



The Catholic University of America

School of architecture and planning

ARPL 601-603-701, Sections 001

Urban Practice Studio

Graduate Architectural Design Studio

Fall 2015

Graduate

6 Credit Hours

Classroom:

Crough Center, Graduate Studio

Days and hours of class meetings:

Monday, Wednesday and Friday, 2:10-6:00PM

Eric J. Jenkins, AIA

Associate Professor
(Studio Coordinator)
jenkinse@cua.edu

Mark McInturff, FAIA

Associate Adjunct Professor
mmcinturff@mcinturffarchitects.com

Ayers Saint Gross Architects

Erin Estep, AIA

Visiting Critic
Ayers Saint Gross Architects
Voice: 202-628-1033
eestep@asg-architects.com

Hickok-Cole Architects

Devon Perkins, AIA, LEED AP

Visiting Critic
Associate Principal
Hickok Cole Architects
Voice 202.667.9776
dperkins@hickokcole.com

Eric J. Jenkins, AIA

Associate Professor
(Studio Coordinator)
jenkinse@cua.edu

Mark McInturff, FAIA

Associate Adjunct Professor
mmcinturff@mcinturffarchitects.com

Thomas Corrado, AIA, LEED

Visiting Critic
Hickok Cole Architects
Voice 202.667.9776
tcorrado@hickokcole.com

Course Description**ARPL 601-ARPL 603-ARPL 701: Themed Studio**

A graduate-level studio devoted to design issues such as urban design, architectural conservation/preservation, architecture and cultural intervention or sacred space. Project critiques include input from the studio critic and consultants in one or more of these areas: site planning/landscape; structures, materials, and building assembly; and environmental systems and sustainability. The difference between 601, 603 and 701 is dependent on individual needs: The instructors will discuss the areas of particular focus with each student.

Instructional Methods

One-on-one and Group critiques

Course Goals

The purpose or goal of the course is to address a fundamental question about architecture: How do we build of our time while respecting the past? Of course, this question raises more questions:

What is the difference between “modern”, “modernity” and “modernism”? Are these philosophies or styles? Are they limited to a specific epoch or are they timeless? What does it mean to be “contemporary”? When, how and for whom do we build?

What is the difference amongst terms such as authenticity, truthfulness, realness and genuineness?

What is “historic”? What role does nostalgia, taste, familiarity play in determining historic designation? What is the role of nostalgia, gestalt and generic concepts in the future?

In a greater question: What is the role of context—historic, environmental, social, religious, cultural and economic—play in the design process? How does the issue of building of “our time” impact the “other”?

Ultimately, this issue will be of both practical and philosophical importance in your role as an architect, urban designer and responsible citizen in the 21st

century. It is estimated that by 2020, 60% of all design projects will involve some form of historic preservation or conservation. Additionally, it is quite possible that the majority of your design projects will involve some responsible response to contexts. As that informed and responsible architect, what is the role of questioning, of informing and resistance to popularism in shaping the future? How can we resist the temptation to either ignore the past or ignore the future without ending up with an architecture schizophrenic modern inside/traditional outside or average mediocre conglomeration of both? In the end, how does an architect play the twofold—and often antithetical and antagonistic—role of shaper of the future and guardian of the past?

Goals for Student Learning

At the conclusion of this course, the student will be able to discuss the fundamental issues regarding building of today in historic cities, have a grasp of how this might be accomplished and show this through design work.

NAAB Criteria Covered in this Course

For the purpose of accreditation, graduating students must demonstrate *understanding* or *ability* in the following areas:

A 2. Critical Thinking Skills

Ability to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret

information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and

test them against relevant criteria and standards

A 3. Graphics Skills

Ability to use appropriate representational media, including freehand drawing and

computer technology, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the

programming and design process

A7. Use of Precedents

Ability to incorporate relevant precedents into architecture and urban design projects.

STUDIO STRUCTURE

Team Teaching

The studio will be divided into smaller groups on the first day of class. Eric Jenkins and Mark McInturff will work with all students but each group will have

a "primary" instructor. As in past studios, Mark will review ALL students (in all sections) on Fridays.

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
12 accred	13 accred <i>HCA Work</i> <i>Day</i> <i>ASG</i> <i>(Estep)</i> <i>Eric</i>	14 accred	15 accred <i>ASG Work</i> <i>Day HCA</i> <i>(Perkins)</i> <i>Eric</i>	16 MICA	17 <i>ends</i> <i>HCA</i> <i>(Corrado)</i> <i>Eric</i> <i>Mark</i>	18

ARPL 601 and 603 students will have a choice of Ayers Saint Gross Studio (Primary Instructor: Erin Estep) and Hickok-Cole Studio (Primary Instructors: Devon Perkins / Tom Corrado)

ARPL 701 students may choose their own projects for the semester (under advisement from the Primary Instructor: Eric Jenkins) or they may work in the Ayers Saint Gross or Hickok-Cole sections.

