2020 Conditions and Procedures
Plan to Correct
for Continuing Accreditation

American University of Sharjah
Department of Architecture

Bachelor of Architecture

June 29, 2023

NAAB

National
Architectural
Accrediting
Board, Inc.

NAAB

Plan to Correct
(2020 Procedures)

Institution	<u>**American University of Sharjah**</u>
Name of Academic Unit	Department of Architecture

Degree(s) *(check all that apply)*
 Track(s) *(Please include all tracks offered by the program under the respective degree, including total number of credits. Examples:*
 150 semester undergraduate credit hours
 Undergraduate degree with architecture major + 60 graduate semester credit hours
 Undergraduate degree with non-architecture major + 90 graduate semester credit hours)
	☒ Bachelor of Architecture
	     Track: *159 undergraduate semester credit hours*
	 ☐ Master of Architecture
	     Track:
	     Track:
	 ☐ Doctor of Architecture
	     Track:
	     Track:

Year of Previous Visit	2022
Current Term of Accreditation *(refer to most recent decision letter)*	Continuing Accreditation (Eight-Year Term)
Program Administrator	George Katodrytis (Head of the Department of Architecture)
Chief Administrator for the academic unit in which the program is located *(e.g., dean or department chair)*	Dr. Varkki Pallathucheril (Dean, College of Architecture, Art and Design)
Chief Academic Officer of the Institution	Dr. Mohamed El-Tarhuni, PhD Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer
President of the Institution	Dr. Susan Mumm (Chancellor)
Individual submitting the APR	George Katodrytis
Name and Email Address of Individual to Whom Questions Should Be Directed	George Katodrytis gkatodrytis@aus.edu

NAAB

INSTRUCTIONS AND TEMPLATE GUIDELINES

A Plan to Correct is required in cases when the NAAB board determines that the program is not in compliance with one or more of the Conditions for Accreditation, either at the time continuing accreditation is granted or as a result of a Special Report review. Programs with a Plan to Correct will have two years to demonstrate compliance with Conditions for Accreditation noted to be out of compliance. Programs submitting a Plan to Correct will be required to provide a narrative response with supporting documentation and evidence of compliance for each Condition noted to be out of compliance.

Review of the Process. The Accreditation Review Committee (ARC) reviewers will make one of the following recommendations to be acted upon by the board:

- In the event a program has demonstrated compliance with all the Conditions for Accreditation previously noted to be out of compliance, accept the Plan to Correct and approve the program for the remainder of the term of accreditation.
- In the event a program has not demonstrated compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation previously noted to be out of compliance, defer action and require a revised Plan to Correct to address all remaining areas of non-compliance. (Submission timelines are December 15 and June 30.)
- In the event a program's Plan to Correct does not demonstrate compliance with Conditions for Accreditation within two years, continue the Plan to Correct, place the program on notice for a period not to exceed one (1) year, and inform the institution's Chief Academic Officer.
- In the event a program's Plan to Correct does not demonstrate compliance with Conditions for Accreditation within one (1) year of notice, place the program on probation for a period not to exceed one (1) year, require a focused visit on remaining areas of noncompliance within six months, and inform the institution's Chief Academic Officer. All accreditation decisions to place a program on probation will be made public on the NAAB website.

Decisions by the NAAB board regarding the program's Plan to Correct are not subject to reconsideration or appeal.

Instructions
1. Type all responses in the designated text areas. Add additional rows as needed to include all conditions not met.
2. Reports must be submitted as a single PDF following the template format.

Deadline and Submission
Programs determined to be out of compliance with one or more Conditions for Accreditation identified at the spring board meeting will be required to submit a Plan to Correct on or before December 15 of the same year.

Programs determined to be out of compliance with one or more Conditions for Accreditation identified at the fall board meeting will be required to submit a Plan to Correct on or before June 30 of the following year.

Programs that fail to submit a Plan to Correct by the deadline will be placed on Administrative Probation, after notice.

All Plans to Correct should be sent to accreditation@naab.org on or before the appropriate deadline.

NAAB

Plan to Correct Form

Conditions Not Met *List the number and title of each condition that must be addressed in the Plan to Correct.*	Corrective Actions *Provide a narrative describing the corrective actions that have been taken and those that are planned but not yet implemented. For all actions taken, provide supporting evidence as described under the relevant Condition in the 2020 Conditions and 2020 Guidelines for the Accreditation Process.*	Timeline *List the timeline for all corrective actions, including actual or planned start and completion dates.*
# – Condition Name	**Program Narrative:**	**Academic Year 1: 2023-2024**
5.3 - Curricular Development	1. During the Faculty Design Review faculty are invited to present the work of their courses (studios, required courses and electives). The discussion is based on evidence of students' work either design studio drawings or samples of assignments such as essays and exams. Faculty propose changes to be made in the course descriptions and course outcomes using students' work as evidence and justification.	Planned start date 1: December 2023 Planned start date 2: May 2024
	2. Following the Faculty Design Review changes are recorded by each faculty in the Course Files Assessment Tool section. HoD reviews and compiles these notes to be shared with the Curriculum and Assessment Committee.	Planned start and completion date 1: December 2023 and January 2024 Planned start and completion date 2: May 2024 and June 2024:
	3. Proposals for course description changes, course outcomes changes, new courses, revision of existing courses, changes in curriculum proposed sequence of study to be prepared and presented to faculty by the HoD and the Curriculum and Assessment Committee. These discussions to be scheduled at the beginning of the following semester during bi-weekly faculty meetings. Changes to be implemented at then next possible opportunity during the semester.	Planned start and completion date 1: January 2024 and May 2024 Planned start and completion date 2: September 2024 and December 2024
	4. Course descriptions and outcomes and sequence of study approved by the department to be prepared as CAFs (Course Approval Forms) and forwarded for approval to the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUCC) and Vice Provost of Academic Affairs. Once approved changes to be included in course syllabi and the university Undergraduate Catalog.	Planned start and completion date 1: January 2024 and May 2024 Planned start and completion date 2: September 2024 and December 2024
	5. For monitoring the implication of these curricular changes, the following tools to continue to be implemented:	During Academic Year 2: 2024-2025

Conditions Not Met *List the number and title of each condition that must be addressed in the Plan to Correct.*	Corrective Actions *Provide a narrative describing the corrective actions that have been taken and those that are planned but not yet implemented. For all actions taken, provide supporting evidence as described under the relevant Condition in the 2020 Conditions and 2020 Guidelines for the Accreditation Process.*	Timeline *List the timeline for all corrective actions, including actual or planned start and completion dates.*
	i. Course File Assessment Tool (for each course completed by faculty). Submitted at the end of each semester.	Academic Year 1: June 2024 Academic Year 2: January 2025
	ii. Employers Surveys (conducted by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis - OIRA - in Spring of each year)	Academic Year 1: Spring 2024 Academic Year 2: Spring 2025
	iii. Graduating Student's (conducted by OIRA in Spring of each year)	Academic Year 1: Spring 2024 Academic Year 2: Spring 2025
	iv. Alumni surveys (conducted by OIRA in Spring of each year)	Academic Year 1: Spring 2024 Academic Year 2: Spring 2025
	v. Course Evaluations by students (conducted by the university before the end of each academic semester).	Academic Year 2: December 2024 and May 2025
	Supporting Evidence: Please refer to the attached document	

June 29, 2023

NAAB (National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc)
107 S West St, Suite 707
Alexandria, VA 22314

Via Email

The Bachelor of Architecture program at the American University of Sharjah application for Continuing Accreditation was reviewed during the October 27-28, 2022, Board of Directors meeting of the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB).

