

**City University of Hong Kong
Course Syllabus**

**offered Division of Building Science & Technology
with effect from Semester B 2017/18**

Part I Course Overview

Course Title:	Appreciation of Built Heritage
Course Code:	GE1307
Course Duration:	1 semester
Credit Units:	3 credits
Level:	A2
Proposed Area: <i>(for GE courses only)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Arts and Humanities <input type="checkbox"/> Study of Societies, Social and Business Organisations <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Science and Technology
Medium of Instruction:	English
Medium of Assessment:	English
Prerequisites: <i>(Course Code and Title)</i>	Nil
Precursors: <i>(Course Code and Title)</i>	Nil
Equivalent Courses: <i>(Course Code and Title)</i>	Nil
Exclusive Courses: <i>(Course Code and Title)</i>	Nil

Part II Course Details

1. Abstract

(A 150-word description about the course)

This course aims to enhance student knowledge to appraise the adaptive reuse of built heritage in Hong Kong from the design, technical, legal, financial, social and cultural perspectives, and understanding on the conservation practice of Hong Kong's heritages.

2. Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)

(CILOs state what the student is expected to be able to do at the end of the course according to a given standard of performance.)

No.	CILOs [#]	Weighting* (if applicable)	Discovery-enriched curriculum related learning outcomes (please tick where appropriate)		
			A1	A2	A3
1.	Describe the various principles and policies of heritage conservation and adaptive reuse of built heritage.			✓	
2.	List the basic legislative requirements governing conservation and adaptive reuse of built heritage.		✓		
3.	Conduct economic appraisal critically on adaptive reuse projects for achieving value for money.			✓	
4.	Explain the key design factors, and considerations on social value and cultural difference issues and implications in relation to users and adaptive reuse requirements for changing new use in built heritage.			✓	
5.	Explain the key factors and considerations on environmental science, services and technology in conservation.			✓	
6.	Evaluate schematic proposal across a combination of project objectives including design, economical, technical, social and environmental.				✓
		100%			

* If weighting is assigned to CILOs, they should add up to 100%.

Please specify the alignment of CILOs to the Gateway Education Programme Intended Learning outcomes (PILOs) in Section A of Annex.

A1: Attitude

Develop an attitude of discovery/innovation/creativity, as demonstrated by students possessing a strong sense of curiosity, asking questions actively, challenging assumptions or engaging in inquiry together with teachers.

A2: Ability

Develop the ability/skill needed to discover/innovate/create, as demonstrated by students possessing critical thinking skills to assess ideas, acquiring research skills, synthesizing knowledge across disciplines or applying academic knowledge to self-life problems.

A3: Accomplishments

Demonstrate accomplishment of discovery/innovation/creativity through producing /constructing creative works/new artefacts, effective solutions to real-life problems or new processes.

3. Teaching and Learning Activities (TLAs)
(TLAs designed to facilitate students' achievement of the CILOs.)

TLA	Brief Description	CILO No.						Hours/week (if applicable)
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
Lecture	A large-class activity involving the whole class and mainly consists of oral presentations by instructors intended to present information on a particular subject. Other forms of large-class teaching and learning activities will also be used to stimulate students' participation during a lecture.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	3 Hours/week
Guest lecture	A large-class activity involving the whole class and mainly consists of oral presentations by invited industrial practitioner(s) intended to present practical cases on particular subject areas.				✓	✓	✓	3 Hours/week for a maximum of 2
Tutorial	As a complementary to the lecture classes to provide more opportunities for student-instructor and student-student interaction. Students will be engaged in more detailed discussions on the lecture materials and/or assessment tasks in a tutorial.				✓	✓		1 Hour/week for a maximum of 5
Workshop	Students will be divided into small team and individual activities to engage students in active discussion, presentation and share information in a critique process for the preparing a schematic proposal as a member of a small team. Teaching and learning are conducted through individual research and regular problem discussions, under the facilitation of a studio tutor.						✓	3 Hours/week for a maximum of 3
Field trip	A guided tour in a small team (around 20-25 students) to visit project(s) related to adaptive reuse of built heritage. The tour will be arranged and guided by concerned project practitioner(s).				✓	✓	✓	N/A

4. Assessment Tasks/Activities (ATs)

(ATs are designed to assess how well the students achieve the CILOs.)

Assessment Tasks/Activities	CILO No.						Weighting*	Remarks
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Continuous Assessment: <u>50%</u>								
Students will be required to carry out desk study on the selected project case(s) prior to a field trip. This desk study will include a detailed review on the design, social and cultural aspects, and historical development on the selected case(s) and facilitate to develop into a reflective learning report after the fieldwork.	✓			✓	✓	✓	10%	
A Field trip report is a reflective statement to be prepared by each student to reflect learning and experience from organised field trip. This field trip report will require each student to provide critical appraisal based on the experience or observation from the field trip. This report will involve student active discussion to evaluate and appraise project case(s) from various perspectives including design, economical, technical, legal, social and environmental.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	10%	
Role play project requires a small team to act as Cultural Tourism Guide and plan for a study trip to visit various built heritages in a small district. This role play project involves student preparation of heritage study trip proposal within preset parameters, such as budget, time, number and nature of	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	20%	

participants. The preparation of heritage study trip proposal includes a detailed itinerary of the trip and an in-depth study for the background and development on the selected built heritages. Students will then be arranged to present their proposal to the instructor and other teams.								
An in-class quiz will be arranged to include short questions and/or multiple choices to assess student understanding on the relevant principles, considerations and relevant factors in the conservation and revitalization of built heritages.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		10%	
Examination: <u>50%</u> (duration: 2 hours)								
Examination	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		50%	This is a close-book examination. This may consist of multiple choice questions and essay questions.
* The weightings should add up to 100%.							100%	

Note: A student must obtain a minimum mark of 35 in both coursework and examination, and an overall mark of 40 to pass the course.

