HISTORY/THEORY/CRITICISM III

Landscape Architecture Research Seminar: Contemporary Common Landscapes

LA 504

August 22-December 3, 2015
Tuesday, 1:50-4:30pm, Crown Hall 014
https://www.siteations.com/courses/HTC2016

Meg Studer, Part-Time Professor
studer@siteations.com, office hours by appointment
(before you email me questions, read the syllabus and read this: http://bit.ly/2bjIFSa)

ULTRASHRED MOBILE TRUCKS
(Predator G3 Series)

DESCRIPTION Look for curled edges, multiple accordion folds, and an overall worn, aged, softened quality to identify material produced by UltraShred trucks. UltraShred's hammermill system pounds the paper with repeated force, recapitulating the process by which fibers are initially prepared for papermaking. Text may be rendered less readable as the paper substrate is broken down ("de-inking"). The hammers crush documents against changeable screens with apertures ranging from 2" to 3/8", producing consistently sized shred particles with a distinctly crumpled appearance. The finest 3/8" screens produce a cottony fibrous mass.

SHRED TYPE Pulverized. Paper is more disintegrated than in other shredding methods.

SHREDDER TYPE Hammermill. In UltraShred's Predator series trucks, a hopper feeds into a mill which consists of a single shaft fitted with a series of 56 hammers (rectangles of hardened steel) rotating at high speeds. These bang repeatedly against the fixed surface of a screen, pulverizing and disintegrating the material which is then pulled through the screen via pneumatic action.

SECURITY LEVEL DIN security level 1-5 (10.5mm × 40-80mm cross cut). By particle size alone, UltraShred hammermills at their finest screen setting produce shred only at security level 1. However, the pulverizing process produces less legible and forensically reconstructable material than comparable methods of cutting and tearing.

SIMILAR Shredfast's Series 200 hammermill trucks produce shred of similar appearance.

RANGE UltraShred trucks are most common in the Pacific Northwest, radiating down into California and have been seen as far east as Minnesota. Despite their superior document disintegration capabilities, hammermills—at one time the most common kind of mobile shredder—are quickly being replaced by quieter, higher-throughput pierce-and-tear shredding trucks.

VECOPLAN MOBILE TRUCKS
(VST 31I, VST 42E, and similar)

DESCRIPTION Shred from Vecoplan trucks is distinctly non-rectangular, with irregular edges on all sides. The effect is of a scattering of tiny European nations torn from a map. Vecoplan's grinding shredder causes edges to part with a sheering action, leaving a fringe of fibers visible through magnification. Particle size may vary considerably but should be relatively consistent within any given batch, as Vecoplan models are equipped with interchangeable screens used to filter the chad by size. Larger screens (3" to 1") are commonly used in situations of low to normal security and finer (1/4" to 1/8") screens create the tiny particles demanded in the disposal of secret and top secret documents. The latter may be rare discoveries, as military specifications can also require assurance of further chemical disintegration, supervised recycling, or burning.

SHRED TYPE Cross-shred. Note: Though technically a type of cross-shred, the grinding/shearing action produces an average of 6-12 torn edges per piece of chad (vs. 4 edges on a standard office cross-cut machine).

SHREDDER TYPE Grinder. Single shaft rotary design with a hydraulic ram that pushes the material against rotating torsion point cutters, which then sheer it by carrying it past a fixed cutting blade.

SECURITY LEVEL DIN security level 5 (0.78mm × 11mm cross cut). For additional security, customers can request a certificate of destruction, with full video documentation provided on a solid-state flash memory chip.

SIMILAR In addition to their mobile trucks, Vecoplan makes a number of stationary (in-plant) shredders using the same technology. It is not certain that the product of these different models can be clearly distinguished. See also the Cresswood Destroyer series.

RANGE Vecoplan shred may be found throughout the US and Canada, but is rare except for national security and military use. Look for Vecoplan shred in areas of high government activity (Washington D.C., Virginia, Maryland) and near military bases and research stations (e.g. Sandia National Laboratories, Area 51).

