

# ***t r a n s l a t i o n***

*from understanding to misreading and back again*

***23rd International Conference on the Beginning Design Student***

1-4 March 2006

Savannah College of Art and Design

School of Building Arts

Professor Conrad Marcus Rathmann, Conference Chair

Conference Committee:

Professor Sam Cribbs

Professor Connie Capozzola Pinkerton

Professor Scott Singeisen

*Offered through the Research Office for Novice Design Education, LSU, College of Art and Design, School of Architecture.*

## **Seventy Chickens on the Sixth Floor: Thoughts about the Redefinition and Renewal of First Year Curriculums**

Carla I. Corbin, Associate Professor  
Department of Landscape Architecture, Ball State University

### introduction

The metaphor of translation is an apt one for thinking about curriculum design, and particularly so for foundation design studies. We expect students to 'translate' from their own experiences to a very new environment and ways of working; we expect them to develop new languages of ideas, and to enact transformations in different situations and media. Faculty in interdisciplinary programs 'translate' their diverse professions into common learning projects, as well as adapting ideas from their own learning and teaching experiences. The focus of this paper is how curriculums change, translating the ideas produced by the periodic, larger-scale curriculum 'overhauls' – the task force type – into ongoing acts of translation that carry these concepts forward in patterns of positive development. Without ideas about how incremental evolution takes place, and how to maintain the critical integrity that resists devolution, the energizing effects of the major efforts can rapidly lose intellectual force and effectiveness.

Our beginning design student program is a common first year for students applying to enter professional degree programs in their second years: architecture, landscape architecture or planning. The College of Architecture and Planning at Ball State University is relatively young, founded in 1966 as a degree program in architecture, soon adding landscape architecture and planning, and subsequently graduate degrees in each of these, plus historic preservation.

The first year curriculum in the College is comprised of three courses. There are studio and design communications/media courses; each taught in a two-semester sequence, and three lecture courses, one in each of the disciplines, that all students take. The latter introduce each of the professions, and include historical and theoretical background. There are three tracks in the First Year: the conventional fall/spring sequence [typically around 90 students], a spring-admit group [usually of 50-60] that completes the second semester during the summer, and an accelerated summer program.

Each of the departments 'contributes' faculty to the first year, headed by the Associate Dean, and coordinated by one faculty member who teaches at least one course in First Year each semester. Faculty are a mix of tenured, tenure-track, and contract faculty, some having long experience, and others recruited to fill empty slots – often a scramble in our small city of 70,000, with Indianapolis an inconvenient commute of hour or more. Sometimes the 'draft' isn't complete until a day or so before classes start. In the fall, as many as ten faculty teach five sections of each of the concurrent studio-based courses. In spring, another 3 sections enter, with potentially six faculty teaching the first semester classes. While Victoria Liptak's paper,<sup>1</sup> presented year before last, offers an excellent model of pedagogical continuity, overlapping faculty vertically [some faculty teaching in each of two concurrent courses each semester], and horizontally

[faculty continuing from one semester to the one following], those desirable connections tend to be by-products in our current system, as there are two to four faculty who typically teach two or more first year classes in any given semester.

#### curriculum history

This is my third year teaching in the program, and second as the First Year Coordinator, and my first experience in team teaching on this scale. I didn't really understand how it worked, but was assured that the project sequence was set, and I wouldn't be inventing a course. Since I'd expressed interest in foundation education, I was also given copies of the most recent curriculum plans: the documents of institutional memory.

The most recent overview document was a six-page statement of the Basic Principles of the Common First Year Curriculum [2002], which had two parental lineages: two faculty surveys, and a prior document, adopted in 1996. (It was six pages long, in nine-point type.) The 2002 Principles acknowledged the faculty's concern for student awareness of issues of globalization, and noted that the shared foundation of common skills had grown in number and breadth in each of the three disciplines, but asserted the need for better focus on a stronger foundation. As with many documents of this kind, the goals, guidelines and descriptions are extensive and idealistic – basically well-founded, some very good specifics, and including descriptions of types of studio and communications projects and work.

The 1996 document is more extensive, and while not greatly different in terms of philosophy and language, is more detailed on specifics of topics, sequence, modes of educational delivery and coordination and synchronization among the studio-based courses. (It was thirty-eight pages long, in twelve-point type.) A sequence of six modules of unstated duration made up each semester 15-week instructional period. The documentation of each module is incomplete, but makes a good attempt at setting out critical questions, goals, educational objectives, types of exercises, suggested readings and other media resources. But it's lengthy, and with this kind of effort, the question of whether it's a working document that's in the hands, willingly, of each first year faculty member for the next two to four years, has to be asked.

