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Abstract

This article is about changes in fine art pedagogy that took place at two North American institutions: Nova Scotia College of Art and Design from 1967 and California Institute of the Arts from 1970. At these, a radical, new paradigm of art pedagogy came to be developed, which has had widespread ramifications. This placed an emphasis on criticality, information and interdisciplinary practice rather than self-expression, formalism and media-specific instruction. It began as an onslaught on modernism, commodification and traditional art practice and discourse. However, through bringing process and enquiry to the fore, this paradigm came to accommodate work in any medium, whether traditional or not, provided it could be explained and justified. Although some aspects of these institution’s pedagogy, such as their formal assessment regimes, would seem very unfamiliar today, in general the pedagogy they developed has come to dominate fine art courses throughout the world. By providing this historical account, it is intended that the present day context is brought into sharper focus.
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Introduction

The year 1968, sometimes referred to as the year of revolutions, witnessed widespread civic unrest. There were demonstrations in the USA against its war in Vietnam while disturbances on its student campuses spread to many other countries. Weeks of student led riots in Paris and violent protests at the Democratic Party Convention in Chicago had their global echoes. Existing power structures were challenged and a plethora of counter-culture and extremist groups and interests proposed radical transformations of society. In England, art education witnessed its own struggle when students and some staff occupied north London’s Hornsey College of Art from May until the summer vacation, demanding everything from a radical change in British art education to improvements to the decrepit toilets (Tickner, 2008).

Almost unnoticed amongst all this global turmoil, two other events were taking place which were to have a far greater impact on art education than the Hornsey occupation. At the very epicentre of the counter culture in southern California, plans were finalised to build a new campus for the incipient California Institute of the Arts (CalArts) which would accommodate the amalgamated Chouinard Art Institute and Los Angeles Conservatory of Music, together with new Schools in other arts disciplines. Meanwhile, in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, a student demonstration took place against the dismissal of almost the entire faculty by the new president of Nova Scotia College of Art and Design (NSCAD) (Soucy and Pearse, 1993).

This article recounts a history of the pedagogy of these two institutions when what was happening at each was not only radical, but was to have a widespread influence on subsequent art education. A few other art schools at the time made some similar experiments with art pedagogy, but on a more limited scale. In the UK, Terry Atkinson, Michael Baldwin and David Bainbridge taught an ‘Art Theory’ course from 1969 to 1971 at Coventry College of Art. Students were expected to theorise and discuss art but rarely if ever made anything concrete, apart from producing their own publications. An art course without artefacts proved too radical for other staff and the national inspectorate and it was closed down after two years (Wood, 2008). Meanwhile, the advocacy for conceptualism in the teaching of art at Nottingham School of Art and Design in the 1970s proved more successful. Although this and similar isolated cases fell short of the radical changes pioneered at NSCAD and CalArts, seeds had been sowed. It is a moot point how much it was these seeds, or an awareness of what had happened in North America, which led to the expansion of this pedagogy in the UK.

The context for this history includes both the worlds of art and educational policy, as well as the kinds of pedagogy which these two institutions challenged. This article begins by outlining this context. Throughout ‘the art school’ is used as a term to refer to anywhere offering higher education courses in art, whether or not it was part of a larger institution. Art is used a term to include fine art, visual art or plastic art.

Background

Educational institutions tend to be very conservative and this includes art schools, despite what many inside them might like to believe. Change has rarely been embraced but instead reluctantly implemented, usually in reaction to outside forces, for example new qualification frameworks or developments outside the institution such as in art practice. Where change does take place, instead of displacing what is there already, it will sit alongside it. In previous publications, I have shown how six historic, contradictory pedagogies exist beside each other within the art school (Houghton, 2009). The apprentice pedagogy dates back to the European middle ages, the academic to the European Renaissance. Modern art and its attendant avant-garde not only started outside the art school, but was in many ways a reaction against a stultified, academic curriculum with its emphasis on copying and drawing and in particular life drawing or modelling. It was only in the middle of the twentieth century that modern art made serious inroads into the art school and it did so through two allied pedagogies, the one centred around formalism and the other on self-expression. No sooner had these pedagogies taken their place within the art school alongside the others, than modern art took a conceptual turn. By the late 1960s, Greenbergian aethetics (Marquis, 2006) based on formalism were no longer dominating the art discourse, while self-expression and the related ideas of (male) genius were being called into question. With the benefit of hindsight it is clear that the avant-garde was splintering and dissolving, although this wasn’t so apparent at the time (Baldessari, 2011).

