URBAN STUDIO – GUGULETHU HOPE:

Discovering spaces of engaged learning in Cape Town

Kathryn Ewing[1]

Architecture, Planning and Geomatics – Urban Design, University of Cape Town
kathryn.ewing@uct.ac.za

ABSTRACT:

Co-design, engaged scholarship and creative learning during a time of deep uncertainty are at the core of this paper. *Urban Studio – Gugulethu Hope* (Studio Hope) is a design-research studio that shapes an on-going and collaborative *space of learning* in Cape Town. Studio Hope was initiated within a taught urban design studio project in 2020 through a series of participatory workshops (urban talks) and site walk-abouts (urban walks) as part of the University of Cape Town Master of Urban Design (MUD) Programme. The studio exposed informal networks in Gugulethu that inspired the (re)design of public space into vibrant, safe places as youth platforms (transformative spaces) for expression and dialogue. The aim of this paper is to untangle the shifting landscape from community engaged learning to the virtual realm of the 2020 studio through three key progressions. Firstly, it investigates a practice of *exploration – to explore*, involving interactive learning through social mapping (off-grid) of everyday place-making and use of in-between urban space in Gugulethu. The students focused on understanding the changing micro-spaces of the city through a series of themes on everyday culture, education, and safety. Secondly, the paper unpacks the concept of *disruption – to disrupt*. This unsettles the debate on urban issues beyond the academy in a quest to co-produce knowledge through a co-design workshop with students, community representatives, youth, and facilitators. Lastly, it reviews *discovery – to discover*, representing the crafting of design through student work in a new age of technology. Studio Hope attempted to decolonise the curriculum of urban design whilst critically reframing the pedagogy of experiential design-research in context, time, and space. The outcomes seek to nourish the imagination of design-research situated within community engaged learning whilst grappling with the impact of the remote cyber world in a Covid-19 landscape.

KEY WORDS

Engaged learning; curriculum development; co-design; challenging practice; urban design pedagogy

LANDING TEACHING AND LEARNING: AN INTRODUCTION

Morning star, wake up, wake up; the sun ain't up. Wash, rush, dressing, rush.
Toot, toot jumping into amaphela, jumping out at the taxi rank, long commute across the
urban thresholds, donning our Christian names.
The long walk, the trains are not churning.
Walking home from school, both parents working. After school, soccer, library.
Socializing with friends, meandering home alone, navigating between the goats and traffic.
No bedtime stories, no home rules.
Long day at work, no time to cook. Working night shift, come home early.
Midweek break, letting your hair down. Jazz lounge.
Meat market. Chick feet snacks on every corner. Fresh dripping 'yumminess'.
Church on Sundays. Church on every day.
Don't go to the cemetery, let our ancestors rest. Their ears are sore from our wailing.
Ululations. Perceptions changing.
Mining for TV parts next to the river. It is rough, it is raw.
The river flows to the ground. The ground does not care for us.
What is the point of complaining?
Viva politics, fanning her face with a gifted hand fan, circa '94.

In 2020, a design-research studio, known as 'Urban Studio – Gugulethu Hope' (commonly referred to as Studio Hope) in Cape Town. It is taught within the post-graduate Master of Urban Design (MUD) Programme in the School of Architecture, Planning and Geomatics (APG) at the University of Cape Town (UCT). Studio Hope exposed students to the urban lived realities of residents in the neighbourhood of Gugulethu. 'Raw pride' was a poem written by urban design students reflecting on their observations based on urban walks through Gugulethu, prior to lockdown and the impact of the Covid-19 on the city. The poem speaks of the perceptions and precarious relationships between people and place, present and past, politics and power. What happens when the train does not move, or the child walks home alone from school? Where and how do we map these spaces that hold moments in the day (and night) and for whom?

