



The End of Summer, Yasujiro Ozu, 1961

INHABIT

INSTRUCTORS

MA, Maggie
HO, Jimmy
MO, Kar Him
KO, Rina
WANG, Zhenfei

maggie.ma@cuhk.edu.hk
jimmyho@cuhk.edu.hk
khmo@cuhk.edu.hk
rinako@cuhk.edu.hk
zhenfeiwang@cuhk.edu.hk

ISSUE

Affordability is not merely a matter of cost—it is deeply entangled with questions of dignity, access, and equity. Hyper-efficiency and standardisation may accelerate housing production, but often at the expense of comfort, connection, and human-centred design. The pursuit of affordable housing in Hong Kong operates within a framework of tensions: efficiency versus empathy, top-down policy versus grassroots initiatives, quantity versus quality, and short-term shelter versus long-term belonging.

High-density cities in developed areas often face challenges of housing shortages, in particular for housing that is affordable to the masses. In Hong Kong, the scarcity of land resources is often discussed; however, the available land is often reserved for high-end developments. The current housing production model focuses on housing as a commodity rather than a place for meaningful living.

Hong Kong's urban housing landscape is characterised by extreme density, skyrocketing real estate prices, and spatial constraints. The complex interplay between space and economic forces has resulted in increasingly constrained living environments. Hong Kong has one of the highest property prices globally, making homeownership nearly impossible for many. Rising rent costs force residents into subdivided units, where living conditions are cramped and inadequate. Hyper-efficiency and standardisation speed up housing production, focusing on the quantitative supply; however, this efficiency often comes at the compromise of human dignity, comfort, and connection.

The design of this studio focuses on human-centred housing, addressing the needs of users. A home should not only be a physical shelter but a space that enhances social connection and individual well-being. The housing designs should consider how buildings interact with their surroundings, ensuring spaces remain liveable and responsive to both human needs and environmental conditions.

Affordability, then, becomes a lens through which all these tensions are examined. It is a rethink of value—what makes a home worth living in? How could it be designed and maintained? What are the people's need?

How can architects reimagine affordable housing not as a constraint, but as a catalyst for equitable, sustainable, and habitable design? This is the core question the studio will explore.

DESCRIPTION

INHABIT (v.)

To dwell in, occupy as an abode; to live permanently or habitually in; to reside in (a country, town, dwelling, etc.)
- Oxford English Dictionary

To inhabit is not only to reside, but to adapt and to find meaning in place. It is a symbiotic relationship between the dweller and their surroundings, making with what is available—materials, climate, context—while enabling dignity and agency. It challenges us to focus on the fundamental needs, and the poetic value of living: cultural rituals, spatial memory, and the rhythms of daily life.

This studio challenges students to reimagine “affordable housing”, we design for every individual that deserves to live with dignity, especially the one with less economic means. The studio questions what constitutes "fundamental needs" in modern society and how design can address them.

Affordable can be a new collective that brings communities together; a way of living well through simplicity; an aging community home that thoughtfully considers the passage of time; an adaptive

reuse building that conserves construction and resources; and a strategy for increasing economic viability by innovating on development potential. The 5 studios' prologues are as follow:

A Home with Simplicity | Section A – Maggie Ma

“Simplicity is the ultimate sophistication.” — Leonardo Da Vinci

In Hong Kong, a consumption-driven economy shapes how we live. Accumulating possessions, chasing innovation, and keeping pace with trends may thrill us—but they also drain us. As housing becomes commodified, housing design drifts from human-centric focus towards market profits values. In a society of abundance, living simply is not easy - it is an art that needs vigorous practices and iteration. Simplicity can be a form of social justice. Shifting from quantity to quality offers a pathway toward a more equitable and ecologically sustainable future. (Satish, 2019)

This studio embraces scarcity as a design opportunity, not a constraint. We focus on affordable public housing, rethinking what is essential for living. Simplicity becomes a catalyst for thoughtful architecture—centered on care, respect, and environmental mindfulness. By re-examining daily complexities and fundamental needs, we aim to develop new housing prototypes for low-income communities in Ngau Chi Wan, envisioning a future of sustainable, dignified living.