Team Teaching

Some students have difficulties with "team teaching" and ask questions such as "To whom do I listen?" This apprehension is natural but is something that must be overcome. *(Oddly enough, all critics share a great many opinions and, in their minds, give consistent critiques. There are nuances and each of us has a different approach, but all three are fairly well aligned strategically and conceptually.)* Any confusion is the point of team teaching: You have to learn to deal with it and embrace it. As an architect, you must learn to synthesize varied critiques, discern germane critiques and decide on your own about the direction. We will never "tell you what to do" but offer guidance--if sometimes specific guidance as a way to help you move forward. In the end, however, you must decide, take actions and argue for those actions to the critics and to the clients. Part of this development is for you to be very clear with us about when you are confused. You must talk to us about any source of misunderstanding so that we can help you learn and feel comfortable with this process.

Work Load

This studio has, historically, produced excellent work. It is the result of the students' hard work, intellectual curiosity and high-standards. The single most significant factor is work. Quality is important, but quantity of production is just as important (It takes 10,000 broken pots to make 1 excellent pot). Showing up with thoughtful, well-produced work will go a long way toward success in this studio.

Group Work

Very few architects work on their own. Even sole-practitioners work with clients, finance officers, accountants, contractors, et al. While architects must be able to lead and make unified decisions, they must also learn to work with others. The key questions include: How do become a strong designer while working with others? How do you make architecture that is not designed by committee but reflects the desires, vision, etc. of many? To help answer these questions we encourage team work. We will begin the semester with a "critic assigned" groups but encourage you to develop a rapport with those who share ideas and possibly work with them on projects.

Readings

In addition to your own research, we will read a series of articles throughout the semester. A list of assigned readings will be distributed with each project.

Expectations and policies

Academic honesty: Academic honesty is expected of all CUA students. Faculty are required to initiate the imposition of sanctions when they find violations of academic honesty, such as plagiarism, improper use of a student's own work, cheating, and fabrication. The following sanctions are presented in the University procedures related to Student Academic Dishonesty (from <http://policies.cua.edu/academicundergrad/integrityprocedures.cfm>): "The presumed sanction for undergraduate students for academic dishonesty will be failure for the course. There may be circumstances, however, where, perhaps because of an undergraduate student's past record, a more serious sanction, such as suspension or expulsion, would be appropriate. In the context of graduate studies, the expectations for academic honesty are greater, and therefore the presumed sanction for dishonesty is likely to be more severe, e.g., expulsion. ...In the more unusual case, mitigating circumstances may exist that would warrant a lesser sanction than the presumed sanction." Please review the complete texts of the University policy and procedures regarding Student Academic Dishonesty, including requirements for appeals, at <http://policies.cua.edu/academicundergrad/integrity.cfm> and <http://policies.cua.edu/academicundergrad/integrity.cfm>.

Other Policies or Expectations. Note your policies or expectations (e.g. Attendance and punctuality policy, Participation expectation, note re: cell phones, timeliness on papers, form of submission of papers electronic vs. hard copy, policy on making up (or not) quizzes, tests etc.)

Accommodations for students with disabilities: Any student who feels s/he may need an accommodation based on the impact of a disability should contact the instructor privately to discuss specific needs. Please contact Disability Support Services (at 202 319-5211, room 207 Prybyla Center) to coordinate reasonable accommodations

for students with documented disabilities. To read about the services and policies, please visit the website: <http://disabilitysupport.cua.edu>.

Assessment

Reviews And Criticism

1. Criticism (we prefer the term "critiquing") is never intended to be personal. It is intended and should remain objective and professional.
2. To keep somewhat objective about your work at this early stage, please try not to see the design as "yours" but a culmination of experience and tested ideas that evolve through analysis and synthesis and the input of others. As a way to develop this thinking, you should refrain from over-using the terms "my idea" or "my building" or "I wanted" in your presentations. In studio, try to open yourselves to varied ideas. With no apologies to Ayn Rand's hero Howard Roark in *The Fountainhead*, the "honest arrogance" of the lone genius is earned.
3. The "Why, How, and What" will be discussed in terms of a logical design process.

Why: the reasons for, its formulation and its validity

How: the process of making it

What: the particular architectural form or product

4. Any criticism from your studio critics or visiting critics should be *addressed* in some fashion. "Addressing" criticism simply means examining and evaluating possible solutions or directions emerging from that criticism. Addressing is more or less an experiment conducted before fully rejecting criticism. It helps you understand and test a suggestion before disregarding because of ignorance. Of course, not all criticism is same—the difficult part is discriminating what and how advice should be followed.
5. Although advice is sometimes exactly on-the-mark, critiquing is not always there for someone to tell you exactly what to do. All criticism should be thought of as "food for thought".

Evaluation

Progress: How far did you come? How far did you take it?

Process/ Interaction: How much study do you do? Did you try other studies suggested by your critic?

How do you respond to critiquing?

Craft: How well you draw, make models and craft your presentations?

Design Solution: How well did you meet the requirements of the problem?

Is it clear and consistent? Are all parts unified to make a whole?

Catholic University of America's Graduate Grading Scale (with instructors' augmentations)

A "Excellent" DESIGN (all aspects worked out, solution was elegant)

IDEA (excellent idea fully and exhaustively researched and developed)

CRITICISM (excellent reaction to critiques, excellent self criticism)

CRAFT (highest attention to accuracy and quality workmanship)

ASSIGNMENTS (brought a great deal more than was asked)

PARTICIPATION (involved in critiques, discussions)

A- "Superior" DESIGN (most aspects worked out, solution was more than very good)

IDEA (ideas well researched and developed)

CRITICISM (very good reaction to critiquing, not fully self-critical)

CRAFT (very good attention to detail and workmanship)

ASSIGNMENTS (brought more than asked)

PARTICIPATION (involved in critiques, discussions)

B+ "Very Good" DESIGN (majority of aspects worked out, solution was very good)

IDEA (ideas only partially researched and developed, needs more work)

CRITICISM (very good reaction to critiques, moderately defensive) CRAFT (very good attention to detail and workmanship, rough in spots)

ASSIGNMENTS (full-filled requirements but very well done)

PARTICIPATION (involved in discussions)

B "Good" DESIGN (many aspects worked out, solved most problems, prosaic)

IDEA (satisfactory idea, not well or only partially researched)

CRITICISM (reacted to critiques with changes only, defensive at times)

CRAFT (satisfactory craft, passable but several problems)

ASSIGNMENTS (fulfilled all assignments satisfactorily)

B- “Satisfactory” Similar to “Good” except with some deficiencies

mostly deficiencies in quality, self-criticism and reaction to criticism, and assignments that are not fully complete or are reactionary only.

C “Passing”* DESIGN (few aspects resolved, solved few problems, created more)

IDEA (weak idea, or only one idea investigated and then poorly)

CRITICISM (no reaction to criticism defensive, no pro-active work)

CRAFT (bordering on poor craft--messy, unprofessional)

ASSIGNMENTS (incomplete assignments, no studies, finds excuses)

PARTICIPATION (no or little participation in discussions)

D and F “Unacceptable Work”

** If a student earns this grade, he/she will need to repeat the studio.*

University grades:

The University grading system is available at <http://policies.cua.edu/academicgrad//gradesfull.cfm#iii> for graduate students. Reports of grades in courses are available at the end of each term on <http://cardinalstation.cua.edu> .

Bibliography

A complete bibliography is available on the Urban Practice Blackboard site. If you are not a "user" on this, please let Eric know and he will sign you up.

Urban Practice Studio

Fall 2015 Schedule

Eric will be in MWF; HCA and ASG critics will be in on WF; Mark will be in each Friday. Please note the review schedule. Most reviews are on Fridays except the final review. All reviews will be on the Wailing Walls unless noted. All dates subject to change.

w	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
	12 accred	13 accred	14 accred	15 accred	16 MICA	17 <i>ends</i>	18

w	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
1	30	31 Studio Starts/ Presentations	1 SEP	2	3	4 Mark Presents	5
2	6	7 Labor Day	8	9 <i>Eric Out @ Miami of Ohio Lecture</i>	10	11	12
3	13	14	15	16 CUA Lecture	17	18	19
4	20	21	22	23 Pope Visit Classes Canceled	24	25 <i>Mark/Eric Out</i>	26
5	27	28 <i>Eric Out</i>	29	30 CUA Lecture	1 OCT	2 Review	3
6	4	5	6	7	8 CUA Lecture	9 Travel?	10 Travel?
7	11 Travel?	12 Columbus Day	13	14	15	16	17
8	18	19	20	21 CUA Lecture	22 Art Night	23	24
9	25	26	27	28	29	30 Review	31
10	1 NOV	2	3	4 CUA Lecture	5	6	7
11	8	9	10	11 CUA Lecture	12	13	14
12	15	16	17	18	19	20 Review	21
13	22	23	24	25 Thanksgiving	26 Thanksgiving	27 Thanksgiving	28
14	29	30	1 DEC	2	3	4	5
15	6	7	8	9	10	11	12

w	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
	13	14	15 Final Review	16	17	18	19
	20	21	22	23	24	25 Christmas	26