2009 Bachelor of Architecture Program Annual Report:
Next Visit:  2013

Part II (Responses to Most Recent Visiting Team Report)

DEFICIENCIES

Condition 1: Architecture Education and Society
This condition is determined to be met. The program is no longer required to continue reporting on this deficiency. However, the program’s overall response to the concerns raised by the visiting team should be thoroughly documented in the next Architecture Program Report.

Condition 2: Program Self-Assessment Procedures
The program is to be commended for the recent progress in this area. However, since the new chair of undergraduate programs has only had a few months to begin her work, much remains to be demonstrated. The program is advised to continue reporting on this deficiency and to document their progress thoroughly in the next APR, due in September 2012.

Under the supervision of Kim Coleman, Chair of Undergraduate Programs, task forces working during the 2008-09 academic year evaluated the effectiveness of the program with respect to digital interface, technology and practice issues, and history/theory issues. Improvements have been initiated this year, and modified course descriptions will be brought to the Curriculum Committee, which includes both faculty and student members, the faculty and the University early in 2010 for further discussion and approval. This semester a design studio task force, consisting of the coordinators of each semester of the undergraduate studio curriculum with advice from our history and technology faculty, is working on clarifying our mission, identifying more clear identities for each semester of the program and looking at ways to reinforce and reciprocate learning between courses. The task force proposal will be brought to the faculty and students for further discussion in the spring semester.

Charles Lagreco, our faculty member in charge of external relations, and Vice-Dean Amy Murphy are currently overseeing the development of a web-based poll of our graduates, which will request information on what they have been doing since graduation, and asking them to comment on their education from their current perspective, including what aspects that were valuable and areas in which the School might improve. Our support group, the Architectural Guild, is assisting in this effort. As well, the School is planning an end of semester super-review with invited guests that include graduates and architecture professionals representing both
national and local perspectives to discuss the current work with faculty and students and help us to assess our academic mission.

**Criterion 13.9: Non-Western Traditions**
Since the Arch214a and b sequence has not yet been approved by the university, and thus no student work has been produced, the program is advised to continue reporting on this deficiency. How this matter has been addressed since the last visit will be of interest to the 2011 visiting team. The program is advised to document their response to this deficiency thoroughly in the next APR.

(Note on comment above – we expect the next visiting team in 2013)
As mentioned last year, Arch 214a & b have been reformulated to teach World History, and faculty not having non-Western history background will no longer teach these courses. The survey courses, renamed World History and Theory of Architecture, have been re-structured as a global series based in each instance on a 5 part division into 1.Africa, 2.Asia and Australasia, 3.Europe, 4.the Americas, and 5.West Asia (the former Middle East). All examples in each time period from prehistory to the present are drawn equally from each region and social stratum. The process of University approval did not take place last spring as expected, because of other delays, but the content of the syllabi has already been adjusted and the new curriculum has been taught since the beginning of 2008. Attached are the syllabi for the two courses.

**CAUSES OF CONCERN**

**Program Self-Assessment Procedures**
The program is to be commended for the recent progress in this area. However, since the new chair of undergraduate programs has only had a few months to begin her work, much remains to be demonstrated. The program is advised to continue reporting on this deficiency and to document their progress thoroughly in the next APR, due in September 2010.

(Note on comment above: our understanding is that the next APR is due September 2012)
Please see notes above on Self-Assessment Procedures.

**Human Resources**
The NAAB is aware of the projected effect of the current economic downturn on colleges and universities. However, the professional development of faculty remains a concern for the program. The program is advised to continue reporting on this cause for concern and to provide additional information as to which faculty members received research support and how that compares with the number of faculty receiving such support in previous years.

This past year has seen much improvement in the School’s commitment to our tenured, tenure track and adjunct faculty. After a several year freeze on supplemental research funding for our faculty, our Human Resource Committee worked with the Dean and School’s Budget Office to create a three tiered faculty support fund. This financial support for teaching and
research activities is available to any faculty with annually renewable contracts and multi-year appointments. This strategy emphasizes: a. basic resources for faculty on multi-year appointments; b. uniform fairness for our tenure track faculty, c. competitive value-based supplemental support for tenured faculty

It follows a tiered approach based on appointment type: Adjunct Faculty with a three-year appointment and annually renewable contract are eligible for $1000/year of basic support for teaching activities and related research. Full Time Non Tenure Track faculty are eligible for a $2000/year of basic support for teaching activities and related research. TT Faculty are eligible for $2000/year of basic support plus an additional uniform amount of $4000/year of supplemental support to be used for appropriate tenure track research activity and costs related to preparing required dossier submittals.

Tenured Faculty are eligible for $2000/year of basic support and may also submit an application for additional resources support three times a year. There is no limit to the amount requested for individual research activities but the general estimated range of support is below $10,000 per faculty per request. Each proposal will be considered independently on its own stated value in regard to how it advances the career of the individual faculty member and the mission of the School and University. There are three dates for submissions, and the proposals are first reviewed by the Human Resource Committee. Recommendations are then forwarded to the Dean for his final approval, setting the amount of the award for research and activities the faculty and the Dean find valuable to the individual, the discipline and the School’s mission.

Along with creating this baseline funding support structure, the School has also worked to reexamine its current staff structure to offer better more robust faculty support for their activities. Over the past two years we have experienced a drastic increase in faculty seeking government funding contracts and grants through NSF and other agencies. During this current fall semester, we are working to realign current staff and add additional staff to better support on an institutional level faculty needs to create viable proposals. The Dean is thoroughly committed to this direction of faculty activity and is involved in making the School itself a better platform from which faculty can gain success in this area.

Lastly, we have re-tooled our tenure track positions slightly, providing a 7th semester teaching release as a standard practice for all of our tenure track faculty. Here the faculty stay at full salary but are released from their teaching responsibilities during this semester to focus on setting up a
successful second half of their six year track. At USC there is a third year review process which occurs for all tenure track during their 6\textsuperscript{th} semester. Once this is complete, the faculty are advised by their mentor and Dean on which areas are most necessary to focus on in the remaining three years. The 7\textsuperscript{th} semester release allows this faculty member the time to really take those suggestions seriously and make adjustments if necessary, and to further current successes.

\textbf{Studio Culture}

\textit{Since the revised Studio Culture Policy has not yet been ratified by students, the program is advised to continue reporting on this cause for concern.}

During the Spring of 2009, the Human Resource Committee further refined our Studio Culture document. The Human Resource Committee has a student representative on the committee but advise from our two student councils was also sought during this updating process. Once the document incorporated all the comments from faculty, students and staff, then it was presented formally to all groups. The Student Councils of both the undergraduates and the graduates presented this to their student body and the Councils voted to support the document. The Faculty voted to support at their last Faculty meeting in May 2009. This document then was as is now common practice, given to all students in the Fall 2009 in each studio, as well as posted on our website. The students and faculty then review the document in class and both parties sign the document stating they have read the material. The School considers this a ‘living document’ and will repeat this process annually each spring so that all can add or debate sections each year.

\textbf{CHANGES TO THE ACCREDITED PROGRAM}

There have been no changes to the B.Arch program.
DEFICIENCIES:

13.23 Building Systems Integration

Although the program has identified the courses in which this SPC is taught, it has not provided evidence of student learning by producing student work that demonstrates that students are achieving at the level of ability. The program is advised to continue reporting on this deficiency and to provide examples of high and low-passing student work in response to the assignments made in the relevant courses.

2009 USC Response:
The M.Arch program continues to provide instruction at a level of ability in Building Systems Integration through the Basic Requirements: ARCH 215 Design for the Thermal and Atmospheric Environment, ARCH 313 Design of Building Structures, ARCH 315 Design for the Luminous and Sonic Environment, ARCH 411 Architectural Technology and ARCH 511 Building Systems. Furthermore, the pedagogy of the first year design studios—ARCH 505a and ARCH 505b—called BASICS is to provide a level of ability through different studio topics that demonstrate the variety of methods and opportunities available to design and integrate building systems. Coordinated by Professor John Mutlow, Chair of Graduate Studies, the revised studio curricular began in Fall 2007 with a single studio for the Eco-Tower, a sustainable energy high-rise structure located off-grid on a resort island. For Fall 2008 and Spring 2009, the first year BASICS curriculum continued to be refined and developed through contemporary and updated solutions to building system integration. Four studios were offered with different building typologies to showcase the rich diversity and potentials in systems integrations. Included in the appendix are projects for a Hotel, a Library, and creative office space.

Note: USC School of Architecture is unclear on whether we are to be attaching a selection of images in response to this question each year; or if we are to only address the answer in narrative text now and have the next Accreditation Team assess the work at the point of our next visit. If NAAB review body would like us to forward a set of student projects that we feel address this concern visually, please let us know and we would be more than accommodating in sending this material to NAAB immediately.
13.28 Comprehensive Design
Although the program has identified the courses in which this SPC is taught, it has not provided evidence of student learning by producing student work that demonstrates that students are achieving at the level of ability. The program is advised to continue reporting on this deficiency and to provide examples of high and low-passing student work in response to the assignments made in the relevant courses.