Two other forms of institutional memory tend to be more compelling: projects of the most recent past, and the projects of distant memory. For me, the prior year's project statements offered the specifics of assignments – what are we really doing. The faculty I would be teaching with had their own accounts of what worked and what didn't, and why. These individual stories, personal histories, are each one colored by preferences, accounts of projects and faculty of the recent present.

Finally, there's the memory of lore and legend, a kind of dramatic history revealed in bits and pieces, here and there. It's the romantic memory of projects and faculty past, one of which was the project of the title. At one time – and perhaps only one time – a project given to seventy or so first year students was the task for each of them to appropriately house, over its different stages of

growth, one young poultry of tender age. It's interesting that somehow this story gets around, every semester, among the current year's students.

curriculum change

I staged my own rebellion against the sequence of assignments in my second semester of teaching in the first year, but there was already thought about revising the current curriculum. A workshop meeting was held of interested faculty who reviewed projects and talked about expectations for first year. There was consensus about the need for change, and a fairly consistent vision of the areas that needed to be addressed, so there was no push for convening an interdisciplinary panel. Agreement that the revisions could be accomplished under the philosophical umbrella of the prior conceptions of First Year meant that this might be a matter of focused effort, more about means than a complex list of aims.

What were the problems that needed to be addressed? I'll touch on those only briefly here, as many are probably familiar issues in other programs.

- reduce the number of projects, increase time and depth of each --

Grand plans have a tendency to expand scope: the first year had been crammed, partly through the expansion of the professions, and partly through second year faculty expectations of what students should know and be able to do on entering the professional programs.

- focus on appropriate expectations of first year development, and strengthen foundation learning – There had been an erosion of understanding that students learned about the professions in their 100-series courses. Instead, each semester of studio had to include an architecture project, a landscape project, and a planning project, along with the graphic tools for each. This resulted in a loss of time for the very basic fundamentals of ordering ideas, tools of analysis and scale and spatial understanding.

- re-examine projects of long-standing use -- Some faculty of long tenure in the First Year taught their own sequence of projects that had varying degrees of allegiance to the larger vision according to the most recent plan.

- projects should build as a coherent conceptual sequence -- Some projects were solidified into place from semester to semester, with a loss of building learning in logical ways.

- consider stronger relationships between communications/media courses and studio -- Different levels of coordination between studio and the graphics course had been tried and mainly discarded.

The work to develop a proposal was undertaken by the Associate Dean and myself, a much smaller task force than previous efforts. An initial goal was clarity. The products envisioned was a linked overview of the content of each course that would provide a framework for developing a new sequence of projects in the design courses. It was important for what we were doing to be 'portable,' to be a full statement of intention, but at the same time to be succinct, easy to have to hand, and to use.

A series of related categories became a 'map' for each of the four courses [see figure 1]. The 'launch' of the new approach in fall of 2005 wasn't particularly auspicious: in the design studio, there was a degree of consternation that faculty would need to develop new projects, in a new sequence. Not all faculty were aware of the initiative, and some were teaching the course for the first time. In the design communications/media course, the idea of fewer projects and more time on each seemed a positive change, but the mandate to link with studio, where possible, was not welcomed. Also unpopular was a weekly coordination and planning meeting for each course, to be attended by the coordinator. Meetings had been happening, in an informal sense, but the additional scheduling wasn't welcomed.

As the semester progressed, what worked, and what didn't?

One great help in effecting change was top-down, direct participation. The Department Chair in Architecture volunteered to be a member of the five-person studio team. His energy tended to carry things forward, as well as adding enough weight in the power balance, relative to tenured faculty who teach in first year, versus new or contract faculty, whose voices weren't heard.

The 'maps' were fine in an abstract and ideal sense, but with studio start-up on the coming Monday, the immediate concern was for a project to introduce on the first day of class. The 'map' lacked the hoped-for magical clarity, and simply listed items under a series of categories whose logic worked from left to right. To be useful, the horizontal linkages needed to happen all the way across from top to bottom. [see figure two] Amended by the next semester, this achieved the 'lightweight and portable' account of what each course was supposed to do, why, and how. Compared with the earlier curriculum documents, this amounted to four pages, one per course, in eleven point type.