Based on the review of the program, the NAAB Directors voted to grant the B.Arch program an eight-year term of Continuing Accreditation with a Plan to Correct and require the program to address the following conditions not met:

• 5.3 Curricular Development

The program is required to provide a Plan to Correct, which includes a narrative response with supporting documentation and evidence of compliance for each Condition noted to be out of compliance. Programs with a Plan to Correct will have two years to demonstrate compliance with Conditions for Accreditation noted to be out of compliance. The Plan to Correct is due on or before June 30, 2023.

The program's accreditation term is effective January 1, 2022, and the program is scheduled for its next visit for Continuing Accreditation in 2030. This visit will be conducted under the provisions of the NAAB Accreditation Conditions and Procedures in effect at the time of the visit.

In a letter of November 28, 20203, NAAB have made the following comment in the Program Review (for '5.3 Curricular Development'):

The program did not provide sufficient information to meet the requirements of this Condition. The program provided sufficient evidence in the APR of various assessment vehicles (course self-assessment, surveys for assessing program outcomes, student course evaluation, faculty performance reviews, etc.). The program needs to provide evidence of the implementation of a system of curricular review including assessment points, assessment methods, benchmarks and data collection and analysis to support subsequent program improvement. This critical connection has not yet been implemented by the program.

Bachelor of Architecture program at the American University of Sharjah response

Following the NAAB Visiting Team Report of March 2022, the program Head of Department (HoD) of Architecture and faculty of the department have worked collectively to address the assessment procedures and deficiencies on Curricular Development as noted by the visiting team. The program has worked to revise and enhance the existing course assessment and curricular development and propose new methods to establish a system of clear connection between assessment and curricular development in our program and a Plan to Correct.

As indicated in our Architecture Program Report (September 2021), the program's system of curricular assessment is best understood through the details of the assessment tools deployed. These area assessments are repeated on a regular basis, assessment outcomes are discussed, and responses are formulated in formal outcomes.

Structure and Roles

A continuous checking of the curricula is performed by the HoD on a frequent basis. The annual main and overall assessment of the curricula is performed by the Curriculum and Assessment Committees, where a comparison of the goals with the student learning outcomes, the reaching of the benchmarks, and the effectiveness of the instruction are discussed.

The Department of Architecture Bylaws (revised in February 2020) in Section 2.2, describe the role and responsibility of the

Curriculum and Assessment Committee (Standing Committee) as: '*The committee's primary charge is oversight of course/program assessment efforts and curriculum development and implementation. The committee will coordinate assessment processes, review, and evaluate proposed modifications to the curriculum, complete course approval forms (CAFs) for new, modified, and cancelled courses, coordinate learning outcomes and ensure that all course and degree program revisions are supported by evidence resulting from assessment. The Committee is also responsible for ensuring NAAB criteria compliance across the Bachelor of Architecture curriculum.*'

Department faculty meet bi-weekly to discuss curriculum enhancement and implementation presented by the chair of the Curriculum and Assessment Committee. Since the last NAAB report, the HoD has created and appointed the Core Curriculum Task Force to work independently of the Curriculum and Assessment Committee and ultimately make recommendations to this committee. The mandate of this committee is to look at the sequence and curriculum content of core instruction (both studios and required courses) in the program which includes Foundations (first year), second- and third-year studios and required courses as well as fourth year comprehensive building design studio which we would include under the umbrella of core studios. A working document and notes prepared by the Core Curriculum Task Force Committee and submitted in April 2023 is attached in this document.

Process

The program has developed a clear policy to assess the outcome of each course within the curriculum sequence and revise the material on an annual basis, if needed. Individual instructors in each program are in charge of evaluating the courses and proposing potential changes to their year studio coordinators. The programs require all instructors to address the NAAB program and student criteria in their related courses. Year coordinators in all studios meet faculty typically once a month. Student work and grading is evaluated, and teaching outcomes and benchmarks are checked and adjusted if needed. Each year coordinator works with the other coordinators to ensure continuity and the integration of all areas of the curriculum. The newly formed Curriculum Core task Force facilitates this coordination. During the end of semester Faculty Design Review / retreat changes are presented to the faculty to discuss, approve, and implement these in the curriculum. During this day long deliberations faculty examine courses to gauge if the content corresponds to the NAAB matric and criteria and make necessary adjustments in case of any deficiencies.

In general, the program relies to some degree on faculty initiatives for updating course content and objectives within a broad pedagogical content and specific areas. Faculty research and interests result in new course proposal as special topics, which are discussed and approved by the Curriculum and Assessment Committee. The HoD assigns faculty teaching in relation to research, expertise, and experience. Curriculum changes can then occur incrementally as new content is phased into the curriculum. The larger course assessment and curricular development is carried out in several steps. The process is initiated by individual instructors who evaluate the courses and discuss outcomes with the coordinators of each year. The NAAB-related courses are examined for assigning the various criteria as even as possible, properly and whether they are fulfilled in each semester. The program goals and student criteria are carefully examined for each course to see if the learning outcomes match the expectations of the program goals and if the course content is matching the assigned NAAB criteria. Adjustments to the content of the courses, focuses to course outcomes, method of delivery and grading mechanisms. If needed a redistribution of the NAAB criteria is made and benchmarks may be reset.

While course outcomes are revised by the department, course description require approval by the University Undergraduate Course Committee (UUCC) for any catalogue changes. Proposing and approving new courses or revising existing ones occur through a formalized process using CAF (Course Approval Form) involving the department faculty, Curriculum and Assessment Committee and HoD (at the department level), the Associate Dean and Dean (at the college level), and the University Undergraduate Course Committee and Provost of Academic Affairs (at the university level). For example, in Spring 2023 the department has submitted (and subsequently was granted approval) of two CAFs, one for a summer study abroad special topics elective 3-credits course in Italy (titled 'Design and Culture in Contemporary Italy') and another a Fall 2023 special topic elective 3-credits course title 'Sharjah Architecture Triennial' to coincide with this global event which will take place in Fall 2023. Both CAFs went through various iterators and revisions before they had been approved.

