



Announcements/Annonces

Architectural Education in Europe

EAAE Vice-President, James F. Horan

Dear Fellow Members of the European Association for Architectural Education

As your incoming President I would like to initiate debate and discussions about issues concerning architectural education in Europe and the role that our association, the EAAE, may wish to play in the future.

The following thoughts should not be regarded as the policy of EAAE as they have not been part of the discussions of the Council.

However, at this time I express them to you and I should be pleased to hear your comments and observations. You may communicate directly with me or through the EAAE News Sheet.

Architectural Education is at a crossroads. The decisions which are being made, and those that will be made in the near future, about how architects are educated have never been more relevant. This is due to a number of factors.

- Firstly, there is the ongoing normal self-analysis that accompanies the business of the education of architectural students. This is a matter which has been re-evaluated many times in the last century and in which most Schools of Architecture engage on a continuous basis regarding their own educational processes.

- Secondly, there is the background of changing education in Europe. In particular there are issues which have been raised by the Bologna Declaration and subsequent meetings of the Ministers for Education in Salamanca and Prague.

- Thirdly, the Commission in Brussels is currently ignoring the existence of the Advisory Body on Architectural Education and Training and has consciously resisted the convening of this group to discuss matters relating to standards and quality. This could be an indication that the Commission intends to abandon the idea of an Advisory Body.

- Fourthly, a series of new and developing concepts particularly in the areas of conservation and sustainability have meant that not only must the knowledge base of architectural graduates increase yet further but a new awareness of the responsibilities which underlie both the education and practice of architecture have emerged.

It is essential for the European Association for Architectural Education [EAAE] to formulate a view about these issues and adopt a position regarding the future of architectural education, the maintenance of educational standards, the quality of the built environment and ultimately the quality of life for the citizens of Europe.

Content/Contenu

1	Announcements <i>Annonces</i>
5	Editorial <i>Editorial</i>
8	Announcements <i>Annonces</i>
17	Interview <i>Interview</i>
26	Reports <i>Rapports</i>
30	Varia <i>Divers</i>
31	EAAE Council Information <i>Information du conseil AEEA</i>
32	Calendar <i>Calendrier</i>

Editor/Editrice

Anne Elisabeth Toft
Dtp
Jacob Ingvartsen

A wider issue regarding the position of the EAAE in the global context could be debated. There are many possible areas with which European architectural education might wish to develop stronger relationships. These are also important as architecture just like every other service or commodity has now become part of a global market. Ultimately the EAAE must see itself in global terms.

However, at this juncture it is necessary for architectural education in Europe to clarify the issues at home and be clear about its objectives within the European context before taking any steps into the limelight of the global stage.

The EU Directive on the education and training of architects is one of the most important documents developed since the notion of the European Union was formulated. Indeed, the UIA/UNESCO Charter for Architectural Education is almost a word for word development of the original Directive and consequently its value is now being recognised worldwide.

The advisory body on architectural education and training has until recently been providing the European Commission with opinions and advices on all matters to do with architectural education. Sadly, the value of this advice is now being ignored in Brussels and there is a strong possibility that the Advisory Body will cease to exist entirely, leaving an enormous vacuum in the area of comment on standards and quality.

The Architects Council of Europe [ACE] a body representing the profession may see itself as being an appropriate replacement for the Advisory Body. It would be a retrograde step if standards in architecture and quality of architectural education were being ultimately monitored by the profession alone.

The Advisory Body to the Commission had one particular advantage, it was comprised of three separate groups of people, each representing different areas in the field of architecture. There were representatives of education from the Schools of Architecture, representatives of the professional Bodies and representatives of the Governments of the Member States. This tripartite group meant

that discussions were balanced between the educators, the profession and the competent authorities. It is essential that any future developments regarding architectural education should attempt to maintain this type of balance and continue to obtain input from the profession, the educators and the competent authorities. It is imperative that architectural education should not be seen as a commodity which might become the preserve of the lowest bidder and that quality of education might take a back seat to what may be regarded by the bureaucrats as value for money. A totally new mindset is required in order to underpin a philosophy for the future.

It may be regarded as a cynical opinion but there is a real danger that the underlying thinking behind Bologna and other moves to change the structure of third level education in Europe is financially driven. The prime concern of the Ministers for Education and the Governments that they represent may be to devise a system which in their minds allows for the education of architects as quickly and as cheaply as possible. This can only have detrimental long term effects on the quality of life and the quality of the environment throughout the European Union.

This may appear to be a somewhat gloomy picture. Rather than taking a negative view let us examine the possibilities that might point to a more optimistic future in architectural education. This more optimistic view stems directly from our unique position at this particular crossroads.

A concept of the totality of educating architects has resulted from a series of conversations that had taken place over a period of time with a colleague who is heavily involved in architectural education in the United States of America.¹

Architectural education is more than just the few years spent being formally instructed in an Architectural School. It is really an education through ones lifetime. The span of architectural education is approximately 50 years. It stretches from the time the young student decides to embark on a career in architecture until the day they retire from their role in the architectural profession, or their role in teaching.

The responsibility for the education of architects throughout their 50 year working lifespan should be shared by the formal educationalists in the Schools, by the profession in which they will serve and by the elected Ministers for Education in the respective countries throughout Europe.

In a contemporary society where change is so prevalent, no-one is in a position to state at any point that their education is complete. The continuous need to upgrade to bring oneself up to date in the thinking, technologically, socially, environmentally, is becoming increasingly important. Schools of Architecture should be thinking about providing a significant number of Continuing Professional Development Courses which naturally follow on from the basic undergraduate education.

In parallel with this the professions should be working closely with the Schools to identify these areas and develop life-long curricula. A close co-operation between educators and practising professionals will be essential to realise this vision. For each to understand their continuing role in this process is critical and this mindset should be central to any future educational development.

The European Directive itself was developed through the co-operation of practising architects, educators and government representatives. There is

no reason whatsoever why this symbiotic relationship cannot be recreated independently of Brussels. Indeed if this opportunity was grasped and a true holistic view of the total education of the architect was established in Europe, it would provide the perfect platform not only for entry onto the global stage but for a leadership role in the global situation.

Yours sincerely

James F Horan DipArch FRIAI MIDI RIBA

Dublin, May 2003

Notes and References

1. Professor Laura Lee, School of Architecture, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Position of the EAAE-Council Regarding EAAE and Networks, Organisations, Institutions

EAAE President, Herman Neuckermans

As a result of a question raised by the schools of the **Nordic Academy of Architecture** at the **5th EAAE Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture** in Chania, September 2002, concerning the policy of EAAE regarding other networks, organisations and institutions, we publish hereby the official position of the EAAE Council.

EAAE has a consistent policy towards the establishment of networks, organisations, institutions related at one time or another to EAAE.

EAAE promotes, develops projects, networks and sub-nets under its own organisation and encourages the full participation of its member schools in these activities.

These projects, networks, subnets gain their credibility and their authority from the history and the identity of EAAE.

In particular EAAE distinguishes 2 types of networks:

- Networks that emerge from the initiative of EAAE: these are considered an integral part of and are organised by EAAE

Apart from the networks developed by EAAE, it is part of the policy of EAAE to link up with other education and professional networks - existing or future ones- in so far as it seems appropriate to EAAE and its member schools

- Networks initiated by EAAE are by definition projects and integral part of EAAE

EAAE will pay special attention not to create or to induce or tolerate any confusion about these relationships.

Prof. Herman Neuckermans, president, on behalf of the EAAE Council

The Council of EAAE,
Copenhagen,
November 24, 2002.

Editorial

News Sheet Editor - Anne Elisabeth Toft

Dear Reader

The city of Chania (Hania) on the Greek island of Crete will again this year be the setting of the discussions on architectural education, when the EAAE for the sixth time is holding its **Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture**. This year the thematic heading of the meeting is **Shaping the European Higher Architectural Education Area**. The meeting takes place from 3 to 6 September 2003.

The discussions at last year's very well-attended Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture were recorded. The tapes have since then been transcribed, and in the beginning of this year the discussions were published in book form entitled **Towards a Common European Higher Architectural Education Area. Transactions on architectural education No. 13**.

The Proceedings Publication announced in the EAAE News Sheet # 65 has been edited by EAAE Project Leader **Constantin Spiridonidis** (Greece) and EAAE Council Member **Maria Voyatzaki** (Greece).

Constantin Spiridonidis (Greece) is responsible for the Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture. Together with **Maria Voyatzaki** (Greece), who participates in the preparation of the meetings, he has this year as a new feature appointed four thematic working groups.

On page 11 Constantin Spiridonidis talks more thoroughly about the many ongoing preparations for this year's Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture. On page 13 he furthermore introduces a preliminary agenda for the meeting from 3 to 6 September 2003.

The meeting will – maybe not surprisingly - be a continuation of the previous meeting as well as the meeting in 2001. The meeting in 2001 was in many respects epoch-making, as the meeting among other things resulted in the formulation of the **EAAE Chania Statement 2001**¹.

The Fifth Meeting of Heads (2002) to a large extent took its starting point in the EAAE Chania Statement 2001. The 115 participants in the 2002 Meeting jointly accepted that the perspective of the creation of a **European Higher Architectural**

Cher lecteur

La ville de Chania sur l'île de Crète accueillera cette année encore les débats de l'AEEA sur l'enseignement de l'architecture à l'occasion de la **6^e Conférence annuelle des Directeurs des Ecoles d'Architecture européennes**. 'Shaping the European Higher Architectural Education Area', tel est cette année le thème autour duquel s'articuleront les discussions. Les séances se tiendront du 3 au 6 septembre 2003.

Les propos tenus à la Conférence très visitée de l'an passé furent enregistrés sur bande. C'est ainsi que les discussions ont pu être transcrites et recueillies dans un ouvrage publié en début d'année sous le titre **'Towards a Common European Higher Architectural Education Area. Transactions on architectural education No. 13'**.

Ces compte-rendus dont la publication a été annoncée dans le Bulletin n° 65 de l'AEEA ont été rédigés par le Chef de Projet de l'AEEA **Constantin Spiridonidis** (Grèce) et le Membre du Conseil de l'AEEA **Maria Voyatzaki** (Grèce).

Constantin Spiridonidis (Grèce) est chargé de l'organisation de la Conférence des Directeurs des Ecoles d'Architecture européennes. En compagnie de **Maria Voyatzaki** (Grèce), qui participe à la planification des séances, il innove cette année en établissant quatre groupes de travail thématiques.

Constantin Spiridonidis détaille en page 11 les nombreux préparatifs actuellement en cours pour la Conférence à venir. Constantin Spiridonidis présente en outre en page 13 l'agenda préliminaire des journées du 3 au 6 septembre 2003.

Vous ne serez pas surpris de savoir que les débats s'inscriront dans le prolongement des deux conférences précédentes. La Conférence de 2001 fit date en de nombreux points puisqu'elle permit de formuler la **Résolution 2001 de l'AEEA**¹.

La 5^e Conférence de 2002 se basait en large mesure sur la Résolution 2001 de l'AEEA. Les 115 participants de la Conférence de 2002 ont d'un commun accord admis que la perspective de la création d'un **'European Higher Architectural Education Area'**



Education Area reveals four basic and strongly related thematic sections to which schools of architecture are invited to respond meaningfully.