Coordination with the design media communications course was rocky. Preparing students with graphic and other skills in readiness for application on studio projects, made for a very choppy fall semester, not leaving the blocks of time to develop the different ways of seeing that support becoming in freehand sketching, for example. And the graphics faculty felt they were delivering a 'service' course, at the whim and request of the studio group, who were hard-pressed to put together a long-term schedule.

Several 'good practices' we'd hoped to put in place – documenting student work, so there would be example projects to go with every assignment, a resource for future faculty; and regular evaluations by faculty to follow the termination of each project – were very difficult to keep as consistent practices.

We're now in the second year of 're-thinking' the project sequence, and working out how to grow and develop the project sequence consistent with the over-all vision of the maps, and in using the maps to chart conceptual change. That is, translating how a larger vision plays out in project assignments and how they're taught. We've found some solutions, and some problems remain. Some good project and practices came from additional iterations of teaching: with the first semester group that starts in the spring, there was an immediate next version to test. Some projects went better; others lost conceptual rigor. With at least one project – meetings and discussion weren't sufficient – the pedagogy of how to

teach it and what the aims should be – still weren't clear. [Not a reflection on the faculty, but rather a difference of thinking and approach.]

Additional areas to be addressed include:

Faculty management structure: The Associate Dean is titular head of First Year. However, faculty being 'contributed' by each participating department to the first year teams, and can function with a great deal of autonomy. They're primarily answerable to their chairs, and until recently chairs haven't been involved with first year, not in a sense of supporting consistency in teaching an agreed-on sequence of projects. Additionally, there is the issue of time: to participate in a weekly team meeting, to document student work, to write critiques, is difficult to find. It needs to be made more easy and efficient to do this.

The dynamic among the three professions: persistence of the idea that the studio is the place where first year students "do" architecture or landscape or planning projects in order to learn what the profession does, so even in fall semester, students need to have a 'planning' project. [Rather than understanding that fall semester is fundamentals, and that in the spring semester the primary engagement is with site – and that these are the foundation for any of the three professions.]

Faculty autonomy: on the spring and summer teams in particular, one member can dominate and may or may not be interested in working from a prior project sequence. While the intent is that the pedagogy of projects be improved and grow, in order for this to happen revised project has to address that same concept and place in the sequence. Faculty have to be willing to bring their developments – most usefully with examples of student work – back into the 'mainstream' process of evolving translations. The history and lore – the vivid romantic memory of students housing chickens, or building cardboard chairs throughout the building – are powerful, and are sometimes associated with revered – absent -- faculty.

Creating new memories, in the form of an accessible, critique-able, set of projects that form a basis of consistent, and evolving pedagogy, is much more prosaic. While we're not quite there yet, after the first full teaching with a different set of projects, faculty reviewing second year admission portfolios remarked on the improvement.

What seems to be necessary [some of which is in place; others are in varying degrees of progress] is the following:

- A project sequence that builds conceptually across the two semesters, and a practicing consensus about the appropriate focus for each semester
- A communications/media sequence that is mainly autonomous, but which overlaps with studio at strategic learning points
- Clear pedagogic aims for each project, expanded slightly as teaching cues for faculty use, and that are stated as objectives in each student handout, then used in the evaluation rubric
- Examples of student work for each project [along with the assignment text], saved to an accessible archive, with some faculty notes as to the successful and weaker aspects of each

- Regular evaluation and faculty critique of the effectiveness of each project, simply a paragraph, which becomes 'notes for next time'
- Faculty willingness to be open and sharing about how they teach and why, and to document alternative projects
- The overview of the College, through participation in regular end-of-semester reviews, and their willingness to critique both the student work [and in a separate format], the pedagogy.

The keys seem to be projects in the present that become as rich and vivid as those in the romantic legends of studios past, somehow...without the chickens.

