CONTEMPORANEITY AND ARCHITECTURE

> "The contemporary is he who firmly holds his gaze on his own time so as to perceive not its light, but rather its darkness." - Giorgio Agamben

Course Description

In "What is the Contemporary", the Italian philosopher Georgio Agamben suggests that the true contemporaries are "those who do not allow themselves to be blinded by the lights of the century, and so manage to get a glimpse of the shadows in those lights, of their intimate obscurity." The M1 studio will engage theoretically, historically and practically in the humble pursuit of contemporaneity in architecture. Identifying the lights of our century, we will endeavor not to place ourselves in their beam but rather seek to engage the depth of their shadow. We will pursue contemporaneity in Agamben's sense: "The contemporary is the one whose eyes are struck by the beam of darkness that comes from his own time." Later he adds: "It is as if this invisible light that is the darkness of the present casts its shadow on the past, so that the past, touched by this shadow, acquired the ability to respond to the darkness of the now."

A more limiting definition of contemporaneity equates the term to what is Modern, characteristic of the present period, even "up-to-date, ultra-modern", or to designate art, furniture, decoration or buildings that have a "markedly *avant-garde* quality". Combined, these definitions of contemporaneity point to both the century's lights and their shadows. Playing between the narrow sense of contemporaneity and its deeper reaches, the studio and seminar will provide opportunities to investigate and reflect upon contemporary discourses so as to foreground their bearing on the conception of architecture in the contemporary world.

Throughout the semester, you will be guided through readings and exercises that will enable you to (1) define your position within a larger theoretical and historical framework, (2) critically consider the links between the representational means you employ and the conditions you can reveal in the represented site and (3) assess the range of potential architectural practices and carefully select your approach together with the intended scope of your proposed thesis intervention.

Using the action of casting as a paradigm of our approach, we will move between the epistemological, the phenomenological and the socio-political grounds of architecture, considering it as it is epistemologically cast against a certain conception of time (global time? acceleration? the non-contemporaneity of the contemporaneous?), as it continues to sculpted by time (and bears the traces of historical, natural and phenomenal weathering) and as it forms, is informed and transformed by its socio-political context. In short, we will attempt to address the cultural role of architecture as it plays out in the shadow of progress, efficiency and productivity. The study of contemporaneity can be particularly fruitful in Rome. As tangible traces from Ancient Rome coexist with the Medieval, Renaissance, Baroque, Fascist, Modern and present-day architecture, the consideration of contemporaneity in Rome calls for an attempt to dwell in the multiplicity of time.

Objectives

There is one main objective in this course, and it is to enable you to posit a clear thesis question that you can then continue to investigate in a self-directed manner during the following semesters. This objective represents the synthesis of three interrelated tasks: (1) the production of a commented bibliography; (2) the selection of the means through which you will be conducting your architectural masters research; and (3) the definition of the particular scope and site of your architectural research.

Structure

Working between Roman sites and your own thesis, the studio will be set up as a series of five exercises:

1. **Position**: investigating contemporary architectural discourse and *taking position*;
2. **Siting/Mapping**: discussing the current means employed to position architectural projects and *siting architecture;*
3. **Application**: surveying different domains that have been staked for architecture and *defining the scope of the architectural intervention*;
4. **Thesis proposal**: reflecting back on the process to propose an individual project that embodies the key elements of the self-directed thesis conducted in the deep sense of the contemporary;
5. **Roman case study:** a design exercise to be completed in Rome;

Final Submission: complete thesis document (including abstract, literature review, case study documentation and project, thesis site and scope of intervention, bibliography, schedule for completion).

Evaluation

You will be evaluated on:

Participation	10%	- participation in the seminar, reviews, attendance and preparation;
June 24 Presentation	25%	- quality of presentation: structure, synthesis, depth, content (1-4);
July 29 Presentation	20%	- quality of presentation: structure, synthesis, depth, content (5);
Development	10%	- ongoing development of the thesis throughout the semester;
Final thesis document	35%	- 20% thesis statement, depth of investigation (project and text);
		10% references, bibliography, case study; 5% timetable, milestones.

