

Course Numbers: ARC4941 + ARC6940
Course Titles: Architectural Education Issues + Supervised Teaching
Term: Spring 2026
Credits: 2
Class Numbers: 10457

Meeting Times: Discussion: Wednesday, Period 3 | Studio: VARIES
Meeting Locations: Discussion: ARC213 | Studio: VARIES

Instructor: Mark McGlothlin, Associate Professor
Office: Antevy Hall, Room 238 | Gainesville FL 32611-5702 USA
Contact: Email: mmcglath@ufl.edu
Telephone: (352) 294-1477

SYLLABUS: Architectural Education Issues Spring 2026

Many of you may recall this language from your studio syllabuses...

- *To have at your fingertips a thousand fruitful ways to approach any problem, and...*
- *To learn to critique yourselves effectively. What we ask from you is a concerted effort, an innovative take on the problem, constructions that raise architectural issues, and, most importantly, for you to challenge yourself and be constantly willing to continue to develop a scheme....*

These two points exist as part of the foundation for grading in lower division (Design 1 through Design 4). Our point here is not to resurrect lower division guidelines, though you will be working with lower division students, so the lessons should continue to resonate. Rather, they serve as reminders to the challenges of design that straddle every aspect of design education, including that off-foggy world of instruction.

As you all know, design education cannot be reduced to problem-solving or product-making alone. If we ask students to consider *a thousand fruitful ways*, we are asking them to risk, to be wrong, to resurrect this failure and try again, to improve...over and over and over. Thus, the problem may not be “solved” in a singular way, but we may arrive at a thousand possible solutions.

To this point, you have joined ARC4941 Architectural Education Issues, though most of you will know it by its colloquial (and more suitable) name... “Teaching Methods.” This is important, as you will be immersed in a world of pedagogical complexities; complicated, ever-shifting issues of curriculum for sure, but also the accelerated influence of technology, or the role of craft within a world increasingly absent the hand, or the palpable tensions between the art and science of architecture. Lofty topics at times, but not the sole focus, as you will also be asked to place these topics into the context of education proper. Said differently, pedagogy is not simply about ideas, but how those ideas are put into the practice of teaching...and thus your secondary charge in this class...teaching methods.

In this regard, there are a few primary objectives that you will:

- Be introduced to the logics of design education and curricular reasoning as exhibited at UF and other schools
- Develop an awareness of the complex issues of iterative educational models (how to address unknown success, failure, confusion, obstacles and/or roadblocks, etc.).
- Develop the ability to see the ideas of others in their work and provide meaningful and constructive feedback to them
- Reinvest in foundational design skills and ways of thinking
- Establish a critical dialogue regarding design thinking by reinvesting in vocabulary that is clear, concise, and precise while also remaining encouraging, open-ended, and reassuring.
- Develop a sense of restraint and appreciation of the importance of education (letting the student do the work).

Course Structure and Methodology

The Teaching Methods class has two components. The most significant is the practicum or the direct participation of the student teacher in our lower division curriculum. This has primarily been in the design studio curriculum but we have had students work in other areas. The second component is a weekly seminar discussion that lasts approximately 1 hour depending on the topic. Potential subjects of those discussions are listed below. We adjust the topics depending on the semester, as each semester brings a different set of goals within the curriculum and we try to address the difference each semester brings. For example, the Fall semester may focus more directly on ways of making and tectonic languages (the world of D1 and D3), while the Spring semester might be directed more towards analytical influences and reinforcing issues of process. Similarly, the Fall may explore the differences between undergraduate and graduate education (it is the season of graduate admissions), whereas the spring may explore the role of upper division admissions (ah, pinup...fond memories).

To be clear, the course will meet weekly on Wednesday morning, period 3 for discussion. When the opportunity of available, this may include a review of student work in the DCP gallery. Participation as a teaching assistant in a lower division studio is schedule-dependent, with the goal of aligning you with a studio that has minimal conflicts with other courses in your schedule.

