

6 ARCHITECTURE

Introduction

The Bachelor of Arts Architectural Studies Society (BAASS) is a recent addition to the ASSU family of Course Unions. BAASS is involved with all aspects, from academic to social, in the Architectural Studies Program.

Editor

ARC 131H1F Introduction to Architecture

Instructor(s): L. Richards

	Resp: 199							Retake: 85%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	1	3	15	26	38	13	5.4
Explains	0	0	4	15	31	35	12	5.3
Communicates	1	3	9	26	26	23	9	4.8
Teaching	1	1	3	18	33	31	10	5.2
Workload	1	2	9	67	14	4	0	4.1
Difficulty	1	2	7	64	14	7	2	4.2
Learn Exp	1	1	6	31	27	19	12	4.9

Some of the students thought that Richards was knowledgeable about the material but delivered the lectures in a monotone voice. Others thought that this was just due to the material for an introductory architecture course.

Overall, however, an interesting course taught by a good instructor.

ARC 132H1S Contemporary Architecture

Instructor(s): R. Levit

	Resp: 195							Retake: 70%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	7	12	27	29	16	4	4.4
Explains	2	4	9	26	28	20	8	4.7
Communicates	1	1	7	20	21	30	16	5.2
Teaching	1	3	10	28	29	21	5	4.7
Workload	0	2	3	71	15	3	2	4.2
Difficulty	0	1	5	50	29	9	3	4.5
Learn Exp	1	3	10	41	21	15	6	4.5

Students appreciated the instructor's enthusiasm for architecture and the topics discussed. They also respected his vast knowledge but unfortunately, they also felt that the lectures were hard to follow due to the advanced terminology. This class should have been less analytical and more direct for an introductory level course. In addition, students also felt that more comments on submitted work was needed to allow for improvements.

ARC 213H1S Architectural Design I

Instructor(s): M. Kelmans

	Resp: 21							Retake: 70%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	20	45	15	20	0	4.3
Explains	5	0	30	20	25	15	5	4.2
Communicates	0	0	15	35	40	10	0	4.4
Teaching	0	5	15	40	25	10	5	4.3
Workload	0	0	0	10	10	60	20	5.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	19	47	23	9	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	40	40	13	6	4.9

ARC 221H1F Architectural Representation I

Instructor(s): M. Dengri

	Resp: 24							Retake: 75%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	8	8	41	29	12	0	4.3
Explains	0	4	12	45	33	4	0	4.2
Communicates	0	0	0	21	47	26	4	5.1
Teaching	0	4	0	21	39	26	8	5.1

Workload	0	0	0	4	25	29	41	6.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	0	52	21	26	5.7
Learn Exp	0	4	4	34	34	8	13	4.8

The course was useful in preparing further studies in the architectural field. Project expectations were, at times, unclear. The workload was extremely high due to the time consuming nature of the projects.

Dengri was helpful and easy to approach, however, more feedback and constructive criticism would have been appreciated.

ARC 232H1S Architecture, Media and Communication

Instructor(s): S. Sorli

	Resp: 28							Retake: 68%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	25	22	33	14	5.3
Explains	0	3	11	11	29	29	14	5.1
Communicates	0	0	0	18	22	48	11	5.5
Teaching	0	0	3	14	25	37	18	5.5
Workload	0	0	7	62	22	7	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	62	22	11	3	4.6
Learn Exp	6	6	0	0	26	33	26	5.4

Many students found the course to be extremely interesting. The topics discussed in class were very helpful in improving the way people communicated visually. Some people found the first assignment to be a challenge, however, slowly students begin to develop an understanding of the expectations.

Sorli was extremely approachable and friendly.