Schedule

WEEK 1

May 6: Introduction: Contemporaneity (am)

| Giorgio Agamben, "What is the Contemporary", in *What is an Apparatus and other essays*, trans David Kishik and Stefan Pedatella, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009, pp. 39-54.
__ Hartmut Rosa, "Social Acceleration: Ethical and Political Consequences of a Desynchronized High-Speed Society", *Constellations,* vol. 10, no. 1, 2003, pp. 3-33.
__ Friedrich Nietzsche, *On the Advantage and Disadvantage of History for Life,* trans. Peter Preuss,

Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 1980 .
__Theodor Adorno, *Prisms,* Cambridge, MA:MIT Press, 1997, pp. 17-35.
__Hannah Arendt, "The concept of history, ancient and modern", *Between Past and Future,* New York:Penguin Books, 1993, pp. 41-90.
__David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change,* London: Wiley Blackwell, 1992
__Paul Connerton, *How Modernity Forgets, C*ambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009
__Marshall Berman, *All that is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity,* Penguin, 1988
__ Jurgen Habermas, "Modernity – An Incomplete Project", In the *Anti-Aesthetic*, ed. Hal Foster, New York: The New Press, 1998, pp. 1-15.
__Alan Colquhoun, "Three kinds of Historicism" in *Modernity and the Classical Tradition, Architectural Essays*, 1980-87, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989, pp. 3-19

Abstract Presentation (pm)
Each student will print out their abstract and present them briefly to the group.

May 8

1. Theorizing architectural practice - Taking position
What is the cultural role of architecture? As an introduction to the themes of the studio, we will survey current architecture debates on the use and abuse of theory, on the relevance or irrelevance of history, and on the notions of creativity and productivity. In this case, the process of casting involves the delineation of a theoretical framework within which the thesis is to be given form.

Assignment: INITIATING BIBLIOGRAPHY
(1) Oral presentation of general field of inquiry
(2) Formulation of the thesis question as it is cast against – but also 'disturbs' this field of inquiry .

Contemporary Discourse: Criticality and Post-Criticality, Marx and its Specters (am)

 | K. Michael Hays, "Critical Architecture: Between culture and form," *Perspecta 23*, Vol. 21, 1984, pp.14-29.
 | George Baird, "Criticality and Its Discontents," *Crossover. Architecture Urbanism Technology,* Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2006, pp.648-659.
| Reinhold Martin, "Critical of What? Toward a Utopian Realism, *Harvard Deisng Magazine 22,* Spring Summer 2005, pp. 104-109.
 | Reinhold Martin, "Moment of Truth", *Log 7,* 2006, pp. 15-20.
--- Michael Speaks, "Theory was interesting...but now we have work," *Architecture Research Quarterly 6* (3), 2002, pp. 209-212.
--- Robert Somol and Sarah Whiting, "Notes around the Doppler Effect and other Moods of Modernism," *Perspecta 33,* 2002, pp. 72-77.
--- Bruno Latour, "Why Has Critique Run out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern,"

*Critical Inquiry 30*m Winter 2004, pp. 225-248.
__Arie Graafland, "On Criticality", *in Crossover. Architecture Urbanism Technology,* Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2006, pp. 688-703.
__K. Michael Hays, "Architecture Theory, Media, and the Question of Audience", *Assemblage 27,* 1995, pp. 41-46.
__Reinhold Martin, "Critical of What?" *Harvard Design Magazine* 22, 2005, pp. 104-108.
__Georges Teyssot,"Heterotopias and the History of Spaces", in *Architecture Theory since 1968,* ed. K. Michael Hays, Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 2000, pp. 296-305.
__Kenneth Frampton, "Towards a Critical Regionalism: Six Points for an Architecture of Resistance", in *The Anti-Aesthetics, Essays on Post-Modern Culture,* ed. Hal Foster, New Press, 2002, pp. 16-30.

