Form: Course Syllabus	Form Number	EXC-01-02-02A
	Issue Number and Date	2/3/24/2022/2963 05/12/2022
	Number and Date of Revision or Modification	
	Deans Council Approval Decision Number	2/3/24/2023
	The Date of the Deans Council Approval Decision	23/01/2023
	Number of Pages	06

1.	**Course Title**	Architectural Analysis and Criticism
2.	**Course Number**	0902341
3.	**Credit Hours (Theory, Practical)**	3 credits/theory
	Contact Hours (Theory,)	3 hours
4.	**Prerequisites/ Corequisites**	History and Theory of Contemporary Architecture 0902244
5.	**Program Title**	Architectural engineering
6.	**Program Code**	2
7.	**School/ Center**	University of Jordan
8.	**Department**	Architectural Engineering
9.	**Course Level**	Third Year and above
10.	**Year of Study and Semester (s)**	
11.	**Other Department(s) Involved in Teaching the Course**	
12.	**Main Learning Language**	Arabic and English
13.	**Learning Types**	■Face to face learning ■Blended ☐Fully online
14.	**Online Platforms(s)**	☐Moodle ■Microsoft Teams
15.	**Issuing Date**	Fall 2023-2024
16.	**Revision Date**	Spring 2024-2015

17. Course Coordinator:

Prof. Saleem M. Dahabreh, PhD. Location: Office 33, faculty of Art and Design

Email: saleem.dahabreh@ju.edu.jo

18. Other Instructors:

Name: office number: Phone number: Email: Contact hours:

19. Course Description:

This course provides a rigorous introduction to the theory and practice of architectural analysis and criticism, equipping students with the intellectual tools necessary to critically engage with architectural works. Students will explore the philosophy, methodologies, and principles that underpin architectural criticism, developing a systematic approach to evaluating buildings through both written and graphic representation.

Through an intensive set of lectures and the study of historical and contemporary case studies, students will refine their ability to deconstruct, interpret, and articulate architectural ideas, engaging with explicit analytical frameworks to evaluate form, function, materiality, context, and meaning. The course examines architectural morphology, formal analysis, and interpretative critique, emphasizing their role in shaping architectural discourse.

Architectural criticism is defined as the intellectual and evaluative discourse surrounding built and proposed projects, encompassing themes such as aesthetics, theory, spatial organization, sustainability, material innovation, and socio-cultural relevance. By examining diverse modes of criticism—ranging from journalistic reviews to academic and theoretical critiques—students will cultivate a nuanced understanding of architecture as a cultural artifact and a disciplinary practice.

The course also addresses architectural morphology, which is concerned with the study of form, structure, and the underlying principles that govern built environments. Architectural analysis, closely tied to morphology, involves systematically dissecting architectural compositions to uncover their spatial logic, symbolic meaning, and performative qualities.

By the end of the course, students will have developed the ability to:

- Critically analyze architectural works using formal, historical, and theoretical methodologies.
- Engage in structured, articulate architectural critique through written, verbal, and visual communication.
- Understand the broader implications of architectural design in cultural, environmental, and societal contexts.
- Apply principles of architectural morphology to dissect and interpret spatial compositions.

Through lectures, discussions, and applied analysis, students will be encouraged to develop their own critical voice, preparing them for advanced architectural discourse and professional practice.

20. Program Intended Learning Outcomes:

- 1. Develop an intellectual base of knowledge in architecture's historical, theoretical, practical, and technological aspects and understand the interaction with allied disciplines such as engineering, mathematics, and arts.
- 2. Identify and analyze architectural problems using critical thinking skills, and synthesize innovative, sustainable, and contextually appropriate architectural solutions that incorporate skills developed from core to advanced design coursework.
- 4. Demonstrate proficiency in applying and developing architectural skills, techniques, tools, and technological advancements necessary for effective and innovative architectural practice.
- 5. Communicate and collaborate effectively with a wide range of audiences to carefully receive and eloquently deliver ideas through various communication methods.
- 7. Employ architectural research methods and critical thinking skills to assess and propose sustainable built environment solutions, and demonstrate commitment to lifelong learning and continuous development.