Two types of curricular changes are typically addressed:

1) Changes and revisions in existing courses:
While core learning outcomes must be maintained, these outcomes can be met through various types of projects and activities. Course Outcome are continually revised following recommendations of faculty. Our Course Files template has a specific section on Couse Assessment. The HoD reviews all Course Files at the end of each semester, identifies comments that require attention and possible revision and makes recommendations to the Curriculum and Assessment Committee.

2) Catalogue changes and updates:
Curriculum review and development takes place on an ongoing basis. The university catalog is revised once a year, typically in Summer before the beginning of the academic year. All departmental changes are initiated by the by the Curriculum and Assessment Committee and the approved by the HoD, UUCC (University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee) and finally by the Provost of Academic Affairs. These changes are included in the next academic year catalog.

Tools used for assessing Program Outcomes

The department has established the following tools for assessing program outcomes:

1. *Course Assessment Report (in Course Files)*

Every time a course is taught, the instructor must submit a 'Course File' containing a self-assessment that includes the following questions:

- *If this semester's grades were unusually higher or lower than the historic values (as distributed by the Associate Dean) please provide an explanation.*
- *Please, list and justify changes made on the course schedule that was initially issued to the students. If no changes were made, please state: "No changes made."*
- *Are there any resources that are currently not a part of CAAD or that you found to be inadequate for teaching the course?*
- *To what extent was each course outcome met? (Met | Partially Met | Not Met) Starting Fall 2021, this is done in the Planning & Self Study system and attached.*
- *Are there any course outcomes that need to be changed? If yes, please provide a rationale outlining specific evidence to support the decision.*
- *Do you consider the prerequisites appropriate for the course? Were the students well prepared for the course?*
- *BArch courses only: In case this course has a NAAB performance criteria associated (as listed in the Course Curriculum Coordination document) has it been appropriate for the course? Have the performance criteria been met?*
- *Samples of student work (high and low pass) for each graded assignment or project must be included. Course files are archived on iLearn and shared with all faculty. This is also a valuable resource for faculty teaching a course for the first time and ensures continuity.*

The department is supported by the university in conducting several surveys that cat as benchmarks and gauging the success of our curriculum. These surveys are reviewed by the HoD and Architecture Committee. Observations are shared with the Curriculum and Assessment Committee.

2. *Graduating Student Exit Survey*

The Office of Institutional Research and Analysis (OIRA) administers a survey to all graduating students. The survey elicits student perceptions of courses, resources, and the extent to which program outcomes are met.

3. *Internship Employer Survey*

The Department requires the intern's employer to complete the Internship Evaluation Survey to help assess the intern's ability to apply what was learned during the student's first 3- years of education, including the ability to (i) advance ideas through design development, (ii) effective collaboration with colleagues and (iii) utilization of critical learning and thinking skills to assigned tasks. An important element of the survey is the employer's insight into the extent to which the intern demonstrates the learning outcomes of the curriculum and program. Surveys of all students are summarized and used as an additional data point in the assessment of curricular effectiveness.

4. *Employer Survey*

Office of Institutional Research and Analysis (OIRA) administers a survey once requested by the department to employers of B.Arch alumni. Rather than reporting on individual alumni, this survey seeks to elicit assessments of the extent to which all alumni they employ provide evidence of program outcomes being met.

5. *Alumni Survey*

Office of Institutional Research and Analysis (OIRA) administers a survey once requested by the department to B.Arch alumni seeking to assess the extent to which they believe program outcomes are being met.

One example of how the department has responded to the B.Arch Alumni Survey in Fall 2019 Report (63 alumni have responded) indicated an issue in the 'understanding of the standards of professional practice' as indicated below:

Demonstrate an understanding of the standards of professional practice	To a great extent 17.46%	11	To a small extent 57.14%	36	Not at all 22.22%	14	Unable to assess 3.17%	2	63 (total number)

As a result of this survey result, the HoD with and faculty member instructing this class have arranged for three seminars on professional practice of architecture in the UAE by practicing architects. This has been established since then as part of professional practice instruction in every semester that the course is offered.

6. *Student Course Evaluations*

Every semester, the university mandates and conducts formal evaluations by students of each course and its instructor. These evaluations include multiple-choice questions and open-ended responses. Aggregated results are made available to the instructor, the HoD, and the Dean once course grades have been submitted. These are used to assess quality and gain student insights; these insights drive course and curricular improvements. As explained below, course evaluations are also included in the annual review of faculty by the HoD and Dean and in reviews of performance for contract extensions and promotions.

7. Faculty Performance Reviews

In addition to improving faculty performance, these reviews generate information that is used in enhancing teaching and learning in the program. At the department, performance reviews have two components: the Performance Enhancement and Achievement Review (PEAR), a planning document submitted at the beginning of the academic year, and faculty annual reviews (FAR) conducted at the end of the Spring semester. Average course grades are compared with the average CGPA of students in these courses to identify unusually liberal or harsh grades. In-person discussions of the PEAR and response to annual reports identify general issues and specific responses.

8. Faculty Design Review

This day-long review is attended by all faculty, occurs at the end of each semester, and typically lasts the whole day. Examples of high- and low-pass work from each studio year-level are displayed and course instructors provide an overview of the pedagogical and curricular intent. This is followed by a discussion on strengths, challenges, and opportunities for improvement in each year level. The review is a venue for reflection and creating awareness of interdependencies among year levels. Links, or potential links, are made between year levels as well as between studios and required courses that deliver specific performance criteria. Discussion outcomes inform further discussion amongst the year-level coordinators, the Curriculum and Assessment Committee and the HoD and often lead to curricular changes.

Proposed Plan to Correct 2023-2024

This will be a recurring process which will take place twice during each academic year at the end of each semester:

<u>Academic Year 1: 2023-2024</u>

1. December 2023 and May 2024:
    During the Faculty Design Review faculty are invited to present the work of their courses (studios, required courses and electives). The discussion is based on evidence of students' work either design studio drawings or samples of assignments such as essays and exams. Faculty propose changes to be made in the course descriptions and course outcomes using students' work as evidence and justification.

2. December 2023 - January 2024 and May 2024- June 2024:
    Following the Faculty Design Review changes are recorded by each faculty in the Course Files Assessment Tool section. HoD reviews and compiles these notes to be shared with the Curriculum and Assessment Committee.

3. January 2024 - May 2024 and September 2024 - December 2024
    Proposals for course description changes, course outcomes changes, new courses, revision of existing courses, changes in curriculum proposed sequence of study to be prepared and presented to faculty by the HoD and the Curriculum and Assessment Committee. These discussions to be scheduled at the beginning of the following semester during bi-weekly faculty meetings. Changes to be implemented at then next possible opportunity during the semester.