Re-inhabit: Critical Adaptive Reuse | Section B – Jimmy Ho

Inhabiting existing buildings through adaptive reuse achieves affordable construction/housing. This section focuses on transforming existing infrastructure and buildings into a mixed-use housing cluster as an affordable design approach. By maximising the potential of existing physical properties in the post-industrial district through adaptive reuse, students will develop design schemes with atypical spatial qualities with comparatively lower energy consumption. Students will investigate critical provisions and alterations to provide a safe dwelling environment for communality and conviviality. Using San Po Kong as the main site, students will critically examine the site context regarding historical, industrial, cultural, social, infrastructural, demographical, typological, recreational and residential aspects. All students are required to analyse the potential of revitalising underused industrial remains into a housing design that accommodates the needs of the future population that they identify or define. Students will also conceive innovative and community-based programs to keep the housing community alive, and all schemes should demonstrate environmentally responsive, evidence-based design strategies to achieve sustainability and beyond.

New Collectives: Reimagining our Social Housing for Future Living | Section C – Mo Kar Him

A "New Collectives" – an architectural framework for designing future social housing that critically questions and challenges the modernist and neoliberal visions of function separation and encroachment of commons. We will study past and current housing projects through the lens of cooperative mechanisms, programmatic innovation, and spatial design/planning. In addition, we will learn from existing spatial practices in Hong Kong's public housing estates to formulate assumptions of residents' spatial behaviours. These findings will guide our investigation of new methods and strategies for planning and designing programme and activity spaces in a volumetric manner. Our studio will develop prototypes across scales, from units (familial and neighbourly relationships) to the public-private interfaces (three levels: cluster, neighbourhood and immediate context), and these prototypes will be tested and synthesised into an architectural framework to guide the design of a mid-to-high density social housing in Kowloon City – a district that its local characteristics might change rapidly due to urban regeneration.

Dreams are where our fears live | Section D – Rina Ko

This section emphasises the realities of life as we age. Gradual bodily changes affect our physical and cognitive functions. Rapid shifts in environmental, cultural, healthcare, and technological contexts add to the emotional vulnerabilities individuals face today. With a focus on older adults, students are encouraged to step into their shoes to explore the bizarre, mystical and spiritual aspects of their fear and dreams, aiming to create therapeutic spaces that serve to inhabit – nurturing equity and well-being as a community – without straining personal capacities such as time, health and finances, ensuring that the pursuit of these goals remains sustainable and affordable.

The project will be situated in To Kwa Wan, a historically rich district renowned for its maritime activities and its past as an industrial hub. We propose developing a new dockland to facilitate urban renewal, specifically addressing the intricacy and nuanced needs of the ageing population. Students will examine elements from the site to uncover deeper meanings, challenging traditional functions and mindsets. By practicing lateral thinking, their findings will be translated into architectural ideas, relational cultures, and everyday practices, allowing them to dream and envision alternative realities for an authentic living as a place we call “Lifetime Homes”.

Organized Complexity: New Public Housing Complex in Hong Kong | Section E – Zhenfei Wang

Organized Complexity New Public Housing Complex in Hong Kong Hong Kong’s high-density public housing complexes are a unique architectural typology, deeply intertwined with the daily lives of their residents. The complex interplay of land scarcity, diverse user groups, and vibrant social activities within these developments makes them a compelling subject for architectural research. This design studio will focus on these complexes, employing cutting-edge design and research methodologies to explore innovative interventions. The term “affordable” in public housing refers to the government’s cost to build it, not a price for sale. These projects have two primary costs: land acquisition and construction. Typically, the land cost is significantly higher than the cost of construction itself. Many city blocks are filled with mid-rise buildings that occupy 50% or more of the permissible height limit. These structures are often economically unviable to redevelop. However, by adding new, small-footprint constructions on top of these existing buildings, we can significantly reduce the effective land cost, making projects “affordable”. The rule-based design method will be applied in the design process, and an integrated advanced complex architecture system is expected.