These thematic sections could, as Constantin Spiridonidis states on page 11, be codified in four generic terms; Curriculum, Exchange/Mobility, Profession and Assessment which are effectively the four key topics of the 2003 meeting.

According to the traditional practice, the EAAE will hold its annual General Assembly in connection with the meeting. One of the main subjects of the agenda of the 2002 Meeting was the nomination of the new EAAE Vice-President, **James Horan** (Ireland), who according to the statutes of the EAAE will become the next EAAE President from September 2003.

James Horan has been a member of the EAAE Council since 2001. On page 1 he introduces the readers to his personal views on architectural education.

His text introduces a number of important discussions about the EAAE, and the organisation's potentialities as he sees them in the future.

"Architectural Education is at a crossroads", says James Horan. "The decisions which are being made, and those that will be made in the near future, about how architects are educated have never been more relevant."

On page 17 you can read an exclusive interview with **Professor Patrick Whitney**, Director of the **Institute of Design, IIT**, Chicago, USA. Professor Patrick Whitney is one of the world's leading experts on design and innovation. His teaching and research focus on new design methods. Professor Patrick Whitney has been the advisor to a large number of corporations, including Aetna, Texas Instruments and McDonalds. He has been a member of The White House Council on Design, and president of The American Center for Design (ACD).

The interview **Design in a Global World** takes its starting point in some of the many complex challenges that both design and architecture are facing today. Not only architecture and architectural education is at a crossroads – so is design and design education. With its leading design schools – including **Institute of Design, IIT** – the USA is these years considered to be leading in the development within design as well as design education.

EAAE Council Member **Emil Barbu Popescu** (Romania) is the initiator of and responsible for a new EAAE-project; the **EAAE/AG2R Architectural**

fait apparaître quatre blocs thématiques de base, fortement interreliés, auxquels les Ecoles d'architecture sont appelées à répondre clairement.

Comme Constantin Spiridonidis le précise en page 11, ces blocs thématiques pourraient être codifiés sous quatre termes génériques : 'Curriculum', 'Echange/Mobilité', 'Profession' et 'Evaluation' qui constituent en effet les quatre dossiers de la Conférence de 2003.

*Comme de coutume, l'AEEA tiendra son Assemblée générale à l'occasion de la Conférence. L'un des principaux sujets à l'ordre du jour de la Conférence de 2002 était la nomination du nouveau Vice-Président de l'AEEA, **James Horan** (Irlande), qui selon les statuts de l'AEEA prendra la présidence en septembre 2003.*

James Horan est membre du Conseil de l'AEEA depuis 2001. Celui-ci vous expose en page 1 sa vue personnelle sur l'enseignement de l'architecture. Son exposé ouvre une série d'importantes réflexions sur l'AEEA et les possibilités de développement de cette organisation telle que James Horan la voit dans le futur.

"L'enseignement de l'architecture se trouve aux croisées des chemins", stipule James Horan. "Les décisions qui sont sur le point d'être prises et celles qui le seront dans un avenir proche sur l'enseignement de l'architecture n'ont jamais été plus pertinentes."

*Nous vous offrons en page 17 une interview exclusive du **Professeur Patrick Whitney**, Directeur de l'**Institute of Design, IIT**, Chicago, USA. Le **Professeur Patrick Whitney** est l'un des principaux experts en matière de design et d'innovation. Son enseignement et ses travaux de recherche s'intéressent aux nouvelles méthodes de design. Le **Professeur Patrick Whitney** a été conseil pour de nombreuses entreprises telles que Aetna, Texas Instruments et McDonalds. Il a été membre du Comité de Design de la Maison Blanche et Président de l'**American Center for Design (ACD)**.*

*Son interview **Design in a Global World** présente quelques-uns des nombreux et complexes défis auxquels se voient confrontés de nos jours le design et l'architecture. Ce n'est pas seulement l'architecture et l'enseignement de l'architecture qui se trouvent aux croisées des chemins - le design et l'enseignement du design le sont aussi. Avec leurs célèbres écoles de design – dont l'**Institute of Design, IIT** – les Etats-Unis se rangent en tête de file du développement du design et de son enseignement.*

*L'initiative du nouveau projet de l'AEEA, le **Concours étudiant EAAE/AG2R** revient à **Emil Barbu Popescu** (Roumanie) qui en est aussi le*

Competition: The Architecture for the 3rd and 4th Age.

The project and the competition are for the first time announced and published in this EAAE News Sheet on page 15.

EAAE Council Member **Maria Voyatzaki** (Greece) was responsible for the Second Workshop of Construction Teachers which took place at **Les Grands Ateliers de L'Isle d'Abeau**, France, from 15 to 17 May 2003. On page 28 she talks about the workshop entitled **Construction Teaching Methods: The Exercise(s) in the Teaching of Construction**.

On page 16 the **2003 ASCA International Conference: Contribution and Confusion: Architecture and the Influence of Other Fields of Inquiry**, from 27-30 July 2003 is re-announced – and on page 26 EAAE President **Herman Neuckermans** (Belgium) reports from the EAAE Conference: "**Four Faces of Architecture**", 8 to 11 May 2003. The conference took place in Stockholm, Sweden, and Helsinki, Finland, respectively.

A large part of the conference, however, also took place on board the ferry **m/s Silja Europa** that sails between the two Scandinavian countries

Keynote speakers at this conference were:

- **Per-Aage Brandt**,
Aarhus, Denmark
- **Halina Dunin-Woyseth**,
Oslo, Norway
- **Jan Henriksson**,
Stockholm, Sweden
- **Juhani Pallasmaa**,
Helsinki, Finland
- **Sverker Sorlin**,
Umeå, Sweden

Yours sincerely

Anne Elisabeth Toft

Notes and References:

1. **The EAAE Chania Statement 2001** is published in **EAAE News Sheet #61**, November 2001 (English translation) and in **EAAE News Sheet #62**, February 2002 (French translation).

responsable actuel : L'Architecture pour les 3ème et 4ème Ages. Tant le Projet que le Concours sont pour la première fois communiqués et mentionnés dans le Bulletin de l'AEEA en page 15.

Maria Voyatzaki (Grèce) a organisé pour les professeurs de construction un second atelier célébré aux Grands Ateliers de L'Isle d'Abeau, France, du 15 au 17 mai 2003.

Elle donne en page 28 ses impressions sur cet atelier intitulé 'Construction Teaching Methods: The Exercise(s) in the Teaching of Construction'.

Vous trouverez en page 16 une nouvelle communication sur la Conférence 2003 de l'ASCA prévue pour les 27-30 juillet 2003: Contribution and Confusion: Architecture and the Influence of Other Fields of Inquiry (Contribution et Confusion: L'Architecture et l'Influence d'autres domaines) – et en page 26 le rapport du Président de l'AEEA Herman Neuckermans (Belgique) sur la Conférence de l'AEEA : Four Faces of Architecture (Quatre faces de l'architecture), du 8 au 11 mai 2003. Cette Conférence s'est tenue respectivement à Stockholm, Suède, et à Helsinki, Finlande. C'est d'ailleurs entre ces deux nations scandinaves que se déroula une bonne partie de la conférence, à bord du ferry Silja Europa.

Principaux conférenciers :

- **Per-Aage Brandt**,
Aarhus, Danemark
- **Halina Dunin-Woyseth**,
Oslo, Norvège
- **Jan Henriksson**,
Stockholm, Suède
- **Juhani Pallasmaa**,
Helsinki, Finlande
- **Sverker Sorlin**,
Umeå, Suède

Sincèrement

Anne Elisabeth Toft

Notes et Références :

1. *La résolution 2001 de l'AEEA fut publiée en version anglaise en novembre 2001 dans le Bulletin n°61 de l'AEEA, et la version française en février 2002 dans le Bulletin n°62 de l'AEEA.*

2003 ACSA International Conference

Helsinki, Finland, 27-30 July 2003

Contribution and Confusion: Architecture and the Influence of Other Fields of Inquiry

Throughout the twentieth century architects have attempted to translate ideas that have originated in other fields into works of architecture.

It would be difficult, for example, to explain the profusion of novel forms that emerged in the early years of this century without reference to particular movements in art.

But have ideas, formed in art and various other fields such as science, philosophy, engineering, linguistics, sociology and psychology advanced the art of building?

If so, in what ways have features, acquired from investigations in other fields, resolved questions or clarified situations essential to the specific nature of architecture and its intrinsic tasks?

Or, in contrast, have appropriated ideas and the desire for novelty marginalized fundamental aspects of the discipline of architecture?

The timing of the **ACSA International Conference** has been coordinated with the **9th International Alvaro Aalto Symposium**, which will be held in **Finland, August 1-3, 2003**. There will be a substantial reduction in symposium registration fees offered to ACSA participants as well as the possibility of participating in tours following the symposium.

Conference Co-Chairs:

- Associate Professor
Pia Sarpaneva, Virginia Tech
- Associate Professor
Scott Poole, Virginia Tech

Plenary Session Speakers

- Diane Lewis, USA
Architect, educator (Cooper Union).
Internationally published award projects from residences to civic spaces. Former winner of the Rome Prize in Architecture
- Mikko Heikkinen, Finland
Partner in the firm Heikkinen + Komonen Architects, architects of the Finnish Embassy in Washington D.C., (Recent Awards: The Aga Khan Award for Architecture 2001, Recent project: The Max Planck Institute, Dresden 2001)
- Juhani Pallasmaa, Finland
Architect, educator, writer (recent awards: The Finland Award 2000, the Jean Tschumi Award of the International Union of Architects for Architectural Criticism (1999), The Fritz Schumacher Prize (1997), The Russian Federation Architecture Award (1996))
- James Carpenter, USA
(not yet confirmed)
Designer, artist, educator
- Toshiko Mori, USA
(not yet confirmed)
Chair, GSD Harvard, architect, educator.

