J A M E S Christopher Luckowski

C R E A T I V E COMPONE N T P R O G R A M F A L L 1 9 8 7

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my parents and family, my wife Mary, and her parents. These people, at one time or another, have provided me with the understanding and support that has allowed me to pursue my education in this School of Architecture.

Without them this project would never have been possible.

Thank You.

Samer Indonestri

James C. Luckowski

I would like to thank the following people for thier support during this project and indeed throughout my neverending educational experience here at Oklahoma State University. Without thier assistance and guidance this project and my education would have suffered deeply.

Thank You.

Jim Knight Thesis Advisor Professor of Architecture Oklahoma State University

Alan Brunken Programming Advisor Professor of Architecture Oklahoma State University

Bob Heatly Listener/Advisor Professor of Architecture Oklahoma State University

Virgil R. Carter, Head School of Architecture Oklahoma State University

The Faculty and Staff University School of Architecture Oklahoma State University

Parks Hammond, Professor Landscape Architecture Oklahoma State University

Margaret Weber, Head Interior Design Dept. Oklahoma State University

RECOGNITION

PURPOSE

This Professional Project is one that marks the end of a period of formal education and the beginning of a life-long educational process. Since the future is yet to be realized I feel that an appropriate subject for this project would be one that has fascinated me for the last six years of my life. The process of Design.

My time at this school of architecture has been an exciting, rewarding, and frustrating experience. Those people with whom I've had the pleasure of working and associating with have given me the oppurtunity to observe and evaluate the day to day, as well as day to night operations of this studio oriented curriculum.

Through all of these experiences I've made note of things which are good in the school and things which are not so good. When I make mention of the bad things it is not to say the program is bad, yet it seems some of the physical restraints placed on the program often hinder rather than help the program to expand and develope as it might under different conditions.

It is intended that this project for the "OSU School of Design" will allow me to rediscover and uncover some of those problems and solve them logically in the manner consistent with the excellent education I have recieved in the School of Architecture at Oklahoma State University. The project begins with an Idea. The Idea being that enrichment and meaning are a direct result of interaction. The forms of interaction that we wish to address are those concerned with the people involved in the process of **Design**.

At present, the schools of Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Interior Design at Oklahoma State University are disparate, both physically, in terms of facilities and, personally, in terms of the human participants, ie; the students and faculty. This poses many problems that individually may not be destructive to each program, but do inhibit the potential growth of the program as well as the student's personal growth.

With the selection of the site in the "Old Central" district it is hoped that a stronger relationship between the studio vocations can be implanted within the University as a whole. Being close in proximity to "Old Central", the first building on campus, which now as a museum draws many people to the site. The Seretean Center for the Performing Arts is vital to this system and provides us with the eastern boundary of the site. The Bartlett Center for Studio Art provides the north-east boundary and gateway to campus, while Morrill Hall, Business Administration, the Student Union, the Paul Miller Journalism Building, and Bennett chapel complete the north and west and south-west edges of the site. The area to the south represents the campus exsposure to the city and a major gateway to campus and as such it will be important to deal with the entry experience of visitors to Oklahoma State University.

The result of this project is intended to unite the seperate design vocations into a conceptual "Critical Mass" of which collective learning and growth are the major goals. These goals are the essence of this proposal to form an Oklahoma State University School of Design.

MISSION STATEMENT

DEDICATION RECOGNITION PURPOSE OF THE PROJ MISSION STATEMENT TABLE OF CONTENTS	i ii ECT iii iv v	TABLE OF CONTENTS
DATA & FACTS USERS HISTORY EXISTING PROGRAMS STATE OF THE ART SITE ANALYSIS CLIMATE ANALYSIS PHOTO SURVEY	1-5 6-16 17-24 25-34 35-54 55-64 65-76	
AREA NEEDS area requirments areas and costs	77-190 191-192	
GOALS & CONCEPT FUNCTION FORM ECONOMY TIME	S 193-207	
STATEMENTOFTHE I FUNCTION FORM ECONOMY TIME	208-211	
		1

Э

DATA & FACTS

USER GROUPS

STUDENTS

EXCELLENCE IN DESIGN



PUBLIC

The main concern of this School of Design is that the design of the students be at the highest level of excellence; therefore the students education is to be considered the highest priority of the school. As such , the students shall be thought of as the primary users of the facility.

The School places great emphasis on the act of Design. The implies that a great deal of time must be spent in the development of solutions to Design problems and the studio is the where this activity takes places. The intensity level that is required by the Faculty to maintain an acceptable level of quality in design often places tremendous stress on the individual students to perform at this level and to excel. Competition is a natural result of the studio system and as such provides a boost to that desired level of intensity. Taking all of these factors into consideration requires that the studio's themselves be of the highest quality and that the equipment be of the highest quality also to insure that students are given every opportunity to succeed.

The Students will be situated in four programs seperated only by the name of thier particular field of study. These are Architecture, Architectural Engineering, Interior Design, and Landscape Architecture.

FACULTY





The Faculty are a unique group of individuals who share a common interest: to teach and demonstrate to students the techniques used in the process of Design.

Even though each faculty members method of instruction may vary with respect to his/her individual personal philosophy, it is important to understand that the overall instuctional technique in the new School of Design is the TEAM approach. To further understand this method it is important to realize the Faculty members are not treated as studio "Masters", that is the students do not recieve instruction from only one member of the faculty over a whole semester of design projects. The Faculty members cycle through the studio of each particular year level so that everyone is allowed the opportunity to be exposed to various viewpoints and philosophies concerning design. Thus, the emphasis is not on an individual critic's style or approach, but rather on the fundamentals of the design process and resolution leading to appropriate building solutions.

It is also important to realize that this proposal will allow greater collaboration among faculty members of the various disciplines, which up until now has been only remotely possible because of the seperation that currently exists.

STAFF

EXCELLENCE IN DESIGN



The Administrative Staff represents the life blood of the School of Design.

The Staff are those people responsible for the day to day administrative operations of the school. Thier tasks include providing overall leadership of the individual programs within the school, providing general student services such as couseling and records maintainance, and faculty services such as typing and general clerical tasks.

The importance of the staff to the success of the school can not be emphasized enough, and as such it is crucial that the solutions be sensitive to thier pyschological, aesthetic, and functional space needs.

UNIVERSITY

EXCELLENCE IN DESIGN





The University is an essential contributor to the success of the programs in the School of Design. The University is the vital framework within which the school exists and operates. This group can be divided into two parts; the first part is the Student body, the second part is the Administration. The first group is the most important in that it provides us with the students, who are crucial to any institution of higher learning because they represent the diversity necessary to insure that growth and development occur both individually and in each field of study. The Administration of the University is also important because it provides the fiscal supports that allow the various Colleges on campus to exist both in terms of the programs and thier physical building needs.

The primary University users on campus are the Students who will come into contact with the School through the public spaces provided such as the Gallery and the Studios since these tend to be used mainly by the students with whom they often are associated with. The point being that the School of Design will now house a large number of students in a prominent location on campus and as such will put many people in contact with the program.

PUBLIC

EXCELLENCE IN DESIGN



PUBLIC

The General Public represents the base of support that allows the School and the whole University to grow and develope. The General Public acts as the primary beneficiary of progress made in the Institutions of Higher Learning and therefore are obliged to continue active support of these programs.

More specifically, the General Public stands to reap substantial gains from its support of the School's programs since its graduates will eventually be charged with making the decisions that will shape the quality of everyday life. Public interest and participation does play a large part in the success of the school as well as that of the university, and as such it should be a major goal of the School to involve itself fully in the issues and topics that concern the General Public.

SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE HISTORY Oklahoma A & M College offered the first architecture courses in the fall of 1909 under the guidance of Professor W. A. Etherton (University of Illinois). Mr. Etherton had come to campus in the fall of 1908 to design buildings and was appointed the first head and only faculty member of the Department of Architectural Engineering the following fall. The department offered a four-year Bachelor of Science degree with seven specialized courses in architecture: wood construction, requirements and planning of buildings, history of architecture, plumbing, building materials, architectural engineering seminar, and office building construction.

The new department had an enrollment of three students. All of the architecture courses were taught in the Gundersen classrooms, then known as the Engineering Building. The first graduate, awarded a degree in the spring of 1911, was Carl F. Harvey of Stillwater. He was able to graduate two years after the department began because all courses in the freshman and sophomore years were the same within the division.

Professor Etherton remained as the head until the end of the 1911 academic year. That summer Fredrick Child Biggin, AIA (BS Arch., Cornell; MS Civil Engr., Lehigh), was invited to assume the headship. Mr. Biggin, an outstanding young architect from Atlanta, traveled with his family by train to Pawnee and then by horse and buggy to Stillwater to open the 1911-12 school year. With his arrival the department and curriculum were reorganized as the Department of Architecture.

According to information on the back of a 1916 department picture, Professor Biggin was the only faculty member. He taught all architectural subjects as well as descriptive geometry to engineers; he was in the classroom 48 hours per week. In the spring of 1916, Professor Biggin was invited to found the first School of Architecture in the South at Alabama Polytechnical College, now Auburn University. Professor Biggin served as dean of the School of Architecture and Fine Arts at Auburn for almost fifty years.

One of Dean Biggin's outstanding students was Philip Armour Wilber. Mr. Wilber came from Guthrie in September of 1914 to study under Dean Biggin and served as his teaching assistant in 1916. After a brief war-related interruption, Mr. Wilber returned to Stillwater in early 1919 and received his BS in Architecture on May 30, 1919. Mr. Wilber was immediately hired by the college to inspect the construction of campus buildings. The first

HISTORY



construction project he supervised was the Gymnasium and Armory, the building which became the Architecture Building fifty years later. Mr. Wilber was appointed instructor in architecture on September 1, 1919, beginning a 45-year association with the education of architects at Oklahoma A & M and Oklahoma State University.