Digging into Everyday Environments, Instruments, and Externalities: (a.k.a. A Field Guide to Shred)
Burnett, D. Graham, et. al. "The Memory Hole Has Teeth." *Cabinet Magazine*, summer 2011, 76-77.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

History/Theory/Criticism III, Landscape Architecture Research Seminar (L A Research) is a 3 credit fall course. As a seminar, it focuses on the advanced study of landscape architecture topics, using a selected theme to emphasis and explore research and writing methods. Across the term, students will examine and practice creating pieces of written and visual description, analysis, criticism, and scholarship. Embracing the overarching mission of landscape architecture (to prepare students to envision, articulate, and design environmentally, socially vibrant urban landscapes), the course helps students hone their voices and feel as comfortable structuring everyday observations, archival exploration, analytic sketches, and causal criticism as when developing traditional scholarship. Offered for second year students, the course is a primer for independent, professional inquiry.

Although the course is a research seminar, it does not focus on producing a single research essay. Instead, it emphasizes the wider range of design writing - its outlets, genres, and the hybridizations of text and image - used in staking a position amidst historical, social, environmental, and policy problematics. Along with writing, students are invited to critically draw upon their backgrounds - in spatial modeling, graphic communication, and typological/temporal scenario creation - to develop rich, vivid responses to an individually defined research proposition or problem.

R E S E A R C H   T H E M E S

This term, the course focuses on common or everyday landscapes as sites of cultural and historical research as well as instrumental exploration and intervention. From the informal observations of J.B. Jackson to Landscape Urbanist inquiries on economies of scale and distributed infrastructures, we'll trace the way landscape systems and patterns have been evoked, evaluated, scrutinized, and given form in discourse. Generally, the 'everyday' offers a number of topical advantages: it opens a very wide array of research sites for defamiliarization, deconstruction, and design thinking; precedent writings provide great demonstrations of how to use the scale-less nature of text to navigate from emblematic, concrete details to emergent structures (historical, cultural, projective); it ask students to be inquisitive narrators (not experts), using their observations in a continuum with other interlocutors.

Within this larger embrace of everyday landscapes, students will develop individual research trajectories. A mixture of course readings, professor and group feedback, and in-class exercises are designed to enable them to situate their work amidst both contemporary landscape praxis and larger cultural contexts. Basic research skills (literature reviews, bibliographic referencing and metadata handling, etc.) will be covered aside the pragmatic tactics necessary for engaging in original research. It is not our intention to master or gain absolute 'expertise' in vernacular research. It is, rather simply, to examine how research is done, by way of a consistent body of examples.

M E T H O D   &   S T R U C T U R E

This course is based on a seminar/discussion format with in-class group exercises and readings. Classes, generally, will begin with a group discussion of a theoretical and precedent texts, which demonstrate the different components and types of structure within landscape research and writing. Students will then take turns leading the discussion of these precedent readings. Each session will end with a short in-class exercises to help students apply the theoretical and structural lessons of the day to their research assignments. Workshop sessions, throughout the term, will provide peer review as an opportunity to strengthen critical and constructive reading abilities, as well as explore peers' evolving research, expository approaches, etc. The final session of the course will be a mock conference panel, where students present their final research to an audience of peers and invited critics, for questions and discussion.

Students will be expected to participate in class discussions, presentations, and exercises as well as complete their research exercises in a timely manner (for workshopping session). Outside of class session, students must engage in archival and site visits, digital and field documentation. Requirements for research/writing assignments will be distributed in class and available on the website. Weekly briefs will define the expectations for the course submissions and blog postings. Deviations from required formats and/or lateness will affect submission grades.

E D U C A T I O N A L   G O A L S

L A Research is the third of four history and theory courses. It follows a) *Landscape Architecture Theory*: the conceptual and genealogical constructions of nature/culture and b) *Landscape Architectural History*: the major projects and disciplinary formations of modern landscape (in N. American); it proceeds c) *Advanced Contemporary Case Studies*: the exploration of Chicago precedents, their dynamic elements and afterlives. LA Research provides basic research conventions, methodological precedents, and a critical awareness of the different platforms for design inquiry and agitation. In exploring common landscapes and media, the course asks students to conceptualize and communicate in an expanded field; to draw out the material and spatial indices and impacts of landscape systems, locating and articulating issue of concern and positions of leverage (polemic as well as tectonic).