Studio Hope provided an opening to engage in complex topics of the divided city and reappropriation of urban space in Gugulethu. The studio uncovered informal networks that inspired the (re)design of public space into vibrant, safe places as youth platforms, or transformative space for expression and dialogue. A city that plans differently (versus a planned city) embraces views of citizens and academics (and multiple stakeholders), allowing us to realise the intersection of the ordinary and the extraordinary through understanding "complex patterning of socio-spatial change after apartheid..." (Harrison & Zack, 2014). Through an integrated design process of studio methodology or what we called 'progressions': *explore*, *disrupt,* and *discover* (and *represent*), urban design students, community youth representatives and fieldwork tutors of Gugulethu generated a narrative around the (re)making of public space. The themes made visible were *everyday culture*, *education,* and *safety*. These progressions and themes build on the idea of local pride in public space and hope emerging from the studio explorations in Gugulethu.

The purpose of this paper is to untangle the co-produced knowledge into a tangible reading of Studio Hope to inform debate and guide future design-research studios. The nature of engaged learning and the move to a remote online platform raised two key questions around pedagogy and curriculum development in 2020. What is the value of community engaged learning in the urban design programme

and the impact beyond the academy? How do we incorporate a sense of social design thinking into the remote, virtual world of teaching and learning devoid of human contact and work on the ground? These questions are explored through the lens of decentring the academy and the progressions of Studio Hope. It highlights a significant time for the academy to radically review the urban design curriculum and pedagogy that questions the injustices of the past, whilst enabling the design of safe spaces in our city. More significantly, *why*, and *how* do we teach concepts of spatial justice and socially responsive design within a time of deep uncertainty?

INTERSECTIONS OF (IM)POSSIBILITY IN A TIME OF UNCERTAINTY

Spatial justice and urban representation of marginalised neighbourhoods are critical for the healing and resilience of Cape Town. Combined with this, the urban debate has never been more relevant in the face of global crisis. The coronavirus pandemic is fundamentally urban space related, from the scale of the individual to an ever-growing sweep of the virus in our cities. The spread is determined by human movement and social interaction in place, starkly displaying the disparity of living conditions, access to resources and support mechanisms. The Covid-19 landscape has revealed visible displacement and a switch in foreground theories and policies to the background realities and actions in the most vulnerable spaces of the city, including unsettling the spaces of learning in the university.

DE-CENTRING THE ACADEMIC / ACADEMY: TRANSITIONS IN IDENTITY

The current displacement of everyday life has upset the epistemology of the university[1]. It has challenged the *space, time*, and *identity* within the community of scholars and students. The academy appears to be moving off-centre allowing for a time to recalibrate towards a collective future. Experimentation and innovation are at the forefront of this thinking, combined with sustained engagement and agency of care. The shift to the emergency remote teaching online questioned the authority and colonial trace within the university, bringing to the fore the often-avoided questions of race, class, gender, and institutional hierarchy. However, at the same time it allowed for deliberation around personal difference and the ideas of local, joint solutions, bringing the way we engage around diversity to the debate. In essence, asking the bigger 'why' questions of learning. There is an urgency for curriculum change and a shake-up of pedagogy that inherently disrupts the academy. This has allowed for the critique of the status quo and to channel the de-centred academic / academy in a changing identity, introducing new ways of communication, pedagogic relationships, ethical behaviour, and political commitments. This does not come without educational and institutional risks combined with the unknowns around artificial intelligence and the fifth industrial revolution. For the academy, 2020 changed teaching, learning and assessment. In retrospect, it unleashed a critical reflection on rethinking the values, content, and structure of learning, linked to Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4 – quality education and inclusion.

In addition, the role of the academic in 2020 transferred from lecturer to teacher, facilitator, mediator, and translator, shifting the ego into a decolonial pedagogy and landing in social practice. Teachers are engaging more systematically about 'how' they teach concepts and content. Connecting with students in different ways has allowed a new respect for the reality of learning (and home) environments and

---

[1] Inspiration from a presentation from Professor Liz Lange at the University of Cape Town Teaching and Learning Conference 2020, entitled "De-centring the academic: Preliminary reflections on academic identity and the university in the 21st century", held on 18 September 2020 online.

thereby influencing (where possible) the support and resources provided. This includes a new understanding of student vulnerability and access, which is often hidden in the physical classroom environment. McMillan (2017) notes, "Transformation also has to be about building new models of teaching and learning that position educators and learners in new relationships – to each other, to knowledge, and to the world beyond the university" (p.161). Resulting in co-creation (Longo, 2013).