With the resignation of Professor Biggin, Professor Frederic W. Redlich (Royal School of Architecture, Stuttgart, Germany) became head of the department in the fall of 1916. He remained in that capacity until 1925 with the exception of two years, 1921 and 1922. Professor P. M. Ceren (Texas A & M) assumed the headship during the two-year period. Professor C. F. Drury (University of Illinois) served from 1925-27. At the time of Professor Drury's appointment, the faculty consisted of Professor Drury, Associate Professor Phillip A. Wilber, Assistant Professor Verle Lincoln Annis and Mr. Donald Boyd.

In the fall of the school year 1927-28, Associate Professor Wilber was promoted to professor and acting head. Assistant Professor Annis was promoted to associate professor. Two new members were added to the staff of instructors: Donald A. Hamilton (Carnegie Institute, assistant professor) and John Rex Cunningham (Oklahoma A & M, instructor). A four year course in architecture leading to the BS degree was the only program offered at that time.

Mr. Annis left the school in the spring of 1928. The following fall two new men were added to the faculty: Robert C. Spencer (University of Wisconsin) was employed to fill the vacancy on the design staff and John Edmond Lothers (Cornell University) was added to teach mechanics and strength of materials.

Mr. Hamilton returned in the fall of 1930 after a one-year leave of absence. Two new men were added to the staff: Mr. R. E. Means (Oklahoma A & M College; University of Illinois) to the structural staff and Kenneth J. Heidrich (Carnegie Institute) to the design staff. At that time the architectural staff consisted of six men: Professor and Acting Head Wilber, Associate Professors Hamilton and Lothers, and Assistant Professors Cunningham, Means and Heidrich. In addition there were three instructors in the Department of Art, one of whom was Doel Reed who later became chairman.

Within three years Mr. Wilber had gathered the strong core of the faculty that would lead a remarkable experiment in quality architectural education for the next thirty-five years. Professors Wilber, Hamilton, Cunningham, Hamilton,

HISTORY



Means and Lothers, joined by Professors Dwight Stevens (Oklahoma A & M) and Alexander Notaras (Ecole des Beaux Arts) immediately after WWII, formed one of the most stable yet innovative teams ever seen in architectural education. Many of the innovations pioneered on the prairie by this group now form the foundation of most schools of architecture.

As the student body grew, the demand arose for specialized work. In an effort to meet the demands of the students and to conform to the standards indicated in the curricula of other innovative schools in the country, the five-year curriculum was adopted during the school year 1929-30. A degree of Bachelor of Architecture was offered in two options, structures and design. The last degree in the four-year course was given in 1930. The department was approved for registration in New York State in 1927 and has remained on that approved list to date.

In 1930 the Department of Architecture made application for admission to membership in the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture. Although the executive board approved standard work being accomplished, the application was denied. The department again made application in 1937 and became a member in June of that year.

For many years the Department of Art had been directed by the head of the Department of Architecture. In 1931 the School of Architecture and Applied Art was established in the Division of Engineering .

In the years immediately before WWII, Professor A. Richard Williams served two years on the faculty. Professor Williams later became head of the graduate program at the University of Illinois and was very influential on the many OSU graduates who later attended that school.

In February of 1941, OSU President Henry G. Bennett asked Professor Wilber to write a brief assessment of the thirty-year history of the school.

"During the life of the department, 134 Bachelor degrees have been granted. Of the 134 students represented, five are now dead, six of the 134 have been women of whom four are now married and not engaged in architecture. Of the remaining 123, 112 are known to be now employed in the building industry as draftsmen, engineers, designers or licensed practioners.



I think this percentage (91%) of graduates engaged in work directly in line with their study is much higher than average. It is much higher than the percentage from other schools with which I am familiar."

The unusually strong emphasis on professional education so apparent after WWII was, in fact, the orientation since its founding in 1909.

In 1942 Dwight Stevens, employed in the College Architect's office since 1939, began part-time teaching in the school. Mr. Stevens brought a wide professional background and was one of the earliest proponents of the now accepted "systems approach" to the construction and technical systems of buildings. Mr. Stevens became a full-time member of the faculty soon after the war and developed the famous "synthesis studio course" which treated programming, schematic design, design development and construction documents as a single continuum. This unique course had great impact on all graduates after 1945. Many of those grads continue to regard that single course as the most important in their college years. The course was known to the students of the 1940, 50s and 60s as "539." Students in the 1970s knew it as "5998" and current students present at the Diamond Jubilee respond to "5119". Under any title, this synthesis course and its influence on current and future students acknowledges the important impact of Professor Dwight Stevens on the School.

In 1947 the office of the College Architect, located on the third floor of Gundersen Hall and supervised by the head of the department, was made a separate organization. Foreseeing the vast expansion of the campus to meet the needs of the 1950s and 1960s, President Henry G. Bennett asked Professor Wilber to retain his position as College Architect and resign the headship. Mr. Wilber, campus architect until his retirement in 1964, was largely responsible for the orderly growth and careful organization of the Stillwater campus. Until his untimely death in the summer of 1977, Mr. Wilber remained an active presence within the school that he first joined in September of 1914.

With the separation of the two functions, Professor Don A. Hamilton was appointed to succeed Mr. Wilber as head. He presided over what many still remember as the "golden years" of the School of Architecture. The returning veterans brought a level of maturity and goal orientation to the

HISTORY



campus rarely seen since. They seemed to relate particularly well to the strong professional orientation tradition. In 1949, national accreditation of schools of architecture was instituted. The school was accredited during that year and has maintained that status continuously to the present.

In the five years immediately after WWII, several faculty were hired who have since made major contributions. Professor W. George Chamberlain joined the faculty part-time in 1947 and full-time in September 1948, beginning a forty-year career on the faculty. Professor Chamberlain has been a witness and an active contributor to the education of over 1200 of the schools graduates during his tenure.

Also during the years immediately following WWII, two Illinois graduates joined the faculty: Paul H. Graven and Edward V. Romieniec. Although these two faculty members served only four years and three years respectively, they brought a fresh viewpoint on architectural education that continued to influence the educational approach of the school long afterwards. After leaving, Paul Graven founded a very successful practice in Wisconsin and served as national president of NCARB in the late 1970s. Professor Romieniec left to accept a position at Texas A & M. After serving a number of years as a faculty member there, Professor Romieniec became department head and dean of the College of Architecture at Texas A & M University.

In 1949-50 the School of Architecture at Oklahoma A & M received the "University Medal of the Societe des Architects Diplomes par le Gouvernment" from the Beaux-Arts Societies of New York and Paris. The medal recognized the outstanding architectural school in the nation. The award for the top student nationally also went to a student of the school, Charles H. Thompson of Stillwater. Two years later, the school again received the medal as the top American school and Mr. Jack B. Kelly won the medal as the outstanding student nationally. The doubling of both medals still stands unique in the history of the awards.

Some of Professor Hamilton's comments in the <u>Oklahoma Times</u> in May 1950 concerning the medals and the school seem especially appropriate in retrospect.



Currently there are some 225 students in the School of Architecture correlated under the Oklahoma Institute of Technology. In the past decade, the quality of production on the part of students has been pointed to as among the top in the country. "We have no intention of deviating from such a rating," said Hamilton.

As a "perfection School" it has gained a reputation for turning out first class architects whose practical experience at graduation has made it easy for them to move into professional fields.

"It is our intention of giving the men and women in architecture every advantage and although requirements may be rigid in some respects, our goals are top ones," said Hamilton.

Members of the faculty who worked under Mr. Hamilton but have since left are; Jean Pierre Ligonnet (Beaux-Arts), Jacques Collin (Beaux-Arts), William H. Hall (Oklahoma A & M), Alexander Notaras (Beaux-Arts) and E. R. Young (Oklahoma A & M). Members of the faculty presently with the school are Alexander Erdely (Beaux-Arts) in 1959 and again in 1974 and W. G. Chamberlain (Oklahoma A & M) in 1948.

After thirty-three years of continuous service and twelve years as head, Professor Hamilton retired in 1959. Professor Cuthbert Salmon (BS Arch.; M.S. Arch., Pennsylvania), previously on the faculty at Pennsylvania State University, assumed the headship in the summer of 1959. Professor Salmon brought a broad background of research and scholarship not previously a strength of the school as well as a strong professional background. In May of 1960 the School of Architecture celebrated its 50th anniversary with an exhibit of alumni and student work. At that time the school had 525 graduate architectural alumni. It was conservatively estimated that OSU graduates had designed over \$25 billion dollars worth of buildings in the preceeding 50 years.

The latter half of the 1960s was a period of transition. The core of the faculty, first structured by Mr. Wilber in 1930, reached retirement. Professor Means and Lothers retired in the early 1960s, followed by Mr.



Cunningham and Mr. Stevens. While the school maintained quality and professional orientation, it was a difficult task to replace educators of the caliber of those six men.

In the late 1960s Professor Salmon and the faculty instituted a complete curriculum review which led to a totally new curricular structure. The fields of architecture and architectural engineering had increased tremendously in complexity during the forty years since the adoption of the five-year program. Greater need for specialization required a longer period of formal education. In 1971 the "4 + 2" curriculum was instituted. A Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies was awarded at the end of four years. This was followed by two years of graduate studies leading to the professional degrees, Master of Architecture or Master of Architectural Engineering.

An additional option was added to architectural engineering. Complementing the long established structures option, a new option in environmental control was initiated. This option, which focused in detail on heating, ventilating, air-conditioning, lighting, acoustics, human comfort and energy use in buildings, strengthened the program in architecture as well as architectural engineering. Professor Lester Boyer (Penn State, U of California Berkley) was hired in 1970 to lead this option.

In the spring of 1972, Professor Salmon announced his desire, after 12 years as head, to return to full-time teaching. Professor George Chamberlain was appointed acting head for the year 1972-73 and an extensive search was instituted for a new head. In the summer of 1973, Mr. Mark Jaroszewicz (Dip. Arch, Swiss Institute of Architecture, Zurich) of Detroit assumed the headship. Professor Jaroszewicz, with 25-years of professional experience, continued the rebuilding process. During his tenure he was able to employ several senior faculty who had long term professional experience as architectural designers.



After another year-long search, Professor John Bryant (B Arch, OSU; M Arch, Illinois) was appointed head. It is somewhat of a historical coincidence that Professor Bryant was serving on the faculty at Auburn when he was appointed. He reversed the journey made 61 years earlier when Professor Biggin left Stillwater in 1916 to found the school at Auburn.

The first few years of Professor Bryant's headship saw a complete revision of the originally adopted 4 + 2 curriculum along with completion of the program of rebuilding the faculty. Professor Bob E. Heatly (B Arch, OSU; M Arch, Illinois) joined the faculty from Texas A & M in 1978; Profesor James F. Knight (B Arch, OSU; M Arch, Illinois) moved from Illinois to OSU the following year. Another key appointment was Robert L. Wright (B Arch, OSU; M Arch, Illinois) who was attracted from Georgia Institue of Technology to lead the early years of the design studio. The new faculty was joined by Professor David Hanser (B Arch, M Arch, Illinois) in 1980, and the first female architectural faculty member, Professor Cheryl Morgan (B Arch, Auburn; M Arch, Illinois) in 1982. The most recent appointment to the permanent faculty was Professor William Haire (B Arch, Ohio State; MBA, Rollins) in 1983.

At the time of the Diamond Jubilee, the faculty rebuilding program is considered to be complete. The faculty of the 1980s is an unusually talented and effective group of professionals. Almost half of the faculty are former recipients of the very prestigious Fulbright Fellowships. The Fulbrights are given nationally (about five per year for architecture) and enable the recipient to spend a year of teaching or research abroad. Professors Bryant, Brunken, Baumiller, Boyer, and Erdely each received the Fulbright award during the decade preceeding the Diamond Jubilee.

In early 1981, after a year of intensive study, the faculty reversed the 1971 decision adopting the six-year, 4 + 2 program. In September of 1981 the school enrolled the first class in new five-year professional programs in both architecture and architectural engineering. This decision was primarily based on the conviction that students should receive a full general architectural education before specializing. Specialization was seen as most suitable in professional life or at the post-professional degree graduate level.

In 1983, after a year-long study, the environmental control program in



architectural engineering was closed. The school, with a mandated limit of 300 students, did not have an adequate base to offer quality education in architecture as well as two complete technical options. The environmental control option as a result was chosen for closure due to declining enrollments in Environmental Control courses.

No history of the School of Architecture would be complete without some discussion of the national design competitions. The Beaux Arts Institute of Design and its modern counterpart, the National Institute for Architectural Education, have been sponsoring national design competitions for architectural students since the turn of the century. Beginning about 1920 Oklahoma A & M was consistently among the top three or four schools represented in the annual competitions. Headlines in the <u>Tulsa World</u> of September 21, 1930 noted that "Aggie Architects Win National Recognition." The article lauded the result of national competitions over the last decade and stated that, in 1930, Oklahoma A & M had garnered four prizes while the nearest rivals--Yale and Illinois--had only won three. This level of accomplishment was maintained throughout the 1930s and as noted earlier was exceeded only by the unique awards of the early 1950s.

The competitive tradition was continued in the 1950s and 1960s. The Paris Prize, the most prestigious student competition available to American students, was won three times by OSU students. Mr. Alan B. Glass won in 1959-60, Mr. John Kelly won in 1963-64 and Mr. James Knight (1962) won while a graduate student at Illinois in 1966-67. In 1958 Mr. Bill N. Lacy won the prestigious LeBrun Competition as did Mr. Jim Daley in 1962 and Mr. James Knight in 1967.

The years 1967 to 1978 saw a decade long interruption of the tradition of success, indeed even participation, in national design competitions. This was partly due to the "non-competitive" orientation of the 1970s in most schools and partly due to the faculty rebuilding program then underway at OSU. However, during those years, at least part of the competition success of the University of Illinois, Georgia Tech, Auburn and Texas A & M was directly attributable to OSU alumni faculty teaching at those institutions. In 1978 OSU returned to the competitive field with at least as much success as in the 1950s and 60s and since that time has one of the best records in the country in national competitions.



Mr. Roger Robison won the Paris Prize in 1979, Mr. Jeff Williams won in 1981, and Mr. David Tobin placed first alternate in 1982. In 1984 Mr. John Hansen placed first alternate in the William Van Alen competition, the world wide competition similar to the Paris Prize. During the period of 1978 to 1984 OSU students won or placed in numerous other regional, national and international competitions. Also in that same period Mr. Gary Flesher placed first in the Le Brun Competition and Ms. Cecilia Ledbetter was the first woman and OSU graduate to win the Rome Prize.

A disproportionate number of architectural educators have been produced by the school, a number holding positions of leadership. John Williams ('40) founded the School of Architecture at the University of Arkansas. Bill Caudill ('36) was director of the school at Rice for many years. Bill N. Lacy ('58) was the founding dean at the University of Tennessee and is now president of the Cooper Union in New York. E. Keith McPheeters ('47) was dean at Rennsaelear for several years before assuming his current position as dean at Auburn University. William Fash ('60) is currently dean at Georgia Institute of Technology.

It is impossible to discuss briefly the accomplishments of graduates in the professional practice of architecture and architectural engineering. Although concentrated in the Southwest, there are OSU graduates practicing literally all over the world. The World War II veterans who were responsible for the "golden years" have for some time been in senior leadership roles in some of the finest firms in the country. The graduates of succeeding years follow in their footsteps and the tradition of competition winning designs in school has carried over directly to award winning buildings throughout the world.

The school takes pride in the accomplishments of graduates as recognized by the American Institute of Architects. Many graduates have been inducted as Fellows in the AIA, and Bob Lawrence ('53) served for several terms as national Secretary, followed by a term as national President in 1982. The school also takes particular pride in the fact that William Wayne Caudill ('36) will receive the Institutes Gold Medal posthumously at the AIA annual convention in the Jubilee year of 1985.

At the end of the Diamond Jubilee Year, 1984-85, the school will have graduated 1412 architects and architectural engineers.



As for the future, we can only repeat Professor Hamilton's farsighted statement made in 1950.

"It is our intention of giving the men and women in architecture every advantage, and although requirements may be rigid in some respects, our goals are top ones."

It's a hard act to follow!



The preceding written account of the history of the Oklahoma State University School of Architecture was compiled by Professor John H. Bryant for use in celebration of the School's 75TH Year Diamond Jubilee which occured during the 1984 - 1985 school year.

EXISTING PROGRAMS



SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE

The School of Achitecture at Oklahoma State University presently has a student population of 255. This total reflects both the students in the Architectural Design option as well as those in the Architectural Engineering option. The curriculum is a 5 + 1program for both the design and engineering options.

The school is presently housed in the historic "Armory" building located just south of Lewis Stadium in the north-east corner of the campus. The current building has three floors with a total of approx. 35,500 G.S.F. The first floor contains Administrative offices, the Arch. Engineering studio, the Gallery, and the main Lecture room. The second floor contains the Arch. Design Studios, and the Library while the third floor contains upper level Design Studios and the Graduate Design Studio.

Areas of concern are the lack of adequate studio spaces at all levels, the gallery size and archival storage, the library holdings shortage due to size, the lecture room capacity, and inadequate desk/general storage.



FLOW CHART (DESIGN)

162 MICHIELIUM, SUPPORT STAUCTURES SCRUCE MAATE GEVENAL

FLOW CHART (STRUCTURES)





INTERIOR DESIGN

The Interior Design program at Oklahoma State University presently has a student population of 178. The curriculum is a 4 year degree program.

The program is presently housed in Home Economics West on the west edge of the main quadrangle. The program occupies 9,500 G.S.F. on the fourth floor of the building. The program lacks adequate studio spaces at all levels as well as faculty and administrative spaces. Thier needs are similar to the School of Architecture in that both programs use the studio as the main instructional area.



S = SPRING SEMESTER ONLY

5 - SPRING SEMESTER UNLT

U = SUMMER SEMESTER ONLY

SPRING SEMESTER OF SOPHOMORE YEAR

BEFORE ENTRY INTO JUNIOR YEAR.

FLOW CHART



LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

The Landscape Architecture program at Oklahoma State University presently has a student population of 100. The Landscape Architecture curriculum is a five year professional degree program.

The program is presently housed in Agricultural Hall just north of Home Economics on Monroe Avenue. The program occupies 6,000 G.S.F. on the third floor of the building. The program is in severe need of Studio spaces at all levels. Administrative space, Gallery and archival storage, Computer Studio space, Resource/Library, Lecture space and General storage, etc.

FLOW CHART

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY Department of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture Landscape Architecture Class Scheduling Guide

	FIRST YEAR			
<u>First Semester</u>	<u>Credit hrs</u>	Second Semester Cri	edit hrs	
AG 1011 Ag Orientation	1	Art of Graphics (drafting or	Э	
HIST 1103 or 1493 or 1443	3	freehand)	U.	
SOC 1112 or PSYCH 1113	3	CHEM 1025 Gen Chem	5	
ART 1103	3	*ENGL 1323 Eresh Comp	3	
ENGL 1113 Composition	3	MATH 1715 Col Algebra-True	5	
I A 4680 Assembly	0	A 4680 Ascembly	5	
	13	L.A. 4000 Assembly	16	
	SECOND	YEAR		
First Semester	300,000	Second Semester		
A 2002 Delineation	2	PHUO 1013 or 1213 or 1313	3	
*AGRON 2124 Fund of Soil Sci	2 A	or 2113	3	
*CIVEN 2614 Surveying	1	POLC 1013 Amer. Court	2	
AG ECON 1114	3	SPCN 0713 or ENCL 2002 or 221	3	
Flactive	•	SPCN 2713 OF ENGL 2023 OF 33	23 3	
	3	ENGL 2023 01 2413 07 HIST 16	13,	
L.A. ASSEMDTY	0	1023, 1713		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		HIST 1103 OF 1483 OF 1493	3	
		L.A. 4680 Assembly	0	
	16		12	
	THIRD Y	(EAR		
First Semester		Second Semester		
L.A. 3773 Design 1	3	*1 A 4013 Design	3	
L.A. 3883 Const I	3	XIA 3893 Const II	3	
*HORT 3153 Turf Mamt	3	L A 3673 History	3	
*HORT 3312 Plant Materials 1	2	A 3002 Adv. Delie	3	
ACCTG 2103 or BUSL 3123	3	HOPT 3322 Plant Materials L	2	
or EIN 2123	0		1 2	
Elective	2	CEOC 4112 of 2122 of 2052	2	
	0		3	
L.A. 4000 Assembly	U	01 3033		
	17		1.6	
			10	
**FOURTH YEAR				
<u>First Semester</u>		- Second Semester		
*LA 4023 Design III	3	*L A 4024 Des IV	4	
*L.A 4893 Const 111	3	L.A. 3682 Prof Practice	2	
*L.A. 4573 Rec Des	3	BISC 3034 Gen Ecology	4	
MC 3333 Elem Photo	3	GEOG 4123 Urban Planning	3	
SOC 3423 or AGEC 3503 or 450	03 3	Flective	1	
1 A 4680 Assembly	1		1	
2		L A AD33 Planting Design	U 2	
		a h. Hoss rianting Design	3	
	16		17	
			11	

FLOW CHART

	FIFTH YEAR		
First Semester		Second Semester	
*L.A. 5024 Design V	4	*L.A. 5025 Senior Project 5	
Elective (HORT 3013, Intern)	3	*L.A. 4434 Land Analysis 4	
L.A. 4680 Assembly	1	L.A. 4680 Assembly 1	
Elective (LA 4990) Spec. Prob.	3	Elective (HORT 2112, 2212, 3	
Elective (WILDL 2503)	3	3013, 3113, 3544)	
Elective (ENVR 5103)	3	Elective (HIDCS 3353,4113,4143)3	
	17	16	

*indicates that the course has a prerequisite **acceptance by the faculty is required for acceptance into the fourth year at total of 160 hours with an overall grade point average of 2.5 or above is required for the B.L.A. degree.

STATE OF THE ART

GUND HALL-HARVARD'S GRADUATE SCHOOL OF DESIGN U N D E R O N E R O O F !

The GSD, was designed by John Andrews, Architects. The concept is based on the multi-disciplined collective program at Harvard, and how this can be applied to all projects which vary in scale from individual buildings to cities; that is the idea that complex design problems must be approached with interdisciplinary contributions.





HARVARD-GSD
$G \cdot S \cdot D$

The central studio at Gund Hall brings together all the programs of the Graduate School of Design into one physical space. The programs include the Department of Architecture, City and Regional Planning, Landscape Architecture, The Urban Design Program, The Program for Advanced Environmental Studies and the Laboratory for Computer Graphics and Spatial Analysis. The space unites these programs by use of the tiered studio spaces and also allows the students to have more private spaces if they choose.





G · S · D

In plan the GSD is arranged so that the Francis Loeb Library, the Piper Auditorium, the faculty offices and the administration act as support spaces to the studio spaces.

The library and auditorium occupy the ground floor, with the largest portion of the library housed on the basement level. The library which houses over 155,000 volumes has become a major architectural collection.

Gund Hall now contains over 150,000 square feet of floor space, with space for 500 students, about 80 faculty, and 50 administrators including library and workshop staffs. The building is air-conditioned using chilled water from the Harvard central utility plant, and it is heated through high-pressure steam from the same source.



à · S · D



WURSTER HALL

WURSTER HALL-COLLEGE OF ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY

Wurster Hall was designed in 1960 by a team of three architects, they were Joseph Esherick, Vernon De Mars, and Donald Olsen, all of which are from the bay area. The campus at Berkeley is baically Renaisance in style and Wurster Hall with it's lack of tile roofs, and colonnaded galleries did stir up a mix of reactions. Many protests came from those who had grown accustomed to the eclectic romanticism that characterized much of the new construction on the campus at Berkeley. Its image is casual in comparison for it is a building of specific purpose.



WURSTER HALL



The facility occupies 215,800 square feet with space for roughly 1000 students, faculty, and administrators.

WURSTER HALL



The Yale Art and Architecture building was designed in 1958 by Paul Rudolph. The building is located on the campus of Yale University in New Haven Connecticut.

Conceptually, the building's form statement is intended to emulate the character of the existing campus through the use of a series of towers and irregular roof lines. The Art and Architecture Building helps unite the various disciplines housed within by providing the ground floor with a large jury/review space allowing activity and interaction to occur as people use the building on day to day basis.





YALE ART AND ARCHITECTURE BUILDING



YALE ART AND ARCHITECTURE BUILDING

This space, which is the Architectural drafting room, is just one example of the "monumental" image of nearly the entire Art and Architecture Building. It is quite a grand space, that if only to be utilized for drafting, creates a slight scale problem for many of its users. The building has created quite a controversy among it's students, so much in fact, that although it was never proven, it is believed that the fire that swept through the building in 1969 was set in protest to its very existence!

YALE ART AND ARCHITECTURE BUILDING



SITE ANALYSIS AND HISTORY











1885

CAMPUS HISTORY

The two original buildings which initially comprised Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College were constructed in 1895, on what is now the southeast corner of the campus. The library building has since been demolished, however the "Old Central" building still remains today and is presently undergoing extensive restoration. The pattern of the University's development, to establish academic functions in the southeast campus and use the remianing land to the northwest for agricultrual open space use, has been essentially retained to this day.

1915

After its founding, the college grew steadily, adding additional academic buildings, a power plant and dormitory facilities. By 1915, the original campus quadrangle had been completed and a basic grid pattern was established. With the 1920's came a growing interest in athletics, which began to play a substantial role in the college with the building of a gymnasium and the constructing of grandstands at what is now the site of Lewis Stadium.

1930-1935; The Philip A Wilber Master Plan

In 1930 Philip A. Wilber, Professor of Architecture and D. A. Hamilton Associate Professor at the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College prepared a plan for the development of the campus. This plan was approved by the State Board of Agriculture on October 8, 1930. The plan established the major physical framework for the University as it grew from a small college with buildings loosely clustered around Old Central to its present academic core concentarted around the Edmon Low Library. This plan established the concept of the library at the center of the campus, the focal point of major open space quadrangle to the north and south and minor transcept-like malls to the east and west. Fifty-two years later these transcepts, the main quadrangle coupled with the Theta Pond nature district have become the recognized symbol of Oklahoma State University. The idea of the main quadrangle was of such an inspirational force that other planning concepts inherent in this plan became secondary and forgotten, i.e. pedestrial linkage, secondary quadrangle, enclosed courtyeards, landscaped enclosures, secondary focal point structures, restricted auto traffic flow, and secluded parking.



CAMPUS HISTORY

Philip A. Weber The campus Master Plan of 1930 represents the product of an exstensive study done by Mr. Weber in an attempt to formulate a framework for the campus to adhere to as it would grow in the future. The plan is extremely Beaux-Arts in character, that is, it was developed from the use of a series of major and minor axes to create a composition from a mix of disparate parts. What is interesting about the plan is that it was generated from and includes a number of existing structures that up to that point were not organized in any real sense. That Mr. Weber could congeal such an impressive plan from such a disorganized collection of pieces is in itself a tribute his talent and dedication to Oklahoma A&M College!

1955

CAMPUS HISTORY

After World War II, the demand for higher education soared with the returning GI's from the armed services. To house this influx of students, a massive housing development known as Veterans Village, was constructed in the area now occupied by married student housing. And with the booming economy came the addition of many major structures, including the Student Union, Bennet Hall, and the new Library building. By 1955, a new quadrangle had been completed and the central core of the campus was shifted northwest from its original location. To announce this new coming of age, the college name was changed to Oklahoma State University. Throughout the 1960's and 1970's the University expanded with new construction in academic housing and athletic facilities, extending the campus even further to the northwest.

1980

At present, the center of the core campus is still in the main quadrangle, as it was in the 1950's. However, the building land coverage has doubled since that time with the University housing a full range of academic, research and athletic programs which are still expanding.

Excerpt taken from DEVELOPMENT CONCEPTS. A study conducted by the OSU Department of Architectural Services - Bill D. Halley A.I.A., Department Director. May 1982. Pages 29-32.



This drawing gives you a graphic account of the growth that has occured during the various stages of the campus' development.



1982 CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

44

MASTER PLAN LEGEND

Illustrative Masterplan legend

existing structures

future construction

1982

			A!
		5/	Agriculture Hall
	Seretean Center	29	Engineering North
د	Gardiner Hall	60	Wentz Hall
4	Morrill Hall	61	Headhouse & Greenhouse;
	Student Housing	67	Controlled Environment La
. 9	Architecture	64	Veterinary Medicine Annis
10	Bennett Memorial Chapel	65	Drummond Hall
12	Paul Miller Journ. & Britcstg.	66	Kerr - Drummond Cafeteri
14	Hanner Hall	67	Kerr Hall
15	Whitehurst Hall	68	Business Administration
19	Public Information	71	Track Building
21	South Stadium	74	Football Offices
22	North Stadium	76	University Children Cente
23	Meat Laboratory	77	Drivers Training Control
24	South Murray Hall	78	Student Services Mainter.a
25	North Murray Hall	79	Physical Plant Services
26	Civil Engineering Laboratories	80	Agricultural Engineering
27	Engineering South	82	IBA Hall
28	Life Science East	83	Willham Hall South
29	Gallagher Hall	84	Willham Cafeteria
30	Wrestling Hall of Fame	85	Food Services
31	Willard Hall	86	Laundry
32	Cordell Hall	87	Athletic Dressing Room
33	Campus Fire Station	88	Upholstery Shop
34	Stout Hall	89	Mathematical Science
35	Student Union	90	Vo-Tech Education Warelic
36	Home Economics West	91	Willham Hall North
37	Power Plant	92	Colvin Physical Education
38	Bennett Hall	106	Agriculture Center
39	Veterinary Medicine	107	Vet Medicine Teaching Has
40	Edmon Low Library	108	Bull Handling Facilities
44	Classroom	109	Colvin Center Annex
45	Poultry	110	Diagnostic Laboratory
46	Animal Science Building	111	Student Health Center
49	Hazardous Reaction	113	Architectural Services &
50	USDA Building		Physical Plant Administrut
51	Physical Sciences	114	Fire Publications & Trair in
53	Life Science West	115	Fluid Power Research Cen
54	Scott Hall	116	Electronics Laboratory
55	Parker Hall	120 -	125 Brumley Apartments
56	Scott - Parker - Wentz Cifeteria	241	Physical Plant Storage
		243	Student Services Wareho

	F	Future Buildings (Undetermined Use)
	F1	Engineering Building
	F 2	Engineering South Annex
	F 3	Engineering Technology Building
lab	F4	21st Century Center/Geology (a thru d)
n:X	F5	Business Administration
	F 6	Computer Center/Central Instruction
oria	F7	Art Building Addition
	F8	Social Sciences
	F 9	Life Sciences
	F 10	Home Economics West Addition
	F11	Institute for Professional Development
ler	F12	Education Building
Tower	F13	Agriculture Labs
ance	F14	Administrative Services
	F15	Exhibit Gallery and Natural History Museum
1	F18	International Culture Center (alternate locations - a or b)
,	F 19	All Events Building (alternate locations - a or b)
	F 20	Student Union Hotel
	F 2 1	Library Addition
	F 2 2	Alumni Foundation Building (alternate locations - a or b)
	F 2 3	Visitor Information Center (alternate locations : a thru d)
	F 2 4	Locker Room Building
	F 25	Vending Warebouse
	F 26	Parking Structures (a thru e)
house	F 27	Student Housing (a thru s)
	F 28	Amphitheatre
u Center	F 2 9	Carillion Tower
in center	F 30	Vehicle Maintenance Building
soital	F 31	BOTC Building
3 aprilar	F 32	Arena Benjacement
	1	Arena Replacement
ution		
ing	1	
nig		
inter		
	1	
	1	
126	1	

OLD CENTRAL HISTORIC DISTRICT

This area presents unique oppurtunities, however it is particularly sensitve for future development. Recent decisions to restore "Old Central" and preserve Gardiner Hall stabilized the character of the district. Historic and visual resources such as Morrill Hall, the Fire Station and its tower further compliment this action. The structures to the north and east of "Old Central" provide sympathetic spatial definition and the open southern exsposure allows an open view to the birthplace of Oklahoma State University. This district has become a campus backwater due to the shift of the campus westward. Remaining uses, lack of strong pedestrian links to the main quadrangle, back door nature of structures to the west and the unsightly parking lots further compound this problem.

It is suggested the future development of this district include the following: reconstruct, as many as possible, the missing historic elements i.e., flagpole, pedestrian gateways, fencing, orchards, light fixtures and wooden walkways; consider painting exterior portion of "Old Central": with historically appropriate colors; develope major pedestrian linkage west along University Avenue (presently impossible due to the design of the Student Union parking structure) and to the courtyard of the Student Union, northward to connect with the major east-west pedstrian linkage along Morrill Avenue and extend on each side of Morrill Hall to connect with the historic Armory Building (existing Architecture Building); following DEMOLITION of Gunderson Hall and removal of the surface parking lot the available site could be used for construction of the Institute for Professional Development and an Exhibit Gallery(or THE O.S.U. SCHOOL OF DESIGN); the existing Student Union parking structure should be rebuilt or redesigned, if possible, to provide auto access from Bennett Memorial Drive, this access could be combined with a revised auto turnaround serving the Bennett Chapel; consider the placement of a modest amphitheatre on axis between "Old Central" and Morrill Hall; provide a new 1000 auto capacity parking structure east of the Architecture Building to connect with major eastwest pedestrian linkage system; complete a mall north of Morrill Hall by constructing an addition to Gardiner Hall for Art function, Morrill Hall for Social Sciences, the College of Business Administration Building, and the construction of a new Engineering Technology Building on the site of Hanner Hall or the tennis courts west of the Architecture Building.

Excerpt taken from DEVELOPMENT CONCEPTS. A study conducted by the OSU Department of Architectural Services - Bill D. Halley A.I.A. Dept. Director.May 1982, page 109.

OLD CENTRAL DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

CLIMATE ANALYSIS

















CLIMATE SUMMARY

"The climate of the Stillwater area and its relationship to personal comfort and implied usage of outdoor space is dependent on a number of factors. These factors, temperature variation, relative humidity in conjunction with wind, solar heat gain and day-to-night temperature shifts have been documented and reveal that there are two periods of distinct outdoor comfort at Oklahoma State University. One period is between late March and early June, while the other is between early September and early October. This demonstrates that there are, during both winter and summer seasons, periods during which indoor space is required to conduct normal activities. Both extremes, hot summers and cold winters, contribute to this condition.

The predominant summer breezes range from 3 mph to 24 mph, and are from the south-southeast. Higher winds occasionally come from the south-southwest reaching 47 mph and above. Spring tornado warnings are common.

The predominant winter winds range from 3 mph to 24 mph, and are from the north-northwest, north, and north-northeast with winds occasionally reaching 47 mph and above from the north-northwest. Air borne dust is common in both summer and winter."

Excerpt taken from DEVELOPMENT CONCEPTS.A study conducted by the OSU Dept. of Architectural Services - Bill D. Halley A.I.A. Dept. Director. May 1982.page 26














GEOLOGY / SOILS SUMMARY

The Primary (top) geologic formation in this area is the Wellington-Admire Unit of the Permian System. This unit is fairly exstensive in North-Central Oklahoma, covering an area from Shawnee north to the Arkansas River, east to Cushing and west almost to Guthrie. Although predominantly reddish-colored shales, the unit does contain sandstones, siltstones and in some localities, even limestones. Due to correlation difficulties with other "redbed" units, the total thickness of the Wellington-Admire is difficult to ascertain but it is generally several hundred feet These "redbeds" are marine sediment thick. deposited from an ancient inland sea which existed during the Permian era. Overlying soils are principally residual (weathered in place) derivaties of the parent formation as modified by normal soil forming processes.

The soil consists of essentially fairly high to high plasticity silty clay underlain by shale. Water penetration of the soil is almost nil resulting in severe flooding during rainy season when ground water follows the clay contour. The soils are considered active with swelling/shrinking related to "dry" or "wet" seasons. Structures are subject to considerable pressure due to this volumetric change. The depth of the shale below grade, its thickness, composition and strength varies considerably requiring exstensive soil exploration and intensive on site observations. As a result of undulation in the clay substrata, considerable "hydrostatic" pressure effects both vertical and horizontal structural surfaces during periods of subsurface water migration. Structural design responses to this condition consist of drilled piers, belled if required, and installed to rest on stable rock strata 20-25'+below grade. Horizontal slab surfaces are grade beam and non-earth bearing. Metal form material is to be avoided due to rusting as are certain paper product formwork for slabs grade beams which interact with chemicals in the water and result in a gaseous release. Native soils are not to be used for backfill.

CONT.

These subsurface conditions have considerable cost implications, i.e. (1) consideration should be given to the inclusion of a positive water removal system; (2) foundation costs imply that building with the smallest footprint would be most economical; (3) little penalty is paid for multi-story construction of up to 5 stories; (4) building designs which include parking at grade level or slightly below on gravel or bituminous pavement is an economically viable concept since little penalty is paid to displace the structure floor slab up by 8'+- by extention of the piers. **GEOLOGY / SOILS**

SUMMARY































		A1 LOBBY
USERS: Visitors	RELATIONSHIPS:	
Faculty *	toilets library-lecture lounge	
Staff		
FUNCTION/ACTIVITY:		
-to serve as a transition		
other parts of the building	entry Al studio	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATION:		
-should allow ease of move-		
ment between gallery, studios and all other areas		
of the facility.	maint. room admin-faculty gallery	
orientation of location of		
vertical circulation.		
ARFA: 1500 + S F		
HEIGHT: varies		
FINISHES		
∘IMAGE: open	•CEILING: varies	
•FLOOR: hard - tile	•WALLS: varies	
SYSTEMS		
H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low velocity	•PLUMBING: water fountain	
∘LIGHTING: daylight / indirect	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets	
 FURNITURE / EQUIPMENT: Seating eler	ments and displays as required	
	inter and apprays as required.	



	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
USERS: Faculty/TA's (will not work here but will retrieve and store projects.	RELATIONSHIPS	A3 ARCHIVES
FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -to provide storage for past student work and displays.	work room A3	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: • -temperature and humidity control important. -security is important.		
AREA: 1000 + S.F.		Ī
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet		
FINISHES		
∘IMAGE: security	•CEILING: GWB - paint	
•FLOOR: hard-concrete	•WALLS: GWB - paint	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C∶ independent system	∘PLUMBING :	
•LIGHTING: ambient-no daylight	•ELECTRICAL:	
FURNITURE / EQUIPMENT: storage rac		1
flat files.	ks for models and board presentations,	

USERS: Faculty Student TA's (2)	RELATIONSHIPS	A4 WORKROOM
<pre>FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -work space for cataloging projects, repairing displays and planning exhibits. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -security is important.</pre>	Gallery A4 A4 Archives	
AREA: 400 S.F.		Ť
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet		
FINISHES		
∘IMAGE: work	•CEILING: GWB - paint	
•FLOOR: hard-tile,	•WALLS: GWB - paint	
SYSTEMS		
•H·V·A·C: independent system	•PLUMBING: sink	
∘LIGHTING: ambient, daylight	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: work table,	shelves, etc.	

USERS: Faculty Students Staff	RELATIONSHIPS: exterior courtyard	A5 LOUNGE
<pre>FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -for coffee breaks, studyin discussions, meetings. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -should allow visual contac with gallery but seperate noise and odors (smoking, B.0.).</pre>	a lobby A5 toilets gallery	
AREA: 500 S.F.	-1	
HEIGHT: varies		
FINISHES		
∘IMAGE: relaxing	•CEILING: varies	
∘FLOOR: hard-tile, soft-carpet	•WALLS: GWB - paint/fabric	
SYSTEMS		
•H·V·A·C∶ multi-zone, low-velocity	•PLUMBING: none	
•LIGHTING: daylight indirect	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: seating, t	ables	

USERS: Faculty (10) Students (40)	RELATIONSHIPS	A6 JURY PIT
<pre>FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -space for student and professional presentations both formal and informal. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -should be accoustically controlled but integrated with gallery.</pre>	lounge lobby A6 toilets Gallery	
AREA: 1000 + S.F.		
HEIGHT: varies		
FINISHES		
•IMAGE: formal	•CEILING: varies	
∘FLOOR: soft-carpet	•WALLS: tack surface	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C: multi zone – low level	•PLUMBING :	
•LIGHTING: daylighting indirect	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: seating, sl	ide projection, tables.	

USERS: Visitors	RELATIONSHIPS	A7 PUBLIC TOILETS
FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -recommended that these be broken into two sets of rest rooms.	lobby A7	
AREA: as required by code		
HEIGHT: 8 feet		
FINISHES		
∘IMAGE: clean	•CEILING: accoustical tile	
∘FLOOR: hard-tile	∘WALLS: hard-tile	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low velocity	•PLUMBING: as required	
•LIGHTING: down light	∘ELECTRICAL:	
FURNITURE / EQUIPMENT:		







B SERIES SPACE RELATIONSHIP DIAGRAM

- B1. Reception
- B2. School Head
- B3. Assistant School Head
- B4. Head Admin. Secretary
- B5. Director, Architecture
- B6. Architecture Secretary
- B7. Director, Landscape Architecture
- B8. L. A. Secretary
- B9. Director, Interior Architecture
- B10. Int. Arch. Secretary
- B11. Finance/Alumni Sec.
- B12. Records Secretary
- B13. Records Room
- B14. General Secretaries
- B15. Conference Room
- B16. Workroom
- B17. Supply Room
- B18. Restrooms
- A. Gallery
- B. Administration
- C. Faculty
- D. Lecture
- E. Library
- F. Studios
- G. Studio/Facility Support












AREA NEEDS













USERS: Staff (1) retrieval and storage of documents only.	RELATIONSHIPS:	B13 RECORDS ROOM
FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -storage of student files.	record B13	
-smoke detection.		
AREA: 200 S.F.		
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet FINISHES		
•IMAGE: none	•CEILING: acoustical tile	
∘FLOOR: hard-tile	∘WALLS: GWB - paint	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low velocity	•PLUMBING: none	
∘LIGHTING: ambient, task	•ELECTRICAL: none	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: shelving u	nits and work surface.	



USERS: Visitors	RELATIONSHIPS:	B15 CONFERENCE
FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -meeting space for meetings brown bag lunches, etc 20 people. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -shall provide light control and slide projection.	other offices irecept. B15 toilets	
AREA: 500 S.F.		
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet		
FINISHES		
•IMAGE: business	°CEILING: acoustical tile	
•FLOOR: soft - carpet	•WALLS: GWB - paint/fabric	
SYSTEMS		
◦H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low-velocity	•PLUMBING: none	
∘LIGHTING: ambient	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: conference t	table for 20, projector, light control.	



















USERS: Faculty committee members FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -rooms used for meetings to discuss issues of various committees. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION:	RELATIONSHIPS: all faculty offices C55-59	C55-59 (5) COMMITTEE ROOMS
AREA: 750 S.F. (5 @ 150)		
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet FINISHES •IMAGE: formal	•CEILING: acoustical tile	
•FLOOR: hard-tile	•WALLS: GWB - paint	
•H·V·A·C: multi-zone	∘PLUMBING:	
∘LIGHTING: ambient, task FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: conference	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets table, chairs, chalkboard.	

USERS: Faculty (1)	RELATIONSHIPS	C60-63 (4) ARCHITECTURAL
	lecture halls	ENGINEERING FACULTY
FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -area where faculty prepare lectures, advises students and do their own work.	s C60-63	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -should have special security alarm as these offices contain computers. -will be outside faculty compound for proximity to AE studios.	AE studios	
AREA: 600 S.F. (4 @ 150)		
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet		
FINISHES		
∘IMAGE: private	•CEILING: acoustical tile	
∘FLOOR: hard-tile	•WALLS: GWB - paint	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C∶multi-zone, low-velocity	∘PLUMBING:	
•LIGHTING: daylight, ambient, task	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets, terminal	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: writing/dr	awing surface, shelving, computers.	

USERS: Architectural Engineering -TA's	RELATIONSHIPS:	C64-67 (4) ARCHITECTURAL
	lecture	ENGINEERING TEACHING
FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -home base for teaching assistants to prepare class assignments, to grade exams and aid students. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION:	C64-67	ASSISTANTS
	AE studios	
AREA: 400 S.F. (4 @ 120)		
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet		
FINISHES		
∘IMAGE: private	•CEILING: acoustical tile	
∘FLOOR: soft - carpet	•WALLS: GWB - paint	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low-velocity	•PLUMBING:	
∘LIGHTING: ambient, task	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets	
FURNITURE / EQUIPMENT: drawing/wri	iting surface for 2, 1 guest seat.	

USERS: Faculty	RELATIONSHIPS:	C68 FACULTY
FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -serves as relaxation, interaction area for faculty. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION:	C68 C68 offices	
AREA: 400 S.F.		
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet		
FINISHES		
•IMAGE: relaxing	•CEILING: acoustical tile	
∘FLOOR: soft - carpet	•WALLS: GWB - paint/fabric	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low-velocity	•PLUMBING:	
∘LIGHTING: daylight, ambient	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: lounge sea	ting, tables, chairs.	





ENGSC	2114	л S	.				ļ		1		1	
ARCH	2003	Г S										
	2263	Г S				,	: : :					
	3123	Р S				,			· · · · ·	10. 10.000 LOLANS - 10.00 LOLANS - 10.00 LOLANS -		
	3133	FS										
	3183	FS					- 1	883				
	3233	F S				1						
	3246	FS				1						
	3253	FS										
	3283	FS				1						
	4123	н S										
	4183	F S				1	1					
	4273	Г S										
	5193	н S										
	5293	F S										
	6143	F S		L	[
	STUDENTS	0	10	2 () 3	D 4	0 5	0 6	0 7 (0 8) 9 (0 100

LECTURE STUDENT POPULATIONS

This Student Lecture Population Survey gives us the oppurtunity to observe the trends exhibited by p ast class student populations which will used in the selection of the size and number of lecture spaces needed. This list includes ENGSC 2114 which will in the future become ARCH 2114 and will be taught within the School of Design.

ARCH 2003 jumps the scale in this survey as it is presently offered to all students in the university and therefore has its enrollment limit at that of the larger lecture rooms(approx. 350+-)available. In the future it is anticipated that enrollment will be limited to the capacity of the large lecture room within the School of Design. (approx. 150 person capacity)

The remaining ARCH lecture courses average a population of 39.8 students.Assume 40 students.



ARCH ENGINEERING lecture offerings are those second level or advanced courses that only AE majors have to take in fullfillment of the requirments for a B. Arch. Engineering Degree. These courses average а student population and it is assumed that they would be taught in a seminar room adjacent the A.E. studio.

INTERIOR ARCH. & LANDSCAPE ARCH. have only a minimal number of lecture courses that need to be taught in a lecture space, the other courses are given in close association with the studio spaces. Those courses needing formal lecture space average a 49 student population.

CONCLUSION

Using the numbers 40 & 49 as the student populations exhibited during the past two years and adding 11 seats which is approx. 22% of 49, for a total of 60 students, let us assume for this project two. (2) lecture rooms seating 60 students (2 lectures rooms to allow flexibility in resolving any scheduling problems that might occur with only one lecture space) and one (1) general lecture/auditorium room seating 150 students.





USERS: Lecturer	RELATIONSHIPS:	D4 PROJECTION ROOMS
FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -for use and storage of projection equipment.	lecture room D4 a-c	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -rear screen projection capabilities.	storage	
AREA: 300 S.F. (3 @ 100 s.f.)		
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet FINISHES		
•IMAGE: none •FLOOR: hard - concrete	•CEILING: acoustical tile •WALLS: GWB - paint	
SYSTEMS		
•H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low-velocity •LIGHTING: ambient	•PLUMBING:	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: projectors	, shelves, etc.	
		40



USERS: Faculty	RELATIONSHIPS:	D6 STORAGE ROOM
<pre>FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -storage of lecture aids (material, samples). SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -this area for systems and materials, samples storage.</pre>	lecture rooms	
AREA : 100 S.F.		
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet		
FINISHES		
∘IMAGE:	•CEILING: acoustical tile	
∘FLOOR: hard - concrete	•WALLS: GWB - paint	
SYSTEMS		
$\circ H \cdot V \cdot A \cdot C$: multi-zone, low-velocity	∘PLUMBING:	
•LIGHTING: ambient	•ELECTRICAL:	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: shelving u	nits.	





USERS: Staff	RELATIONSHIPS:	E2 RESTORATION WORKBOOM
<pre>FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -to provide space for the restoration and maintenance of the library holdings. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -should have kitchenette built in.</pre>	storage room gen. area E2 i kitchenette	
AREA: 200 S.F.		
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet		
FINISHES		
∘IMAGE:	•CEILING: acoustical tile	
∘FLOOR: soft - carpet	•WALLS: GWB - paint/fabric	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C [:] independent system	•PLUMBING: sink	
∘LIGHTING: ambient, task	•ELECTRICAL:	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: work table,	, shelving.	




USERS: Staff Faculty	RELATIONSHIPS	E5 SLIDE ARCHIVE STORAGE
FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -deep storage of slide holdings.	slide work room E5	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -should be secure and have special HVAC controls.		
AREA: 200 S.F.		Ī
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet		
FINISHES		
∘IMAGE :	•CEILING: acoustical tile	
•FLOOR: hard - tile	•WALLS: GWB - paint	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C∶ independent system	•PLUMBING ·	
•LIGHTING: ambient	•ELECTRICAL:	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: slide storag table, work	ge racks inside fire boxes, light table.	



USERS: Students	RELATIONSHIPS	E7 SLIDE VIEWING AREA
<pre>FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -to provide students with the option to view slides at any time. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -provide table top writing surface.</pre>	gen. area E7 slide work room	
AREA: 100 S.F.		
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet		
FINISHES		
∘IMAGE: relaxed	•CEILING: acoustical tile	
∘FLOOR: soft - carpet	•WALLS: GWB - paint/fabric	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C: independent system	•PLUMBING:	
∘LIGHTING: ambient	∘ELECTRICAL:	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: table top t	writing surface, projection controls.	

























USERS: Students Faculty	RELATIONSHIPS	F100.5a SEMINAR ROOM
FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -to provide quiet space for reviews of projects and studying. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION:	all other areas	
AREA: 600 S.F.		
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet		
FINISHES		
∘IMAGE: formal	•CEILING: acoustical tile	
•FLOOR: hard - tile	•WALLS: tack surface	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low-velocity	•PLUMBING:	
•LIGHTING: ambient	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: tables, cha	irs, chalkboard.	
		1























USERS: Students (40 @ 90 s.f.)	RELATIONSHIPS:	F300.4 FOURTH YEAR STUDIO
<pre>FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -to provide students with their own individual studio space for the study and development of designs. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -the studio s.f. count in- cludes (3) light tables, (3) artographs, (1) slide module, flat file storage.</pre>	all other areas	
AREA: 4400 S.F.		
HEIGHT: varies		
FINISHES		
∘IMAGE: open	•CEILING: exposed	
∘FLOOR: hard - tile	•WALLS: tack surface	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low-velocity	∘PLUMBING :	
•LIGHTING: ambient, daylight	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: laytables, graphs, sli	desks, chairs, light tables, arto- de module, flat files.	



USERS: Students (40 @ 90 S.F.)	RELATIONSHIPS:	F300.5FIFTH YEAR STUDIO
<pre>FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -to provide students with their own individual studio space for the study and development of designs. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -the studio s.f. count in- cludes (2) light tables, (2) artographs, (1) slide module, flat file storage.</pre>	all other areas studio support F300.5	
AREA: 4200 S.F.		
HEIGHT: varies		
FINISHES		
•IMAGE: open	•CEILING: exposed	
	•WALLS: tack surface	
SYSTEMS		
•H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low-velocity	∘PLUMBING :	
•LIGHTING: ambient, daylight	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: laytables, graphs, sli	desks, chairs, light tables, arto- de module, flat files.	



USERS: Graduate Students (10 @ 100 s.f.)	RELATIONSHIPS	F300.6 GRADUATE
<pre>FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -to provide more individuate space for graduate stude to inhabit as they purse their specific education objectives. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -the studio s.f. count include (1) light table (1) artograph, (1) slide module, flat file stora;</pre>	dual ents ue nal to e ge. ge. graduate lounge F300.6 F300.6 F300.6 all other areas	
ARFA: 1400 S.F.		
HEIGHT: varies FINISHES		
•IMAGE: open	•CEILING: exposed	
◦FLOOR: hard - tile	•WALLS: tack surface	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low-veloci	ity •PLUMBING:	
∘LIGHTING: ambient, daylight	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets	
FURNITURE / EQUIPMENT: laytabl graphs.	les, desks, chairs, light tables, arto-	
		162






USEFS: Students (100 students, 5 seperate studio sections)	RELATIONSHIPS:	F400.1 FIRST YEAR STUDIO
<pre>FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -to provide 20 studio stations for 100 students to use in interim archi- tecture. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -the 100 students will ro- tate through one studio in 5 sections on a daily basis. Total s.f. count includes (1) light table, (1) arto- graph, (1) slide module (300 s.f.).</pre>	all other areas studio support	
AREA: 1560 S.F. (-300 s.f.)		
HEIGHT: varies		
FINISHES		
•IMAGE: open	•CEILING: exposed	
∘FLOOR: hard - tile	•WALLS: tack surface	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low-velocity	•PLUMBING: sink	
∘LIGHTING: ambient, daylight	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: laytables, graph, slid	desks, chairs, light table, arto- le module.	



USERS: Students (30) Faculty	RELATIONSHIPS	F400.1b SEMINAR ROOM
FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -to provide quiet area for reviews of projects and studying. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION:	all other areas	
AREA: 450 S.F.		
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet		
FINISHES		
∘IMAGE: formal	•CEILING: acoustical tile	
∘FLOOR: hard - tile	•WALLS: tack surface	
SYSTEMS		
H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low-velocity	∘PLUMBING:	
•LIGHTING: ambient	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: tables, c	hairs, chalkboard.	



USERS: Students	RELATIONSHIPS	F400.2a LOCKER
<pre>FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -to provide lockers for the second year students to store studio equipment and supplies. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -this area should be direct- ly accessible to the second year studio as well as circulation.</pre>	all other areas	
AREA: 400 S.F.		
• HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet		
FINISHES		
∘IMAGE: secure	•CEILING: acoustical tile	
•FLOOR: hard - tile	•WALLS: GWB - paint	
SYSTEMS		
•H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low-velocity	∘PLUMBING:	
∘LIGHTING: ambient	•ELECTRICAL:	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: lockers for	100 students.	
		170

USERS: Students (30) Faculty	RELATIONSHIPS:	F400.2b SEMINAR ROOM
FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -to provide quiet area for reviews of projects and studying. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION:	all other areas F400.2b studio	
AREA: 450 S.F.		
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet		
FINISHES		
•IMAGE:formal	•CEILING: acoustical tile	
∘FLOOR: hard - tile	•WALLS: tack surface	
SYSTEMS		
•H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low-velocity	•PLUMBING:	
∘LIGHTING: ambient	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: tables, cha	airs, chalkboard.	

USERS: Students (50 @ 63 s.f.)	RELATIONSHIPS:	YEAR STUDIO
<pre>FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -to provide students with their own individual studio space for the study and development of designs. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -the studio s.f. count in- cludes (2) light tables, (2) artographs, (1) slide module flat file storage</pre>	all other areas studio support F400.3 Seminar room	
sample writing area		
(700 5.1.).		
AREA: 3850 S.F. (-700 s.f.)		
HEIGHT: varies		
FINISHES		
∘IMAGE: open	•CEILING: exposed	
∘FLOOR: hard - tile	•WALLS: tack surface	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low-velocity	•PLUMBING: sink	
∘LIGHTING: ambient, daylight	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: laytables, graphs, sl	desks, chairs, light tables, arto- ide module, flat file, storage.	
		1

USERS: Students (25) Faculty	RELATIONSHIPS:	F400.3a-b SEMINAR ROOM
FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -to provide quiet space for reviews of projects and studying. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -2 @ 375 s f	all $F400.3$ areas $a - b$ studie	
AREA: 750 S.F.		
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet		
FINISHES		
∘IMAGE: formal	•CEILING: acoustical tile	
∘FLOOR: hard - tile	•WALLS: tack surface	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low-velocity	•PLUMBING:	
∘LIGHTING: ambient	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: tables, ch	airs, chalkboard.	

USERS: Students (40 @ 63 s.f.)	RELATIONSHIPS :	F400.4 FOURTH
<pre>FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -to provide student with their own individual studio space for the study and development of designs. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -the studio s.f. count in- cludes (2) light tables, (2) artographs, (1) slide module, flat files storage, sample cutting area (700 s.f.).</pre>	all other areas studio support F400.4 seminar rooms	
AREA: 3220 S.F. (-700 s.f.)		
HEIGHT: varies		
IMAGE: open	•CEILING: exposed	
•FLOOR: hard - tile	•WALLS: tack surface	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low-velocity	• PLUMBING : sink	
∘LIGHTING: ambient	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: laytables, artographs,	desks, chairs, light tables slide module, flat files.	

USERS: Students (25) Faculty	RELATIONSHIPS	F400.4a-b SEMINAR ROOM
<pre>FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -to provide quiet space for reviews of projects and studying. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -2 @ 375 s.f.</pre>	all other areas F400.4 a - b studio	
AREA: 750 S.F.		
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet		
FINISHES		
•IMAGE: formal	•CEILING: acoustical tile	
•FLOOR: hard - tile	•WALLS: tack surface	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low-velocity	∘PLUMBING:	
∘LIGHTING: ambient	•ELECTRICAL: duplex outlets	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: tables, cha	airs, chalkboard.	





USERS: Design Students (20 @ 63 s.f.)	RELATIONSHIPS: all other areas	G2 DESIGN COMPUTER LAB
FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -stations for studying computer applications in design.	G2 G2 G2 design studio	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -should be secured with alarm system.		
AREA : 1260 S.F.		
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet		
FINISHES		
•IMAGE: computerish	•CEILING: acoustical tile	
∘FLOOR: hard - tile	•WALLS: GWB - paint	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C: independent system	∘PLUMBING:	
∘LIGHTING: ambient	•ELECTRICAL: as required	
FURNITURE / EQUIPMENT: computers,	printers, plotters, shelves, etc.	











USERS: Students	RELATIONSHIPS:	G12 REPRODUCTION LAB
FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -to provide reproduction services to students @ their convienience SPECIAL CONSIDERATION:	G12 design studios	
AREA: 200 S.F.		
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet		
FINISHES		
•IMAGE: none	•CEILING: acoustical tile	
°FLOUK: hard - tile	• VVALLS: GWB - paint	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low-velocity	•PLUMBING:	
∘LIGHTING: ambient	∘ELECTRICAL:	
FURNITURE / EQUIPMENT: diazo print machine.	machine, vaccum frame, xerox	



USERS: Students	RELATIONSHIPS:	G14 MODEL SHO
<pre>FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -to provide shop for the building of models and project. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: -should provide all tools needed for building these models.</pre>	G14 G14 G14	
AREA: 300 S.F.		
HEIGHT: 10 feet		
FINISHES		
∘IMAGE: none	∘CEILING:	
∘FLOOR: hard - concrete	•WALLS: GWB	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C: multi-zone, dust control	•PLUMBING: sink	
∘LIGHTING: ambient, task	•ELECTRICAL: as required	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: saws, hamm	ers, work tables, etc.	
		1

USERS: Students Faculty	RELATIONSHIPS	G15 EQUIPMENT STORAGE /CHECKOUT
<pre>FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -to provide storage for field equipment such as hardhats, tape measures, etc. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION:</pre>	G15 G15 Studios	
AREA: 200 S.F.		
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet FINISHES •IMAGE: none •FLOOR: hard - concrete	•CEILING: acoustical tile •WALLS: GWB - paint	
SYSTEMS •H·V·A·C: multi-zone, low-velocity •LIGHTING: ambient FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: shelves, we	•PLUMBING: •ELECTRICAL: ork tables.	



USERS: Staff FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -storage of cleaning supplies, etc.	RELATIONSHIPS: all other areas	G17 FACILITY MAINTENANCE ROOM
GREGIAL CONSIDERATION		
AREA: 200 S.F.		
HEIGHT: 8 - 10 feet		
FINISHES		
∘ IMAGE: clean	°CEILING:	
∘FLOOR: hard - concrete	•WALLS: GWB - paint	
SYSTEMS		
∘H·V·A·C ·	•PLUMBING: slop sink	
∘LIGHTING: ambient	∘ELECTRICAL [:]	
FURNITURE/EQUIPMENT: chairs, wor	k table, shelves.	

USERS: Staff Service personnel FUNCTION/ACTIVITY: -location of mechanical systems of building. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION:	RELATIONSHIPS: all other areas indirectly G18	G18 FACILITY MECHANICAL ROOM		
AREA: .05% of net S.F. (5,049 s.f.	.)			
HEIGHT: varies				
FINISHES				
∘IMAGE: none	°CEILING:			
•FLOOR: hard - concrete	•WALLS:			
SYSTEMS				
∘H·V·A·C :	•PLUMBING: as required			
∘LIGHTING: as required	•ELECTRICAL: as required			
FURNITURE / EQUIPMENT: HVAC equipment, electrical switchgun, etc.				

AREAS & COSTS

			GROSS
SPACE COMPONENT	ж	SQ.FT.	AREA
ASSIGNED SPACE			
A. GALLERY B. ADMINISTRATION C. FACULTY D. LECTURE E. LIBRARY F. STUDIOS G. STUDIO SUPPORT	6 4 8 4 45 5 76%	7,300 3,925 10,450 3,900 4,350 66,230 4,835 100,990	The ratio of the assigned square footage to unassigned square footage is 76 % to 24 %. The assigned square footage percentage is slightly higher because circulation was included in the various design studio square footage tabulations according to the module developed and presented in the area needs analysis section of this program.
UNASSIGNED SPACE			
CIRCULATION MECHANICAL WALLS, STRUCTURE TOILETS (public) JANITORS CLOSETS	10 5 7 1.5 0.5	10,099 5,049 7,069 1,514 504	
	24%	35,343	
GROSS BUILDING AREA	J	136,333 S.F.	

COST ESTIMATE ANALYSIS

COST ESTIMATE ANALYSIS

A.BUILDING COSTS B.FIXED EQUIPMENT C.SITE DEVELOPMENT	136,333 S.F. at \$65/S (8% of A) (15% of A)	.F. \$8,861,645.00 \$708,931.00 \$1,329,246.00
D.TOTAL CONSTRUCTION	N(A+B+C)	\$10,899,822.00
E.SITE AQUISITION F.MOVEABLE EQUIP. G.PROFESSIONAL FEES H.CONTINGENCIES I.ADMIN. COSTS	N/A (8% of A) (6% of D) (10% of D) (1% of D)	N/A \$708,931.00 \$653,989.00 \$1,089,982.00 \$108,998.00
TOTAL BUDGET	(D+E thru J)	\$13,461,722.00

,

GOALS AND CONCEPTS

GOAL: to provide a common facility that joins together and strengthens the now seperate design programs within the university.



CONCEPT: consolidate these programs into a single intergrated, operating unit.



GOAL: to insure that the design education of the students is of the highest priority within the school.

CONCEPT: proper consideration of the needs of the students, and that these considerations be given the highest priority, followed by the faculty, the administration and the university.



FUNCTION

GOAL: to establish relationships between the studio groups themselves and the other functions of the facility to enhance the effectivness of the students, the faculty, the administration and the university.



CONCEPT: logical organization and interrelationships of spaces to promote the effectiveness of these people in their activities.



GOAL: to promote maximum interaction among the students, faculty, administration and the university.



CONCEPT: to organize the functional areas of the facility to enhance and increase the amount of interaction normally caused by everyday use patterns.



GOAL: to promote individual and group identity among the various studios allowing them to establish a sense of place within the facility.



CONCEPT: development of the organizational concept that enhances the characteristics of the students, faculty, administration and the university as individuals, small groups, or large groups.



GOAL: to provide a clear circulation system users and visitors while also allowing the inner-facility relationships to occur smoothly.



CONCEPT: development of a sequence of spaces which clearly articulates a progression of experiences to the facilities various user groups.



GOAL: to provide a sense of orientation for the visitors and users while inside the facility.



CONCEPT: using some major functional element as a reference point within the facility to prevent people from feeling lost.


FUNCTION

GOAL: to provide security in those various areas where it is required while still allowing maximum access to the whole facility.



CONCEPT: provide individual control points throughout the different functions of the facility, creating a secure network of control.

GOAL: to provide first time visitors and passers-by with a clear indication of access to the school facilities.



CONCEPT: develope a strong but not overpowering sense of entry both visually and physically.



FORM



GOAL: to maximize and preserve the existing site and its features; i.e. vegitation, views, historic imagery and the existing fabric



CONCEPT: locate the facility so as not to destroy or disturb these existing favorable characteristics.



FORM



ECONOMY

GOAL: minimize maintenance costs and maximize building lifespan by considering those elements that cause wear and tear on the building.

CONCEPT: explore building materials that by their nature require a minimum of maintenance both on the interior and the exterior.



ECONOMY

GOAL: to minimize operational costs and maximize natural passive gains.

CONCEPT: the form, construction, and orientation should be such that the building takes advantage of passive energy techniques as they present themselves, such as, daylighting, natural ventilation and materials that can shed or absorb moisture and heat.



GOAL: provide for future advances that occur in instructional techniques and equipment.



CONCEPT: allow flexible space to be an intergral part of the life of the facility so that adaptation to future trends would not cause a major inconvience to its normal operation.



TIME

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

FUNCTION

The studios, being the central focus of the activities of the school, should promote interaction and interface between the students, the faculty, the staff and indeed the whole university. As such, these areas should be developed in such a way to create as few barriers as possible, both physically and visually throughout the facility.

Since the design programs at Oklahoma State are presently decentralized across the campus, consideration should be given to promoting new relationships among the design studios to facilitate interaction and an awareness of each to the other. The University population should also be included in the project while maintaining the sense of privacy that is needed for the effective growth of the creative studio process.

Because of an "open" door policy that is displayed by the school, consideration should be given to security and how it can best be maintained in sensitive areas such as the Gallery, the Library, the Faculty and Administrative offices and yet maintain an flexible "open" schedule to insure effective student/studio usage.

FORM

The new School of Design should be a good neighbor. The context surrounding the site in the "Old Central Distict" constitutes some of the oldest on the campus at OSU and efforts must be made to compliment and add to that existing framework.

Building placement and orientation are two of the most signifigant factors that can positively or negatively effect that framework of character. Materials, techniques of construction, and choice of colors are other minor factors, while not of any lesser importance they can still have an effect on the projects sensitivity.

Other elements that can have effects on the outcome are fenestration, scale and glazing. While passive systems should be used to their fullest potential for economic reasons, they also must be controlled to insure that the image conveyed is one that compliments and enhances the character of the project and its impact on the context.

ECONOMY

The project, while being very large requires some careful scrutiny in terms of selecting the methods of construction, materials used, equipment chosen, finishes and passive techniques employed to insure that they provide the maximum in performance throughout the buildings lifetime. The object being to minimize building maintenance and operating costs.

One key objective is not to compromise on the quality of the materials chosen as they will, if properly selected, extend the overall lifespan of the facility and reduce future maintenance and replacement costs.

TIME

Since the project is being undertaken as a whole at the outset it is imperative that the design be thoughtful and sensitive to the needs that have been previously established. This will insure that over a period of time, the project will be flexible and can adapt to its users needs and functional requirements both now and in the future.