For further information and registration:

www.acsa-arch.org

Topic Sessions

Thought, Language and Making

Lily Chi

USA, Cornell University

Xavier Costa

Spain, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya,
Barcelona

- Translating Knowledge from Other Fields of Inquiry
- The Limits of Language: What Can Be Said About Architecture?
- The Thinking Hand: Art and The Process of Making

The Material Cause

Jorgé Rigau

USA, Polytechnic of Puerto Rico

Kirsi Leiman

Finland, Helsinki University of Technology

- Material, Memory and Imagination in Art and Architecture
- The Resistance of Matter in Art and Architecture
- Applications of New Materials in Architectural Practice

Nature

Joe Mashburn

USA, University of Houston

Steven Neille

Australia, Curtin University of Technology

- Ecological Design and Architectural Practice
- Questions of Topology: Building in Landscape and Landscape in Building
- How Would Nature Do It?: Biomimetics in Design

Pedagogy

Peter MacKeith

USA, Washington University in St. Louis

Pentti Kareoja

Finland, University of Arts and Design

- The Influence of the Computer in Design Studio: The Question of the Image and Material Resolution
- Literary Discourse, Narrative and the Education of the Architect
- Adopting Concerns from other Disciplines: The Influence of Sociological, Economical, Political and Environmental Questions on the Design Studio

Avant-Garde

Nichole Wiedemann

USA, University of Texas at Austin

Thomas Wiesner

Denmark, The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts

- The Influence of Other Disciplines on the Architectural Avant-Garde: A Search for Depth or a Crisis of Confidence
- Bold New Architecture: Pushing the Limit or Overlooking the Boundary
- Other Avant-Gardes

The City as a Work of Art

Graham Livesey

Canada, University of Calgary

Mark Dorrian

Scotland, University of Edinburgh

- The Public Function of Art and the Contemporary City
- Arrivals and Departures
- Urban Interiors: The Public Living Room

Questioning Disciplinary Boundaries

Leslie Van Duzer

USA, Arizona State University

Helen Welling

Denmark, The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts

- Conceptual Art and Architecture
- Minimal Art and Architecture
- Land Art and Architecture

Image

Marco Frascari

USA, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Bruno Queysanne

France, University of Grenoble

- The Image in Art and Architecture
- Research in Cognitive Science and the Image
- Theories of Vision and Architectural Imagery

Interactions with the Other Arts

Sandra Iliescu

USA, University of Virginia

Beate Hølmebakk

Norway, Oslo School of Architecture

- Architecture and Painting
- Architecture and Cinema
- Architecture and Photography

Crossovers and Collaborations

Felecia Davis

USA, Cornell University

Lisbeth Funck

Norway, Oslo School of Architecture

- Aging Research and Contemporary Architecture
- Technological Innovation and Architectural Practice
- Architecture and Industrial Design

The Lived World

Peter Waldman

USA, University of Virginia

Esa Laaksonen

Finland, Alvar Aalto Academy

- The Question of Duration: Making Time Present in Art and Architecture
- Existential Space in Art and Architecture

Philosophy

Frank Weiner

USA, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Andrew Ballantyne (not yet confirmed)

England, University of Newcastle

- The Philosophical Scope of the Tectonic
- The Ethical Task of Architecture
- Contemporary Philosophy and Architecture

Doctoral Works in Progress Relating to the General Topic

Open Sessions Relating to the General Topic

Open Discussions with Invited Speakers

- The Finnish Architectural Policy
- Architectural Competitions in Finland
- Architectural Education in Finland
- New Technology in Elevator Design (Kone)

The 6th EAAE Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture

Chania, Greece, 3-6 September 2003

Shaping the European Higher Architectural Education Area

The Sixth Meeting of Heads of Schools of Architecture in Europe entitled **Shaping the European Higher Architectural Education Area** will take place in **Chania, Crete**, from **3 to 6 September 2003**. As in all the previous years the event is supported by the **Centre for Mediterranean Architecture (CMA)** and will be hosted in the 'Arsenali', the recently rehabilitated building of the Centre.

Background and Context

For the past five years the EAAE has organised this meeting which gathers those responsible for the management of academic issues at schools of architecture (heads, deans, as well as academic and international program coordinators). The aim of these meetings is to develop a positive milieu for exchange of views and positions, criticism and proposals for support to schools of architecture to integrate in the, under construction, European Higher Education Area.

From last year the Meeting of Heads has been incorporated as one of the activities of a broader Thematic Network ENHSA (European Network of Heads of Schools of Architecture) which is developed in the framework of the Socrates Program after a proposal originated by the EAAE. The scope of the Network is the generation of a milieu for the support of schools of architecture, which will survey the tendencies and dynamics of architectural education in Europe. Having this survey as foundation, the Network will attempt to articulate the convergence but also the divergence among schools in relation to the general principles, values and priorities in the education of the architect. In parallel, the Network will record the strategies adopted by schools of architecture for the organization of their curricula with the perspective of shaping the contemporary European profile of architectural education. The data collected and the conclusions drawn from this project will be passed on to all European decision-making centers.

The Conclusions of Last Year's Meeting of Heads

During the Fifth Meeting of Heads last year the 115 participants jointly accepted that the perspective of the creation of a European Higher Architectural Education Area reveals four basic and

strongly related thematic sections to which schools of architecture are invited to respond meaningfully. They also agreed that the perspective of the creation of the European Higher Architectural Education Area to a great extent depends on the compatibility of the general principles and values with which schools encounter these four thematic sections:

- The structure of school curricula at the undergraduate and post-graduate level and their academic content.
- The relationship of the curricula structure with the types of professionals as these emerge from the diplomas awarded, as well as the relationship of schools with the respective professional bodies.
- The main principles for the assessment of school curricula in terms of self-assessment as well as in terms of assessment by the broader academic society.
- The form(s) of mobility of students, teaching and research staff as well as the institutional framework and more specifically, the ECTS system, for the development of this mobility.

In order to further elaborate the issues, the 2002 Meeting defined four working groups consisting of participants who volunteered to make a contribution. In these four groups, there are 38 Heads and/or their representatives, as well as curriculum coordinators from 30 schools of architecture. These thematic sections could be codified in four generic terms; Curriculum, Exchange/Mobility, Profession and Assessment which are effectively the four key topics of the Sixth Meeting of Heads.

The Concept of the Sixth Meeting of Heads

Up till now the debates have been based on personal views and appreciations of the participating Heads or their representatives, giving to the meetings the nature of a valuable exchange of experience. Despite their value, the elimination of spontaneous but not necessarily representative narrations of specific cases or personal views will give way to a more systematic and reliable presentation of the state-of-the-art of the way that schools of architecture in Europe consider the above four topics. The outcome is expected to be a consistent survey of the trends and dynamics which have been formed to date. This outcome alongside the debates that it will stimulate upon



Venetian Lighthouse, Chania

presentation at Chania, will hopefully indicate the potential or possible difficulties of approaches in the effort of schools to generate a broadly accepted European Higher Architectural Education Area.

As in previous years, the meeting is not a conference with paper presentations but primarily a milieu for exchange of views and dialogue. The representation of a large number of schools is important for shaping a more representative proposal for the future of architectural education in Europe.

The Organisation of the Meeting

This year the meeting is organised around a new structure based on what was proposed and decided by the participants of the September 2002 Fifth Meeting in Chania. The school representatives that volunteered at the Chania 2002 Meeting to be attached to four working groups -each group working exclusively on one of the four key topics-having undertaken to work on the preparation of the event, will open up the sessions of the meeting. They will not present their personal views or considerations on the respective issue, but the outcome of their preparation which is the processed and elaborated information as this is supported by the results of the inquiry to which all schools of architecture are asked to contribute.

The Antwerp Preparatory Meeting

The preparatory meeting of the four working groups took place in Antwerp on 29 March 2003. The working groups, taking into account the debates from the 2002 Meeting in Chania as these were recorded in the proceedings, and the discussions which were developed in Antwerp, defined as a first step issues which will constitute the objectives of the inquiry in all schools of architecture. This inquiry occurs from mid May to the end of June 2003. All schools of architecture in Europe have already been contacted with the request to help with this inquiry. The collection of these data is of vital importance for drawing a concise picture of the-state-of-the-art of architectural education in Europe and due to that, school academic coordinators are asked to dedicate some of their precious time to responding to this appeal.

Further information

on the Fifth and Sixth Meetings of Heads and registration form can be downloaded from:

www.emhsa.org

In the **Working Group on Curriculum** the following persons are involved:

- Batirbaygil, Harun (Istanbul, Turkey)
- Culand, Pierre (Bordeaux, France)
- Doevendans, Kees (Eindhoven, The Netherlands)
- Gatermann, Harald (Bochum, Germany)
- Gökan, Koray (Istanbul, Turkey)
- Hanrot, Stéphane (Marseille, France)
- Kealy Loughlin (Dublin Ireland)
- Kotsakis, Dimitris (Thessaloniki, Greece)
- Liberloo, Roger (Diepenbeek, Belgium)
- Liviu Ianasi (Bucharest, Romania)
- Musso, Stefano (Genoa, Italy)
- Tran, François (Lyon, France)
- Verbeeke, Johan (Brussels, Belgium)
- Wagner, Andreas (Karlsruhe, Germany)

In the **Working Group on Exchanges and Mobility** the persons involved are:

- Baranowski, Andrzen (Gdansk, Poland)
- Caglar, Nur (Ankara, Turkey)
- Harder, Ebbe (Copenhagen, Denmark)
- Michel, Michèle (Bordeaux, France)
- Pilate, Guy (Brussels, Belgium)
- Van Cleempoel, Koenraad (Antwerp, Belgium)

In the **Working Group on Profession** the persons involved are:

- Balogh, Balazs (Budapest, Hungary)
- De Bleckere, Sylvain (Diepenbeek, Belgium)
- Johnston, Lawrence (Belfast, UK)
- Krumlinde, Heiner (Bochum, Germany)
- Radford, Denis (Leicester, UK)
- Roosebeek, Marina (Amsterdam, The Netherlands)
- Tilmont, Michele (Lyon, Paris)

In the **Working Group on Assessment** the following persons are involved:

- Baltzaki, Katia (Thessaloniki, Greece)
- Braizinha, Joaquim Jose (Lisbon, Portugal)
- Bridges, Alan (Glasgow, UK)
- Foqué, Richard (Antwerp, Belgium)
- Hilti, Hansjoerg (Liechtenstein)
- Neuckermans, Herman (Louvain, Belgium)
- Onür, Selahattin (Ankara, Turkey)
- Robiglio, Matteo (Torino, Italy)
- Schaefer, Wim (Eindhoven, The Netherlands)

The 6th EAAE Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture

Chania, Crete, Greece, 3-6 September 2003

Shaping the European Higher Architectural Education Area Preliminary Agenda

The meeting will be structured on the basis of five sessions according to the following preliminary agenda.

Session 1:

Shaping the Curriculum in the European Higher Architectural Education Area

Thursday morning, 4 September 2003, 9:00-10:30 Introductory panel, 11:00-13:30 Workshop

From the 2002 Chania Meeting it became apparent that there is a significant divergence as far as the priorities of school curricula, the study systems and the diplomas awarded are concerned.

It was agreed that a common basis has to be established on which the European profile of each school will be shaped. It was also supported that the particularities and special features of every school curriculum have to be protected and preserved.

For this reason it became evident that there is a need for: generating a more systematic knowledgebase of the differences, the dynamics and the state-of-the-art of architectural education in relation to the different types of architectural undergraduate and postgraduate studies in Europe; identifying the typologies of diplomas in architecture awarded by various institutions and their characteristics; finding out the directions adopted by schools of architecture that have recently restructured their curricula and their priorities; articulating the intentions of the schools that have not altered their curricula; examining the possibility of constructive grouping of schools on the basis of their similarities or differences.

Session 2:

Shaping the Academic Assessment and the Quality Assurance in the European Higher Architectural Education Area

Thursday afternoon, 4 September 2003, 15:00-16:00 Introductory panel, 16:30-18:30 Workshop

The first attempt to collect information on assessment revealed in Chania last year the existence of polymorphic systems, methods, techniques and procedures implemented at schools of architecture in order for their curricula to be assessed. In its Chania Statement 2001 the EAAE

committed itself to undertaking initiatives in the direction of the development of a quality assurance and assessment system tailored to the needs of architectural education while respecting its diversity.

As a result of this information the perspective of creating of a European system of evaluation is a challenge despite the obvious difficulties it entails and it is worth investigating further. This system may refer to the 'academic' assessment of the educational programs by means of a peer review and not to the 'professional/governmental' assessment of the diploma leading to the accreditation and the validation by the professional/governmental bodies of the individual member states.

Further work was proposed to shed more light on assessment by finding out more about the various methods and techniques applied by schools in order to control and improve the quality of their education. The work will elaborate further on recording and discussing the various methods employed by schools of architecture, and will assess their efficiency given the particularities of architectural education and its divergence in the structure and organization of studies in different schools of architecture in Europe.