These changes were to contribute to a new pedagogy in the art school, but they weren’t the only cause. In North America, the UK and elsewhere there had been a growing art history component of art courses from the 1950s (Macdonald, 2005). In the UK, this was enhanced by the policies set in train by the First Report of the Coldstream Council, 1961 and the establishment of the Diploma in Art and Design, which was intended to have a higher status than the previous National Diploma in Design. The new qualification not only required an enhanced role for art history and complementary studies, but when, from the mid 1960s, the Summerson Council made decisions about which art schools could offer it, this was determined largely on the basis of the quality of the art history or complementary studies part of the programme (Macdonald, 2005). In a further development, a UK government White Paper of 1966 recommended the amalgamation of art schools with colleges of engineering, commerce, domestic science etc to form polytechnics and from 1970 this started to take effect. Three years later the Diploma in Art and Design was replaced by the BA (Hons).

In North America meanwhile, during the 1960s art schools were rapidly moving into postgraduate provision, in particular through the introduction of the MFA. At this higher level, studio production needed to be accompanied by an ability to discuss art and write a short dissertation about one’s own art. These dissertations were grounded in art history with an occasional foray into aesthetics, but very rarely theory (Daichendt, 2012). All the same, it was the beginning of a trend whereby students needed to develop their ability to articulate what lay behind their work, a trend accelerated by the growing uptake of the critique (crit). These trends in North America, the UK and many other countries meant that from then on the curriculum had to accommodate the learning of propositional alongside practical knowledge.

Although this article is about fine art pedagogy, my research into the history of the art school has discovered that what was happening in design during the 1960s is pertinent. In North America and Europe, changes in industry and to some extent sites of production were bringing about a decline in the need for print technicians, pattern cutters and industrial draftsmen etc. Providing education for these trades had been a major part of the provision of many art schools. Therefore, an imperative for these institutions was to change focus towards producing designers; that is people who earned a living through the originality of their ideas, rather than exclusively through their hand skills. Hence the design curricula of many art schools shifted from a grounding in materials and techniques to one where students learned a systematic approach to problem solving and were praised for ‘creative’ solutions. Art was to follow the same direction, as creativity became a new justification for the subject, sitting alongside and sometimes displacing self-expression.

NSCAD

In 1967, Garry Kennedy, a Canadian artist and educator then aged 32, was appointed president of the small art school in Halifax, Nova Scotia. He had been working as head of a small art department at Northland College, Wisconsin and if the intention was for him to ring the changes, he didn’t disappoint. He found a school still teaching an academic curriculum and where even the notion of abstract art was highly controversial. The following year he dismissed most of the existing faculty and having cleared the deck, handpicked as replacements those who he knew shared his passion for the latest trends in post-minimal art (Soucy and Pearse, 1993). Key amongst these were Gerald (Jerry) Ferguson who had been a fellow student on the MFA programme at Ohio University and David Askevold. Ferguson was a live wire, ardent in his views and a perfect foil for Kennedy, who hid the fire in his belly behind a more languid persona. Together they came up with a number of initiatives for which the College is now well known (Young, 2009).

Of equal importance was the appointment of Jim Davies as Dean. Also from Northland College, Davies was fully supportive of Kennedy’s vision and had the relevant knowledge of higher education administrative structures to make it possible (Soucy and Pearse, 1993). Turning on its head normal academic practice, radical ideas would come first and Davies would then devise policies and structures to make them possible. One of these was to do away with grades and adopt a system whereby the only outcomes possible were pass or incomplete.

Kennedy was aware that contemporary art practice was being transformed and was determined that the College would be a major participant in this. He saw conceptual art as making possible a different sort of art world which wasn’t based on commerce and would therefore require an alternative infrastructure. He thought of an art school as being like the medical faculty of a university, with a dual responsibility to teach and to the furtherance of the discipline of medicine. Although he had no overall vision for what NSCAD would become, he was determined it would be unlike all existing art schools (Kennedy, 2012a).