4. January 2024 - May 2024 and September 2024 - December 2024
    Course descriptions and outcomes and sequence of study approved by the department to be prepared as CAFs (Course Approval Forms) and forwarded for approval to the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUCC) and Vice Provost of Academic Affairs. Once approved changes to be included in course syllabi and the university Undergraduate Catalog.

    <u>Academic Year 2: 2024-2025</u>

5. For monitoring the implication of these curricular changes, the following tools to continue to be implemented:

    i.   Course File Assessment Tool (for each course completed by faculty). Submitted at the end of each semester.
         Academic Year 1: June 2024 and Year 2: January 2025

    ii. Employers Surveys (conducted by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis - OIRA - in Spring of each year).
         Academic Year 1: Spring 2024 and Academic Year 2: Spring 2025

    iii. Graduating Student's (conducted by OIRA in Spring of each year)
         Academic Year 1: Spring 2024 and Academic Year 2: Spring 2025

    iv. Alumni surveys (conducted by OIRA in Spring of each year).
         Academic Year 1: Spring 2024 and Academic Year 2: Spring 2025

    v.   Course Evaluations by students (conducted by the university before the end of each academic semester).
         Academic Year 2: December 2024 and May 2025

We consider this Plan to Correct to be comprehensive and it will be a recurring system of inclusive participation by students, faculty, and administrators. Following the NAAB Visiting Team Report of March 2022 comments on the deficiency of our program on curricular development and assessment, we see this as an opportunity to institute a clear process in our curriculum and establish specific connections to address the 2020 NAAB Conditions. This will be a formal process to improve further our B.Arch program at the American University of Sharjah.

Sincerely,

George Katodrytis
Head of the Department of Architecture
Professor of Architecture
College of Architecture, Art and Design
American University of Sharjah
United Arab Emirates

Section A: Background
Following the establishment of the Department of Architecture Core Curriculum Taskforce on October 18, 2022 the participating faculty, (R. Castillo, M. Hughes, W. Sarnecky and G. Spaw), met regularly throughout the fall and spring semester to discuss the scope of the endeavor, define the current core and speculate broadly on opportunities to strengthen student learning across the first six semesters of the BArch program. Initial meetings involved expansive brainstorming focused on structure, content and challenges leading to the creation of a preliminary document designed to outline key issues and opportunities. Discussions in two department meetings combined with written comments provided by colleagues were incorporated and broadly supported by the faculty in the February 6th DoA meeting, resulting in the summary document as follows.

Section B: Outcomes + Proposals
The taskforce produced a "Core Studio Sequence Outline" (see Section F below) and a list of outstanding issues to be addressed by the faculty. In addition, the taskforce defined the following proposals:

1. Define 'Core' in ARC as beginning with DES111/131 and ending with ARC 302.

2. Implement a meaningful coordination strategy across all sections of DES111, DES112, DES131 and DES 132 with a focus on the design principles and co-teaching in the form of collective pinups, multi-section discussions, and group lectures as well as shared content, projects, and schedules common to all sections.

3. Develop an integrated approach to Core that features structural, pedagogical, and tangible alignments between design studios and associated non-studio courses.

4. Establish a standing Core Committee charged with convening and moderating ongoing discussions that build program cohesion and institutional memory. Managing a coherent core curriculum involves a complex mix of curricular, pedagogical, and interpersonal relationships that demands an ongoing dialogue between key, committed core faculty.

5. Strive to create multi-year teaching assignments throughout Core in support of consistent content delivery and student learning.

Section C: Outstanding Core Questions Beyond the Scope of the Task Force
Discussions among faculty identified several topics worthy of further examination, but outside the scope of the taskforce's mandate.

1. The production of an IDE core curriculum document.
2. Debate and define ARC 302
3. Debate and define the nature of ARC 201 vs ARC 202 in terms of site, program/project type, sequence, etc)
4. Examine where, when and how we introduce content related to the region.
5. Examine where, when and how we introduce content related to sustainability and ecology.
6. Reassess the representation sequence- DES 111, DES 112, ARC 265
    a. Analog vs Digital Content: Where, When, How Much?
    b. BIM
    c. ARC 265 or similar as required
7. Study the History/Theory sequence with particular attention on the following:
    a. Foundations History- Arch vs Art content %?
    b. Integration between history/theory courses + studios is lacking.

Final: April 27, 2023

Section D: Outstanding Issues Beyond the Scope of Core
The taskforce identified several topics worthy of further examination that impact the BArch curriculum but exist beyond the scope of Core.

1. Holistic examination of representation within the curriculum.
   a. Should there be an intermediate representation course after 1st yr?
2. Accreditation
   a. NAAB and Ministry requirements overlayed on course and program outcomes
3. Cross-listing DES 121 & DES 122 to allow for discipline specific sections.
   a. Potential to better integrate 121 & 122 into the ARC281, ARC 222, ARC 221, ARC 421 sequence.
4. Is a single gateway after 1st year adequate?
5. Disciplinary Competence vs Urbanism
   a. Is there room for added content in terms of student performance and faculty expectations for competence?
6. Study Abroad
   a. Required in some form?
   b. Overcoming University rules re travel during the semester.
   c. Spectrum of study abroad 'types'
      i. Long (full semester)
      ii. Medium (Summer + Winter Session)
      iii. Short (long weekend even to include Thursdays and/or Mondays)

Section E: Additional Issues, Observations, + Opportunities
1. Inadequate focus on the experiential/phenomenological
2. Lack formal introduction to the principles of graphic design
3. Verbal + written presentation skills are limited to trial/error.
   a. Capacity for discourse + debate beyond overreliance on notes (and reading notes) during the initial presentation.
   b. Potential for the creation of ENG verbal + written presentation course that is specifically catered to ARC students.
4. Promote a higher integration of upper-class technical courses and design studios. Currently, technical issues are introduced as separate from design. Enable students to move beyond technical competency with examples that showcase how pragmatics become poetic, buildings become Architecture. Ex) exit stairs can become expressive (ICA Boston)

Section F: Core Studio Sequence Outline (Proposed)

    a. DES 131
   - i. Focus on 2D composition + Introduce 3DComposition – Abstract/Geometric
   - ii. Elements: Point, Line, Plane, Volume, Mass, Void
   - iii. Design Principles: Axis, Symmetry, Asymmetry, Balance, Datum, Hierarchy, Repetition, Rhythm, Contrast, Displacement, Transformation, Additive/Subtractive
   - iv. Graphic Conventions- Abstract (Analog + Digital)
   - v. Verbal Presentation Skills

    b. DES 132
   - i. Refine + reinforce content introduced in DES 131
   - ii. Develop and Refine 2D + 3D Composition - Abstract/Geometric/Spatial
   - iii. Focus on experience and spatial relations - enclosure, boundary, zones, overlap, transparency (literal + phenomenal), procession, threshold, additive/subtractive,etc.

