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1 INTRODUCTION

The city in the twenty-first century is witness to fundamental changes in its form, organisation, and structure and affected by both relentless urbanisation and shrinkage. The multi-scalar complexity of contemporary cities can no longer be comprehended in isolation or through the functional separation of planning, urban design, and architecture. This fundamentally challenges the conventional practices and theories of architecture and urbanism.

Since the nineteenth century, cities and their architecture have been predominantly reasoned through positivist concepts of scientific urbanism. An ideology still upheld in its recent disguise of ecology, sustainability, and economy—functionalist, modernist agendas. Thus the task for urban thinkers and practitioners alike is to reconceptualise the city and our roles as designers.

In response, Projective Cities provides a forum for meaningful speculations on the contemporary city and prepares students for practice and independent research through a rigorous methodological framework.

Projective Cities proposes architectural design as a precondition to the conception, realisation, and subversion of urban plans.

Projective Cities recognises architecture and the city as a collective form of knowledge shaped by cultural, social, political, and economic contexts.

Projective Cities specifically raises the question of what kind of project and research arises from architecture and architectural urbanism. It sets out to define the status and methods of design research. This is understood both as an intellectual problem, exploring the relationship between theory and design for knowledge production and the discipline, as well as a practical problem, of the way that design research can affect practice.

The ambitions of Projective Cities are framed by the following methodological and pedagogical propositions through which our research is clarified:

- That the contemporary city can be read as an architectural project and the city as a projection of the possibilities of architecture.

- That the urban plan and its cultural, social, political, historical, and economic contexts are defined by architectural design operative at different scales.

- That typal and typological reasoning make available alternative but complementary disciplinary frameworks to understand and project the synthesis of the city and its architecture. However type and typology are never understood as purely formal symbolisations but rather through a conceptual mode of thinking in which reason acquires its critical and conjectural structure.

- That architectural and urban plans are intelligible as formal and theoretical products of disciplinary activity as well as the collective outcome of socio-political forces.

- That through type the ideas, conventions, and histories of architecture in the formation of the city become analysable. And consequently collective ideas of the city can be discovered and proposed.

- That design and research activities are inseparable in architecture and urbanism, and
that knowledge production (theory) and formal production (practice) are methodologically linked.

Architecture and urbanism are symbiotic modes of enquiry driven by relevance and agency within a field and not novelty for their own sake. This field is defined in terms of a series of distinct diagrams that are always social and spatial.

In the following, this document sets out the structure and content of Projective Cities. It outlines the teaching and learning strategies, the assessment procedures, and resources. The Programme Guide is to be read in conjunction with the current versions of the AA School Academic Regulations and AA Student Handbook.
2 PROGRAMME SPECIFICATION

Programme Name: Taught MPhil in Architecture and Urban Design (Projective Cities)
Degree Award: MPhil in Architecture and Urban Design
Teaching Institution: Architectural Association School of Architecture (AA)
Duration of Programme: 20 months full-time
External Examiner: Professor Charles Rice / New appointment in 2015

The AA is an Approved Institution and Affiliated Research Centre of The Open University (OU), UK. All taught graduate degrees at the AA are validated by the OU. The OU is the awarding body for research degrees at the AA.

Programme Requirements
Entry into the programme is open to students with a four- or five-year degree in architecture (BArch, Diploma or equivalent degree).

A total of 360 credits are required to qualify for the MPhil in Architecture and Urban Design degree. 240 credits at the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) Level 7 are gained by completing the taught MPhil programme at the AA. 120 credits at FHEQ Level 6 are achieved by prior learning through formal education, which is assessed at the application stage and forms an entry requirement to the programme.1 Previous grades are not considered in the final MPhil degree mark. Credits are given on the basis of 1 credit for 10 ‘notional’ hours of learning.2 Coursework assessed for the degree is assigned by academic term, but extends into the vacation periods. The credits in the programme are distributed as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIOR LEARNING</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>% of Final Degree Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Weeks</td>
<td>Final previous degree project(s) and/or paper(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL [FHEQ Level 6]</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECTIVE CITIES</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>% of Final Degree Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Term 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Weeks</td>
<td>Seminar 1, Studio 1 and Academic Writing 1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Term 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Weeks</td>
<td>Seminar 2, Studio 2 and Academic Writing 2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Term 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Weeks</td>
<td>Thesis-Studio (incl Seminar) and Academic Writing 3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Taught Phase</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Term 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Weeks</td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Term 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Weeks</td>
<td>Subtotal Research Phase</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Weeks</td>
<td>TOTAL [FHEQ Level 7]</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Entry to the programme is conditional to students demonstrating their academic ability and competence by giving evidence of final degree project(s) and/or paper(s). See section 5 Prior Learning for further details.

2 Notional hours indicate the time required by a typical student to achieve the learning outcomes and includes all forms of learning (formal contact, independent learning, and assessment activities).
3  PROGRAMME STRUCTURE

The Taught MPhil in Architecture and Urban Design (Projective Cities) is part of the AA Graduate School consisting of 12 postgraduate programmes offering advanced studies in one of the world’s most dynamic learning environments. Full-time Masters programmes include 12-month MA and MSc, and 16-month MArch options. Projective Cities is a 20 months full-time postgraduate programme. On its successful completion, candidates are awarded the degree MPhil in Architecture and Urban Design.

Projective Cities is divided into a Taught and Research Phase. During Year 1, the programme follows the AA’s trimesters and is organised around seminar courses, design studios, and workshops (Term 1 and Term 2), which prepare students for the formulation of a Dissertation Proposal during the Thesis-Studio (Term 3). Year 2 consists of two longer terms (Term 4 and 5) in which students under close supervision by programme staff develop their individual designed-and-written Dissertation, which is started with the Dissertation Proposal in Term 3 of Year 1.

3.1  Taught Phase

During Year 1, integrated design studios, seminars, and academic writing courses are the core modules providing students with a knowledge and skills of research methodologies and practices necessary to formulate and complete an independent research project. While design studios and seminars train analytical research skills and methods, students learn in complementary workshops the technical skills required for design research.

Design Studios and Skills Workshops
The two design studios, Studio 1: ‘Analysis of Architecture’ (Term 1) and Studio 2: ‘Architectural Urbanism’ (Term 2), introduce the pedagogy of the programme and provide students with the methodologies, concepts, and means to analyse architectural case studies and urban plans. The studios are supported by integrated workshops that teach and exercise technical and analytical skills.

Assessment of design studios is through submitted reports, but also considers the progress made during regular tutorials and presentations.

Seminar Courses and Academic Writing Course
Related to the design studios, Seminar 1: ‘Architectural Theories and Design Methods’ and Seminar 2: ‘Theories of the Contemporary City’ examine the relationships between theory and practice and architectural and urban scales. They discuss the histories, theories, and practices of architectural and urban design through different historical and conceptual frameworks or methodologies. Complementary to the seminars, an academic writing course introduces students to the conventions of academic writing and provides shorter writing exercises in preparation for a longer written piece such as an essay.

Assessment of seminar courses is through submitted essays (4,000 words), but also considers students’ seminar presentations and participation. The academic writing course is assessed through submissions of written pieces of varying length (1,000-2,000 words).

Thesis-Studio
The Thesis-Studio in the final Term 3 of Year 1, is a combined design studio and seminar course. Building on the different methodologies of critical analysis from the first two terms, students define their research interest. This is developed into a formal research enquiry and
topic, and becomes consolidated in the Dissertation Proposal. This marks the beginning of the Dissertation project and Research Phase, which is continued in Year 2 of the programme.

The Thesis-Studio is assessed through the Dissertation Proposal – submitted at the end of Term 3 and includes written and design elements that frame the theoretical and design research of the Dissertation – but also in parts through the final Dissertation, which is submitted at the end of the programme.

*Successful completion of Year 1 and all its modules is a condition to progress to Year 2.*

### 3.2 Research Phase

The start of Year 2 of the programme corresponds to the beginning of the next academic year at the AA. The second year is dedicated to the development of the designed-and-written Dissertation. Throughout the year, students are closely guided by their personal dissertation supervisor(s) and have access to other programme staff and external consultants for further or specialist advice as needed.

A final Dissertation, consisting of a comprehensive design and fully integrated written research [max. 15,000 words] is submitted at the end of Year 2. The dissertation accounts for 60% of the final degree mark.
### 3.3 Programme Summary: Credits and Assessed Work

The course credits and assessed work are listed below for each term and phase. The hourly breakdown is indicative only, with the proportion of ‘contact hours’ and ‘independent learning’ approximately 20% to 80% respectively, but varying depending on a student’s need and ability. The ‘% Total’ refers to the final degree mark for the MPhil in Architecture and Urban Design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>Assessed Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDY PHASE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YEAR 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUTUMN TERM 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio 1: Analysis of Architecture</td>
<td>Contact time</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Studio Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent learning</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar 1: Theories and Design Methods</td>
<td>Contact time</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent learning</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>(max. 4,000 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Writing 1</td>
<td>Contact time</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent learning</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ca. 1,200 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPRING TERM 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio 2: Architectural Urbanism</td>
<td>Contact time</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Studio Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent learning</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar 2: The Contemporary City</td>
<td>Contact time</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent learning</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>(max. 4,000 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Writing 2</td>
<td>Contact time</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent learning</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ca. 2,000 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMER TERM 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis-Studio: Diagrams of the City</td>
<td>Contact time</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Dissertation Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent learning</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>(incl. essay and design proposals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Writing 3</td>
<td>Contact time</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent learning</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ca. 1,000 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>960</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Total Taught Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YEAR 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUTUMN TERM 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROGRAMME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RESEARCH PHASE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>Contact time</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent learning</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td>(incl. design proposals and writing of max 15,000 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Total Research Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Total Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Not included in the matrix are the 120 study credits at FHEQ Level 6 given for prior learning, see 5 Prior Learning section for details.

4 Contact hours generally mean formal contact in individual or group teaching sessions, but include informal opportunities of exchange to discuss study related subjects with teaching staff (via email, during study trips, etc.). Independent learning means all the remaining study related activities and make up the required remaining notional hours of learning. Their balance varies between the modules, with studios having a higher ratio of individual tutorials while seminars are predominantly based on group teaching.
4 AIMS AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

The MPhil in Architecture and Urban Design is a taught research-based degree that prepares students for independent research. The programme expects candidates to make an original contribution to knowledge in the field of architecture and urban design. Projective Cities is conceived as a stand-alone degree, but training in research methods and thesis work offers students a structured way into a PhD.

4.1 Programme Aims and Outcomes

The programme provides subject-specific and generic knowledge and skills with the aim to enable students to conduct independent research in both the disciplines of architecture and urban design. This knowledge and understanding includes that of their histories and theories, the skills required for design at various stages and scales, and the research methods and design skills required to complete a substantial written and design Dissertation.

A Subject-specific Attributes

Graduates of the programme are expected to have demonstrated:

A1 a systematic and in-depth knowledge and understanding of the disciplines of architecture and urban design informed by current scholarship, research, and practice, including a critical awareness of current issues and developments in the field;
A2 a comprehensive understanding and ability to use a range of techniques and research methods applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship, including the critical use of the case study method in analysis and design and diagramming techniques;
A3 a conceptual understanding enabling them to evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline;
A4 a conceptual understanding enabling them to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses;
A5 originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the disciplines of architecture and urban design, in particular through a synthesis of written and design research; and
A6 the ability to study independently and complete a substantial research that includes written and design research.

Teaching and Learning Methods

The required knowledge and understanding is acquired through the seminar courses, design studios, and academic writing courses. Intellectual and research skills are developed throughout the programme, in particular the seminar courses and the Dissertation, while the design studios present opportunities to develop knowledge and understanding in an analytical design context.

Individual research, presentations, written essays and, in particular, the Dissertation Proposal, encourages students to make critical and analytical observations and formulate hypotheses.

Students are introduced to research methods, academic writing through the programme. An initial comprehensive reading list is provided at the start of the course (see Appendix 1), which is supplemented by guidance on reading in the seminars and supervision as relevant. Research methods, techniques, and analytical skills are developed through all coursework.
Students benefit from continuous support by regular feedback sessions in individual and group tutorials throughout the programme to assist, direct, and monitor progress.

**Assessment**
The primary assessment of knowledge and understanding is through submitted work, but also through a combination of workshop exercises and seminar presentations. All assessment methods, from essays, design reports, seminar papers, and Dissertation, place great emphasis on a student’s ability to demonstrate research skills, critical and conceptual understanding, originality, and methodological rigour.

**B Generic Attributes**
On successful completion of the programme, graduates are expected to be able to:

B1 use initiative and take responsibility; act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks;
B2 deal with complex issues and problems systematically, creatively, and independently; make sound judgements in the absence of complete data or information;
B3 have the ability to continue to learn independently and to develop professionally; and pursue further research where appropriate; and
B4 communicate effectively, with colleagues and a wider audience, in a variety of media.

**Teaching and Learning Methods**
The course requires students to take responsibility in planning their own research and provides regular opportunities to present their work through visual, written, and oral means. Through the coursework, students develop independently and systematically how to frame concepts, techniques, and ideas in creative and rigorous ways. Hereby regular feedback is provided in the form of tutorials, submission assessments, or review reports.

**Assessment**
Effective development and communication of analysis, design concepts, and research speculations and findings are important criteria in all areas of a student’s work and continuously assessed at all stages. Time management, organisation, and skills to work individually or with others are generally reflected in the quality of submitted coursework.
### 4.2 Curriculum Map

The Curriculum Map below shows how learning outcomes are deployed across the programme. The map relates the delivery and assessment of learning outcomes to the different inputs and outputs of each module, identified in terms of their delivery (light grey shading) and assessment (dark grey shading).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECTIVE CITIES</th>
<th>Subject-specific Attributes</th>
<th>Generic Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Writing 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Writing 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis-Studio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Writing 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For details on the Curriculum Map for prior learning, see section 5 Prior Learning.
5 PRIOR LEARNING

To enter the Taught MPhil in Architecture and Urban Design (Projective Cities), students have to provide evidence of their previous degree project(s) and paper(s), as well as a formal transcript of their academic performance.

This is assessed on application to the programme to determine the comparability of previous degree studies to 120 study credits at FHEQ Level 6 (equivalent to 1,200 notional study hours and 30 weeks). A full year of study at, for example, BArch, Diploma or equivalent degree level will usually satisfy this requirement. Non-academic, professional or employment-based prior learning is not considered when determining these credits.

Previous credits and achieved grades form the basis of assessment, with credits treated equivalent to a credit transfer. The grades from the previous degree are not part of the final MPhil degree mark.

### PRIOR LEARNING CREDITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term/Period</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>% of Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum entry requirement: 1 year full-time studies at degree level</td>
<td>30 weeks</td>
<td>120 credits</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30 weeks</td>
<td>(FHEQ Level 6) 120 credits</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Curriculum Map below shows indicative how learning outcomes are assessed for previous learning. A light grey shade identifies expected delivery and a dark grey shade assessment of learning outcomes.6

### PRIOR LEARNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject-specific Attributes</th>
<th>Generic Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Degree Course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 For further details on learning outcomes refer to section 4. Aims and Learning Outcomes.
6 TEACHING AND LEARNING STRATEGIES

The programme’s seminar courses, design studios, skills workshops and writing courses are thematically and pedagogically related, providing students with the information, knowledge, skills, and guidance needed to undertake the required project work and complete the programme.

Prior Learning
Students are expected to have previously gained basic academic abilities and levels of competency that allow them to fully engage with the programme. Familiarity with teaching and learning methods common to design studios and seminar courses is a prerequisite on which the pedagogy of the programme builds.

Seminar Courses
The pedagogical aim of the seminar courses is to provide students with a knowledge and understanding of architectural and urban histories and theories and to develop their intellectual and research skills. A particular focus is given to the fields of knowledge that define design research in architecture and urban design.

All seminars have a common structure and method, with appropriate minor variation in delivery. They run for 10 weeks every term during Year 1. Each session takes up an entire morning or afternoon. A typical session consists of a lecture or seminar by the instructor and presentations by students, followed by group discussions. Students are asked to read preparatory or follow up material, and make short oral or written individual presentations.

Each seminar course has a written submission (maximum 4,000 words). The seminars are supported by individual and group tutorials to aid students in their essay development. Students present an essay outline and a draft prior to the final submission.

All seminars are open to members of the AA.

Academic Writing Course
The aim of the academic writing courses is to teach and exercise academic writing conventions and general writing skills, preparing students for longer written submissions.

The courses are in parts organised as seminars and workshops. Seminars discuss the structure and purpose of writing, as well as academic conventions, while workshops provide writing exercises and direct feedback.

Each course is assessed through several short written pieces of up to 2,000 words, with students provided with feedback on several drafts prior to submission.

In addition, the AA Graduate School offers a general ‘Introduction to Academic Writing for Postgraduates’ in Term 1 of each academic year.

Design Studios and Skills Workshops
The pedagogical aim of the seminar courses is to provide students with a knowledge and understanding of architectural and urban design practices and to develop their analytical rigour and creativity through case study research and small design exercises. The design studios are complemented by skills workshops to develop the technical (computer) skills needed to draw, model, and analyse architecture and urban plans.
Students work in small groups or individually as assigned at the beginning of each exercise. They document their progress for individual tutorials each week (at least twice a week) and regularly present to their peers, programme staff, and external reviewers.

The work is compiled and submitted at the end of each term in a Studio Report for assessment. Submissions are based on graphical, visual, and physical work (diagrams, drawings, collages, models etc.) as appropriate. The Studio Reports include concise writing and analysis of relevant projects, theories, and histories to clearly establish the context and framing of the studies, thereby directly linking to the seminar courses.

**Thesis-Studio**

The Thesis-Studio combines the teaching and learning strategies of the design studios and seminar courses. Its pedagogical aim is to provide students with the knowledge and understanding of formulating an independent research and design agenda. Throughout the Thesis-Studio, seminars and studio tutorials aid students to define their research enquiry for the Dissertation.

At the end of the Thesis-Studio, students present their Dissertation Proposal in a formal review with programme staff and invited external reviewers for final comments prior to submission. The submission consists of an integrated written portion (equivalent to an essay), an illustrated research dossier, and preliminary design proposals. The Dissertation Proposal is to clearly frame the planned research by providing: a problem definition, research aims, discussion of relevant literature and case studies, research methodology, a plan of execution, and preliminary design briefs and proposals.

During the Thesis-Studio, the Taught Phase and Research Phase overlap, with students beginning work on their Dissertation.

**Dissertation**

The aim of the designed-and-written Dissertation is to provide students with an opportunity to conduct a substantial and original research project through independent study. The Dissertation represents 60% of the total credits for the MPhil degree and reflects on the programme’s areas of research and a student’s personal interests, background, special skills, and knowledge.

Dissertation supervision is in principle through two programme staff or assigned by agreement with the Programme Director. Students are able to meet their personal supervisor[s] at least twice a week for advice and guidance. In addition, students can seek direction from other programme staff or external expert consultants as needed.

Supervision and progress monitoring of students during the Dissertation takes place through the following formats:

- **Twice a week:** Individual tutorials with supervisor[s].
- **Once a month:** Dissertation Forum in which all students of a cohort present and discuss their research.
- **Once a term:** Internal progress review with staff.

In addition, there is a Final Design Review (beginning of Term 5) and a Final Presentation (end of Term 5) with invited critics. Students receive written feedback on these reviews, as well as oral feedback in tutorials prior to submission of the Dissertation.