Design Communications Media, CAP 161; 2 CR  
Meets 2 hr, 3x/wk over 15 weeks

Objectives	Content	Skills	Reading list; texts	Project types	Standards	Assessment
Acquisition of communication skills, which at times will be independent of CAP 101, and at other times will be complementary and/or integrated	Theory of communications	Acquisition of environmental design vocabulary; understanding of basic concepts	<u>Freehand sketching: an introduction</u> ; by Paul Laseau	Mark making and expressive lines	[to be added: Accreditation standards to be met by the three disciplines]	[to be expanded: assessment tools and criteria, methods]
Foundation in the following:	Seeing and drawing Freehand sketching Right brain/left brain thinking	Ability to use vocabulary in discussing assigned work, both verbally and in writing	<u>Design Drawing</u> , by Frank Ching <u>The New Drawing on the Right Side of the Brain</u> by Betty Edwards	Inverted drawing Contour, value and texture drawing Positive/negative space		First Year faculty to decide on grade and evaluation standards; consistent across sections
Learning to see the environment in a different way	Graphic conventions: Depth Value Orthogonal projection Axonometric projection Perspective concepts	Freehand sketching in pen or pencil; introduction to sketching in the field Analysis graphics		Framing and proportion Drawing from observation Analysis graphics Composition		Sketchbook [evaluated periodically through the semester] Introduction to self-assessment
Graphic, modeling and written/verbal communication skills for the environmental design professions		Use of value to describe form and depth				Project binder at end of semester
Understanding of basic tools and conventions		Fundamentals of line quality Basic concepts of composition and layout Perspective concepts; application in sketching and proportional constructions Ability to make and use well-crafted concept models		Perspective concepts, sketching and proportional construction Orthogonal projection; line weight and drafting conventions; basic rendering Axonometric construction Model-building.		Note: Students will be required to produce a portfolio at the end of the year. Consider/design some projects as candidates for inclusion.

**Design Communications Media, CAP 162; 2 CR**  
**Meets 2 hr, 3x/wk over 15 weeks**

Objectives	Content	Skills	Reading list; texts	Project types	Standards	Assessment
<p>Acquisition of communication skills, which at times will be independent of CAP 102, and at other times will be complementary and/or integrated</p> <p>Expanding on foundations skills and thinking from 161</p> <p>Beginning to think graphically; to express process graphically</p> <p>Beginning to make choices in the best ways to represent ideas and other content</p> <p>Beginning to make self-assessments of graphic work</p>	<p>Graphic analysis and documentation</p> <p>Ability to represent experience of place: <i>in situ</i> sketches.</p> <p>Perspective drawing as design and communication tool</p> <p>Color theory and application</p> <p>Introduction to digital image manipulation and layout</p>	<p>Field sketching and analysis diagrams. Ability to use Lynchian graphics</p> <p>Design of presentations</p> <p>Ability to use color in functional and expressive ways</p> <p>Expanded potential of graphic expression; exploring different ways to see and communicate with drawings</p> <p>Basic skills in the use of scanned images; Adobe InDesign and Photoshop</p>	<p>Texts from 161; add: <u>Drawing Shortcuts</u> by Jim Leggitt</p>	<p>Gesture-type drawings; quick field sketches of place</p> <p>Rendering orthogonal and axonometric drawings at a range of scales, including shade and shadow; use of scale figures and entourage</p> <p>Constructed one and two-point perspectives</p> <p>Color theory; use of color to express quality of place and experience; colored pencil and marker</p> <p>Experimental and expressive use of appropriated media and images: collage and photography</p> <p>Design of narrative presentations with context images, analysis drawings, different types of constructed drawings, text</p> <p>Basic presentation-quality models.</p> <p>Digital visualization; design of booklet-type presentation</p> <p>Portfolio design</p>	<p>[to be added: Accreditation standards to be met by the three disciplines]</p>	<p>[to be expanded: assessment tools and criteria, methods]</p> <p>First Year faculty to decide on grade and evaluation standards; consistent across sections</p> <p>Sketchbook [evaluated periodically through the semester]</p> <p>Self assessment</p> <p>Portfolio [evaluated at end of semester]</p>