Students will explore the intersection of private and public, formal and informal, temporary and permanent, examining how architecture reflects and shapes evolving modes of habitation. Through this lens, the studio challenges what the fundamental needs of the living are in modern society and argues that home is more than the physical provision of housing, but a physical realisation of a complex balance of needs with a design that considers social, environmental and economic sustainability.

The goal is to design an affordable and contextually grounded residential prototype that inspire new housing designs in Hong Kong. By focusing on affordable housing as a testing ground for novelty, the studio design will serve as a prototype and call for design excellence across further housing types— from affordable to public, and beyond.

DESIGN TASK

The key task of this studio is the design of a comprehensive affordable housing project, with a strong emphasis on contextual sensitivity, stakeholder engagement, and sustainable living. Students will be

challenged to envision a new housing scheme that responds to pressing social issues and redefines standards for modern affordable homes.

The design process will work across multiple scales. Beginning with a contextual understanding at the urban level, students will collaborate in groups to develop strategies for the estate, to allow for a living community with 900 to 1,500 units, which will be separated into 300-500 units for individual students in the next phase. This collective phase encourages dialogue and shared responsibility in a collaborative design which interacts with each other. Subsequently, each student will undertake an individual building design of 300-500 units, allowing for focused architectural exploration for individual students on building design, cluster design and unit design.

The programme will be 70% defined by studio tutors which include the essential residential programme, with 30% open for students to propose innovative and contextually relevant additions. Designs must address estate, building, cluster, and unit scales, with a clear narrative that reflects both social responsiveness and a vision for dignified living.

Environmental integration is essential as a part of social responsibility. Projects must demonstrate responsible inhabitation through sustainable strategies and contextual adaptation. Dedicated consultation sessions will support this process.

SITE

As a cohort, we will be working in cluster of interconnected neighborhoods in Hong Kong, with a focus on affordable housing as both a spatial and social challenge. The five sections are focusing on one of the following areas: Kowloon City, San Po Kong, To Kwa Wan, Ma Tau Wai and Ngau Chi Wan. This constellation of sites, while sharing geographical proximity, exhibits distinct urban textures, demographic compositions, offering diverse conditions for critical engagement.



Section A - Ngau Chi Wan - known for its iconic colourful public housing estate, features a diverse mix of living forms—from squatter settlements to hillside residences that blend with the natural topography. The area's layered urban fabric connects directly to ongoing conversations around redevelopment and collective identity.

Section B - San Po Kong - once industrial, now transitional, speaks to the potential of adaptive reuse and mixed-use revitalization, bridging past production with future innovation.

Section C - Kowloon City – a district that its local characteristics might change rapidly due to urban regeneration. The students will be designing a mid-to-high density social housing.

Section D - To Kwa Wan - a historically rich district renowned for its maritime activities and its past as an industrial hub. The students will be developing a new dockland to facilitate urban renewal, specifically addressing the intricacy and nuanced needs of the ageing population.

Section E - Ma Tau Wai - defined by aging tenements and tight-knit communities, reflects post-war urban growth and grassroots resilience. Its ongoing redevelopment highlights tensions between lived heritage and renewal.

