

## Open?

I have to say the Open Jury which I attended (Space and Politics) was disappointing. It was disappointing not because of the contents of presentations given by the five Units but because of the way they were presented. It was written on the leaflet for the Open Jury that the presentations were to be made between 2:30-5:30pm, and this was also mentioned at the beginning of the session. However, this was not kept to due to the over timing of the presentations which supposed to be 15 minutes each. The following 10-15 minutes ought to have been dedicated to discussions However, this was almost ignored by some of the juries, causing the delays to the session. As timekeepers, both Hitoha Tsuda and I were trying to keep both presentations and discussions to time but our role was ignored, and we were advised no to interrupt the discussion.

Later on that day, I had an opportunity to talk with some of the students who gave presentations. I asked them whether they were instructed to create a presentation that would finish within fifteen minutes and their answer was that they knew of the time limit but had been told by their lecturer to ignore this restriction. This was my first experience of this kind of event within the Architecture Association, so I have no idea to what extent it is representative of how these events are usually run. However, I felt that this was an unprofessional manner in which to conduct the event.

I am not sure if the intention was for the discussion to be limited to members of the teaching staff, but this was certainly the reality. All discussions were initiated by the teaching staff and proceeded to be conducted between themselves. As the teaching staff were seated in the front row of the lecture room and conducted their discussion at a conversational volume it was not even possible for many present to hear the contents of the debate. This atmosphere did not give the impression that student contributions to the debate would be welcome.

The presentations and projects under discussion were largely very interesting and had the possibility to stimulate a good debate. Thus it seems regrettable that the event was not conducted in a manner that would be more stimulating and enjoyable for all. The idea of the open nature of the event is something that should be celebrated, but the reality was an event that seemed largely catered to the interests of the teaching staff.

In terms of future events, I believe the experience of all attendees should be considered more closely.