagement tool movie
As said before, the engagement tool itself wasn’t that useful. Showing the movie that was made from this experiment did trigger some reactions from the participants. In this movie the most important insights were summarized thus showing how we thought the people felt in the neighborhood.

Because of the lack of routine in this final part, the conversation just raddled on about several topics, giving a few more examples of personal encounters that were linked to their drives and motivations.

Example: Jo
Jo is an active member in the neighborhood of the Coevering. One year she wanted to put up a big central christmas tree in the middle of the neighborhood and needed permission to do so from the municipality. After waiting for a decent amount of time she decided to take matters in to her own hands and plant the tree herself. Everybody in the neighborhood liked it and no real complaints came her way from the city counsel.

The reason she told this story is that she wanted to make a point that she feels as if the municipality doesn’t trust its community. She doesn’t see the need for all the regulations and rules. She feels as if these slow down the process of applying change in the neighborhood.
By this time, I was concluding most of the research done in the Coevering. It was clear that social connectivity and social interaction was highly important and linked to any physical activity done in the neighborhood. Therefore I wanted to focus on bringing people together working towards a common goal. These projects are called bottom-up projects where the collective is in charge and works together to achieve one specific (set of) goal(s).

Through Izabela Boloz (project coach) contact was made with Cees Donkers (See Fig. 7). Cees Donkers is educated in Architecture and Urban Planning but through his approach in daily life and in his career he has become an expert on these type of projects.

The goal of this meeting was to shortly present him with the project of City Vitality and the research that already has been done. Cees Donkers would be able to give insights how successful bottom-up projects are organized and approached.

An insight in successful projects

By telling lots of inspiring stories about the huge amount of work Cees Donkers has done for and with the city of Eindhoven he generated some insights on how to approach these projects. This advice can be summarized in to three general statements.

- In these projects you must focus for the creation of awareness through usage of a tool, service or product. This is actually they only thing you need to do because if they are aware what needs to happen they will be(come) motivated themselves to take action.

- You need a core team that pulls the car, meaning a small amount of people from the context that work with you from the start. These people become examples for the larger group you want to engage.

- You yourself need to kickstart it. If you wait for others to pick it up you will fail because people aren’t yet aware of your service/product/tool and therefore there is no motivation to pick it up. Lead by example and involve yourself in the product as if you were one of them.

Figure 7: Cees Donkers. Picture is taken from a short movie in which he explains his work as Urban Designer. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IOQ8v23yiYE.
Summarizing the Research

After these activities it was time to summarize and conclude the research that was already done. The main insights from the research will be summarized in 5 statements. Some lesser important insights are already mentioned throughout the report and will be linked to when needed.

Research conclusions
Beneath are 5 statements that conclude most of the research in my interpretation. These 5 statements formed the foundation and the boundaries for the design direction I have chosen to follow.

- People are more scared to take initiative because of the consequences.
  These consequences range from disapproval of the neighborhood, problems with house or tax corporations & municipalities or police involvement (fines / jail time)

- People complain more nowadays because they feel unheard by the government (high and low).
  There is no real and good communication between government and community making it difficult to change something from within the community.

- There is a general feeling that back in the days (1970 - 1980) life was better and more comfortable.
  Back in the days there was still time for raising children or having a nice cup of coffee with your neighbors. Nowadays people only work, for money, to buy stuff they don't need.

- People feel as if other people are more self-obtained.
  Rather focus on their own than take an active role as part of a community. Also mentionable is that by being self-obtained one might not even notice that he/she is part of a community. Some people have more in common than they think but just by not being open towards somebody else makes them unaware or incapable of finding these similarities.

- People (mostly) move for the social contact and social interaction that comes with it.
  The physical activity gets its value through the people that are involved in it. The social contact makes it an enjoyable experience. That the physical activity itself is good for them is something that the doctor says and is commonly known and doesn’t contribute to the motivation to do so.

Concluding these five statements brought forth a design direction. The main conclusion is that people move for social contact, which implies that creating a situation for social contact to arise results in people inherently moving more.

This became the foundation for the design direction that is described in the next chapter.
Design Direction

From these conclusions I concretized a design direction. Because social contact is one of the main reasons that motivates physical activity I stated the following angle for the design direction.

„Create possibilities (read: experiences) for social contact to arise, invite and/or engage and people will inherently move more”

From this angle, an approach was concretized following the insights from Cees Donkers.

„ A bottom-up approach where through small interaction / participation people are able to give individual input. By putting this input into a situation where social contact is made they are stimulated to become more engaged with the community in order to work towards a common goal.”

What is meant by this is that the design for this project has to create a possibility or an experience that results in social contact. The way to do so is to create a conceptual design that is implemented in a bottom-up process thus in this context focusing on bonding a community and making them work together towards a common goal.