This record will also target identification of the key points which should be subject to assessment.

EAAE General Assembly

Friday morning, 5 September 2003, 10:00-12:00:
EAAE General Assembly with transfer of presidency.

(Note: Official invitation with the agenda will be sent to all EAAE member schools separately).

Session 3:

Shaping the Exchanges and Mobility in the European Higher Architectural Education Area

Friday afternoon, 5 September 2003, 14:30-16:00 Introductory panel, 16:30-18:30 Workshop

From the 2002 Chania Meeting it became apparent that all schools pursue mobility. It was accepted that mobility has developed so far on the basis of personal contacts and acquaintances. Schools have not adopted very clear policies on exchange and mobility in order to enhance their curricula.

European Commission • Societas-Erasmus Thematic Network
ENHSA
European Network of Heads of Schools of Architecture



Host: CENTER FOR MEDITERRANEAN
ARCHITECTURE

It was agreed that exchanges constitute an essential mechanism for the creation of the European Higher Architectural Education Area. It was also pointed out that the ECTS is an important tool for the development of mobility and comparability of different educational environments.

It was suggested that there has to be clearer strategies adopted by the schools with regard to mobility and exchange for a more direct and effective impact of these collaborations on school curricula. Finally, it was suggested that there is a need for structuring collaborations between schools, respecting and appreciating the particular identity of each school.

To exhaust the investigation into the effectiveness of mobility and exchange, we need to understand the ways in which a school defines an ECTS credit. It is similarly important to identify the policies of schools on student and staff mobility. The question that emerges is whether it is possible for a common type of credit to be invented, which can cover various types of modules. Proposals on policies and strategies for the development of exchanges should be put forward so that they can contribute significantly to the improvement of architectural education.

Session 4:

Shaping the Relations Between the European Higher Architectural Education Area and the Professional Bodies

Saturday morning, 6 September 2003, 9:00-10:30 Introductory panel, 11:00-13:00 Workshop

In the 2002 Chania debate it became clear that the funds for education are progressively cut, a phenomenon that pushes schools into seeking funding from, and therefore become dependent on, external bodies which may threaten their academic freedom. Moreover, the relationship of schools of architecture with professional bodies degenerates to a relationship of control and interference of the profession in school curricula, which may threaten their academic liberty.

It was agreed that schools have to preserve their close links with the professional bodies in order to follow the tendencies of the profession, while, however, protecting and maintaining their academic nature and freedom.

It is crucial to find out ways to redefine the grounds of this relationship at European level, and the initiatives that have

to be taken in order to ensure the conditions for the successful generation of the European Higher Education Area.

Session 5:

Proposals for Future Actions and Strategies

Saturday afternoon, 6 September 2003, 14:30-16:30

This session will attempt to synthesize the discussions and suggestions made in the previous days with the ambition to draw useful and constructive conclusions, as well as to generate a framework of agreements on the various themes, and to decide on ways forward.

Deadline for Submission of the Registration Form

Heads, deans, academic and international program coordinators or their nominated representatives are kindly requested to send the registration form by e-mail or fax as soon as possible and not later than **30 June 2003** to the following address:

**6th EAAE/ENHSA Meeting of Heads Secretary,
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, School of
Architecture,
Univer. Box 491,
GR-54124 Thessaloniki, Greece.
Tel./Fax +30 2310 458660.
spirido@arch.auth.gr**

EAAE/AG2R Architectural Competition

The Architecture for the Third and Fourth Age – The Architectural Environment for the Elderly

At a meeting of the Council of EAAE in Paris in March 2003 a competition sponsored by AG2R was launched.

The competition is open to Schools of Architecture who are current members of EAAE. The competition will be conducted and assessed in two phases.

Phase One

The invention and development of a programme within each competing School to establish the brief and the competition parameters for that School.

Phase Two

The introduction of this competition programme by the Schools to their own students who will develop projects based on the parameters established in Phase One.

Each School will select a maximum of two projects to participate in the international competition.

Schools wishing to participate should register with the Competition Registrar on or before:

- **31 October 2003.**

Completed projects should be submitted by:

- **1 May 2004.**

Judgement of entries and an exhibition of the projects will take place in Paris at:

- **The end of May 2004.**

Jury

President : Mario Botta, architect

Jury to be formed (under way)

Registration

Registration forms may be downloaded from website:

<http://competition-eaae.ag2r.com>

and should be sent by e.mail to:

concours_aeea_ag2r@hotmail.com

or by hard-copy to:

**AG2R,
35 Boulevard Brune,
75014 Paris, France.**

EAAE/ARCC Conference 2004

School of Architecture, DIT, Dublin, Ireland, 2-4 June 2004

Call for Papers

First Announcement

The proposed conference will be the latest in a series of international research conferences sponsored jointly by the *European Association for Architectural Education (EAAE)* and the *Architectural Research Centres Consortium (ARCC)*. These conferences are held every second year. Previous conferences were held in Raleigh, North Carolinas, Paris, France and Montreal, Canada.

The objective of these conferences is to provide a focussed forum for discussion and dissemination of architectural research findings, philosophies, approaches and potentials.

The Architectural Research Centres Consortium (ARCC) is an international association of architectural research centres committed to the expansion of the research culture and a supporting infrastructure in architecture and related design disciplines. Since its foundation as a non-profit corporation in 1976, ARCC has exhibited a concerted commitment to the improvement of the physical environment and the quality of life.

Historically, ARCC's members have been schools of architecture that have made substantial commitments to architectural research, often by forming centres, ARCC sponsors workshops, undertakes sponsored projects, sustains networks, and exchanges information and experience in architectural schools and beyond.

Topic: Between research and practise

Architectural discipline seeks to close the gap between teachers, practitioners and researchers – while at the same time allowing synergies to develop without loss of individual character or identity.

Conference Co-ordinator:

Eddie O'Shea
School of Architecture, DIT
Bolton Street,
Dublin 1, Ireland
e-mail: eddie.oshes@dit.ie
Tel. : ++353-1-4023689
Fax : ++353-14023989

The aim of the conference are:

- To examine how practice and research are knowledge producers and how they could collaborate to create a synergy.
- To examine the links between researchers and practitioners and explore the potentiality they create for each other.
- To examine current research collaborations between individual schools and between schools and practitioners in the areas of design methodology, technology, sustainability, conservation, computers, etc.

Timetable:

Contributing authors should submit an abstract (max. 500 words) to the conference co-ordinator on or before:

- **19 September 2003.**

Authors will be notified of provisional acceptance:

- **24 October 2003.**

Deadline for submission of full papers for refereeing:

- **30 January 2004.**

Presented papers will be published in a Conference Publication.

Design in a Global World

Interview with Professor Patrick Whitney, 4 November 2002.

In the course of history design has evolved radically, always keeping pace with technology. Just as the design profession responded to the age of industrialization by training designers to create products and messages for mass production and national markets, today we are seeing a new paradigm shift, from mass production to flexible production, and from national markets to global ones.

In an increasingly globalized world, the challenges of design to overcome cultural, social, and political barriers are immense. Similarly it is today an almost immense challenge for the design profession – but also for the design schools which educate the designers of the future – to keep up with the high speed of the technological development. The design concept itself, the design profession and the design educations are for that same reason right now in the process of a very decisive change and redefinition.

The United States - led by schools like the *Institute of Design, IIT*; *Media Lab and Center for Innovation in Product Development, MIT*; *Department of Management Science and Engineering, Stanford University*; and *School of Design, CMU*; etc - is recognized around the world as being the cutting-edge of design and design education.

'Human-centred design', which is being taught at the *Institute of Design, IIT*, is in many ways a response to the present paradigm shift.

This is a time in design that is as exciting as when the Bauhaus was founded, says *Patrick Whitney*, Director of the *Institute of Design, IIT*.

"As waves of new technology happen again and again and make the world more complex, we need a new way to cope. The need to humanize design has never been greater."¹

EAAE News Sheet Editor, *Anne Elisabeth Toft* visited *Patrick Whitney* at the *Institute of Design, IIT*, in Chicago, USA. The below interview, which takes its starting point in some of the many complex challenges facing design - but also architecture – today, took place on 4 November 2002.

The German artist *Joseph Beuys* (1921-1986) who challenged the traditional, narrow confines of art to embrace a much broader, philosophically based political practice, formulated the legendary dictum: "Everyone is an artist".

Design – and not least the way we define, develop, brand, expose and promote design – has undergone radical changes in recent years. Therefore, design is no longer limited to only dealing with design of products, layout, and printed matters – design now includes to an equal extent the development of strategies, concepts, systems, product families, innovative business ideas, websites, services, and much more.

Today, when design is typically developed by creative teams consisting of for instance sociologists, anthropologists, architects, graphic designers, engineers, market analysts, communication and media scientists, business executives, etc. – but where also the customer is still more often invited to actively participate in the individual 'fitting' of an otherwise global product – one feels tempted to ask the question: *Is everyone a designer?*

What do you think about the development – and do you think there is a limit to how far we

should actually go in our efforts to meet the customer's individual design wishes or needs?

Should everyone be a designer?

Design emerged as a profession in response to the development of mass production. Before mass production craftsmen created things for their local village or community, and they could make things that were sensible to their local, cultural needs – e.g. economical and material needs.

With the industrial revolution, however, economy of scale became important. And, making large numbers of standardized things for lots of people became the thing to do. One of the main reasons why the Bauhaus School in Germany became significant was that it was perhaps the first school that recognised the shift from local markets to national markets, and from craft production to mass production. This shift caused the designer to become closer to the manufacturer and a little bit farther away from the user.

Now today, with flexible manufacturing and global trade, users have many more choices of products and information than they did fifty years ago. I see

it as nothing but a good thing to have products and services that are a better fit for the daily lives of individuals. This, in my opinion, however, does not mean that the individuals – the users – should become the designers. It just means that the designers need to have a better understanding of the daily lives of the people for whom they are designing. It also means that designers need to understand that the modes of production are more flexible today. This, among other things, leads to the fact that designers do not have to design the same things for lots of people, but they can design systems of offerings where things can be tailored for small groups of people, and indeed - in some cases - can be tailored for individuals.

Our society is a consumer society and a product, a strategy or a design is certainly easier to sell if it meets the need or taste of the individual customer. However, the fact that you aim at this service probably does not always make a better design – or does it?

How do you define an abstract concept like for example *quality* – and with what kind of criteria of *quality* and *value* do you typically operate when you develop design products or strategies?

Well, of course it is the individual user that finally decides which options best suit his or her personal needs.

But, you also want to design things that are good for society. To use an example - one can of course design a car which burns a lot of fuel and uses a lot of materials that are difficult to recycle, but fits the individual needs of the consumer. Such a design, however, is bad for society.

Societal and environmental issues are criteria that are in the end as important as the criteria focused on the individual users.

So, ethical considerations are important?!

Absolutely! Ethical considerations are – or should always be - at the base of what a profession does.

Do we really *comply* with the customers' wishes and needs for design – or do we actually *create* them?

(Pause) I think that two things can happen. One thing is that one can go *beyond* what the users *think* their needs are, and by identifying the patterns of their daily lives one can design products, messages and services that fit the users' needs in ways *beyond* what the users *expected*.