ARC 236H1F Design and Cultural Transformation

Instructor(s): R. Fones

	Resp: 29							Retake: 92%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	33	48	18	5.9
Explains	0	0	3	7	28	46	14	5.6
Communicates	0	3	0	24	24	37	10	5.2
Teaching	0	0	3	3	42	42	7	5.5
Workload	0	3	17	75	3	0	0	3.8
Difficulty	0	7	3	85	3	0	0	3.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	35	30	15	5.4

Students enjoyed Fones' interactive, highly organized, and well-informed lectures. Students especially appreciated Fones' ability to keep the material vibrant and interesting - apparently both rotary saws and tup-ware were involved. Negative comments were few, a couple of students thought the grades were a bit low, but overall students seemed happily shocked to find such a dedicated and exuberant instructor at the Architecture building.

ARC 313H1F Architectural Design II

Instructor(s): T. Bessai

	Resp: 14							Retake: 75%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	8	16	50	25	0	4.9
Explains	0	0	8	16	16	41	16	5.4
Communicates	0	0	8	8	8	58	16	5.7
Teaching	0	0	7	0	53	38	0	5.2
Workload	0	0	7	0	14	7	71	6.4
Difficulty	0	0	7	15	15	46	15	5.5
Learn Exp	0	0	16	16	25	41	0	4.9

Bessai was a good instructor although limited in availability outside of the classroom. His goals were often unclear. He was very enthusiastic and cared about the progress of students' projects.

ARC 314H1S Architectural Design III

Instructor(s): D. Carter

	Enr: 23							Resp: 16		Retake: 64%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	0	12	25	50	6	6			4.7	
Explains	0	6	25	31	12	12	12			4.4	
Communicates	0	0	0	25	25	37	12			5.4	
Teaching	0	0	18	31	25	12	12			4.7	
Workload	0	0	0	6	37	31	25			5.8	
Difficulty	0	0	6	12	43	31	6			5.2	
Learn Exp	0	8	8	25	25	25	8			4.8	

The major concerns with this course was that the goals and the evaluation criteria were unclear, as well as the difficulty in reaching the instructor after class.

Instructor(s): M. Meredith

	Enr: 21							Resp: 9		Retake: 77%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	0	0	44	33	11	11			4.9	
Explains	0	0	0	11	44	33	11			5.4	
Communicates	0	0	12	37	12	12	25			5.0	
Teaching	0	0	22	11	33	11	22			5.0	
Workload	0	0	0	11	55	11	22			5.4	
Difficulty	0	0	0	22	44	33	0			5.1	
Learn Exp	0	0	16	16	0	50	16			5.3	

Students found the class interesting. Some students appreciated working on one assignment for most of the term while others wanted the class broken up into smaller assignments.

ARC 321H1F Architectural Representation II

Instructor(s): T. Bessai

	Enr: 23							Resp: 17		Retake: 100%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	0	0	23	41	17	17			5.3	
Explains	0	0	0	5	52	23	17			5.5	
Communicates	0	0	0	0	6	68	25			6.2	
Teaching	0	0	0	11	41	41	5			5.4	
Workload	0	0	0	0	6	73	20			6.1	
Difficulty	0	0	0	18	43	37	0			5.2	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	33	16	41	8			5.2	

The instructor was found to be always willing to help students' projects through feedback. His openness to student ideas encouraged a freely expressive course.

The workload was very high and with high expectations. Some students felt that these expectations were not clearly communicated in the course and project outlines. The problem students had with the course were not related to the course itself but more to the poorly defined objectives of the program in general.

ARC 342H1S Building Technology - Ecology II

Instructor(s): M. Lio

	Enr: 51							Resp: 41		Retake: 63%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	2	2	9	31	39	14			5.5	
Explains	2	0	2	15	42	30	7			5.2	
Communicates	0	0	0	12	24	36	26			5.8	
Teaching	2	0	0	14	29	43	9			5.4	
Workload	0	0	4	51	29	14	0			4.5	
Difficulty	0	0	7	50	30	12	0			4.5	
Learn Exp	2	0	5	32	35	14	8			4.8	

The majority of the students found the instructor to be well-organized, clear, and enthusiastic. Many expressed appreciation of the instructor's emphasis on student feedback.