2009 USC Response:

Advance design studios, ARCH 605a and ARCH 605b, continue to focus on the integration of structural and environmental systems, life safety provisions and principles of sustainability. Coordinated by our new tenure-track faculty, John Enright (who also teaches ARCH 526: Professional Practice: Legal and Economic Context, Project Documentation) the Fall 605a studio begins with a month-long exercise of designing a desert pavilion with only environmental, ecological and tectonic parameters. The studio continues the focus on the inter-relationships between these systems by introducing a substantially larger project: the Museum of Materials. The project’s size, its program and urban site advances the lessons from the pavilion and frames the comprehensive design as the academic and conceptual basis of the studios. With such reliance on the environmental and safety performance of the building as the principle curricular structure, reaching the level of ability in Comprehensive Design has become an inherent trait of the design studios.

Curricular options are being added through our Graduate Studies Abroad Program. For 2010, the program is proposing an option of providing ARCH 605a studios off-campus, either domestically or internationally, dedicated to a pedagogical integration with our three sister programs: Master of Building Science, Master of Historic Preservation and Master of Landscape Architecture. The integration with any of these programs, let alone two or three, will provide an invaluable academic framework to attain a level of comprehensive design.

Note: USC School of Architecture is unclear on whether we are to be attaching a selection of images in response to this question each year; or if we are to only address the answer in narrative text now and have the next Accreditation Team assess the work at the point of our next visit. If NAAB review body would like us to forward a set of student projects that we feel address this concern visually, please let us know and we would be more than accommodating in sending this material to NAAB immediately.

13.34 Ethics and Professional Judgment
Although the program has identified the courses in which this SPC is taught, it has not provided evidence of student learning by producing student work that demonstrates that students are achieving at the level of ability. The program is advised to continue reporting on this deficiency
and to provide examples of high and low-passing student work in response to the assignments made in the relevant courses.

2009 USC Response:
The SPC matrixes show ARCH 315, ARCH 411, ARCH 525 and ARCH 526 as providing an “understanding” of Criterion 13.34. *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation: 2004 Edition* outlines Criterion 13.34 at a level of “understanding”, not “ability” as the VTR comment above states. ARCH 525 Professional Practice: Pre-Design, Project and Office Administration and ARCH 526 Professional Practice: legal and Economic context, Project Documentation has been revised to reflect more accurately a level of understanding in Ethics and Professional Judgment. Two days are dedicated to this particular topic including a group exercise / project designed to promote discussion and awareness.

For Example, CASE STUDIES: San Carlos Borromeo vs. Redwoods/ The Vernal Pool

The students were broken into about 12 groups, had to read the case study, and discuss the points amongst their groups. Then, they had to present their argument FOR or AGAINST one position or another -- to the whole class. Usually this results in a very LIVELY debate about which position might have merit in certain areas over others. This particular exercise has become popular in the course as a fun and VERY VERY INFORMATIVE session. The answers that each group comes up with are sometimes very inventive.

THE ARGUMENTS ARE ALWAYS POSITIONED IN TERMS OF ETHICS. The students get credit of a full quiz grade for participating in the discussion. They turn in their group names at the end of class.

Furthermore, the Graduate Studies Abroad Programs (GSAP) has offered workshops, electives and studios in China to research, analyze and offer responsible proposals for the rapidly developing and emerging inner urban areas. As history, culture and people clash in such countries, development and economic growth confront issues of preservation, relocation, and conservation of local culture. Issues of ethics and professional judgment are addressed and understood in very real terms as students interview all affected parties, from the local residents to the government officials, and defend arguments and positions that arise from their research and analysis.

*See Syllabus and Ethics Case study in ARCH 525 at the end of this document.*
CAUSES OF CONCERN

Disconnect between technical studies and studio design

The program is to be commended for addressing this concern through the changes to the first year sequence for M.Arch students. However, at this time the program has not provided sufficient evidence that students are integrating these two areas of learning in their work. The program is advised to continue reporting on this deficiency and to provide examples of high and low-passing student work in response to the assignments made in the relevant courses.

2009 USC Response:
Continuing vigilance on the integration of building systems and comprehensive design will bridge any disconnect between technical studies and studio design. The majority of the M.Arch students pursue the Certificate in Building Science and this has had an implicit impact in studio design. Additionally, the emergence of technology, sustainable energy systems and technical studies as the central pedagogy in studio design seamlessly connects the two areas. Finally, the continuing efforts of BASICs, the first year building integration curriculum, continues its role in establishing a foundation for all entering +2 students. The current second year has shown a remarkable increase in their ability to integrate, process and design their projects with improved technical and tectonic sensibilities.

CHANGES TO THE ACCREDITED PROGRAM

There have been no changes to the M.Arch +2 program.
Introduction:

Courses on the history of architecture have typically focused on the western tradition, following a rather predictable pattern through the analysis of civilizations that have been considered to be instrumental in the formation of western culture.

The World History of Architecture Series offered by the University of Southern California School of Architecture changes this pattern by looking at a world wide perspective of history, in all its textured richness and variegated scope. It is based on a five part structure to ensure complete coverage. In alphabetical order, this is: (1) Africa (2) Asia (3) Europe (4) The Americas (5) West Asia (formerly known as the Middle East).

For clarity, this part of the survey will be divided into chronologically coherent groupings, related to discernable similarities.

Course Goals and Objectives

1. To provide students with a fundamental level of literacy in the topics, names, terms and ideas of the historical period being studied
2. To make students aware of the fact that architecture is the product of social, cultural, religious and political forces and cannot be understood without introducing those issues and studying their place in the civilization or national history being analyzed.
3. To make students aware of the fact that, in any given point of time in the past, great cultures and civilizations have existed all over the world, not just in one part of it. These cultures and civilizations interacted and were interconnected. This means that there is a great deal more texture and complexity to world history that has typically been conveyed by the more conventional, one-dimensional Eurocentric history course offered in the past.
4. Such courses have also tended to focus on the monumental architecture of the past, which has survived because more financial and human capital was lavished on it by the upper class or rulers who built it, so that it was built of more durable materials. However, these monuments only represent a small fraction of the story of each civilization under scrutiny. In order to present a more complete picture, it is also necessary the everyday architecture of the
people themselves, especially the domestic equivalent to monumental accomplishments.

5. To make students aware of the fact that people in the past had a more finely attuned relationship with the natural environment and their local context than we do today. They built in direct response to these factors. We have a great deal to learn from this traditional wisdom, and must approach the study of it with respect, rather than dismissing it as quaint and primitive.

Course Schedule:
The course is divided into three sessions, related to three discernable divisions within the timeframe being studied. Each session ends with an review and an examination.

January

Session One: The Search for the Cosmos

Tuesday 13: Introduction to the course.

Thursday 15 Asia
   Africa: Ancient Egypt: The Old Kingdom
   Europe: The Early Neolithic: Lascaux
   The Americas:
   West Asia: Catal Huyuk
   Read: FC P17-19

Tuesday 20 Asia The Shang Dynasty
   Africa Ancient Egypt: The Middle Kingdom
   Europe
   The Americas
   West Asia: Sumer
   Read: TH p67-76
   FC p.37-63

Presentation: Team 1

Thursday 22 Asia
   Africa: Ancient Egypt: The Amarna Culture
   Europe
   The Americas
   West Asia
   Read: FC p 28-36

Presentation Team 2

Tuesday 27: Asia
Africa
Europe  The Neolithic in Britain and France: Stonehenge
The Americas: The Ohio Valley Cultures,
West Asia
Read: TH p. 49-52
FC p. 374

Presentation Team 3

Thursday 29: Asia
Africa
Europe: The Minoans
The Americas
West Asia
Read: TH p. 77-80
FC p. 66-70

Presentation Team 4

February

Tuesday 3  Asia
Africa
Europe: Mycenae
The Americas
West Asia
Read: TH p. 80=81
FC p. 71-73

Presentation Team 5

Thursday 5 : Review

Tuesday 10 : Examination: Session #1

Session 2: The Rise and Fall of Empires

Thursday 12 Asia The Song Dynasty
Africa: Great Zimbabwe
Europe The Greeks
The Americas; Cahokia
West Asia: Sargon of Akkad
Read: TH p. 83-90
FC p. 78-80, 90-92

Presentation Team 6
Tuesday 17  Asia  
Africa  
Europe The Greeks II  
The Americas:  
Read: TH 90-109  
FC 116-130  
Presentation Team 7

Thursday 19 Asia  
Africa: The Ptolemys  
Europe: The Hellenistic Age  
The Americas: Chan Chan, Peru  
West Asia  
Read: FC 130-135  
Presentation Team 8