PRECEDENTS

Section A:

Modulus Matrix 85, Peris + Toral Architect
Nightingale Housing, Breathe Architect
The Ingot, Jack Self
Im Gut Housing, Peter Markli
The Barbican Estate, Chamberlin, Powell and Bon

Section B:

Baltimore Lifestyle Community
Youth residence in Copenhagen
De Hoorn brewery creative hub
House in a Warehouse, Splinter Society Architecture
Sabadell Housing Renovation

Section C:

Silodam (MVRDV)
Golden Mile (Singapore)
Tower of David (Caracas)
Robin Hood Gardens / Golden Lane Estate (Smithsons)
Copper Lane (Henly Haybrown Rorrison Architects)

Section D:

Appleby Blue Almshouse, Witherford Watson Mann
530 Dwellings, Lacaton & Vassal
15 Clerkenwell Close, Amin Taha Architects, Groupwork
Unite d' Habitation, Le Corbusier

Section E:

Tripolis Office Park MVRDV
Habitat 67, Moshe Safdie

IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY

This studio positions design as a transformative agent in confronting the challenges of urban housing in Hong Kong. By engaging with the concept of Inhabiting in affordable housing, students are prompted to explore how architecture can advance sustainability—not only environmentally, but socially and economically—within a context marked by scarcity, inequality, and displacement.

The studio foregrounds **human-centred approaches** that prioritize well-being, dignity, and ecological responsibility. Rather than replicating top-down efficiencies, students are encouraged to pursue *contextual, participatory design strategies* that respond to existing communities, landscapes, and material conditions. By interrogating the thresholds between permanence and adaptability, formality and informality, the studio seeks to redefine the metrics of architectural impact.

Sustainability here is understood as a **multiscale commitment**: from low-impact construction and resource stewardship, to the cultivation of long-term social resilience and community agency. Through design, students will explore how affordable housing can foster belonging, reduce environmental footprints, and set new benchmarks for quality living in compact urban settings.

Ultimately, this studio invites emerging architects to propose **affordable housing models** that resonate beyond their immediate contexts—designs that contribute meaningfully to broader conversations about equity, urban justice, and the future of sustainable dwelling.

METHODS

ADVISER

Prof. HE, Aaron (yueyanghe@cuhk.edu.hk)

PHASE 1

RESEARCH (4 weeks) (Group and individual)

- 1.1 Choreographic Exercise (individual, cross studios)
- 1.2 Context research and analysis (Group)
- 1.3 Interpretation (Group)

PHASE 2

SCHEMATIC DESIGN (4 weeks)

The design sequence of Phase 2 may vary for each section.

- 2.1 Estate Design (Group)
- 2.2 Building (Individual)
- 2.3 Clusters (Individual)
- 2.4 Unit design (Individual)

PHASE 3

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT (5 weeks)

- 3.1 Detail design development (individual)

WORKSHOPS

Workshops will be organised with an environmental advisor, to help students develop environmental consciousness in the design. Students shall bring proposals that will be discussed individually or in groups.

FIELD TRIP

1. Joint studio Public Housing Tour will be arranged
2. Section tutors will organise field trips unique to the topic for each section.

GUEST LECTURES

1. Lectures with different themes will be held with all Studio 5 tutors.
2. Guest lecture on housing would be arranged.

DELIVERABLES

The deliverables establish the basic requirements for studio representation. Students are encouraged to exceed these expectations, with discussion and approval from their tutor, by developing advanced presentation materials tailored to the unique ambitions of their projects.

REVIEW 01 – Research

Type	Topic	Scale
Title	Project name	n.t.s.
Site Analysis	Site	1:1000 / 1:500
	Site plans & sections	1:500
Program	Program studies	Varies
Precedent studies		n.t.s.
Concept	Diagrams	Varies
Model	Site model	1:500
A3 progress booklets	Documenting the process	n.t.s.
	200 words written statement of design concept	n.t.s.

REVIEW 02 (Mid Term review) – Schematic Design

Type	Topic	Scale
Title	Project name	n.t.s.
Review 01 materials		
Design	Site plan + GF plan	1:200
	Plans	1:200
	Unit Plans	1:100/50
	Sections including site and massing design	1:200
	Axonometric drawing with design concept	1:200
	Diagrams (Urban, Social, Climate, Form)	Varies
	200 words written statement of design	n.t.s.
Model	Site model with design massing	1:500
	Building design models	1:200
A4 progress booklet	Documenting the process	n.t.s.
	200 words written statement of design concept	n.t.s.