It was the 1970 Halifax Conference which brought NSCAD to international attention. For this two day event, 18 American and European artists of international repute came to NSCAD and talked amongst themselves about art. Its achievement was probably more symbolic than real, since it concluded without any sort of statement or manifesto, no recording or transcript was made and nobody can recall much at all about what was discussed. In addition, not everyone approved of its format whereby the 18 artists were in the boardroom on the sixth floor while the students were assembled on the ground floor, where they listened to a relay. Three of the invited artists: Robert Morris, Robert Smithson and Richard Serra walked out in protest and joined the students (Pearse, 2012). Moreover, the day after the conference Kennedy received a telegram from New York signed by several women artists protesting that not a single woman had been invited. It says much about the status of women artists then that the only name Kennedy recognised was Lucy Lippard (Kennedy, 2012b).

The year before, four initiatives contributed to the formulation of a new art pedagogy for NSCAD. The first was the establishment of a lithography workshop. A grant from Canada’s federal government had enabled NSCAD to have a new building erected beside its existing premises with enough money left over to install a professional quality lithography workshop. Having appointed a master printer, artists were invited to come to NSCAD and make an edition of prints. The aim was not to make money, but to provide opportunities for artists to experiment with the medium. (An irony is that they are now valuable artefacts.) This broke down the normal barriers between students and the professional art world as a succession of up and coming artists worked there alongside students (Cameron, 1982).

The second was the establishment of the Mezzanine Gallery in 1969. The College already had a good size gallery on the ground floor of the new building named after its founder, Anna Leonowens. In size the Mezzanine was no match, being little more than the rather generous half landing the architects had designed for the stairs leading up from the main gallery. However, the director of the Mezzanine, Charlotte Townsend-Gault readily understood that much leading edge conceptual art of the time was being produced on small sheets of paper, or as video tape, which needed limited space and moreover could easily be sent through the post (and at the time had little or no monetary value). As a result, from 1969 to 1973 she put on a programme of high quality exhibitions despite having only a small space and budget. No space in the world came close to matching its programme of shows by post-minimalist and conceptual artists. These exhibitions were interspersed by exhibitions of work by NSCAD staff and students (Soucy and Pearse, 1993).

One of the best known shows at the Mezzanine was of a work by John Baldessari called ‘Punishment’, where he had sent instructions for students to write on the walls the kind of ‘lines’ sometimes used at the time for disciplinary purposes at schools. The line they had to repeat was ‘I will not make any more boring art’. Not only has this proved to be one of Baldessari’s most enduring works, it became an unofficial motto for NSCAD (Townsend-Gault, 2012a).

The third initiative was Kennedy’s Art Now class. Like the above mentioned Art Theory course at Coventry, this was an art class where students were not expected to produce any art. Instead they discussed contemporary art. They were then able to use this to explain and contextualise their own practice. Because these classes included a succession of well-known visiting artists, students were learning about contemporary art first hand from (mainly conceptual) artists with burgeoning, international reputations.

The fourth initiative was David Askevold’s Projects Class, which was taught to foundation year students. Askevold asked artists he knew to submit instructions by post or fax (at the time fax was a leading technology) and the students then carried them out, usually working in groups. Artists who submitted instructions included: Robert Barry, Mel Bochner, James Lee Byers, Jan Dibbets, Dan Graham, Doug Huebler, Joseph Kosuth, Sol LeWitt, Lucy Lippard, N. E Thing Co, Robert Smithson and Larry Weiner. This pedagogy matched the kind of conceptual art many of those artists were making at the time, which often consisted of proposals or propositions typed onto standard sized, office writing paper (Askevold, 2012). Whether or not this experience enabled students to adopt a similar approach in their own work is another matter. What is clear, however, is that through all these initiatives a pedagogy was developing whereby students leaned to set their own rules and parameters and work within them. Rather than intuitively expressing themselves, they were learning to understand and articulate the process.