RESET / REFRAME: INVESTMENT IN COLLECTIVE KNOWLEDGE BEYOND THE ACADEMY

Prior to impact of 'lockdown', there was an intent to create an engaged and change-orientated studio. The concept was to prepare urban design students to understand, interpret, analyse informality, uncertain situations and complex locations. From the beginning, the students were seen as proactive and engaged global citizens delving into context-specific challenges as "reflective practitioners" (Schön, 1995; Winkler, 2013) through a series of *progressions* or stages of design. In a sense, what Longo (2013) identifies as a "deliberative pedagogy in the community" (p.1), bringing together three overlapping ways of teaching and learning as "…a collaborative approach that melds deliberative dialogue, community engagement and democratic education" (p.2, 3). McMillan (2017) argues, "Creating deliberate spaces for deep and engaged learning is a challenging but critical task if higher education is to play a role in graduating socially conscious professionals who can act as caring and empathetic citizens" (p.159). Unbeknown to the convener at the time, that the reality of the crisis of Covid-19 would take effect halfway into the studio course in 2020, intensifying *design for resilience and care*.

"…Engaged scholarship is the *how* it is done, and for the common or public good" (Sandmann, 2009)(p.3), not forgetting the *where*, in context and *what* is learned (Longo, 2013). This paper does not intend on unpacking the theory of engaged scholarship (Boyer, 1996; Eatman et al., 2018; Hale, 2008; Nagar, 2002), but recognises Sandman's (2009) push for "multisided conversations between scholarly and the practitioner communities to broaden horizons and improve lives" (p.1). To quote Meyers (2006) suggestion to "engage outwards" beyond academia, extended to what Oldfield (2007) refers to as "multiple conversations" (p.104), including academic disciplines and beyond to include policy and power, people and place. Hearing the intersections of many voices through deliberation. Badat (2013) argues, "…community engagement is increasingly an accepted social responsibility and activity of the universities" (p.1). Although there is growing acknowledgement and literature on engaged learning (Brown-Luthango, 2013) and increasing support for social responsiveness with UCT, it still remains in the background of *teaching* in the design field. Funding is difficult to source for fieldworkers, community stipends, local venues, and site work. Where funding is provided, small scale budgets and cash payments (for example, compensation for data to upload live information) are arduous to resolve through conventional institutional structures. Technology is difficult to access on the ground, nor financially supported (for example, provision of decent smart phones for community members to map and record the local context). As experienced by other global studios conducting similar situated learning experiences, *access, safety* and *logistics* remain unnecessarily convoluted (Owen, Dovey, & Raharjo, 2013).

The recommendation from the academy was to form *partnerships* between the university and communities to overcome such issues, but partnerships are complicated (Bourner, 2010). The concept of *partnership* or *collaboration* may be considered on a ranging scale starting at communication (ad hoc) to cooperating (informing), to formalising actions (sharing information) to formal recognition and

shared strategies, to an integrated approach or trusted and continuous partnership of collaboration[2]. This takes many years of trust building, beyond a twelve-week studio to be "conscious of the interweaving theories with collaborative methodologies; to produce knowledge that can travel across borders of academia, NGO's, or people's movements; and to reimagine reciprocity in collaboration" (Oldfield, 2015)(p.2075).