Contemporary Discourse: Globalization, Productivity and Architectural Reification (pm)

 | Rem Koolhaas, "Junkspace," in *October 100,* 2002, pp. 175-190.
 | Fredric Jameson, "Future City", *New Left Review 21,* 2003, pp. 65-79
 | Hans Ibelings, "Grade Zero", in *After Crisis, Contemporary Architecture Conditions,* Zurich: Lars Müller Publisher, 2011, pp. 28-33.
 | Keller Easterling, "We will be Making Active Form", John Wiley & Son, 2012, pp. 58-63
--- Keller Easterling, "Zone: The Spatial Softwares of Extrastatecraft", *The Design Observer Group, http://places.designobserver.com/feature/zone-the-spatial-softwares-of-extrastatecraft/34528/*
---Ellen Dunham-Jones, "Rem Koolhaas and the 1990s", in *Architecture and Capitalism,* ed. Peggy Deamer, London: Routledge, 2014, pp. 150-69.
---Michael Sorkin, "Afterword: Architecture without Capitalism" in *Architecture and Capitalism,* ed. Peggy Deamer, London: Routledge, 2014, pp. 217-220.
__ Fredric Jameson, "Globalization and Architecture", in *The Domestic and the Foreign in Architecture,* Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2007, pp. 94-122.
---Michael Speaks, "Design Intelligence and the New Economy," *Architectural Record,* 2002, pp. 72-79.
__ Marc Augé, "From Places to Non-Places," in *non-places: introduction to an anthropology of supermodernity,* New York and London: Verso, 1995, pp. 75-120.
__Guy Debord, *Society of the Spectacle,* London: Rebel Press.
__Dalibor Vesely, *Architecture in the Age of Divided Representation*, Cambridge (MA): The MIT Press, 2004.
__Jeremy Till, "Scarcity contra Austerity", *The Design Observer Group,* posted 10.08.12: http://places.designobserver.com/feature/scarcity-contra-austerity/35638/
__ Saskia Sassen, "Cities in Today's Global Age", *SAIS Review XXIX* (1), 2009, pp. 3-34.
--- Keller Easterling, "Enduring Innocence", *The Grey Room,* vol 7, 2002, pp. 106-113.
--- Saskia Sassen, "The Global Street, *Making* the Political", *Globalization 8* (5), pp. 573-79.
__Peter Sloterdijk, *In the World Interior of Capital: Towards a Philosophical Theory of Globalization,* Polity, 2013.

WEEK 2

May 13 and May 15

Tuesday:
Individual meeting to discuss thesis context (field of inquiry, relevant literature, key questions)

Thursday:
Presentations (field of inquiry, commented bibliography, dominant questions & criticism)

Oral Presentations
Each student will present one or two key readings in relation to the general contemporary field within which they are situating their thesis question. Prior to the presentation, you will have to select an article and circulate it to the class. Half of the class will be presenting on Thursday morning, the other half on Thursday afternoon. Each student presenting in the morning will be coupled to a student presenting in the afternoon, and they will act as the primary respondent to each other's presentations. As a respondent, you will carefully read the text circulated by your classmate, you will formulate three critical questions, and also suggest at least one additional reading which either undermines or reinforces the position defended in the text circulated by your classmate.

Presentation format: Your presentation should not exceed 20 minutes to allow for a group discussion.

Submission:
Please submit at least one page including:
1. Working thesis title
2. One paragraph describing the general field of inquiry
3. A preliminary bibliography with a personal comment on the potential use and relevance of each text to your research.

WEEK 3

May 20

> **2. Siting architecture – implantation**
> *How do we define the site of architecture?* Emerging form a larger discussion of the means used to define the delineates the sites of architecture (data collection, geographical analysis, historical analysis, mappings), but also from a survey of the implications of the means employed on the development of the project (biologism, parametric, algorithms, diagrams, networks, etc), this second exercise will involve the drawing of a map or maps that position the project in a variety of dimensions (spatial, temporal, theoretical). The premise is that the means selected or investigated contribute to the definition of the site. To draw the site in its geographical, theoretical and historical dimensions, we will look at issues surrounding mapping, timing, and differences and similarities in analytical and conceptual approaches.
>
> **Assignment: INITIATING DOCUMENTATION**
> **(1) the mapping of a site and a critical reflection on the means used to map (i.e. locating the documentation approach in contemporary practice);**
> **(2) ' drawing the map' of the thesis site (world, region, city, building, program, joint).**

Contemporary Means: Gathering, Storing, Using and Transforming Information - I (am)

| Alberto Pérez-Gomez, "Ethics and Poetics in Architectural Praxis", *Crossover. Architecture Urbanism Technology*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2006, pp. 676-87.

| Robin Evans, "Translations from Drawing to Building", in *Translations from Drawing to Building and Other Essays,* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1997, pp. 153-193.