21. Course Intended Learning Outcomes:

Upon completion of the course, the student will be able to achieve the following intended learning outcomes)

1. **Demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of fundamental philosophical and architectural terminologies**, including **worldviews, theory, history, form, design, and style**, and articulate their relevance in architectural discourse.
2. **Critically evaluate architectural works by distinguishing between different modes of architectural criticism**, such as **formal, theoretical, functional, and contextual analysis**, and apply these methodologies appropriately in diverse architectural contexts.
3. **Conduct systematic morphological analysis of architectural projects**, deconstructing their **spatial organization, formal principles, material logic, and cultural significance** to develop an informed critique.
4. **Synthesize architectural analysis into well-structured critical essays**, demonstrating **clarity of argument, analytical depth, and scholarly rigor** in both written and graphic formats.
5. **Engage in critical dialogue about architectural works**, articulating **well-reasoned interpretations and critiques in verbal and visual communication** while considering broader cultural, environmental, and socio-political implications.
6. **Meet NAAB standards for design, human behavior, and professional responsibility**, demonstrating preparedness for architectural licensure and professional practice.

NAAB Student Performance Criteria (SPC) Alignment

ILO	Relevant NAAB Student Performance Criteria (SPC)	Justification
Understanding fundamental philosophical and architectural terminologies (worldviews, theory, history, form, design, style, etc.)	**A.7 (History and Global Culture)**	Enhances students' ability to critically analyze architecture within historical, cultural, and theoretical contexts.
Differentiating between different modes of architectural criticism and applying them in appropriate cases and contexts	**A.4 (Communication Skills), A.6 (Human Behavior)**	Develops skills in verbal, written, and visual critique, fostering clear articulation of architectural ideas and their societal impact.
Conducting systematic morphological analysis of architectural projects	**A.5 (Ordering Systems), A.8 (Analysis and Evaluation)**	Equips students with analytical skills to dissect spatial and formal relationships, understanding underlying structural and organizational logic.
Writing a well-structured critical essay on architectural works	**A.4 (Communication Skills), A.8 (Analysis and Evaluation)**	Strengthens students' ability to construct coherent architectural arguments and present them effectively in written form.
Engaging in critical dialogue about architectural works and articulating interpretations in verbal and visual formats	**A.1 (Design Thinking Skills), A.4 (Communication Skills), B.1 (Pre-Design)**	Encourages students to develop reasoned critiques, connecting architectural design with broader cultural, environmental, and societal frameworks.

Course ILOs	The learning levels to be achieved					
	Remembering	Understanding	Applying	Analysing	evaluating	Creating
1	✓					
2	✓	✓	✓			
3				✓		✓
4	✓	✓		✓		
5	✓					
6	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

22. The matrix linking the intended learning outcomes of the course with the intended learning outcomes of the program:

Program Intended Learning Outcomes (PILOs)	Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)						Justification
	CILO 1	CILO 2	CILO 3	CILO 4	CILO 5	CILO 6	
PILO 1:	✓					✓	CILO 1 builds a theoretical and historical knowledge base, while CILO 6 aligns with a broad intellectual foundation and professional readiness, including interaction with allied disciplines via NAAB standards.
PILO 2:		✓	✓				CILO 2 and CILO 3 involve critical analysis and problem-solving through criticism modes and morphological analysis, though the course focuses more on evaluation than solution synthesis.
PILO 4:						✓	CILO 6 ties to proficiency in professional practice skills, including NAAB standards, though the course emphasizes theoretical rather than technical application.
PILO 5:		✓		✓	✓		CILO 2, 4, and 5 directly involve communication skills through critique, essay writing, and verbal/visual dialogue, aligning with effective idea delivery.
PILO 7:		✓	✓				CILO 2 and 3 engage research methods and critical thinking for assessment, though the course focuses on critique rather than proposing solutions.

Notes on the Mapping:PILO 1: Strongly aligns with CILO 1 (building a knowledge base) and CILO 6 (broad professional preparedness), reflecting the course's emphasis on theoretical and historical understanding.