Tuesday 24 Asia: Jomon Japan  
Africa  
Europe: The Romans I  
The Americas: The Maya  
West Asia: Jerusalem  
Read: TH p. 111-135  
FC p. 104  
Presentation Team 9

Thursday 26; Asia: Yayoi Japan  
Africa  
Europe: The Romans II  
The Americas: The Aztecs and the Inca  
West Asia:  
Read: TH p.135-153  
Presentation Team 10

March

Tuesday 3 Asia  
Africa  
Europe: The Carolingen Empire  
The Americas  
West Asia The Byzantines  
Read: TH p. 159-178
Presentation Team 11

Thursday 5  Asia
Africa: The Mamluks
Europe: The Holy Roman Empire
The Americas
West Asia: The Fall of Constantinople.
Read: TH p. 185-190
    FC p. 441-442

Presentation Team 12

Tuesday 10 : Review : Session 2

Thursday 12 : Examination Session 2

Session III: The Age of Faiths

Tuesday 17  Asia  Kubla Khan
Africa
Europe: The Romanesque
The Americas: The Anazasi
West Asia: The Seljuks and the Ottomans
Read: TH p. 185-190
    FC p. 437-440

Presentation: Team 13

Thursday 19  Asia
Africa
Europe
The Americas
West Asia: The Rise of Islam
Read: TH p.215-223
    FC p.303-309

Presentation: Team 14

Tuesday 24  Asia; Buddhist Architecture
Africa
Europe
The Americas
West Asia
Read: FC p. 168-173

Presentation Team 15

Thursday 26  Asia: The Khmers
Africa
Europe
The Americas
West Asia
Read: FC: p. 168-173

Presentation Team 16

Tuesday 31  Asia
Africa
Europe: The Medieval City
The Americas
West Asia
Read: Handout

Presentation Team 17

April

Thursday 2  Asia
Africa
Europe: High Gothic I
The Americas
West Asia
Read: TH p. 225-238

Presentation Team 18

Tuesday 7  Asia
Africa
Europe: High Gothic II
The Americas
West Asia
Read: TH p. 238-257

Presentation Team 19
Thursday 9  Review

Tuesday 14  Examination Session 3

Conclusion

Thursday 16
Asia
Africa
Europe
The Americas
West Asia: The Mughals in India
Read: FC 472-480

Presentation Team 20

Tuesday 21
Asia
Africa
Europe The Renaissance in Italy
The Americas Colonial Spanish Architecture
West Asia
Read: TH: p. 281-325

Presentation Team 21

Thursday 23
Asia
Africa
Europe The Renaissance in Britain
The Americas Colonial Spanish Architecture
West Asia: Tokugawa Japan
Read: TH p.325-333
FC p. 461-462

Presentation Team 22

Tuesday 28  Review for the Final Examination

Thursday 30  Review for the Final Examination

Course Requirements and Grading;

Examination 1: 15%
Examination 2: 15%
Examination 3: 15%
Final Examination: 40%
Class Participation: 15%

There are two Textbooks for this course, as well as a Reader. The Textbooks are:

3. The Reader is available at Magic Machine, University Village. It is still in preparation, and its availability will be announced in class.

The participation portion of this class is determined by a team project (see team listings under each lecture on the class schedule). There will be six members on each team, and each participant will be assigned one of the following roles.

Research Topic: The Representation of the Past

1. **Group Editor**. Will collect information from each of the other team members, and assemble it into a complete presentation.
   
   **Written component**: create a story line for the lecture to which you are assigned to ensure that the material you receive conforms to it.

2. **C.D Editor**. Edit the C.D. given to you by viewing it, and marking the portion that is most critical, to be shown in class. (20 minutes max). You will assist in showing it in class. Return the CD to the TA’s

   **Written component**: Critique the CD. Are there any better alternatives?

3. **Film Editor**: This team member will search for film versions of the assigned lecture topic

   **Written component**: Describe how the topic has been presented in film. List what they are.

4. **Picture Researcher**. Search for high quality images of the major buildings presented in the lecture you are assigned to. (15-20)

   **Written component**: Describe sources. List them. Describe copyright issues and procedures.

5. **Existing C.D. Editor** There are existing CD’s of each lecture which need to be updated and improved. This team member will be issued one of these existing CDs and will be responsible for deciding how to improve it. This will require reference to and the use of the resources found by each of the other team members.

   **Written component**: What are the essential aspects of the period being
studied?

6. **Bibliographer;** This team member will compile an exhaustive bibliography of the subject involved in the lecture being assigned.

**Course Bibliography:**

1. Elizabeth French: *Mycenae, Agamemnon’s Capital, The Site and It’s Setting*

More to come..

**Attendance Policy**

Any student not in class within the first 10 minutes is considered tardy, and any student absent (in any form including sleep, technological distraction, or by leaving mid class for a long bathroom/water break) for more than 1/3 of the class time can be considered fully absent. If arriving late, a student must be respectful of a class in session and do everything possible to minimize the disruption caused by a late arrival. It is always the student’s responsibility to seek means (if possible) to make up work missed due to absences, not the instructor’s, although such recourse is not always an option due to the nature of the material covered. Missing more than the equivalent of one week of class will have a significant effect on the student’s grade. Unless due to exigent circumstances, late papers shall not be accepted, and a mark of F shall given for that assignment.

**Diversity**

This course meets university diversity requirements; as such it addresses the ways race, gender, ethnicity, and class have been the basis for conflict as well as oppression, and the social and cultural consequences of this oppression. It will also consider the ways in which race, gender and class have represented social and cultural resources in post-Industrial Revolution cities on four continents. One of the objectives of the course is to understand ways in which different types of oppression are structured into the built environment, and how people have attempted to confront this oppression through transformations in the built environment.

**Statement for Students with Disabilities**

Any student requesting academic accommodations based on a disability is required to register with Disability Services and Programs (DSP) each semester. A letter of verification for approved accommodations can be obtained from DSP. Please be sure the letter is delivered to me (or to TA) as early in the semester as possible. DSP is located in STU 301 and is open 8:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. The phone number for DSP is (213) 740-0776.
Statement on Academic Integrity

USC seeks to maintain an optimal learning environment. General principles of academic honesty include the concept of respect for the intellectual property of others, the expectation that individual work will be submitted unless otherwise allowed by an instructor, and the obligations both to protect one’s own academic work from misuse by others as well as to avoid using another’s work as one’s own. All students are expected to understand and abide by these principles. Scampus, the Student Guidebook, contains the Student Conduct Code in Section 11.00, while the recommended sanctions are located in Appendix A: http://www.usc.edu/dept/publications/SCAMPUS/gov/. Students will be referred to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs and Community Standards for further review, should there be any suspicion of academic dishonesty. The Review process can be found at: http://www.usc.edu/student-affairs/SJACS/.

“The USC School of Architecture’s five year BARCH degree and the two year M.ARCH degree are accredited professional architectural degree programs. All students can access and review the NAAB Conditions of Accreditation (including the Student Performance Criteria) on the NAAB Website, http://www.naab.org/accreditation/2004_Conditions.aspx.”
University of Southern California  
School of Architecture  

World History of Architecture Series: Part II: Arch 214 B  
1500 A.D to the Present  
Fall Semester 2009  

Instructor: James Steele  
Harris Hall 101, 4:30 to 6:15 p.m., Tuesday and Thursday  

Courses in the history of architecture have typically focused on the western tradition, following a predictable pattern of covering those civilizations that have been considered instrumental in the formation of western culture.  

The World History of Architecture Series offered by the University of Southern California School of Architecture changes this pattern by looking at the world wide perspective of history, in all of its textured richness and variegated scope. It is based on a five part structure to ensure complete coverage. In alphabetical order, this is: (1) Africa, (2) Asia, (3) Europe, (4) The Americas, (5) West Asia (the area formerly known as the Middle East).

Course Goals and Objectives  

1. To provide students with a fundamental understanding and level of literacy in the theories, topics, names, terms and ideas of the historical period being studied.  
2. To make students aware of the fact that architecture is the product of social, cultural, religious and political forces and cannot be understood without introducing those issues and studying their place in the historical topic being analyzed.  
3. To make students aware of the fact that, at any given point in time, great cultures and civilizations have existed all over the world, not just in one part of it. Cultures and civilizations have interacted and now do so more than ever, which means that there is a great deal more complexity to the world history of architecture than has typically been conveyed by the more conventional, one dimensional, Eurocentric history courses offered in the past.