---Mark Wigley, "Network Fever," *Grey Room 4,* 2001, pp. 82-122.

__Mark Burry, "Between Intuition and Process: Parametric Design and Rapid Prototyping", in *Architecture in the Digital Age: Design and Manufacturing,* London: Taylor & Francis, 2005 pp. 148-162.

--- Branko Kolarevik, *Architecture in the Digital Age: Design and Manufacturing,* "Digital Morphogenesis", "Digital Production", "Information Master Builders", London: Taylor & Francis, 2005, pp. 1-62.

--- Neri Oxman, "Digital Craft: Fabrication-Based Design in the Age of Digital Production", in Workshop Proceedings for Ubicomp 2007: International Conference on Ubiquitous Computing. September; Innsbruck, Austria; pp. 534-538.

---Michael Hansel, "Designing Morpho-Ecologies: Versatility and Vicissitude of Heterogeneous Space," Architectural Design 78 (2), 2008, pp. 102-11.

__Michael Weinstock, "Metabolism and Morphology," *Architectural Design 78* (2), 2008, pp. 26-33.

__Thomas Mayne, *Combinatory Urbanism: The Complex Behaviour of Collective Form,* Stray Dog Cafe, 2011.

__Kostas Terzidis, "The Etymology of Design: Pre-Socratic Perspective," *Design Issues* 23, *(*4), 2007, pp. 69-78.

__Manuel de Landa, "Deleuze and the Use of the Genetic Algorithm in Architecture," in Neil Leach, *Designing for a Digital World,* London, 2002, pp. 117-120.

__Achim Menges, "Manufacturing Performance", *Architectural Design 78* (2), 2008, pp. 42-47.

__Achim Menges, "Manufacturing Diversity" *Architectural Design 76* (2)*,* 2006, pp. 70-77.

__Lisa Iwamoto, *Digital Fabrications: Architectural and Material Techniques,* Princeton Architectural Press, 2009.

__Akos Moravanszky, "Power Lines", *Crossover. Architecture Urbanism Technology*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2006, pp. 660-75.

Contemporary Means: Gathering, Storing, Using and Transforming Information - II (pm)

| Mario Carpo, *Alphabet and the Algorithm,* "Preface", "The Fall" and "Epilogue", MIT Press, 2011, pp. ix-xi and 81-128.

| Anthony Vidler, "Diagram of Diagrams: Architectural Abstraction and Modern Representation," *Representations 72,* 2000, pp. 1-20.

| James Corner, "The Agency of Mapping" in *Mappings,* ed. by Dennis Cosgrove, Critical Views, London: Reaktion, 1999.

| Stan Allen, "Diagrams Matter," in *Diagram Work, ANY No. 23*, eds. Ben van Berkel and Caroline Bos, 1998, pp. 15-26.

| Eyal Weizman, "Forensic Architecture: Notes from Fields and Forum, *Documenta 13,* 2001, pp. 2-42.

---Eyal Weizman, "Lethal Theory", *Open 18,* 2009, pp. 80-99.

-- Mark Linder, "Drawing, Literally" in *Architecture as a Craft: Architecture, Drawing, Model,* ed. Michiel Ridijk, Amsterdam, SUN, 2010, pp. 37-51

---Stan Allen, "Mapping the unmappable: on notation," in *Practice: Architecture, Technique and*

Representation, New York: Routledge, 2000, pp. 31-45.

__Marshall McLuhan, "The Medium is the Message," and "Media Hot and Cold," in *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man,* New York: McGraw Hill, 1964, pp. 7-32.

__ Robert Somol, " Diagrams of Matter," in *Diagram Work, ANY No. 23*, eds. Ben van Berkel and Caroline Bos, 1998, pp. 15-26.

May 22: Documentation

Each student will research one or two key examples of collecting or using information. You should choose an approach that is of interest to you and seems suitable to your proposed topic of research. The presentation will include your commentary on the examples selected, as well as a preliminary analysis your specific site, through this means. As such, you will also speculate on the site that this method of representation points to, particularly as it relates to the scale of the project that you envision.

Thursday: Individual reviews to discuss mapping and siting

WEEK 4

May 27: Presentation of Documentation
Each student will present one or two key examples, along with their own documentation of their proposed thesis site.