Within the NAAB realm of Critical Thinking and Representation, the educational goals in this course include the development of the following list of skills and concepts:
  · Professional Communication
  · Critical Design Thinking
  · Investigate skills, inclusive of use of precedents, ordering systems, historical and cultural contexts

L A RESEARCH 3

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

The learning objectives of LA Research are developed from the above educational goals, and include the following actions and activities through which these specific skills and concepts are conveyed to the student.

- Professional Communication skills are developed through assigned readings, secondary research, abstract exposure, and, in-class, analytic engagement with research precedents and peer work, including reference and citation conventions from both the humanities and sciences, exploration of 'design' translations and interpretations of history and policy papers, and the use basic research guides.

- Critical design thinking is enhanced through the iterative development, adaptation, and revision of the students' research writings, based on alternate audiences and media of communication; this should cultivate precise writing, thoughtful editorial choices, and the intelligent establishment of visual/verbal arguments suited to public and disciplinary discourse.

- Investigative skills are developed through bibliographic assignments, archival visits, and the process of documentary collation, analysis, and synthesis. This pragmatic exposure should expose students to a) the typically iterative, 'triangulated' nature of archival and original research and thus b) help them pragmatically organize their materials and time when considering a research project by c) strategically balancing secondary and primary sources.

SCHEDULE OVERVIEW

Phs 0:   wk1-2   Introduction/Problematizing the Everyday Landscape
                         Assignments: (1) 100 word problem/research statement with visuals

Phs 1:   wk3-5   **Description**: Experiential, Comparative (Detail in Design Discourse)
                         Assignments: (2) 200-300 word descriptive explorations (~3 paragraphs, each)
                         Workshops (each phase): notes & constructive response to peer writings (rotating partner reviews)

Phs 2:   wk6-8   **Analysis**: De-Construction, Construction (Parts, Wholes, & Structuring Systems)
                         Assignments: (1) 400 word analysis of interlocutor's argument (~3-4 paragraphs)
                         (1) 600 word analysis of element, editing together descriptions and interpretation, with address of interlocutors, independent research (~4-6 paragraphs, casual tone)

Phs 3:   wk9-11   **Criticism**: Succinct Syntheses (Short-Form Exploration & Argument)
                         Assignments: (2) 1200 word pieces of landscape criticism (~10 paragraphs), each edit of the piece should respond to media conventions (print vs. digital links & graphics)

Phs 4:   wk12-14   **Scholarship**: Extended Exposition (Academic Articulation)
                         Assignments: (1) 2500-3000 word piece of landscape scholarship (~12-14 paragraphs), for extended exposition of their research, inclusive of footnotes, full disciplinary & theoretical significant of argument/findings, original & analytic use of visuals
                         (1) 200-300 word abstract or pitch (publishing outlet specific) for your final piece

Conference: wk15   After the mock panel, final revisions will be due by Dec. 9th.

                         Final Presentation/Submission: Students can choose to present either a polished piece of criticism or scholarship (revised from above), reading their work in tandem with visuals. They should identify a target publication/outlet for the audience.
                         Likely sites include: *Places, Cabinet, The Atlantic's* 'Object Lessons', ASLA's *The Dirt, Topos, Jola, Landscape Journal, Avery Review, Forty-Five,* etc.

REFERENCE TEXTS
ALL READINGS & REFERENCES ARE POSTED ON THE WEB

Most weeks will include specific texts to aid with assignments and discussion. There are also three reference texts that serve as background for a) basic written structures in art and architectural history, b) research types within landscape architecture, and c) practices and challenges of non-fiction writing. I will introduce some of their ideas/schema in course discussions and, based on individual student issues, refer you to specific sections.

a) Barnet, Sylvan. *A Short Guide to Writing About Art.* 11 edition. Boston: Pearson, 2014.

b) Deming, M. Elen, and Simon Swaffield. *Landscape Architectural Research: Inquiry, Strategy, Design.* John Wiley & Sons, 2011.

c) McPhee, John. "The Writer's Life" (column), *The New Yorker.* Misc editions from 2011-2015.

