

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Schoenefeldt, Henrik (2016) Architectural Pedagogy. Kent School of Architecture, Canterbury.

DOI

Link to record in KAR

<http://kar.kent.ac.uk/55981/>

Document Version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

researchsupport@kent.ac.uk

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

PEDAGOGY

AR600-Architectural Pedagogy is a new module that I have developed to formally embed architectural education as a pathway within the MArch programme. It is one of three parallel 'Options' Modules undertaken by Stage 5 students (the others are Dissertation and Artefact). The development of this module was underpinned by a research project for which I had received funding from the Higher Education Academy but it also built on the earlier, and now parallel, Tutorial Assistants (TAs) scheme initiated by Michael Richards and coordinated by Chris Gardener. The module has been running for the second time this year, following a successful first year in 2014-15. We are currently the only school of architecture in the UK that offers a taught module in architectural education, combining a formal program of lectures, tutorials and seminars with research projects and teaching placements. (Fig. 1) The taught component covers social science research methods, educational theory and philosophy. The students undertake individual research projects, engaging with a diverse range of topics. This year two student projects looked at the respective roles of universities and practices in the delivery of architectural education, and another project, involving questionnaires and interviews, examined how far employers and students themselves consider the architectural degree effective in getting architects ready for industry. Other projects addressed questions related to teaching practice, such as the use of technical drawing and model making as an educational tools, the student experience of design crits or the interaction between Architectural Pedagogy students/TAs and studio tutors.



The students teach in Stage 1 of the BA(Hons) Architecture Programme for one day a week during Autumn and Spring Term. During these teaching placements the first year tutors provide mentoring to the Architectural Pedagogy students and TAs. Following Donald Schön's model of 'reflective practice', students are also required to record and review their teaching experience and observations in journals and write a critical reflection on their practice at the end of Spring Term. (Fig. 2) In these reflections MArch students engaged critically with different aspects of the current first year curriculum, and a series of formal reviews provided a forum in which the pedagogy students and the more experienced professional university tutors could jointly explore some of the challenges associated with teaching architecture at undergraduate level. The first year tutors Rebecca Hobbs, Chris Gardner and Patrick Crouch provided opportunities to critically re-examine and improve the curriculum and teaching methods.

Over the past two years the cohort actively contributed to the development of new educational practices. This included the production of an architectural dictionary, which was handed out all new first years students arriving in September 2015, recommendations for restructuring the undergraduate technology curriculum, and the development of a new learning material for the teaching of digital design tools. As such the module enabled the Architectural Pedagogy students to be fully embedded within the educational culture of the school, a benefit that was also highlighted by the external examiners in 2015, who had interviewed the students. One examiner wrote that the module:

'teaches skills, in particular 'articulation', relevant to practice as well as teaching which would otherwise only be acquired over time and through experience'

Dr Henrik Schoenefeldt
Module Convenor

2

	Physical Layouts/Notes from tutorial	Events of the day	Reflective Analysis of the day	
Date/week	Monday 10/03/16 10:30 - 11:30am Week 10		Jeff Smith - University of Exeter Summary - Analysis	Current Tutor
Illustration of the layout				Analysis of personal response
Analysis of the layout	The dynamics this week were slightly different, Jeff opted to sit on the other side of the table in order to try and involve as many other students as possible. In addition, upon arriving work was already carried up on the oct boards (red highlight). Throughout the day work also started to manifest on the table (yellow) as we went through each student.	The day started by going through the group work that had been set for the last two weeks. We started with the Site Plan Group, whose work was much improved. Although they were missing some members the work was much clearer than the previous week. We moved onto the Site ethnographic group, whose work did not move on from last week. Jeff had to talk fairly honestly with them about how it seemed only one person in the group was doing the work. The site model group had improved on their site model, with the remainder of the students being fairly impressed with the work. Finally the Site analysis group had some promising work, through the site photographs and movement diagrams.		
Notes from the day		After discussing the importance of these tasks within the context of improving each student's design, we then moved onto talking about each student's work in a group. Jeff was quite keen to have each student present to the whole group. As a result it meant most of the students were engaged.		
Commentary for the day	I made two separate batches of notes, the first (top section) being the group work of site analysis and ethnographic etc. The bottom were individual key points for each student's design. The notes were digitised to ensure I could easily access the notes in the next tutorial.	After lunch we then proceeded to continue go through students work and give precedence where relevant. As the day continued on, we could see the students becoming less engaged, therefore Jeff and I decided to split up and have separate tutorials which would hopefully be more intimate. This was a lot more engaging for all participants and yielded some interesting insight into the remaining students midweek regarding design.		Pictorial Examples of the day
		The 1:1 tutorials were then agreed to be carried on next week. I talked to Jeff about my idea of considering the size of spaces.		

3



- 1 Integration of research, teaching practice and reflection, (Schoenefeldt, 2015)
- 2 Page from teaching journal by student Jamal Beckford, MArch, 2015-16
- 3 Crit on teaching practice held in March 2016.