ARC 413H1F Architectural Design IV

Instructor(s): T. Van Elslander

	Enr: 16							Resp: 11		Retake: 30%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	18	9	27	45	0	0			4.0	
Explains	9	18	18	18	27	9	0			3.6	
Communicates	0	9	18	54	9	9	0			3.9	
Teaching	9	18	27	9	27	9	0			3.5	
Workload	0	0	0	0	27	18	54			6.3	
Difficulty	0	0	0	27	18	27	27			5.5	
Learn Exp	10	20	10	30	10	20	0			3.7	

Although students found the instructor knowledgeable, his harsh criticisms and inconsistent grading scheme were not at all helpful to the students.

Instructor(s): D. Lieberman

	Enr: 22							Resp: 16		Retake: 87%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	0	0	18	31	31	18			5.5	
Explains	0	0	6	0	25	37	31			5.9	
Communicates	0	0	6	0	25	37	31			5.9	
Teaching	0	6	0	0	37	31	25			5.6	
Workload	0	0	0	25	31	25	18			5.4	
Difficulty	0	0	0	43	18	37	0			4.9	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	18	37	18	25			5.5	

While most students found Lieberman to be one of the best studio teachers they had ever had, a few found him vague and unapproachable. Almost all students agreed that Lieberman was enthusiastic and highly knowledgeable and interested in creating a course without many boundaries and/or limitations.

ARC 415H1S Introduction to Furniture Design

Instructor(s): T. Van Elslander

	Enr: 41							Resp: 23		Retake: 80%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	0	4	13	47	17	17			5.3	
Explains	0	0	8	13	39	21	17			5.3	
Communicates	0	0	0	21	26	30	21			5.5	
Teaching	0	0	4	18	22	22	31			5.6	
Workload	0	0	4	26	30	17	21			5.3	
Difficulty	0	0	4	39	30	17	8			4.9	
Learn Exp	0	0	5	17	35	17	23			5.4	

The majority of the students found the critiques insightful and helpful in developing design skills. Several students found this to be the best studio course in the program. Some students thought that this course should have been offered at an earlier stage of the program.

ARC 416H1F Introduction to Design for Performance and Media Arts

Instructor(s): A. Leroux

	Enr: 45							Resp: 25		Retake: 31%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	12	12	44	24	8	0	0			3.0	
Explains	8	12	32	28	20	0	0			3.4	
Communicates	4	4	4	24	32	28	4			4.8	
Teaching	12	8	33	37	8	0	0			3.2	
Workload	0	4	4	72	20	0	0			4.1	
Difficulty	4	8	16	60	4	8	0			3.8	
Learn Exp	26	15	15	31	10	0	0			2.8	

Clearly, students were disappointed with this course. Although the instructor was knowledgeable, the course was disorganized and taught without any enthusiasm.

Due dates for projects/assignments kept changing and there was little feedback.

For most students, this was an educational disappointment.

8 ARCHITECTURE

ARC 431H1F Historical Perspectives on Topics in Architecture I

Instructor(s): P. Scrivano

	Enr: 71							Resp: 49	Retake: 32%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	2	2	12	31	33	16	2	4.5	
Explains	2	4	10	35	39	6	2	4.3	
Communicates	2	2	10	31	22	20	10	4.8	
Teaching	2	4	6	25	50	10	2	4.6	
Workload	0	0	2	73	14	8	2	4.3	
Difficulty	0	0	2	69	18	8	2	4.4	
Learn Exp	2	0	13	47	30	2	2	4.2	

A large number of students found Scrivano to be knowledgeable and very well-prepared for the lectures. He was however, difficult to understand at times. A few students noted that the instructor had greatly improved by the end of the semester. Scrivano was enthusiastic and tried to help students.

Some students were concerned with the fact that the course overlapped with material of a required FAH course.