5. Assessment Rubrics

(Grading of student achievements is based on student performance in assessment tasks/activities with the following rubrics.)

Assessment Task	Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B, B-)	Fair (C+, C, C-)	Marginal (D)	Failure (F)
1. Case Study Review and Field trip report		As in B, but covers all conservation issues. Innovative solutions or recommendations are supported by relevant conservation principles.	The evidence presents a good appreciation of relevant theories, and covers most conservation issues. Good application of conservation principles to the specific case. Solutions or recommendations are well justified.	The evidence is relevant and accurate, and covers a fair number of conservation issues. Demonstration of declarative understanding of relevant conservation principles. Able to discuss the case content meaningfully. Fair justification of solutions or recommendations.	The evidence is relevant and accurate, but is isolated, addressing few conservation issues. Demonstration of understanding of relevant conservation principles in a minimally acceptable way. Weak justification of solutions or recommendations.	The evidence is either irrelevant or inaccurate, addressing a limited number of conservation issues. Inability to demonstrate the correct conservation principles. Poor coverage. No proper justification of solutions or recommendations.
2. Role play project report		As in B, but covers all conservation issues and pre-set parameters. Innovative solutions or recommendations are supported by relevant conservation/management principles.	The evidence presents a good appreciation of relevant theories, and covers most conservation issues and pre-set parameters. Good application of conservation/management principles to the specific case. Solutions or recommendations are well justified.	The evidence is relevant and accurate, and covers a fair number of conservation issues and pre-set parameters. . Demonstration of declarative understanding of relevant conservation/management principles. Able to discuss the case content meaningfully. Fair justification of solutions or recommendations.	The evidence is relevant and accurate, but is isolated, addressing few conservation issues and pre-set parameters. Demonstration of understanding of relevant conservation/management principles in a minimally acceptable way. Weak justification of solutions or recommendations.	The evidence is either irrelevant or inaccurate, addressing a limited number of conservation issues and pre-set parameters. Inability to demonstrate the correct conservation/management principles. Poor coverage. No proper justification of solutions or recommendations.
3.Oral Presentation for Role play project		The presentation is effectively planned and well structured. Stimulates interest amongst listeners and conveys to the audience well developed ideas of the report. Able to	Well handled presentation with clear ideas and intelligible delivery. Able to answer most questions from audience. Some minor problems with use of language and/or	Acceptable presentation with reasonably clear ideas. Able to answer some questions from audience. No major difficulties with the language and/or delivery.	May have prepared, but have some fairly major problems with content or delivery. Able to answer few questions from audience. Makes listening to the presentation a	Structure of presentation not clear. Poorly prepared and difficult to follow. Unable to answer most questions from audience. Inaccurate use of language or poor delivery

		answer all questions from audience. Student uses clear, accurate and appropriate language.	delivery, but these do not cause major difficulties for audience.		strain for audience.	caused a lot of strain for audience.
4. in-class quiz		As below + analytically and theoretically sophisticated with a wide and deep knowledge of relevant literature and a superior marshalling of evidence.	As below + a command of theory and some analytical depth. Deeper knowledge of relevant literature. Ability to combine factual knowledge with logical argument.	As below + a more interesting answer that demonstrates some reflection on the lectures and required readings, and uses evidence fairly well. Small factual errors are allowed.	A coherent and relevant answer to the question, showing a basic knowledge of lectures and required readings. Some understanding of basic concepts. Some factual errors are allowed.	The answer is incomplete, irrelevant or inaccurate; based on poorly understood learning materials or containing many errors of fact. Concepts are disordered or flawed.
5. Examination		Analytically and theoretically sophisticated with a wide and deep knowledge of relevant conservation principles with the support of relevant literature on legal, economic, management, social and cultural aspects and a superior marshalling of evidence.	Cover a good command of theory and some analytical depth. Deeper knowledge of relevant literature on legal, economic, management, social, and cultural aspects with the ability to combine factual knowledge with logical argument.	A more interesting answer that demonstrates some reflection on the lectures and required readings and uses evidence fairly well but with small factual allowable error.	A coherent and relevant answer to the questions showing a basic knowledge of lectures and required readings. Some understanding on basic concepts. Some factual errors are allowed.	The answer is incomplete, irrelevant or inaccurate; based on poorly understood learning materials or containing many errors of fact. Concepts are disordered or flawed.