- PILO 2: Relevant to CILO 2 and CILO 3, as these involve analyzing architectural problems, though the course does not emphasize synthesizing solutions, limiting its scope compared to PILO 2's solution-oriented focus.
- PILO 4: Primarily linked to CILO 6, as the course focuses on theoretical skills rather than hands-on techniques or technological advancements.
- PILO 5: Directly supports CILO 2, 4, and 5, which center on communication and critique across multiple formats, aligning with collaboration and idea delivery.
- PILO 7: Connects with CILO 2 and 3, where research methods and critical thinking are applied to assess architectural works, though the course lacks a focus on proposing sustainable solutions.
- Unmapped PILOs: PILO 3 (related to design and construction processes) and PILO 6 (leadership and management) are not directly addressed, as the course is theory-based rather than practice- or management-oriented.
- Justifications: Each mapping is justified by the course's focus on intellectual engagement, critical analysis, and communication, with CILO 6 serving as a broad umbrella aligning with multiple PILOs due to its NAAB preparedness component.

23. NAAB Student Performance Criteria (SPC)

This course contributes to the following NAAB learnings outcomes (2020 edition):

A.1 (Design Thinking Skills) – Encourages students to approach architectural criticism as a structured intellectual process.
A.4 (Communication Skills) – Develops students' ability to communicate critiques effectively through writing, speaking, and visual representation.
A.5 (Ordering Systems) – Helps students understand and analyze spatial and compositional relationships within architectural works.
A.6 (Human Behavior) – Enhances the ability to critique architecture in relation to cultural, social, and behavioral considerations.
A.7 (History and Global Culture) – Strengthens students' understanding of architectural theory and history in a global context.
A.8 (Analysis and Evaluation) – Cultivates the ability to conduct in-depth architectural analysis and synthesize findings into critical assessments.
B.1 (Pre-Design) – Supports the development of critical thinking skills essential for pre-design research and analysis.

24. Topic Outline and Schedule:

Week	Lecture	Topic	ILO(s) Linked	Learning Type	Platform	Synchronous/Asynchronous	Evaluation Methods	Learning Resources
1	1.1	General Introduction	1, 5	Face-to-Face	teams	Synchronous	Participation	Syllabus, Instructor Notes
1	1.2	General Introduction	1, 5	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Participation	Syllabus, Instructor Notes
2	2.1	Definitions of Jakobson Model, Worldviews	1	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Participation	Lang (1987), Lang (1991), Zube & Moore (1991)
2	2.2	Definitions of Jakobson Model, Worldviews	1	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Participation	Lang (1987), Lang (1991), Zube & Moore (1991)
3	3.1	Theory, Philosophy, History	1	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Participation	Instructor Notes
3	3.2	Theory of architecture	1	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Participation	Instructor Notes
4	4.1	Form and Function	1, 3	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Participation	Arnheim, Eisenman, Forty, Hendrix, Madrazo
4	4.2	Form and Function	1, 3	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Participation	Arnheim, Eisenman, Forty, Hendrix, Madrazo
5	5.1	Form and Function	1, 3	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Participation	Arnheim, Eisenman, Forty, Hendrix, Madrazo
5	5.2	Style, Formal Languages	1, 3	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Participation	Akerman (1962), Knight (1994)
6	6.1	Aesthetics and Performance	1, 2	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Participation	Winters (2007)
6	6.2	Aesthetics and Performance	1, 2	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Participation	Winters (2007)
7	7.1	Analysis	2, 3	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Participation	Clark & Pause (1996), Unwin (2003, 2008)
7	7.2	Analysis and morphology	2, 3	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Participation	Clark & Pause (1996), Unwin (2003, 2008)
8	8.1	Morphology	3	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Midterm Exam	Instructor Notes
8	8.2	exam						
9	9.1	Criticism	2, 4	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Participation	Raymond Williams (1976)
9	9.2	Criticism	2, 4	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Participation	Raymond Williams (1976)
10	10.1	Architectural Criticism	2, 4	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Participation	Attoe (1987)
10	10.2	Architectural Criticism	2, 4	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Participation	Attoe (1987)
11	11.1	Architectural Criticism principles	2, 4, 5	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Presentation	Instructor Notes, Case Study Materials
11	11.2	Competitions	2, 4, 5	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Presentation	Instructor Notes, Case Study Materials
12	12.1	Case Study Presentations	2, 4, 5	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Presentation	Instructor Notes, Case Study Materials

