

On 12th and 13th October, the Education Academy held its fourth workshop at the NTUA in Athens. On behalf of the Education Academy, I would like to thank Riva Lava for the great job she did in organising the event and in hosting 49 participants, from 22 countries and 30 institutions, including a delegation from Lebanon and Israel, as well as guests from Vietnam and Tanzania.

With the title “why do you teach like you do?”, this workshop challenged prevailing pedagogies of architectural education. The first workshop session - introduced with trigger presentations by Gro Rødne & Nina Haarsaker (NTNU Trondheim) and Vassilis Ganiatsas (NTUA Athens) – asked the audience for an introspection about what we value when we teach. The Bologna reform has firmly established a conception of higher education in terms of pre-specified qualifications competences. With this workshop session, we shifted the debate about architectural education as a set of pre-specified competences, towards a debate about what we, as educators, really are concerned about, when we teach, and what we, as educators, aim to reach.

The second session focussed on impacts of hidden and unspoken dimensions in prevailing pedagogies of architectural education. Architecture is a gendered profession, and so is architectural education. In a presentation entitled “Mistresses of the Architecture Academy”, Harriet Harriss (RCA London) pointed to pervasive gender-unbalanced pedagogies and institutional pressures. She presented eight tactics to counter inequality – particularly gender inequality – and to strive towards pedagogies for parity. Sevgi Türkkän (ITU Istanbul) presented the result of her recently defended PhD dissertation. She revealed a set of hidden architectural design conventions – particularly related to the notion of the architect as “author” and “authority”. She searched for tactics and strategies to develop new conceptions of authorship beyond the individuality of the designing student/practitioner, in order to discuss authorship in a socio-cultural context, and consequently, extend the understanding of architectural education and practice beyond respectively the studio and the office only. Konstantina Demiri (NTUA Athens) gave a systematic overview of the different types of critics and the potentials and limitations of each, underpinning her presentation with concrete examples at the NTUA. She concluded with a convincing case of interweaving intramural and extramural critics in the design studio.

The third workshop session resolutely opened-up the enclosure of the design studio, to advocate a conception of architectural education as a process of interaction with society. Nadia Charalambous (NCY, Nicosia) presented an approach of studio pedagogy which aims to study architecture not from within the own discipline, but from how it is experienced in culture and society. Only when reaching the insights from within society, the architect can become a catalyst of (societal) change. Liat Brix Etgar (Bezalel, Jerusalem) furthered this discourse in a convincing plea for architectural education as a way to reach a more ‘civic architecture’. The methodology of the studio relies upon tackling societal issues; learning outcomes are not pre-specified but identified from an analysis of what can be reached in a particular situation. This implies that the programme is ‘fluid’: studio units are set up in response to societal challenges. Theoretical courses are combined with studio design and methodology workshops. Pedagogy for civic architecture is not only aiming at personal formation of the student but also at enhancing the ‘civic imagination’ of what to do with space.

With the story of the foundation of a new school of architecture in Limerick, keynote speaker Merrit Buchholz made us think about the interaction and mutual impact of an architecture school and its direct and larger environment. Also Buchholz - Liat Brix alike - pointed to the qualities of a fluid curriculum, which responds to actual societal needs, challenging prevailing conceptions of the profession. Students are no “empty minds”, but come in as architects already, aware of belonging to

a specific community; the studio is the space, receiving academics, practitioners, or who is needed at the moment that they are needed - architecture school as a reconsidered idea of Univer-City, a new partnership with society.

A common concern that was surfaced throughout all workshop sessions, was the absence of professionalization in architectural education – “being a good architect does not equal being a good educator”. Without doubt, this is a topic that will be followed up in future initiatives of the Education Academy.

The workshop in Athens closed a first cycle of three workshops that were systematically focussing on the three main strategic themes of the Academy: (i) the workshop at FAUP in Porto – “the profession of the architect, and the role of the school in relation to this profession” (25-26 November 2016) – addressed the first theme, namely the *changing roles of the architect*; (ii) the workshop at the Academy of Architecture Amsterdam– “School Practices” (3-4 March 2017) – addressed the second theme, namely the different *roots and traditions of institutions*, and focussed on the relationship between teaching and practice; (iii) this workshop in Athens focussed on the third theme, namely *pedagogies* of architectural education.

These three workshops served as an exploration of “what lives among educators”. They provided rich material for a next goal of the academy: the writing of a Charter on Architectural education. A writing group continues the work, and will present a draft of the Charter at the next - fifth - workshop of the education academy, which is likely to be held in Madrid, June 2018, in connection with an ACSA Conference. More details about this next workshop will be announced in due time.