CLASS BY CLASS COURSE SCHEDULE

PROBLEMATIZING EVERYDAY LANDSCAPE

T_01 08.23   COURSE INTRODUCTION + EXPECTATIONS
Syllabus Review & Project Overview
Opening Question: What is landscape? Why research/write?

Assigned Reading:
> Listed under week when discussed

Optional, Support Reading:
> Mattern, "Reading Effectively – Words in Space." http://www.wordsinspace.net/wordpress/teaching/student-resources-2/readingeffectively/
> Deming, Chp 1.
> Barnet, Chp 1.

T_02 08.30   VERNACULAR AGGREGATIONS, INTENSITIES, & INFRASTRUCTURES
Landscape Organization & Problematization

Readings:
Jackson, J. B. "The Word Itself," "A Pair of Ideal Landscapes" (excerpts), *Discovering the Vernacular Landscape.* Yale University Press, 1984.
Lewis, Pierce "Common Landscapes as Historic Documents" in *History from Things.* Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institute, 1993.
Holmes, Rob. "Glitches & Flash Crashes" in the *Resilient Infrastructure Series.* University of Minnesota, 2013. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rjYAWIMqNLc

Assignment (due week 03):
Blog Post: Propose a feature/element to problematize in your everyday environment –
> 100 words and 3-5 quick iphone shots – what intrigue about spaces, materials...

Alt. Sources/Ref.:
> Alphabet Books, Koolhaas' Biennale Fundamentals, Object Lessons, Giedon's Anonymous Histories, Hugh's Evolution of Large Technological Systems, McPhee's 'Progression; How and What?' etc.

Optional, Support Reading:
Barnet, Chp. 3: "Formal Analysis" (questions for looking)
Cronon - "Reading Landscapes" http://www.williamcronon.net/researching/landscapes.htm.

D E S C R I P T I O N Details in Design Discourses

T_03 09.06   EXPERIENTIAL AND FORMAL ARTICULATIONS
The ontological power of immersive description – narrative/observation/tactility in constructing, conveying interactions

Readings:
Mumford, Lewis. "The Medieval Tradition" in *Sticks and Stones*. Dover, 1955. 1-10.
Perec, Georges. "The Page," "The Street," "The Town," "The County," "Space" in *Species of Space*. Penguin, 1999 (1974).

Assignment (due week 04):
Blog Post: develop 300 word description (3 paragraphs) of your chosen element/feature/space, use
    formal/immersive/tactile details to hint at its larger cultural, ecological effects/interactions.

Alt. Sources/Ref.:
            Olupians, EcoCriticism, Marx on Jefferson vs. Hamilton/Cox, Phenomenal Transparency, Picturesque
journaling, other incisive formalisms

Optional, Support Reading:
Barnet, Chp. 10: "Style in Writing"

T_04 09.13   COMPARATIVE CAPTURES
Between phenomenal description and analysis, critically engaging with 'given' classifications and simple comparative frameworks

Reading:
Burnett, D. Graham, et. al. "The Memory Hole Has Teeth." *Cabinet Magazine*, Summer 2011, 76-77.
Hindle, Richard L. "Levees That Might Have Been." (excerpts) *Places Journal,* May 18, 2015. https://
    placesjournal.org/article/levees-that-might-have-been

Assignment (due week 05):
Blog Post: develop another 300 word description (3 paragraphs) setting your chosen element into
    a familiar landscape framework (standards, catalogs, etc.). As before, consider how detail,
    comparison, and interpretation focus the reader on relevant, meaningful information; highlight
    how your element provokes a critical re-reading or re-working of given frames (historical, social,
    projective... etc.).

Alt. Sources/Ref.:
            40 Cities, The Toaster Project, Isotype/Neurath, Teysott on Typology, Gracias' MAP brochures,
Giedion, etc.