The minimum requirement to qualify for the MPhil degree is the submission of a designed-and-
written Dissertation that consist of comprehensive design proposals at architectural and urban scales and integrated written research consisting of maximum 15,000 words. The Dissertation is to demonstrate academic rigour and originality.

**Tutorials**
Within all modules, the progress of students is monitored and assisted through regular weekly individual and group tutorials. The modules have appointed tutors who are available at scheduled times. However, teaching staff are available for additional tutorials if necessary.

**Project Presentations and Reviews**
Individual and group presentations are regular events and part of all modules. Their aim is to develop presentation skills, but also serve as a means to monitor progress by staff as well as between peers.

**Student Feedback**
Feedback is essential for the continued development, improvement, and updating of the course. Student feedback on the programme’s structure, content, delivery, and methodology is welcomed at any time. A formal, minuted feedback meeting on with programme staff and students takes place at the beginning of each Term 2. In addition, students are issued with an anonymous Programme Evaluation Form before submitting their Dissertation.

**Study Trips and Special Events**
Study trips involve visits to buildings and cities of interest, meetings with designer, experts, and researchers outside the School. Special events, such as symposia or reviews with other students, depend on the topics and interests of the on-going research agendas.
7 ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

Students are continually assessed through tutorials, presentations, and reviews during the programme, as well as their participation and contribution in the taught modules. The formally assessed works are essays, studio reports, academic writing submissions, Dissertation Proposal, and the Dissertation. Assessed work is submitted to the Graduate School Coordinator at agreed dates and times.

All submissions are assessed by two members of the programme’s teaching staff, and written reports and grades are given to the students. Further informal feedback is given during tutorials.

The Examination Board makes the final decision regarding student’s work. The Examination Board’s decisions concerning the award of degrees are final. The board includes the course’s staff and the appointed External Examiner(s). The Examination Board’s decisions are reported and confirmed by the Joint Assessment Boards who pass them to the Graduate School’s Management Committee (GMC). The GMC shall then report the results to the OU and request the OU to award the degree. Students are notified of the results by the Registrar’s Office (Graduate School Coordinator).

7.1 Assessment Criteria and Grading

The assessment of submitted work is based on the following overall assessment criteria in addition to specific ones given for each module. The degree MPhil in Architecture and Urban Design is awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- A systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and insights at, or informed by, the forefront of the architectural and urban design disciplines and their practices.
- A comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship.
- Originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline; how the boundaries of knowledge are advanced through research.
- Conceptual understanding that enables them:
  - to evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline; and
  - to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and to propose new hypotheses.

The coursework is marked numerically on a percentage scale. The grades are given on the basis of the assessment criteria above and the relevant syllabus for each module.

### Old Marking Scheme (applicable to students entering the programme prior 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% or above</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>Distinction: An outstanding piece of work, only marginal mistakes or shortcomings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75–79%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Very Good: Some mistakes or shortcomings of the work, but overall still excellent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 The overall assessment criteria are based on the descriptor for level 7 master’s degree in the QAA’s Master’s Degree Characteristics, March 2010.
New Marking Scheme (applicable to students entering the programme in 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70% or above</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Distinction: Outstanding work with only marginal mistakes or shortcomings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–69%</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>High Pass: Some mistakes or shortcomings of the work, but overall still very good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–64%</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Good Pass: Above average work with some mistakes or shortcomings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57–59%</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>Satisfactory Pass: Sound work, but with some basic mistakes or shortcomings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54–56%</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Adequate Pass: An average piece of work, clearly showing some deficiencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–53%</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Low Pass: The work fulfils the minimum criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49% or below</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All coursework is marked by two internal assessors. Their marks are averaged to establish a moderated mark for each graded submission. Where the result of the assessment calculation creates a mark of 0.5% or greater, this will be rounded up to the next full percentage point (e.g. 69.5% is rounded to 70). Where the calculation creates a mark below 0.5% this will be rounded down to the next full percentage point (e.g. 69.4% is rounded to 69%). For the purposes of rounding up or down, only the first decimal place is used.

To qualify for the degree MPhil in Architecture and Urban Design, students must attain the 50% threshold mark on both the course work average, and on the dissertation mark. The overall final mark is calculated as the weighted average of course work and the dissertation.

The Masters certificate are awarded ‘with Distinction’ when the overall final mark (i.e. the combined weighted average of course work and dissertation) is a minimum of 70%. (For students entering prior to 2015, to be awarded a Distinction, only the Dissertation mark is considered and has to achieve a minimum of 80%).

All grades attained by students are kept on records in the AA School’s database, and are available for transcripts, but do not appear on the certificates.

Students who fail to attain a pass mark of 50% for any given course will be required to resubmit [only once] and pass before being allowed to proceed with their dissertation. Students who fail to attain at least a mark of 50% for their dissertation will be allowed to resubmit only once for the Examination Board of the following academic year. Failure from any resubmission will lead to disqualification from the degree.

Failure to attend at least 80% of the activities of a module without mitigating circumstances will result in a student failing the module and in repeated cases the programme.

All resubmissions will be subjected to grade capping at 50%.
In cases where there are no accepted mitigating circumstances and where coursework is submitted late, marks will be deducted. Any element of assessed work submitted up to seven days after the deadline will be marked and 10 marks (on a scale of 100) will be deducted for that element, for each calendar day of lateness incurred. Any piece of work submitted 7 or more days after the deadline will not be assessed and assigned a mark of 0, unless the student submits personal circumstances and these are accepted. (For students entering prior to 2015, non-submission or late-submission without extenuating circumstances are recorded as a ‘Fail’).

The exit award of an AA Graduate Diploma certificate in Architecture and Urban Design is available in case of students that have to abandon the course for other reasons than failure or expulsion and have completed at least half of the credits for the course.

7.2 Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct is defined as improper activity or behaviour by a student which may give that student, or another student, an unpermitted academic advantage in a summative assessment. The most serious examples of misconduct are plagiarism and student substitution.

Plagiarism, ‘the action or practice of taking someone else’s work, idea, etc., and passing it off as one’s own; literary theft’ will be penalised. If plagiarism occurs unknowingly, students will be asked to resubmit the work. In cases were plagiarism is intended to deceive, penalties include: removal from the School without right of resubmission; suspension from registration at the School or in particular courses for such period as it thinks fit; denial of credit or partial credit in any module; and an official letter of warning [see AA School Academic Regulations].

See Appendix 4 for recommended referencing format or use www.citethemrightonline.com, available online through the AA. Essays and Dissertations are generally subject to submission to Turnitin, an internet-based service to check for unoriginal content.

7.3 Extenuating Circumstances

A student who is unable to attend or complete a formal assessment component or who feels that their performance would be seriously impaired by extenuating circumstances may submit a deferral request.

Students are responsible for ensuring that the course director is notified of any extenuating circumstances at the time they occur and for supplying supporting documentation not later than 7 days after the deadline for the corresponding assessment component.

---

Extenuating circumstances have to be agreed by the course director and ratified by the GMC, in which case the student will be given the opportunity to take the affected assessment(s) as if for the first time and without any capping.

7.4 Appeals and Complaints

The formal procedure for appealing a decision and for registering a complaint is laid out in the current version of the AA School Academic Regulations. Any complaints that cannot be dealt with informally by the programme staff must be lodged with the Registrar.

Students may appeal against the result of an assessment or submission on one of the following grounds: that there were special circumstances affecting the student’s performance such as illness or close family bereavement; that there is evidence of procedural irregularity in the conduct of the examination; or that there is evidence of unfair or improper assessment on the part of one or more of the examiners.

A complaint is an expression of dissatisfaction with a service provided or the lack of a service for which the AA School is responsible and which impacts directly and substantively on the student’s programme of study. It must relate to services that students were led to believe would be provided by the AA School.
### 7.4 Submission and Resubmission Map

All submissions are to be made to the Graduate School Administration Office on Friday by 5pm of the respective week, unless otherwise agreed with the teaching staff.

#### YEAR 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Resubmission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autumn Term 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10 Weeks)</td>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td><strong>Academic Writing 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week 10</td>
<td><strong>Seminar 1 Essay (outline)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christmas Break</strong></td>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td><strong>Studio 1 Report</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td><strong>Seminar 1 Essay (draft)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Term 2</strong></td>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td><strong>Seminar 1 Essay</strong></td>
<td><strong>Academic Writing 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10 Weeks)</td>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td><strong>Academic Writing 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week 10</td>
<td><strong>Seminar 2 Essay (outline)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easter Break</strong></td>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td><strong>Studio 2 Report</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td><strong>Seminar 2 Essay (draft)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Term 3</strong></td>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td><strong>Seminar 2 Essay</strong></td>
<td><strong>Seminar 1 Essay</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10 Weeks)</td>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td><strong>Academic Writing 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Academic Writing 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week 9</td>
<td><strong>Dissertation Proposal (Final Review)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Break</strong></td>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td><strong>Dissertation Proposal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Seminar 2 Essay</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week 11</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Academic Writing 3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### YEAR 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Resubmission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autumn Term 4</strong></td>
<td>Week 9</td>
<td><strong>Dissertation Progress Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12 Weeks)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Design review)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Term 5</strong></td>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td><strong>Final Design Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18 Weeks)</td>
<td>Week 13</td>
<td><strong>Dissertation Progress Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Thesis review)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week 18</td>
<td><strong>Final Presentation (Symposium)</strong></td>
<td>Following academic year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


8 COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

The studios, seminars, and workshop are structured to prepare students to complete a substantial and independent research project. The general focus in Term 1 is on architecture, in Term 2 on urban plans, and in Term 3 and the Dissertation on multi-scalar relationships by which architecture and the city are defined.

The field of interest of Projective Cities is the contemporary city and related questions of design-research. This interest includes amongst others the specific contexts that shape them politically, governmentally, culturally, socially, spatially, infrastructurally, territorially, and economically.

Through the studios and seminars, a number of concepts and propositions key to the pedagogy and methodology of the programme are explored: Architecture’s modern disciplinary knowledge principally originates from the abstractions afforded by typal reasoning, a primarily conceptual and systematic thinking, and typological reasoning, the diagrammatic and analytical resolution of formal models. They together constitute the collective knowledge and forms that underlie the discipline of architecture. Essential to making this typo-diagrammatic knowledge available to the multi-scalar city is the premise that architecture does not only exist as a specific object at one scale, but as a generic possibility at many scales. If urbanity then can be said to emerge from the synthesis of fundamental types – buildings and urban armatures critical to a city’s formation – type can be defined as a specific spatial, socio-cultural and political product that as much derives from the city as it organises its idea, whereas typology enables the translation of generic into specific practice-driven and structural solutions. Therefore, both type and typology are interrelated and necessary to conceptualise, design, and manage an urban plan, suggesting the importance of the concurrent reading of the city at different scales. With this, an analysis of the common organisational and structural diagrams of type, its formative diagrams, becomes critical to make typology translatable and operative to design. The methodology of typal and typological reasoning, once extended to the scales of the city, can be termed architectural urbanism. Its pursuit is the definition of diagrams that are both social and spatial.

The following sections describe the programme modules and detail the submissions, credits, aims, learning outcomes, and assessment criteria.
8.1 STUDIO 1: Analysis of Architecture

Projective Cities examines a common diagrammatic condition as a research theme. The current theme is the Architecture of Education and Knowledge. The political and economic dimensions of education and knowledge can be seen as disclosing common and conflicting ambitions. These conflicts between regions, between cities, and between inhabitants, point to the interrelated scales through which education and the city are conceptualised: the scale of architecture, its specificity and typological analysis, the urban scale, its configuration, limits, and centralities but also the political and socio-economic realities that organise it, the national scale and the building of a citizenry, and the regional scale and its economic and geopolitical meanings. The Architecture of Education and Knowledge therefore opens up a discussion of how the urban can be understood through specific architecture and its design, and how its effect as an urban armature is not only of spatial importance but equally organised by larger political discourses.

A. The Architecture of Education and Knowledge

Educational types have a spatial organisation that reflects on the formal processes of teaching and learning and are well defined by educational frameworks, curriculums, and institutions. They are also commonly shaped by distinct social diagrams that underlie education as a cultural, political, and economic product. Educational buildings typically include the different building types of:

- Kindergartens
- Schools
- Academies
- Colleges
- Universities

Whereas education is based on formal instruction and defined by educational institutions, knowledge, although closely linked to education, as such does not depend on its institutionalisation and is largely informal. In addition to educational buildings, some institutional buildings that are considered to belong to the Architecture of Knowledge are:

- Libraries
- Museums
- Community centres

These are, like educational institutions, without exception known as public buildings. However, defining an Architecture of Knowledge more broadly, the following can be included amongst others:

- Buildings part of knowledge economies (offices, campuses, laboratories etc)
- Buildings of worship (monasteries, temples, mosques etc)

The range of buildings falling within the Architecture of Education and Knowledge, on the one hand is characterised by iconic structures designed by starchitects, whether universities, libraries, or museums, and on the other by buildings with generic plans, as in the case of speculative offices for knowledge economies or state-built schools. Although educational institutions generally have specific programmatic constraints and organisational layouts that knowledge architecture commonly lacks, a current tendency is to hybridise buildings of education and knowledge in order to promote a synergetic ‘learning environment’ and imply
learning as an integral part of our daily life. For example, schools become academies and universities economic knowledge hubs. This is largely explained by the fact that ‘knowledge’ is the most important asset and economic driver of developed countries, requiring a conflation of learning, knowledge, and economy. Yet in the process, architecture and its design has become ineffective, a failure betrayed by marketing jargon that uses adjectives such as ‘innovative’, ‘communicative’, ‘synergetic’, ‘creative’, ‘experimental’, ‘interdisciplinary’, ‘liveable’, and ‘sustainable’ to sell an ‘environment’ that architecture only strenuously fulfils.

Thus, one of the challenges arising from the Architecture of Education and Knowledge is how architecture can respond to changing cultural, economic, and urban contexts and how to propose new effective design ideas and models.

The Privatisation of the Public
What the Architecture of Education and Knowledge makes further apparent, is the problem of conceptualising the public. The notion of the public is frequently linked to the questions of: Who is the public, and what is their role in public spaces, or, what are public spaces to provide for the public? This line of questioning coincides too often with the assumption that the public in architecture is representative of a public sphere and a democratic constituency. This is of course contradicted by a growing privatisation of public institutions and infrastructures, but also the phenomenon of privately owned public spaces—the so-called loss of the public sphere and public spaces.

However, architecture and urban design tend to simplify the in reality differentiated concepts of the public and the private. Public spaces are stereotyped and seen exemplified by longed-for historical models that ought to be revived—with the Greek agora, old city centres, and street life or markets especially popular—or are understood in terms of a unified and equal public sphere in which private people come together for the common good. A perpetuation of the myth of the Greek polis. Yet historically, public spaces were often never unified and the differences between public and private are not as evident as one would like to believe. Public spaces have a long history of private ownership and serving a limited constituency. In England, the Crown has legally owned all land, and the commons, common land that gives rights of use to commoners, belonged to the lord of a manor. Similarly, Bedford Square in London, an exemplary Georgian urban set piece, was always a private ‘gated community’ and its garden is still closed to the public today. Likewise Paternoster Square, as the Occupy London movement found out to their dismay, is private land owned by the Mitsubishi Estate Co. The private ownership of public land is nothing new, but the perception of an increasing privatisation of the public implies a shift in context and what public space is or ought to be.

While a debate on, and clarification of, public spaces is essential for any discourse on the city, a more rigorous and nuanced definition that takes into consideration the increasing private ownership and limited constituencies that public spaces serve, is necessary. Hereby the Architecture of Education and Knowledge is an effective framework through which the conflicts between what is vaguely termed the public and private or the common can be re-examined, in order to better understand how different stakeholders and constituencies affect the formation of an urban plan and how architectural design is part of this process.

B. Studio 1 Structure

Studio 1 is structured by a number of related analytical studies and begins with the definition of a preliminary research interest that frames the individual work by students during the Taught Year 1.
1. Field of Interest and Enquiry (2 Weeks)

The programme starts with students determining a general field of interest and enquiry that must be embedded into the larger discussion of the Architecture of Education and Knowledge outlined above. To do this, a number of simple decisions must be taken:

In the first week, students decide which specific group of educational or knowledge types they want to study and a city that will become the context for the research.

[For example, universities (city campus) and London.]

In the second week, students will compile a list of at least 6 case studies (precedents) that are chosen from the selected group of educational or knowledge types and will identify a series of existing larger urban plans/proposals within the chosen city that have a clear relevance to the type.

[For example, case-studies: Berlin Free University by Candilis, Josic, Woods (1967-74), IIT Crown Hall by Mies van der Rohe (1956), Institute of Advanced Legal Studies and Education by Denys Lasdun (1965-76), Ravensbourne College by Foreign Office Architects (2010), School of Oriental and African Studies by Denys Lasdun (1973), and University College London, Cancer Institute by Grimshaw (2007); and urban plans: University of East London, Docklands Campus by Edward Cullinan Architects (1999-2000), University College London Campus, and Aga Khan University in London by Fumihiko Maki (ongoing).]

When selecting the case studies, consideration of their organisation relative to each other is important. Hereby the morphological classification by OM Unger for museums can be followed and case studies should either fall all into one of the main 3 groups or be a comparison of them if possible:

- **One-room Buildings**
  - One-room, unoriented buildings
    (With self-contained form and plan based on a square, rectangular, or circle)
  - One-room buildings with defined surrounding-space
    (Regular buildings defined by enclosing figures; and irregular buildings with an axial extension to a defined exterior, while generally self-contained the main spaces are defined by limiting figures.)

- **Multi-room Buildings**
  - Multi-room buildings with equal disposition
    (Comparable yet differentiated spatial units disposed within a coordinating matrix organised by an enfilade, corridor access, or connecting elements. Sometimes they form an inner courtyard, an exterior but enclosed centre integrated with the interior.)
  - Multi-room buildings with clear configuration
    (Their spatial units are ordered by a connecting element—aisle, gallery, corridor, arcade, pergola, alley, street, boulevard, avenue, and square—that either forms a link with multiple directions, a single sinuous link between two points, a linear link, or a connection in the form of a spiral.)

- **Building Complexes**
  - Building complexes with simple composition of building elements
    (Centred and with multiple directions, ranging from linear to a cruciform configuration and from a cruciform to a free-form arrangement around an open centre.)
• Building complexes with compound composition of building elements
  (Without centre and unoriented but with an accumulative or combinatory arrangement
  without no apparent ordering principle other than functional or compositional criteria.)

[Note: For building examples of each group see Oswald Mathias Ungers, ‘Berliner
Vorlesungen 1964–65’, ARCH+, 179 (July 2006), 20–139]

2. Architecture’s Formative Diagrams (3 Weeks)
Once the case studies are selected, students proceed with their analysis. This analysis of
building types and their formative diagrams requires the study of common shared traits by
recognising organisational and structural repetitions or exceptions that define their typicality
both in a formal sense and their socio-cultural meaning. The commonalities and
transformations evident in a particular group of building types are compared as a series of
descriptive and analytical diagrams that convey a building type’s collective form, structure,
organisation, and construction (over time). In architecture, typology is closely connected to
the functions of the diagram, and this is explored in the following. By abstracting the
formative diagrams of built form, type becomes available to comparison, analysis, and
ultimately speculative projection.

For the abstraction of formative diagrams, students will redraw the projects. Consideration
should be given to the typical unit (classroom or modular units) and its interior definition by
furniture, pupil-teacher relations, teaching and classroom regimes, production modes, and
forms of knowledge exchange, but also the relevance of outdoor spaces, shared and
common spaces, and spaces other than the typical units. The drawings should clearly convey
the following characteristics and details (as applicable):

• Project descriptions (name, location, year, architect, project brief)
• Location plan, plan(s), section(s), and elevation(s)
• Figure-ground plan/section
• Orientation
• Massing [+ axonometric]
• Structural organisation [+ axonometric]
• Programme
• Circulation-to-use (hierarchy and procession)
• Part-to-whole [+ axonometric]
• Repetitive-to-unique (modularity) [+ axonometric]
• Geometrical order
• Parti

[Note: The drawing conventions given in Clark Roger and Michael Pause, Precedents in
Architecture: Analytical Diagrams, Formative Ideas and Partis (London: John Wiley & Sons,
2005) are to be followed. This book provides details on the different categories to be drawn.
For examples of axonometric building analysis see Peter Eisenman, Ten Canonical Buildings
(New York: Rizzoli, 2008)]

3. Comparative Analysis (1 Week)
Following the abstraction of the formative diagrams, matrices comparing the precedents can
be drawn to define shared traits and structures characterising the studied group of types.
This should analyse:

• Disposition: single-room building, multi-room building, and building complex; square,
  radial, and triangular.
• Distribution: linear, parallel, axial, radial, centralised, and clustered; rooms, corridor (single and double loaded), passages, and enfilade (single and double).

• Hierarchy and Layering (Comparison of hierarchy and relational shifts evident in different layers).

• Modularity or Difference (Comparison of repetitive parts in relation to the structure of the whole or comparison of formal, structural, and organisational differences).

• Growth and Limits (Comparison of growth patterns and their limit in relation to specific formative elements, repetitive or modular elements, programme, and structure).

4. Conclusion 1: Historical and Structural Analysis (2 Weeks)

Although precedents are often understood as historical objects, the studio considers the inevitable redundancy and expiry of current typological models within its context and in relation to the contemporary city. The previous comparative matrices are meant to assist in drawing these analytical and in parts speculative conclusions in order to raise a number of questions to be answered:

• What are their idea diagrams?
  (What are the commonalities and inter-dependencies between relative formal, structural, cultural, and performative types within a group?)

• What are their transformative matrices?
  (What generates or limits the emergence of a particular type and what is the historical transformation of this type in response to its possible redundancy and expiry?)

• What are potential typological transformations?
  (How can historical or existing types be defined as having a sustained relevance?)

The analysed case studies, representing certain moments in the transformation of types, should be contextualised by framing them within a comparative history. This history, a very brief survey made up of diagrams, photographs, drawings, and text, maps out the emergence and development of the chosen type and should be part of the conclusions. Questions to be considered, for example, are what are generic room sizes and how are they defined, and how does the social diagram of education or knowledge change (e.g. from home schooling to formal school buildings, or from specific university buildings to generic office plans). At the same time, although being a general history, ideas of what kind of urban question this potentially raises should be outlined. This analysis requires:

• A list of exemplary and typical precedents that represents the chosen type and significant transformations.

• A written and illustrated description and review of these precedents, outlining their commonalities and differences, and providing a coherent argument and criteria for the inclusion or exclusion of precedents.

• A historical timeline that charts the case studies and their typological transformations.

Through the comparative history and matrices, an argument and assessment of the historical transformations of types and moments of redundancy and expiry can be attempted, providing the grounds for a preliminary projection of an anticipated or necessary (future) typological transformation.

Altogether, the aim is to understand typology less a classification of building types, or for that matter as contained by building types itself, but to seek typological diagrams that transcend the classificatory restraints.
5. Conclusion 2: Design Exercise (1 Week)
Based on the studied type, the identified formative diagrams, and typological transformations, a short design exercise lasting a week is to be proposed by each student. The brief for the exercise is to specify:

- An area schedule [programme in m$^2$]
- A typological and limiting constraint.

[Note: Examples of design briefs are given in OM Ungers’s ‘Wochenaufgaben’]

Deliverables are drawings and physical sketch models that illustrate possible solutions.

C. Workshops

Complementary to Studio 1, skills workshops introduce the computational knowledge necessary to fulfil the drawing, modelling, analytical and design requirements. Studio workshops are intense full day sessions that are production focussed.

Students are encouraged to attend courses offered by the AA Media Studies.

Week 1 Skills Workshop: AutoCAD
AutoCad refresher

Week 2 Skills Workshop: Introduction to Rhino 3D Modelling
Introduction to Rhino 3D modelling environment: user interface, commands, tools, potential uses and limitations.

Week 3 Skills Workshop: 3D Modelling of Case Study
3D modelling exercises. Modelling of 1 case study.

Week 4 Skills and Studio Workshop: Case Study Diagramming
From 3D Rhino model to 2D and 3D diagrams (elevation, section, plan, perspective, axonometric, aerial views etc.).
The workshop outcome is to produce a full analytical set of ‘formative diagrams’ for 1 case study (2D and 3D diagrams). This requires decisions on the categories and how information is abstracted and represented.

Week 5 Skills Workshop: Tutorials
Production tutorials based on students’ studio work.

Week 6 Skills Workshop: Adobe Suite

Week 6 Skills Workshop: Grasshopper (Visual Scripting)
Introduction to Grasshopper scripting: user interface, commands, tools, potential uses and limitations.

Week 6 Studio Workshop: Comparative Analysis
The workshop outcome is to produce at least 1 comparative matrix that includes all case studies. This requires decisions on the categories on how information is abstracted and represented.
Week 7 Skills Workshop: Grasshopper Design Script
Translation and implementation of design parameters derived from case study analysis to produce design variations.

Week 7 Studio Workshop: Timeline
The workshop outcome is to produce a timeline that describes structural and organisational changes of the studied building type.

Week 8 Skills and Studio Workshop: Design Conclusions
The workshop outcome is to produce diagrams of typological transformations and to translate these into a parametric matrix of formal transformations that can be scripted with Grasshopper.

D. Reading

Hertzberger, Herman, *Space and Learning* (Rotterdam: 010 Publisher, 2008)
Hoeger, Kerstin & Christiaanse, Kees, eds, *Campus and the City: Urban Design for the Knowledge Society* (Zurich: GTA Verlag, 2000)

Recommended Reading:

Manipour, Ali, *Knowledge Economy and the City: Spaces of Knowledge* (Rotledge, 2011)
Müller, Thomas, and Romana Schneider, *The Classroom: From the Late 19th Century until the Present Day* (Berlin: Wasmuth, 2010)
Rosenberg, Daniel, and Anthony Grafton, *Cartographies of Time: A History of Timeline* (New York:
Princeton Architectural Press, 2010)

**E. Course Specification**

**Tutors:** Sam Jacoby, Adrian Lahoud, and Workshop Consultant

**Submissions:** Studio Report

(illustrations, drawings, and writing)

**Credits:** 16

**Aims and Learning Outcomes:**
Familiarisation with the case study method and concepts of *fundamental type* and *formative diagrams*. Development of descriptive and analytical diagrams.

On completion of this design studio and workshops, students are expected to:

- **A2** have a comprehensive understanding and ability to use a range of techniques and research methods applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship, including the critical use of the case study method in analysis and design and diagramming techniques;
- **A4** have a conceptual understanding enabling them to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them;
- **B1** use initiative and take responsibility; and
- **B4** communicate effectively, with colleagues and a wider audience, in a variety of media.

**Assessment Criteria:**
The Studio Report assessment is based on the following:

- The ability to critically analyse, interpret, compare, and generalise case studies.
- The depth of understanding disciplinary knowledge and design research techniques in architecture.
- Competence in architectural modes of representations and productions.
- Originality and rigour in developing a design brief and proposal.
- The ability to clearly communicate concepts and work.
8.2 SEMINAR 1: Architectural Theories and Design Methods

The seminar course discusses different concepts of type and their importance to the systematic understanding of disciplinary knowledge and methodical design in architecture. It examines how the modern reasoning of form emerges from, or is reliant on, concepts of type and typology. How they establish architectural histories and theories as a discursive field of knowledge and provide a collective framework for architectural speculation. Type connotes a conceptual thinking that anticipates and precedes problems of architectural formations, and negotiates the possibilities of the generic, the typical, and the specific that become articulated in design through the analysis of typology.

All seminars are structured as follows:

1. Discussion of student summaries of previous seminar.  
   (Students are asked to write a few paragraphs following each seminar to summarise the main discussion and in addition formulate a number of questions that were examined and/or raised by the last seminar).
2. Presentation/lecture by seminar tutor.
3. Presentation of a text and/or project by a student.  
   (A student will present a selected text or project. This should include a short background to the text/author, and a review and discussion of the text/project. This is to be submitted as a written text of 2-3 pages.)
4. Discussion.
5. (Optional reading and discussion of selected texts.)

A. Session Descriptions

1. History and Theory of Architecture

The concept of history and historicism in architecture was first introduced by Le Roy in The Ruins of the Most Beautiful Monuments of Greece (1758) in order to separate it from the practice of architecture, which he considered its theory. This critical distinction derived from the need to clarify the disciplinary knowledge of architecture and is closely connected to the French seventeenth- and eighteenth-century normative discourse in architecture and the age of Enlightenment with its quest for rationality. (Sam Jacoby)


Recommended:  


2. Typal Reasoning: Quatremère

The theory of type in architecture emerged at the turn of the nineteenth century in the theories of Quatremère de Quincy based on an encyclopaedic clarification of knowledge and an art
historical enquiry into imitation. Type represented Quatremère’s radical conclusion to his studies of origins and the eighteenth-century obsession with classification, and was defined by a new historical consciousness and concepts arising from historicism. (Sam Jacoby)


Secondary Reading:
Vidler, Anthony, ‘The Third Typology’, Oppositions, 7 (1976), 1-4

Recommended:

3. Typological Reasoning, Diagrams, and Design Method

In architecture, an early typological reasoning can be traced back to Le Roy, however, the first typological design method only emerged with Durand, despite him not dealing with types but genres. Durand devised a didactic method of disposition by translation his demand for utility and functionalism into a procedural differentiation of building elements, which he systematically combined into the progressive disposition and taxonomy of building parts and the geometric transformation of a pre-established parti. The seminar discusses Durand’s great impact on following design methodologies, such as those by Ungers, Rossi, and Eisenman, but also on the various concepts of diagrams and their relation to the notion of type. (Sam Jacoby)

Jacoby, Sam, ‘Architectural Urbanism: Proposals for the Arab World’, in Reconceptualising
Boundaries: Urban Design in the Arab World, ed. by Robert Saliba [Ashgate: forthcoming]


Secondary Reading:
Vidler, Anthony, ‘What is a Diagram Anyway?’, in Peter Eisenman: Feints [Milan: Skira, 2006]

Recommended:
Lee, Christopher, Jacoby, Sam, eds. Typological Formations: Renewable Building Types and the City [London: AA Publications, 2007]

4. Housing and the Emergence of the Typological Discourse
The discussion of the idea of type emerged at specific moments in the history of architecture, and engaged with it in ways that highly depended on economic and social circumstances. After the industrial revolution, the focus of the typological discourse shifts for the first time from public, exceptional and representative buildings to the problem of mass housing. However, the emergence of a typological approach to housing is a long process that starts with the rise of an urban bourgeoisie during the Renaissance. The seminar will discuss how the attention to private dwellings went from being a marginal question to becoming the key point of the discourse on type, and how this process dovetailed with a condition that we could define as the mature biopolitical era. (Maria S Giudici)

Secondary Readings:

Recommended:
Dennis, Michael, Court and Garden [Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988]
Rosenfeld, Myra Nan [edited by], Serlio on Domestic Architecture [New York: Dover, 1996]

5. Semper’s Typal Motive
Synthesising Quatremère’s theory and Durand’s method, Semper in his search for a general and ‘empirical’ theory of architecture, reinterpreted the original formations of art as depending on elementary and typal motives. These motives, he argued, developed through advances in the technical arts and their techniques, which defined the material transformations and limitations of the arts. Therefore, Semper posited that architectural formations could be analysed through comparative studies. [Sam Jacoby]


Secondary Reading:

Recommended:
Herrmann, Wolfgang, Gottfried Semper: Theoretischer Nachlass an der ETH Zürich, Katalog und Kommentare [Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag, 1981]
Hvattum, Mari, Gottfried Semper and the Problem of Historicism [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004]
Semper, Gottfried, The Four Elements of Architecture: And other Writings, trans. by Harry Francis Mallgrave and Wolfgang Herrmann, with introduction by Harry Francis Mallgrave [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989]
Semper, Gottfried, Style in the Technical and Tectonic Arts; or, Practical Aesthetics, trans. by Harry
6. Standards and Archetypes
This session establishes a basic glossary of terms related with the general discourse on type, and discusses the instrumentality of their use within specific moments of the recent history of architecture and political thinking: standard and architectural Modernism, paradigm and Agamben’s philosophical method, example and Virno’s post-operaist politics, prototype and Hans Schmidt’s work on prefabrication, and the possible field of intervention of yet-to-be defined architecture as archetype. (Maria S Giudici)


Secondary Readings:
Agamben, Giorgio, ‘What is a Paradigm?’, in Lecture at European Graduate School, August 2002 <http://www.egs.edu/faculty/giorgio-agamben/articles/what-is-a-paradigm/> [accessed 09 September 2012]

Recommended:
Teige, Karel, Minimum Dwelling: The Housing Crisis, Housing Reform [Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002]

7. Rational Typologies and Symbolism
The seminar discusses the attempts by Rossi, based on his concept of the analogous city, and Unger, deriving from his morphological concept of type, to devise rational typologies in their design projects. It compares Rossi and Unger to the ‘symbolic’ analyses proposed by Krier, Venturi, and Rowe, which utilise notions of tradition and history with typology increasingly becoming reduced to providing simply a framework of borrowed meaning. [Sam Jacoby]


Secondary Reading:
Ungers, Oswald Mathias, ‘Dieci opinioni sul tipo / Ten Opinions on the Type’, Casabella, 509–510 [1985], 93

Recommended:
Aureli, Pier Vittorio, ‘Towards the Archipelago’, Log, 11 [2007]
Carl, Peter, ‘Type, Field, Culture, Praxis’, Architectural Design, 81.1 [2011], Typological Urbanism
Eisenman, Peter, ‘The End of the Classical—The End of the Beginning, The End of the End’,
8. The Generic and the Typical

If the post-war period sees a resurgence of the discussion on type, the actual spatial production of the late XX century can be read under quite a different genealogy that goes from Le Corbusier’s Maison Dom-ino to the ‘typical plan’ of factories and offices that for Koolhaas is actually the main ingredient of the contemporary city. The Dom-ino system – a blank, customizable skeleton – is the starting point for the proliferation of an architecture that is decidedly anti-typological: flexible, adaptable, completely generic, a perfect apparatus to handle the fast-changing economic conditions of the post-industrial world. It is therefore precisely against the growing conformity of cities that in the 1970s typological discourse attempted to recuperate an idea of character able to overcome the genericness of the Dom-ino era. The seminar will reread the political and economic background of the rise of ‘the generic’ as social and spatial category, as well as discussing the possible potential of type against the typical. [Maria S Giudici]


Secondary reading:
Recommended:

9. Seriality
This seminar will explore questions of seriality, repetition and difference in forms over time especially as they emerge through debates in art history. Intrinsic to this is the status of art, its meaning and its autonomy in regards to a broader constellation of social and political forces, but also the way in which specific traits within art are seen to embody an evolutionary model of artistic transformation. [Adrian Lahoud]


Secondary Reading:

Recommended:

10. Open Discussion
Concluding session to discuss questions raised by the seminars. Student presentations of their essay outline.

B. Course Specification

**Tutors:** Sam Jacoby, Maria Giudici, and Adrian Lahoud
**Delivery:** Lectures and student presentations
**Submissions:** Essay of maximum 4,000 words
**Credits:** 16

**Aims and Learning Outcomes:**
Familiarisation of students with architectural theories and theories of design methods. To provide a critical survey of the historiography and history of ideas framed by typological and typal reasoning, including the clarification of type as a form of reasoning that is traditionally distinguished as relating either to a design method or critical theory.

On completion of this seminar students are expected to:
A3 have a conceptual understanding enabling them to evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline;
A4 have a conceptual understanding enabling them to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them;
B4 communicate effectively, with colleagues and a wider audience, in a variety of media.

**Assessment Criteria:**
The Essay assessment is based on the following:

- A critical knowledge and understanding of the principles and concepts introduced in the seminars.
- The rigour and originality in developing arguments and providing supportive evidence.
- The ability to demonstrate clear methodology and structure in the planning and execution of a research inquiry.
- The ability to clearly and persuasively present and debate arguments.
- The ability to reference sources of information using agreed conventions.
8.3 ACADEMIC WRITING 1

Complementary to Seminar 1, students are introduced to academic writing. The course is scheduled once a week. On days when no seminars or group sessions take place, individual tutorials are given to discuss any writing in progress (also available to Year 2 students).

A. Session Descriptions

Week 1: Evidence
This seminar examines the role of note taking and the preliminary collection of information for the purpose of scholarly writing.

Week 3: Format / Structure
This seminar examines how the format and structure of written material can inform the intellectual argument of the writing.

Week 6: Submission 1 (Marked)
Edited summary of one of the Seminar 1 texts (maximum 1,200 words) is to be submitted in Week 6 and will be formally assessed and marked.

Week 6: Research Methodologies
This seminar examines how varied and multivalent modes of research can be employed to inform a scholarly project.

Week 6-10: Submission 2
Descriptions of 3 case studies related to Studio 1 are to be completed between Week 6-10. A summary text should frame a problem or issue that relates the case studies. Drafts of case studies will be work-shopped during the term.

Week 9: Formulating an Argument
Drawing on the first seminars, this session will examine how the research, case studies and other collected supporting materials (such as images) can be collated and structured in order to formulate and express a scholarly argument.

B. Course Specification

Tutor: Mark Campbell
Submission: Edited summary of one of the Seminar 1 texts (maximum 1,200 words)
Credits: 4

Aims and Learning Outcomes:
To familiarise students with academic writing conventions and the importance of writing to formulate a research argument. Understanding of the differences in writing when examining a case study or text source.

On completion of this workshop students are expected to:
A2 have a comprehensive understanding and ability to use a range of techniques and research methods applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship.

Assessment Criteria:
- Clarity, intelligence, and rigour in summarising texts and case studies.
- Compliance with academic referencing standards.
8.4 STUDY 2: Architectural Urbanism

The assumption underlying architectural urbanism is an interdisciplinary relation between architecture, urban design, and urban planning that can be understood through multi-scalar typal and typological reasoning. The analysis of architecture’s formative diagrams in Studio 1 is therefore a prerequisite to an operative understanding of built forms within the city. The questions emerging from the Architecture of Education and Knowledge and the Privatisation of the Public, provide a typological and intellectual framework to study this relationship in Term 2.

Studio 2 builds on the previously defined concepts of formative diagrams and fundamental type as the basis to the analysis of collective and disciplinary forms of knowledge. The idea of type and typology is now expanded to the study of the city. Studio 2 introduces to students the conventions of urban planning, its parameters, processes, and limits.

A. Studio 2 Structure

Understanding fundamental types as providing basic organisational, structural, and tectonic elements of the city, and drawing a deliberate relationship between the scales of building types and city, architectural design becomes operative at different scales. Therefore the hierarchies, limits, and differentiations of types and their structural and organisational diagrams become meaningful to control urban development. In this sense, architectural and urban plans are intelligible as formal and theoretical products of disciplinary activity as much as the collective outcome of socio-political forces. The city, in other words, is defined by typological conflicts and transformations that arise when types encounter a context. By uncovering these conflicts and transformations of built form and the necessary scalar negotiations and translations, a specific idea of the city emerges: intrinsic formal, spatial, and social relationships.

Studio 2 is divided into three parts:

1: Urban Plan Analysis (4 Weeks)

The studio begins with the methodical analysis of existing or proposed urban plans in which types of education or knowledge play a significant and formative role. This should be one of the urban plans chosen in Term 1. If necessary, alternative urban plans can be proposed, as long as they are relevant to the type-study in Term 1. The first analysis is that of common urban design and planning criteria. This initial study should include the following common elements of an urban plan (as applicable):

Identification of Urban Plan
• Master plan
• Land use (zoning, coverage, massing, and density)

Analysis of Urban Plan
• Context and strategic analysis
  - Planning goals and policies
  - Economic development
  - Landform (and landscape)
  - Implementation and phasing
• Spatial and programmatic analysis
  - Figure-ground plan
  - Circulation and transportation
  - Services, facilities, and infrastructures
- Natural resources, open space, recreation, and landscape
- Hierarchy and organisation (structure, route, connection, and view)
- Part-to-whole and repetitive-to-unique
- Geometry, grids, and symmetry

2: Typological Conflict and Transformation (4 Weeks)
Following the basic analysis of the urban plan, the relationship of educational and knowledge types to its conceptualisation, organisation, and formation is studied. How does the generality of type adapt to socio-cultural, economic, and political contexts? Within this study, the question whether a typological transformation results from a typological conflict, created by an insertion into a context, or a strategic argument and its possibilities within a context is emphasised. This expands the conclusions of Studio 1 and requires a good knowledge of the physical, social, and cultural context of the urban plan.

The identified conflicts and transformation are diagrammed and develop the preceding analysis. To begin with, the urban plan is compared to other plans and/or its architecture:

- Architecture and urban plan; scalar comparison
- Distribution: linear, parallel, axial, radial, centralised, and clustered
- Hierarchy and layering
- Modularity, difference, and flexibility
- Comparative matrix
- Timelines

Subsequently the transformation of the urban plan and its relation to formative types is studied:

- Growth and limits
- Idea and strategy diagrams
- Transformation diagrams

This should be concluded in a set of speculative transformative matrices for the architectural type and urban plan.

To conclude the analysis and speculations, a first attempt should be made to define:

1. How do the relationships between type and urban plan raise a larger disciplinary question, a discursive research problem that not only relates to the specific city and plan studied but to a general discussion and the contemporary city?
2. What is a clear urban design-research question that emerges from the analysis?
3. What is a related yet distinct typological/architectural design-research question?

While this is a first attempt to formulate questions important for the Dissertation Proposal, it is also a conclusion to Studio 1 and 2, potentially questioning some earlier conclusions.

3: Design Exercise (2 Weeks)
Similar to Studio 1, a short design brief that will be explored over two weeks is to be written by students. The brief for the exercise is to specify:

- A typological transformation
- A number of urban constraints (structural, physical, material, and programmatic)

Deliverables are propositional drawings, diagrams, collages, and physical sketch models
that illustrate possible solutions.

B. Workshops

Complementary to Studio 2, skills workshops introduce the computational knowledge necessary to fulfil the drawing, modelling, analytical and design requirements. Studio workshops are intense full day sessions that are production focussed.

**Week 1 Skills Workshop: Introduction to Python Scripting**
Basic concepts of scripting iterations, conditionals and functions in relation to case studies and design data.

**Week 2 Skills Workshop: Generative Processes**
Python and Grasshopper: Translating and implementing design parameters to produce design variations and relevant diagrams through scripting.

**Week 2 Studio Workshop: Urban Plan Analysis**
The workshop outcome is to set up all necessary descriptive and analytical drawings for an urban plan. This requires decisions on the categories and how information is abstracted and represented.

**Week 3 Skills Workshop: Comparative Analysis (through Scripting) I**
Geometrical & structural analysis. Development of relevant diagrams.

**Week 4 Skills and Studio Workshop: Comparative Analysis (through Scripting) II**
Typological and urban analysis. Development of relevant diagrams.

**Week 5 Skills Workshop: Rapid Prototyping**
Introduction to rapid prototyping. How to prepare files for laser cutting, CNC or 3D printing.

**Week 6 Skills Workshop: Design Exercise (Physical Prototypes)**
Preparing of digital files for physical prototypes of student work.

**Week 7 Skills Workshop: Tutorials**
Individual computational support to student projects.

**Week 8 Skills and Studio Workshop: Design Conclusions**
The workshop outcome is to produce diagrams of typological transformations and to translate these into a parametric matrix of formal transformations that can be scripted with Python and Grasshopper.

C. Reading

Sudjic, Deyan, *The 100 Mile City* (London: Flamingo, 1993)
Recommended Reading:
Fraser, Nancy, ‘Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy’, *Social Text*, 25/26 (1990), 56–80

D. Course Specification

Tutors: Sam Jacoby, Adrian Lahoud, and Workshop Consultant
Submissions: Studio Report (illustrations, drawings, and writing)
Credits: 16

Aims and Learning Outcomes:
Familiarisation with the concepts typological conflict and transformation, and introduction to urban design and urban planning methodologies. Understanding of the socio-political, economic, ecological, spatial, and physical parameters or processes informing the development and formation of an urban plan.

On completion of this design studio students are expected to:
A2 have a comprehensive understanding and ability to use a range of techniques and research methods applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship, including the critical use of the case study method in analysis and design and diagramming techniques;
A4 have a conceptual understanding enabling them to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them;
B1 use initiative and take responsibility; act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks;
B2 deal with complex issues and problems systematically, creatively, and independently; make sound judgements in the absence of complete data or information;
B4 communicate effectively, with colleagues and a wider audience, in a variety of media.

Assessment Criteria:
The assessment of the Studio Report is based on:

- The ability to critically analyse, interpret, compare, and generalise urban plans.
- The depth of understanding disciplinary knowledge and design research techniques in urbanism.
- Competence in modes of representations and productions in urban design and master planning.
- Originality and rigour in developing a design brief and proposal.
- The ability to clearly communicate concepts and work.
8.5 SEMINAR 2: Theories of the Contemporary City

The phenomena of the contemporary city has been theorised in the recent past in a number of critical writings and projects that reformulate, and object to, the traditional history of urban planning. A history emerging with scientific urbanism in the late nineteenth century and formalised by the Modern Movement. The course positions the modernist theories of a new contemporary city, which developed with an increased fascination with the city, and discusses twentieth-century theories that largely define themselves in opposition to these modernist doctrines. The course further proposes that the city has increasingly become a critical field of theory driven by practitioners in an attempt to reconnect architecture with the challenges and questions raised by the contemporary city and prolific urbanisation.

A. Session Descriptions

1. Nineteenth-Century Concepts of City Planning

Following the Industrial Revolution, a rapid growth of cities led to a radical change of its traditional spatial organisation. In the second half of the nineteenth century, new systems and concepts of planning cities emerged. Ildefons Cerdà coined the term ‘urbanisation’ in the 1860s as part of his new progressive and scientific understanding of planning as an ordering discipline. While to him issues of housing, mobility, and hygiene raise a social question and are pragmatically embedded in technical, economic, legal, administrative, and political considerations, Camillo Sitte at the end of the nineteenth century suggested an alternative culturist urbanism that highlighted the aesthetic experience of the city. (Sam Jacoby)

Howard, Ebenezer, Garden Cities of To-morrow (1898)

Projects:
Haussmann’s Renovations of Paris (1852-70) by Georges-Eugène Haussmann
Extension Plan of Barcelona: Eixample (from 1859) by Ildefons Cerdà
The Vienna Ring (1898) by Camillo Sitte
Letchworth Garden City (from 1903) by Barry Parker and Raymond Unwin

Secondary Reading and Project:
Snow, John, Broad Street [London] Cholera Map (1854)
Booth, Charles, Poverty Map of London (1898-99)

Recommended:
Hall, Peter, Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the
2. The City of Architectural Modernism

As the city becomes an object of rational enquiry and planning in the 1800s, the focus of architecture as a discipline shifts from representation to management. It is in this shift that we can find the roots of the great narratives that will inform the modern movement in the XX century: the rhetoric of functionalism, the obsession for hygiene, and the search for a well-ordered living environment. The hidden rationale beneath the myth of the city-as-perfect-machine – a trope that will triumph with the Modern Movement – is obviously an attempt to maximize production and minimize unrest. The seminar will re-discuss the main theses put forward by modernism, focusing on the Athens Charter, and try to construct a critique of these theses in the light of the economic processes started with the industrial revolution – and of their political consequences.

(Maria S Giudici)

Congrès Internationaux d’Architecture moderne (CIAM), La Charte d’Athenes (Paris: 1933)
Le Corbusier, Towards an Architecture (London: Frances Lincoln, 2008), pp.149-198

Projects:
Ville Radieuse, Le Corbusier (1922-35)
Vertical City, Ludwig Hilberseimer (1924)
Plan Voisin, Le Corbusier (1925)

Secondary readings:

Recommended:

3. Urban Design: The Emergence of a New Discipline

Reacting to the bankruptcy of the Modern Movement’s urban planning doctrine charged with the decline of cities, the concept of urban design in its modern usage as a concern with the processes involved in physically shaping cities and towns emerged in the late 1950s. Initiated by writers and designers such as Kevin Lynch, Jane Jacobs, and Christopher Alexander, it propagated practical architectural solutions with the aim to influence urban renewal through the design of public spaces and changes in policy. Within the new discipline, two opposite interests arise, on the one hand community driven and political activism, on the other an attempt to find procedures to understand and design the city. [Sam Jacoby]

Secondary Reading and Project:

Recommended:

4. **The City as a Landscape**

Since Laugier urged architects to ‘read the city as a forest, modernity has hailed the idea of environment as both management model and solution to the pressure of metropolitan life. This seminar will reread paradigmatic cases in which the rhetoric of nature has informed modern citymaking – as well as their hidden social agendas. The Natural City is post-ideological; yet, if politics is what defines humankind, the post-political subject is nothing but an animal – the subject of biopolitics as the ultimate act of *oikonomia*. [Maria S Giudici]


Projects:
*Park of the Royal Residence of Potsdam* (Berlin, 1816), Peter Joseph Lenné and K.F. Schinkel
*Kollektivplan – Stadtlandschaft Berlin*, Hans Scharoun and Associates (1946)
*Hansaviertel Berlin* (1955)

Secondary Readings:
*Ferme Radieuse et Village Radieux*, Le Corbusier(1934)
*Plan for St. Dié*, Le Corbusier (1944)

Recommended:
Jackson, John Brinckerhoff, *Discovering the Vernacular Landscape* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986)

5. **The City as Project**

The ‘Superarchitecture’ by Archizoom and Superstudio, is a critique of the Modern Movement and formulates a different kind of modernity. Their polemic against ‘total architecture’ and megastructures, large, flexible and ever-expanding structure, was anticipated by, yet did not share the excitement of Archigram and the utopian belief in realisation that inspired Yona Friedman’s Spatial City and even Constant Nieuwenhuys’ New Babylon. Architecture became dedicated to the conceptual production of space and cultural criticism. [Sam Jacoby]

1976], pp.13-69
Schaik, Martin van, Exit Utopia: Architectural Provocations, 1956-76 [Munich: Prestel, 2005], pp. 76-87, 125-45, and 156-90

Projects:
Le Corbusier, Plan Obus, Algiers, 1932
Tange, Kenzo, Tokyo Bay Project, 1960
Le Corbusier, Venice Hospital, 1965
Constant, Nieuwenhuys, New Babylon, 1956-74
Friedman, Yona, Mobile City and Paris Spatial City, 1960
Peter Cook/Archigram, Plug-in-City, 1962-66
Archizoom, No-Stop City, 1969
Superstudio, Continuous Monuments, 1969
Metropolis (Rem Koolhaas, Elia Zenghelis, Madelon Vriesendorp, and Zoe Zenghelis), Exodus, or the Voluntary Prisoners of Architecture, 1972

Secondary Reading:
Frampton, Kenneth, Megaform as Urban Landscaps [Michigan: University of Michigan, 1999]
Ungers, O.M., Grossformen im Wohnungsbau [Veröffentlichungen zur Architektur Nr 5, 1966; Reprint, Universitätsverlag der TU Berlin, 2007]

Recommended:
Branzi, Andrea, No-Stop City: Archizoom Associati [Orleans: HYX, 2006], pp. 176-82
Brayer, Marie-Ange, et al., Experiments: Radical Architecture, Art and the City [London: Thames & Hudson, 2005]
Cook, Peter, Archigram [Praeger, 1973]
Lang, Peter, Superstudio: Life without Objects [Milan: Skira, 2003], 119-47
Ley, Sabrina, and Markus Richter, eds., Megastructure Reloaded [Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2008]
Smithson, Alison, ed., Team 10 Primer [Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1974]

6. Architecture, the City and its Scale
This seminar explores the idea of scale as a problematic rather than as a ratio or measure. Drawing on the concept of individuation from Gilbert Simondon it proposes that the constitution of a problem, its epistemic model and subsequent mobilization is fundamental to understanding the process of scalar individuation. Moreover the idea of scale as problem allows elements typically separated by convention to be brought into a new relation. It argues against the idea of unity put forward by proponents and critics of modernism by demonstrating the way different
and often-paradoxical forms of scalar rationality can co-exist within a project. It does so by exploring an urban project by Oscar Niemeyer in the Lebanese city of Tripoli, suggesting that the apparent unity of the project conceals a multiplicity of historical genealogies and their attendant forms of spatial rationality. (Adrian Lahoud)

Lahoud, Adrian Architecture, the City and its Scale Journal of Architecture [Routledge: London 2013]
Koetter, Fred & Rowe, Colin, Collage City [Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1978]

Secondary reading:
Underwood, D. K., Oscar Niemeyer and Brazilian free-form modernism [New York, George Brazillier,1994]

7. The City and History
In architecture and planning, the notion of historical continuity had already been rejected by pre-war Modernism; however, it is in the aftermath of WWII that in political thinking the idea of a possible ‘end of history’ becomes all the more relevant. The seminar will discuss the use of history in urban discourse between 1950 and 1980 – from a first phase in which the Soviet countries propose a ‘Historical’ city in contradiction with the western ‘Natural’ city, to the moment in which Europe and the US, following a growing discontent with the outputs of functionalism, looks again to history as a critical tool to reframe the social relevance of architecture in the process of constructing the urban environment. (Maria S Giudici)

Rowe, Colin, and Koetter, Fred, Collage City [Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1978]

Projects:
Roma Interrotta (1979)
Stalinallee, Berlin, Hermann Henselmann et al. (1947-1955)
Gallaratese complex, Milan, Aldo Rossi, Carlo Aymonino (1967-1972)

Secondary reading:

Recommended:
Die 16 Grundsätze des Städtebaus [1950]
8. The Metropolis and Contemporary Culture

Rem Koolhaas fascination with the metropolitan condition and contemporary culture developed from Exodus in 1972 into a theory of the archipelago with its ‘city within the city’ concept, owing to OM Ungers. These speculations were expressed in Delirious New York (1978) as the ‘Culture of Congestion’ that characterises Manhattanism. Through the practice of OMA, these ideas eventually evolved into a related theoretical framework of ‘Bigness’, as propounded in S, M, L, XL, which paradoxically claimed on the one hand ‘that there is no more architecture’ and on the other that ‘we are left with a world without urbanism, only architecture, ever more architecture’. [Sam Jacoby]


Projects:
Koolhaas, Rem, The City of the Captive Globe, 1972
Ungers, Oswald Matthias, Berlin: A Green Archipelago, 1977
Koolhaas, Rem, Parc de la Villette, Paris, 1982
OMA, Agadir Convention Centre, Morocco, 1990
OMA, Jussieu Library, Paris, 1992
OMA, Seattle Library, 2004

Secondary Reading:
Starrett & van Vleck, Downtown Athletic Club, New York City, 1931

Recommended:
Koolhaas, Rem, Sze Tsung Leong and Chuihua Judy Chung, eds., Great Leap Forward: Harvard Design School Project on the City I [Taschen, 2001]
Ungers, Oswald Matthias, Rem Koolhaas, Peter Riemann, Hans Kollhof, Peter Ovaska, ‘Cities within the City, Proposal by the Sommerakademie Berlin’, in Lotus International, n.19,
9. From Landscape Urbanism to Ecological Urbanism

In the 2000s, faced with the shrinking of western cities on the one hand, and the explosion of the Asian metropolis on the other, architects and theorists started to shift the focus of their inquiry from the city as a form, to the city as a system. In this context, the idea of landscape lent itself as the perfect lens through which to address a shifting condition of urbanity that did not resemble any traditional precedent. However, while landscape urbanism did introduce an interesting take on process over result, on relational thinking rather than representation, it somehow avoided any social and political discussion of the territories it explored. Ten years after its emergence, it is perhaps the time to assess critically the contribution of landscape urbanism to the discourse, its evolution, and its discontents. (Maria S Giudici)


Secondary Reading:
Stan Allen, Marc Mc Quade, Landform Building: Architecture’s New Terrain [Lars Muller, 2011].

10. Open Discussion

Concluding session to discuss questions raised by the seminar course. Student presentations of their essay outline.

B. Course Specification

Tutors: Sam Jacoby, Maria Giudici, and Adrian Lahoud
Delivery: Lectures and student presentations
Submissions: Essay of maximum 4,000 words
Credits: 16

Aims and Learning Outcomes:

To provide students with a survey of theories that conceptualise the city, in particular the contemporary city, through its architecture and architectural projects. The seminar discusses theories of the city in relationship to critical architectural practice.

On completion of the seminar course students are expected to:
A3 have a conceptual understanding enabling them to evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline;
A4 have a conceptual understanding enabling them to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them; and
B4 communicate effectively, with colleagues and a wider audience, in a variety of media.

Assessment Criteria:
The essay assessment is based on the following:

- A critical knowledge and understanding of the principles and concepts introduced in the
seminars.

- The rigour and originality in developing arguments and providing supportive evidence.
- The ability to demonstrate clear methodology and structure in the planning and execution of a research inquiry.
- The ability to clearly and persuasively present and debate arguments.
- The ability to reference sources of information using agreed conventions.
8.6 ACADEMIC WRITING 2

Complementary to Seminar 2, the academic writing course is scheduled once a week during the term. On days when no seminars or group sessions take place, individual tutorials are available to discuss any writing in progress (also available to Year 2 students).

A. Session Descriptions

Week 1: Bibliographic and Graphic References
This seminar outlines good academic practice for assembling large collections of bibliographic and graphic references.

Week 3: Comparative Analysis
This seminar examines how to draw on different and multiple references in order to structure and formulate a comparative analysis.

Week 6: Submission (Marked)
Edited literature review of critical texts from Seminar 2 (4,000 words maximum) is to be submitted in Week 6 and will be formally assessed and marked.

The structure and writing of the literature review will be work-shopped in individual and group sessions throughout the term (prior and post submission).

Week 9: Introduction to the Thesis
This seminar examines the notion of an academic thesis and begins to discuss how to approach a longer form of academic writing and time managing the production of a thesis.

B. Course Specification

Tutor: Mark Campbell
Submission: Literature review of source texts from Seminar 2 (maximum 4,000 words).
Credits: 4

Aims and Learning Outcomes:
To familiarise students with the writing of literature reviews, to assess current knowledge and to position one’s own writing.

On completion of this workshop students are expected to:
A2 have a comprehensive understanding and ability to use a range of techniques and research methods applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship.

Assessment Criteria:
• Intelligence, structure, and clarity of the literature review.
• Ability to synthesise arguments between several texts.
• Compliance with academic referencing standards.
8.7 THESIS-STUDIO: Spatial and Social Diagrams of the City

The Thesis-Studio is a combined design studio and seminar course in which students develop their Dissertation Proposal and start the Dissertation. The premise of the programme and the Thesis-Studio is that critical and speculative projects on the city, whether practice and/or theory oriented, manifest an underlying ‘idea of the city’ that can be understood through typological and social diagrams.

Some of these ideas and different historical, theoretical, and epistemological perspectives of the city will be discussed in seminars through critical projects of the recent past: exemplary proposals, representations, theories, and reflections of and on the city. The seminar examines how diverse readings of the city promulgate specific ideas and define aspects of the city that are formative and fundamental. Most of these readings share a medium specificity and have a clear methodological approach through which a critical urban thesis is related to its processes of conceptualisation and representation. Often speculative—un-built or unbuildable—many critical urban projects have remained in the realm of projection but with an enduring effect on our (disciplinary) understanding and knowledge of the city. The ideas of the city in that sense are diagrammatic and open-ended in their possibilities but consistent in their construction.

A. Studio Structure

1. Object of Research [4 Weeks]

In the Thesis-Studio students will finalise their research interest and confirm a theoretical and physical context in which this is situated. They develop their initial research enquiry outlined in Term 1 and 2 into a proposal for the Dissertation. Students are asked to formulate a research problem with relevance to a larger disciplinary discourse, and research questions that are typologically specific and examine a distinct urban problem. A clear relation but also distinction needs to be established between the typological and urban research questions. The research questions defining the typological and urban problems must be further located within the discourse of the Architecture of Education and Knowledge.

The educational and knowledge type[s] and the city and urban plan examined in Term 1 and 2 constitute the specific site and context for the Dissertation Proposal and later the Dissertation. Both types and sites should not be simply defined as physical and material contexts but also be considered geographically, socio-politically, culturally, economically, and ecologically. This will define the limits of the research investigation.

The main challenge of the Dissertation Proposal is to formulate a coherent research thesis and enquiry that structures the intellectual and disciplinary research project: the research problem, but also creates a rigorous framework for design and research speculations at an architectural and urban scale, the research questions. This requires a problem definition, methodological clarity and coherence, the demarcation of a site and context (physical, historical, theoretical, and speculative), and the writing of a preliminary design and research brief. It further has to formulate speculative and operative idea[s] of the city through written and visual manifestoes that outline the object of research. The Dissertation Proposal will be judged on the ability to:

1. Posit a clear and rigorous research problem that is original and contributes new disciplinary knowledge.
2. Define a specific typological design-research question that is both analytical and projective, while having relevance to the condition of the contemporary city.
3. Articulate an urban design-research question that is complementary to but also distinct from the typological question and challenges the scale of architecture.
The Dissertation Proposal should demonstrate that the proposed enquiry is within the student’s grasp, capabilities, and time schedule. In addition, students are expected to clarify how their research project relates and makes use of theoretical and design research by stating how they intend to synthesise their designed and written research in the Dissertation. Equal weighting is given to designed and written research in the Thesis-Studio.

A good Dissertation Proposal has to be original, have a potential for impact, and be feasible.

Originality: Proposes an original, innovative, and challenging idea based on critical and independent and/or new or experimental approaches to research.

Impact: Makes a meaningful contribution to the discourse and/or to the field by expanding knowledge and defining new and future enquiries.

Feasibility: Is clearly defined with realistic goals achievable within the programme.

2. Idea of the City: Design Proposal (6 weeks)
To clarify the object of research of the Dissertation Proposal and start the Dissertation, a number of questions and problems should be explored through writing and drawings:

- The relation of architecture’s disciplinary knowledge to the city and its discourse. (What is the relevance of types and their transformation to the contemporary city? Clarification of the research problem.)
- Diagramming of typological transformations (Matrices that contextualise incremental or abrupt variation and transformation of types deriving from speculations on their deep structures. What structural and organisational elements of type are transformed?)
- Concluding typological transformation diagrams (Derived from the matrices of typal transformation. What are the criteria and objectives of transformation and speculation? Clarification of the typological research question.)
- The urban plan (Programmatic and organisational analysis, but also socio-cultural, political, economic, ecologic etc studies of the city and its plans.)
- Concluding urban organisational and programmatic change diagrams (How does the urban scale differs from and provides resistance to the typological approach? What are the urban conflicts and transformations in relation to those of architecture? Clarification of the urban research question.)

The above is as much an analysis of, as it is a speculation on, the formation of the city and its organisation, diagrams, and representations by providing the grounds to hypothesise new relations between a fundamental type, its formative diagrams, and an urban plan. These idea(s) of the city are therefore a means to clarify the object of research through drawings and graphical manifestoes. They are further the basis to write a preliminary design brief, which is an essential part of the dissertation framework.

Design briefs typically include: descriptions of the project background and context, a problem description with definition of constraints and needs, including guidelines on approach and methodology and planning criteria, and a statement of the project or research objectives with a list of deliverables and time schedules.

Based on the design brief, a first design proposal should be developed that elaborates the object of research through a series of design speculations. This explores another means to clarify the research problem and research questions.
B. Workshops

Skills workshops introduce computational knowledge and studio workshops are intense full day sessions that are production focussed.

**Week 1 Skills Workshop: Analysis of Environmental Factors and Structure**  
Tools for evaluating design in relation to environmental factors (solar exposure, shading, sky view factor etc.) and structural performance.

**Week 2 Skills Workshop: Analysis of Spatial Criteria**  
Tools for evaluating design in relation to spatial criteria (ground coverage, percentage of public space, density, etc.).

**Week 3 Skills Workshop: Rendering I**  
Introduction to rendering in Rhino.

**Week 4 Skills Workshop: Rendering II**  
Developing concept illustrations in relation to the design project.

**Week 5 Skills Workshop: Rendering III**  
Developing digital collages in Rhino and Photoshop or illustrator.

**Week 6 Skills and Studio Workshop: Design Conclusions**  
The workshop outcome is to produce diagrams of typological transformations and to translate these into a parametric matrix of formal transformations that can be scripted with Python and Grasshopper.

**Week 7 Skills Workshop: Rendering IV**  
Production of visual manifesto.

**Week 8 Skills Workshop: Tutorials**  
Individual computational support to student projects.

C. Seminar Descriptions

The seminar course is an integral part of the Thesis-Studio and explores ideas of the city from a historical, theoretical, and epistemological perspective, but also through the representations available to and defined by different media. The seminar studies how diverse (ideological, technique-based, or representational) readings of the city in exemplary projects, ideas, representations, and writings, produce specific ideas that are either graphic-, design-, and process-oriented, or are expressed through alternative forms of representation (painting, writing, film, etc). However shared by all is a medium specificity or operativity that relates a critical urban thesis to the process of conceptualisation and representation. Largely un-built or unbuildable and remaining in the realm of speculation and projection, these ideas of the city develop instead conceptual diagrams.

1: Research Methodologies  
(Programme staff, discussion of methodological approaches to research.)

2: Utopia and Dystopia  
As Choay argued, More’s concept of utopia has created a literary category that shares with all
writings on urbanism a critical approach to reality and the modelling in space of a future reality. (Sam Jacoby)


Projects:

*Filarete, Storzinda* [c. 1470]

*Bruegel, Pieter the Elder, The Tower of Babel* (1563)

*Paolo Soleri, Mesa City, USA* [1955] and the concept of *arcology* [since 1969]

*Epcot, Walt Disney World Resort, USA* [1982]

Secondary Reading:


Recommended Reading:


3. The Rediscovery of Context

After the Second World War, a new generation of architects raised with the principles of Modernism started to question the utopian tendency of the first CIAMs. These architects put forward an interest in the city ‘as it is’ rather than as it ‘ought to be’ and substituted the focus on standards and statistics of the previous generation with a more socially oriented kind of analysis. The rediscovery of context did not only bring forward a different approach to planning and design, but also, and perhaps especially, the development of new methods of representation and research that sought to chart out the human experience rather than an abstract point of view. The seminar will discuss some key projects and texts to underline its ground-breaking value and interesting consequences, as well as its problematic acceptance of political and economic existing conditions. (Maria Giudici)


Secondary readings:

Jackson, John Brinckerhoff. “Other-directed Houses”. In *Landscapes: Selected Writings of J. B. Jackson* [Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1970], 58. Originally published in
4: The Image of the City

The painterly perspectiva artificialis with its origins in the Renaissance paintings of the ideal city provides a specific visual form of signification that, according to Damisch, functions equivalent to the Western tradition of language. Evans similarly argues that geometry is the disciplinary instrument of architecture to translate between drawing, imagination, thinking, and building. Drawing, perspective, and representation are thus central to inventing an idea of the city and form its epistemological basis. (Sam Jacoby)

Panofsky, Erwin, Perspective as Symbolic Form, trans. by Christopher Wood (New York: Zone Books, 1991)

Projects:
The Ideal City, Urbino Panel by Piero della Francesca (c. 1470), Baltimore Panel by Fra Carnevale (c. 1480-84), and Berlin Panel by Francesco di Giorgio Martini (c. 1495)
Sebastiano Serlio, Comic, Tragic, and Satyric Scene, in Il secondo libro dell’architettura (1545)
Gambattista Nolli, The Nolli Plan of Rome (1748)
Umberto Boccioni, The City Rises, 1910
Antonio Sant’Elia, La Città Nuova (The New City) (1912–1914)

Secondary Reading and Projects:

Recommended Reading:
Damisch, Hubert, The Origin of Perspective (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995)
5. A Tour of the Monuments of the Postindustrial City

The postwar urban landscape has been interpreted and rediscussed in a radical way by artists whose work challenges the perceived boundaries between visual and verbal, sculpture and theatre, objet trouvé and work of art. The session will investigate the work of a generation of American artists whose practice moved between the writing of texts and the production of images and installations. These works chronicle the uncontrolled growth of the late-XX century city not only from a spatial point of view, but also and more importantly from the point of view of new subjectivity born precisely on the ruins of the traditional city. Parking lots, construction sites, commercial strips become the prime material of an art that offers a disenchanted and critical eye on an urban condition that might not be city anymore, but still offers an experiential potential. [Maria S Giudici]


Secondary reading:
Smithson, Robert. “A Tour of the Monuments of Passaic, New Jersey”. In Artforum 6, no. 4 (December 1967): 48-51

Recommended readings:

6: Writing the City

The conflation of literary speculations and urban representation has produced a rich genre at least since the latter half of the nineteenth century. Hereby the idea of the flâneur, first developed by Baudelaire, arguably created one of the most influential ideas of the modern city that relate writing and urban theories. Two seminal works of Modernist literature written at the...
same time, Joyce’s *Ulysses* (1922) and Benjamin’s never completed magnum opus, the *Passagen-Werk* (1927-40), portray a particular image of the city that reflects on human culture. (Sam Jacoby)

Joyce, James, *Ulysses* (Paris: Sylvia Beach, 1922)

**Project:**
Giovanni Battista Piranesi, *Campo Marzio dell’antica Roma: Ichnographia*, 1762

**Secondary Reading:**

**Recommended Reading:**
Joyce, James, *Finnegans Wake* (London: Faber and Faber, 1939)

**7. Icon, Sign, Index, Symbol – and the City**
Since the late 1960s the communicative value of architecture – an aspect that had been somewhat disregarded by decades of functionalism – started to become again a debated topic, especially in its relationship to an urban context, which seemed more and more ‘unreadable’ for the average citizen. Notions such as sign, symbol, and icon became part of the way we describe the interaction of buildings with the city tissue. The seminar will discuss these notions, their emergence and their evolution across the last decades. In the aftermath of the shift in perception caused by the development of digital technology, ‘communication’ might not be any longer just a matter of visual qualities, a fact that prompts the need for a new reading of the symbolic potential of the city and its structure. (Maria S Giudici)

Eisenman, Peter. “Duck Soup”, in *Log* 7 (Winter-Spring 2006): 139-143

**Secondary readings:**

**Recommended readings:**
8. The Liberal Diagram: Governing in Real Time
This case study examines an experiment in territorial management from the 1970s, as the government of Salvador Allende struggled to rally the productivity of the newly nationalized Chilean industries. The resulting network of communication infrastructure stretched across Chile’s entire landscape linking a dispersed series of industries in a cybernetic diagram. The mathematical modeling of the Chilean society and economy proceeded according to the latest scientific notions of self-organization, non-linearity and complex feedback, all of which could be calculated through a series of equations designed to regulate Chilean society and maintain its homeostasis. The experiment is paradigmatic for two reasons: firstly, it proposed a scale of governance both in time and in space that was unprecedented; secondly, the system’s fragility directly related to the unquantifiable political pre-suppositions that were already growing around Allende. This case study will recount both the dramatic individuation of a new territorial ambition in Allende’s Chile and the concerted scientific effort that went into it, seeing in them both a paradigm of urban governance that exists to this day. (Adrian Lahoud)

Lahoud, Adrian The Cybernetic Ethos, unpublished book chapter

9. The City as Political Form
The paradigm of urbanization has emerged as a powerful apparatus to govern, manage, and make productive the inhabited territory; urbanization is inherently post-political, it avoids conflicts, and strives for the construction of a smoothly navigable space. However, architecture historically has always been about the creation of discontinuity, boundaries, limits; architecture is nothing if not political, and does not have the inclusive character of urbanization. While there are certainly positive aspects to urbanization, in the late 20th century the plea for the possibility to create spaces of representation and political negotiation in the city has re-emerged as both an attempt to counteract the rhetoric of the capitalist ‘smooth’ suburban city, and as a reminder of the power of architectural form to create ethical values that go beyond pure instrumentality. [Maria S Giudici]


Projects:
Neue Wache [Berlin 1816], Altes Museum [Berlin 1823-30], Karl Friedrich Schinkel
Locomotiva 2 [Turin, 1962], Meda, Polesello, Rossi
Neue Nationalgalerie [Berlin 1968], Mies van der Rohe
Field of Walls [Rome, 2012], Dogma

Secondary Readings:
Recommended:
(New York: Schocken Books, 2005), 93-200

10. Open Discussion
Concluding session to discuss questions raised by the seminars. Student presentations of their abstracts.

D. Required Contents of Dissertation Proposal

The recommended order and contents that the Dissertation Proposal should follow (this might vary depending on research focus):

1. Working Title

2. Introduction
A polemic [radical or controversial] statement through which the context of your research is established. This should be accompanied by preferably a film clip [alternative an image or series of images] that relate to the statement and describes, reveals, and defines the context of the research problem you set up. The film/image can affirm or contradict the statement.

3. Problem Definition [Object of Research]
Definition of a question/problem that concerns disciplinary knowledge and its specific context.
- This describes the research topic and research problem.
- This defines the [problematic] research ‘context’.
- This provides a historical/theoretical/critical framing of the question/problem raised.
- This sets up a hierarchy of concerns and defines the related terms central to the thesis.
- This relates the defined problem to an urban and architectural problem = a multi-scalar design problem.
- This discusses the interests and problems you have identified from the work done so far and the literature consulted.

4. Research Questions and Aims
Summarises and concludes the problem definition. States a (disciplinary) research problem and a series of research questions (urban and architectural questions). It outlines specific topics and questions that will be investigated. This should further narrow down your area of research defined above. Provide tentative answers by formulating research hypotheses that will be examined in the Dissertation.
- **Disciplinary question**
  Posit a clear and rigorous research problem that is original and contributes to disciplinary knowledge.
- **Urban question**
  Articulate an urban design-research question that is complementary to but also distinct from the typological question and challenges the scale of architecture.
- **Architectural question**
  Define a specific typological design-research question that is both analytical and projective, while having relevance to the context of the contemporary city.
5. Methodology
This section states what kind of research method do you propose in order to best examine your research hypotheses and why.
- This can make reference to the methodologies and methods given by the programme
- This states your own methodological framing (historical, theoretical, empirical…). What kind of method do you propose in order to best examine your research hypotheses and why?
- This clarifies the status of the project /design.
- This outlines expected outcomes and how they relate to existing approaches in practice and theory.
- This states how you intend to communicate the outcomes and the dissertation format.
- This also states how your research is an original contribution to current knowledge.

6. Design
First, a design brief needs to be formulated that includes a discussion of its engagement with the research questions above. Second, this is developed in preliminary design proposals that consider the design problem at various scales.
- This should start with a ‘manifesto’ (image, text, film etc). This might be a counter to the first image/film of the overall proposal introduction.
- This rehearses the studies and conclusions on typologies, typological transformations, and overview of the context and specific details of the existing urban plan
- Detailed design brief that includes: areas, programmes, context description etc, as well as an urban and architectural argument.
- This includes the diagrammatic development of first proposals.
- This includes at least one model.

7. Literature Review
Review of existing literature and projects related to the research. A literature review can start with the summary of the main arguments found in the source. But essentially it uses these sources as evidence for your arguments and research framing. Therefore, while this section might focus on the discussion of literature by topics and their relations to each other, references to these sources as evidence must be provided throughout all previous sections of the proposal.
- Summarise literature and projects you have already consulted and intent to use. Order chronologically, thematically, or methodologically. Then evaluate and synthesise their differences and relevance to your proposal.
- Identify open questions and gaps in existing research and indicate how your research addresses them.
- Use sources as evidence to your arguments.

8. Preliminary Conclusions
How does the research carried out so far in the Dissertation Proposal clarify or raise new questions/problems for the Dissertation?

9. Bibliography
Divided into primary and secondary literature and projects that have been or will be studied.

Appendices

1. Thesis Structure
Summary of proposed chapters.
2. Research Plan
Timetable of the research and plan of work.
- External consultants if required.

E. Course Specification

Tutors: Sam Jacoby, Adrian Lahoud, Maria Giudici, and workshop consultant

Delivery: Lectures and student presentations for seminars

Submissions: Dissertation Proposal consisting of integrated:
  - Essay of maximum 4,000 words defining object of research
  - Outline design proposal defining object of research
  - Research dossier (illustrations, drawings, and writing)

Credits: 20

Aims and Learning Outcomes:
Familiarisation with the idea of the City and the relationships of spatial and social diagrams. Developing of a clear research inquiry and definition of the theoretical or physical context. Formulation of a Dissertation Proposal.

On completion of this Thesis-Studio students are expected to:
A1 have a systematic and in-depth knowledge and understanding of the disciplines of architecture and urban design informed by current scholarship, research, and practice, including a critical awareness of current issues and developments in the field;
A2 have a comprehensive understanding and ability to use a range of techniques and research methods applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship, including the critical use of the case study method in analysis and design and diagramming techniques;
A3 have a conceptual understanding enabling them to evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline;
A4 have a conceptual understanding enabling them to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses;
A5 demonstrate originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the disciplines of architecture and urban design, in particular through a synthesis of written and design research;
B1 use initiative and take responsibility; act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks;
B2 deal with complex issues and problems systematically, creatively, and independently; make sound judgements in the absence of complete data or information;
B3 have the ability to continue to learn independently and to develop professionally; and pursue further research where appropriate; and
B4 communicate effectively, with colleagues and a wider audience, in a variety of media.

Assessment Criteria:
The Dissertation Proposal assessment is based on the following:

- The depth of understanding disciplinary knowledge and design research questions.
- The rigour and originality in developing design brief and proposals, as well as theoretical arguments and providing supportive evidence.
- The ability to demonstrate clear methodology and structure in the planning and execution of a research inquiry.
• The ability to clearly and appropriately formulate research questions, hypotheses and arguments.
• The ability to synthesise written and design research.
• The ability to clearly and persuasively present and debate arguments.
8.8  ACADEMIC WRITING 3

Complementary to the Thesis-Studio, the writing workshop is scheduled once a week during the term. On days when no seminars or group sessions take place, individual tutorials are available to discuss any writing in progress (also available to Year 2 students).

A. Session Descriptions

Week 1: The Abstract
This seminar examines the role of the Abstract in defining and then formulating and producing the thesis.

Week 2: Writing Practice – Long-Form Writing
This seminar examines the production of a thesis.

Week 3: Thesis Structure
This workshop discusses the initial structural layouts of the individual student theses.

Week 6: Submission 1 (Marked)
A first abstract of the Dissertation Proposal of 600 words maximum is to be submitted in Week 6. Abstract will be work-shopped during the term prior and post submission.

Week 7: Formatting — The Thesis
This seminar examines in detail how the graphic materials and layout can be used to assist the writing of an academic thesis.

Week 8: Revising the Abstract
This workshop discusses the initial formulation of the theses abstracts and their potential revision.

Week 10: Submission 2 (Marked)
A longer abstract of the Dissertation Proposal of 1,200 words maximum is to be presented and submitted in Week 10. Abstract will be work-shopped prior to submission.

B. Course Specifications

Tutor: Mark Campbell
Submissions: 1 abstract of maximum 600 and 1 of maximum 1,200 words
Credits: 4

Aims Learning Outcomes:
To familiarise students with the academic abstract writing for a research thesis.

On completion of this workshop students are expected to:
A2 have a comprehensive understanding and ability to use a range of techniques and research methods applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship,

Assessment Criteria:
• Structure and precision of abstracts.
• Compliance with academic referencing standards.
8.9 DISSERTATION

In order to qualify for an MPhil in Architecture and Urban Design, candidates have to demonstrate proficiency and rigour in research, design methods, and techniques, as well as knowledge of the subject context, literature, and precedents. This is demonstrated in an original Dissertation, the final and most substantial piece of work in the programme that is started at the end of Year 1 and developed throughout Year 2.

While students conduct their independent research under the close guidance of their supervisor(s), they have access to other programme staff and specialist consultants as needed. The supervisor(s) role is to aid developing ideas and encourage critical and independent thinking.

A. The Projective Cities Framework

The research enquiry and object of research of the Dissertation is to be concurrently developed through writing and design. Theory-driven and practice-driven researches are complementary and define different aspects of knowledge production and disciplinary discourses. Hereby both the theoretical and design research should be considered within a general and specific context, and discuss the histories, theories, instruments, and practices underlying the dissertation project. The methodological emphasis on intersections of design theory and practice is reflected in the assessment of the Dissertation as one coherent piece of work. Thus, the Dissertation must include a comprehensive design proposal based on a clearly defined design methodology, and an integrated theoretical proposition based on a clearly defined research method. This requires students to reason and define the overlaps and limits of writing and design in their Dissertation. Part of the dissertation challenge is therefore to clarify how a written dissertation can effectively utilise design methodologies and outcomes, and how a design proposal benefits from and is enriched by written research. Writing should not just become a description of the design work and Dissertations should carefully consider how the final submission is structured and presented.

The Dissertation must demonstrate a clear research problem that is of disciplinary relevance and contributes to knowledge. Based on it, the Dissertation will articulate a specific research agenda dealing with the relationships between architecture and the city. This should be formulated as two research questions and research hypotheses, one that advances a clear urban question and another that posits a related typological question.

B. Research and Design

Throughout the dissertation phase, students work concurrently on their design and research project. Activities during the dissertation Year include the:

- Collection of supporting sources and information;
- review of literature;
- analysis of case studies;
- synthesis of the research agenda;
- study and analysis of site and context;
- study of the theories, practices, and instruments of design and production relevant to the research enquiry;
- design and research development.
The Dissertation is documented, written, and refined throughout the dissertation phase and will be presented during regular supervision tutorials and reviews.

1. Review of Dissertation Proposal (2 Weeks)
The research problem and research questions defined by the Dissertation Proposal should be reviewed at the beginning of the dissertation phase. In preparation of this, students over the summer break between Year 1 and II are asked to produce about 10,000 words based on the proposed research object and content.

The Dissertation Proposal needs to be analysed, interpreted, developed, and synthesised in order to update the design and research brief. This brief defines the dissertation framework and research agenda. Strategic design decisions and research arguments will be made within and judged against this framework. Thus it should clearly restate hypotheses and objectives of the research project.

2. Emphasis Design-Research (14 Weeks)
Once the Dissertation Proposal has been revisited and the dissertation agenda clarified by the design and research brief, the main work on the Dissertation starts.

The Dissertation is to demonstrate an evident process of analysing, interpreting, and generating meaningful types and urban plans. This should be done by studying relevant types, urban plans, and typological transformations or conflicts, and by researching a specific context defined by an idea of the city. Deriving from the design and research brief, the Dissertation is thus to consider questions of typal reasoning, typological design, and architectural urbanism as discussed and prepared for in Year 1:

- The effects and/or conflicts of typal transformation.
- The generative potential of typological differentiation, evolution, and invention.
- The organisational and/or structural levels/elements of architecture.
- The effects and/or conflicts of architecture at different scales. In particular the relation of architecture to the scale and formation of the city.
- The specificity of context and design.
- The idea of the city.

The above needs to be developed into a comprehensive and detailed design proposal and at the beginning of Term 5, a Final Design Review will take place. Students are expected to have completed all their primary design-research at this point.

3. Emphasis Theoretical-Research (14 Weeks)
All Dissertations should address how typal reasoning and typological design contributes to the conceptualisation and realisation of the contemporary city—and ultimately to disciplinary discourses and knowledge. The Dissertation serves as a projective proposition and its speculations should be re-assessed in terms of its potentials and limits at the end of the research project.

Following the Final Design Review, the research so far completed needs to be evaluated, analysed, and developed, including speculations on the possible enactment, regulation, and administration of the proposal/research at the various scales from the building to the city. This is another opportunity to clarify the relations between theoretical or design research.

Design proposals should not be understood as conventional final master plans but as speculative frames that diagrammatically discuss the possibilities of design. Thus, the results of
the primary design-research should be reconsidered as typological guidelines, opening up a
discursive debate on the role of design and urban plans to the discipline and knowledge of
architecture and urbanism. Typological guidelines define a framework of spatial and material
organisation, policy-making, and implementation, rather than a literal design or proposal.

Finally, the research conclusions should reiterate how the research problem and the research
questions at an urban and typological scale have been defined and developed throughout all
research and what their projective outcome and potential are for architecture, urban design,
and planning.

C. Written Content of Dissertation

Although students are asked to rethink conventional formatting, the following contents should
be included (please also refer to contents section for the Dissertation Proposal):

- **Abstract**: Summary of the dissertation aims and key findings (ca. 600 words).
- **Table of contents**: A numbered list of the main headings and subheadings of the paper
  and the page number of the start of each section.
- **Acknowledgements**: Individuals who have helped or provided resources, advice and
  information (including acknowledgment of sponsorships, bursaries or scholarships
  towards your studies at the AA School).
- **Preface**: Polemic statement, images, and context.
- **Introduction**: The issues, problems and questions which led you to the chosen topic with
  reference to the relevant literature and projects; what is the dissertation setting out to do
  and what methodology is used to explore this; identify and characterise problems with
  which you will engage in the dissertation; the research questions and hypotheses;
  summary of conclusions; how is the dissertation structured and how is the contents
  organised and presented.
- **Main body**: Subdivided into chapters as needed.
- **Conclusions**: How can the research be contextualised at different scales and
  generalised? What are the findings in regards to typological and social diagrams? What is
  the original contribution of your designed-and-written Dissertation to the field and
  knowledge of architecture and urban design?
- **Bibliography**: published and unpublished sources consulted including internet sources.
- **Appendices** (if any): Complementary information, illustration or data.

D. Course Specification

Tutors: Dissertation supervisors

Submissions: Dissertation (to include a comprehensive design proposal and integrated
written research of maximum 15,000 words)

Credits: 144

Aims and Learning Outcomes:
The Dissertation is the demonstration of a significant and comprehensive piece of
independent research, including its planning and execution. The Dissertation consists of the
development of a critical theoretical argument and a series of comprehensive design
proposals.

On completion of the Dissertation, students are expected to:
A1 have a systematic and in-depth knowledge and understanding of the disciplines of
architecture and urban design informed by current scholarship, research, and practice,
including a critical awareness of current issues and developments in the field;

A2 have a comprehensive understanding and ability to use a range of techniques and research methods applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship;

A3 have a conceptual understanding enabling them to evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline;

A4 have a conceptual understanding enabling them to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and to propose new hypotheses;

A5 demonstrate originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the disciplines of architecture and urban design, in particular through a synthesis of written and design research;

A6 have the ability to study independently and complete a substantial research that includes written and design research;

B1 use initiative and take responsibility; act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks;

B2 deal with complex issues and problems systematically, creatively, and independently; make sound judgements in the absence of complete data or information;

B3 have the ability to continue to learn independently and to develop professionally; and pursue further research where appropriate; and

B4 communicate effectively, with colleagues and a wider audience, in a variety of media.

Assessment Criteria:
The Dissertation is assessed based on the following:

- The depth of understanding disciplinary knowledge and design research questions.
- The rigour and originality in developing theoretical arguments and providing supportive evidence.
- The rigour and originality in developing design brief and proposals.
- The ability to demonstrate clear methodology and structure in the planning and execution of a research inquiry.
- The ability to clearly and appropriately formulate research questions, hypotheses, arguments, and conclusions.
- The ability to synthesise written and design research.
- The ability to clearly and persuasively present and debate arguments.
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The current versions of the AA Student Handbook and AA School Academic Regulations provide general information on all aspects of the AA School’s organisation, resources and facilities, as well as academic and administrative policies. All students automatically become members of the Architectural Association (Inc.) and enjoy the privileges that come with the membership. Students are also part of the AA School, an independent school of architecture governed by the Architectural Association.

9.1 Reference Material and Libraries

All printed items on the programme’s reading lists will be available in the AA Library or will be made available by the programme (digitally or as hardcopy). In addition, London has a wealth of specialised libraries that include:

- **British Library**
  www.bl.uk/

- **RIBA British Architectural Library and Drawing Collection**
  www.architecture.com/RIBA/Visitus/Library/TheRIBALibrary.aspx

- **University College London, Bartlett Library**
  www.bartlett.ucl.ac.uk/architecture/about-us/facilities/library

- **University of London, Library**
  www.london.ac.uk/libraries

- **Westminster Reference Library**
  www.westminster.gov.uk/westminster-reference-library

- **Open University Library**
  www.open.ac.uk/library

All students may in addition request material not held in the AA Library through the Inter-Library Loan scheme that sources books from the British Library and other UK Higher Education libraries, or where necessary from across the world.

9.2 AA School Resources

The main facilities available to all students, such as the Archives, Audiovisual Lab, Bookshop, Computer Room, Digital Prototyping Workshop, Digital Photography Studio, Drawing Material Shop, Exhibitions, Hooke Park, Library, Model-making Workshop, Photo Library, Restaurant and Bar, and Wood and Metal Workshops, will be introduced at the beginning of the academic year to new students if needed.

Computing

Students are expected to at least own a laptop. Each student has access to a full suite of design software and the school’s intranet, internet, and other resources. Software introduced in the programme is available on the computers in the Computer Room and students are required to observe software licensing at all times. Computers, printers, and scanners are accessible in the school’s Computer Room and AA Library. **Back up your work regularly and keep a copy safe!**

Model Making & Prototyping

The AA School has its own Workshop, Model Workshop, and Digital Prototyping Workshop in which most types of models can be produced. Modelling materials can be either purchased through them or at the AA Materials Shop. The School also has a Digital Photo Studio for
photographing models and drawings.

Outside useful sources are:
- Paperchase [www.paperchase.co.uk/]
  For cards, papers, etc
- London Graphics Centre [http://www.londongraphics.co.uk/]
  For all graphics supplies
- 4D Modelshop [http://www.modelshop.co.uk/]
  For model materials
- Cavendish Imaging [www.cavendishimaging.com/]
  For rapid prototyping
- Lee 3D [www.lee3d.co.uk/]
  For colour 3D printing.
- i.materialise [http://i.materialise.com]
  For 3D printing.
- 2MZ [http://2mz.co.uk/]
  For laser cutting
- Online Reprographics [www.onlinerepro.co.uk]
  For high-quality printing

**Studio Space**
All students have their individual workspace within the programme’s studios. They are generally open during term time from around 10am until 10pm on weekdays and from 10am till 5pm on Saturdays.

**Communication**
Students on the programme are required to confirm their contact details at the beginning of the course and to check their emails on a daily basis for updates on weekly events, tutorials, and reviews.

All AA students are eligible to open an AA email account, the use of which is subject to AA’s Internet and Email Usage Policy. The AA School provides wireless internet access within its premises.

**Pastoral Care**
All students experiencing difficulties personally or with their studies should initially consult with and notify their Programme Director. Following this initial meeting the student should then contact and arrange to meet with the AA Registrar.

In addition, meetings can be arranged with the Head of the Graduate Management Committee, if the matter is related to academic or study activities. Students are encouraged to inform programme staff immediately of any issues or concerns that arise at any time throughout the year.

The AA School has access to psychological counselling services and appointments can be arranged during term times through the office of the AA Registrar. All information given is treated in the strictest confidence. Information given to the counsellor is not reported to the School unless the student is deemed to be a danger to him/her-self or to others. The AA School may, in some circumstances, refer students for treatment at the recommendation of a tutor or other School or Association employee. These references are also handled in the strictest confidence and information given to the counsellor is not reported to the School.
9.3 Admissions, Fees, and Bursaries

Application to the Projective Cities programme is open to candidates with a four or five-year degree in architecture (BArch, Diploma or equivalent degree). As part of the entry requirement to the programme, students have to give evidence of their final project(s) and paper(s) that were completed in fulfilment of their previous degree.9

All applicants are required to complete an application form, which is available online (www.aaschool.ac.uk). The application needs to be accompanied by the appropriate registration fee and original evidence of qualifications and the standard attained (copies will not be accepted). Academic and/or work references should also be provided. All documentation must be provided in English.

Applicants must submit a portfolio consisting of around 20-40 pages (no larger than A3 format) that provide evidence of their previous learning and details their previous degree work. The portfolio should demonstrate their range of abilities and emphasise the design process and considerations that have informed the work, e.g. sketches, development drawings/models, research, etc. In addition, sample(s) of writing (preferably academic) should be included with the application.

To meet both the AA and the Home Office/UKVI English language requirements applicants will need to have one of the acceptable language qualifications listed below, unless they are from one of the following groups:

- They are a national of a majority English-speaking country as defined per the list on the UKVI website;
- They have successfully completed an academic qualification of at least three years' duration, equivalent to a UK bachelor’s degree or above, which was taught in a majority English-speaking country as defined by the UKVI (Tier 4 Policy Guidance version 06/11/2014 paragraph 129); or
- They successfully completed a course in the UK as a Tier 4 [Child] student visa holder. The course must have lasted for at least six months, and must have ended no more than two years prior to the visa application.

If a place is given conditional on providing an English language qualification the following qualifications satisfy both the requirements of the Home Office/UKVI and the entry requirements of the AA:

- Trinity College London (Integrated Skills in English)
  - AA requirement – C1 (ISEIII) or C2 (ISEIV)
- IELTS Academic (IELTS SELT Consortium – Cambridge English Language Assessment)
  - AA Requirement – 6.5 overall with a 6.0 in each band

Applicants are required to meet the scores in each category and overall.

The AA reserves the right to make a place in the school conditional on gaining a further English language qualification if deemed necessary.

Additional information on the school, its programmes, and facilities is published in the AA Prospectus. A copy of the prospectus, together with an application form, is available on request.

9 Compare section 7 Prior Learning.
from:

Graduate School Admissions Coordinator
Architectural Association School of Architecture
36 Bedford Square
London WC1B 3ES
United Kingdom

T: +44 (0)20 7887 4067
Email: graduateadmissions@aaschool.ac.uk

Information on the Projective Cities programme and updates, including application deadline updates, will be published on the programme’s microsite: http://projectivecities.aaschool.ac.uk

Notification of Continuing Studies
Students should confirm with the Graduate School Coordinator’s Office their continuation of studies no later than 1st August prior to the new academic year.

Withdrawal from Studies
Students who are considering withdrawing from the course should immediately notify their course director, the Registrar and the Chairman of the GMC. Only in exceptional circumstances, re-registering for the course will be considered. Students who make the decision to withdraw from a year of study for person or other reasons at any time after the academic year commenced are liable to pay fees to the end of the corresponding term, if the notification is provided before the half-term notice threshold, or the end of the following term, if the notification is given after the half-term notice threshold.

Fees
Tuition fee for the intake starting in the 2015/16 is £35,615 for both years, payable pro rata per term or year. Fees are thereafter subject to review annually.

Bursaries
AA Bursaries are offered to new AA Graduate School students for an academic year. Students must apply by the January application deadline for admission to the School, in order to be considered for an AA Bursary. Students must indicate on the application form that they wish to be considered for the AA Bursary. Upon an official offer of a place in the AA Graduate School, a completed AA Bursary Form must be returned to the Registrar’s Office by the March deadline. The AA Graduate Bursary Committee meets in late March / early April to distribute the awards, and bases its decision on a combination of merit, financial need, and recommendation from the AA Graduate School Programme Director/s.

Projective Cities’ students are also eligible to apply for an AA Bursary for their second year of study. Information is advertised in March of each year via the Events List, AA website and posters.

An AA Bursary award covers a portion of a student’s fees for up to one term of the academic year’s tuition fees. Please note that bursaries are awarded on the understanding that students are not in receipt of an additional award that is more than the value of one term’s fees.
10  PROGRAMME STAFF AND EXTERNAL EXAMINER

PROGRAMME STAFF

Dr Sam Jacoby
Programme Director

Sam is a chartered architect with an AA Diploma and a doctorate from the Technische Universität Berlin, Institute of Architectural Theory. His research interest is in the histories, practices, and theories of the city and its architecture, especially in relation to questions of design research.

He has worked for various architectural and planning offices in the UK, USA, and Malaysia, and trained as a cabinet-maker in Germany. At the AA he taught in Intermediate School, was a unit master in Diploma School, lecturer for History & Theories Studies, director of the Spring Semester Programme, and director of the AA Visiting School at the OM Ungers Archive. Sam further taught at the University of Nottingham and the Bartlett School of Architecture, University College London.


Dr Adrian Lahoud
Studio Master

Adrian is an architect, researcher and educator. Before his current role as Head of Architecture at the Royal College of Art London he taught at The Bartlett School of Architecture UCL where he was Director of the Urban Design masters. Prior to this, he was part of the Centre for Research Architecture, Goldsmiths as a Director of the MA programme and a researcher on the Forensic Architecture, ERC project.

He received his PhD from the University of Technology Sydney where he taught for a number of years while running an award winning architectural practice. His dissertation titled ‘The City, the Territory, the Planetary’ explores the way architecture structures problems through the concept of scale. He has written extensively on questions of climate change, spatial politics and urban conflict with a focus on the Arab world and Africa.

Dr Maria Shéhérazade Giudici

Studio Master

Maria earned her PhD from Delft University in 2014; her thesis *The Street as a Project: The Space of the City and the Construction of the Modern Subject* is a critique of the contemporary idea of public space and an attempt to rethink the ‘void between the buildings’ as the object of political and architectural intentions. Maria also earned an MA in Architecture from the Mendrisio Academy, Switzerland, with an award-winning project for Venice developed in Elia Zenghelis’ unit. She has worked between 2005 and 2007 in Bucharest-based office BAU and collaborated with De Architekten Cie Amsterdam in 2008, DONIS Rotterdam in 2010, and Dogma in 2011, specializing in large-scale urban developments and mass housing projects. As well as teaching core design studios at the Berlage Institute and BIArch Barcelona, Maria has been a Diploma Unit master at the Architectural Association since 2011, and a First Year studio master since 2012.

Education

2014 PhD, TU Delft
2009 Postgraduate Master in Urbanism, Berlage Institute, Rotterdam
2006 MA in Architecture, Accademia di Architettura, Mendrisio, Switzerland
2005 Nanjing Graduate School of Architecture, China - W.I.S.H. research on social housing
2002-2006 Accademia di Architettura, Mendrisio

Academic Work

2012–present: Studio Master, Projective Cities MPhil Program, AA, London
2012–present: Unit Master, First Year, AA, London
2011–present: Unit Master, Diploma Unit 14, AA, London [with P. V. Aureli]
2013: Co-director, AA Visiting School Ivrea, *Factory Futures*
2012: Tutor, Core design studio *Labour, City, Form*, BIArch Barcelona [with P. V. Aureli]
2010–11: Tutor, Berlage Institute [with P. V. Aureli, P. Issaias, E. Zenghelis ]
2010: Lecturer, History and Theory course, BIArch Barcelona [with P. V. Aureli]
2010: Tutor, Strelka Institute, Moscow [with T. Stellmach]
2009: Research assistant, TU Munich [Unit Master P. P. Tamburelli]
2008: Assistant tutor, Semester in Aleppo, Syria, TU Delft [with P. P. Tamburelli, I. Volaki]

Professional Work

2011–present: Architect at Dogma, Rotterdam
2010: Architect at Donis, Rotterdam
2008: *Saemangeum City Project* developed at de Architekten cie., Amsterdam
2005–08: Junior architect at BAU Arhitectura Urbanism, Bucharest
2001–02: Internship at Lukas Meyer + Ira Piattini Architects, Lugano, Switzerland

Publications and Exhibitions

2013 “Indifference and Absorption of Architectural Form: Notes on Le Corbusier’s La Tourette Monastery”, with Pier Vittorio Aureli, in *San Rocco 7.*
2012 “The Last Great Street of Europe”, in *AA Files* 65.
2012 “From Dom-Ino to Polykatoikia”, with Pier Vittorio Aureli, Platon Issaisas, in *Domus* 962 [October 2012].
2012 “Nederlands Architectuurinstituut”, in M. Biraghi, A. Ferlenga [ed], *Architettura del ’900,*
Dr Mark Campbell

Mark has taught history and design at the AA since 2004. He completed his PhD and MA as a Fulbright Scholar at Princeton University and undergraduate BArch (Hons) and BA at Auckland University. He is a Visiting Professor of Architecture at South-East University, Nanjing, and has also taught at the Cooper Union, Princeton University and Auckland University. He is the founding director of Unreal Estates and has worked in practice in Auckland, New York and London and served as the Managing Editor of Grey Room and the Cooper Union Archive, in addition to publishing extensively. He is the Director of the 'Paradise Lost' AA Research Cluster.


EXTERNAL EXAMINER:

Professor Charles Rice

Charles is an architectural historian, theorist and critic. He received a Bachelor of Design Studies (Honours) from the University of Queensland in 1996, a Master of Research from the London Consortium [Birkbeck, University of London] in 1998, and a PhD from the University of New South Wales in 2003. He was a lecturer in the Architecture Programme at the University of New South Wales from 2000-2005, and was most recently Associate Professor of Architecture at the University of Technology Sydney, where he had taught since 2005. Charles was appointed Professor of Architectural History and Theory and Head of the School of Art and Design History at Kingston University in 2010. He has lectured at universities and cultural institutions internationally, and has taught architectural history and theory at the Architectural Association School of Architecture.

New appointment to be made in 2015
APPENDICES

Appendix 1: PROGRAMME READING LISTS

ESSENTIAL PROJECTIVE CITIES READING

SUGGESTED FURTHER READING
Hertzberger, Herman, *Space and Learning* (Rotterdam: 010 Publisher, 2008)
Hoeger, Kerstin & Christiaanse, Kees, eds, *Campus and the City: Urban Design for the Knowledge Society* (Zurich, GTA Verlag, 2000)
Lee, Christopher, Jacoby, Sam, eds. *Typological Formations: Renewable Building Types and the City* (London: AA Publications, 2007)
Manipour, Ali, *Knowledge Economy and the City: Spaces of Knowledge* (Routledge, 2011)
Ungers, O.M., *Grossformen im Wohnungsbau* (Veröffentlichungen zur Architektur Nr 5, 1966; Reprint, Universitätsverlag der TU Berlin, 2007)
Younés, Samir, *Quatremère De Quincy's Historical Dictionary of Architecture: The True, the Fictive and the Real* (London: Andreas Papadakis Publishers, 2000)

**TYPE AND TYPOLOGY DISCOURSE**

Semper, Gottfried, *Four Elements of Architecture and Other Writings*, trans. by Harry Francis
Mallgrave and Wolfgang Herrmann (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)
Semper, Gottfried, ‘Manuscript 122 [‘Design for a System of a Comparative Theory of Style’], in Gottfried Semper, Harry Francis Mallgrave, and Joseph Rykwert, ‘London Lecture of November 11, 1853’, RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics, 6 [1983], 5-31 (pp. 8-17)
Ungers, Oswald Mathias, ‘Dieci opinioni sul tipo / Ten Opinions on the Type’, Casabella, 509–510 [1985], 93
Vidler, Anthony, ‘The Third Typology’, Oppositions, 7 [1976], 1-4
Younés, Samir, Quatremère De Quincy’s Historical Dictionary of Architecture: The True, the Fictive and the Real (London: Andreas Papadakis Publishers, 2000)

RECOMMENDED READING
Aymonino, Carlo, ‘Type and Typology’, Architectural Design, 55.5/6 (1985), The School of Venice, 49–51
Bandini, Micha, ‘Typology as a Form of Convention’, AA Files, 6 [1984], 73-82
Vidler, Anthony, ‘Quatremere de Quincy: Type’, Oppositions, 8 [1977], Paris under the Academy: City and Ideology, 148–50

FURTHER READING
Lavin, Sylvia, Quatremère de Quincy and the Invention of a Modern Language of Architecture (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992)
Palma, Vittoria Di, ‘Architecture, Environment and Emotion: Quatremère de Quincy and the Concept of Character’, AA Files, 47 [2002], 45-56

DESIGN METHOD, (PRECEDENT) MODELS, AND DIAGRAMS
Allen, Stan, Practice: Architecture, Technique and Representation [Amsterdam: G+B Arts International, 2000]
Cassarà, Silvio, Peter Eisenman: Feints [Milan: Skira, 2006]


Eisenman, Peter, *Ten Canonical Buildings* [New York: Rizzoli, 2008]


Hertzberger, Herman, *Space and Learning* [Rotterdam: 010 Publisher, 2008]

Hoeger, Kerstin & Christiaanse, Kees, eds, *Campus and the City: Urban Design for the Knowledge Society* [Zurich, GTA Verlag, 2000]


Lehnerer, Alex, *Grand Urban Rules* [Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2009]


Vidler, Anthony, ‘What is a Diagram Anyway?’, in *Peter Eisenman: Feints* [Milan: Skira, 2006]

RECOMMENDED READING

Berkel, Ben van, and Caroline Bos, *UN Studio: Design Models: Architecture, Urbanism, Infrastructure* [New York: Rizzoli, 2006]


Eisenman, Peter, *The Formal Basis of Modern Architecture* [Zurich: Lars Müller Publisher, 2006]


Marcus, Alan, and Dietrich Neumann, eds., Visualizing the City (London: Routledge, 2008)
Müller, Thomas, and Romana Schneider, The Classroom: From the Late 19th Century until the Present Day (Berlin: Wasmuth, 2010)
Sarkis, Harshim, ed., Le Corbusier’s Venice Hospital and the Mat Building Revival (Munich: Prestel, 2002)
Teige, Karel, Minimum Dwelling: The Housing Crisis, Housing Reform (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002)

FURTHER READING
Perrault, Claude, Ordonnance for the Five Kinds of Columns after the Method of the Ancients, trans. by Indra Kagis McEwen (Santa Monica: Getty Center for the Art and Humanities, 1993)
Serlio, Sebastiano, Five books of Architecture (London: Dover, 1982)

HISTORIES AND THEORIES OF ARCHITECTURE AND THE CITY
Agamben, Giorgio, ‘Metropolis’ trans. by Arianna Bove (http://www.generation-online.org/p/fpagamben4.htm
Blundell Jones, Peter, Hans Scharoun (London: Phaidon, 1995)
Branzi, Andrea, No-Stop City: Archizoom Associati (Orleans: HYX, 2006)
Carpo, Mario, “The Duck’s Swan Song”, in Log 9 (Winter-Spring 2007): 7-9
Congrès Internationaux d’Architecture moderne [CIAM], La Charte d’Athenes (Paris: 1933)
Dennis, Michael, Court and Garden (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988)
Eisenman, Peter, “Duck Soup”, in Log 7 (Winter-Spring 2006): 139-143
Frampton, Kenneth, Megaform as Urban Landscape (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1999)
Hertweck, Florian and Sébastien Marot, eds, The City in the City - Berlin: A Green Archipelago by Oswald Mathias Ungers et al [Zurich, Lars Müller, 2013]
Howard, Ebenezer, Garden Cities of To-morrow (London: Sonnenschein, 1902)
Jackson, John Brinckerhoff, Discovering the Vernacular Landscape (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986)
Koolhaas, Rem, Delirious New York [010 Publishers, Rotterdam, 1994]
Krier, Leon, Architecture: Choice or Fate [Windsor: Andreas Papadakis Publishers, 1998]
Lahoud, Adrian, ‘Architecture, the City and its Scale’, *Journal of Architecture* [Routledge: London 2013]

Lahoud, Adrian ‘The Cybernetic Ethos’, unpublished book chapter

Lang, Peter, *Superstudio: Life without Objects* [Milan: Skira, 2003]


Lynch, Patrick, *The Image of the City* [The MIT Press, 1960]


Rosenfeld, Myra Nan [edited by], *Serlio on Domestic Architecture* [New York: Dover, 1996]


Smithson, Alison, ed., *Team 10 Primer* [Cambridge, MA: The MIT, 1974]


Ungers, Oswald Mathias, *Architettura come tema / Architecture as Theme* [Milan: Electa, 1982]


Ungers, Oswald Matthias, Rem Koolhaas, Peter Riemann, Hans Kolhoff, Peter Ovaska, ‘Cities within the City, Proposal by the Sommerakademie Berlin’, *Lotus International*, 19 [1977], 82–97


RECOMMENDED READING
Blundell Jones, Peter, Hans Scharoun [London: Phaidon, 1995]
Branzi, Andrea, Weak and Diffused Modernity [Milan: Skirà, 2006]
Congrès Internationaux d’Architecture moderne [CIAM], La Charte d’Athènes [Paris: 1933]
Cook, Peter, Archigram [Praeger, 1973]
Friedman, Yona, Pro Domo [Barcelona: Actar, 2006]
Jackson, John Brinckerhoff, Landscapes: Selected Writings of J. B. Jackson [Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1970]
Jackson, John Brinckerhoff, The Vernacular Landscape [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984]
Jordan, David, 'Haussmann and Haussmannisation: The Legacy for Paris', *French Historical Studies*, 27.1 (2004), 87-113
Kipnis, Jeffrey, 'A Family Affair', in *Greg Lynn FORM*, ed. by Mark Rappolt (New York: Rizzoli, 2008)
Kipnis, Jeffrey, 'P-Tr’s Progress’, *El Croquis*, 83 (1997), Peter Eisenman
Koolhaas, Rem, 'Junk Space' in *October, Vol. 100, Obsolescence*. (Spring, 2002), pp. 175-190
Rowe, Colin, *As I was Saying: Urbanistic V.3: Recollections and Miscellaneous Essays* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999)
Rowe, Colin, with Peter Carl, Judith Di Maio and Steven Peterson, 'Roma Interrota, Noli Sector’, *Architectural Design Profile*, 49.3-4 (1979)
Sant’Elia, Antonio, Manifesto of Futurist Architecture (1914)
Scott Brown, Denise. "Learning from Pop”. In *Casabella* 35, no. 359-60 [December 1971]: 15-23
Scott Brown, Denise. “Pop Off: Reply to Kenneth Frampton”. In *Casabella* 35, no. 359-60 [December, 1971]: 41-46
Sudjic, Deyan, *The 100 Mile City* (London: Flamingo, 1993)

Ungers, Oswald Matthias, *The Dialectic City* (Milan: Skira Editore, 1997)

Ungers, Oswald Matthias, *Morphologie, City Metaphors* (Cologne: Verlag Walter König, 1982)


**FURTHER READING**


Burdett, Ricky and Deyan Sudjic, *The Endless City* (Phaidon Press Ltd, 2008)


Hilbersheimer, Ludwig, *Grosstadt Architektur* (Stuttgart: Julius Hoffmann, 1927)


Koolhaas, Rem, Sze Tsung Leong and Chuihua Judy Chung, eds., *Great Leap Forward* (Cologne: Taschen, 2001)

Ley, Sabrina, and Markus Richter, eds., *Gigastructure Reloaded* (Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2008)


**ART THEORY AND CRITICISM**


Graham, Dan, *Dan Graham’s New Jersey* (Baden: Lars Müller, 2012)


Marinetti, Filippo Tommaso, *Futurist Manifesto* (5 Feb 1909)


Smithson, Robert. “A Tour of the Monuments of Passaic, New Jersey”. In *Artforum* 6, no. 4 (December 1967): 48-51


**RECOMMENDED**


Kipnis, Jeffrey, ‘Some Thoughts on Contemporary Painting in the Hope that Analogies to Architecture Might be Drawn...’, *Hunch*, 9, (2005), 26-39


PHILOSOPHY AND CRITICAL THEORY
Agamben, Giorgio, 'What is a Paradigm?', in Lecture at European Graduate School, August 2002 ←http://www.egs.edu/faculty/giorgio-agamben/articles/what-is-a-paradigm/→ [accessed 09 September 2012].
Foucault, Michel, The Order of Things [London: Routledge, 2001]
Virno, Paolo, A Grammar of the Multitude [Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2004]

RECOMMENDED READING
Foucault, Michel, 'Of Other Spaces', Diacritics, 16.1 (1986), 22-27

ON THE PUBLIC
Fraser, Nancy, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy', Social Text, 25/26 (1990), 56–80
Kayden, Jerold S., et al, Privately Owned Public Space: The New York City Experience [New York:

RECOMMENDED
Gehl, Jan, Life Between Buildings: Using Public Space (Copenhagen: The Danish Architectural Press, 2001)

GENERAL REFERENCES AND COMPENDIUMS
Farmer, Ben, and Hentie Louw, eds., Companion to Architectural Thought [London: Routledge, 1993]
Appendix 2: FORMATTING OF COURSEWORK

Coursework submissions are made to the Graduate School Administrative Coordinator’s Office by 5pm on the day agreed. Essays must have a minimum A4 and studio reports a minimum A3 paper size. All submissions must include:

- 2 securely bound hard copies of work
- 1 signed Authorship Declaration Form
- 1 digital copy (CD/DVD)

All submissions must comply with academic referencing conventions, see Appendix 4. All texts must be spell-checked and when requested, submission of some coursework include an upload to Turnitin.

1. Submission Cover Page
All submissions must have a cover page that contains the following information:

FULL TITLE: SUBTITLE [e.g. HOUSING IN LONDON: ROW HOUSING]
Student Name [first and family name(s)]
MPhil in Architecture and Urban Design
Projective Cities, 2014/16 [years of cohort]
Architectural Association School of Architecture
Graduate School
Module Name [e.g. Dissertation; or Seminar 1 Essay]
Submission date in month and year [e.g. June 2015]

There is freedom in formatting and placing this information, but the exact wording and order must be used.

2. Authorship Declaration Form
All submissions for assessment must include an Authorship Declaration Form signed by all the students concerned to certify that the contents of the document are their own work and the use of material from the work of others is duly acknowledged. The form should be bound into the document in a prominent position after the cover page. The form is available from the Graduate School Coordinator.

3. Formatting of Written Submissions
All essays or written submission should comply with the following structure, depending on their length, but all must include the bold items:

- Cover page: See above.
- Abstract: A very brief summary of the paper.
- Table of contents: A numbered list of the main headings and subheadings of the paper and the page number of the start of each section.
- Acknowledgements: Individuals who have helped or provided resources, advice and information [including acknowledgment of sponsorships, bursaries or scholarships towards your studies at the AA School]. Only in dissertation or if required by sponsor.
- Introduction: Overview of issues and questions which led to the chosen topic with reference to the relevant literature; what did your paper set out to do and what is your methodology to explore this; results obtained or conclusions drawn; how is your paper structured.
- Main body: To be subdivided according to thematic, procedural or methodological criteria. To include relevant illustrations and drawings.
- Conclusions: Summary of main argument, findings and conclusions.
• **Bibliography**: Published and unpublished sources consulted.

The maximum numbers of words for written submissions exclude abstract, footnotes, bibliographies, appendices, etc. A word count provided. Text should be formatted as follows:

- Body text in Arial, font size 11, or in a similar legible font and size.
- Line spacing to be at least 1.15.
- Footnotes instead of endnotes.
- All figures and tables must be numbered, titled, and referenced.
- Pages to be numbered.
- Text hyphenation to be turned off (e.g. in InDesign)
- Margin sizes are at the student’s discretion but must allow for the binding.

### 4. Binding of Submissions and Paper

Essays, Studio Reports: At least **metal spiral bound** (or e.g. perfect bound with soft cover)

Dissertation Proposal: **1 copy perfect bound with soft cover**, 1 copy securely bound

Dissertation: **1 copy hard bound** (dark grey cloth with black text).
- 1 copy securely bound (soft or hard bound but not spiral bound).

All Dissertations are to be printed on matt 200gsm fine-grained cartridge paper or matt photo-quality paper.

Many print shops will perfect bind your printed sheets. But you can also get them printed and bound by the same company, two recommended are:

- Imprint Digital
  http://www.imprint.co.uk/digital/randomorder.html
- Inky Little Fingers
  http://www.inkylittlefingers.co.uk/

Recommended bookbinders (hard binding):
- The Wyvern Bindery
  56-58, Clerkenwell Road, London EC1M 5PX [http://www.wyvernbindery.com/]
- City Binders
  1st Floor, 39 Ludgate Hill, London, EC4M 7JN [http://www.citybinders.co.uk/]
- Bookbinders of London
  11 Ronalds Road, London N5 1XJ [http://www.bookbindersoflondon.com/]

### 5. Formatting of Digital Copy

A digital copy burned to a CD or DVD is to be provided with all submissions.

The CD cover should have the following information:

- AA PC followed by module name [e.g. AA PC: Studio 1]
- Project title
- Student’s name

The CD is to contain:

- A complete copy of the submitted document in **PDF format with lines retained as vectors** and pages retained as pages, not spreads.
- In addition, all illustrations must be included individually in a folder titled `<Images>` in JPG format at 300 dpi resolution in their original (largest) size. Images should be numbered and titled in accordance with the list of figures or image credits given in the submitted document.
Appendix 3: WRITING AN ESSAY

Mark Cousins
[Director of History and Theory Studies]

These notes are designed to help students understand the importance of writing during their training at the AA, to understand the nature of an essay, and to provide advice on how best to prepare to write an essay, and how to plan it. It may be that some lucky individual students already possess a proven way of doing this and if this is the case then they can continue with their method and the habits that suit them. But experience teaches us that very few students have thought about the issue carefully and have developed a successful solution to the problems involved. Hopefully this guide will help them to approach the question in an intelligent way.

Architecture and writing

Often students take a negative view of the role of essay writing in their work as students at the AA. I have often heard it said that students feel that their ‘real’ work as students is design and learning to design. In this sense students of ten experience the obligation to write essays as a rather unwelcome supplement, as if essay writing is an onerous diversion from their real work. And so the first issue to be addressed is why essay writing is a vital part of a student’s work. Firstly, essay writing is central to the overall objective of enabling a student over a five year period, to develop an individual identity not just through their design work but through the capacity to articulate an independent and critical intelligence in respect to architecture. At the end of five years students should know what they think and should be able to justify that in terms of argument. One of the central functions of writing essays is to develop a skill in argument, which is the student’s own argument. This skill determines their capacity to explain and justify their own design work and to assess the designs of others. These are skills, they can be learned and the best way to learn them is to practice them. The second point which needs to be made is that professionally speaking, arguing in both speech and in writing is a fundamental dimension of the work of an architect and someone who lacks the skills will soon find themselves severely disadvantaged in practice. To this should also be added the general point that architects need to be able to describe architecture and architectural projects in words whether written or spoken. But the verbal description of architecture is a complex skill. We may think that architecture is best represented by plans, elevations, sections, etc. and we may use various forms of imagery to describe buildings and projects but this does not dispense with the centrality of the word. A student who graduates without having acquired the skill of describing buildings will not be able to animate their relation to architecture with the power of speaking or writing. The essay is a crucial starting point of being able to represent architecture in discourse. It is a skill just as much as drawing.

What is an essay?

An essay is the attempt to answer a question through argument and the presentation of evidence for the argument. In this sense a good essay requires a good question. You cannot write an essay on a topic. It makes no sense to write an essay on the architecture of Michelangelo or of Le Corbusier. A topic is just a title. It provides the student with no definition of the essay— which is a problem to be solved. All that a topic invites is information. But information can never be the basis of an essay even though information has a subordinate role as evidence. This is why from the beginning reliance upon sources of information such as Wikipedia or encyclopedias, or even scholarly books can never provide the basis of an essay. Of course information or ‘facts’ are crucial in the field of evidence. You cannot construct a reasonable argument which doesn’t have evidence or which runs counter to the evidence. In this sense an essay is by its nature hybrid, it is an argument but one which must appeal to the evidence. In practice this means that every time you use a fact in an essay it must be in support of an argument. An essay then is an answer to a question based upon
an argument which in turn justifies itself by reference to evidence or facts.

But what is an argument? This is worth asking because the answer is to some extent counter
to the ways in which some educational systems have developed. There are still some
systems in which a certain privilege is accorded to an official ‘line’ whether that is expressed
by the lecturer or manifest in a textbook. In this case learning, memorizing, and repeating
the ‘line’ is the desired outcome. If anything the essay would simply be a test to the student’s
capacity to reproduce the ‘line’. This is absolutely what we do not mean by an essay. Taken to
an extreme this is actually what we would call plagiarism. Perhaps this is why there is still
some confusion about what the AA and other universities mean by plagiarism. Had one been
brought up in an authoritarian educational system, the uncritical reproduction of the official
‘line’, be it the professor’s or the textbook’s, then what we call plagiarism would presumably
be judged as a virtuous form of the completion of an academic task. We do not take this view
at all. While we would hope that you find lectures helpful and interesting and while we insist
that you read more than you do, the objective of the essay is not to reproduce them but to ask
you what you think about them. In this sense the essay is a subjective response to a question.
You ask yourself what you think about the question and your essay will be guided by your
conclusions. In this way you are using the essay to come to a decision about what you
yourself think. This may take the form of agreement with what you’ve read or it may take the
form of violent disagreement. But in either case what is important is what you think. Only in
this way can you come to learn what you think. Perhaps you will change your mind next year
but this doesn’t matter, you will still be using the basic skill of asking yourself what you think
now.

We have established that an argument must be made from a subjective point of view. It must
be from your point of view. But that does not mean that it is what we might call ‘merely
subjective’. An essay is not just the dogmatic presentation of personal opinions. While the
whole essay is from a subjective point of view, at the same time it is controlled by the need to
justify your claims and perhaps to changing your views in the light of the evidence which you
have been studying. An argument is different from the expression of an opinion because it is
constructed via the use of evidence. The evidence you use will support your argument.
To establish your argument you need to select and present evidence that supports it.
Sometimes this might involve your need to deal with the fact that your argument is in
opposition to other arguments. In this case you will use evidence to reject the opposing
arguments. So the fact that the essay is subjective, is your own argument, nonetheless has to
be justified in terms of evidence. We might think of evidence as the public space of
arguments. My definition of the essay is one which both insists upon its subjective character,
that it is your answer and what you think but that this is quite different from it being just a
personal expression of feeling and intuitions. You are as it were subjecting your subjectivity
to the public forum of evidence. The essay is both subjective and public. You can see then
that it follows the basic logic of design- of a private creation transformed into a public object.

Preparing for the essay
Having tried to explain what an essay is, let us look at the stages of preparing for it. Obviously
it is here that you will be preparing by consulting a range of sources. It would be too much to
call this research but it has about it the elements of research and the skills which you
acquire here will enable you to undertake larger projects than just the essay. Assuming that
you have attended the lectures and have done the reading indicated by the course
bibliographies and assuming that perhaps in conjunction with your tutor, you have
formulated an appropriate question at a certain point you will be ready to prepare the essay.
You should regard this preparation as a vital and independent stage. Many students still
leave no gap between the research they have been doing and starting to write the essay. It is
as if they are largely concerned to get the essay ‘done’. This is a minor but real piece of
insanity. You cannot start writing without knowing what to write. You need to prepare for the
essay by thinking about the essay. Some will do this with a piece of paper, some will do it by
going for a walk, and some will ask a friend to listen to their proposal. Each person will
probably find a different way of performing this task. You should follow whatever device
seems to suit you. But in one way or another it is a vital and indispensable moment. You are
asking yourself what you think and you are coming to some sort of conclusion. As we have
already implied, those conclusions which will form the outline of your argument need to be
fitted together with the evidence for them.

Planning the essay
Many students’ essays do the students a real injustice. The essay they produce, one can tell,
is not nearly as good as it could have been. This is not necessarily about the quality of the
student or the amount of research done, it stems solely from the student’s failure to plan the
essay and therefore to organize the argument of the essay. They could have done it but they
didn’t. No one can write an essay expecting to answer the question as a result of just writing
it. You must make a clear distinction in your mind between the structure of your argument
and the process of writing. In other words you must have a plan which contains both the
argument you wish to make and what is a separate issue, the sequence in which you are
going to make it. If perhaps out of urgency if you think you will just start writing and hope that
the argument will miraculously appear, you will inevitably produce a much poorer essay than
you are capable of. You cannot burden the process of writing with too many simultaneous
tasks. If we look at this problem carefully we see that there are in effect three quite separate
tasks. The first we can call the argument as such or the ‘logic’ of the argument. You should
put down, and it need not take more than half a sheet of paper what the overall argument is
and how it connects to different pieces of evidence. The second stage is a somewhat different
task- it is how you are going to sequence the first stage in a continuous piece of writing. You
may, for example, decide to start the essay in a way which is different from a logical
sequence of your argument. Often successful openings concentrate upon the nature of the
question rather than stating the logical sequence of the argument. Often conclusions return
to the opening paragraph as a way of ending the essay. The end of an essay is rather different
from the conclusion of the essay. If the first stage is a plan for the logic of the essay, the
second outline concerns a plan of the sequence of the essay- what we might call the rhetoric
of the essay. In all events this process of planning the essay should leave you in no doubt
about what you are going to argue and how you are going to argue. You are now ready to
write the essay, and can now concentrate on the literary task of writing it in as clear and
interesting a way as you can. You are no longer burdening the writing with all the other tasks
of organization within the essay. You now know at every moment in writing the essay what is
coming next. Indeed if you have planned properly, you yourself will no longer be burdened
with the anxiety of what you are going to say next. You already know. I would hope at this
point that you begin to experience the pleasure which can come from writing. If you
experience it as a dreaded punishment, it almost certainly means that you haven’t prepared
the argument.

The essay and the paragraph
This section is implied by the previous section but looks at the problem from a functional
point of view. The essays you are asked to do are really very short. But even in a short piece
of writing it is worth breaking it down further into basic units. We might say that the basic
unit of an essay is the paragraph. In an essay of say 3,500 words there are only a limited
number of paragraphs- perhaps between ten and twelve. There is here a useful convergence
between the number of paragraphs and the number of points which you might make in the
essay. Each paragraph is the place where you make a point, an element of your overall
argument. In this case we can look at the essay overall in which it is useful to think of the
first paragraph as a statement of your overall argument. Paradoxically the first paragraph is
really a statement of your conclusion. Apart from anything else this makes it much easier on
the reader. It is as if the reader is now in the position of immediately seeing what it is overall
that you wish to argue. The reader can now understand where you are going in the essay.
This is very important. Too often students write essays without any sense that the essay is designed to be read by someone else. Too often one reads an essay which might in itself be full of interesting observations. But at the same time one has no idea where the essay is going and you begin to suspect that the writer did not either.

These points establish a kind of strategic link between the opening paragraph and all subsequent paragraphs. Indeed what is true of the essay as a whole is true about each paragraph. One can regard each paragraph in terms of an opening sentence which establishes the nature of the point that the rest of the paragraph argues for as well as presenting evidence that supports the argument. This advice should not become a mechanical formula for the essay but it is certainly worth applying it to the plan for the essay. The actual essay will deal with the plan by drawing it back to considerations of the essay in terms of its literary composition. But I have never seen an essay which suffered from too much clarity.

**Footnotes and Bibliography**

Overall these notes are designed to help students think about how to do an essay. There are of course published guides on how to write an essay but they tend both to be very obvious and not very concerned with how skills of argument and writing are in fact part of the general skill of an architect. But such guides might be useful in establishing a number of conventions such as how to present footnotes and bibliographies. My only observations on these issues would be that footnotes are mostly used by students to identify the source of a quotation. Obviously students must always acknowledge quotations, or they risk being accused of plagiarism. Certainly the correct way to acknowledge a quotation is to provide the source with a footnote. But there are other uses of a footnote. Sometimes one will have some very interesting piece of information which one wishes to express to the reader although it may not be relevant to the argument. It might confuse the reader if it were in the main body of the text. In this case it is better to put it as a footnote and to free the main text from it. Sometimes it is worth putting in your own thoughts in a footnote if they do not directly bear on the argument.

**Conclusion**

Although these notes were intended to deal with issues which are not usually part of the practical guides to essay writing, they also I hope serve as a justification for the importance of essay writing. An essay is an opportunity to develop your skills in argument and writing. These skills at an intellectual level are an absolute condition of acquiring an independent identity as an architect. Like all skills it is neither natural nor spontaneous, it develops only through and with practice. In professional terms it cannot be overstated how important these skills are. Without them, a student would emerge into a professional world with one hand tied permanently behind his or her back. It is the means through which you will be able to translate your design skills into a public world of architecture. The practice of architecture requires skills of analysis, of advocacy, and of analysis. The architect is by definition a public intellectual. No one can and no one can afford to neglect the centrality of these skills. Their effective employment is one which is both required and rewarded in architecture. I hope you find these notes useful and I am more than willing to discuss them individually with students during the year.

[From the AA Complementary Studies Course Booklet 2011/2012]
Appendix 4: MHRA REFERENCING STYLE

All referencing is to acknowledge someone else’s work or ideas and is done to avoid plagiarism. The preferred conventions are set out by the Modern Humanities Research Association (MHRA), but other reference systems are permitted, as long as they are followed consistently. An online site available at the AA to create references is www.citethemrightonline.com. An MHRA guide on referencing can be downloaded at www.style.mhra.org.uk.

The following text and examples of the MHRA referencing style are taken from the Cardiff University’s Information Services:

For all academic assignments it is vital that you acknowledge the sources of information you have used for your research. This will help you protect yourself against charges of plagiarism and also demonstrate that you understand the importance of professional academic work.

You must acknowledge your sources whenever you paraphrase or summarise another person’s ideas, or when you quote another person’s work, or use tables, graphs, images, etc. which you have found from another source, whether printed or online.

Introducing the MHRA Style
Whenever you refer to another’s words or ideas in your work, insert a footnote number in your text. When referring to the publication for the first time, give full bibliographic details in the footnote. Subsequent references can then be provided in an abbreviated form.

Example

References should be given for ‘all direct or indirect quotations, and in acknowledgement of someone’s opinions, or of a source of factual information which is not general knowledge’. Li and Crane point out that the main objective of citing references is to give sufficient information to allow sources to be located. Additionally, ‘another important principle is to make reference to that information in the source in hand. As a rule, it is not necessary to provide supplementary information that has to be located elsewhere’. General overviews of the process of citing references are given by Bosworth and Craig and in Walliman.

Inserting Footnotes
Wherever possible, place numbers at the end of the sentence, after the full stop. Be consistent in your approach and use continuous numbering throughout the text, starting at number one. For theses, restart the numbering at the beginning of each chapter. When you refer to several sources close together in the same paragraph, use one footnote number and enter a reference for each source, separated by a semi-colon.

3 Ibid., p. 3.
4 David P. Bosworth, Citing Your References: A Guide for Authors of Journal Articles And Students Writing Theses or Dissertations (Thirsk, N Yorks: Underhill Press, 1992); P. Craig, ‘How to Cite’, Documentation Studies, 10 (2003), 114-122; Walliman, pp. 300-313.
Directly Quoting from Your Sources
You should aim to paraphrase information provided by an author in your own words rather than quote large amounts of their work verbatim as this helps to demonstrate to the reader your understanding of the information. It may be necessary to quote directly from the text when you:

- cannot present the information more succinctly or in any other way
- need to present a particular portion of an author’s text in your work to analyse it.

If the quotation is short (fewer than 40 words of prose or 2 complete lines of verse), enclose the writer’s words in single quotation marks within your sentence and insert a footnote number:

Mackintosh’s Glasgow School of Art ‘heralded the birth of a new style in 20th century European Architecture’.¹

Longer quotations should be separated from the body of your text and indented from the left-hand margin. There is no need to include quotation marks:

Bernard outlines his design ethos:

Mackintosh’s firm belief that construction should be decorated and not decoration constructed, in other words that the salient and most requisite features should be selected for ornamentation, he applied with great rhythm and inventiveness, especially in those projects, such as the Glasgow School of Art and Scotland Street School, where budgets were severely limited.²

This theme is taken further by Macleod.³

If you omit some words from the middle of the quotation, you need to indicate this by typing three dots in square brackets, e.g. ‘The state has an essential role […] in the legal definition of property rights’.⁴ If you are omitting lines of verse, write […] on a separate line.

Referencing Sources for the First Time
When referencing a source for the first time in your piece of work, provide full bibliographic details in the footnote:

- Write the author’s name(s) as it appears on the text: put the author’s forename(s) or initials first, followed by their surname. If there are more than three authors, write the first author’s name followed by ‘and others’.
- Italicise the titles of books and journals.
- Capitalise the first letter of all principal words throughout the title and after the colon, if there is a subtitle.
- Include the specific page number(s) referenced at the end by writing p. or pp. followed by the page number(s).
- Write references for online publications using the format for printed publications as far as possible, adding the <internet address of the document> and the [accessed date].
- Indent the second and subsequent line of each reference.

Book

Journal article

**Chapter in an edited book**

**Newspaper article**

**PhD Thesis**

**Electronic journal article**

**Web page**

**Images, figures and tables**
Fig. 1. List of housing performance indicators for multi-family residential buildings.

**Further References to the Same Source**
If you reference the same source more than once in a particular piece of work, abbreviate the second and subsequent references by providing only the author and page numbers. Use the abbreviation *Ibid.* (meaning in the same place) to refer to a reference immediately above:

2 Ibid., p. 133.
4 Curtis, pp. 56-78.

**Bibliography**
At the end of your work, list each of the sources you have referenced, and any other works you have read in relation to the subject, in a bibliography. Write the list in alphabetical order by the first author’s surname, placing their surname before their forename(s) or initial(s). There is no need to include the specific page reference in a bibliography, but page ranges for edited book chapters and journal articles are required. You should also exclude the full stop at the end of the reference:

Craig, P., ‘How to Cite’, *Documentation Studies*, 10 (2003), 114-122
Publication Dates and Editions
To find out when a book was published, look at the back of the title page. This page will contain details of the publisher and the publication date. If there is more than one date, use the latest publication date, not the latest reprint dates. This is often located next to the © symbol.

If no publication date is given in the book but it can be ascertained, put the year in square brackets e.g. [1989]. If no year can be determined write [n.d.], meaning no date.

The back of the title page will also tell you the edition of the book. If the book you are acknowledging is not the first edition, state this in the full reference in your footnote and bibliography e.g.: *Alan Everett, Materials, 5th edn (Hartow: Longman, 1994), pp. 102-24.*
Appendix 5: ACADEMIC CALENDAR 2015-16

YEAR 1 SCHEDULE

INTRODUCTION WEEK (only new students)
21 to 25 September 2015

TERM 1
28 September to 4 December 2015 (10 weeks)
Final Review = 27 November 2015
Studio Submission = 11 December 2015
Essay Submission = 11 January 2016
(Programme Trip: 11-19 December 2015)

TERM 2
11 January to 18 March 2016 (10 Weeks)
Final Review = 11 March 2016
Studio Submission = 24 March 2016
Essay Submission = 18 April 2016

TERM 3
18 April to 24 June 2016 (10 Weeks)
Final Review = 17 June 2016
Dissertation Proposal Submission = 15 July 2016

YEAR 2 SCHEDULE

TERM 4
28 September to 18 December 2015 (12 weeks)
Progress Review = 27 November 2015

TERM 5
11 January to 1 April (12 Weeks) and 18 April to 27 May 2016 (6 Weeks)
Final Design Review = 5 February 2016
Progress Review = 11 March 2016
Final Presentation (Symposium) = 27 May 2016
Dissertation Submission = 17 June 2016
AA Exhibition Opening = 23 June 2016

AA ACADEMIC TERMS

AA Term 1: 28 September to 18 December 2015 (12 weeks)
[School closed: 19 December to 3 January]
AA Term 2: 11 January to 24 March 2016 (11 weeks)
[School closed: 25 March to 12 April; Good Friday: 25 March, Easter Monday: 28 March]
AA Term 3: 25 April to 24 June 2013 (9 weeks)
[School closed: 20-29 August 2016; Bank Holidays: 2 and 30 May]