Week	Lecture	Topic	ILO(s) Linked	Learning Type	Platform	Synchronous/Asynchronous	Evaluation Methods	Learning Resources
12	12.2	Case Study Presentations	2, 4, 5	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Presentation	Instructor Notes, Case Study Materials
13	13.1	Case Study Presentations	2, 4, 5	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Presentation	Instructor Notes, Case Study Materials
13	13.2	Case Study Presentations	2, 4, 5	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Presentation	Instructor Notes, Case Study Materials
14	14.1	Student Presentations	2, 4, 5	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Presentation, Term Paper	Instructor Notes, Student Projects
14	14.2	Student Presentations	2, 4, 5	Face-to-Face	Teams	Synchronous	Presentation, Term Paper	Instructor Notes, Student Projects

25. Instruction and Evaluation Methods:

This course employs a **seminar-based approach**, integrating **theoretical instruction, literature review, critical discussion, and applied case study analysis** to enhance students' understanding of the **intersection between architecture and psychology**. The structure is designed to be **open-ended yet well-organized**, fostering an environment that encourages **active participation, critical thinking, and application**.

The course will follow a **progressive two-phase teaching methodology**, ensuring a **gradual transition from foundational knowledge to independent inquiry and project-based learning**:

1. **First Phase: Lecture-Based Instruction**
   - The initial phase will consist of **lectures delivered by the instructor**, focusing on **fundamental theories, principles, and key readings** necessary for subsequent discussions.
   - These lectures will provide a **structured foundation in environmental psychology, perception, and human behavior in architectural spaces**.
2. **Second Phase: Seminar-Based Engagement**
   - The course will shift toward **student-led discussions**, where students will **analyze and critique** selected readings.
   - Each session will incorporate **summarized reading materials, student essays, and guided discussions**, encouraging deeper engagement with **environment-behavior theories, spatial cognition, and case studies**.
   - Small **group collaborations (2-4 students per group) will be formed** to facilitate **critical discourse and interactive learning**.
   - **Applied Project & Case Study Presentations**
     - Students will **take an active role** in directing discussions by presenting **group projects focused on architectural psychology, morphology, and design critique**.
     - Emphasis will be placed on **writing as a craft, architectural modeling techniques, and analytical skills**.
     - Students will engage in **peer critiques**, refining their ability to **articulate architectural arguments and respond to critical feedback**.
     - Discussions will revolve around **textual analysis, case study precedents, and real-world design applications**.

After the second week of the semester, students will be **provided with reading materials** ensuring **adequate preparation for discussions**. The class will meet **twice weekly**, fostering a consistent **balance between theoretical instruction and hands-on application**. This **dynamic teaching method** ensures that students develop **a robust conceptual framework**, while also **enhancing their ability to critically analyze, discuss, and apply design psychology principles** in architectural practice.

The final grade for this course will be based on a **comprehensive evaluation of students' engagement, analytical rigor, research quality, and presentation skills**. Assessment will encompass **active participation in seminar discussions, performance in examinations and quizzes, quality of written work, and effectiveness in verbal and visual communication**.

1. Participation, Seminar and reading Engagement, and Preparation (10%)

To facilitate meaningful discussion and **intellectual engagement with the course material**, students are required to **complete all assigned readings before each seminar session**. Active reference to these readings in discussions will be taken into account in participation grading.

Participation in this course is **not limited to attendance** but requires **active intellectual contribution** to seminar discussions. Students are expected to critically engage with the course material by asking questions, formulating arguments, and contributing meaningful insights. Passive attendance without substantive engagement in discussions will not be sufficient to attain a **grade of B or above**.

2. Examinations (Midterm and Final) – 80%

Both the midterm and final exams will assess students' **factual, procedural, and conceptual knowledge** accumulated throughout the semester. The exams will evaluate students' ability to:

- Demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of key **theories, concepts, and case studies**.
- Apply **environmental psychology principles** to architectural contexts.
- Critically analyze and synthesize theoretical perspectives with **design applications**.

3. Term Paper (10%)

The **term paper** serves as a major component of the assessment, emphasizing **depth of research, intellectual strength of argumentation, and clarity of structure**. To receive a **grade of B or higher**, the paper must:

- Be based on **thorough and methodologically sound research** on a specific topic relevant to design and psychology.
- Demonstrate **coherent argumentation, critical analysis, and engagement with scholarly literature**.
- Be professionally structured and well-articulated, following **academic writing standards**.