Another thing is that design, of course, often presents new products and new services to people. If people are being presented new qualities in one area, they can easily imagine those same qualities being used or applied to other areas. For example *Federal Express* in many ways changed our perception of what service and speed could be. This has led to our expecting better service and higher speed from all organisations – even from the ones that have nothing to do with organised package delivery. *Federal Express* in a sense changed the standards of what we can and will *expect* from an organisation – any organisation!

What makes a good brand or design?

A strong brand starts with good design; *products*, *services* and *content* that create intrinsic value for users by fitting their patterns of daily life. Finally, a strong *brand* is achieved with a *promise* or a *statement* of how the products or the services will contribute to the person's life.

Companies need to create integrity between the intrinsic value of their offerings and the extrinsic value of their statements.

Technological development – and in particular the arrival of the computer and the Internet – has been an important cause of many global changes, which we have experienced in the last 10-20 years. We are in a paradigm shift – going from an industrialised society to an information based society. This paradigm shift influences everything in society. For that same reason we are today witnessing that many conditions in life change. Often we have to reconsider or replace things, methods or ways of understanding that we have so far taken for granted and usable.

It goes without saying that these developments have also caused many changes for architecture and design and for the work of architects and designers. Following this, design education and architectural education are also facing a number of new and complex challenges. These challenges will not only change the content of the curricula – they will also change the way we teach.

What position does the *Institute of Design, IIT*, take on these challenges, and which curricular changes has the institute made in recent years?

At the *Institute of Design*, we believe that different schools should teach in different ways and that it is undesirable for schools to try to have a common way of teaching or identical content. Of course, there has to be a core base of information, but in general schools should offer a variety.

We differentiate ourselves by offering a stronger methods approach than any other design school in the U.S. All our projects incorporate user observations to understand users' patterns of daily life. Similarly, the *Institute of Design* has a strong link to the business world in that we try to create innovations that are good for the user as well as for the company.

'Human-centred design' has grown out of traditional design, social sciences, engineering, and business. It is taught at the *Institute of Design* through a large number of seminar classes focused on specific content and a few workshop classes in which students do projects that integrate the specific content learned in the seminars. In general, classes cover methods and frameworks in four areas: understanding users and the context of the problem; discovering patterns of user activities and other problem elements; creating alternative solutions; and communicating and implementing innovations. An example of specific classes to do with understanding users are courses in user observation, physical human factors, cognitive human factors, social human factors, and cultural human factors.

What about the mode of teaching – has it changed because of the technological development in recent years?

Actually, the computer has not changed the way we teach very much. All the students have laptops, there is a fast network running through the school. The students use software to do design, and they are doing a lot of design for computer applications, but the main method of teaching is still a discussion amongst a small group of students and a faculty member.

Other main methods of teaching are taking the students out to do user observation and to help them analyse what they see; having the students produce behavioural prototypes early in the design process that let them see how users will interact with a propose design while there is still time to alter the concept . We have few lectures, but we strongly believe in discussions - back and forth exchange - between students and faculty members.

We are putting successful projects on our intranet so that students can get to these resources at any time.

What is, in your opinion, the main challenge facing design today? Is globalisation the dominant question?

The main challenge is helping companies decide what their innovation should be in the first place.

In recent years, organisations' knowledge of how to make new products, communications, and services has grown tremendously. The decreasing costs of computing, the ability to embed computing into everyday products like cars and household products, connecting products and services via networks, and flexible manufacturing have exponentially increased the variety of offerings a company can create. Consumers have many more choices now.

At the same time, organisations have a decreased ability to predict how consumers will use these new offerings. Twenty years ago it was possible to predict the general patterns of how people worked, learned, played, managed family life, and kept healthy. Today people have many more lifestyle options, making the old methods of market segmentation and demographic studies less reliable. The global economy has exacerbated this situation – not only are patterns of living becoming less predictable, but cross-cultural differences are becoming subtler as well.

This growing gap between the increased knowledge of how to create offerings, and decreased understanding of the patterns of daily life, has left executives in a precarious situation. Organisations that know *how* to make just about anything find they are not certain about *what* to make.

I think the main problem facing design is coping with complex problems like this.

In general, I would say that traditional design education, which is a craft-based education, is very good for solving relatively simple problems, but when you get into more complicated problems, you need a stronger and more robust toolbox of methods to cope with those problems.

Hence this, I think that the biggest problem facing design today is actually an internal problem of developing a set of methods that can help the design field cope with complex problems, with globalisation being one of them.

Seen in a historical perspective, architecture, unlike for instance the visual arts, seems to be a 'slow' and tradition bound art form. An art form and a cultural production which is not essentially influenced by the many changes in society. This is undoubtedly connected with the fact that the essential and universal function of architecture – to give man 'roof over his head', to paraphrase Walter Benjamin in his text *The Work of Art in*

***the Age of Mechanical Reproduction* – has not changed much since the very first constructions.** ²

These steady conditions have been crucial for architecture as well as for the development of the architectural discipline, its deeply rooted self-understanding and canonised norms.

New disciplines and professions came into existence as a consequence of the technological development in the 19th and 20th century – among these were industrial design and graphic design. These two new disciplines were not only allied to architecture and engineering – they were also closely connected to furniture design and other crafts.

The new design disciplines, however, solely addressed the industry and its production methods. Compared to architecture they have always been much more interested and engaged in the newest technology.

Has it been difficult, though, for the above mentioned design disciplines to adapt themselves to the new conditions caused by the paradigm shift?

(Pause) In a way design has had to adapt. It had no other choice! Thus, the design offices and the design schools that have not paid attention to the new technology and to the other forces at play have become marginalized.

Design has been forced to adapt and change because it deals with issues of markets and production. Because architects still to a large extent build single buildings, which for all intents and purposes are handcrafted, their field does not face the same forces, nor does it have the same opportunities as design.

Architecture does not deal with markets in the same sense as design. Nor does architecture really deal with strategy. Other than being a symbol for a corporate headquarters, architecture seldom deals with strategic issues of its clients. Besides the example of the headquarters, I suppose examples of architecture dealing with a clients competitive context could be fast food chains, and gasoline stations, but architecture is normally unrelated to the competitive strategies of the clients.

Today we experience to an increasing degree, however, that architectural assignments are also solved by mixed teams and network-based groups consisting of for instance architects, designers, sociologists, artists, market analysts, brand developers, business executives, engineers, etc.

Has this development, in your opinion, something to do with the above?

In the area of retail environments, which for instance an architect like *Rem Koolhaas* is very interested in, there is a strong integration now between graphic designers, display designers, information services and brand developers. Because Rem Koolhaas does things that are so high profile and tend to be on the luxury side of the retail industry – and because he writes – he gets more attention than most other contemporary architects. However, I think it depends upon the target. If you are for example designing an airport or a hospital you have to also deal with the way-finding issues, sign direction issues, etc. as you are designing the building. I would say it probably changes with building category.

Please tell me a little about the history and the background of the *Institute of Design, IIT*, – and please tell me some more about ‘human-centred design’!

The *Institute of Design* was founded as *The New Bauhaus* by *Laszlo Moholy-Nagy* in 1937.

Moholy was invited to Chicago by the *Association of Arts and Industries* who’s members thought it would be good for both commerce and culture to have a design school in Chicago.

In Germany *Laszlo Moholy-Nagy* had headed the *Visual Fundamentals* program that was central to the Bauhaus – the first school dedicated to the new world of industry. At the Bauhaus, faculty and students had looked forward to a new world full of possibilities. They believed that intelligent design could improve the world. The Nazi government which considered the school subversive closed it in 1933, however.

Four years later *Laszlo Moholy-Nagy* instituted his idea of ‘total education’ here in Chicago. His school was an experimental art and design school. The Association members felt it was too experimental, and just over a year after the opening of the school, in the fall of 1938, withdrew their support. *Laszlo Moholy-Nagy*, nevertheless, continued his pursuit. He found an important backer in *Walter Paepcke*, a member of the Association and chairman of the *Container Corporation of America*. *Walter Paepcke* helped *Laszlo Moholy-Nagy* reopen the school under a new name, the *Chicago School of Design*. In 1944 it acquired its present title, the *Institute of Design*. The school remained independent until 1949, when it became part of the *Illinois Institute of Technology*.

In addition to the design school *IIT* has schools of architecture, law, business, psychology, science, and engineering.

The Institute of Design has all through its history attracted faculty and students from around the

world who wanted to experiment with new ways of design. About 15 years ago we developed a particular focus upon what we call 'human-centred design'.

We use this term to distinguish it from what goes on in most design schools, which one could call designer-centred design. This approach is almost exclusively based on studies of existing design solutions. In this context, students, when given a new design project, will very often look in design magazines to see what looks trendy, and they will then typically design something which is in that style.

There are also two frequently used approaches to design in companies from which we distinguish our approach. One is technology-centred design where the designers more or less style a product after the engineers have developed it. Another approach is market-centred design where you use focus groups in demographic studies to produce products and services.

At the *Institute of Design*, we believe there is an equally strong need for understanding of the patterns of daily life, and that one can use this along with knowledge of business and technology to design innovations that are more sustainable and more likely to be accepted by the market.

This belief is at the core of 'human-centred design'.

The *Institute of Design, IIT*, offers a professional degree: the Master of Design, as well as a research degree: the Ph.D. Yours is the first doctoral program in design in the United States, and your graduate curriculum is perhaps the world's most highly focused and intensive program for learning advanced methods and for exploring new theories of design.

Please elaborate on how the *Institute of Design, IIT*, in other respects differs from other schools of design in North America and Europe!

Well, first of all I think it is important to underline the fact that the *Institute of Design* is only a graduate school. The average age of entering students is 29 - meaning that almost all of our students have worked for several years before attending the school. Entrants can come with a degree in design, but students with a background in for instance business, psychology, sociology, engineering, architecture and law are also welcome. The *Institute of Design*, offers an additional one-year Foundation Program of introductory courses for these students, providing them with prior experience in design before beginning the graduate degree.

About half of our students enter with design experience, the rest coming from engineering, architecture, social sciences and other fields.

The school has about 100 Master of Design students, 12 Ph.D. students, 11 full-time faculty, and 20 adjunct faculty.

We attract students from around the world. About 90% of the students are from outside the Chicago area, and 50% of the students are from Europe, South America and Asia.

The Master of Design program at the Institute of Design, is a two-year, full-time professional degree that prepares design leaders who can lead the process of researching, planning and developing new products, communications and services. The program is divided into three concentration areas, or tracks: *Communication Design*, *Product Design*, and *Strategic Design Planning*.

Across all three tracks, the program employs many common frameworks, such as the Human Factors framework, which organises design thinking along four dimensions: *physical human factors* (how well an innovation works for individual users physically), *cognitive human factors* (how understandable and intuitive it is), *social human factors* (how it is used by a group of people working together), and *cultural human factors* (how it resonates with a user's cultural beliefs and habits). The program also strongly emphasises cross-functional teamwork in a workshop setting, providing students with the multidisciplinary collaborative skills that are essential in professional practice.

The *Institute of Design*, created the first doctoral design program in the U.S. in 1993 as a way of beginning to formalise the theory and practice of design. Since then, the Ph.D. has rapidly become the new terminal degree of the profession. Doctoral students in design conduct research to ask and answer essential questions concerning the discipline's fundamental activities, adding to a growing body of knowledge that strengthens the entire profession.