Presentation format:
> One presentation panel including
> 1. Working thesis title;
> 2. One paragraph describing the general field of inquiry;
> 3. Critical reflection and graphic analysis of two relevant projects;
> 4. The mapping of your thesis site;
> 5. A critical reflection on the means used to map (whether graphic or written);
> 6. The drawing of the map of your thesis site with a brief description (max 300 words).

Your presentation should not exceed **15 minutes** to allow for a group discussion.

May 29

> **3. Defining architecture and its Material FORMs - application**
> *How does architecture communicate?* Investigating different domains that have been staked for architecture - whether sculpture, landscape or infrastructure – this third exercise calls for the creation of an architectural lining to the theoretical cast. This probe will take the form of a material investigation of the selected theoretical field and the site drawn as they inform a certain manifestation of architecture. In which zone of the spectrum of architectural practices will you situate your project? What form - sculpture, infrastructure, landscape, criticism, joint, ornament or urbanism - will your project take?

COMPILING CASE STUDIES
(1) presentation of relevant case studies (i.e. your own documentation)
(2) material investigation (architecture as intersection of thesis and site)

Contemporary Forms I: ecology, urbanism, landscape, and their combinations (am)

| Roemer van Toorn, "After Criticality: The Passion for Extreme Reality in Recent Architecture ... and Its Limitations," in *Crossover. Architecture Urbanism Technology,* Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2006, pp. 170-83.
| Kenneth Frampton, "Megaform as Urban Landscape", in *Landform Building: Architecture's New Terrain,* Schirmer/Mosel, 2011, pp. 238-249.
---Christophe Girot, "The elegance of topology", *in Topology,* eds. Christophe Girot, Anette Freytag, Albert Kirchengast, Dunja Richter, ETH Zurich, 2013, pp. 79-115.
---Charles Waldheim, "Landscape as Urbanism", in *The Landscape Urbanism Reader*, New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2006, pp. 35-54.
---Chris Reed, "The Agency of Ecology" in *Ecological Urbanism,* ed. Mohsen Mostafavi and Gareth Doherty, Baden: Lars Muller Publishers, 2010, pp. 324-329.
__Sanford Kwinter, "Notes on the Third Ecology", in *Ecological Urbanism,* ed. Mohsen Mostafavi and Gareth Doherty, Baden: Lars Muller Publishers, 2010, pp. 94-105.
__Pierre Bélanger, "Landscape as Infrastructure", in *Landscape Journal 28,* 2009, pp. 79-95.
__Alan Berger and Charles Waldheim, "Logistics Landscape", in *Landscape Journal 27* (2), 2008, pp. 219-46.
__Rafi Segal and Els Verbakel (eds) "Architecture and Dispersal", with Stan Allen, Margaret Crawford, Marcel Smets and Sarah Whiting, *Architectural Design, 78* (01), pp. 102-07.
__ Stan Allen, "Infrastructural Urbanism," *Points+Lines: Diagrams and Projects for the City,* New York: Princeton Architectural Pres, 1999, pp. 46-57.
__ Rem Koolhaas, "What Ever Happened to Urbanism?" in *Small, Medium, Large, Extra Large,* New York: Monacelli Press, 1995, pp. 958-971.
__ James Corner, "Terra Fluxus" in *Landscape Urbanism Reader*, ed. Charles Waldheim, New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2006, pp. 22-33.

Contemporary Forms II: from materiality to infrastructure, architecture as theory (pm)

| Ignasi de Solà-Morales, "Weak Architecture", in *Architecture Theory sinc 1968,* ed. K. Michael Hays, Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 2000, pp. 614-623.
| Pierre Bélanger, "Redefining Infrastructure", in *Ecological Urbanism,* ed. Mohsen Mostafavi and Gareth Doherty, Baden: Lars Muller Publishers, 2010, pp. 332- 349.
| Wang Shu, "Wang Shu" in *After Crisis, Contemporary Architecture Conditions,* Zurich: Lars Müller Publisher, 2011, pp 50-59.
--- Mary McLeod, "Herni Lefebvre"s Critique of Everyday Life: An Introduction", in *Architecture of the Everyday,* ed. Steven Harris and Deborah Berke, Yale: Princeton Architectural Press, 1997, pp. 9-29.
--- Georges Teyssot and Catherine Seavitt, "Boredom and Bedroom: The Suppression of the Habitual", *Assemblage 30,* 1996, pp. 44-61.
---Mark Burry, "Homo Faber," *Design Through Making, AD75* (4), 2005, pp. 30-37.
---Stan Allen, "From the Biological to the Geological", "Geological From", "The Megaform Revisited", "Nature in the Plural" and "Matters of Surface", in *Landform Building: Architecture's New Terrain,*