The Projects Class is an example of how, in developing a pedagogy for the new art, a decision had been made early on by Ferguson they should adapt problem solving (Townsend-Gault, 2012b). In the form of basic design exercises, problem solving had long been a staple of foundation courses from the 1950s. Moreover, it had been used on other art and design courses long before that (Read, 1944). During the late 1960s, design teaching had adapted this to a formal four stage process of problem, research, idea development and final solution. Whether or not due to serendipity, this happened to have similarities to how conceptual artists worked, with the important proviso that in art there can be no solutions (Schor, 1997) and it is usually the artist (rather than the client) who sets the problem (Getzels and Csikszentmihalyi, 1976). To what extent design teaching influenced the art teaching at NSCAD is unknown. What is known, however, is that one of Kennedy’s innovations had been to introduce design to the name and curriculum of the College and appoint forward thinking teachers to teach it. Not only did teachers of art and of design have to collaborate on the foundation program, in such a small institution it is inconceivable that there would not have been further interaction between them. There had certainly been a good deal of common ground, which included agreeing not to teach drawing at all to foundation students, which was a revolutionary step at the time (Soucy and Pearse, 1993).

Another revolutionary step in the teaching of art at NSCAD was moving to an interdisciplinary approach. Instead of the traditional silos of painting, sculpture and printmaking, the new art being promoted by NSCAD had expanded to include performance, installation, photography, video, text and sound art, but before any of them, in their view, must come the idea. This presented a massive challenge to the curriculum, a problem which no art school ever escapes. That is: which medium-specific skills should be taught, if any?

In the North American context, this had an added complication. Those unfamiliar with the North American model of university education need to bear in mind that it entails signing up each semester for a smorgasbord of taught classes. In this way, it is intended that the student’s education matches depth with breadth while accumulating the requisite credits for a qualification. Therefore the programme of study at NSCAD would have been, in theory at least, much more cut up into bits than for a parallel qualification in Europe at this time. However, Kennedy and Ferguson were determined to ensure that there would be the maximum of flexibility within this structure and that all workshops, equipment and resources would be available when needed, irrespective of which class a student had signed up to. This was abetted through Kennedy appointing staff for the workshops who shared similar views about art, for example Wally Brannen who had taken ideas from conceptual art into his ceramics practice.

Hence the pedagogy that was created was one where skills were available à la carte, ideas and process dominated and students learned to justify and explain their work in relation to contemporary art and recent art history. The gulf between critical discourse in the studio and in complementary studies or art history found at the time at other institutions just did not exist at NSCAD, where the two were inseparable (Baker, 1982). Although the artwork and discourse might include a critique of the institutions of the art world, it rarely included issues beyond art, the artist or the artist’s body and a post-Greenbergian critique. This gradually changed; from 1973 classes were being offered in semiotics. In following years the range of issues would broaden, as developments at CalArts were absorbed into NSCAD’s pedagogy.

CalArts

Although ostensibly founded in 1961, CalArts only became a reality nine years later when a single campus was provided which accommodated not only the merged Los Angeles Conservatory of Music and the Chouinard Art Instituate, but also Schools in other arts disciplines. Because of delays in building the new campus at Valencia, it was first found a temporary home in a former girls’ school in 1970 and moved to its permanent home the following year (Hertz, 2003).

Despite being funded and overseen by the conservative Disney family, CalArts was radical in outlook and this was reinforced by its situation in southern California at the epicentre of global counter-culture at that time. If this was to lead to occasional bouts of whimsy, it was far outweighed by a firm commitment to action and radical ideas. The overall ethos was one of professionalism, despite a commonplace use of marijuana (Fischl and Stone, 2012).

Although it might not have become the institution the Disney family intended, two of their aims proved to be influential. It had been expected to become a kind of trade school producing skilled workers for the film industry and if this didn’t come about, a strong vocational mission was retained. Following Disney’s idea of a range of artists collaborating in making a film (especially an animated film), interdisciplinary practice lay at the heart of its mission, whereby artists in a range of arts disciplines would be learning from each other. In the event, there turned out to be only limited interaction between its various Schools. However, an interdisciplinary ethos was always important within the School of Art.

Paul Brach was appointed Dean of the School of Art in 1970 and embraced the opportunity to start a new art school, unencumbered by history. He considered Black Mountain College to be an important precedent and was aware of NSCAD, where he himself was to be a visiting member of the faculty four years later. In a striking parallel with Kennedy’s arrival at NSCAD, Brach dismissed almost all of the existing Chouinard faculty and made his own appointments (Hertz, 2003). It was on these that much of the subsequent success of CalArts depended. However, unlike at NSCAD, he wanted the faculty to represent a plurality of positions about contemporary art. Key appointments included his partner Miriam Schapiro (who in turn brought in Judy Chicago); Allan Kaprow; Nam June Paik and John Baldessari.