Professor McGlothlin will be teaching the course for the fall term and though he will be the primary point of contact, the larger goal of the course is to engage several faculty members in the discussion of design pedagogy. Over the years many other UF faculty have participated directly in the teaching seminar: Cohen, Cronin, Walters, Hofer, Alread, Gundersen, Monk, and others. Additionally, enrolled students will be active with lower division studio faculty, acting as teaching assistants in the studio and in doing so, engaging the teaching objectives of each studio section and faculty.

Potential topics of discussion

Each discussion/seminar session will be directed to a particular topic. Early sessions will focus on specific topics to establish a firm pedagogical foundation for the class. The remaining sessions will be targeted to a range of conversations that are of interest to the class. The following demonstrated the range of topics that have formed the basis of the seminar discussions:

- Topic: Responsibilities and expectations of Teaching Assistants within the School of Architecture
- Topic: Introduction and assignment of teaching internships
- Topic: The National Curriculum; NAAB and professional accreditation
- Topic: The History and development of the design curriculum
- Topic: The Current Undergraduate Curriculum at the University of Florida
- Topic: Integrating Technology; cross-curricular structure
- Topic: Design I and 2; Fundamentals
- Topic: Design 3 and 4; Refined Fundamentals
- Topic: The role of Context
- Topic: Option studios
- Topic: Travel Programs in the curriculum
- Topic: Studio as teaching context; technique and assignment
- Topic: Making Assignments within design studio
- Topic: Bridging between research, scholarship, and teaching
- Topic: Contemporary Programs of Architecture
- Topic: Architectural Education & the Reflective Practitioner

In addition, student teachers report on the progress of their studio and their own effectiveness as design educators. This self-criticism and conversation occur throughout the term. We also use the gallery exhibits as a major teaching laboratory through discussion of the work. Frequently the work in the gallery exhibitions is presented by the students who are assisting in the studio to the other students for discussion. These discussions will be held on Wednesday mornings, period 3 in the gallery. The proposed exhibit schedule is included with the Fall Schedule (see below):

Over the years and depending on the semester, we have also produced:

- Teaching and/or assignment portfolios for various lower division classes.

- Curriculum maps – students identify the important goals of the courses as they understand them and we map their relationships within the larger undergraduate structure.
- Reports and discussions on other Schools of Architecture and their professed strengths and positions.

The Teaching Methods course has become an integral part of the lower division design curriculum in two ways. First, with the current structure of Design 1 and Design 2, student teachers have become essential in facilitating the success of those studios. Maybe more important; the course is a foundation for students aspiring to become Graduate Teaching Assistants in our Graduate Program.

Spring 2026 Schedule (to be reframed based off interests discussed in weeks 2 and 3)

Wk 1	01/14	Introduction and syllabus review: Development of Teaching Assistant assignments
Wk 2	01/21	Working as a Teaching Assistant: Maintaining professional relationships with students
Wk 3	01/28	Curricular Structures: History of Architectural Pedagogy and Curricula at UF
Wk 4	02/04	Competition: The role/relationship of competitive work in studio
Wk 5	02/09	Undergraduate and Graduate education: what gives? (Grad 2 work to help)
Wk 6	02/16	Process and Product: Addressing the good versus the perfect.
Wk 7	02/25	Hand-based and digitally-based work: the role of craft in architecture (D4 work to help)
Wk 8	03/04	Bigness: The wacky world of program and scale (D6 work to help)
Wk 9	03/11	Al...thinking and making when you may not be thinking anymore
Wk 10	03/18	It's Spring Break (think about something else, please)
Wk 11	03/25	On Beginning and Ending: the relationship between idea and conclusion (go to PILOT review!)
Wk 12	04/01	April Fools! Not really...Lines toward licensure: is it a race or a longer slog?
Wk 13	04/08	Ah Fundamentals! The world of analysis (aka, looking at work – with D1 work to help)
Wk 14	04/15	Thresholds!! The world of pinup, admissions, and making the bar.
Wk 15	04/22	Finale!!! General Discussion about teaching, studios, semester as a whole
Wk 16		FINALS WEEK...GOOD LUCK!!!!

