

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date: **Friday, 8 July 2005 (3:30 p.m.)**

Present:

Roger Mitchell	RAIC Syllabus Local Program Coordinator
David Edwards	Studio Coordinator
Rod Stutt	Jury Member
Bron Nurkowski	Jury Member
Pat Kelly	Jury Member
Ingrid Moisuk	Educational Advisor
Sherman Martinson	Educational Advisor
Alton Tangedal	Thesis Advisor/Mentor
Reid Pattison	Thesis Principal
Gerry McCudden	Syllabus Student
Kurt Dietrich	Syllabus Thesis Candidate

Purpose of Meeting: Stage One Presentation

ITEM / DISCUSSION

1.1 Presentation Format

The following format was applied to the presentation:

- Round table introductions
- R. Mitchell distributed the critique materials and course outline for this level. The standard format has been modified to suit the nature of this presentation.
- Student Presentation (K. Dietrich)
- Round table discussion
- Questions and Feedback
- Adjournment (Presentation concluded at 5:20 p.m.)

1.2 Curriculum Section

The curriculum section was very well received. The potential application as well the method through which the curriculum has already been used in the classroom was discussed by the educators. The educators noted that a full unit of instruction could be based on the curriculum submitted. The educators stated that the curriculum submitted exceeds their requirements and expectations.

General discussion on the education process continued. It was noted that the student will be working with the educators in the future to carry on with potential development and application on his own accord (unrelated to the thesis jury analysis).

1.3 Programme Section

The programme section was well received. The educators noted that their existing "classroom" spaces are inadequate to properly conduct the activity portions of the curriculum. The discussion process raised questions for the student to consider in future development. These questions include:

- Provide clarity on the connection between curriculum and programme.

1.3 Programme Section Continued...

- Provide basis for rationale towards a design solution.
 - What assumptions have been made relative to the program delivery?
 - The program alludes to individual spaces for all section of the curriculum. Is it intended to provide individual spaces or flexible spaces?
 - Would one dedicated space suffice for all instruction functions?
 - Would spaces added to existing structures around the city suffice for this purpose?
 - Clarify the intended usage of the solution.
 - A scheduling matrix may be used to rationalize the intended spatial usage.
 - Provide background on the use of school buses and half-day program delivery.
 - Provide clarity on the influence that the curriculum provides to the design for the spaces and overall solution.

1.4 Design Areas

The design areas for the intended solution were presented and well received. The discussion process raised questions for the student to consider in future development. These questions include:

- Provide basis for rationale in developing the design areas:
 - What assumptions have been made relative to the program delivery?
 - Detail the use of existing data as provided by SaskLearning as well as the variances on this data generated by the curriculum.
 - Ensure that the generation of design areas is easily understood relative to the origins, assumptions, variations and resulting requirements for the facility. (Item relates to the influence of the curriculum instructional requirements as detailed in the foreword of each section).
 - Are design areas for the individual curriculum sections to be cumulative or one space used for several purposes? This item to be explored further under Future Development.

1.5 Jury/Advisory Board Comments

The conclusion of the presentation provided the following statements/observations from jury and advisory board:

- Curriculum has been well developed and was properly presented.
- The student has demonstrated a clear understanding of the task initiated with a positive result provided by his efforts.
- Future development into a hard line design solution (plans, elevations, sections, technical details) is not required nor was it recommended due to the nature and depth of the research.
- It was felt that the student has clearly demonstrated the knowledge required by this level of study.
- The potential may exist to consider the thesis effort completed at this stage in the process.

1.6 Future Development

- R. Mitchell requested copies of the curriculum which may be forwarded to the RAIC Syllabus National Office.
- K. Dietrich is to consider the questions/comments raised during this presentation and prepare an appropriate response.
- The format of the remaining work remains to be determined as it varies from the original thesis proposal submission.
- It was discussed that the thesis submission may require an "architectural design component" or concept in order to meet the guidelines of the RAIC Syllabus program.
- It was suggested that development on a simple conceptual level for space, language and format of a design solution may be an asset to the submission
- The advisory team and student will have to consider and discuss the potential format for the final work on this thesis.
- K. Dietrich will contact R. Mitchell and A. Tangedal next week to discuss the future development options.

Should there be any errors or omissions in the foregoing Minutes, please advise the candidate before or at the next meeting, otherwise the Minutes shall be considered correct as written.