Schirmer/Mosel, 2011, pp. 20-41, 74-84, 192-200, 284-292 and 363-372.
---Mason White, Lola Sheppard, Neeraj Bhatia, Maya Przybylski, *Coupling, Strategies for Infrastructural Opportunism,* "Formatting Contingencies" and "Afterword: Figuring it out", Pamphlet Architecture 30, Infranet Lab/Lateral Office, Princeton Architectural Press, 2011, pp. 6-9 and 76-78.
---Stan Allen, "Introduction: Practice vs. Project," in *Practice: Architecture, Technique and Representation*, New York: Routledge, 2000, pp. xiii-xxv.
---Charles Waldheim, "Weak Work: Andrea Branzi's "Weak Metropolis" and the Projective Potential of an "Ecological Urbanism", in *Ecological Urbanism,* ed. Mohsen Mostafavi and Gareth Doherty, Baden: Lars Muller Publishers, 2010, pp. 114-121.
__Michael Hensel, "Extended Thresholds I: Nomadism, Settlements and the Defiance of Figure-Ground", "Extended Thresholds II: The Articulated Envelope" and "Extended Thresholds III: Auxiliary Architectures", *Architectural Design 80* (1), 2010, pp. 14-19, 20-25 and 76=83.
__Michael Hensel, "Type? What Type? Further Reflections on the Extended Thresholds", *Architectural Design* 81 (1), 2011, pp. 56-65.
__Moussavi Farshid, *The Function of Ornament,* Actar, 2008.
__Moussavi Farshid, *The Function of Form,* Actar, 2009.

WEEK 5

June 3: Individual reviews for development and presentation of *Application*

June 5: Presentation
Each student will present between three and five case studies of practices or interventions that are of interest to them and seem suitable to their proposed topic of research. Your presentation will include your commentary on the examples selected, as well as a personal documentation (through textual or graphic means) of the projects studied. Finally, you will also speculate on how an architecture can materialize at the intersection of the theories, means and examples that you studied so far. This application should also speculate on the form of a built exploration, whether crafted, digitally fabricated or both.

Your presentation should not exceed 20 minutes to allow for a group discussion.

    The presentation will be in the form of a powerpoint presentation that will include slides on:

    1. Working thesis title;
    2. One paragraph describing the general field of inquiry;
    3. A preliminary bibliography with a personal comment on the potential use and relevance of each text to your research;
    4. The mapping of a site and a critical reflection on the means used to map;
    5. The drawing of your mapping of your thesis site with a brief description (max 300 words).
    6. A group of relevant case studies, including your own documentation of the cases
    7. Speculation on the form of built exploration to be realized within the next two weeks.
    8. Any additional material (studies, diagrams, maps, sketches, drawings, models) that help convey your intention.

    You must submit your presentation as a pdf file by 10pm on June 5.

WEEK 6

June 10 and June 12

4. SYNTHESIS AS PROLEGOMENON
Casting the shadow of our time? A last exercise in two parts: (1) the draft of a thesis proposal; (2) the definition of an exploratory project to be conducted in Rome.

THESIS and SYNTHESIS:
(1) thesis proposal:
(2) working thesis summary: working title, 1000 words description, 4 images.
(3) development of exploratory project brief and scope; selection of Roman site.

Tuesday /Thursday all day:
Individual reviews

WEEK 7

June 17
Informal group reviews (pin-up in groups of 3 – 1.5 hour / group)
June 19
Individual reviews

WEEK 8

June 24 and June 26

Tuesday: INTERIM REVIEWS – with invited guests

At this point, your submission should include:
1. Working thesis title;
2. One paragraph describing the general field of inquiry;
3. A preliminary bibliography with a personal comment on the potential use and relevance of each text to your research;
4. The mapping of a site and a critical reflection on the means used to map;
5. The drawing of your mapping of your thesis site with a brief description (max 300 words).
6. A group of relevant case studies, including your own documentation of the cases
7. A material investigation, addressing the scope and ambition of the thesis through the means and site selected.