Bringing in so many strong personalities with competing views was a high risk strategy and could have led to a destructive form of in fighting. In the event, accounts of what happened report a healthy, if highly competitive atmosphere, where the art you made had to be justified in relation to all the other competing positions and everyone was trying to impress the others (Fishl and Stone, 2012, Schor, 2011). Camps coalesced around Fluxus, performance art, post-minimalist conceptualism known as post-studio, painting and feminist art (Fischl and Stone, 2012, 54), although it would be wrong to think of these as always mutually exclusive.

No matter which position you adopted, as at NSCAD ideas were crucial. However, the justification had to be much more exacting and carried out in a highly charged environment. For example, nobody could be a painter without addressing the accusation that they were engaged in a pursuit which was elitist, anti-feminist, anti-minorities and irrelevant to contemporary culture (Fischl and Stone, 2012).

The main formal, pedagogic tool CalArts adopted to interrogate work was the crit. Although far from being new, at CalArts this was transformed into the expanded crit. In the expanded crit, how to be an artist had to be learned through being able to hold your own in the face of intense and lengthy interrogation, which has been likened to a gladiatorial contest (Hertz, 2003). It is hardly surprising therefore that whereas many thrived in this competitive environment, as Ciment (2011) points out, others who were less driven or confident fell by the wayside.

In accord with its vocational ethos, students were never referred to as such, but instead as fellow artists or mentees (Baldessari, 2011). In keeping with this appellation, they were expected to take responsibility for obtaining any skills or knowledge they might need. As at NSCAD, skills were only taught when requested and the creed of CalArts was: no information before need (Schor, 2011). It also shared with NSCAD an academic structure which had no grades (Ciment, 2011).

Baledessari’s post-studio class shared many preoccupations with NSCAD, with a concentration on conceptual art and media such as photography, film and video. In common with NSCAD, he felt he had responsibility to keep ‘mentees’ informed of all the latest developments, either through texts and images or, if possible, by bringing in artists (Hertz, 2003). He didn’t share NSCAD’s uncompromising hostility to the commercial art world and encouraged his students to devise strategies for success (Lacey, 2011). Even by the standards of an institution known for its expanded crits, his could be especially exacting. Although soft spoken, he could be unrelenting in asking questions.

At this time, critical theory was only making marginal inroads into art theory and played no more than a small part in the discourse at CalArts (Schor, 1997). It is reported that Baldessari was fond of quoting Wittgenstein and had a certain familiarity with French structuralism (Fischl and Stone, 2012). Nevertheless, this didn’t stretch to his doubting a linear view of art history which led inexorably to post-studio conceptualism (Baldessari, 2011). Rather than reference Derrida et al., students would be more likely to connect their own art to current and recent art practice (Schor, 2011). Issues beyond high art did find their way into the post-studio class and the Californian context probably led to a particular interest in popular culture and appropriation. At the time he believed this activity put them at the head of the avant garde; looking back he saw this much more as the beginning of postmodern art practice (Baldessari, 2011).

While Baldessari’s contribution to CalArts continues to be celebrated, other initiatives tend to be overlooked (Schor, 2009). None was more important than the Feminist Art Program, led by Schapiro and Chicago and based in part on what Chicago had instigated the year before at Fresno State College. At a time and place where debate was concentrated on art, this not only explored women’s historic and current place within the art world, but also many issues to do with women’s role within society and family, their sexuality, the menstrual cycle, patriarchy etc. These issues came to find their way into their art (Schor, 2009). The pedagogy adopted on this Program owed much to Paulo Friere and his belief in education as empowerment, liberation and a challenge to power (Lacey, 2011). Schapiro (1989) tells how, as she taught this class, her approach to teaching changed from instruction to facilitation.

To some students Schapiro and Chicago appeared too domineering (Schor, 2011). However, it is almost certain that without this kind of personality they could never accomplished what they did. After all, at this time male students at CalArts were given the best studios and the lion’s share of resources as a matter of course, so ingrained was the patriarchy. This wasn’t something that only happened there: it was normal in those days (Ciment, 2011). The very fact of drawing attention to these issues and to the place of women in art history was highly unusual and ground breaking.