Entry into communities is sometimes unrealistic and requires respect from the outset. Engagements are frequently governed by good will and informal agreements. In addition, many academics are not trained in this field of community participation and end-up in constant negotiations. "Mutual learning" (Friedmann, 1987) is sometimes not equal, unless carefully facilitated. This links to Sandercock's (2003) "different ways of knowing"; knowing through dialogue, knowing in action, knowing from experience, learning from local knowledge, learning to read from symbolic and nonverbal evidence, and learning through contemplative or appreciative knowledge (Winkler, 2013)(p. 225). The dilemma of co-producing (and co-writing) knowledge is dense, loaded with expectation (Joosse et al., 2020), let alone the co-production of physical space (public space upgrade). Altogether, resulting in a journey of engaged learning that is hard to make visible and trusted, and sustainable for the future. So what does this mean?

'UNLEARNING' THE WAYS OF LEARNING: BREAKING DOWN THE ACADEMIC WALLS

Emergency remote teaching (ERT) during the pandemic lockdown, combined with other moments in time, Black Lives Matter (BLM), Rhodes Must Fall (RMF) and Fees Must Fall (FMF) movements have radically challenged the intersections and spaces of learning across the globe and in South Africa. "In streets and public spaces, acts of protest and resistance demonstrate ordinary people questioning power, and naming and shaming injustice" (Oldfield, 2015). In many ways exposing the lack of change in the institution on the public platform. Uncovering extreme inequality and insecurity of students and academics has allowed the ethical and political status quo to be challenged in a decolonial trajectory. However, we need to be careful not to isolate such instances of activism in the academy but consider accountability and positioning of knowledge in the current institutional terrain. The pandemic authorised the potential to break down the walls of impossibility and open the dialogue on topics that were previously taboo conversations. Reflection on the 'unlearning' of the ways of learning brings what we previously called 'radical' into mainstream thinking (Driscoll & Sandmann, 2016). Hereby, creating urgent transformative spaces of learning. The new age of technology is also under question as rapid change has been hard to keep track of the nuances in the learning sphere. 2020 turned the design teaching platform upside-down from an interactive community learning, seminar-style studio to a remote form of learning through a computer screen – "zooming into the blue". Technology forced us to be in a different space. The disappearance of a linear timetable allowed for abstract progressions of action and activities by both student and facilitator. There was a sense of freedom to engage in learning external to the physical space and time requirements, albeit confusing and sometimes too flexible.

As argued by Hamdi (2004), even under 'normal' circumstances, there are often confusing boundaries between design teaching of the academy and the social environment. The studio (face-to-face or online) world is ordered, rigorous with deadlines and structure, embedded in complex theory and ideals. In today's world, "The connection between democracy and education has been confined to the classroom…

---

[2] The author's experience on the Violence Prevention through Urban Upgrading (VPUU) Programme in Cape Town and understanding of the term 'collaboration' as a measurement scale when working on projects funded by Comic Relief and workshops with Triple Line Consulting in 2013.

making civic learning a more theoretical exercise…" undermining "…the many assets of neighbourhood and community institutions for learning" (Longo, 2013)(p.4). The outside world is diverse with uncertainty, linked to everyday concrete realities, constantly adapting and 'making do'. It is at the intersection of these disparate worlds where innovation and experimentation have the potential to occur if carefully facilitated. As Campbell (2012) debates, "Few contest that planning operates at the interface of knowledge and action" (p.135). Yet, the tension within this intersecting realm is overpowering.

SPACES OF LEARNING: URBAN STUDIO – GUGULETHU HOPE

The MUD programme convener was approached by two community members from Gugulethu, namely Nontsika Mnotoza and Xolile Ndzoyi[3] to form a project partnership in 2019. Nontsika had conducted fieldwork with architectural students since 2015 and was aware of the teaching style of the built environment studios. Xolile had a keen interest in facilitating and upgrading a space for the youth in Gugulethu, known as *Gugulethu Wall of Hope* [4]. The project was envisaged as a 20-metre-long wall, creating a platform for the youth to express their challenges and messages of hope. The project has the potential for the implementation of an experimental design-build public space. This collaboration with local representatives, subsequently known as 'fieldwork tutors', enabled community engaged learning and deliberate dialogue to be placed centre of the studio. Seven youth members were interested in working with urban design students and so Studio Hope emerged and became a visible practice or space of learning. This provided the beginnings of a *collaboration* and a *context to the context,* but also an understanding of the influence of people in shaping spaces in urban society (Mehrotra, Vera, & Mayoral, 2017). Within this practice, the original questions of design for resilience and urban transformation in a time of uncertainty became more pertinent than ever.