Thursday: Intermediary Hand in
(1) thesis proposal;
(2) working thesis summary: working title, 1000 words description, 4 images;
(3) presentation of Roman exploratory project brief, scope and site

WEEK 9

July 1: University Holiday
July 3: **First Rome meeting: via S. Apollonia 3:** Rome project introduction

WEEK 10

July 8: Site visits / individual desk reviews
July 10: Individual desk reviews

WEEK 11

July 15: Individual desk reviews

July 17:Informal group reviews

WEEK 12

July 22: Individual desk review
July 24: Individual desk review

WEEK 13

July 29: Rome Project investigation: **FINAL REVIEW**

WEEK 14 and WEEK 15

August 1 to August 15:

Field Trip/ Building Workshop

* * * Come prepared with a Pecha Kucha presentation as we will have a day of reviews at Grymsdyke Farm. The format for the presentation will be 20 slides/ 30 seconds each, to include:

1) Synthesis of thesis project and
2) Rome experimentation

FINAL SUBMISSION: August 22, 2012

Your **final submission** must include:

1. your own graphic, photographic or textual documentation of project at Grymsdyke Farm, UK
2. working thesis summary: working title, 1000 words description, 4 images.
3. thesis proposal**:**

> **1**. Working thesis title;
> **2**. One paragraph describing the general field of inquiry;
> **3**. A preliminary bibliography with a personal comment on the potential use and relevance of each text to your research;
> **4**. The drawing of the map of your thesis site with a brief description (max 300 words).
> **5**. A group of relevant case studies, including your own documentation of the cases
> **6**. A documentation of your material investigation, that is, the process through which you are attempting to define your architecture at the intersection of the thesis, the means and the site.
> **7**. A text of 5000 words maximum situating your thesis (discourse, means, site).
> **8**. Relevant drawings (your drawings may be integrated to your text; your text may consist of a commentary and discussion of the drawings, or both).
> **9**. Timetable of research activities and milestones leading to thesis completion.
> **10.** A copy of your final Pecha Kucha presentation

4. text and image submission for M1 STUDIO 2014 publication

Academic Integrity:
In order to maintain a culture of academic integrity, members of the University of Waterloo community are expected to promote honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility. [Check www.uwaterloo.ca/academicintegrity/ for more information.]

Grievance:
A student who believes that a decision affecting some aspect of his/her university life has been unfair or unreasonable may have grounds for initiating a grievance. Read Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances, Section 4, www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy70.htm. When in doubt please be certain to contact the department's administrative assistant who will provide further assistance.

Discipline:
A student is expected to know what constitutes academic integrity [check www.uwaterloo.ca/academicintegrity/ to avoid committing an academic offense, and to take responsibility for his/her actions. A student who is unsure whether an action constitutes an offense, or who needs help in learning how to avoid offenses (e.g., plagiarism, cheating) or about "rules" for group work/collaboration should seek guidance from the course instructor, academic advisor, or the undergraduate Associate Dean. For information on categories of offences and types of penalties, students should refer to Policy 71 - Student Discipline, www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy71.htm. For typical penalties check Guidelines for the Assessment of Penalties, www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/guidelines/penaltyguidelines.htm.

Appeals:
A decision made or penalty imposed under Policy 70 (Student Petitions and Grievances) (other than regarding a petition) or Policy 71 (Student Discipline) may be appealed if there is a ground. A student who believes he/she has a ground for or an appeal should refer to Policy 72 (Student Appeals) www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy72.htm

Notes for Students with Disabilities:
The Office of Person with Disabilities (OPD), located in Needles Hall, Room 1132, collaborates with all academic departments to arrange appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities without compromising the academic integrity of the curriculum. If you require accommodations to lessen the impact of your disability please register with the OPD at the beginning of each academic term.

Penalty:
No extensions will be given on presentations scheduled in class, and students who fail to present will be given a grade of 0%. Students who hand in their work late will be penalized. There will be a -5% penalty for documents handed in after the deadline. An additional 5% a day will be deducted for each calendar day after the deadline.