T_05 09.20   WORKSHOP WEEK:
Initial round of peer reviews - 3 rotating pairs - work on 2 descriptive assignments
Focus understanding argument structure, rhetorical/poetic tools at work, identifying ways to
    strength writing

Assignments (due week 06):
Annotated Bibliography of on-going research (5 min. entries, Chicago Style)

Blog-Post: Identify a target print or web publication for your final project, submit links to precedent articles/post/slide-shows. (See list in schedule overview).

Optional, Support Reading:
Barnet, Chp. 9: "Effective Essays"

A N A L Y S I S deconstructing and constructing relationships

T_06 09.27   PARTS & WHOLES (& HOLES)
moving from single/simple objects to systems: articulating parts, processes, and context
critically engaging a discursive field, its claims, and its construction of sites and systems

Reading:
Van Leeuwen, Thomas A. P. "Iron Ivy." in *Cabinet Magazine*, Winter 2008. Online at: http://www.
    cabinetmagazine.org/issues/32/vanleeuwen.php
Davis, Brian. "Easements." in Bhatia eds. *The Petropolis of Tomorrow*. Actar, 2013. 388-405.
Gandy, Matthew. "The Paris Sewers and the Rationalization of Urban Space." *The Fabric of Space:
    Water, Modernity, and the Urban Imagination*. MIT Press, 2014. 27-54.

Assignment (due week 07):
Blog Post: select one of the main interlocutors from your annotated bibliography; in 400-600
    words analyze their argument (its structure, tone, visual aids, intended audience); use your
    conclusion to suggest how their research should be extended, corrected, or extrapolated in light
    of shifting contexts (time, other research, etc.). Implicitly, these later avenues should align with
    how you are conceiving/executing your larger project.

Alt. Sources/Ref.:
            Auge's In the Metro, Hughes' Evolution of Large Technological Systems, Latour's Objects/Matters of
Concern in *Reassembling the Social*, Rose's Discourse Analysis in *Visual Methods*, etc.

Optional, Support Reading:
McPhee, 'Structure'
Barnet, Chp. 4: "Analytic Thinking"

T_07 10.04   CONSTRUCTING NARRATIVES (textual/graphic)
triangulating, ordering, and omitting elements in structuring arguments
mixed genres of visual-textual output- mediums/manifestations of research

Reading:
Nye, David E. "Introduction," "Constructing Nature." in *Narratives and Spaces*. Columbia University
    Press, 1997. 1-24.
1 reading per student - skim and analyze how graphic argument works, how it corresponds to textual
    argument (consider in tandem with your analysis of your sources/interlocutors) - present to
    peers
    Mathur, Anu and Dilip Da Cunha. "Basin" in *Mississippi Floods*. New Haven, CT: Yale U. Press,
        2001. 11-30+. (flip through larger print sequence)
    RVTR. "Design Operations," "System" in *Infra-Eco-Logi-Urbanism*.
    Venturi, Robert and Scott-Brown, Denise. "A Significance for A&P Parking Lots..." in *Learning
        from Las Vegas*. Cambridge, MIT Press: 1972. 3-73 (mostly drawings, schematic).
    Corner, James and MacLean, Alex. *Taking Measures*. New Haven, Yale U. Press: 1996. (Skim
        generally).
    Kate, Orff and Richard, Misrach. "Intro," "Oil," "Waste" in Petrochemical America. Aperture,
        2014. (focus on claims for diagrams, degree of photo-collage, how the text and images
        integrate).

Assignment (due week 08):
Blog Post: Write a 600-800 word analysis of your chosen element, editing together descriptions,
   address of interlocutors, and your evolving independent research; alternately, develop an
   analytic poster/layout (draft drawings), incorporating succinct elements of the above in 500
   words of copy.

Alt. Sources/Ref.:
   Drucker *Graphesis*, Berger/Belange/Lateral curation of graphic arguments, CUP Vendor Power &
What's in the Water, RSVP annotations, etc.

Support Reading:
Barnet, Chp. 8: "...Writing Text Panels and Other Materials"
McPhee, 'Omissions'

T_08 10.11   WORKSHOP
Second round of peer reviews - 3 rotating pairs - work on 2 analysis-synthesis assignments
Focus understanding type of argument (formal, historical, theoretical, etc.) as well as structure and
   order of evidence unveiled, identifying ways to strength writing

Assignments:
Update Bibliography and Annotations
Blog-Post: Develop rough list of potential pieces (text/graphics) for use in criticism and scholarship,
based on research progress.

Support Reading to anticipating Final Assignments:
Barnet, Chp. 13/14: "Writing a Research Paper," "Manuscript Form"

CRITICISM   Succinct, Styled Syntheses
T_09 10.18   CHOREOGRAPHING CRITICISM
fitting complex narratives to enlarged audiences
synchronizing tone, pacing, theme, and main approach to reinforce your arguments about
   landscapes' agenda/agency

Reading: (polemic appeal vs. proposal critique)
Lange, Alexandra. "Parks (Olmsted)" in *Writing About Architecture: Mastering the Language of
   Buildings and Cities. Chronicle Books, 2012. skim intro 7-11, 121-147.*
Pollak, Linda. "Sublime Matters" in *Praxis 4: Landscapes*. 2002, 58-63.

Assignment (due week 10):
Blog Post: in 1200 words, develop a draft of accessible criticism based on your research; at the end
   of the piece note your anticipated audience, list your main themes/approach (assuming print
   outlets).

Alt. Sources/Ref.:
   Survey Graphic RPAA ed. criticisms, misc. J. B. Jackson, LAM reviews, Blanchon's 'Criticism...Or, the
difficult art of interpretation' in JOLA 11:2, etc.

Support Reading:
Lange, Other Samples
Barnet, Chp 11. "Art Historical Research" - criticism/scholarship differences (judgments/context constructions)

McPhee, 'Frame of Reference'

T_10 10.25   OTHER ACCESSIBLE GENRES
Summarizing as process/product in design research:
    abstracts, pitches, reviews, visual notes, round-tables, blogging

Readings:
abstracts: skim 3-4 conference abstracts (2015 CELA, SAH, CCA, other tbd).
thinking eye: selections from *JOLA*'s graphic column tbd., selections from the 'gallery' series of
    Environmental History tbd.
blog criticism: 1 per student: samplings from blog-based essays (dates/entries to be assigned) -
    consider the tools/tactics of blog criticism and their relationship to traditional polemic/project
    readings above), look at the handling of images, link, etc. within arguments:
    BldgBlog,
    Mammoth,
    Subtopia,
    CityofSound,
    Pruned (archive),
    EdibleGeographies

Assignment (due week 11):
Blog Post: in 250 words, summarize your current argument in an abstract or a pitch. This should
    clarify your intent, help identify weak sections and suggest where to start your editing/
    alternations for a new audience.
Blog Post: develop a revised version of your criticism for an alternate outlet (web), with links
    and images. Specifically rework one section of description to shift the theme and audience
    addressed.

T_11 11.01   WORKSHOP WEEK:
Third round of peer reviews - 3 rotating pairs - work on 2 versions of criticism piece

Assignments (due week 12):
Focus on research, outlining/prepping materials for scholarship structure.

Support Reading:
Barnet, review Chp. 9 "Effective Essays"
McPhee. 'Draft no.04'

S C H O L A R S H I P Extended Expositions
T_12 11.08   ANNOTATED ARGUMENTS
informal allusions to structured engagement, sign-posted assertions/expositions

Readings: (three vantage points, onto an 'everyday' topic: lawn instruments/metrics)
McPherson, E. Gregory. "Modeling Residential Landscape Water... Use" in *Landscape Journal.* Fall
    1990, 122-134.
Mosser, Monique. "The Saga of Grass: From Heavenly Carpet to Fallow Fields" in *The American
    Lawn.* New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999. 40-64.
Geffel, Michael. "From Landscaping to Infrastructure: The Scope and Agency of Maintenance" in
    Scenario Journal 03: Rethinking Infrastructure, 2013. http://scenariojournal.com/article/from-
    landscaping-to-infrastructure-the-scope-and-agency-of-maintenance

Assignment (due week 14):

Blog Post: in 2500-3000 words, develop a short scholarly essay for a journal or on-line publication. This can pull from your criticism drafts, but it should emphasize context construction over judgment; it requires formalize footnotes, clear and concise exposition of argument - including orienting introduction and conclusion, schematic segmentation, hierarchical ordering of arguments and evidence (as opposed to relaying on the succinct performance of narrative flow).

Support Reading:

Barnet, Chp. 11/12/13 "Art Historical Research," "Critical Approaches," "Writing a Research Paper"

T_13 11.15   NAVIGATIONS, NEGOTIATIONS

This is predominantly a working week. Students will share the process behind their working essays, their pathways/network of research sketched or visualized, in the first half of class. This should help them consider the strength, focus, address of their arguments. The later half will be desk critics and one-on-one discussion to help them address omissions or issues this process revealed.

Readings: to be determined by student contributions

Assignment:

    work on scholarship piece

T_14 11.22   WORKSHOP WEEK:

Final round of peer reviews - 3 rotating pairs - scholarship piece

C O N F E R E N C E P A N E L Final Presentation of Research

T_15 11.29   Visual/Verbal presentation for visiting critics, open audience

G R A D I N G B R E A K D O W N

Grading for the class will be determined according to the following criteria:

Planning & Prep Assignments (wk 5, 8, 11) (~3% each)	10% total
Descriptions, Argument & Element Analysis (~6% each)	25% total
Criticism, Scholarship, & Final Presentation (~12% for drafts, ~9% final submission)	45% total
Attendance, Participation/Discussion leadership, Peer Reviews	20% total

Documentation is expected throughout. Each week, students will post their work to the course blog by a) attaching an uploaded word document or open office file and b) pasting a readable text version to the blog itself. Late posts will be docked 25% of their value each week. An additional 25% will be docked if the assignment is not submitted and available for peer reading and constructive criticism during workshop weeks.

At the end of term, final docs for each assignment plus their revised presentation essay should be packaged on a digital drive (google or flash); this will be due by the 9th and failure to submit will effect entire grade

L A R E S E A R C H 10

GRADING CRITERIA:
WORK WILL BE GRADED BASED ON THE FOLLOWING:

Completeness: Instructions carried out in detail

Technical Skills and Attention to Detail: Assignments executed with the appropriate method and knowledge of technique? Student shows proficiency in the various media skills?

Accuracy and Presentation: Assignments completed with precision and presented professionally?

Effort and Concept: Student iterates through multiple drafts and shows evidence of experimentation and improvement during the assignments? Concepts are clearly articulated and well developed. On a broader scale, student shows consistent effort and improvement over the course of the semester.

Incompletes: There will be no Incomplete given for a course except for a documented medical excuse at the discretion of the instructor. You are required to attend all classes and be present in the classroom during the allocated times. Absence need to be notified as mentioned in the paragraph above in schedule.

Attendance and timely submission of assignments: More than two unexcused absences in a course will result in a failing grade (two absences is equal to over 13% of total class time). Each student must turn in what is completed or receive a failing grade for the particular assignment. Names of groups and individuals should be clearly indicated on all assignments.

!!! Plagarism will not be tolerated !!!
Copying of other's work, outside of formal quotations and citations, will not be tolerated. Please see the Honor Code for rules and repercussions: http://web.iit.edu/student-affairs/handbook

!!! WE START ON TIME, PLEASE BE IN CLASS AND READY TO DISCUSS AT 1:50pm !!!
Students who are not in class and ready to participate at 1:55 will be marked late. Three lates will equal an unexcused absence.

ACCOMMODATIONS: ADA POLICY STATEMENT

Reasonable accommodations will be made for students with documented disabilities. In order to receive accommodations, students must go through the Center for Disability Resources office. The Center for Disability Resources (CDR) is located in Life Sciences Room 218, telephone 312 567.5744 or disabilities@iit.edu.

GRADING STANDARDS
FROM THE IIT OFFICIAL GRADE LEGEND

Grade	Explanation (refers to class performance)	Quality Points
A	Excellent	4.00
B	Above Average	3.00
C	Average	2.00
D	Below Average	1.00
F	Course failure	0.00

USEFUL REFERENCES

see course website for additional links to landscape journals, blogs, archives, and area institutions