FINAL PRESENTATION (Format: Presentation & A3 booklets of progress work)

Type	Topic	Scale
Title	Project name	n.t.s.
Analytical Drawings	Site	1:1000 / 1:500
	Site plans & sections (conceived, perceived, lived)	1:200
Program	Program studies	Varies
	Precedent studies	n.t.s.
Design	Site plan + GF plan	1:200
	Plans	1:200
	Section	1:100
	Cross Section showing habitation	1:50/ 30
	Axonometric drawing with design	1:200
	Diagrams (Urban, Social, Climate, Form)	Varies
	Key views	n.t.s.
Model	Site model with design massings	1:500
	Final Building Model	1:200
	Partial model	1:50/100
A3 progress booklet	Documenting the process	n.t.s.
	500 words written statement of design summary	

PROJECT BOOK

Physical printed and bound portfolio document with a common format across all students within the studio. This will include:

1. 500 words written statement on the overall project position identifying design intention in relationship to context and society.
2. Graphic collection of your design process. All design stages need to be documented with sketches, ideas, concepts, precedent studies etc. and include a narrative of your design decisions
3. Documentation in the form of plans, sections and elevations that meet with the standards widely accepted by the profession

LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. To engage with the reading of the city and different urban conditions through disciplinary studies and analysis.
2. To develop a design project with specific programs that foster the community life and individual living, particularly considering the needs of different groups of people.
3. To examine the complexities implicit in resolving urban problems acquiring proficiency in working across different scales: from the city to the building, from building to the living unit.
4. To reflect on the critical challenge of the affordable housing by conceptualizing alternative forms of living, providing a sustainable architectural prototype.

ASSESSMENT SCHEME

SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT

1. Review 01 (20%)
2. Review 02 (20%)
3. Final Review (50%)
4. Project Book (10%)

Total: 100%

Each assessment result will be released to students upon completion accompanied by written comments based on student progress and performance.

COURSE FORMAT

Teaching Days

1. Students must attend for F2F teaching during these teaching hours:
Teaching Day: 13:30-18:00, Monday and Thursday
2. Students must attend School's Public Lectures scheduled 12:00 – 13:30.
3. Field trips, lectures, and other learning activities may be scheduled outside of teaching days.

Student Study Effort (Total: 300 hrs)

1. Class Contact: 130 hrs (Lecture, Tutorial, Critique, Field Trip)
2. Other Student Study Effort: 170 hrs (Studio / Self Study)

Studio Spaces

1. Each Studio will have their own space, accommodating a desk for each student.
2. Layouts will be issued at the start of the academic year.
3. The school has made studio space and use a priority. Students should maximise the use of their space by conducting design work in studio.
4. Working in the studio creates an opportunity for peer learning and collaboration – take advantage of this valuable resource.
5. Studio space should be respected – especially with consideration of food, drinking, material use, personal safety, disruption to others, and building safety regulations. Areas relating to fire escape should be always kept clear.

REQUIRED READINGS

Section A:

Kumar, S. (2019). *Elegant simplicity: The art of living well*. New Society Publishers.

Certeau, M. D., & Rendall, S. (1988). *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bose, S., Self, J., Williams F. (2016). *Home economics: Five new models for domestic life*. British Pavilion, Venice Architecture Biennale 2016. London: The Spaces with REAL.

