

6 ARCHITECTURE

Bachelor of Arts Architectural Studies Society



Introduction

The Bachelor of Arts Architectural Studies Society (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

Enr: 357	Resp: 201							Retake: 76%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	2	10	18	29	26	13	5.1
Explains	0	4	7	20	32	24	10	5.0
Communicates	1	6	8	16	22	26	18	5.1
Teaching	2	4	5	20	27	27	13	5.0
Workload	1	1	7	55	25	7	2	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	12	60	20	5	1	4.2
Learn Exp	1	3	6	29	30	20	7	4.8

Richards showed high interest in the course material, however, his delivery of the material was rather boring. The readings were quite difficult, however, the projects were generally enjoyable. Overall, the majority of students felt the course was interesting and insightful.

ARC 132H1S CONTEMPORARY ARCHITECTURE

Instructor(s): R. Levit

Enr: 314	Resp: 225							Retake: 80%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	4	17	31	28	15	5.3
Explains	0	3	5	15	24	31	18	5.3
Communicates	0	0	2	10	25	35	24	5.6
Teaching	0	2	4	12	27	38	15	5.4
Workload	0	2	7	68	12	6	1	4.2
Difficulty	0	1	8	57	22	6	2	4.3
Learn Exp	0	2	2	27	25	26	14	5.1

Some students felt that the use of essays as evaluation was difficult and uninteresting.

However, most felt that Levit was enthusiastic and knowledgeable.

ARC 213H1S ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN I

Instructor(s): M. Kelmans

Enr: 30	Resp: 17							Retake: 87%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	17	17	58	5	0	4.5
Explains	0	0	35	29	17	11	5	4.2
Communicates	0	0	0	47	41	11	0	4.6
Teaching	0	0	0	41	35	23	0	4.8
Workload	0	0	0	6	12	31	50	6.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	12	12	56	18	5.8
Learn Exp	0	7	7	7	46	7	23	5.1

Many students did not like how this design studio course did not

actually provide studio space. It was difficult to bring work to class from home. The class was less like a studio and more like a critique session.

Kelmans provided fair feedback and was quite friendly. However, some felt she did not allow enough time for each student to explain their projects.

ARC 231H1F ARCHITECTURE AND TECHNOLOGY

Instructor(s): D. Armstrong

Enr: 94	Resp: 65							Retake: 63%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	1	1	6	26	36	27	5.8
Explains	0	0	3	7	21	36	30	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	1	15	40	43	6.2
Teaching	1	0	0	7	23	33	33	5.9
Workload	0	0	1	31	34	22	9	5.0
Difficulty	0	1	0	26	50	20	1	4.9
Learn Exp	0	1	1	32	25	25	14	5.1

Armstrong was described by students as being engaging, energetic, and passionate about teaching. The lectures were clearly organized and very informative. However, many felt that his expectations were high and the readings were difficult.

ARC 232H1S ARCHITECTURE, MEDIA AND COMMUNICATION

Instructor(s): S. Sorli

Enr: 56	Resp: 40							Retake: 66%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	25	38	20	12	5.2
Explains	0	0	7	35	20	28	7	4.9
Communicates	0	0	0	20	12	41	25	5.7
Teaching	0	0	2	16	43	29	8	5.2
Workload	0	7	17	53	12	7	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	0	10	47	27	7	7	4.6
Learn Exp	0	3	6	51	18	12	9	4.6

Some students had difficulty understanding the relationship between the lectures, screenings and the assignments. The subjects discussed in class were usually highly conceptual, and some were difficult to understand, but they were "eye openers". Many appreciated Sorli's enthusiasm and liked his availability for private consultation.

ARC 235H1S ARCHITECTURAL CRITICISM

Instructor(s): A. Payne

Enr: 35	Resp: 18							Retake: 66%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	5	22	11	27	33	0	4.6
Explains	0	5	0	29	5	52	5	5.2
Communicates	0	5	0	11	11	38	33	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	27	16	38	16	5.4
Workload	0	0	0	22	5	66	5	5.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	16	11	55	16	5.7
Learn Exp	0	0	6	6	26	46	13	5.5

Most students felt that Payne was knowledgeable, friendly and enthusiastic. During his lectures, some felt his overly advanced use of words worked against the understanding of the discussion. The workload was high as well as general expectations. However, the course was interesting, and insightful.

ARC 236H1F DESIGN AND CULTURAL TRANSFORMATION

Instructor(s): R. Fones

Enr: 59	Resp: 50							Retake: 95%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	2	17	48	31	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	2	6	38	53	6.4
Communicates	0	0	0	4	22	32	40	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	0	16	54	29	6.1
Workload	2	10	14	66	6	0	2	3.7

Difficulty	0	2	18	74	4	0	2	3.9
Learn Exp	0	0	2	26	26	35	9	5.2

Fones was clearly knowledgeable in the subject and his enthusiasm helped too. Assignments were fairly graded and his demonstrations were very clear and helpful. His class was both interesting and fun.