Course Schedule  

Textbooks for this Course:  

August  
Tu. 25 Introduction to the Course  
Th. 27 The Renaissance  
September
Tu  1  The Late Renaissance and the Baroque
   Reading: *A Global History of Architecture*
   Pgs: 485 to 499, 502 to 508, 531 to 534, 563, 564

Th  2  The Enlightenment: Rationalism
   Reading: *A Global History of Architecture*
   Pgs: 544 to 553, 593 to 597, 715, 716,
   *Architecture Today*: pgs: 36 to 65
Tu  8  Typology
Th  9  The Arts and Crafts Movement
   *A Global History of Architecture*
   Pgs: 631 to 633, 644, 645 , 650
Tu 15 Charles Rennie Mackintosh
   Reading:
Th.16  Review for Exam #1
Tu. 22 **Exam. #1**
Th. 24 The Shift to Germany
   Reading: *Global History of Architecture*, pgs: 666, 667
Tu. 29 The Bauhaus
   Reading: *Global History of Architecture*, pgs: 682, 683, 678, 696, 692, 697, 718

October
Th.  1  The Constructivists,
Tu.  6  De Stijl
   Reading: *Global History of Architecture*: pgs: 680, 681, 690
   Term Paper Topic Distributed and Discussed
Th.  8  Le Corbusier: The Domino Phase
   Reading: *Global History of Architecture*, pgs: 684-686, 690, 693, 696, 703,
Tu. 13 Le Corbusier: The Monol Phase
   Reading: *Global History of Architecture*, pg. 721, 726 to 729
Th. 15 America : Frank Lloyd Wright
   Reading: *Global History of Architecture* pgs: 654, 660, 661, 676, 709, 710, 720
Tu 20 Los Angeles
   Reading: *Global History of Architecture* pgs: 694, 710, 719,

Th. 22 Japan
   Reading: *Global History of Architecture*: pg. 738,750
   *Architecture Today*, pgs 432 to 463
Tu. 27 Review for Exam #2
Th. 29 **Exam #2**
November
Tu. 3 Louis Kahn
   Reading: *Global History of Architecture*: pg. 723, 737, 743
Th  5 The New York Five
   Reading: *Architecture Today*: pgs 304 to 311
Tu 10 Post- Modernism
   Reading: *Architecture Today*, pgs 172 to 179, 340 to 367
Th 12 The Search for Identity
   Handout distributed from: *Rasem Badran* by James Steele, Thames and Hudson, London, 2007

Tu 17 Deconstructivism
   Reading *Architecture Today* pgs: 202 to 223
Th 19 Sustainability

Tu 24 Generative Architecture
Th 26 Thanksgiving Holiday

December
Tu.1 Review for Final Exam
   **Term Paper Due**
Th 3 Review for Final Exam
   Last Class Session

Course Requirements and Grading

Examination #1 : 15%
Examination #2 : 15%
Examination #3 : 15%
Term Paper: : 15%
Final Examination: 30%
Class Participation: 10%

Attendance Policy
Any student not in class within the first 10 minutes is considered tardy, and any student absent (in any form including sleep, technological distraction, or by leaving mid class for a long bathroom/water break) for more than 1/3 of the class time can be considered fully absent. If arriving late, a student must be respectful of a class in session and do everything possible to minimize the disruption caused by a late arrival. It is always the student's responsibility to seek means (if possible) to make up work missed due to absences, not the instructor's, although such recourse is not always an option due to the nature of the material covered. Missing more than the equivalent of one week of class will have a significant effect on the student’s grade. Unless due to exigent circumstances, late papers shall not be accepted, and a mark of F shall given for that assignment.
Diversity
This course meets university diversity requirements; as such it addresses the ways race, gender, ethnicity, and class have been the basis for conflict as well as oppression, and the social and cultural consequences of this oppression. It will also consider the ways in which race, gender and class have represented social and cultural resources in post-Industrial Revolution cities on four continents. One of the objectives of the course is to understand ways in which different types of oppression are structured into the built environment, and how people have attempted to confront this oppression through transformations in the built environment.

Statement for Students with Disabilities
Any student requesting academic accommodations based on a disability is required to register with Disability Services and Programs (DSP) each semester. A letter of verification for approved accommodations can be obtained from DSP. Please be sure the letter is delivered to me (or to TA) as early in the semester as possible. DSP is located in STU 301 and is open 8:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. The phone number for DSP is (213) 740-0776.

Statement on Academic Integrity
USC seeks to maintain an optimal learning environment. General principles of academic honesty include the concept of respect for the intellectual property of others, the expectation that individual work will be submitted unless otherwise allowed by an instructor, and the obligations both to protect one’s own academic work from misuse by others as well as to avoid using another’s work as one’s own. All students are expected to understand and abide by these principles. Scampus, the Student Guidebook, contains the Student Conduct Code in Section 11.00, while the recommended sanctions are located in Appendix A: http://www.usc.edu/dept/publications/SCAMPUS/gov/. Students will be referred to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs and Community Standards for further review, should there be any suspicion of academic dishonesty. The Review process can be found at: http://www.usc.edu/student-affairs/SJACS/.

“The USC School of Architecture’s five year BARCH degree and the two year M.ARCH degree are accredited professional architectural degree programs. All students can access and review the NAAB Conditions of Accreditation (including the Student Performance Criteria) on the NAAB Website, http://www.naab.org/accreditation/2004_Conditions.aspx.”
08-31-09 Ethics and Professional Conduct

Review of AIA Professional Ethics: Membership obligations
The American Institute of Architects requires all of its members to abide by a higher
standard of professional behavior (ethics) that includes transparency and conduct
appropriate to a professional with responsibilities to the law and the public.

“Architects shall do NOTHING to violate the law.”

If an architect is cited for violating the AIA Code of Ethics, they can take 3 possible actions: 1.)
Admonish you. 2) Censure you. 3.) Suspend membership 4.) Terminate membership.

General Obligations:
Rule 1.101: In practicing architecture, Members shall demonstrate a consistent pattern of
reasonable care and competence, and shall apply the technical knowledge and skill which is
ordinarily applied by architects of good standing practicing in the same locality.

“Standard of care” is a legal concept that covers all professions. All professionals must exercise
reasonable and knowledgeable judgment that is considered “average” to that practiced by others
in that jurisdiction. NOTE: Be careful of contracts that CHANGE this standard to one that is
ABOVE the standard of care! A client’s lawyer may attempt to change your contract to
expectations that are beyond reasonable.

Obligations to the Public:
Rule 2.101: Members shall not, in the conduct of their professional practice, knowingly violate the
law.

(ie—A setback might be 15'-0" by local code. What if you designed it at 5'-0" unknowingly and no
official caught this mistake during plan check review and the permit process. Later, a senior
inspector on the job construction site catches the mistake—after construction has started.
YOU—the architect made the mistake by NOT doing enough preliminary research to find out the
local codes. Q: What recourse do you have? 1.) Jackhammer it out and fix it. Your liability
insurance will pay for the mistake, and your insurance will go up. 2.) You apply for a variance,
BUT on your own time and cost because YOU missed the code issue. These are the ethical
actions that can be taken.
Scenario: What if a plan checker misses a code stipulation, and everyone else missed it too.

Q: What if a bystander gets hurt because the project was not built according to this code
stipulation. Who is liable?

A: The architect is liable because “ignorance of the law is not an excuse for breaking the law.”
(You might hear this one in traffic court.) Note: There is a 7 year statute of limitations. It is
unfortunate that many widows of deceased architects must keep their husband’s liability
insurance because their estates are still liable for 7 years after a project is built.

Errors and Omissions are missing or incorrect design data that might cause harm to the public
or bystander. (ie—The 1981 Hyatt Regency Hotel bridge collapse killed 114 people in Kansas
City, Missouri. The architect and structural engineer detailed the bridge correctly—in the original
design. BUT, the shop drawings were issued with fatal mistakes—because the steel contractor
changed the original design. The architect approved and signed off the shop drawings—without
reviewing the new changes thoroughly. The architect was found partially responsible because of
this sign off. However, the sub-contractor who built the bridge bore the brunt of liability. [See wikipedia.org “Hyatt Regency Walkway Collapse”]

Rule 2.102: Members shall neither offer nor make any payment or gift to a public official with the intent of influencing the official’s judgment in connection with an existing or prospective project in which the Members are interested.

You can be friends with bldg officials. (Mina has friends in the LADBS.) But you cannot do anything that might compromise their position as public servants or do anything untoward that might be considered bribery in the AIA Code of Ethics.

Rule 2.105: If, in the course of their work on a project, the Members become aware of a decision taken by their employer or client which violates any law or regulation and which will, in the Member’s judgment, materially affect adversely the safety to the public or the finished project, the Members shall: (a) advise their employee or client against the decision, (b) refuse to consent to the decision, and (c) report the decision to the local building inspector or other public official charged with the enforcement of the applicable laws and regulations, unless the Members are able to cause the matter to be satisfactorily resolved by other means.

We have an obligation to protect the public from the profession itself. This might not be easy and terribly uncomfortable—but we always must “do the right thing.” Most of the time, architects might not know that they are violating the law, or causing danger. When they do know it, they usually are willing to make changes to the situation in order to “foster success.”