Teige, K. & Dluhosch, E. (2002) *The minimum dwelling = L'habitation minimum = Die Kleinstwohnung: the housing crisis, housing reform*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Section B:

- Bullen, P. A., & Love, P. E. D. (2009). Residential regeneration and adaptive reuse: Learning from the experiences of Los Angeles. *Structural Survey*, 27(5), 351–360.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/02630800911002611>
- Cellucci, C. (2021). Circular economy strategies for adaptive reuse of residential building. *VITRUVIO - International Journal of Architectural Technology and Sustainability*, 6, 110.
<https://doi.org/10.4995/vitruvio-ijats.2021.15404>
- Lanz, F., & Pendlebury, J. (2022). Adaptive reuse: A critical review. *The Journal of Architecture*, 27(2–3), 441–462. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13602365.2022.2105381>
- Petković-Grozdanovića, N., Stoilković, B., Keković, A., & Murgul, V. (2016). The Possibilities for Conversion and Adaptive Reuse of Industrial Facilities into Residential Dwellings. *Procedia Engineering*, 165, 1836–1844. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2016.11.931>
- Tam, V. W. Y., Fung, I. W. H., & Sing, M. C. P. (2016). Adaptive reuse in sustainable development: An empirical study of a Lui Seng Chun building in Hong Kong. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 65, 635–642. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2016.07.014>

Section C:

- a+t Research Group (2016). *Form & Data, Collective Housing Projects: An Anatomical Review*. Spain: a+t Architecture Publisher.
- Barton, H. and Grant, M. (2006). A health map for the local human habitat, *Journal of The Royal Society for the Promotion of Health*, 126(6), pp. 252– 253.
- Gehl, J. (1996). *Life between buildings: using public space*. Copenhagen:: Arkitektens Forlag.
- Jacobs, J. (1961). *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. Random House., New York.
- Karadima, D. & Bofylatos, S. (2019). Co-living as a means to re-engagement. A literature review, *The Design Journal*, 22:sup1, 751-762, DOI: 10.1080/14606925.2019.1595397

Section D:

- CUHK JC Institute of Ageing (2025). *Curating Homes: A Guide in Residential Design for Ageing-in-Place*. <https://bit.ly/3Jq2uqI>

Section E:

- Balmond, C. (2002). *Informal*. Prestel.
- Pottmann, H., Asperl, A., Hofer, M., & Kilian, A. (2007). *Architectural geometry*. Bentley Institute Press.
- Wai, R. C. C. (n.d.). 《香港公屋设计变奏曲》. 非凡出版.

OTHER REFERENCES

- Picon, A. (2010). *Digital culture in architecture: An introduction for the design professions*. Birkhäuser Architecture.
- Allen, E., Zalewski, W., Michel, N., & Boston Structures Group. (2009). *Form and forces: Designing efficient, expressive structures*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd
- Ministry of Housing and Local Government. (1961). *Homes for today and tomorrow*. HMSO.
- Matsumoto, S. (2018). *A Monk's Guide to a Clean House and Mind*. Penguin.
- Lefebvre, H., Moore, J., & Elliott, G. (1991). *Critique of everyday life*. London: Verso.
- Douglas, Mary, *The Idea of a Home: A Kind of Space*, *Social Research*, 58:1 (1991:Spring) p.287
- Schneider, T. & Till, J. (2007) *Flexible housing*. 1st ed. Amsterdam ; Architectural Press, an imprint of Elsevier.
- Dogma. (2022). *Living and working*. The MIT Press.
- Chiodelli, F. and Baglione, V. (2014). Living together privately: for a cautious reading of cohousing, *Urban Research & Practice*, 7:1, 20-34, DOI: 10.1080/17535069.2013.827905

- Lang, R., Carriou, C and Czischke, D. (2020). Collaborative Housing Research (1990–2017): A Systematic Review and Thematic Analysis of the Field, *Housing, Theory and Society*, 37:1, 10-39, DOI: 10.1080/14036096.2018.1536077
- Törnqvist, M. (2019). Living Alone Together: Individualized Collectivism in Swedish Communal Housing. *Sociology*, 53(5), 900–915. DOI: 10.1177/0038038519834871
- Williams, J. (2005) Designing Neighbourhoods for Social Interaction: The Case of Cohousing, *Journal of Urban Design*, 10:2, 195-227, DOI: 10.1080/13574800500086998
- Hillier, B., & Hanson, J. (1984). *The Social Logic of Space*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

