

Department of Architecture
Spring 2008
Thesis Review Schedule

Week 1 (Wednesday, February 13)

1st DESIGN REVIEW.: SITE, PROGRAM, PROPOSITIONS

This review concludes the work done over the summer or winter break, on the basis of the proposed plan laid out at the end of the thesis prep semester in consultation with the thesis prep advisor and the thesis advisor. The following components are required to be presented in the form of a presentation (drawing boards or Powerpoint) and a dossier. A copy of the dossier should be submitted to the thesis advisor and the thesis coordinator.

1. A finished analysis of the site and its surroundings. This is not a generic mapping operation, but an analysis of the site from the viewpoint of the hypothesis that had been formulated by the end of thesis preparation.
2. A completed program brief. The functions that the design will accommodate, are to be precisely formulated by this stage. For instance, in case of a building, landscape or urbanism project, the program brief including the square footage for each of the elements is to be included. If thesis involves a processual or critical element that asks for a different thesis outcome than a building, then the presentation should clearly outline the desired “product” of the thesis process: e.g. film, the technique for a typological examination, and so on.
3. Clearly outlined design propositions or strategies – two or three if you are unsure – that can be used to address the thesis problem. The propositions or strategies would have to be substantiated in rough overall dimensioning. A rough 3d-model, rough basic perspectives of the most important views, as well as the diagrams and ideograms illustrating the ideas and hypotheses underlying the project need to be present. Also at least one plan and one section with rough dimensions are required. Thesis emphasizing other objectives such as processual concerns of drawing, technology, typology and so on must also present two or three potential strategies by which the response to the thesis question is to be pursued. Most importantly, these strategies must be VISUALLY REPRESENTED, and not just listed out as potential narrative threads through which the thesis will be undertaken.
4. Finally, the student should argue for one of the propositions as more effective than other ones at elaborating the hypothesis developed during thesis preparation. The committee will then decide, in consultation with the student, which option is to be further pursued.

Submission and presentation of all required data to the thesis advisor and thesis prep advisor. To be submitted in 11” x 17” folio format that includes both presentation boards and dossier. This can be done at any point within the first ten days after registration and is scheduled by the student directly with the advisors.

It should be clear from the above that the summer break/IAP is a period for intense exploration and study; missing this step will result in problematic delays of the thesis as a whole. This first design review is a crucial launch point to develop the thesis. Lack of progress vis-à-vis the previous presentation (thesis prep finals) will result in a REPEAT of the 1st design review, before February 15th, on the form to be signed that day, the committee shall state whether this repeating of the 1st design review is required, and if so, when it is to happen.

If at repeated 1st design review, still no progress is apparent, the thesis student should extend her track and shall not present in final public review.

Week 4: (on or before Wednesday, March 12)

2nd DESIGN REVIEW (Internal INFORMAL review with committee, i.e. advisor and readers). COMPETITION-ENTRY SUBMISSION QUALITY, CHOICE TO DEVELOP ZOOM-IN

At this stage, the student has substantially developed the scheme beyond the first diagrams and formations. The overall precision of the project begins to take shape. AT this stage, the overall scheme needs to be at a 'Competition Entry-level': the project needs to be legible and understandable as a whole based on the drawings presented :

- (1) Final formalization of thesis question, and clarification of architectural strategy as a critical and deliverable response to the thesis question
- (2) A narrative structure, and crucial drawings to back up each step of the narrative
- (3) An explanation of the project, using whatever means required, that succeed in answering basic question required to understand the overall project: sections, plan, views, models...
- (4) Plan for further development, including writing plan
- (5) The project should show the potential to "zoom-in" into detail examinations in the next stage.

Furthermore, at this stage, the committee shall propose for the student to FOCUS /elaborate a particular component of the project in greater detail, solving all the final conceptual, organizational and technological or socio-political problems within the focus on the component.

Should the results of the second design review be inconclusive, the committee will still recommend which segment of the project to further develop.

Week 8: (Wednesday, April 9, 9 am to 1 pm) PUBLIC MID REVIEW.

- (1) Presentation of the project with a clear contour of the concrete, final project:

Here, fundamental changes to the project as brought up after the 1st and 2nd design review need to have been resolved.

Broad design, layout, and well-articulated strategy of design development. Elaboration of thesis question, presentation of research and notes in written form. This is to be scheduled by the MArch administrator and MArch faculty coordinator as a public review to be held on one morning or afternoon.

- (2) First presentation of zoom-in. Design development and detail development of a single critical aspect.

Week 11: (Wednesday, May 7, 9 am to 1 pm) PENULTIMATE REVIEW.

Mock-up of the final review, including the complete setup of boards, panels and models envisaged by the student as being necessary in order to transform the hypothesis into a thesis. Of course, some panels will contain placeholders, and incomplete sequences, but these will have to be delineated *as such*.

Penultimate review where student will lay out progress so far, point out what is missing and which areas need work in terms of remaining semester time, in addition to scheme of presentation, drawings, narration, audio-visuals, envisaged for the final review. This is to be scheduled by the MArch administrator and MArch faculty coordinator as a public review to be held on one morning or afternoon.

THIS IS A PENULTIMATE REVIEW: Presenting in the final review is to be seen as a privilege, not a right. If student's progress is found wanting, s/he will not be allowed to present at the public final review, but be advised to take the winter/summer break to work on the thesis, finishing up just before the beginning of the next semester. The student will be expected to register for the following term and submit the approved, signed archival-ready thesis by the end of the first week of the new

term. Tuition will be prorated to one week. Summer tuition is fully subsidized.

Week 15: (Monday, May 19, location and time TBA) Final Review. For those students who passed the Week 11 review.

Week 20: (Friday, May 23) FINAL THESIS DOCUMENT. Two copies of the approved, signed, archival-ready thesis documents due to MArch administrator.