

Department Meeting

May 22, 2018

Noon – 1:20 Gould 440

Agenda items

12:00 – 12:15	Overview of MUP Core curriculum reform and proposed model	Campbell
12:15 – 12:25	Clarifying questions	Campbell/ Curriculum Committee
12:25 – 1:10	Discussion of Curriculum Framework: Focus on 4 questions outlined in Chair's note	Campbell/ Curriculum Committee
1:10 – 1:15	Vote of Confidence and Continuation	Campbell
1:15 – 1:20	Next Steps	Campbell

Present:

Christopher Campbell, Rachel Berney, Sofia Dermisi, Himanshu Grover, Qing Shen, Dan Abramson, Diana Siembor, Larissa Maziak, Phil Hurvitz, Marina Alberti, Marty Curry, Christine Bae, Bob Mugerauer, Manish Chalana

Overview:

Power point presentation

Clarifying Questions?

None

Overall comments?

When you talk about The Planning in Context course, as related to the Puget Sound, is it possible to extend this to problems not only in the Puget Sound but as it relates to planning in a larger picture, like internationally?

There is currently not a course that helps students “formulate the problem” and “How do I look at and solve the problem” In the Urban Ecology course we cover this briefly but it would be great if we could have more focus in looking at these problems and how then do they turn them into skills

We haven't see anything in the model about introducing science into the program...the world is getting more science based. Somehow this should be more dominant...

Has any program ever set a measure of success after implementing curriculum change and whether those changes made have any effect....Is it possible to track the success of these changes?

The world is changing and this model is not focused on Planning Context. What are the challenges in Seattle but don't exclude other major issues.

Several things are not reflected in this model like ..Survey of Planning. Also 510, & 520 are now one? A large part of 520 stays in intro to comp. The exercise in 510 are important, so how can we keep these...

Would Planning in Context tackle the overall problems...issues?

Can we put the focus on the PNW in the Comp Planning class and then we have the Planning in Context hone in on larger, global focus issues?

In the studio group discussion, we talked about reforming 506...so I'm surprised that it would be dropped...I think we could look at some aspects of 506 so they could be covered in comp planning...No other planning programs are offering studio prep courses like 506...students don't like it but at the end of the day what they learned in 506 helps them in 507

In the past when there was no studio prep.... the students were falling behind because 10 weeks for 507 wasn't long enough

Did the committee consider spreading 507 over two quarters??

DO we still want to keep a strong emphasis on studio?

Seems like the committee is looking to compromise for all specializations

Is it possible to offer two parallel tracks? One group focus on contemporary teaching? One focus on more traditional teaching

Studio is a pedagogy...not a track

A studio is one way to solve a "problem"

In our model of studio...we have a client who has a problem

In the studio discussions regardless of their specialization...it is important for students to experience studio...they have to have a set of soft and hard skills

With the shorter time we have in the quarter system, you can run a successful studio but there has to be more structure...

At most planning schools, studio is a core pedagogy

There has been a conversation about bringing 503 and 573 closer together...

10 weeks is not enough time...it's more than just design it's learning how to work as a team, it's learning how to deal with challenges...Employees want students to come out with these skills
If you don't have a studio prep...it would be good in planning in context...could you have vignettes to dealing with an issue

We've been getting positive remarks on the Planning in Context...This has been kind of a big bucket...but it sounds like we are beginning to tick all the boxes.

Can we incorporate some of the studio prep elements in the other core courses...?

If instructors include topics that feed into the arrows for the core classes.... can there be working together, skills and exercises working together...

As we work out sequencing.... it's important that we relay this information to students

How about LCY being the place that all the exercises would lead to? Can the experiences be the same year to year? Doesn't really matter what they are focusing on..

Are there any comments on the Planning History and Theory over 2 quarters?

If you have over 2 quarters...it should be 3 credits not 4

With the stats class...let them focus on statistics so students can learn properly...

In electives there is room for more methods courses...

GIS/Digital practicum? Should be 5 credits...

If there's a need for a science course in the core...we should consider creating room in the core. A good place may be Planning and Context

Last thought

Vote of Confidence and Continuation

Should we continue to move forward?

Dan move Qing second

10 yes

0 no

0 abstention

Next Steps

We also want to meet with the PC