Our Ph.D. students work with faculty members to create new tools, methods and theories of design. They focus on uncovering new possibilities in the relationships between people and the technology in order to better adapt technology to people's needs; they explore the relationship between intuitive patterns of thought and the construction of the digital world; and they study the economic and social underpinnings of design and the creation of new value.

Most students seeking their Ph.D. in design are motivated primarily by intellectual curiosity. Many in the program of our institute come from emerging nations, however, whose governments understand the connection between economic development and design. Funded by their government or their university, these candidates bring back to their home country research skills and cutting-edge

thinking in design, helping elevate the standards of their educational programs and enhance their development opportunities. The faculty of our institute support doctoral researchers in several areas, including product definition, design and economic value, global design planning, multi-modal communication, interactive systems, and general theories of design.

Operationally we have what is probably the largest corporate sponsored basic research program in design in the U.S.

Motorola, Steelcase, Zebra Technologies, SBI Corporation, etc. give us hundreds of thousands of dollars a year – not to do projects for them – but to develop design methods which then get transferred back into the companies for their own use.

This issue of the creation of design methods and design theories that can be used by companies to develop their individual products is the core of our mission.

This year we launched a new Master of Design Methods (MDM) degree for people with a strong background in product design and visual communication design who want to learn the methods we teach. Advanced designers can complete it in 9 months and we hope it will attract designers and design educators from Europe and Asia.

Please tell me more about the research done at the *Institute of Design, IIT*. How is it integrated in the teaching?

The research is centred upon the faculty research interests and the Ph.D. students who work with faculty. Topics vary from economics and design and the creation of value on one hand, to interaction and how to create more humane products and services, as computing, chips and sensors are being embedded in them. Topics also include the study of media and interactive media. We have a great interest in how we can make new media more effective, and how we get across complicated information to users.

Our research goal is to develop methods that will help organisations gain a deeper understanding of users.

I understand that the *Institute of Design, IIT*, is currently developing a database. Please tell me about this project!

An example of a research project developing deeper methods of user understanding is a programme called *Global Companies in Local Markets* which is helping companies to get a more profound under-

standing of the cultural similarities and differences of people in diverse markets.

A key aspect of it is creating a network of people who share methods and conduct similar studies about the activities of daily life in different parts of the world. For example, we have a team now at *Tsinghua University* – the leading technological university in China – doing in-home observation of home entertainment and home controls. We are doing similar studies here in Chicago. We are doing this for a variety of reasons. One reason is to transfer the observation methods to *Tsinghua University*; another reason is to develop the way of working between universities on projects like this.

The goal is to set up teams like this at 10 to 20 universities around the world where we will all be studying topics like ‘making breakfast’, ‘managing the family schedule’, ‘working on the move’, ‘team-work’, ‘shopping’ or ‘keeping healthy’. All the regular activities of daily life, so to speak.

We will create a database that will look at which aspects are common across cultures and which aspects are different. One of the purposes of that is – from the corporate point of view – to help companies understand, when they are designing new offerings, which parts of the offerings can be common across cultures and which parts have to be tailored to be more sensible to the cultural differences.

How much is it going to cost for individuals and companies respectively to be given access to the information of the database? Who is going to gain financially from the project – the involved universities?

Initial memberships range from \$10,000 to \$33,000 per year. The intention is to support the research work at the universities.

What is the primary agenda of your institute in the near future?

There are two goals: the development of new methods of design – particularly complex problems that serve people’s needs; and to educate a new type of design professional who has a stronger methodological background and is more relevant to business.

According to Rem Koolhaas – and I am referring to his acceptance speech given on 30 June 2000, when he was awarded the Pritzker Prize – architecture is today governed by market economy. He adds: *Unless we break our dependency on the real*

and recognize architecture as a way of thinking about old issues, from the most political to the most practical, liberate ourselves from eternity to speculate about compelling and immediate new issues, such as poverty and the disappearance of nature, architecture will maybe not make the year 2050.

What is your opinion of Rem Koolhaas' statement – and how do you see the future for architecture?

Well, I think *Rem Koolhaas* is right. In many respects the mainstream of architecture has ignored the changes that are going on in the modern world. Perhaps beginning in the late 60s – at least in this country – there was almost a concerted effort to isolate architecture from issues of economics and issues of technology. The discipline became insular and almost an 'art form' of architecture. I think that does not serve its needs well.

I think a profession is robust and grows when it is open to the forces that are driving its time. And certainly environmental concerns, economic concerns, and issues of the growing gap between poor people and wealthy people, the new information society, etc. – are all the drivers of contemporary life. Any field, including architecture, needs to understand those and figure out how to respond to them.

Which 'role' do you think will devolve on us as architects? Right now there is a lot of debate about 'authorship'. Coming back to *Rem Koolhaas*: *Rem Koolhaas* has stated that he foresees that in the future a 'good' and successful architect will, first and foremost, be someone who is good at 'editing'. Do you agree with him?

I do not know. I think it is difficult to make generalisations about 'fields'. Just as healthy fields need to respond to forces in their time, healthy fields need to have many specialities within them. And having a speciality within the field of architecture that can act as 'editors' like *Rem Koolhaas* refers to makes sense, but you also have many other 'roles' that need to be played if the field is going to be healthy.

Architecture is a social and cultural construction. It demands to be understood in context. Thus, it demands to be understood within the context of its production and the context of its consumption, representation and interpretation.

Does it still make sense to talk about architecture as a specific discipline?

What is architecture – and what can it be? What do you think we will 'read' as architecture in the future?

All modern disciplines are going through changes as they learn from and work with other disciplines. Certainly the world of physics and chemistry are coming together in the new bio-technology revolution. The world of computing, the world of mathematics and the world of physics came together with separate disciplines to create the computing revolution.

Often it is in the intersections between fields that the interesting work occurs - and I am sure this should be the case for architecture as well.

By the way - going back to the previous question – that is why you do not want to look for a single role for architects but why you want multiple roles. It allows the field to have different 'hooks' that can cause it to relate to other fields.

I think that if architects limit the core of their discipline to the aesthetic form of buildings, architecture will be marginalized as a field. However, if architects take a broader view that deals with the social, the economic and the political issues in society, then they will develop deeper specialities. Architecture will be healthy if it has lots of 'hooks' at the periphery of the field, which can cause it to add value to users and clients.

"A picture says more than a thousand words!" a well-known saying goes.

A general feature of our time is that the text is disappearing from the pictures. Where text used to be the context of pictures, we are now to an increasing degree experiencing that pictures become the context of pictures.

By this I mean that we are more and more 'decoding' and understanding pictures based on our understanding of other pictures. Pictures generate pictures – and not least the pictures and signs that are circulated by the mass media constitute meaning and are mythopoetic to us. In many ways, our culture is an increasingly visual one.

This development is connected with globalisation – and images or signs, as we all know, can of course quite easily and quite immediately be communicated and understood globally.

Images are highly important when you brand a design, an institution, a company, a strategy, a concept, etc.

Please tell me a little about the way you work with images in the design and branding process!

We feel that the use of images is very important. In a standard design project here at the *Institute of Design*, the way we understand users is primarily through pictures and the analysis of pictures – whether it is video ethnography, photo diaries or

field notes which includes maps as well as sketches.³

In all of those cases, however, we care a lot about the text as well – the field notes, the interviews with subjects of the videos or the photo diaries.

We use diagrams in the design process to help us understand and help us analyse the data that we find from the user-observations.

Another way that we use images is in the development of concepts. You can describe your ideas in words, but because words are so abstract they can be interpreted in many different ways.

By visualising the new services, the new products or the new information that one wants to create for users, one can help the development team in a company make decisions that are much faster and much more likely to succeed because of the specificity of pictures.

How do we as teachers avoid teaching our students 'formulas' or 'strategies'? How can we prepare the students for the vast complexity of our time?

(Pause) One way is to admit more experienced students. That sounds simplistic, but achieving a goal of taking people with limited life experience when they are 17 or 18 years old, and in the course of 4-6 years helping them become professionals is more and more of a challenge.

That is one of the reasons why we admit people whose average age is 29. The methods they learn here can be leveraged much more because of the life experience they have before they come to design school. I think this means that in general design education will become more important at the graduate level and perhaps less important at the undergraduate level.

The main way you can avoid students mimicking you is by giving them methods that allow them to work, rather than styles or answers that they are supposed to follow. You should give them methods of how to understand a problem rather than a particular set of answers.

This will give the students flexibility and much more of an open base for exploring problems, developing new projects and eventually discovering their careers! ■

Notes and References

1. Fact Sheet. Institute of Design, Illinois Institute of Technology, p. 2

2. *Das Bedürfnis des Menschen nach Unterkunft aber ist beständig. Die Baukunst hat niemals brach gelegen. Ihre Geschichte ist länger als die jeder anderen Kunst und ihre Wirkung sich zu vergegen wärtigen von Bedeutung für jeden Versucht, vom Verhältnis der Massen zum Kunstwerk sich Rechenschaft abzulegen.*

Benjamin, Walter: *Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit* (1936). In: *Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit. Drei Studien zur Kunstsoziologie*. Frankfurt am Main, Suhrkamp Verlag, edition suhrkamp 28, 1963, p. 46

3. Ethnographic observation is a method borrowed from social science research. ID students utilise this method to understand unarticulated needs and issues that users of particular products, environments, software, and systems have in order to create innovative design solutions.

Video ethnography is a way to capture human behaviour in the context of the person's natural environment as a means of gaining insight into user behaviour. The analysis of the tapes is used to present insights and implications for design solutions. Not only is videotaping essential at the beginning of the design process as needs are identified, but it is also the key throughout the process as students gain an understanding of a particular user context and as prototypes are developed.

Source:

<http://www.id.iit.edu/ideas/methods.html>

Biography

Patrick Whitney is Director of the *Institute of Design, IIT*, and holds the Steelcase/Robert C. Pew chair, the school's first endowed professorship. His courses and research at the *Institute of Design, IIT*, focus on new methods of understanding users and methods of planning products, communications, and systems.

Professor Whitney has published and lectured widely throughout the world on how to make technological innovations more humane, on the link between design and business strategy, and on methods of designing interactive communications and products. He is the editor of *Design in the Information Environment* (Knopf, 1984). He has been a consultant to a number of corporations, including *Aetna*, *Texas Instruments*, *RTC Industries*, and *McDonald's*; he has been on the jury of numerous award programs including the *1995 Presidential Design Awards*; he has been a member of the *White House Council on Design*; and has served as President of the *American Center for Design (ACD)*. He holds a *B.F.A.* from the *University of Alberta*, Canada, and an *M.F.A.* from *Cranbrook Academy of Art*, USA.

He is the principal researcher on the *Global Companies in Local Markets* project.

Source: www.id.iit.edu

For further information, please contact:

Institute of Design
Illinois Institute of Technology
350 N LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610, USA
Tel. 312.595.4900
Fax. 312.595.4901
www.id.iit.edu

Four Faces - The Dynamics of Architectural Knowledge

Kungl Tekniska Högskolan, Stockholm, Sweden

Report

EAAE President, Herman Neuckermans

A conference starting on a boat in Stockholm and ending on a boat returning from Helsinki is an experience that forever will stick in the memory of the participants of the *Four Faces Conference*. More than 85 delegates representing 19 countries, 4 continents and more than 40 schools of architecture participated actively in the *Four Faces* 'wandering' conference from the 8th till 11th of May 2003. All participants received beforehand a copy of the pre-proceedings with all papers submitted. The format of the conference was very promising and innovative: participants moved from one place to the other where they experienced authentic and real Swedish and Finnish architecture, in combination with keynote lectures in situ. If this conference-in-motion was a metaphor for today's (architecture) condition of mobility, it certainly was not at all a conference of timelessness and placelessness.