ARC 313H1F ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN II

Instructor(s): K. Weiss

Enr: 24	Resp: 12							Retake: 90%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	25	25	33	16	5.4
Explains	0	0	8	0	50	33	8	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	33	25	41	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	0	50	33	16	5.7
Workload	0	0	0	8	25	33	33	5.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	16	41	16	25	5.5
Learn Exp	0	0	11	11	22	22	33	5.6

Most students enjoyed this design class more than the 2nd year design class. Weiss gave constructive comments, critiques and suggestions, although it would have been better if more office hours were available.

The course would be more interesting if students were given time to work in class. Goals of assignments were not very clear.

Instructor(s): M. Graham

Enr: 19	Resp: 16							Retake: 93%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	20	6	33	40	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	13	26	40	20	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	18	12	37	31	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	12	12	31	43	6.1
Workload	0	0	0	0	25	37	37	6.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	31	18	50	0	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	15	7	53	23	5.0

The comments for Graham were very positive. Students praised her honesty and clarity in her critiques.

ARC 314H1S ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN III

Instructor(s): H. Sample

Enr: 24	Resp: 24							Retake: 58%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	4	0	8	33	33	20	0	4.5
Explains	0	4	8	37	33	16	0	4.5
Communicates	0	8	16	45	25	4	0	4.0
Teaching	0	0	25	41	20	12	0	4.2
Workload	0	0	0	8	26	26	39	6.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	20	29	20	29	5.6
Learn Exp	4	4	9	31	22	18	9	4.5

Many felt Sample and the TA did not communicate with each other, resulting in confusion among students. Conflicting views between them also frustrated some students. A few felt Sample did not provide the necessary learning environment and gave vague directions to students. Some found Sample lacking enthusiasm while teaching and unapproachable in general. The course had three separate, but linked projects which were supposed to build on one another, however, many students felt this not to be the case.

Instructor(s): D. Carter

Enr: 20	Resp: 16							Retake: 66%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	6	0	31	37	12	12	4.9
Explains	0	0	6	12	50	25	6	5.1
Communicates	0	0	0	18	18	56	6	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	13	26	60	0	5.5

Workload	0	0	0	6	37	25	31	5.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	35	21	35	7	5.1
Learn Exp	8	0	0	25	8	41	16	5.2

Most found Carter to be helpful and concise. Some felt there was too much emphasis on analytical projects. Also, some felt that Carter needed to have better time management since some classes lasted 4.5 hours instead of 3. Overall, an enjoyable and rewarding experience.

ARC 321H1F ARCHITECTURAL REPRESENTATION II

Instructor(s): T. Bessai

Enr: 20	Resp: 16							Retake: 87%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	13	60	26	0	5.1
Explains	0	0	0	25	18	56	0	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	6	26	40	26	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	26	26	40	6	5.3
Workload	0	0	6	12	37	31	12	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	37	6	43	12	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	27	36	36	0	5.1

Generally, students found Bessai to be knowledgeable and enthusiastic with constructive criticisms. However, students found it harsh for the assignments in ARC 313 and 321 to be always due on the same week.

Instructor(s): K. Weiss

Enr: 20	Resp: 15							Retake: 93%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	13	13	26	40	6	5.1
Explains	0	0	6	20	13	46	13	5.4
Communicates	0	0	6	13	13	26	40	5.8
Teaching	0	0	7	21	0	50	21	5.6
Workload	0	0	0	6	13	53	26	6.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	26	26	33	13	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	6	13	6	33	40	5.9

Weiss was very friendly and he made the class environment a very relaxing one. Students liked his encouragement at critiques and thought his comments were strong and reasonable. However, students felt he could have devoted more time for individual consultation. Overall, Weiss was a fun and intelligent instructor.

ARC 341H1S BUILDING TECHNOLOGY-ECOLOGY I

Instructor(s): M. Liefhebber

Enr: 35	Resp: 20							Retake: 80%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	10	5	5	35	15	20	10	4.4
Explains	0	5	5	20	30	30	10	5.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	25	35	40	6.2
Teaching	0	5	10	15	40	25	5	4.8
Workload	0	0	26	57	10	5	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	0	15	85	0	0	0	3.8
Learn Exp	0	11	0	35	17	29	5	4.7

Liefhebber was quite excited about the course material and was a very knowledgeable architect. However, some students felt he was unorganized in his presentation and that the course was lacking in structure. The course material was interesting and useful though.

ARC 413H1F ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN IV

Instructor(s): D. Lieberman

Enr: 17	Resp: 12							Retake: 70%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	33	50	16	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	0	33	50	16	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	41	58	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	91	8	6.1
Workload	0	0	0	0	36	18	45	6.1

8 ARCHITECTURE

Difficulty	0	0	0	27	27	36	9	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	11	33	33	22	5.7

Lieberman was liked by many students and their response to the course material was equally positive. Lieberman provided good insight and care to each and every student.