    c. ARC 201
   - i. Graphic Conventions: Discipline Specific (Analog + Digital)
   - ii. Spatial Organization: Procession, Public/Private, Building/Landscape integration.
   - iii. Coordinate with ARC271 and ARC281.
   - iv. Spatial Experience + Formal Dexterity
   - v. Typology= Small building, Large Landscape
   - vi. Precedents= Kate Mantillini, Rachofsky House, LA Cathedral, Villa Gamberaia, Palmyra House, Poli House

    d. ARC 202
   - i. Refine + reinforce content introduced in ARC 201
   - ii. Introduction to the experiential potential of materiality (Material Semiotics- texture, rhythm, tectonics)
   - iii. Design from the inside-out: Atmosphere + Phenomenology
   - iv. Local/Regional typology, history + context
   - v. Typology= Dense, urban infill at a simplified level (no cars/parking, 2 story max, domestic and/or small cultural/retail program)
   - vi. Precedents= Therme Vals, LTL interiors,

    e. ARC 301: (2nd yr +)
   - i. The public dimension of architecture (through program, facade as interface between inside and outside given the infill nature of the project, etc)
   - ii. Multistory + Vertical Circulation (stairs, elevators)
   - iii. Examines + reconsiders traditional typologies (library, museum, school, etc) in relation to evolving social/cultural values.
   - iv. Introduce + study alternative representational strategies (precedents)
   - v. Typology= Dense, urban infill at an intermediate level (multi story, vertical circulation/egress, parking, complex site, cultural/institutional program)
   - vi. Precedents= Williams/Tsien American Folk Art Museum, RCR Library in Barcelona

    f. ARC 302 (Option 01: New)
   - i. Focus on phenomenology, material language (texture, pattern, surface), ergonomics/furniture and detailing (builds upon ARC202)
   - ii. Small scope addressed in detail. Ex) Rural Studio Toilets
   - iii. Articulate a narrative/position/'thesis'
   - iv. Explicit examination of representational precedents
       1. Encourage/Require link between design idea(s) and representational strategy
   - v. Full-scale fabrication in full or in part (component)?
   - vi. Typology= Very small in scope, but addressed in depth with a focus on detailing (furniture, installation, small building)
   - vii. Precedents= Rural Studio Toilets, CAAD Gatehouse, CAAD Display Wall

Addendum 01: Narrative Overview + Preliminary Conclusions, December 8, 2022
Committee discussion refined the broad outline (see Addendum 02) to highlight three key proposals/goals. First, the committee recommends an integrated approach to core that features structural, pedagogical, and tangible alignments between design studios and associated non-studio courses. Second, any reassessment of the core curriculum demands inclusion and coherent integration of the foundations year into the core sequence. Third, managing these interrelationships demands an ongoing dialogue between key core faculty, best supported by the establishment of a standing Core Committee charged with convening and moderating ongoing discussions that build institutional memory.

The potential for effective core integration relies on continuing, interpersonal relationships beyond curricular adjacency, which is to say faculty teaching courses in the core need to communicate regularly in a proactive manner. Simply scheduling ARC201 in the same semester as ARC 271 and ARC 281 is insufficient to build meaningful connections that translate to enhanced student learning. There is a complex series of interrelationships between core studio and non-studio courses (see diagrams attached). Extracting maximum impact from these overlaps demands a more hands-on approach than is currently the norm.

Foundational principles are fundamental to any disciplinary core. As such, defining and delivering consistent, coherent foundational knowledge in the first year is crucial to the vision of an integrated approach that begins with the first semester of first year and continues through ARC/IDE 302. Across this expanded view of the core, coordination across all Foundations sections is key. In First Year, the committee recommends that the department implement a tight coordination strategy across all sections of DES111, DES112, DES131 and DES 132 with a focus on the design principles addressed in ARC281, (Point, Line, Plane, Volume, Mass, + Void, etc). This coordination would privilege co-teaching, collective pinups/discussions, and group lectures introducing core principles in service of student learning. Further, meaningful coordination would include shared content, projects, schedules, etc. across all sections.

Logistical challenges could be easily managed through the establishment of co-coordinators for the studio and drawing sequence who would each teach at least two and preferably three sections of the course. Given that there are four timeslots (M/W AM, M/W PM, T/Th AM and T/Th PM) this co-coordinator system would ensure that each timeslot is led by at least one co-coordinator.

The committee envisions an annotated Core Studio Course Overview document inclusive of descriptive narratives and pedagogical goals alongside course descriptions, project and site typologies and precedents. (see initial outline attached). This document serves as a scaffolding that should be filled-in, expanded upon and modified continually by the newly established standing Core Committee.

All of the above must operate under the recognition that effective learning privileges people over paper. Without discounting the importance of written course descriptions and outcomes the committee posits consistent, ongoing communication between faculty and careful selection, integration and rotation of core faculty as the essential ingredient in the construction of a robust core experience.

Final: April 27, 2023

Addendum 02: Notes from Faculty Discussion at Dept Meeting on Feb 6, 2023

Informal vs Structural Change.
- Task Force proposals would not require structural changes to the curr or the catalog with the possible exception of making ARC 265 a required course.

Key Proposals
- Integration of First-year (Foundations) as part of the coordinated core studio sequence
- Core Curriculum Standing Committee
- Consistent teaching assignments for core coordinators + faculty. 3yr commitments.
- Make ARC 265 a required course

Why is ARC 402 excluded from core? (JM)
- It is where core competencies are tested.
- Physically/Temporally separated from the 101-302 sequence by 401.
- ARC 401 is an options studio marking the end of Core/Introductory disciplinary skills.
- Historically 401 was a core studio with a focus on object buildings in a larger landscape. Once that changed to an option studio there was a natural break after 302 b/t core and 'upper level'

Has there been student feedback of where comprehensive is located in the studio sequence? (JC)
- The placement of 402 is dependent on non-studio courses such as Env Control Systems which occurs in the fall of 4th year.

