

To a degree, the 3 theory courses on our MA-programme present the basic features of the Johannine degrees: 1) *apprentice*; 2) *journeyman*; 3) *master*. In the first term, Theory1/T1 establishes an apprenticeship in keeping a log-book. Theory2/T2—the 2nd term—readies the MA1 students to *journey*: embarking on the explorations in Studio3, *capping* it with Theory3/T3: the *master* level.

The logbook is a *process-tool*—a *backdrop*—for *theory development*. What is achieved at the 3rd level (Theory3/T3) is a degree of *precision*. A candidate *learning-outcome* from this school year (2021/22) lies here: that reaching a level of precision, *environmental care* and *theorising* that are connected: there is *no* environmental care *nor* theoretical clarity *without* some precision.

The argument is simple: inasmuch as the diary *interfaces* 1) the student's *task* record and 2) its environmental *trail*, we expect environmental care to *take hold* of practice only as the relation between *the two* is *precise enough*. But what defines this *threshold* of precision? This question is a bit *more* complex, as it hinges on the clarification of a relation between *precision* and *accuracy*.

To simplify: precision = accuracy *delivered*. While accuracy is *technical*, and often assumed to be achieved by *more/less* automated processes, precision articulates *jointly* at the human- and environmental *delivery*. Precision is the human *edge* we define as skill. But it is also the environmental *end* we define as sustainable. Finally, the *conjoint* articulation of these must yield precision.

So, the accuracy must somehow be *assigned* to yield precision: the kind of diary that will do—in regard of precision—is the one in which accuracy is *assigned*. Without this the skills edge and sustainable end will *not* be within a *learning range*, because they are matters of precision. That is, learning at the level of *skills* and learning at the level of *sustainability* both require precision.

The diary page in display on the front page [*recto*] the DAY LOG features what we can understand as environmental notes. While SKILLS ACQUIRED is a record of works(wo)manship. While the TO DO list—tasks that, at this point, are *anticipated*—constitutes the rubric of precisions. The point being that all the sectors of the page are devoted to a record of *ongoing* processes.

The top sector of the page features the coordinates of the job-location (date, clock, phone numbers, address). While the body of the three main sectors below feature 3 different faces of *assigning* accuracy: care, enskilment and precision. The sector for precisions (to do) develops and internal coupling between care and enskilment, environment and human adequacy, and so on.

Unfortunately, the technological advancements of the the 21st century has come with what—from lack of a better term—can be called *symbolic accuracy*. A kind of pro/claimed accuracy which remains *unassigned*, and where precision remains anticipated *and* postponed (*automatically*). While it is the opposite which is now unfolding: environmental *crisis*, human *inadequacy*.

Over time, keeping a diary/logbook is likely to help: 1) constituting a *field* of operations; 2) selecting *topics* of interest; 3) investigating a *sensory* approach to *sense-making* in matters requiring *precision* (as joint sustainability & skills). Compiling this mean-term sense of precision, in care and mastery, which may well be the hallmark of *theory* in design. Developing reflection *with* design.