Rule 2.106 Members shall not counsel or assist a client in conduct that the architect knows, or reasonably should know, is fraudulent or illegal.

This is pretty self-explanatory. If a client is asking you to do anything that YOU KNOW is wrong, it’s not worth the money they are paying to break the law.

Rule 2.301 Members making public statements on architectural issues shall disclose when they are being compensated for making such statements or when they have an economic interest in the issue.

Again, it makes sense to disclose any self-interest—for the benefit of the public welfare.

The Architect’s Practice Act: In the state of California, it is extremely restrictive to be called a practicing architect, or to call yourself an “architect.” California is very protective of the profession of the Architect. Nevada is even more protective. You cannot even “think” about practicing architecture in the state of Nevada. You cannot pursue work in the state of Nevada WITHOUT ALREADY being a licensed architect in that state. In Alabama, “drawings are produced under the direct supervision of a practicing architect”—so you cannot outsource drafting services to China or Guam. Every state is different. It is important that YOU know the difference between each place you want to work.

Ethics are based on a mutually agreed upon core value and principles of behavior.

There is NO DIFFERENCE between business ethics vs. ethics (in general). They are the same thing—“Ethics are ethics.”

“Ethics is the code of behavior we share on the basics of reason, law, honor and an inborn sense of decency.” (M. Hricak)
Q: What are some areas in which ethical dilemmas (or conflicts of interest) might arise?
A: Planning commission, design review boards, competition juries…

There are countless opportunities for architects to slip ethically in the various relationships between architect/owner and architect/contractor relationship.

Scope creep is another area of ethical and legal concern faced by architects and designers today.

There are too many litigious situations between clients and architects that claim that the project was over budget—because the project kept expanding beyond control. (ie—the client decided that he/she wanted more space—or increases the scope of the project BEYOND the original definition of the design problem.) It could be considered unethical of the architect—if he/she did not keep the client informed of increasing costs due to the addition of new scope. It is also bad business practice.

**Situation 1:** The Architect is hired in CA to administer the contract documents and to mediate between the Owner and the Contractor. The GC (general contractor) requests additional costs because in the process of grading, there is the discovery of an abandoned oil tank. Hazardous materials waste removal must be hired to dispose of this tank. This is a legitimate claim for additional costs because there is no way that the GC could have KNOWN about this tank. If the client refuses to pay for this additional cost, then the architect must reason with the client to explain the justification for these costs. The architect must act as an impartial arbitrator between the Owner and Contractor.

The Spirit of Impartiality—Fairness:

**Situation 2:** An architect is hired for Construction Administration (CA) and is to handle pay requests made by contractors. The contractor spends more than the contracted amount to complete a task. However, he helped the architect by doing a favor for him/her. He submits a pay request that is over the contracted amount and asks you to approve of the extra costs.

The architect MUST act fairly between the Owner’s interests and the Contractor’s interests. Even if the Contractor did a favor for the architect, this is NO BASIS to approve the extra costs—if the costs are unjustified. If the costs were due to an “unforeseeable condition” in construction, then they could be justified.

In another situation, what if the Owner helped the architect get additional projects for the design firm? Yet, what if he/she made so many change orders on their current project that might justify additional payment to the Contractor. The architect must act impartially to ensure the Contractor additional payment—even though the Owner helped the architect in another capacity.

Members shall protect the confidentiality of the client’s work.
Members shall report violations conducted by other members to the professional organization responsible (CAB, AIA, NCARB etc…)

Most of the complaints are from architects against other architects—mostly about attribution. The no. 1 complaint is someone took credit for a project or design that the architect was not involved or only peripherally involved.

**Situation 3:** An architectural intern posts work that he did at another office on his own website. This is not necessarily terrible BUT-- Q: Did he/she ask permission from the firm that he/she did the work? Q: Did the client grant permission for this project to be posted in a public forum?

The states of Alabama and Nevada are VERY protective of their licensed architects.

Licensing in the state of CA is down. Q: WHY? Around the year 2000 was the height of the economy—just before the dot.com bubble burst. Most interns were too busy working to study for their exams. After this recession, it will be interesting to see HOW MANY more licensed architects there will be.

Members shall recognize and respect the professional contribution of their employees, their colleagues, partners etc… Employees may ASK and receive permission for examples of work.

Members leaving a firm shall not take examples of work without permission of the employer or partner outside the firm. Members MUST ASK for permission to take the project examples outside the firm. In addition, a member shall not PREVENT an employee from retaining copies of project work that is not specially protected.

Concepts of ethics can change with the times just like concepts of law and legality.

**Unethical behavior is bad for business.** It is worse than even doing bad business practice. It is better to make mistakes in business practice (ie—go bankrupt), than to be cited and found guilty of unethical conduct.

With the advent of digital technology (ie—BIM, new approaches and new software), it’s become easier to calculate how well a building will perform (energy efficiency, waste production, etc…). This puts architects in a position of needing to be on the vanguard of cutting edge technology.
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1. Discuss ethics and its specific relationship to the practice of architecture to establish the foundation for future study of ethical principles.

2. Compare and contrast a range of decisions that are a part of traditional and nontraditional practice, with particular emphasis on the ethical framework that should be used in making socially responsible decisions.

3. Demonstrate knowledge in the necessarily holistic approach to problem resolution and the benefits of collective problem resolution and discussion when dealing with ethical dilemmas.
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INTRODUCTION

This workshop exposes its participants to the fundamental interrelationship of architecture and ethics. It addresses ethical thought, methods of reasoning, and methods to discern ethical dilemmas. It describes a practical guide to the occasions in architectural practice that inherently require ethical consideration. Participants will interactively discuss case studies which require a holistic consideration of ethical concerns in situations where multiple issues are at stake.

The format has been designed to provide a guide for the participants to become teachers, group discussion leaders, and mentors to undergraduate/graduate students, office colleagues, and interested community participants.

This workshop focuses on the participants and use of case studies as a method to apply ethical reasoning processes to problem solutions. The case studies replicate the complexity of the ethical issues faced in most situations that involve being an architect and/or making architecture.

Specific cases deal with social and community responsibility. Acting in a socially responsible manner is a concern for the common good, a respect for human dignity, a commitment to the cause of social justice, and a responsiveness to the effects of one's interventions in the natural environment.

Ethical considerations should be a universal part of the architect's decision-making process. Strong ethical convictions lead to better work, more valued work, and more meaningful work, regardless of one's ability, whether it be in design, technology, management, or business acumen.

These case situations, which are taken from actual professional practice situations, have complex aspects and raise ethical issues. Part of your challenge and, therefore, learning experience is to determine when and how ethical considerations could impact your stance in resolving your position about the case.

Further, what is the value of bringing ethical considerations to bear on your decision-making process? Does it require you to look closely at everyone's point of view? Does it require you to evaluate greater impacts? Does it open possibilities of dealing positively with those who might disagree with your course of action? Does it help you make decisions that you can truly justify to yourself?

While there may be some "universal" ethical truths, the reality is that ethics is personal and your positing of your attitudes in these case situations may well not be understood, agreed with, or welcomed by all those affected. But you will be making more informed decisions because they will be based on a set of your values and principles. Additionally, if there is a common understanding that an ethical position has been taken, then there is an opportunity for meaningful dialogue between parties when disagreement exists.

You will note that some of the case studies raise issues that go beyond the strict boundaries of the case. In many instances, you will have to determine your professional values. No matter the size or scope of the decision to be made, it often is a critical determinant -- who are you, what do you stand for, and what does your professional practice truly represent to your colleagues, your clients, and your conscience?

Consideration of values -- societal, professional, and personal -- have always had a critical impact on the contributions that we as architects have made to the world that we are and have been a part of -- and the world which our descendants will inherit.

It is our hope that your participation in this workshop will reinforce for you the need and potential to act ethically in all aspects of your professional life. Acting ethically can help us all leave a legacy of works and actions that are no less than it could or should be.
CASE STUDY 1: WHEN DO WE CUT DOWN THE GREEN

We measure progress in different terms and accomplishments at different times and eras. In addition, our values change. Cultural heritage buildings with difficult preservation issues are serious ethical dilemmas. For example, neglect and blight, economic development and jobs, or alternative uses serving greater public objectives are common subjects presented to planning boards.

During the 1700s the parish built a significant church in Monterey, California. As the congregation grew and prospered over two centuries, several landscape projects added to the beauty and significance of the setting.

Today the landscape appears to conflict with the church. The following situation was reported in the Los Angeles Times on Sunday, December 24, 2006, by Maria L. La Ganga. This account presents several professional, ethical and environmental dilemmas. An abridged version is presented.

One state icon might be doomed
A historic church is threatened by redwoods, the official tree of California. The church wants to ax the trees, and the city of Monterey seeks a compromise.