Do It Yourself!

To concretize this direction further, a decision was made to focus on creating a Do It Yourself (DIY) tool or toolkit. This toolkit would enable people to first create input themselves what is then moved to a central location/situation in the neighborhood. The reason for this is that from the research it shows that people actually do want to be seen and heard but aren't able or aren't comfortable enough to do so. To enforce this a DIY toolkit could contribute to people their need to create input. In order to make a relevant change to their environment, all this input is put together and the result is something much bigger than individually would be possible with the same amount of effort.

For example growing vegetables and herbs. If person A, B, C etc all first plant this at home with the use of their toolkit and then move it together into one central location, with very little effort a community garden is created. After the community garden is created, the toolkit can be used to maintain the garden eventually creating a self-organizing system which stimulates both physical activity and social contact.

Growing Community

The example above is given for a reason. The first conceptual idea for starting a bottom-up project was a community garden. Providing every member of the community with a different kit for different parts that are necessary or important in a community garden.

The central location would provide not only a place for social contact but would also be common goal for those involved to work to. Also the use of nature was a fitting metaphor since it costs effort for it to grow and the results aren’t always directly noticeable.

For the design direction taken from the research I believed this to fit perfectly. However working out an angle within this idea was difficult since a lot has already been done before. The idea generation was stuck on ideas concerning customizable flowerpots or creating a business model for a community gardenshop which provided its members with fresh vegetables each week. These ideas were too limited in their (new) contribution to society.

Although I believe creating a community garden would have increased the physical activity in the neighborhood, the idea generation took to much time out in the process. Because the project had a limited amount of time left, the decision was made to go back to the drawing board and reflect again what were the main values for creating a concept.
Design Direction

Changing the context
Going back to the drawing board resulted in the decision to change the context for the project. This new context was the Green Space at the faculty of Industrial Design where the theme Out of Control is situated. Their theme identity involves putting the responsibility on the students for cleaning, arranging activities, exhibitions, space lay-out etc.

Although several ideas for stimulating this have been implemented, no real results were achieved in changing the behavior of the students. The reason to choose this context is because it rooms a community that possibly can get more out of working together but until now haven’t used this.

In this new context the focus would be on creating a self-organized system for ID students with tools that enables them to initiate and work out activities such exhibitions, expert meetings, workshop etc together. There are plenty of topics in which all students can relate, contribute or find a goal in.

The goal was to create a system that mediates creating awareness of what needs and can be done in the space. During this time the Final Demo Day Exhibition came close so therefore this topic was most focused on and used multiple times for validation.

For understanding the iterative process that developed the tool I will first describe the final design and afterwards break down how this was developed, explored, validated and evaluated.
The Concept: Green goes Self-Organized

The concept for the Green Space is a system that enables students to apply change in their immediate environment. Helping them asking the right questions, getting (quick) feedback and input from the community and finding frames / channels to tackle the question.

The tools
The way this is done is by a set of designed tools and a large centrally located board. The toolset consists of a box including 3 different cards. There is an Initiator card, a Player Card and a Category Card. This box is free for anyone willing to partake in the system as an initiator and obtained at the centrally located board.

Initiator Card
There is only one Initiator Card in a deck. This card is for the initiator only and can be displayed in the front of the box. This card contains an example on how to fill it in and on the backside there is room for the initiator to fill in their topic, the reason for them to address this topic and their goal. The reason behind this is that it pushes this person to think why he wants something changed and what he actually wants to achieve. This creates borders for asking the right relevant question which is the foundation for the rest of the process.

![Figure 8: The initiator card](image)

Player Card
The Player Card (see Fig. 9) is a card used to obtain feedback and input from the community. The initiator personally writes his question on one side while spreading these cards among the community. On the other side the person who this card has been given to has room to fill in three things: Full name, his thoughts and his proposals. Separating room for thoughts and proposals is done to push this person to come up with ideas themselves too instead of solely complaining.

Category Card
The Category Card (see Fig. 9) is used to summarize a x-amount of Player Card's input. An essential part of this process is finding out what categories, topics or keywords are (most) mentioned throughout all the input from the community. This card is therefore used to pinpoint the category of the surrounding feedback and has room for descriptive keywords to be added (if necessary to understand context).
The Concept: Green goes Self-Organized

The board
The board is divided in 5 different sections. Players, Expert Team, Subject, In Process & Achievements.

The first section, Players, is filled with cards displaying photos of every student and involved coach in the space. On the card there is room for these people to fill in their name and (main) expertise. This already is an attribution to the community because there is an overview of who is who and who knows what.

The Expert team section is used to display who is working on what subject. In the beginning of the process this only is the Initiator. Other players might feel interested to help or they are invited because of the expertise they filled in.