Disclaimer: This syllabus represents the current plans and objectives. As we go through the semester, those plans may need to change to enhance the class learning opportunity. This could include alignment with studio exhibits (schedule pending), guest lectures (typically held on Monday evenings), studio reviews (schedule pending), and, most importantly, the interests of you as a group. We want you to help shape the conversation and value what you think, where your concerns lie, and where your aspirations and insights might lead us.

Thus, the schedule may shift and therefore changes, communicated clearly, are not unusual and should be expected.

Performance + Grading

Professor McGlothlin will initiate seminar discussion sessions held on Wednesday morning, period 3. Attendance and participation scores for each of the session will be recorded. This portion of the course will constitute 40% of the total course grade. The participation through teaching in studio constitutes the remaining 60%. Each student will be involved as a teaching assistant in a lower division studio and will need to coordinate the specific expectations of the assistantship with the faculty leading that studio. These faculty mentors will be asked to evaluate the teaching assistants regarding their overall effectiveness, contribution, dedication and advancement for the studio. If you are engaged in studio, offer insightful feedback, and are otherwise constructive with your efforts, all should go well. If you are distracting, uncommitted, or otherwise a liability to the studio, you should expect things to end poorly.

Letter Grade	Numeric Grades	Quality Points	Qualitative Description
A	100 to 94.0%	4.0	<u>Outstanding effort.</u> Student was insightful and constructive. Attendance was consistent and the student was fully engaged in developing meaningful discussions of work.
A -	< 94.0% to 90.0%	3.67	Close to outstanding effort in studio.
B+	< 90.0% to 87.0%	3.33	Very good, effort in studio.
B	< 87.0% to 84.0%	3.0	<u>High quality work.</u> Student demonstrated a consistent effort to develop meaningful feedback and discussion within the studio. Minor degrees of distraction and/or detachment of day-to-day work was observed.
B -	< 84.0% to 80.0%	2.67	Good effort with some problems.
C+	< 80.0% to 77.0%	2.33	Slightly above average effort.
C	< 77.0% to 74.0%	2.0	<u>Average or satisfactory work.</u> Student effort in studio was consistent and generally strong, though moments of disconnectedness from assignment or rote feedback was present.
C -	< 74.0% to 70.0%	1.67	Average effort with some problems.
D+	< 70.0% to 67.0%	1.33	Poor effort.
D	< 67.0% to 64.0%	1.0	Poor or less than satisfactory effort. Student was disconnected from studio discussions and offered little meaningful feedback or guidance during studio discussions. Attendance and engagement were also weak.
D -	< 64.0% to 61.0%	0.67	Poor work with some problems.
E	< 61.0% to 0.0%	0.0	<u>Inadequate and unsatisfactory effort.</u> The student was largely disconnected from the class. Attendance patterns were very weak, making the student a liability to the course as a whole.

UF Academic Policies and Resources

For additional UF "Academic Policies & Resources," go to: <https://go.ufl.edu/syllabuspolicies>. These resources include information about:

- Requirements for class attendance, make-up exams, and assignments
- Processes for students with disabilities who may require accommodations
- Current UF grading policies
- Expectations for course evaluations and constructive feedback
- The University's Honesty Policy regarding cheating, plagiarism, etc.
- In-class recording of class lectures for personal use
- Academic resources, including contact information
- Campus health and wellness resources, including contact information

Discussing difficult topics objectively and without endorsement

People learn best when they are encouraged to ask questions and express their diverse opinions on course content which may include images, texts, data, or theories from many fields. This is especially true in courses that deal with provocative or contemporary issues. UF offers many such courses, in which students encounter concepts of race, color, sex, and/or national origin. We teach these important issues because understanding them is essential for anyone who seeks to make economic,

cultural, and societal contributions to today's complex world. With this in mind, we do not limit access to, or classroom discussion of, ideas and opinions-including those that some may find uncomfortable, unwelcome, disagreeable, or even offensive. In response to challenging material, students and instructors are encouraged to ask honest questions and thoughtfully engage one another's ideas. But hostility, disruptive and disrespectful behavior, and provocation for provocation's sake have no place in a classroom; reasonable people disagree reasonably.