Monterey – A classic struggle is playing out here in the first capital of California, and it's anyone's guess who the victor will be: God or nature.

On one side stands San Carlos Borromeo de Monterey, believed to be the oldest continuously functioning church in California, completed in 1794. On the other, a small stand of stately redwood trees, whose roots have made their way through the chapel's foundation and threaten its survival.

For this clash of California icons, there is no easy solution: Church officials have asked the city of Monterey for a permit to cut all of the trees down to preserve this landmark of California's Spanish colonial era. The city recommends that at least two of the four redwoods remain, no matter what.

"You have the classic conflict," said Robert G. Reid, urban forester for the city of Monterey, a historic building versus "rightfully magnificent native redwood trees that also have some serious standing in the community."

The massive redwoods can live for millenniums. They have been likened to the great cathedrals of Europe. The world’s tallest living thing is a skyscraper of a redwood named Hyperion, which towers nearly 380 feet above Humboldt County in Redwood National Park.

"There's something about these trees that makes people want to reach out and protect them," said Ruskin Hartley, director of conservation for the Save-the-Redwoods League. But he also warns that "you have to alter your perspective and time scale when you go about planting these trees that will live for 2,000 years."

That’s advice that should have been given in the 1950s, when the four redwoods were planted – probably by well-meaning parishioners – along the east side of San Carlos Borromeo, a church with its own impressive set of superlatives.

The petite stone structure is variously heralded as California’s first cathedral, the smallest cathedral in the continental United States and the first structure in California designed by
a known architect. It is home to one of the first non-indigenous sculptures created in the
Golden State, a stone carving of Our Lady of Guadalupe, patroness of the Americas.

It was completed in December 1794 and dedicated two months later. Daily Mass has
been celebrated in the church since, said Father Pert Crivello, the pastor.

San Carlos “goes off the Richter scale as a work of architectural significance,” said Jack
S. Williams, executive director of the Center for Spanish Colonial Research. “It’s a
miracle that the presidio chapel is still standing.”

In more ways than one. The city of Monterey has swallowed up the rest of the presidio;
today San Carlos is across the street from a Mercedes-Benz dealership and other
secular shrines.

The entire building must be seismically strengthened. Concrete patching – the well-
intentioned but disastrous renovations of an earlier time – must be removed and
replaced. The statue of Our Lady of Guadalupe must be taken down from its place of
honor above the church doors for treatment in a conservation lab.

The parish plans to launch a $5.5–million fundraising effort in early 2007 to pay for
extensive renovations and reverse the damage wrought by the redwoods.

Moisture is anathema to a structure’s stones, and the tall trees’ shade prevents the small
cruciform church from drying out.

Then there are the insidious roots

One recent Monday morning, archeologist Ruben G. Mendoza was leading a team of
student volunteers from Cal State Monterey Bay in part of a months-long excavation
effort around the church’s foundation.

The redwoods’ roots snake out from the neat excavations, through the foundation, to
freedom on the west side of the building. To Mendoza, director of Cal State Monterey
Bay’s Institute for Archaeological Science, Technology and Visualization, the need to
choose is clear.

“You save the building or you save the trees,” he said. “You can’t save both.”

Crivello, the pastor, applied in late November for a city permit to cut down the redwoods.
Having grown up in the San Carlos parish and worshiped alongside the trees throughout
his childhood, Crivello finds it “regretful” that they must go. “We wish we could have
both,” he said, but “we’re caretakers of this historic gem….We have to be good stewards
of this building.”

The application landed on forester Reid’s desk shortly after Thanksgiving. Reid, who
hopes for a compromise, has recommended that only the two redwoods closest to the
building be cut down. If the church appeals, the matter would probably go before the
city’s architectural review committee within a month or two and eventually could make its
way to the City Council.

Reid has suggested pruning the roots of the remaining trees, digging a trench between
them and the church and filling it in with material through which new roots could not
penetrate. But that would destroy the layers of history buried beneath the site, Mendoza said.

And here at San Carlos Borromeo, history is everything.

I love redwood trees, and I would hate to see one come down,” said historian Williams. “But we cannot plant another presidio.”

DISCUSSION

- Can you develop and justify your position regarding each outcome to yourself, your family, and your colleagues?
- As a professional member of the architectural review committee, how would you choose to discuss this dilemma with the public?
- Should this issue be “kicked upstairs” to the city counsel without a recommendation?
- Is there a direction that can achieve a successful compromise?
- Is there a technical solution to this dilemma?

This case confronts you and your professional ethics at several different levels. You must look at the relative importance of historical structures and artifacts that have recently been uncovered. (Are there more?) Cultural heritage is often under assault from neglect and lack of resources to protect it and from economic development and the creation of jobs (the elimination of so-call blight).

There is also a value continuum described – stemming from social mores:

- Saving environmental cultural history, e.g., buildings and gardens.
- Saving wilderness and related ecosystems.
- Saving rare species or certain species of plants and animals.
- Saving certain endangered species.

It is obvious that the city and numerous socially conscience groups have a commitment to questions of ethical responsibilities including saving old growth redwoods. However, the trees are only fifty years old. The issue of what the decision will influence and what the impact of this decision will have on the future is a consideration. There are lots of redwoods that affect development and historic sites. Where does one draw the line?

This situation presents an interesting dilemma – special trees with their own cultural importance that are part of the landscape we created to enhance the unique and historic building are now destroying it!

The issue of how these decisions are structured and what circumstances you consider continually involves ethical assessment of options. A consideration can surface from the environmental, political, social, and economic stance of your clients, your colleagues, and yourself.
CASE STUDY 2: VERNAL POOL

An architecture firm was retained by a major developer to create a master plan for several thousand acres of land at the edge of the county’s urban services boundary. The land is vacant, mostly covered with grasses and with few trees. There are no strong natural features, and there are no cultural underpinnings to its previous uses.

After much study, one plan has been developed which meets a compendium of goals. The plan is consistent with the newly developed General Plan which calls for some new growth area development in conjunction with an overall sustainable strategy that emphasizes policies of infill development, transit-supportive land use, expanded social equity in jobs and housing opportunities, economic development, and preservation of environmental and cultural resources.

The master plan meets the developer’s economic goals in terms of providing for a strategy of land development which provides a rate of return that justifies past and future investment. The plan meets the architect’s goal of creating a new community which is representative of the best of sustainable development practices and will lead to the build-out of a special place for those who live and work there.

The heart of the master plan is a town core that is a representative piece of transit-oriented development. The core location is based on producing a community synthesis design that deals with everything from transit, vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns to maximize open space, parks, and recreation opportunities.

The environmental impact process has surfaced the fact that the area is home to a network of vernal pools, an ecology that is particularly fragile to disturbance. It is clear that some will be lost and that mitigation options will depend on minimizing their destruction. An analysis of the proposed master plan by a coalition of local environmental groups has supported the plan’s general approach to this issue. The plan preserves a number of vernal pools with an open space network that threads through the residential neighborhoods. However, they take strong exception to the location of the town core. They contend that it is located on a sector of the site that will cause irrevocable damage to this fragile ecology, and they call for its relocation some distance from where it is shown.

The environmental groups state that its relocation will not irrevocably damage the laudable planning goals. They state that the resulting community plan will be less ideal than what was presented but that is a reasonable price to pay.

The architectural firm has analyzed the critique and is concerned that the suggested relocation will definitely create a community plan that reduces the opportunity to increase transit usage and reduce automobile usage, both goals that it feels very strongly about in light of major concerns about transportation impacts on global-warming reduction and public health improvement through improvement in air quality.

The developer wants the proposed plan unaltered because it comes closest to meeting his goals and economic development needs. The developer is proud of the plan’s claim that it will produce a model sustainable community, but his commitment is only as strong as his fulfillment of the economic goals.

The architect is willing to work out some kind of compromise, but the developer does not wish to compromise unless absolutely required to do so by planning commission. The developer maintains that a change to relocate the town core will lessen his ability to obtain necessary economic utilization of the land he controls. Further, he will not pay the architectural firm to look at alternatives. The developer believes that he will prevail at the commission hearing.
The architectural firm is concerned that its professional standing may be damaged with the environmental community. The firm is also concerned that if options are not looked at now, then planning commission actions might impose conditions that will not produce the best long-term solution. The firm seeks to see that irrevocable direction is not taken, that it stays in good standing with its client and the county, and that it does what is best both for future residents and for environmental needs. Complicating the issue is the tendency to minimize the importance of the role of vernal pools and their small supported life structure on a larger environmental docket.

DISCUSSION

- It seems that there is a conflict between what may be legally acceptable (locating the town center as proposed appears to be within EIS guidelines) and maximizing environmental protection for the vernal pools. There is nothing noted here about the current designs to control vernal pool damage: “mitigation options will depend on minimizing their destruction.”