Papers that fail to properly cite all sources, including **textual and visual materials**, will not be considered for **a grade in the B range or higher**. **Plagiarism or failure to attribute sources will result in academic penalties.**

Grade Scale:
Approximate distribution of students within scale

A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F
88-100	84-87	79-83	75-78	71-74	66-70	62-65	58-61	54-57	53-50	45-49	0-44
15%		50%						35%			

Grade Scale:

- **A, A-** indicates **excellent** performance.
- **B+, B, B-** indicates **good** performance.
- **C+, C, C-** indicates **satisfactory** performance.
- **D+, D** indicates **less than satisfactory** performance.
- **D-, F** indicates unsatisfactory performance (no credit: always include last date of attendance).

Passing Grades	Description
A, A-	**Outstanding** and **excellent** performance. Normally achieved by a minimum of students. These grades indicate a student who is self-initiating, exceeds expectation and has an insightful grasp of the subject matter. The student demonstrates a flawless and comprehensive understanding of the required knowledge and skills, executing them impeccably across various situations. Consistent evidence of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation is apparent, alongside frequent displays of originality, insight, and consistently
B+, B, B-	**Very good**, **good** and **solid** performance. Normally achieved by the largest number of students. These grades indicate a good grasp of the subject matter or excellent grasp in one area balanced with satisfactory grasp in the other area. The student consistently and comprehensively grasps the required knowledge and skills, applying them proficiently in diverse contexts. Evidence of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation is typically present, with occasional displays of originality and insight.
C+, C, C-	**Satisfactory**, or **minimally satisfactory**. These grades indicate a satisfactory performance and knowledge of the subject matter. The student demonstrates a good overall understanding of the required knowledge and skills, effectively applying them in standard situations. Occasional instances of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation are evident.

D+, D	**Marginal** Performance. A student receiving this grade demonstrated a superficial grasp of the subject matter. The student displays limited achievement across most objectives, or encounters clear difficulties in specific areas. There is a restricted understanding of the required knowledge and skills, with full application possible only in typical situations with assistance.
Failing Grades	**Description**
D-, F	**Unsatisfactory** performance. Wrote final examination and completed course requirements; no supplemental. The student exhibits very limited achievement across all objectives, struggling to grasp the required knowledge and skills and facing challenges in applying them adequately even with support.

Course Evaluation Table: Architectural Analysis and Criticism

Evaluation Activity	Mark (%)	Topic(s)	ILO/s Linked to the Evaluation Activity	Period (Week)	Platform
Participation, Seminar Engagement & Reading Preparation	10%	Architectural criticism, theoretical frameworks, environmental and morphological analysis	Develop critical thinking, actively contribute to discussions, formulate arguments, reference readings in discussions	Weeks 1–14	In-Class, LMS
Midterm Examination	30%	Key theories of architectural analysis and criticism, historical and contemporary case studies	Demonstrate understanding of theoretical and practical criticism methods in architecture	Week 8	In-Class
Final Examination	50%	Comprehensive knowledge of architectural analysis methodologies, applied critique approaches	Apply theoretical perspectives to practical architectural criticism and morphology	Week 14	In-Class
Term Paper	10%	Critical essay on architectural analysis and critique	Develop structured, well-argued, and research-driven architectural criticism	Week 13	LMS (Turnitin, Submission Portal)

26. Course Requirements:

(e.g.: students should have a computer, internet connection, webcam, account on a specific software/platform…etc.):

27. Course Policies:

All university rules and regulations will be strictly followed in evaluating students.

A- Attendance policies:

Absence percentage will not exceed 15% of the total lectures of the semester, which means that by the sixth absence, the student will not attend the final exam. Leaving class before it ends, or taking an extended bathroom or water break that lasts 1/3 of the class time or longer, will be considered an unexcused absence.

B- Absences from exams and handing in assignments on time:

- assignments are to be handed in on the dates and times scheduled
- incomplete work is accepted with the highest grade being at a C
- late work is not accepted
- work submitted by others is not accepted
- extensions are not granted
- make-ups are not granted

If a student is unable to submit a piece of coursework or attend an exam by the published deadline due to circumstances beyond control such as an emergency or other mitigating reasons that is accepted by the University (The circumstances must be fully and officially documented), the student has to hand it in as soon as he/she can after that. There will be no adjustment made for absence, late work, or incomplete work due to controllable events (such as visits to the Student Health Center, job interviews, holiday flights, and work schedules).

The grade of I (Incomplete) is assigned ONLY in accordance with the criteria set out in the School of engineering Bulletin and University regulations. A grade of Incomplete may be given only when the work of the course is substantially completed when the student's work is of passing quality. https://units.ju.edu.jo/ar/LegalAffairs/Regulations.aspx

C- Health and safety procedures:

D- Honesty policy regarding cheating, plagiarism, misbehavior, and Ai use:

Misbehaviour:

Instructor may refuse a student admission to a lecture, a tutorial or learning activity set out in the course outline because of lateness, misconduct, inattention or failure to meet the responsibilities of the course set out in the course outline. Students who neglect their academic work may be assigned a final grade of N or debarred from final examinations.

Behaviours that inhibits other students' ability to learn and an instructor's ability to teach persistently or grossly interferes with classroom activities is considered disruptive and is subject to disciplinary action. A student responsible for disruptive behaviour may be required to leave class pending discussion and resolution of the problem and may be reported to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs for disciplinary action.

Academic dishonesty includes but is not limited to acts such as cheating on exams or assignments; plagiarizing the words or ideas of others; fabricating material or citations; facilitating acts of academic dishonesty by others; claiming authorship of works done by others whether students or professionals; submitting work completed previous works by self or others; and/or submitting the same work to multiple classes in which a student is enrolled simultaneously. All these cases will be dealt with according to the rules and regulation stated out in the rules and regulations applied at the University of Jordan as posted on the University webpage

Policy on the Use of Generative AI Tools in the Course

In this course, the use of **generative AI tools** (e.g., **ChatGPT, DALL-E, Midjourney, etc.**) is **permitted under specific conditions** to support students in **enhancing their research, refining their ideas, and improving their academic writing skills**. However, AI tools **must be used ethically and transparently**, adhering to **academic integrity standards** set by the university.

Permitted Uses of AI Tools

Students may use generative AI tools for the following activities:

- **Brainstorming and conceptual development:** Exploring ideas related to design and psychology in architecture.
- **Refining research questions:** Structuring and narrowing down research topics.
- **Finding preliminary information on a topic:** Gaining insights to support critical analysis.
- **Drafting outlines and organizing thoughts:** Structuring arguments and coursework.
- **Grammar and style checks:** Enhancing the clarity and readability of academic writing.

Prohibited Uses of AI Tools

The use of generative AI tools is **not allowed** for the following activities:

- **Generating content that misrepresents your original work**, including AI-composed responses for seminar discussions, presentation scripts, or Zoom chats.
- **Completing group work assigned specifically to you**, unless explicitly approved by all group members.
- **Drafting writing assignments in part or in full**, including essays, case study analyses, or reports.
- **Producing entire sentences, paragraphs, or complete assignments using AI tools**, as this undermines independent critical thinking and academic originality.

Responsibility, Citation, and Academic Integrity

Students are **fully responsible** for all submitted work, including any content derived from AI tools. This means ensuring that information is **accurate, free from misinformation, does not violate intellectual property laws, and aligns with ethical research standards**.

Any use of AI tools must be properly documented and cited in accordance with the university's academic honesty policy. Students should use **[Insert Preferred Citation Style, e.g., APA, Chicago, MLA]** when referencing AI-generated content.

Consequences of Unauthorized AI Use

Unauthorized use of AI tools will be considered a **violation of academic integrity** and subject to appropriate academic penalties. Any assignment found to have relied on AI in **unauthorized ways** will be subject to penalty as stated by the rules and regulations of student conduct at the university of jordan
https://units.ju.edu.jo/ar/LegalAffairs/Regulations.aspx

E- Grading policy:

See above

F- Available university services that support achievement in the course:

Access to Wi-Fi internet, Proper electronic library, Department library, Main Library

G-Lecture room courtesy

- Academic and social manners and civility are not trivial; they help to establish and maintain the quality of relationships between individuals involved in the academic experience and they inform proper everyday behaviours. To that end, kindly observe the following guidelines for maintaining a civil educational environment
- Punctuality in attendance and leaving: It's courteous to be on time and to not leave class early. Students who arrive late disrupt class unnecessarily. Students who walk out of class early risk giving an unintentionally negative impression by exiting unexpectedly. If circumstances require you to be late for class, or require you to leave early, please alert the instructor either before or after class. Punctuality is highly appreciated; habitual lateness is likely to have a negative impact on one's grade.
- In deciding whether or not to attend class: Please do not ask your instructor if she is covering anything "important" on that day. This course is carefully planned out – every lecture is important.
- Respect for others: treating opinions and ideas with respect is a basic courtesy that is appreciated by all. It's important that each of us extend this courtesy to each other as part of our everyday class interactions. Respectful behaviors include listening carefully and attentively to what others have to say, offering comments and challenges to ideas in ways that address issues rather than personalities, coming to class on time, being prepared for the day's readings and activities, and refraining from talking or reading while others are speaking.

- Class Rules: lecture halls are communal spaces. All students are expected to be respectful to others who share the space, no beverages or food is allowed into the lecture room. Keep the room tidy and clean, and give utmost care to the equipment.
- Working on the lab computers during presentations: all students are expected to pay attention and take notes during lectures. Please refrain from working on the individual computers during class, presentations or discussions unless you take permission or doing so is an explicit component of the class exercise. Working on anything not related to lecture topic will lead to immediate dismissal from class. Repeating such actions will eventually affect the final grade
- Mobile phones: the use of phones in any manners is strictly prohibited. All Please make certain that all electronic devices are turned off before class begins.
- Bringing a newspaper or study materials (from other classes) to class: do not study material from other classes during this class. If you feel that you must spend our class time studying or doing homework, please go to the library.
- The content of the syllabus, lectures, and presentations; the design of the assignments; and calculation of the grade you earn are not starting points for negotiation. While the instructor is always willing to work with students on a one-on one-basis, individual terms cannot be negotiated with each student.
- Bringing guests to class: If you wish to bring a guest to class e.g. friend, relative, siblingplease consult with the instructor prior to the visit. Visitors are generally welcome in class; however, the instructor does reserve the right to decline accommodating requests for visits.
- The instructor reserves the right to request that a student (or visitor) leave the classroom in the event that his or her behaviour becomes unduly distracting or disruptive to the purposes of the class or to maintaining the civility of the classroom environment.

28. References:

A- Required book(s), assigned reading and audio-visuals:

B- Recommended books, materials, and media:

- Akerman, J. S. (1962). A Theory of Style. The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism. Vol. 20, No. 3. pp. 227-237. Wiley: on behalf of The American Society for Aesthetics. DOI: 10.2307/427321 Architecture(Routledge, 2013)
- Arnheim, Rudolf, The Dynamics of Architectural Form (Berkeley: University of
- Baker, Geoffrey H. 91996). Le Corbusier: an analysis of form. 3rd edition. Van Nostrand
- Benjamin, Andrew E, Architectural Philosophy (London: Athlone Press, 2000) California Press, 2009)
- CLARK, R. H., PAUSE, M., 1996. Precedents in Architecture. 2nd edition. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- DAHABREH, S. M., ABU GHANIMEH, A., 2012. Design as Formulation: from application to reflection, Disegnare idee immagini, 45, Registrazione Presso, Univerita di Roma, 76-88.
- DAHABREH. SALEEM M., 2006. The Formulation of Design: the Case of the Islip Courthouse by Richard Meier. PhD thesis, Georgia Institute of Technology, GA.
- Eisenman, Peter, (1963). The formal Basis of Modern Architecture. PhD dissertation Cambridge form (ETH Zurich 1995).
- Forty, Adrian. (2000). Words and Buildings: A Vocabulary of Modern Architecture. New York: Thames & Hudson

- FRIEDMAN, K., 1992. Strategic design taxonomy. Oslo Business School, Oslo, Norway.
- FRIEDMAN, K., 2003. Theory construction in design research: criteria: approaches, and methods. Design Studies (24), 507–522
- Gelernter, Mark. (1995). Sources of Architectural Form: A critical theory of Western design theory. Manchester and New York: Manchester University press.
- Groat, L., Depres, C. (1991) The significance of Architectural Theory for Environmental Design research. In Zube, E., Moore, G. et.al. Advances in Environment, Behavior, and Design. pp 3-52. New York and London: Plenum Press.
- Hendrix, John Shannon, The Contradiction Between Form and Function in Hendrix, John, Architectural Forms and Philosophical Structures (New York: Lang, 2003)
- Hendrix, John, The Contradiction Between Form and Function in Architecture, 27th edn
- JOHN S. GERO, J., KANNENGIESSER, U. (2007). A Function-Behavior-Structure Ontology of Processes. AI EDAM: Artificial Intelligence for Engineering Design, Analysis, and Manufacturing. 21(4), pp 379-391
- Jupp, J. Gero. J. (2006).Visual style: Qualitative and context-dependent categorization. Artificial intelligence for engineering design analysis and manufacturing. 20(3):247-266.
- Knight, Terry (1994). Transformations in Design: A Formal Approach to Stylistic Change and Innovation in the Visual Arts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- KOLODNER, J., 1993. Case-Based Reasoning (Morgan Kaufmann Series in Representation & Reasoning). Morgan Kaufmann
- Lang, J. (1987). Creating Architectural Theory: The Role of Behavioral Sciences in Environmental Design. VNR, New York. Pp. 13-21
- Lang, Jon. 1991. Design Theory from an Environment Behavior perspective. In: Zube, Ervin & Moore, Gary T. (editors), Advances in Environment, Behavior, and Design vol. 3. Plenum Press, New York & London, pp. 53-101.
- Laseau, Paul. (2001). Graphic Thinking for Architects and Designers. (3rd Ed.) New York, Chichester, Weinheim, Brisbane, Singapore, and Toronto: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Leach, Neil, Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory (Routledge, 2005)
- Leupen, Bernard. [et al.]. (1997). Design and analysis. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1997.
- Madrazo, L. The concept of type in architecture: An inquiry into the nature of architectural
- Mitchell, W. J. (1990). The Logic of Architecture: Design, Computation, and Cognition. Cambridge: MIT Press Reinhold.
- UNWIN, S., 2003. Analyzing Architecture. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge.
- UNWIN, S., 2008. An Architecture Notebook. 3rd ed. London and New York: Routledge.
- Winters, Edward, Aesthetics and Architecture (London: Continuum, 2007)
- Zube, Ervin & Moore, Gary T. (editors). 1991. Advances in Environment, Behavior, nnd Design vol. 3. Plenum Press, New York & London. pp.vii-ix
- References by the instructor
- 4F_C: A Conceptual Framework for Understanding Architectural Works. Dr Saleem M. Dahabreh. Published (March, 2014) Scientific Research and Essays
- Design as Formulation: from application to reflection. Dr Saleem M. Dahabreh, Dr Ali Abu Ganemieh. Published: Disegnare idee immagini n.45/2012: 76-88
- Between the Abstract and the Analytic: The case of the Douglas house by Richard Meier. Dr Saleem M. Dahabreh, Sama A. Jabr. Publication at Scroope 22/2013: The Cambridge Architectural Journal: 102-109. (Supported research by the University of Jordan).
- Investigating the Quality of Open Educational Spaces: the case of Al-Bayt University Al- Mafraq/Jordan Dr. Mwfeq Haddad, Prof. Samer Abu Ghazalah, Dr. Ali Abu Ghanemieh, and Dr Saleem M. Dahabreh. Published:

Research Journal of Applied Sciences, Engineering and Technology 5(4) 2013: 1075-1085, Maxwell science Publication.

- The hidden Geometry of the Douglas House. Dr Saleem M. Dahabreh. Published 09/2013: Research Journal of Applied Sciences, Engineering and Technology. Maxwell science Publication.
- The Architectural Design Machine (AD_M): integrating architectural knowledge. Dr Saleem M. Dahabreh. 01/2014: International Journal of Applied Engineering Research. (Supported research by the University of Jordan).

29. Additional information:

Name of the Instructor or the Course Coordinator: Prof. Saleem M. Dahabreh	Signature: ……	Date: 1/3/2025
Name of the Head of Quality Assurance Committee/ Department ……	Signature: ……	Date: ……
Name of the Head of Department ……	Signature: ……	Date: ……
Name of the Head of Quality Assurance Committee/ School or Center ……	Signature: ……	Date: ……
Name of the Dean or the Director ……	Signature: ……	Date: ……