**Design Studio, CAP 101; 3 CR**  
**Meets 4 hr, 3 x/wk over 15 weeks**

Objectives	Content	Skills	Texts, reading list [list in process]	Project list	Standards	Assessment
<p>Connection, when effective, with the work of 161. Introducing or reinforcing communication techniques and skills, when needed</p> <p>Understanding of the fundamentals of design</p>	<p>Concepts and concept generation</p> <p>Design fundamentals in 2d and 3d: rhythm, geometry, sequence, pattern, hierarchy, balance and tension, scale, form, unity/diversity; space, enclosure, volume, etc.</p>	<p>Ability to work from project statements</p> <p>Ability to manage an assignment through development of a design process; analysis, experimentation, development of alternates, resolution, presentation</p>	<p>[list in process]</p> <p>Required texts:  <u>Ching, Form, Space and Order</u>  <u>White, Site Analysis</u>            Readings:  <u>Berger, Ways of Seeing</u>, first essay</p>	<p>“Tile” project: 2d composition and geometry and patterns</p> <p>Exercises to explore design elements</p>	<p>[to be added: Accreditation standards to be met by the three disciplines]</p>	<p>[to be expanded: assessment tools and criteria, methods]</p> <p>First Year faculty to decide on grade and evaluation standards; consistent across sections</p>
<p>Basic understanding of design process, and its application in discovery, problem solving and generation of ideas</p>	<p>Spatial definition, design and experience; basics of phenomenology; perception of place</p>	<p>Ability to understand and develop concepts, and to express them coherently</p>	<p><u>Pressman, Architecture 101, Guide to the Design Studio</u>, Ch. 1, “The Initiation”</p>	<p>Form in three dimensions; deforming a cube [for example]</p>		<p>Introduction to self-assessment</p>
<p>Awakening of curiosity; playfulness + rigor; initiative</p>	<p>Fundamentals of design interpretation and analysis</p> <p>Learning from critiques and review juries</p>	<p>Ability to make 2 and 3 dimensional compositions</p> <p>Able to diagram ideas and processes</p>	<p><u>Halprin, The RSVF Cycles: Creative Processes in the Human Environment</u>, pp 1-18</p>	<p>Field trip assignment [how to look at the environment; space, place, scale, experience]</p>		<p>Note: Students will be required to produce a portfolio at the end of the year.            Consider/design some projects as candidates for inclusion.</p>
<p>Understanding of the language of design for the environmental disciplines [vocabulary]</p>		<p>Understand spatial definition, composition</p>	<p><u>Jakle, Visual Elements of Landscape</u>, Ch. 1 Introduction and Ch. 2 “Visualizing Landscape”</p>	<p>Enclosure and definition of space; interpretation of sensory information</p>		
<p>Tools for beginning to think about space and its experience</p>		<p>Ability to use visualization media, such as sketches and concept models</p>	<p><u>Anthony, Design Juries on Trial</u>, Ch. 4</p>	<p>Horizontal and vertical movement in space; transitions</p>		
<p>Foundation of literacy in design and environmental ideas [readings and discussion]</p>			<p>“Learning the Art of Time Management” and Ch. 9 “Delivering Constructive Criticism”</p>	<p>Seminar-type discussions of readings; writing short critiques</p>		
<p>Foundation in critical thinking</p>			<p><u>Berger, The Sense of Sight</u>, “The White Bird” [excerpt]</p>	<p>Guest speaker presentations; subjects for discussion and writing reports</p>		

Design Studio, CAP 102; 3 CR  
Meets 4 hr, 3x/wk over 18 weeks

Objectives	Content	Skills	Reading list	Project list	Standards	Assessment
<p>Connection, when effective, with the work of 162. Introducing or reinforcing communication techniques and skills, when needed</p> <p>Expanding on foundation skills and thinking from 101; transfer and application to specifics of place, different scales</p> <p>Idea of site, how to document and study; introduction to idea of design as response to site and context</p> <p>Fundamentals of understanding urban environments</p> <p>Individual and societal connections with nature</p> <p>Cultural and natural aspects of environments</p> <p>Form generation</p> <p>Materiality; considering and responding to materials in design</p>	<p>How to explore and define design problems; problem solving; idea of design methods</p> <p>Tools for studying sites; critical analysis of assets + liabilities; documenting existing conditions</p> <p>How to look at place; varying scales from intimate to urban [field trip]</p> <p>Systems in the built environment: circulation, infrastructure, etc.</p> <p>Idea of form language; vocabulary of form</p> <p>Continue to expand resources and skills in representation</p> <p>Basic research tools; core publications, references, web sites</p> <p>Study and use of precedents</p>	<p>Understanding of human scale and how it affects design; personal, group and community space; public and private space</p> <p>Better understanding of design process</p> <p>Build on skills to make field sketches and notes</p> <p>Ability to do basic research of precedents and design issues; use of library, core publications and standard references</p> <p>Understands fundamental ideas about material in design; influence on experience and perception</p> <p>Ability to write a critique of a built work or place</p> <p>Ability to design a presentation</p> <p>Ability to make a coherent verbal presentation</p> <p>How to document work; photographing models</p>	<p>[list in process; will use chapters and sections from texts below, plus others to be added]</p> <p>See 101 for required texts.</p> <p>Lynch, <u>Image of the City</u></p> <p>Cullin, <u>Close Up</u></p> <p>McHarg, <u>Design with Nature</u></p> <p>Alexander, <u>Notes on the Synthesis of Form</u></p> <p>Ashihara, <u>Exterior Design in Architecture</u></p> <p>Tuan, <u>Space and Place</u></p>	<p>Exploring site; documentation and response</p> <p>Design for another culture or viewpoint</p> <p>Field trip research project; design project for a field trip site</p> <p>Transitional spaces</p> <p>Site specific interventions; design/build; use of shop</p> <p>Exploring materials, basic ideas of structure and connections/joint conditions</p> <p>Frame and skin; definition of space, transparency</p> <p>One to many; units and wholes</p> <p>Design of portfolio</p>	<p>[to be added: Accreditation standards to be met by the three disciplines]</p>	<p>[to be expanded: assessment tools and criteria, methods]</p>