First Year
- Foundations Director has instituted Arch Dept Coordinators for 131/132 and 111/112 which gives the dept an opportunity to reconceive 1st year as a coordinated part of the core curriculum
  - This shift allows us to envision a 3+2 curriculum in contrast to the current 1+4 format
  - Director of Foundations has proposed spring discipline specific (GK). But that is irrelevant as we could still decide to treat both fall and spring as discipline specific which is also the reality in the current situation. (MH)

- History survey courses (des 121 122) would benefit from a close examination to ensure that the content is balanced to serve ARC Dept students effectively.
  - Currently the weighting of the material is approx. 70 Art/30 Arch (JM)
  - Chronology is the issue. (BS)
  - We could have different versions of des 121/122 for arc vs design (FT)

- Structural change vs tactical (FT) historically the dean has not gone along with this
  - Informal changes have the advantage of allowing students to carry credit to design (GK)
  - Cross listing could be a solution (FT)
  - ARC 265 could become ARC 165 (FT)

What is missing from the outline/task force study? (MH)
- Ecology (GN)
- Would ARC 265 replace DES 112? (EH)
- The city in the core sequence / larger scale / mapping (JC)
  - Where can it fit in to the sequence? (JC)

- ARC/IDE 201- Potential overlap if interiority is a focus (JM example)
  - IDE needs a separate Core Curr task force because the 4yr program is fundamentally different (1+3)c of familiarity 1+3 (MH)
    - This is in process (GK)

Final: April 27, 2023

- NAAB requirements ARC 402 carrying a lot of weight / Could some be offloaded (JC)
  - ARC 301 short span/infill ARC 302 open site (MF)
  - ARC 401 could play a role and carry weight (MF)
  - ARC 302 mini core capstone (GK)
  - ARC 581 and ARC 501 smaller projects with emphasis on detailing (MH)

- Can the identity of school (international or DB) be introduced in the core? (JC)
  - Logistics challenge= CAAD Labs are not capable of handling a full yr level cohort (48) or more in addition to the current courses engaged in 'making' (seminars and DB studios).
  - Students can make it through with different tracks and miss others (DB, representation, etc.) Why is that a problem? (MH)

- There is nothing in the core that ties us to local condition (FT)
  - ARC 421 tied to the place + half of readings are regional (JM)
  - Build a collection of regional precedents (JC)
    - MH- Apply for an FRG that funds faculty fieldtrips in the region
  - Culture vs regulation (AM)
  - Alumni recently identified the lack of regional awareness as a shortcoming of the dept. (JC)
  - Readings vs site visit / holistic (many of us are ignorant as outsiders) (MH)
  - Establishment of board of advisors (AM)
  - Univ discussion about doing away with 6-credit writing requirement opens possibility to include another course(s) (JC)

- History/Theory and Ecology are addressed at a couple of points in the curriculum, but what about sustainability? (BS & CC)

Addendum 03: Faculty Questions and Ideas with Responses from Task Force

Categories of Curriculum
Under preliminary conclusions you mention forming tangible alignments between studio and non-studio courses. This makes a lot of sense. ==Might there be a clearer matrix of these courses which can be organized into 4 categories[1]:==

1. *Design Studio*
2. *History/Theory*
3. *Technology/Material/Systems*
4. *Visual Communication*

This matrix of course categories could be used to more clearly organize the flow chart of courses on the graphic you included with the report. It seems that there are a lot of mandatory visual communication courses in Year 1, but then they become largely elective in subsequent years. I agree with the idea to include a required digital media course (ARC265) in the core sequence.

1. Taskforce Response: Agree. Good idea.

Foundations
I fully agree that a more coordinated curriculum and outcomes across sections and between courses is necessary. Foundations is (or should be) an important part of the core curriculum. The ideas put forward in Section 3 of the outline are much appreciated.

==Faculty should be excited to teach foundations courses or participate in Foundations reviews.[2] Could there be more resources directed to this important year? Workshops? Fieldtrips? Guest speakers?[3]==

2. Taskforce Response: It seems reasonable for faculty to gravitate toward their areas of interest. Everyone doesn't need to want to teach 1st year. Some like teaching early years while others prefer adv courses or a mix. Hopefully we can maintain a balance in terms of faculty preferences. Participation in foundation reviews is another matter… and actually a responsibility of all faculty if the dept agrees to pursue the idea.

3. Taskforce Response: Maybe, but is this new funding or shifted from somewhere else? And are these the types of activities that would be priorities and/or would make a significant impact? Strikes me more as added bonus if/when we had a more fundamentally sound program. Further, given the size/number of students in Foundations additional resources devoted to the program would be a challenge particularly in a context of less-than-generous budgets at the University level. Logistics also suggest a challenge. Are we talking about engaging 1st yr students in the dept or across the entire college?

==Special workshops that engage first year students could be an interesting aspect to consider.[4]== *Years ago we had Reiser/Umemoto Architects come to HKU for a one week workshop in furniture design. Students worked in teams to make full scale mock-ups, drawings and projects. There was a food-themed workshop at CAAD before the pandemic, but the results were a bit underwhelming. How can projects from foundations year students take on a more important position in the culture and identity of the school?*

4. Taskforce Response: A workshop or field trip is not going to fix the fundamental problems in 1st year. The potential benefits have to be weighed against the time/effort/costs AND most importantly the pedagogical benefits

==Might exercises at the scale of the city and/or landscape be introduced in some way in Y1? [5]== *It seems like most of the exercises are scaled for architecture.* ==The themes of point/line/plane/void etc, could also be considered in (very general terms) at the scale of the city. Issues might include Mapping? Density? Connectivity? Scale? [6]==

Final: April 27, 2023

5. <mark>Taskforce Response:</mark> Anything could be done, but the key would be to examine the entire program holistically rather than adding things piecemeal. If we look at our dept and college honestly/critically it would be difficult to identify any **sustained** curriculum debate/effort aimed at significantly revising or altering the curriculum as these things would take a degree of commitment and patience that has been uncommon historically. Also, there are limits to how much can be addressed in these early years. What would be removed in order to add urban and/or landscape topics? What is the actually pedagogical objective of a 1st year design class in terms of providing 'foundational' skills that can then inform later coursework. It might not be exciting but when you learn a new language you start by counting to 10, enunciating the letters, basic vocabulary, etc.

6. <mark>Taskforce Response:</mark> These are valuable discussion topics, but ultimately outside the scope of this taskforce. Hence the suggestion of a standing core comm able to focus on these issues. Presumably such a core comm would be staffed by faculty with a passion for the topic.

Years 2 and 3

There's a lot of good work here in trying to clarify the various studios and sequence of projects and learning. Much of this seems to be thinking about architecture from the building outwards, or from the interior outwards…I would ask again where the complexity of the city could play a larger role in the curriculum. <mark>Alternate types of mapping processes, or understanding the city in new ways? [7]</mark> Letting urban patterns and flows affect the architecture? <mark>In the proposed sequence here, it seems like 301 is the best place for these types of unconventional analysis exercises? [8]</mark>

7. <mark>Taskforce Response:</mark> Core is not the place for "alternate types" of content.

8. <mark>Taskforce Response:</mark> ARC 301 is where fundamental urban issues have typically been introduced. Again, there is and needs to be a clear understanding of what constitutes fundamentals. It is difficult to see how students in their 3rd semester of the discipline are ready for anything unconventional when they have not yet been introduced to the conventional.

The small scope, intensely detailed project in ARC302 is an interesting proposal. <mark>The idea that this a place for all students in the curriculum to have a taste of design build is a nice one (Section F.V)[9]</mark> Does requiring them to all construct a full scale detail or chunk strengthen the notion (institutional identity) that AUS has a commitment to a design/build education?