These guidelines can help instructors and students as they work together to fulfill the mission of the University of Florida, which includes the exploration of intellectual boundaries, the creation of new knowledge and the pursuit of new ideas.

The following summary of Florida HB7 (2022) is provided for additional information and context:

HB 7 – Individual freedom

“(4)(a) It shall constitute discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex under this section to subject any student or employee to training or instruction that espouses, promotes, advances, inculcates, or compels such student or employee to believe any of the following concepts:

- 1. Members of one race, color, national origin, or sex are morally superior to members of another race, color, national origin, or sex.*
- 2. A person, by virtue of his or her race, color, national origin, or sex is inherently racist, sexist, or oppressive, whether consciously or unconsciously.*
- 3. A person's moral character or status as either privileged or oppressed is necessarily determined by his or her race, color, national origin, or sex.*
- 4. Members of one race, color, national origin, or sex cannot and should not attempt to treat others without respect to race, color, national origin, or sex.*
- 5. A person, by virtue of his or her race, color, national origin, or sex bears responsibility for, or should be discriminated against or receive adverse treatment because of, actions committed in the past by other members of the same race, color, national origin, or sex.*
- 6. A person, by virtue of his or her race, color, national origin, or sex should be discriminated against or receive adverse treatment to achieve diversity, equity, or inclusion.*
- 7. A person, by virtue of his or her race, color, sex, or national origin, bears personal responsibility for and must feel guilt, anguish, or other forms of psychological distress because of actions, in which the person played no part, committed in the past by other members of the same race, color, national origin, or sex.*
- 8. Such virtues as merit, excellence, hard work, fairness, neutrality, objectivity, and racial colorblindness are racist or sexist, or were created by members of a particular race, color, national origin, or sex to oppress members of another race, color, national origin, or sex.*
- (b) Paragraph (a) may not be construed to prohibit discussion of the concepts listed therein as part of a larger course of training or instruction, provided such training or instruction is given in an objective manner without endorsement of the concepts.”*

References

- Angélil, Marc. *Inchaote: An Experiment in Architectural Education*. Zurich: Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich (ETHZ), 2003. Print.
- Brawne, Michael. *Architectural Thought: The Design Process and the Expectant Eye*. Burlington MA: Architectural Press, 2003.
- Caragonne, Alexander. *The Texas Rangers: Notes from an Architectural Underground*. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press, 1995. Print.
- Deamer, Peggy. *First Year: The Fictions of Studio Design*. 2005. Web. Accessed: 28 November 2010.
<<http://www.peggydeamer.com/images/fictionsofstudiodesign.pdf>>
- Education of an Architect*, Ed. Elizabeth Diller, Diane Lewis, and Kim Shkapich. New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 1988. Print.
- Gundersen, Martin and Adeline Hofer, Ed. *Constructions: Studio Work from the Department of Architecture*. Gainesville: Department of Architecture University of Florida, 1993.
- Kandinsky, Wassily. *Punkt und Linie zu Fläche* (ninth in a series of fourteen Bauhaus books edited by Walter Gropius and L. Moholy-Nagy). Reprinted as *Point and Line to Plane*. Trans. Howard Dearstyne and Hilla Rebay, Ed. Hilla Rebay. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1979. Print.
- Love, Timothy. *Kit-of-Parts Conceptualism*. Cambridge: Harvard Design Magazine, 2003. Fall 2003/Winter 2004, Number 19. Print.
- Moholy-Nagy, L. *Vision in Motion*. Chicago: Wisconsin Cuneo Press, 1947. Print.
- Rowe, Peter T. *Design Thinking*. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press, 1987. Print.
- UF School of Architecture. *NAAB Architectural Program Report*. Various years – digital via Canvas