- Contrary to their initial stance, should the developer authorize additional study to “work out some kind of compromise”? This might yield a plan that does more to preserve the pools, retain the public transit and reduced automobile usage, while maintaining the economic benefits. Why or why not go ahead and do this now rather than wait until “absolutely required to do so”?

- Is there a significant risk in taking a chance that the commission will provide a directed solution? What are those risks, and are they ethical ones rather than economic ones? Who are the best-qualified and informed designers in this case – the architect or the commission?

- Should the architect prepare multiple options to “work out some kind of plan compromise” at his own expense? Why or why not? As licensed professionals, do architects have an obligation beyond economic solvency for their client?

- What is a fair return, and does the alternative plan create significant increased risk to the landowner/developer. Competing outcomes exacerbate the need for solid economic, transportation and environmental assessment and forecasting.

This is a case of competing “good benefits”: maximizing protection of vernal pools and inducing more rapid transit use, thus reducing pollution. Given competing “good benefits,” this case produces a conflict between an absolute ethical position (the vernal pools are rare and irreplaceable, thus should be protected even if other goals are compromised) and a utilitarian “cost benefit” approach in which multiple benefits are optimized (including protection of some vernal pools). In the utilitarian sense, the developer’s “right” to profit in the private-property, libertarian perspective and the protection of the environment intersect here.

It is tricky business – to determine if an alternative plan would preserve more of the vernal pool capacity to support specific rare life forms, as suggested by the environmental group. This raises the specter of competing “experts” – those selected by the developer and those selected by the environmentalists. How does one evaluate the capacity of one plan versus another to enable or retain the life-supporting qualities of an ecosystem unless a design proposal is far enough along for experts to examine? This might imply that perhaps the client ought to hire the architect to develop alternative plans. Is it ethically “wrong” for the client not to hire the architect?
CASE STUDY 3: RECLUSAL

An architect, known for his environmental and smart-growth design leadership, has been hired by his local county planning agency to develop new multi-family design guidelines that reflect the county’s new sustainable growth management policies.

The architect also sits on the city’s planning commission. He is aware that a controversial project will be presented to the commission in the near future. This project is for the expansion of a major public hospital located in the middle of a residential neighborhood. The expansion is on the city’s property which borders the local commercial street on one side, but is otherwise surrounded by a stable residential neighborhood which has co-existed with the institution for many years. Neighborhood organizations in this part of the city are split over the development’s impact on environmental quality, traffic, and neighborhood sustainability. All agree that the institution has been an important contributor in the past to the city’s welfare. The issue is clearly a volatile one.

A letter has been sent to the planning commissioners from two of the major neighborhood organizations that oppose the project. A flyer has been sent to perceived stakeholders by another neighborhood organization supporting the expansion project.

The architect has knowledge that the vice-chair of one of the two neighborhood groups that signed the opposition letter is the county staff official who hired him for the design guidelines project. He has established a good relationship with this person. In addition, he is confident that when the project is completed, he will receive contracts to perform additional county work.

The architect is concerned about any potential conflict of interest. He wonders if he should recluse himself from the project deliberations when the project comes before the city planning commission. Alternatively, he wonders if he has the option of asking the county official to step back from his role as vice-chair of the neighborhood group. The architect has talked with the city attorney that serves the planning commission and has been told that this is not a clear legal issue.

The architect has accepted service on the planning commission so he could be an effective voice for sustainable, environmentally smart growth within the city, and he has had strong support from the mayor who made the appointment. He is aware that in previous deliberations within the planning commission his positions have been well heeded by his commission colleagues who respect his professional experience in producing environmentally and socially responsible community designs.

The architect is a board member of the leading community-wide environmental organization and has voted on a number of projects on which it has taken strong positions. He was recently the key vote in a rezoning proposal that cast the development community against the environmental community. He feels that his current board position does not put him in an indirect owner/client perceived relationship. He works for the community.

The architect wants to participate in this planning decision. He has not formed an opinion on the merits of the proposal. However, he does feel that its outcome will be important in terms of city planning policy and direction.

DISCUSSION

- It is not clear who received his “key vote” – the environmental community or the development community?
The county staff official, “client,” is acting as a citizen in his role in the neighborhood organization, just as the board member is acting as a citizen in his role as an environmental community leader. There may be an “indirect”, owner/client perceived relationship, but that may or may not affect the architect’s judgment.

Is the potential conflict – trading a vote for current and future work with the county – on the surface hard to ignore?

Would you recluse yourself? Why? If not, why not?

This case illustrates numerous community responsibility issues and dilemmas. Members of many community boards are appointed specifically because of their community leadership positions and known points of view. Whatever the size of the community, it is virtually impossible for community citizen leaders and government officials to not know each other.

However, to recluse himself every time the architect knows someone who comes before him, or someone who takes a position on a project who might hire him, would render him ineffectual.

Does this mean that architects ought not to ever be members of planning and zoning or architectural review boards?
CASE STUDY 4: BUILDING MATERIAL CHOICES

You are the principal-in-charge of a project for the design of an automobile showroom-and-service complex. The project is located on an urban site near the city core and entails a complete remodeling of and addition to an existing building. The construction documents are at 95% completion, and you are reviewing them for your project manager before their final completion. You are particularly interested in the manner in which your staff carried out your directive to maximize the use of recycled materials for the project's construction. Both you and your client had settled on this initially as a major strategy to make the project environmentally responsible. As you review the drawings and specifications, you note that the design team has been diligent in following your directions. A wide range of materials is being utilized in the project, some of which you perceive as very innovative.

You note that a number of the materials are in exposed conditions and that others, while concealed from view, are exposed to the mechanical-system operation. You are aware from a recent continuing-education seminar that you attended on issues of indoor air pollution that some recycled materials have potential toxicity associated with their use and that their use can lead to health problems for building occupants. You note that the specifications do not require any toxicity certifications or the like.

When you raise the issue of the latter with your project manager, he states that the proposed material usages were based on projects and sources listed in materials the office had acquired from a local recycling organization. He and his staff had pursued no independent research on the materials or their use. You express some concern about two particular material usages based on some anecdotal information that you had heard about at the continuing-education seminar. Your project manager indicates that changing these materials will involve a project-completion delay because of the many places they are used; he also mentions the resultant impact this would have on redesign and document revision. Doing valid independent research on the impact of these materials would also cause a delay because this would call for acquiring the services of an independent consultant.

You know that you are already over your internal project budget for production of the design. You also know that the imminent deadline for delivery of the completed bid documents to the client is very important to your client because of his interim financing schedule. You are also aware that an unhealthy work environment can expose you to serious liability if conditions jeopardizing the health of building occupants can be demonstrated.

You ponder whether to dismiss these concerns because you have no hard evidence that any problems will result.

DISCUSSION

- The facility and its occupants are already surrounded daily with the toxicity associated with automobile emissions because of the facility use and its urban location.

- You are aware that there is no certainty that this facility will remain in this building over its lifetime. Automobile agencies in other parts of the city have been shuttered within ten years of their opening, such being the vicissitudes of the automobile industry.

- You doubt that your client will be sympathetic now at this late stage of the design process to any additional fees to investigate your concerns. Additionally, you are concerned about making the issue visible to your client now since this could bring into question some of your performance and threaten your credibility with your client.

- Your project design, to your knowledge, has met all applicable building codes.
The anecdotal information has been communicated to you by a reliable source.

You have wanted this project design, both aesthetically and environmentally, to bring your firm positive public and professional exposure and recognition.

This case involves the issue of risk management in the context of the architect’s responsibility to protect the public health, safety, and welfare. It is another instance in which one's legal responsibilities may not coincide with one’s ethical obligations. At what point does one overtake the other?
CASE STUDY 5: POST-OCCUPANCY EVALUATION

Architect XYZ received a commission for the design of a large office building from a state agency that has an ongoing office-construction program. The building program called for an innovative project design which would illustrate the feasibility of designing for reduced energy usage from that mandated by the state's Energy Code within this typical building's energy budget. It also called for the project to be a demonstration of user-responsive, healthy, productive workspace, particularly for clerical workers who were the majority of the occupants.

Architect XYZ completed the project on time, within budget, met the users' needs and received public acclaim. The agency issued publicity materials that proclaim that this project demonstrates the direction that responsible office-building design should and can take. It is an affirmation of the agency's philosophy and their regulatory mandates.

One year after completion of the building, a partner in Architect XYZ revisits the building to attend a public workshop on some public-policy issues with which the agency is currently dealing.

While attending the all-day session, the partner tours the building and observes several conditions that lead her to suspect that the building is not being operated as intended.

The partner makes several informal inquiries and determines that the building's energy usage is no longer being monitored and that the building systems operations are apparently being determined by the lowest current cost options rather than total energy consumption.

The partner also notes that some operational/design strategies that affect human comfort have been subverted without full user awareness that they exist (i.e., opening windows were locked, daylight sensors were disconnected, task lighting was scattered, and the programmed pattern of open office spaces was subverted).