IMPORTANT NOTE TO STUDENTS

Expectations for Professional Conduct

The motto of The Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) is “Through learning and temperance to virtue”. This motto places equal emphasis on the intellectual and moral education of students. In addition to pursuing academic excellence, students of CUHK are expected to maintain and uphold the highest standard of integrity and honesty in their academic and personal lives, respect the rights of others and abide by the law. More information on undergraduate studies can be found in the UG Student Handbook. https://rgsntl.rgs.cuhk.edu.hk/aqs_prd_aplx/Public/Handbook/

Attendance

Class attendance is required in all courses. For an excused absence, the instructor must be notified and presented with documentation of illness or personal matter. Please note: **Three (3)** or more unexcused absences may result in a failing grade for the course.

Academic Honesty

The Chinese University of Hong Kong places very high importance on honesty in academic work submitted by students and adopts a policy of zero tolerance on academic dishonesty

Attention is drawn to University policy and regulations on honesty in academic work, and to the disciplinary guidelines and procedures applicable to breaches of such policy and regulations. Details may be found at: <http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/policy/academichonesty/>.

With each assignment, students may be required to submit a statement that they are aware of these policies, regulations, guidelines and procedures.

Third-Party Assistance

All intellectual work essential to the design project must be completed by the student and cannot, under any circumstance, be outsourced to a third party (including, but not limited to a company, consultant, alumni, and/or friend).

In the design studio context, students may utilize external resources, such as printing services for presentation materials, and/or laser cutting and 3D printing services for prototyping purposes. Use of such third-party services constitutes non-intellectual work done by others. It is only permitted with prior written consent from the studio tutor and acknowledgment of such work done by the third party.

Assistance from other students or friends for aspects of project production also constitutes non-intellectual work done by others; this is allowed only if declared and acknowledged in a written statement attached to any such work that has received assistance.

Under all circumstances, students must declare all work done by others by completing the school's designated form before assessment. This form must include a detailed explanation of the third party's identity (name and relationship to the student), when and how they were utilized, and the specific tasks they performed in the project. The completed form, signed by the student, must be endorsed by the tutor and presented during the final review. The school will collect and retain this form for record-keeping purposes.

Failure to follow this code of conduct may be considered a case of academic dishonesty, to be reviewed by a disciplinary board, and possible failure of the course.

Artificial Intelligence

Students are allowed to use AI tools to clarify concepts and understanding of their learning activities. This can come in the form of text prompts to engage in a critical discussion of ideas, or through visual ideation. The rationale being that thoughtful use of AI can allow the student to deepen their critical understanding and generate richer options. No AI shall be used to practically execute the Projects. The student must explicitly acknowledge the use of these tools. When utilising AI tools, students must document the following in their process book: the specific AI tools used; how these tools were employed, including details of their interactions; their assessment of the feedback received from the AI tools and whether that feedback was incorporated into their submitted work. Failure to follow these points may result in disciplinary action in accordance with university policy on academic dishonesty.

Students may refer to Approach 3 of the CUHK 'Use of Artificial Intelligence tools in Teaching, Learning and Assessments' – A Guide for Students.

Student Work

Submission of studio documentation must be complete and correctly formatted. Missing or incomplete submission of the documentation folder will result in the grade for the course being withheld. This will prevent registration for the following term or delay graduation.

External Examination

Of paramount importance to the academic rigour and professional relevance of the architecture programme, the external examination process serves as a critical and impartial review mechanism. An invited panel of distinguished practitioners, academics, and industry experts convenes to rigorously evaluate the school's pedagogical ecosystem. This comprehensive audit scrutinises the fairness and consistency of the internal assessment process, benchmarks the standard and ambition of student work against national and international norms, and provides invaluable feedback on the intellectual and pedagogical direction of the curriculum itself.