## Design Studio, CAP 101; 3 CR – *Foundation: concepts, ordering ideas and understanding*

Meets 4 hr, 3x/wk, over 15 weeks

Objectives	Content	Skills	Project types	Assessment
Connection, when effective, with the work of 161. Introducing or reinforcing communication techniques and skills when needed.				
Basic understanding of design fundamentals	Concepts; ordering ideas; organizational characteristics	Ability to understand and work with ideas such as form, geometry, unity/diversity, pattern, rhythm, sequence, balance and tension, axis and alignment, and others	Two- and three-dimensional exercises that explore, develop and illustrate ordering ideas, organizational concepts and geometries	[to be expanded: assessment tools and criteria, methods]
Understanding of the language of design for the environmental disciplines: concepts and vocabulary	Awareness of design in the environment; ability to recognize elements of design in built places	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to diagram ideas and processes</li> <li>Ability to make simple graphic analyses of place</li> <li>Ability to discuss basic concepts of place and experience, and to apply in the context of a project</li> </ul>	Precedent studies; analyses of precedents that develop into a design project Field trip: how to look at the environment; space, place, scale, experience	First Year faculty to decide on grade and evaluation standards; consistent across sections
Tools for beginning to think about space and its experience	Perception, enclosure, scale, volume, definition; qualities and meanings attached to ideas of space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to represent space, 2d + 3d</li> <li>Ability to distinguish among scales, and awareness of different perceptual qualities</li> <li>Consideration of sequence and transitions; ideas of threshold and place</li> </ul>	Two- and three-dimensional exercises that explore and manipulate space Projects that take an existing place as a point of departure, and allow study of issues such as scale + perception	Sketchbook [evaluated periodically through the semester]
Basic understanding of the design process; how it works in discovery, problem-solving and generation of ideas	Awakening of curiosity and playfulness; initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Able to use visualization media as tools, such as sketches, diagrams and concept models</li> </ul>	Keeping a design diary Able to follow and critique own process	Introduction to self-assessment
	No one right answer; importance of alternatives; that ideas are <i>developed</i>		Introduction in projects of phases that encourage play and experimentation	Project binder at end of semester
Foundation of literacy in design and environmental ideas [reading and discussion]	Major ideas, designers and projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Awareness of core publications in each environmental design profession</li> <li>How to use the library for basic research [beyond the Web]</li> <li>Able to discuss and apply learning from examples</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participation in guest speaker presentations; writing a précis or critique; seminar-type discussions</li> <li>Research assignment; may be incorporated in field trip</li> <li>Faculty presentations</li> </ul>	Note: Students will be required to produce a portfolio at the end of the year.
Foundation in critical thinking	Independent thinking; exposure to written critiques; active participation in critiques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to write a short critique</li> <li>Able to write about own process</li> </ul>	Integrate with studio projects, juries, guest speakers and readings	Consider/design some projects as candidates for inclusion.
How to be a design student	How studio learning works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Time management</li> <li>Managing the process of an assignment through analysis, investigation, alternatives, development, presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integrate into projects; workshops at beginnings of projects to develop skills</li> <li>Readings</li> <li>Role-playing</li> <li>Students active participants in critiques; writing critiques; visiting upper-level studio juries</li> </ul>	
	Learning from critiques and juries			