The partner mentions this to some agency staff that he encounters during her walk-through, with whom she had worked with during the project's development. They indicate that some of these "changes" were the result of upper-management decisions reflective of overall agency budget cuts and, in some instances, were the response to some users who did not adjust immediately to the new environment.

The partner is aware that the agency has continued to tout the building as a demonstration of its philosophy and accomplishments. Architect XYZ has utilized this project as a prime demonstration of its abilities as it seeks new work. The public-agency client has served as a strong and positive reference for Architect XYZ in these pursuits.

The partner ponders if he should take any action based on her observations.

DISCUSSION

- Should Architect XYZ "blow the whistle" on the agency with the intent that the building be restored to its designed conditions? If so, how, and in what forum?

- Should Architect XYZ "blow the whistle" on the agency, with intent to stymie future funding for agency projects if they do not demand safeguards requiring compliance to project programs? If so, how, and in what forum?

- Should Architect XYZ "let well enough alone"?
Should Architect XYZ offer services to the agency to facilitate remedial steps? For a professional fee? For free?

What are Architect XYZ’s ongoing responsibilities to the agency, the building occupants, the public, and the architectural profession?

This case illustrates conditions that can arise from the reality that once architects finish their contract responsibilities for a project, they are not necessarily finished with the project. Architects should be prepared and knowledgeable with respect to this reality. This awareness should be framed in terms of their ethical responsibility, as well as their legal liability for public-health, -safety, and -welfare aspects of their project over time. Architects clearly have a stake in the way that their buildings fulfill their original intent, particularly with regard to their fullest aspirations for them.
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Learning Objectives
As published on www.aiaconvention.com Web site

1. Discuss ethics and its specific relationship to the practice of architecture to establish the foundation for future study of ethical principles.

2. Compare and contrast a range of decisions that are a part of traditional and nontraditional practice, with particular emphasis on the ethical framework that should be used in making socially responsible decisions.

3. Demonstrate knowledge in the necessarily holistic approach to problem resolution and the benefits of collective problem resolution and discussion when dealing with ethical dilemmas.

Ethics
AND THE PRACTICE OF ARCHITECTURE

ETHICS:
is the study of human conduct and moral values; may refer to a set of values or moral systems; comprises duties and standards of conduct for individual persons, groups and professions; includes writings and treatises on ethics; entails critical reasoning with respect to moral considerations.
Ethics is concerned with how to go about life, what it means to “live well”, to accomplish “good in the world, and to be “just” or “fair” in one’s personal and professional life.

ARCHITECTURE

Architecture is about shaping our physical habitat to suit human purposes, and in doing so has the capacity to fulfill spiritual and emotional needs.

Architecture and Ethics

The processes of designing and constructing our habitat, with the presumed intention of improving the quality of life, implicitly require a judgement of the “right” thing to do. It is in this manner that architecture and ethics are joined together.
The Lens of Architecture's Purposefulness and Social Benefit

Architecture is grounded in human intention and purpose. It is, therefore, subject, as are other human affairs, to judgement with respect to its intentions: who and what purposes are served by those intentions, and how well are those intentions met. These are not only practical or utilitarian judgement, but also ethical.
The Lens of Aesthetics

In all cases, aesthetics and beauty matter: either as art production per se, or as a beneficial contribution to human happiness or flourishing. Thus, a building’s aesthetic embodiment is a part of its virtue, its aesthetic value.

The Lens of Architecture’s Rhetoric and Ideologies

Design and process rhetoric and ideologies, which speak to architecture’s purposes, aesthetics, and methodologies, define the discipline. Understanding these definitions and acting from them comprise another basic framework for considering architecture’s ethics.

The Lens of Praxis

Many seemingly everyday events in architectural practices are ethical in their import. Duties to self, the client, the general public, and to the discipline itself can clearly be traced. They are ethical and demand an ethics.
ARCHITECTURE AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Representatives of the ethical underpinnings of acting in a socially responsible manner, is a concern for the common good, a respect for human dignity, a commitment to the cause of social justice, and a responsiveness to the effects of one's interventions in the natural environment.
A Selected History of the Profession
1950-2012

Early Years of Change
- Mies Landing
- Library of Congress
- Gold Medal Awards
- Profession in Sciences

1973
- Concept of Green Building

1980
- Energy Crisis

1985
- Computer Aided Design

1990
- Globalization
- LEED Certification

2001
- New Professional Technique - Design | Build, Commissioning

The Process
(Education | Internship | Licensure)

Definition: To be recognized as an architect the individual must complete a rigorous series of steps.
- More than four years of college
- A defined, regulated internship
- Test and licensing procedures - important regulatory infrastructure
- Agree to the profession's code of ethics (American Institute of Architects)

The professional degree, more than the baccalaureate or associate, determines the normal degree of talent. Also, the professional is held to a higher standard.

American Institute of Architects (AIA)
Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct

Preamble to 1997 by
- John Portman
- Frank Gehry
- William L. Pereira
- Robert Stern
- Richard Meier
- Lella and Massimiliano and Doriana Fuksas

1. Professional Conduct
   - Honor
   - Duty
   - Integrity
   - Respect
   - Confidence
   - Commitment

2. Professional Conduct
   - Honesty
   - Loyalty
   - Autonomy
   - Respect
   - Confidence
   - Commitment

3. Professional Conduct
   - Honesty
   - Loyalty
   - Integrity
   - Respect
   - Confidence
   - Commitment

The Code of Ethics
- "Preliminary to The Code of Ethics 1997"
- "Code of Ethics 1980" by Louis Sullivan

4. Professional Conduct
   - Honesty
   - Loyalty
   - Integrity
   - Respect
   - Confidence
   - Commitment

The Code of Ethics for Architects
- "An Honor Code For Architects" by Louis Sullivan
- "The Code of Ethics for Architects" by Louis Sullivan
- "Code of Ethics 1980" by Louis Sullivan
- "Code of Ethics 1997" by Louis Sullivan

5. Professional Conduct
   - Honesty
   - Loyalty
   - Integrity
   - Respect
   - Confidence
   - Commitment

The Code of Ethics
- "Preliminary to The Code of Ethics 1997"
- "Code of Ethics 1980" by Louis Sullivan
- "Code of Ethics 1997" by Louis Sullivan

6. Professional Conduct
   - Honesty
   - Loyalty
   - Integrity
   - Respect
   - Confidence
   - Commitment

The Code of Ethics
- "Preliminary to The Code of Ethics 1997"
- "Code of Ethics 1980" by Louis Sullivan
- "Code of Ethics 1997" by Louis Sullivan

7. Professional Conduct
   - Honesty
   - Loyalty
   - Integrity
   - Respect
   - Confidence
   - Commitment

The Code of Ethics
- "Preliminary to The Code of Ethics 1997"
- "Code of Ethics 1980" by Louis Sullivan
- "Code of Ethics 1997" by Louis Sullivan

8. Professional Conduct
   - Honesty
   - Loyalty
   - Integrity
   - Respect
   - Confidence
   - Commitment

The Code of Ethics
- "Preliminary to The Code of Ethics 1997"
- "Code of Ethics 1980" by Louis Sullivan
- "Code of Ethics 1997" by Louis Sullivan

9. Professional Conduct
   - Honesty
   - Loyalty
   - Integrity
   - Respect
   - Confidence
   - Commitment

The Code of Ethics
- "Preliminary to The Code of Ethics 1997"
- "Code of Ethics 1980" by Louis Sullivan
- "Code of Ethics 1997" by Louis Sullivan

10. Professional Conduct
    - Honesty
    - Loyalty
    - Integrity
    - Respect
    - Confidence
    - Commitment

The Code of Ethics
- "Preliminary to The Code of Ethics 1997"
- "Code of Ethics 1980" by Louis Sullivan
- "Code of Ethics 1997" by Louis Sullivan
Manitoulian Decision - Restraint of Trade
(U.S. Department of Justice)

The U.S. Department of Justice has vigorously enforced the Sherman Antitrust Act since 1890. This law is designed to prevent antitrust practices that restrain trade. This includes the practice of boycotts, price discrimination, and other practices that may harm consumers by decreasing competition.

American Code of Ethics

The AIA Code of Ethics is an ethical code for architects and is designed to promote excellence in the profession. The Code is comprised of three parts:

- Ethical Conduct
- Professional Practice
- Responsibilities

Ethical Conduct consists of ethical principles that architects should follow. Professional Practice consists of guidelines for good business conduct. Responsibilities includes responsibilities that architects should fulfill.

Alternative Roles

The AIA has identified a number of alternative roles for architects. These roles include:

- Project Manager
- Building Director
- Design Director
- Construction Manager

Each of these roles requires a different set of skills and knowledge.

In the future, the AIA will continue to identify alternative roles for architects and promote them through education and training programs.
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