After a first exploration of Stockholm by a water tour, the conference really started with a keynote lecture by *Jan Henriksson* on 3 great masters of Swedish architecture "Asplund, Lewerentz and Celsing", in the *Skandia* cinema designed by Asplund. This lecture clearly highlighted, for each of the 3 architects, their feeling for intimacy, the well-thought use of materials, the sensitivity for light, in short their deep understanding of the Nordic genius loci, which we were going to experience in reality later on.

The guided tour in the densely populated *Stockholm Town Library* by Gunnar Asplund with its top lit convivial cylindrical central hall, was followed by *Juhani Pallasmaa's* keynote lecture on 'Eye, Head, Hand and Heart' in the *Kulturhuset* designed by Peter Celsing. Pallasmaa developed his speech along many different lines of thoughts referring (amongst others) to the role of images, especially photography, in architecture today (the eye), referring to the over-intellectualisation of architecture (head), the salvation that poetry and the art of making bring over uncertainty and insecurity (hand), the artistic dimension of architecture (heart).

Friday morning started with a visit to the silent world of the death, the magnificent landscape of the *Woodland* cemetery by Gunnar Asplund and Sigurd Lewerentz. We experienced the Nordic calm of the graves between the pine trees. Nowhere else

the sense of eternal rest has been better expressed. There *Sverker Sörlin* lectured on 'Scale, memory and landscape: Fieldnotes from a forgotten Future' in the *Heliga Korssets* chapel by Asplund. From there the conference wandered further to the *St Mark's* church by Lewerentz, where *Jan Martelius* delivered a keynote speech on "The Persian wall", referring to the asymmetric mosque-like vaults, the plain treatment of the brick walls and openings in this robust chapel with its glass panels hooked on the inside of the deep walls.

In the afternoon the whole conference boarded the *Silja line* boat to Helsinki.

That ferryboat is an experience in itself; it is a gigantic floating tax free market with a huge atrium like central mall, a supermarket, restaurants, bar and most important for our purpose: conference rooms in the front of the boat. *Halina Dunin-Woyseth's* speech on "Architectural Scholarship 'Doctorate Way'" introduced two major challenges to doctoral scholarship: one of the two parallel modes of knowledge production, and another, that of a growing awareness of a "continuum from scientific research to creative practice". The response to these challenges identified more inclusive attitudes to different kinds of doctoral scholarship. She described three types of doctorates: those traditional, academically based; those profession-based, which build upon a dialogue between practice and academic knowledge, and, finally the so called doctorates by design, which per se stand for doctoral achievements. The speaker focused on the criteria for the practice-based doctorates.

"The doctoral way" presented a set of criteria for a doctorate by design, resulting from preliminary consultation with the *Nordic Academy of Architecture*.

Participants then had to choose which of the 4 discussion groups they were going to attend: *theory, education, practice, research*. The kernel of these groups was formed by the authors who had submitted a paper pertaining to that topic and they were joined by other participants depending on their choice. The authors were invited to give a short statement about their paper, without real presentation, to start the discussions. The presupposition that every participant had been able to read all contributions beforehand proved to be

false and that somehow handicapped the level of the debates.

Upon arrival in Helsinki buses took us on a quick tour through the capital and the *Otaniemi University* campus (HUT) with Aalto's masterpieces and the well known *Piëttila* centre. After a stop at Alvar Aalto's atelier – frozen in time as if the master still was working there – the group landed in the *Chiasma* museum of Modern Art, designed by Steven Holl – one of the musts of contemporary museums for architects – and then moved to the *Finlandia House*, within walking distance. This huge white marble hall is completely different from Aalto's previous work in scale as well as in the use of materials, although the hand and the spirit of Aalto are still tangible, especially in the main hall. In the *Finlandia House Per Aage Brandt* gave a lecture on the semiotics of architecture in a very dense style of speech, which required all our attention and it only became clear in his last sentence why his lecture was entitled 'Architecture after 9 11 – The death of postmodernism'.

On the way back to Stockholm, again on the *MS Silja Symphony* which had patiently waited for us, *Helena Mattsson* lectured on 'The feminization of Material culture and the 'house of the future'', in which she presented the project of Alison Smithson for the *Daily Mail Ideal Home Exhibition* in 1956, revisited from a gender point of view.

Following another session of the discussion groups, as initiated on the journey to Helsinki, there was a plenary session where a short summary of the discussions within each of the 4 groups was presented.

The themes at stake in the theory group were scattered over general topics as is the nature of theory in architecture, its relationship with philosophy, the question whether there is a similarity in the learning process of language and the learning of architecture.

The group on education witnessed a manifold of isolated pedagogical practices and experiments presented. The main issue discussed was how in pedagogical practice the aim of liberating creative and intuitive thinking can be complemented by training in critical academic thinking.

For the report of the group on practice I refer to the proceedings. As most of you may know this subject is also being tackled in one of the groups

preparing the coming *EAAE Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture* in Chania next September.

The group on research reported from their vivid discussions on the changing character of architectural research. A new factor has emerged: advanced practices bring about new demands for knowledge as an integral part of architectural tasks.

This development seems to be promising for architectural research in its new role of promoting architectural practice. Architectural education often turns out to be another vehicle for research. A new constellation seems to emerge: a closer interplay among architectural practice, research and education.

Just to finish two afterthoughts:

The 'trick' of the conference on the ferryboat to Helsinki kept all participants together and made it a fully attended conference from the beginning till the end and above all turned it into a memorable social event.

Organising a conference is always faced with the dilemma of focussing on a specific topic versus a more general approach: focussing makes a few specialists happy but reduces the number of participants, on the other hand broadening weakens the basis for discussions; the former allows for in-depth debates and maybe furthering the discipline, the latter has the advantage of confronting specialists in one area with reflections from outside that area, which ultimately can contribute to the discipline.

I would like to express EAAE's gratitude to the brains and the hands behind this conference: to name but a few, *Staffan Henriksson*, *Dan Edvardsson*, *Helena Rosenberg* and the entire backstage crew, our bus tour guide in Stockholm *Anna Odlinge*, the guides on the bus tour in Helsinki: dean *Tom Simons* and prof. *Simo Paavilainen*, the keynote speakers, the contributors and all participants. We are looking forward to seeing the proceedings. ■

Construction Teaching Methods: The Exercise(s) in the Teaching of Construction

Les Grands Ateliers de L' Isle d'Abeau, France, 15-17 May 2003

Report on the Second EAAE-ENHSA Workshop

EAAE Council Member, Maria Voyatzaki

Last May (28 May -1 June 2002) which was the *First Workshop of Construction Teachers*, the forty-five members of the *Network* came to a unanimous decision to continue its efforts to strengthen itself towards a more effective collaboration with the ultimate aim for its members to learn from each other, and enriching their pedagogic methods and approaches when they are teaching construction.

The proposal at the time was for it to be held at *Les Grands Ateliers* (www.lesgrandsateliers.fr/webcam) at *L'Isle d'Abeau*, an innovative centre where students of architecture, engineering and the arts get together and experiment on constructions with real materials.

The proposal was finally elaborated and Les Grands Ateliers, partner of the *ENHSA Network* kindly accepted to host the *Second Workshop of Construction Teachers* from 15 to 17 May 2003, and to demonstrate during the event some of its activities.

Following suggestions by the participants of the First Workshop, the theme for the Second Workshop was an in-depth investigation into the 'how' question of the *2002 Workshop Agenda*, or in other words, into the ways in which construction is taught at different schools of architecture in Europe. It was thought that to approach this question it would be more effective to focus discussions on the exercises, as the entire range of issues related to the pedagogy of construction is revealed through them.

For this Second Workshop participants were invited to present some of the key-exercises that enhance construction teaching in their school, which reveal their and/or their school's philosophy on construction teaching.

To set up the agenda for the Second Workshop five of the participants in the first workshop (*Cyrille Simonnet* from the *Geneva School of Architecture*, *Christine Simonin Adam* from the *Normandy School of Architecture*, *Ed Melet* from the *Amsterdam School of Architecture*, *Denis Grezes* from *Les Grands Ateliers* and *Maria Voyatzaki* from the *Aristotle University School of Architecture*, Thessaloniki) started out from the fact that in the framework of the construction course in a school of architecture, teachers design exercises.

The emerging question was what a construction exercise is? Is it an application of the course, a specific illustration, or on-site practice? Is the construction exercise closer to the physics exercise or to an architectural design exercise? Most teachers invent original exercises, which are adapted to the pedagogy of architecture. Some exercises call on science, on the theory of elasticity, others require imagination, invention, or experiments....Whatever the type of exercise, its narration can constitute useful material and tool for debate, exchange and study towards enriching the knowledge and experience of a construction teacher.

Four issues formed the basis of the debates on the exercises that were presented: an issue linked to knowledge itself ('explain'), an issue linked to pedagogy ('transmit'), an issue linked to capitalization ('memorize'), and an issue linked to the operational potential of the exercise ('acting').

More specifically the four issues were articulated as follows:

- 'Explain': The exercise (or the series of exercises) aims at exposing, exploring and explaining a specific problem, at 'staging' by means of various tricks so as to make the initial problem intelligible. This may involve a simple calculation, like that of a beam for a project, or the design of an original construction principle. Whatever the case, the exercise generally shows and demonstrates something.
- 'Transmit': This function is often difficult to represent, and teachers tend to consider it natural. Yet, any exercise includes a measure of efficacy or even of considerable educational productivity. This is especially true of architecture in which students are strongly conditioned, so to speak, by imagination. One can imagine a thousand ways of inscribing construction laws or rules within the architectural design process.
- 'Memorize': A construction exercise often appears like a happening, which raises the problem of its memorization. It leaves no trace but a recollection. A lot of teachers give handouts and bibliographies with their course.

But the exercise itself may be designed as a memorization tool. It is a kind of writing. The problem raised here is how construction exercises generate their own traces.

- 'Acting': In the teaching of architecture, construction is not a science in itself, universal, abstract and positive. It is by definition 'applied'. The question raised is precisely to know how to apply certain rules or phenomena and then to do the modelling. How can such phenomena, represented in this way, generate a project? What specific energy can the exercise develop in the process of putting it to work?

The sixty-three participants represented thirty-eight schools of architecture from fifteen European countries - from Turkey to Spain and from Norway to Italy- and contributed vividly and constructively to the debates while taking the opportunity to voice their own views deriving from their own experiences. Following the structure of the First Workshop, the Second Workshop was not a paper presentation but was primarily based on debate.

From last year's experience it became apparent that alongside participants' written input, posters that illustrate their school's graphic output made contributions valuable to the communication and exchange. As a consequence, a poster exhibition was held at Les Grands Ateliers with the presentation of the key-exercises and graphic output of the students' work during the workshop.

Selected innovative paradigms as well as posters were not the only stimuli for the debates. Keynote speakers who are specialists in the area of construction teaching submitted their experiences to the Network.