ARC 414H1F INTRODUCTION TO GRAPHIC DESIGN

Instructor(s): K. Sugden

Enr: 29	Resp: 23							Retake: 91%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	4	0	0	26	52	17	5.7
Explains	0	4	0	4	13	34	43	6.0
Communicates	0	4	0	0	4	36	54	6.3
Teaching	0	4	0	0	8	60	26	6.0
Workload	0	0	17	69	13	0	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	4	78	17	0	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	42	36	21	5.8

Sugden was extremely knowledgeable and approachable. Students enjoyed working on his projects and felt that the assignments were useful for their portfolio. Sugden was also very flexible about assignment due dates. However, students would have liked more classes dedicated to critiquing the projects.

ARC 417H1S WORD, IMAGE AND FORM

Instructor(s): R. Fones

Enr: 15	Resp: 12							Retake: 91%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	8	58	16	16	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	33	58	8	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	16	75	8	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	0	33	58	8	5.8
Workload	0	16	0	41	25	8	8	4.3
Difficulty	0	16	25	33	25	0	0	3.7
Learn Exp	0	0	8	25	25	25	16	5.2

Fones was friendly and helpful. The course was enjoyable with interesting projects, however, a few felt that this course should have been offered in second year. The projects were mostly model-based, therefore a lot of time could be spent on developing the ideas instead of spending hours on drafting. The overall, this was a great course.

ARC 431H1F HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES ON TOPICS IN ARCHITECTURE I

Instructor(s): A. Sornin

Enr: 18	Resp: 17							Retake: 81%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	18	31	43	6	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	18	25	50	6	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	6	6	62	25	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	6	26	60	6	5.7
Workload	0	0	12	68	18	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	62	31	6	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	30	30	30	7	5.2

Students felt that the course material was difficult but interesting enough and that the course was well-structured. Sornin was very enthusiastic about the subject and content of the course but students felt he needed to speak louder. He was also available for extra help.

ARC 432H1S HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES ON TOPICS IN ARCHITECTURE II

Instructor(s): P. Scrivano

Enr: 16	Resp: 7							Retake: 71%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	16	66	16	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	14	28	42	14	5.6

Communicates	0	0	0	0	33	50	16	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	14	42	42	0	5.3
Workload	0	0	42	57	0	0	0	3.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	40	20	40	0	5.0

Most enjoyed Scrivano's enthusiasm and his abundance of knowledge. His course was cohesive and achieved a clear and concise goal. However, students complained about assignments not being marked. Overall, most felt the course was useful and enjoyable.

ARC 433H1S URBAN DESIGN HISTORY, THEORY CRITICISM I

Instructor(s): A. Blackwell

Enr: 16	Resp: 11							Retake: 80%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	10	0	0	60	10	20	5.2
Explains	10	0	0	10	20	30	30	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	10	20	20	50	6.1
Teaching	0	0	10	0	30	30	30	5.7
Workload	0	0	0	45	45	9	0	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	45	18	36	0	4.9
Learn Exp	0	11	0	11	11	33	33	5.6

The course was interesting with challenging material. Class discussions were of high quality and most students liked the seminar-like class size and format. Most students liked Blackwell and felt he did a good job.

ARC 441H1F ARCHITECTURE IN ITS TECHNOLOGICAL-ECOLOGICAL CONTEXT

Instructor(s): J. Stinson

Enr: 13	Resp: 11							Retake: 60%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	9	36	36	0	18	4.8
Explains	0	0	0	45	27	9	18	5.0
Communicates	0	0	0	10	40	20	30	5.7
Teaching	9	0	9	27	36	0	18	4.5
Workload	0	9	0	81	9	0	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	54	27	18	0	4.6
Learn Exp	9	0	9	36	18	9	18	4.5

Many thought this course concentrated too much on technological and construction aspects but not on the ecological aspects. Stinson communicated well but his lectures were unrelated to the themes of the course and the assignments. He gave too few examples to explain content. Case studies and the reader were interesting but 50% of the course mark was based on the reader which was hardly discussed in class.

ARC 442H1S BUILDING SCIENCE, MATERIALS AND CONSTRUCTION I

Instructor(s): M. Lio

Enr: 16	Resp: 16							Retake: 40%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	6	31	50	12	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	25	31	37	6	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	6	68	25	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	56	37	6	5.5
Workload	0	0	0	18	50	25	6	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	6	37	18	37	5.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	46	13	33	6	5.0

Lio was professional, well-organized and taught well. Many felt that this course should have been offered in second year through fourth year, instead of having it in the last semester of the last year. The material was very useful and very practical - unlike most other courses which are airy and conceptual.