The Subject section is reserved for the mapping of the feedback from the Player Cards. The Initiator and maybe his already assembled expert team pins the different cards on the board grouping them based on their input. In this part the Category Card is also used for the first time, visualizing what the topic is that binds the different groups of Player Cards.

Both the In Process and Achievements section are there to clearly visualize what topic is worked on or already has been implemented / arranged / taken care of. When a category is decided to be further developed this is moved to the In Process section and when success is booked it is moved to the Achievements section.

Figure 9: The Player Card & Category Card
Scenario

Figure 10: A visualization of the system process with its tools.
Development Process of the Final Concept

Because the Final Demo Day was coming up the decision was made to develop the final concept parallel to the validation and evaluation of the tools. Meaning that by creating a first iteration and using it to obtain feedback from the community it was tested on how it should work, how it could become a relevant integrated part of Out of Control and what kind of contributions could be made by using it.

For getting new insights on how to design certain elements, meetings were arranged with experts that either have a connection to Out of Control, have tried such to implement such systems and tools or are experts on particular aspects concerning the concept.

Coaches from Out of Control such as Mathias Funk, Sander Mulder and Bart Hengeveld gave a green light for this concept to be tested. They were enthusiastic about such a system and were interested in what kind of contributions it could make. Their feedback consisted mostly of pointing out small remarks on the designs of the system making sure that the system would run smoothly but these meetings didn’t result in new insights how to design for this system to work.

Contact was made with Migchiel van Diggelen to ask for help designing a tool that helps students to ask the right question. This meeting resulted in gaining insight that there should be certain designed elements in my concept that pushed people to write down what their cause and goal was. This would help them finding the right framework in which they can formulate a question.

The rest of the development of the final concept was a running iterative user test spread out over the remaining time in the semester. Meaning that different explorations of the designed tools were implemented in the Green Space to obtain feedback and input.

The result of this running iterative user test was a final concept for the project accompanied by an Final Demo Day Exhibition which was organized, set-up and designed by the students themselves.

Further details about this different iterations will be discussed in the following chapter.

Figure 11: The box containing the deck of cards. The box has a double front where the Initiator card can be displayed showing the initiators topic reason and goal.
Evaluation

As said earlier, the development of the system and its tool went parallel to the evaluation of the tool. When the first iteration of the system using physical cards to obtain feedback from the community was made, the first user test was done immediately to validate design decisions and evaluate outcomes.

Because the community wasn’t already familiar with the system the decision was made to include myself as an initiator in the system. This links back to the feedback that Cees Donkers had given, saying that in order for such projects to work, I had to kickstart it myself.

Iteration 1
In the first iteration the question was „What can you still learn about pitching?“. This was asked because there was the possibility for students to follow a pitching workshop the next day. The feedback they gave could then be incorporated in the workshop.

Results iteration 1
In this iteration it was clear that they design of the cards didn’t work as was intended. The Player Card was divided in two ways, Reaction & Proposal. This confused people, not knowing what they were meant to write in both areas.

Although not every card was completely filled in, either with their ideas or proposals, it was possible to already filter out three different categories.
* English (referring to their speaking capabilities and the usage of the right language.)
* Selling the story (referring to how to make a memorable and selling pitch.)
* Audience (referring to how to incorporate, use, guide the audience.)

Because this was already a predefined workshop no real integration of the feedback was used during the workshop.

Iteration 2
A new iteration was made clearly stating on the card I think:… I propose… instead of Reaction and Proposal. These guiding elements on the card made it clearer for the students what to fill in in terms of their feedback and input. When testing this the students were actually able to both write down their thoughts on a topic but also take the time to create a concrete proposal.

The question was asked „How can we make students aware of their possibilities & responsibilities in their space/theme?“. The reason this question was asked is that the feedback would actually be a contribution to the understanding how to design the tools more properly. This shows that the user test is both an evaluation on one part and contributes to the development of another.

Results iteration 2
Instead of getting concrete insights on how these tools could further be elaborated most of the feedback and input focused on wanting more group / theme activities. Observing this in the feedback from the community made it clear that such a system is potentially useful if realized. However, for this to work the system had to be introduced immediately at the beginning of the semester in order for the students to become fully capable of using it.
Evaluation

Final iteration
For the last iteration the focus was on the Final Demo Day Exhibition. The question was „What elements do you need to to improve your exhibition?“.

The tools stayed almost the same, tweaking some minor details in the naming of the cards and the explanations needed for the students to understand what was asked of them.

The goal of this user test was to actually integrate the feedback and input from the community in organizing a qualitative better exhibition. A small expert team was already assembled to do so consisting of me, Sebastiaan van de Venne as an initiator, Job Huberts because of his role as staff assistant being partially in charge of the exhibition and Izabela Boloz because of her expertise in exhibition design. Later Sander Mulder was also added because of his previous responsibility of taken care of the exhibition.

Results final iteration
The feedback from this session consisted of 4 different categories

- DaGMIS (Designing a Group Music Improvisation System) requirements
  This is a project within Out of Control focusing on music. There was a lot of uncertainty what was expected of them at the exhibition.

- Darkness
  Lots of students took this opportunity to ask for a dark room for their exhibition since their project incorporated light.

- External Support
  This was aimed at the need for support from outside of the community. Ranging from workshops on exhibition set-up to coaches being more involved in the space for inspiration rather than solely coaching their own students.

- Modification
  This was aimed at everything that could or should be modified and is connected to the final demo day exhibition. This ranged from poster templates, to exhibition set-up and project identities.

Integration of the feedback
With the expert team it was decided to focus on the last topic, the modification of the exhibition.

The only action needed to be initiated was that a large print of the basic lay out was made and placed within the green space. People were invited to come have a look at the layout and were asked to become representatives for their project group. This task meant being in charge of coming up with a exhibition design for that specific project. By doing so, in one hour, 6 representatives were chosen that all went out and asked what their fellow project students needed for the exhibition.

The result of this action was that the exhibition was qualitatively much better. The room was perfectly divided in terms of spacing and design and every project had a different approach to how they had set up their exhibition. This was confirmed by several coaches and other ID related people by saying that the exhibition had a pleasant open feeling and that this most likely was one of the best and nicest looking exhibitions ever to have happened in the Green Space.

Some minor actions that also contributed to the quality of the exhibition is that the decision was made to have a introduction talk at the opening of the exhibition. This was done to boost the moral of the students and showing the gratitude of the coaches to all the students their hard work. Next to that there was also coffee and tea available which is a nice attribution to the whole community.
Conclusion

The final concept of this system is to my idea not finished yet. For such a system and its tools to reach full potential and be realized it needs to be implemented immediately in the beginning of the semester in order for students to fully understand the possibilities and the way it works. For now this final concept provides a system and tools for initiating activities and does so with the input of the community. This already created results within the community in terms of the exhibition.

Also mentionable is that by involving myself as an initiator I started talking more to people I didn't know and vice versa. People in the space also started noticing I was working on the exhibition and came up to me with questions, thoughts and proposals. I didn't approach these people previously, asking them to give feedback through the tools, but merely because I was moving more within the space I got recognized and approached.

I see potential for this system to be further elaborated and developed through an iterative process and an explorative hands-on research in which numeral activities are initiated. However this takes up quite some time that simply was not available anymore in the timeframe of my project. Mathias Funk, who is the theme champ of Out of Control has given me the possibility to come back next semester and further work out this project. If this will happen is not sure yet.

In the end, the concept I created is the result of an active exploratory and iterative process in which the understanding of the design problem and the design solution co-evolved together. If I look back at the conclusions I made from the research and the design direction, I succeeded in concretizing my research in a conceptual design that has brought real results to the community of the Green Space.

Figure 12: Presenting the final design at the new improved final exhibition.
Discussion

In this last part I will discuss three parts that are up for discussion or need further improvement.

Different community
Because the concept is now implemented in a student community doesn’t mean this can just be transferred and implemented in a different community. The scale of the Coevering is extremely higher and the community is more decentralized and heterogeneous. This makes it difficult to see future realizations in such communities and therefore is a limitation of the final concept as is right now.

With a little modification this system could be implemented in a new community but would only serve as a tool to observe how feedback can be obtained from that community. Exploring how this could be realized in a new context is a whole new project.

Getting Initiators
The initial step of an initiator standing up could be stimulated more within the system because without an initiator the rest of the process is left behind. A potential solution to this is by following the advice of Cees Donkers, making a core team responsible for the first couple of cycles in the system. The students can then learn and adapt to using such a system through the examples of the coaches.

It was also pointed at the presentation on the exhibition that generally speaking in a community only 4% actually is considered an initiator against almost 95% of followers. For future development of such a system it could be interesting to search for ways to address this 95% more directly. By doing so their might be a chance that they become aware of their own capabilities of initiating and join the 4%. The expectation that a initiator just stands up is a best case scenario in this system and therefore needs further exploration.

In process & achievements
The sections In Process and Achievements could use more explorations by searching for ways to visualize and communicate what is going on. Making this also into an explorative process in which the rest of the community is involved makes it the results much more a product of the community rather than the decisions of the expert team.

In the development of this concept the focus was more on the first part of this systems’ process, helping the initiator and obtaining feedback from the community. However, finding a better way of incorporating the community in the practically working out the input from the community will be a big contribution to the overall concept.
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