In his lecture entitled: 'Construction, Experimentation and Design Process' *Pascal Rollet*, graduate from *Grenoble School of Architecture* with

postgraduate studies at the *University of California, Berkeley*, and construction teacher at *L'Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Arts Décoratifs* in Paris, the school of architecture in Grenoble, and occasionally at Berkeley, talked not only about his experience in the design of the purpose-built Grands Ateliers, but also about his understanding of the interdependence of design and construction in his teaching as well as in his architecture.

In his lecture *Jean-François Blassel*, graduate in engineering from the *Ecole Centrale des Arts Manufactures*, and holding a Master's Degree in Architecture from *Oregon University*, construction teacher at *Marne-la-Vallée* and occasionally teacher at the *Graduate School of Fine Arts* in Pennsylvania, partner in several projects by *Peter Rice*, *Francis* and *Ian Ritchie*, presented extremely interesting exercises of construction teaching alongside his views on the philosophy of the pedagogy of construction.

The ambiance of Les Grands Ateliers was ideal, as students from the *Lyon School of Architecture* were executing some bridge design model load tests during the workshop, and as works from previous workshops were exhibited on site.

In their last session the participants expressed their commitment and willingness to encourage the continuity of the Network and proposed to meet again next year to discuss the future of construction teaching in the ever-changing world of the education and the practice of architecture. Please watch this space as the detailed proposal for the forthcoming *Third Workshop of Construction Teachers* will be presented in the near future.

Maria Voyatzaki, EAAE Council Member
(Construction Sub-network)

On behalf of the Organising Committee
EAAE-ENHSA Construction Teaching Sub-network



Shell and Spatial Structures from Models to Realization

Montpellier, France

The International Association for Shell and Spatial Structures organizes an international student competition related to the 2004 IASS Symposium "Shell and Spatial Structures from Models to Realization", to be held in Montpellier, France. The aim is to promote interest in lightweight structural creativity among future designers, "Bridging Architecture, Engineering and the Arts", and a better knowledge of IASS activities.

Each team has to be composed of at least :

- one student from an Architecture/Landscape School
- one student from a Civil Engineering School
- one student from a Fine Arts School

Teams of competitors from different countries are accepted. One competitor must belong to only one team.

You can get more details by consulting the site www.ias2004.org

For further information, please contact:

Denis Grèzes
Coordinateur scientifique et pédagogique
Grands Ateliers de l'Isle d'Abeau
BP 43, 38092 Villefontaine Cedex
denis.grezes@lesgrandsateliers.fr
Tel 04.7496.8870
Fax 04.7496.8871

The Economics of Architecture

18 June 2003

This RIBA-AJ one-day conference concentrates on the correlation between architecture and business, an area not frequently explored. Some of the country's leading architects, developers, QSs and academics will debate ways we can all add or derive value from the process - calculations every bit as important to the delivery of good architecture as those of the engineer. This conference brings together some of the country's leading architects, developers, QSs and academics to talk about and debate ways in which we can all add or derive value from the process. These calculations are every bit as important to the delivery of good architecture as are those of the engineer. The discussions will be illustrated with case studies from a number of leading architects, who will talk about projects which gave their clients added value.

For further information:

www.riba-london.com

9th Alvar Aalto Symposium Permanence and Chance in Architecture

1-3 August, 2003
Jyväskylä, Finland

For further information:

www.jkl.fi

13th International Brick and Block Masonry Conference

4-7 July 2004,
Amsterdam, The Netherlands

For further information:

www.13-ibmac.bwk.tue.nl

ECLAS Conference 2003

Lisbon, Portugal,

23-26 October 2003

Subject

Landscape Architecture and Modernism: Exploring the Heritage and Learning the Lessons.

The objective of the conference is to discuss the content and meaning of the performance and achievements of our profession in Europe between the 1930s and the 1970s. This time period only recently started to be explored within the European context. The recognition of the contribution of the acting landscape architects as a whole is not yet understood.

Presenters are invited to bring out the achievements in the different countries and the impact on today's practice of landscape architecture in Europe.

For organizational purposes we propose that the conference addresses three themes:

- Gardens
- Urban Design
- Landscape Planning

Conference Venue

Host Institutions High Institute of Agronomy, Lisbon Technical University
Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, Lisbon, Portugal

Contact Person

Luis Ribiro, Assistant Professor
Tel: ++351 21 362 17 35
Fax: ++351 21 362 17 35

First International Architecture Biennial

Rotterdam, The Netherlands

7 May - 7 July, 2003

Mobility

This large-scale event will be held every two years in the Dutch port city of Rotterdam, itself recognized worldwide as an architectural trendsetter. The first architecture biennial focuses entirely on the theme of mobility, examining the issue of modern-day mobility and the consequences for architecture and urban development. Architects, civil engineers, urban planners, traffic experts, landscape architects, students, filmmakers and photographers from around the world will spend two months presenting plans and exchanging ideas in the form of exhibitions, lectures, publications, debates, films and excursions. The curator is Francine Houben, partner in the Mecanoo architecture firm and professor at the Delft University of Technology.

Conference Venue

- Las Palmas (Kop van Zuid)
- Nederlands Architectuurinstituut
- Natuurmuseum Rotterdam
- V2_
- Nederlands Fotomuseum

For further information, please contact:

www.1ab.nl

Project Leaders/*Chargés de Mission*

VAN DUIN, Leen
(Guide and Meta-university)
Delft University of Technology
Faculty of Architecture
Berlageweg 1
2628 CR Delft/THE NETHERLANDS
tel ++31/15.2 785957
fax ++31/15.2 781028
l.vanduin@bk.tudelft.nl

HARDER, Ebbe
(EAAE Prize)
Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts
School of Architecture
Holmen
1433 Copenhagen/DENMARK
tel ++45/32.686000
fax ++45/32.686111

MABARDI, Jean-François
(Summer School)
Université Catholique Louvain
Unité d'Architecture
Place du Levant 1
B-1348 Louvain-La-Neuve/BELGIOUE
tel ++32/10.234949
fax ++32/10.234949
Jeanfranc.mabardi@skynet.be

SPIRIDONIDIS, Constantin
(Heads' Meetings; ENHSA)
Université Aristotelienne de Thessaloniki
Ecole d'Architecture
Bte. Universitaire 491
GR-54006 Thessaloniki/GREECE
tel ++30/310.995589
fax ++30/310.458660
spirido@arch.auth.gr

TOFT, Anne Elisabeth
(News Sheet)

Council Members/*Membres du Conseil*

FJELD, Per Olaf
Olso School of Architecture
Postboks 6768
St. Olavs Plass
N-0139 Olso/NORWAY
tel ++47/22.997070
fax ++47/22.99719071
pof@mail.aho.no

HANROT, Stephane
Ecole d'Architecture de Marseille Luminy
184 av. de Luminy
F-13288 Marseille/FRANCE
tel ++33/4.91625235
fax ++33/4.91957744
stephane@hanrot-et-rault.fr

HORAN, James
(EAAE/AEEA Vice-President)
Dublin Institute of Technology
School of Architecture
Bolton Street 1
Dublin /IRELAND
tel ++353/1.4023690
fax ++353/1.4023989
james.horan@dit.ie

MICHIALINO, Paola
UCL
Unité d'Architecture
Place du Levant 1
B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve/BELGIOUE
tel ++32/10.472421
fax ++32/10.474544
michialino@urba.ucl.ac.be

NEUCKERMANS, Herman
(EAAE/AEEA President)
KUL-Dpt. of Architecture
Kasteel van Arenberg
B-3001 Leuven/BELGIOUE
tel ++32/16.321361
fax ++32/16.321984
herman.neuckermans@
asro.kuleuven.ac.be

POPESCU, Emil Barbu
(Treasurer)
Institute of Architecture Ion Mincu
Str. Academiei 18-20
Sector 1
70109 Bucarest/ROUMANIE
tel ++40/1.3139565
++40/1.3155482
fax ++40/1.3123954

TOFT, Anne Elisabeth
Aarhus School of Architecture
Noerreport 20
DK-8000 Aarhus C/DENMARK
tel ++45/89.360287
fax ++45/86.130645
anne.elisabeth.toft@a-aarhus.dk

VOYATZAKI, Maria
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
School of Architecture
GR-54006 Thessaloniki/GREECE
tel ++30/310.995544
fax ++30/310.458660
mvoyat@arch.auth.gr

Thematic Coordinators

HANROT, Stephane
(Research)

MICHIALINO, Paola
(Urban Issues)

VOYATZAKI, Maria
(Construction)

Secrétariat permanent

EAAE/AEEA Secretary

SCHOL, Lou
Kasteel van Arenberg
B-3001 Leuven/BELGIOUE
tel ++32/(0)16.321694
fax ++32/(0)16.321962
aeea@aeeae.be
<http://www.eaae.be>

EAAE Calendar
AEEA Calendrier

2003			
27 – 30	07	Contribution and Confusion Helsinki/Finland	Contribution et Confusion Helsinki/Finlande
02	09	EAAE Council Meeting Chania/Greece	Réunion du conseil de l'AEEA Chania/Grèce
03 – 06	09	6th Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture Chania/Greece	6^o Conférence des Directeurs des Écoles d'Architecture en Europe Chania/Grèce
2004			
	05	EAAE/AG2R Competition Exhibition and Presentation of Prizes Paris/France	Concours EAAE/AG2R Exposition et remise des prix Paris/France
02 – 04	06	International Conference on Architectural Research ARCC/EAAE, Dublin/Ireland	Conférence Internationale sur la Recherche Architecturale ARCC/EAAE, Dublin/Irlande
	09	7th Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture	7^o Conférence des Directeurs des Écoles d'Architecture en Europe
	11	Architectural Projects for the European City Delft/ The Netherlands	Projets architecturaux pour la Cité européenne Delft/Pays-Bas

EAAE News Sheet

Aarhus School of Architecture
Noerreport 20
DK-8000 Aarhus C

Editor's Office

Anne Elisabeth Toft
Ph.D.-Student
The Aarhus School of Architecture
Noerreport 20
DK-8000 Aarhus C
tel ++45/89.360287
fax ++45/86.130645
anne.elisabeth.toft@a-aarhus.dk

EAAE interactive
www.eaae.be

NEWS SHEET deadlines

#67 (B3/2003), Sept./Sept. 03/03
#68 (B1/2004), Jan./Jan. 01/04

Contributions to EAAE News Sheet
Contributions AEEA News Sheet

Contributions to the News Sheet are always welcome, and should be sent to the editor, who reserves the right to select material for publication. Contributions might include conference reports, notice of future events, job announcements and other relevant items of news or content. The text should be available in French and English, unformatted, on either disk or as an email enclosure. Deadlines are announced in the News Sheets. ■

Secretariat AEEA-EAAE

Lou Schol

Kasteel van Arenberg

B-3001 Leuven/BELGIOUE

Les contributions au News Sheet sont toujours bienvenues. Elles doivent être envoyées à l'éditeur, qui décidera de leur publication. Contributions d'intérêt: rapports de conférences, événements à venir, postes mis au concours, et d'autres nouvelles en bref sur la formation architecturale. Les critères à suivre sont: Les textes doivent être en Français et en Anglais, en forme d'un document de texte non formaté, qui peut être attaché à un e-mail ou être envoyé en forme d'une disquette. Les dates limites sont publiées dans chaque bulletin. ■

tel ++32/(0)16.321694

fax ++32/(0)16.321962

aaee@eaae.be

http://www.eaae.be