9. <mark>Taskforce Response:</mark> Agreed. It could be great. But again, there would be a lot of work to do in order to make it a reality. Perhaps 301/302 could be taken out of sequence so we don't have 45+ students in CAAD Labs in the same semester on top of whatever fabrication courses are running

10. <mark>Taskforce Response:</mark> Evidence does not readily support the assertion that AUS has a commitment to DB. Some arch faculty have/had a commitment to DB and there was/is some funding, but 300k annually compared to the scale of funding in other depts/programs combined with a high degree of institutional friction (if not outright hostility) from the administration (Dean to Chancellor) does not suggest there is much commitment at an institutional level

Digital Media and Representation

How can this be embedded into foundations year while maintaining key learning aspects of traditional drawing and drafting? <mark>It would be interesting to look at other programs positions/curricula on this.[11]</mark> (Cornell? UVA? Cal Poly SLO? Pratt?)

11. <mark>Taskforce Response:</mark> Good idea and something to be addressed by the standing Foundations Program Committee or a new standing Core Curriculum Committee. It is worth noting that the programs mentioned have control over the full sequence of study starting at day 1. In reality the department currently has 1+4 (ARC) and 1+3 (IDE) programs.

If more introductory digital instruction can be moved into 1st year, students would be better prepared for drawings second year. Perhaps if a course like ARC265 was required, some of the basic content could be shifted to year 1 and there would be more room for a basic intro to BIM/Revit? [12]

12. Taskforce Response: Deliberations regarding specific content are beyond the scope of the current taskforce, but the topic merits further study by the department and the appropriate standing committee(s).

I think the idea of a required digital representation is a good one. Again, not software specific, but about moving between software platforms and focusing on representation techniques and principles.

People versus Paper
The idea of year level coordinators is a good one, but then these instructors are locked into a specific year for three years at a time. Could this type of commitment be incentivized? [13] At HKU Year coordinators had teaching release, or less admin work…or budgets that they could manage to plan events, trips and speakers. In general, a bit more autonomy.

13. Taskforce Response: As mentioned above, faculty have different preferences. In this case we are talking about two people potentially… 2nd year and 3rd year. Maybe 4 if you include co-coordinators for 1st year. For participating faculty there are various options including committing to one semester in core or both semesters in core. Also, we should be wary of incentivizing people to do their jobs. Currently coordination is counted as service, though how much and to what effect (in terms of lightening other service commitments) is unclear. Clarity on that topic would be welcome.

Bridge faculty-- If communication between dedicated coordinators is stronger, is bridging needed? [14]

14. Taskforce Response: Bridging is key to the broader vision of a coherent, well-coordinated core. As we all know agreeing to things on paper or in conversation is radically different than teaching together day to day. The bridge faculty can help to implement things coordinators and core comm discuss.

I'm a bit concerned about students having the same instructor over and over. [15] This might also complicate teaching assignments, but maybe not.

15. Taskforce Response: There is nothing fundamentally good or bad with students having an instructor more than one time. This happens frequently at CAAD and is not uncommon at peer institutions. However, bridging does not require that all sections/instructors stay the same from one semester to the next. If one faculty serves as the 'bridge' between 202 and 301 (as Bill Sarnecky did in ARC 202 S22 and ARC301 F22) they could teach with 2 new faculty and have a section full of students they did not have in the previous semester.

Before another permanent committee is established, there should be an overview of all department standing committees and their roles. [16]

16. Taskforce Response: Agreed. A review of standing committees including an analysis of the related workloads would be valuable.

CAAD is the smallest college, Architecture a relatively small department at AUS, and faculty are already overburdened with administrative tasks when compared to our colleagues in CAS or CES. I agree that the work of the proposed Core Curriculum Committee is important and needs to be done, but perhaps there is space for this within an existing Architecture Program Committee or Curriculum Committee. Some committee/service auditing is likely required in any case.[17]

17. Taskforce Response: Developing and implementing a coherent, well-coordinated core would require a substantial, consistent commitment over a number of years by a subgroup of faculty committed to the related issues. Also, if core is just another thing added to an already busy committee that is addressing a number of issues/challenges it likely to suffer from some degree

of inattention or divided attention due in no part to the comm members but simply due to limited time.

That said, we agree that a review of the standing committees and what they are actually doing would be welcome. It has been some time since the dept was made aware of the standing committee's agenda at the start of the year or their accomplishments at the end of the year.

Other Thoughts

The Task force has outlined ideas for the Architecture Program, but not yet directly the Interior Design program. [18] Should there be a task force member who teaches more regularly in IDE to extend these proposals more universally to both department programs? The recently discussed relationship of ARC201 and IDE201 would be affected by this discussion.

18. Taskforce Response: Given the significant distinctions between ARC and IDE the taskforce recommends that the HOD charge a similar task force to examine 'Core' in relative to the Interior Design program. There is a significant difference in the definition of 'core' for a 48 student 5yr ARC program and a 16 student 4yr IDE program. Once work is completed, or at least started, by both task forces then there could be a discussing focused on areas of overlap, ie IDE/ARC 201.

Additional Issues / Problems / Opportunities

International experience of some sort would be great to have. Resources or funding may be necessary? Or is this built somehow into the tuition/fees? Even a more regional international experience may be something to consider? Amman instead of Milan for instance? [19] I think when many of us think of international experience we automatically think of Europe or North American.

19. Taskforce Response: In addition to geographic location, it would be useful to examine pedagogical pros/cons of international experience more broadly. What learning experience are we hoping the students gain from international experience? How is a foreign destination distinct from lessons/experience locally? In terms of funding there are different models for different types of travel that can be examined/debated, but these topics also lie outside the scope of this task force.

Is ARC402 part of the core? [20] No? I would like to know more about why it's not considered so. I think that the option studio in ARC401 might also be reconsidered to carry more curricular responsibility. Pedagogically, should the Core Curriculum end abruptly…or fade out through 4th year into a more free 5th year. Might a 401 studio course be the place to have more complex urban themes for instance? Worth discussing more…or at least what is 402's relationship to the Core.

20. Taskforce Response: Core introduces fundamental disciplinary skills. Comprehensive Studio tests the ability to integrate those skills. Further, 402 exists beyond the introductory level just in terms of course numbers and student maturity/capacity.

How would we explain that we return to 'core' after having an options studio in 401? Historically 401 was not an options studio.

The change was made in approximately 2012-13 in response to student concerns re the perceived 'sameness' of 201-402 and the lack of diversity in the program. At the time faculty shared this sentiment. Faculty also favored the idea of a distinct break between core and options that in some way parallels the British system (3yrs undergrad +2yrs grad) or even the 4+2 model in the US.

Comprehensive has always a bit of an oddball in that model, but remained in spring 4th year due to the desire to give students something different (an options studio) after 302 and also to facilitate the study abroad semester (Barcelona) as the expectation was that it would not be possible/sustainable to expect 15 students from one cohort (501) to sign up for study abroad. Therefore, in order to make the program more resilient the department invented the 401/501 vertical studio.

Final: April 27, 2023

Another, perhaps secondary, benefit was to get 4th year students some experience with a DB studio without having to do a whole year (presuming a 2-semester project). This would allow them to start a 5th year DB with a better sense of the operation and provide a potential focus for their options studios. As an aside, the idea of informal 'tracks' (DB, urban, experimental, etc) in the options studios + 581 was discussed but never really manifest. Certainly a 'cleaner' curriculum would position comp in 401 or 302. The task force discussed moving comprehensive to 302 but the majority voted against. If the department were to gain full control of 1st year perhaps that idea would be worth revisiting.

If there is to be integration between ARC 201 and IDE 201, then the parameters should be established accordingly. ==The leap from DES 132 to an open site project seems considerable and resolution of all of the issues is a challenge.==[21] ==An urban infill project in ARC 201 would allow an interior focus and the basis for integration with IDE 201.==[22] If framed appropriately, the project would facilitate the development of an approach to interior space that explores three-dimensional habitable space through the construction of plan and section (potentially addressing the tendencies to resort to the stacking of floors/lack of three-dimensional articulation that we often complain about).

21. **Taskforce Response**: ARC201 outcomes dating to 2010 provide evidence of significant success in transitioning from DES 132 while dealing with an open site relative to all 201 course outcomes. Notably, the NAAB Accreditation Team in Spring 2013 highlighted the work as 'Exceeds Expectations'. Arguably, the spatial constriction associated with a dense, interior focused project would require skills and dexterity less directly associated with the outcomes common to DES132. That said, there is little doubt that a number of approaches could prove successful. Ultimately, deliberations regarding specific content beyond the scope of the current taskforce, but the topic merits further study by the department and the appropriate standing committee(s).

22. **Taskforce Response**: Agreed. The potential coordination between ARC 201 and IDE 201 is worthy of further discussion and the impacts on both programs should be examined in depth with a particular emphasis on what might be lost as well as gained.

==In terms of knowledge and pedagogy, ARC/IDE 201 + ARC 281 (fall) and ARC 202 + ARC 271 should be considered and perhaps piloted for a period.==[23] The move from infill project to open site would allow for a "bracketing" of the issues in the fall and ==an expanded range of concerns in the spring. ARC/IDE 201 + ARC 281 would allow for a focus on the formal/spatial, whereas ARC 202 + ARC 271 would allow for emphasis on applying the strategies explored in ARC/IDE 201 to an open site condition with greater complexity.==[24]

23. **Taskforce Response**: Historically, issues related to Landscape (ARC271) were aligned with ARC201 in an attempt to highlight the importance of site in architecture. The task force encourages the faculty to consider potential changes carefully and determine in advance how to evaluate outcomes. Variables are not limited to project site and scope. The taskforce has highlighted the importance of 'people over paper' and that variable must be considered carefully as the core evolves. Notably, the tradition of continuity in which one or more faculty taught both 201 and 202 has changed over the past +/-5 years and it is not clear that this has had any beneficial outcomes.

24. **Taskforce Response**: It is not clear that students in ARC202 will be ready for "an expanded range of concerns" or "greater complexity" regardless of the ARC201 content.

Addendum 04: Committee Brainstorming Outline Fall 2022 (Short Version)
1. Establish a narrative outline/overview of the Integrated Core
   a. Content + Communication (b/t faculty, b/t semesters, b/t years)
      i. Narrative Overview vs Guidelines vs Prescriptive
         1. Narrative Overview
            a. Define Pedagogical Goals + Articulate Values
            b. Logic Map including (recent?) History
         2. Studio Course Descriptions
            a. Broad Guidelines, Overview
         3. Project + Site Typologies
            a. Venue for the learning, not the content/goal.
            b. Analogy to Chemistry Lab= Petri Dish vs. Beaker
   b. Individual Courses:
      i. Define Pedagogical Goals + Curricular Values (ex. Privilege design in the technical)
      ii. Articulate a Logic Map (?)
      iii. Include brief course history, how it has operated, what is/was included, etc
   c. Curriculum (Holistic)
      i. Explain/map the interrelation between all core courses (studio + support)
   d. Explain/strengthen integration between Studio + Support Courses in the Core
      i. Current:
         1. 201 w/ ARC271 Intro to Landscape + ARC281 Arch Principles
         2. 202 w/ ARC282 (?) Materials + Methods I
         3. 301 w/ ARC??? Structures
         4. 302 w/ ARC382 Detailing
      ii. Proposed Courses:
         1. ARC265 Intro to Digital (w/201 or DES132/ARC/IDE102)
         2. ARC??? Intro to Revit (w/301) as a new required course.
2. People vs Paper
   a. Key Principles=
      i. People matter more than text (course descriptions, course outcomes, etc)
      ii. Consistent, ongoing communication between core faculty is essential
   b. Proposals
      i. Coordination + Consistency
         1. Year Level Coordinators: teach both spring + fall 101/102, 201/202, 301/302
         2. "Bridge" Faculty": teach spring 102/202 + fall 201/301
         3. Semester Faculty: teach one semester in core yr after yr
         4. Core Faculty agree to a 3yr 'contract'/commitment
         5. All faculty new to the core teach in a coordinated semester 2x before taking on the coordinator role
      ii. Establish a standing (permanent) Core Comm in the department
         6. Charge: Define, Implement, Review, and Refine core course content and pedagogy.
         7. Core Comm meetings held 3x per semester (min)
         8. Comm Chair = Core Coordinator who oversees all core courses in concert with the HOD

3. Define + Deliver Consistent Foundational Knowledge in 1st year
   a. Institute meaningful coordination and establish consistent content, projects, schedules, etc across all sections
      i. Privilege student learning, shared core principles and foundational knowledge over faculty independence, individual preference, and idiosyncratic approaches.
      ii. Currently 2nd year faculty must teach foundational principles while also introducing discipline-specific content b/c rising 2nd year students do not evidence consistent, reliable knowledge or skills

      iii.   Implement coordinated, co-teaching in each time-slot
1. Deploy multi-section group pinups, discussions, and introductory lectures to ensure consistent 'foundational' knowledge
2. Introduce + reinforce a common, shared 'language' of design
   a. Elements= Point, Line, Plane, Volume, Mass, + Void
   b. This will Prepare students for ARC281 + IDE/ARC201
   c. Reference and utilize this shared language in all core courses
   d. Avoid faculty-specific lingo
      iv.   Establish Topic Coordinators (Des + Drawing) + Time-Slot Coordinators
   a. One person could coordinate + teach in all 3 time slots to ensure consistency. Use co-coordinators if/when there are 4 timeslots
   b. Ensure faculty overlap between time slots