"DO NOT TRY TO REMEMBER": PEDAGOGY IN TRANSITION

Winifred E. Newman, Mickel Professor and Associate Dean of Research and Academic Affairs, elyssen@clemson.edu
College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities, Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina, USA

Lee A. Fithian, Associate Professor, leefithian@ou.edu
Christopher C. Gibbs College of Architecture, The University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, USA

Let's break it down. What are the underlying assumptions of our current architecture program curricula? Is NAAB the dog wagging the program tail, or are we borrowing piecemeal from previous generations of pedagogues? More importantly, what are our pedagogy biases? Are design skills naturalized or learned? What should twenty-first-century architecture programs include to address professional education and practice? What models of education or curricula would you propose? One familiar trope is the perception of the architect as a generalist, but this emerged from the Vitruvian model and is (almost) two millennia out of date. Vitruvius's first-century text, *The Ten Books on Architecture,* arguably still informs the underlying intellectual structure of the education of the architect, but the educational context of Vitruvius's text lacked institutional or professional bearings. Universities and professional offices didn't exist in Augustinian Rome. In contrast, texts like the 1996 Boyer Report are a product of the modern research university indebted to the *liberal artes,* or "free arts," model, which is divided between (1) knowledge for knowledge's sake and (2) knowledge about how things are made.

The papers in this session looked at the epistemology of our discipline. We wanted to know what an architectural education could or should be in the twenty-first century. We hoped papers would challenge, validate, analyze, critique, or invent new curricula for the professional education of an architect. The conference was held in person pre-COVID. Now, in what seems a different era, some of the modes of delivery discussed in these papers, which at the time seemed novel, are commonplace. However, this does not lessen the challenges of how content is informed by our modalities of delivery.

Jonathan Scelsa focuses our attention on possibilities beyond the static critique and suggests engaging with new media practices for an action-oriented interface with our representational schema. This prepares students for the profession but optimally also informs the decision spaces in the design process. Seung Ra makes a similar argument for using embedded computer technology to create a visual platform for interactions between users, including community stakeholders. His case studies are urban and suggest that multifaceted digital media, when fully engaged in the process, not only improve design outcomes but make better designers. Pedagogy in design is extended by both Robert Brackett and Oswald Jenewein, but where Jenewein calls for a structural format change integrating the studio, seminar, and study abroad experience to address "wicked" problems, Brackett targets integrating computational thinking as opposed to digital drawing into the studio so as to position our students to define the parameters of automation and challenge the confines of our current software programs and their complicity in the kinds of

architecture we produce.

Finally, Massimo Santanicchia and Ole Fischer link architecture education and ethics. Santanicchia acknowledges that architecture education should teach students how to consider design decisions within the space of ethical operations in practice. Fischer argues that ethics is proactive as an "acting in public," a reference he owes to Hannah Arendt's call for technical artists who operate outside of the politics of labor in a dialectic with society, culture, and technology. Unlike Vitruvius, who gave us an outline of the *activities* of architecture, or Boyer, whose argument positioned architecture at the borderline between a humanist and a professional activity, these authors make a strong claim for architecture education as a professional education that acts responsibly and is informed by computational and data-driven design spaces. Elaine Scarry argues that beauty "is an inclusive affirmation of the ongoingness of existence, and of one's own responsibility for the continuity of existence."[1] Acting responsibly cannot be decoupled, in any profession, from the objects of making. Perhaps this is one of the tenets we owe to our planet, its resources, and ourselves in the twenty-first century.

Note: You may view a selection of "Do Not Try to Remember: Pedagogy in Transition" paper presentations online here: https://youtu.be/qLttL907s_w

Session Papers

p. 63   "Reviewing Digital—Critiquing the Static Crit" (Jonathan Scelsa, Pratt Institute)

p. 71   "Doing the Right Things" (Seung Ra, Oklahoma State University)

p. 81   "Architecture Revisits Math & Science: Computation in a Visual Thinking Pedagogy" (Robert Brackett, Pratt Institute)

p. 97   "Architecture in the Anthropocene: Toward an Ecological Pedagogy of Parts and Relationships" (Oswald Jenewein, University of Texas at Arlington)

p. 106   "Architecture Education for World Citizenship" (Massimo Santanicchia, University of Iceland & Iceland University of the Arts)

p. 114   "Design Research Methods—Applied Theory and Studio" (Ole W. Fischer, University of Utah)

Not all authors submitted papers for inclusion in the conference proceedings; below are additional papers accepted into this session.

"A Template for a Speculative Pedagogy" (Ellen Donnelly, University of Nebraska—Lincoln, and Marc Maxey, University of Nebraska—Lincoln)

"Computational Literacy: A Pedagogical Framework for 21st Century Making and Thinking" (Nick Senske, Iowa State University)

"Pedagogy in the Wild: A Field Guide to Contemporary Architectural Education" (Bradley Horn, The City College of New York)

---

[1] Elaine Scarry, *On Beauty and Being Just* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), 92, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt28557b.