The most celebrated manifestation of the Feminist Art Program was Womanhouse. In 1971, a soon to be demolished house in Hollywood was first renovated by those on the Program and its rooms then divided up as spaces for students, some women faculty and three other invited artists to develop site-specific work. A house was chosen as it provided an opportunity to examine and criticise woman’s traditional confinement within a domestic space (Wilding, 1977). The media used varied from installation to performance to painting. Many but not all of the works were collaborative. Overall the renovation and mounting of the exhibition involved a great deal of teamwork, which was in contrast to the usual stress on individuality in an art school at that time (Sider, 2010). The content was ground breaking, in being the first ever major public exhibition of feminist art (Wilding, 1977). The fact that Womanhouse isn’t better known tells a lot about the continued influence of patriarchy. Not only was it important as art, but it extended the pedagogy developed at NSCAD in the Projects Class into a new dimension and was the precursor of the now ubiquitous off-campus, group project.

The Feminist Art Program cut across other divisions at CalArts: you could be a feminist and also a performance artist, a conceptual artist, a painter etc. (Schor, 2009). A lasting legacy of CalArts has been a pedagogy suited to these cross-currents and as time has shown, able to accommodate the complex series of channels and tributaries which make up the delta of contemporary art.

Conclusion

NSCAD and CalArts had much in common (Hertz, 2003). Both art schools started afresh. Both tied all they did closely to the latest trends in contemporary art, in which they were not so much following as participating. CalArts took a more pluralistic view of contemporary art and moreover was the springboard for feminist art. They both adopted a pedagogy which has since become commonplace. All the same, there are important differences. At first NSCAD based its pedagogy on conceptual art tout court. By contrast, CalArts developed it into the plural form more familiar today. In this form traditional media can co-exist with an expanded field of practice, with the essential proviso that whichever medium or position is adopted it has to be justified and explained. While the learning of practical skills has often become voluntary or on demand, the one essential skill demanded is the ability to talk in an informed way about process, context and outcome of an artwork. CalArts insisted that students develop an intellectual framework for their art (Fischl and Stone, 2012) and this has become an established requirement in art schools everywhere. This applies no matter what kind of art is being produced, be it conceptual, self-expressive, formalist, traditional or anything else.

If it wasn’t until the 1980s that critical theory had a widespread influence on art education, CalArts was pointing the way through feminist theory and some references to theory made in the post-studio classes. It is also pertinent that by 1973, NSCAD was offering classes in semiotics while Rick James, who succeeded Charlotte Townsend-Gault as Director of the Mezzanine Gallery the same year, was a key force in introducing critical theory to NSCAD.

There were regular exchanges of key faculty between the two institutions, including Kennedy and Ferguson going to Cal Arts in 1973-4 and Brach and Schapiro coming to NSCAD in 1974, while Askevold was later to join the faculty of CalArts. In 1974, two CalArts MFA graduates Mira Schor and Eric Fischl were appointed by NSCAD, both of whom were painters, while Schor had also been part of the Feminist Art Program. All this toing and froing probably contributed to NSCAD adapting its pedagogy so that, like at CalArts, the expanded field of practice sat alongside traditional media in a more plural version of its conceptual pedagogy.

However, in one respect the two institutions remained different, almost like two sides of a coin. While CalArts, with its competitive atmosphere and vocational focus proved a good training ground for success in the commercial art world, NSCAD was much more ambivalent to the art market. On the other hand, NSCAD was very conducive to experimentation. Artists liked to visit NSCAD and take advantage of such things as its lithography workshop and (then) state of the art video facilities and try out new ways of working. With the formation of its own press in 1973, artists were presented with another vehicle with which to explain and interrogate their work. Although at this time art as research was yet to be formally recognised as such, the NSCAD model, with its responsibility to the discipline and its encouragement of different ways to develop practice and articulate this, can be seen as a precursor of the practice-based research degree. Meanwhile, CalArts was a precursor of the art school as a launch pad for art stars.

So much of what was devised at these two institutions has now become commonplace, such as visiting artists programmes, student travel and a pluralistic definition of fine art. Most of all, however, their influence has been through the pedagogy they developed. Although the innovations were based on two longstanding learning tools: problem solving and the crit, they developed these and the curriculum so that, at the time, they were quite unlike any other art school. Today, the pedagogy they pioneered would be familiar in all but the most entrenched and conservative art schools throughout the world.
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