Part III Other Information (more details can be provided separately in the teaching plan)

1. Keyword Syllabus

(An indication of the key topics of the course.)

Conservation & revitalization: principles, policy, characteristics, concepts and methods in conservation practice, such as UNESCO, ICOMOS and ICCROM; Analysis and evaluation criteria of user and adaptive reuse requirements.

Statutory & non-statutory control: outline and study the impacts of various guiding principles and legal framework and requirements for heritage conservation and adaptive reuse of heritage buildings.

Study of major design factors: environmental, history, socio-cultural, technological, economic factors and Fung Shui requirements affecting design and technical challenges on conservation and adaptive reuse on built heritage; Introduction on the properties of traditional and modern materials commonly encountered in heritage structures in Hong Kong.

Study of socio-cultural: understanding of the cultural values of heritage buildings and sites, and how to use these values to create a viable conservation plan.

Study of major economic factors: sources of finance, concepts and methods on analysis of return, concepts of value for money, etc.

2. Reading List

2.1 Compulsory Readings

(Compulsory readings can include books, book chapters, or journal/magazine articles. There are also collections of e-books, e-journals available from the CityU Library.)

1.	Ashworth, G.J. and Larkham, P.J. (1994), Building a new heritage : tourism, culture and identity in the new Europe, London ; New York : Routledge.
2.	Campbell, Gordon, (2001), Heritage law and policy: listed buildings and conservation areas, Bembridge, England : Palladian Law Pub.
3.	Haskell, Tony, ed. (1993), Caring for our built heritage conservation in practice, London: E & FN Spon.
4.	Pickard, Robert, (2001), Policy and law in heritage conservation, London ; New York : E & FN Spon.
5.	Sørensen, Marie Louise Stig and Carman, John, ed. (2009), Heritage studies : methods and approaches, London ; New York : Routledge.

2.2 Additional Readings

(Additional references for students to learn to expand their knowledge about the subject.)

1.	Heritage conservation [videorecording]: a continuing mission = Wen wu bao hu, ji wang kai lai [Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong, 2009].
2.	Heritage conservation in Hong Kong. [Hong Kong: Civic Exchange, 2002]
3.	Heritage for the people: position paper by the Conservancy Association Hong Kong : The Conservancy Association, [2003]
4.	Mac Lean, Margaret G.H., editor. (1991), Cultural heritage in Asia and the Pacific, conservation and policy: proceedings of a symposium held in Honolulu, Hawaii, September 8-13, 1991, organized by the U.S. Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites for the U.S. Information Agency with the cooperation of the Getty Conservation Institute,

	Marina Del Rey, Calif., U.S.A. : The Getty Conservation Institute.
5.	Revitalising historic buildings through partnership scheme, batch II / Development Bureau 活化歷史建築伙伴計劃, 第二期 / 發展局. Hong Kong: Government Logistics Dept., [2009]
6.	Review of built heritage conservation policy: consultation document (文物建築保護政策檢討 : 諮詢文件) Hong Kong: Government Logistics Dept., [2004].
7.	Wong, Phoebe Lai-chu, (2008), Conservation by contract [electronic resource] : land lease as a mechanism for carrying out built-heritage conservation in Hong Kong, Thesis (M.Sc.)--University of Hong Kong.
8.	Yu, Michael, (2008), Built heritage conservation policy in selected places Hong Kong: Research and Library Services Division, Legislative Council Secretariat.

- A. Please specify the Gateway Education Programme Intended Learning Outcomes (PILOs) that the course is aligned to and relate them to the CILOs stated in Part II, Section 2 of this form:

GE PILO	Please indicate which CILO(s) is/are related to this PILO, if any (can be more than one CILOs in each PILO)
PILO 1: Demonstrate the capacity for self-directed learning	
PILO 2: Explain the basic methodologies and techniques of inquiry of the arts and humanities, social sciences, business, and science and technology	CILOs 4 & 5
PILO 3: Demonstrate critical thinking skills	CILO 6
PILO 4: Interpret information and numerical data	
PILO 5: Produce structured, well-organised and fluent text	CILO 6
PILO 6: Demonstrate effective oral communication skills	CILO 6
PILO 7: Demonstrate an ability to work effectively in a team	CILO 6
PILO 8: Recognise important characteristics of their own culture(s) and at least one other culture, and their impact on global issues	
PILO 9: Value ethical and socially responsible actions	
PILO 10: Demonstrate the attitude and/or ability to accomplish discovery and/or innovation	CILO 6

GE course leaders should cover the mandatory PILOs for the GE area (Area 1: Arts and Humanities; Area 2: Study of Societies, Social and Business Organisations; Area 3: Science and Technology) for which they have classified their course; for quality assurance purposes, they are advised to carefully consider if it is beneficial to claim any coverage of additional PILOs. General advice would be to restrict PILOs to only the essential ones. (Please refer to the curricular mapping of GE programme: http://www.cityu.edu.hk/edge/ge/faculty/curricular_mapping.htm.)

- B. Please select an assessment task for collecting evidence of student achievement for quality assurance purposes. Please retain at least one sample of student achievement across a period of three years.

Selected Assessment Task
Field trip report Role play project report