As a cornerstone of this process and a mandatory graduating requirement, final-year students from both the Bachelor of Social Sciences (Architecture) and Master of Architecture programmes must present their final project and portfolio work in person. This formal defence before the external panel not only validates the authenticity and depth of their learning but also simulates a professional practice environment, demanding they articulate their design rationale, critical thinking, and technical resolution to an authoritative audience, thereby preparing them for the collaborative and discursive nature of the architectural profession.

SCHEDULE

Important Dates

Review 01	29 September 2025	(Monday)
Review 02	27 October 2025	(Monday)
Final Review	26 November 2025	(Wednesday)
Project Book	8 December 2025	(Monday)

Term 1: 1 September 2025 (Monday) – 8 December 2025 (Monday)

WEEK 01		
01.09	FIRST DAY OF SCHOOL	Studio Selection Joint Studio Exercise
04.09	PHASE 1: RESEARCH	Pinup of Joint Studio Exercise
WEEK 02		
08.09		Mini Lecture
11.09		
WEEK 03		
15.09		Field trip – Public housing walk
18.09		
WEEK 04		
22.09		
25.09		
WEEK 05		
29.09	Review 01	
02.10	PHASE 2: SCHEMATIC DESIGN	
WEEK 06		
06.10		Climate Response Lecture and Workshop
09.10		
WEEK 07		
13.10		Mini Lecture
16.10		
WEEK 08		
20.10		
23.10		
WEEK 09		
27.10	Review 02 – Mid-Term Review	
30.10	PHASE 3: DESIGN DEVELOP	
WEEK 10		
03.11		External Lecture (TBC)
06.11		No class (Congregation)
WEEK 11		
10.11	Prefinal review	
13.11		
WEEK 12		
17.11		
20.11		
WEEK 13		
24.11		
26.11 (Wed)	FINAL REVIEW	
WEEK 14		
01.12		No Class
04.12		No Class
WEEK 15		
08.12	PROJECT BOOK SUBMISSION	

Grade	Descriptor	Criteria	Points
A	Excellent	Comprehensively excellent performance on all aspects of the design intention, development, technical resolution and presentation. Achieving all learning outcomes with distinction.	4
A-	Very Good	Generally outstanding performance on the design intention, development, technical resolution and presentation. Achieving all learning outcomes with merit.	3.7
B+	Good	Substantial performance on the design intention, development, technical resolution and presentation. Achieving all learning outcomes satisfactorily.	3.3
B			3
B-			2.7
C+	Fair	Fair performance on the design intention, development, technical resolution and presentation. Achieving all learning outcomes at a passing standard.	2.3
C			2
C-			1.7
D+	Pass	Barely satisfactory performance on the design intention, development, technical resolution and presentation. Achieving all learning outcomes at a barely satisfactory standard.	1.3
D			1
F	Failure	Unsatisfactory performance on the design intention, development, technical resolution and presentation. Not achieving all learning outcomes.	0

Academic Honesty Statement

*Please print out and pin-up next to your works on your allocated panels

Relating to the 2025-26 Studio Review pin-up (BSSc students)

Please tick one of the following:

All the work and models presented at the Final Review were made by me personally

All the work and models presented at the Final Review were made by me.
with the exception of the following:

Under all circumstances, students must declare all work done by others by completing this form before the review. Provide a detailed explanation of the third party's identity (name and relationship to the student), when and how they were utilized, and the specific tasks they performed in the project.

Student's Name: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Tutor's Name: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Written Feedback to Students

Term: _____

Grade: _____

Course Code: _____

Review: _____

Tutor: _____

Student Name: _____

Student ID: _____

Feedback from Course Instructor:

Achievements:

Challenges: