

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, Executive Committee

distributed

26 September, 2016

Minutes

meeting

Friday

12:00–1:00

23 September, 2016

Acting Chair

Mark Blizard

members present

Bob Baron, Ian Caine, Sedef Doganer, Jim Dawes, Armando Ariza, Hazem Rashed-Ali, Steve Temple, Antonio Petrov, Curtis Fish (for Diane Hays)

members absent

John Alexander (excused), Bill Dupont (excused)

action items indicated below

next meeting

at a future meeting



approval of minutes

committee unanimously approved the meeting minutes for Friday 16 meeting

proposal (Acting Chair)

curriculum discussion | the curriculum as a whole

to be held after NAAB visit later this semester

solicit from executive curriculum committee

structure / schedule

engagement + discussion topics

proposals such as

the sequence of introduction / development and mode / structure

of integration of digital tools, skills and techniques

After a brief discussion, there was general support for the proposal. The ramifications of which will be discussed at a later meeting. In the mean time, all members are encouraged to discuss the contents and ideas of a curricular discussion with the general faculty.

reports + discussion

catalog descriptions (Acting Chair)

A brief history of our current catalog descriptions and a reminder of our task to consider the suggestions brought up by this committee and those in the sub-committee reports.

analogue / digital (Jim, Sedef, Armando, Steve)

Following much discussion, there was general agreement on the following items

moving 1 credit hour (essentially, this is the weekly Friday lecture) from Design 1 to Design 2. Core Curriculum requirements (Social Responsibility) would be met in Design 1 through individual faculty course content. This would be informally coordinated through the vehicle of the Design 1 informal weekly meetings. It must be noted that this change in credit hours (Design 1 is a Core Curriculum class), would have to be passed through Nancy Martin and the University Core Curriculum Committee. (Bob—can you investigate the procedure)

introducing a basic software into Design 2 late in the semester through a series of on-line tutorials (coordinated between digital faculty and Design 1 faculty). The sequence of design projects and their content would essentially stay the same. Ian: In order for the upper year students to have a stronger grasp of the digital tools and techniques, this step (first year) could be considered as “setting the table”

Antonio: What is critical here is that we consider a very limited range, or a specific software rather than a broad introduction of several softwares. This is about learning to think through the digital environment.

Proposal: a test would be conducted this Spring Semester with one or two studios. Followed by an end of the semester discussion among this committee and interested faculty. The committee would like to see what this would “look” like. We will follow up in a future meeting.

2nd Year Studios: change in catalog description to reflect the focus on course content rather than technique (analog or digital division would be erased). Fall Semester: non-urban + small (relatively simple) program + basic building / spatial types; Spring Semester: and urban + medium (more complex) program + hybrid building / spatial types. There is still need of further discussion.

Curtis: There is a growing concern about “fitting” CIDA requirements into the 2nd year design studios. A digital IDE studio has already been implemented. The Fall Semester studio may follow.

- ▶ Propose changes will be presented by Mark and discussed next meeting. Following much discussion, there was general agreement on the need for further discussion in the following area:

Vertical Studios: understood as a critical part of the analogue / digital discussion.

The return of Systems Studio (Whole / Sound Building Studio—see below) and the careful sequencing of course offerings and studio requirements (Study Abroad, 4126 x 2, Systems Studio) would provide a stronger sequence to support the analog / digital teaching / learning objectives.

Hazem: This is another area where careful testing and evaluation would be necessary. I caution against proceeding without these measures as we have made this mistake before.

3rd + 4th year studios

As the content has been taught and is generally understood as a necessary part of the curriculum, a Systems / Sound Building approach would provide a clearer and more defined framework for this content. The studio project, however, would be limited in size in order to promote the thoughtful investigation and design of a “sound” building. It was noted that this is a different approach from a Comprehensive Design Studio and was appropriate for the 4th year of a BARCH education.

Bob: presented the essential points from the recent SACS Assessment Report (see attachment) should guide us in our considerations of 4th year studios.

- ▶ Sedef (with input from others including Mark) will consider a catalog description for Systems Studio and present it at the next meeting.

attachments

For your reference and for the record, the following documents have been attached via e-mail:
BS Arch Spring 2016 SACS Assessment Report (pdf file)
Report of the Analogue/Digital sub-committee of the Executive Sub-committee of the Curriculum Committee, UTSA, CACP. (pdf file)

next meeting:
Friday, 30 September
12:00–1:00
the commons

omissions or additions to these minutes may be submitted directly to me or bring them to the next meeting. thank you all for your presence and input into this rather compressed process!
—MAB