ARC 432H1S Historical Perspectives on Topics in Architecture II

Instructor(s): P. Scrivano

	Enr: 68							Resp: 31	Retake: 32%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	6	0	6	22	25	32	6	4.8	
Explains	6	0	12	25	22	22	9	4.6	
Communicates	3	0	3	12	29	32	19	5.4	
Teaching	3	3	3	25	29	29	6	4.9	
Workload	0	0	23	70	6	0	0	3.8	
Difficulty	0	0	13	66	20	0	0	4.1	
Learn Exp	4	4	8	48	28	8	0	4.2	

Students found Scrivano to be very interesting, helpful and knowledgeable. The course material was more focussed than usual Architectural courses.

ARC 435H1F History/Theory of Urban Landscape Architecture Design I

Instructor(s): I. Elias

	Enr: 24							Resp: 19	Retake: 52%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	10	26	36	21	5	4.8	
Explains	0	0	15	26	31	21	5	4.7	
Communicates	0	0	10	10	36	31	10	5.2	
Teaching	0	0	5	33	22	33	5	5.0	
Workload	0	0	0	61	33	5	0	4.4	
Difficulty	0	0	0	57	26	15	0	4.6	
Learn Exp	0	6	20	40	20	13	0	4.1	

The instructor was very passionate about her work. Unfortunately, the lectures were rushed which sometimes prevented a clear understanding of ideas and concepts.

The students thought that there was too much reading. More discussion of the required texts would have been helpful in understanding some of the more complex theories.

ARC 437H1F Housing Design: Theory and Practice

Instructor(s): S. Fong

	Enr: 28							Resp: 18	Retake: 58%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	5	5	11	61	16	5.8	
Explains	0	0	0	11	11	58	17	5.8	
Communicates	0	0	0	11	33	38	16	5.6	
Teaching	0	0	0	11	27	50	11	5.6	
Workload	0	5	23	58	11	0	0	3.8	
Difficulty	0	5	17	64	11	0	0	3.8	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	64	7	28	0	4.6	

Students found the instructor to be helpful, concise, and enthusiastic although the material presented was described as a bit dull and/or introductory.

Students appreciated the field trips and special events which helped render lecture material more relevant and interesting.

Fong's feedback to the students was found to be helpful and overall, Fong appeared to have "performed effectively" as a University instructor.

ARC 441H1F Architecture in its Technological-Ecological Context

Instructor(s): P. Sandori

	Enr: 59							Resp: 29	Retake: 96%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	0	24	51	24	6.0	
Explains	0	0	0	0	6	34	58	6.5	
Communicates	0	0	0	0	13	41	44	6.3	
Teaching	0	0	0	0	17	35	46	6.3	
Workload	0	0	17	68	10	3	0	4.0	
Difficulty	0	0	3	75	20	0	0	4.2	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	4	36	27	31	5.9	

Many students noted Sandori's ability to maintain fun and interesting lectures. Most felt that the instructor communicated difficult concepts in an easily understandable way. The use of slides along with the guest lecturers were found to be useful and relevant to an education on ecology and technology.

Overall, most students found both the instructor and the lectures excellent and interesting.

ARC 442H1S Building Science, Materials and Construction I

Instructor(s): M. Lio

	Enr: 53							Resp: 33	Retake: 33%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	18	33	33	15	5.5	
Explains	0	0	0	9	40	34	15	5.6	
Communicates	0	0	0	6	15	45	33	6.1	
Teaching	0	0	0	6	34	46	12	5.7	
Workload	0	0	0	42	42	9	6	4.8	
Difficulty	0	0	0	48	33	9	9	4.8	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	28	32	28	12	5.2	

Most students liked the instructor's enthusiasm and his encouragement for student participation to ensure that topics were well-understood.

It was suggested that perhaps the class could be offered earlier in the program as it contained practical and useful information. They also felt that there was a lot of information and perhaps it could have been a full-year course. The majority agreed that there was too much reading. The class thought that the weekly problem sets were effective and some suggested a midterm or other test to ensure greater understanding of the material.