There was a deliberate intent to teach urban design to students to critically engage in issues of spatial justice (Soja, 2010) and the just city (Fainstein, 2010) within the urban everyday context. The original course objective of Studio Hope was to encourage *interdisciplinary collaborations* within and beyond the academy, where integrated *co-design approaches* involved joint decision-making processes. The idea was to produce design projects that tested *scenario-orientated* typologies and practical spatial strategies for resilient urban spaces. Thereby pushing innovative ideas into practice. This process encouraged anticipating potential solutions for implementation, such as the Wall of Hope. The setting of the local neighbourhood area scale was considered ideal where contextual issues could be fully acknowledged. However, as the studio unfolded, there was a need to adapt as the lockdown had an impact on the original ideas, form of engagement and progressions over time.

EXPLORE: LEARNING TO MAP OFF-GRID TO REVEAL EVERYDAY URBAN SPACE

Exploration – to explore, the initial phase of Studio Hope, Part A – Interactive Learning in Term 1 of 2020, was deeply grounded in the lived experience and everyday reality giving an evidence-based understanding of how neighbourhoods work and transform. It situated the design-research in a context

---

[3] Nontsika Mnotoza conducted fieldwork with APG – Master of Architecture students over a period of time from 2015 to 2018. Xolile Ndzoyi is a representative of the Gugulethu Youth Development Council – GDYC and local leader. The author met Xolile in 2014 as part of practice work on the Violence Prevention through Urban Upgrading Programme (VPUU) GUNYA (Gugulethu-Nyanga) project.

[4] In 2017 the Gugulethu Youth Development Council (GYDC) identified "ERF 8743" (in Gugulethu), which is situated next to the Gugulethu Police Station and College of Cape Town (see: *https://www.change.org/p/city-of-cape-town-petition-tobuild-a-gugulethu-wall-of-hope-to-inspire-the-youth*). The GYDC submitted an inquiry to the City of Cape Town to use the empty portion of land. The City of Cape Town have the potential to be co-partners through ward council and IDP funding.

of engaged discourse – with design as the core discipline that integrated the findings (Angelil & Hebel, 2016). Drawing and mapping are methods of communication of urban design, a way of representing the world in space and time (Vaughan, 2018). Many works have been conducted on the mapping of urban life, but these are largely isolated to the Global North, such as Gelh's (Gehl, 2013) research on how to study public life in Europe and Lynch's empirical research (1960) and Scott-Brown's (1990) teaching and practice in American cities. Although the theory is beyond this paper, it is acknowledged that social mapping holds the potential for radical enquiry and activist engagement to illustrate the in-between occupation of space and informal activities experienced in the Global South context (Atmodiwirjo, Johanes, & Yatmo, 2019; Mogel & Bhagat, 2008). Maps can illustrate the social infrastructure of the city, revealing people's connections, stories and experience in their local environment (Vis, 2018). If they are co-produced, maps can act as a means for activism, conviviality, networking, and collective urban design strategies.

The studio course (5083F) was aligned with an urban design representation course (4052F), which was also an elective course for architectural honours students in 2020. Learning the basic tools on social mapping was a focus of the representation course content, the 'how' of mapping in a context where you need to generate off-grid data. The coming together of these two courses, complimented by engaged learning, was important in the overall urban design programme. Interactive social mapping of urban transformation based on public space in Gugulethu was the preparatory groundwork to progress to the next phase of engagement. Working with community expanded the choice of representation of the city. The idea in Studio Hope was to capture and illustrate the youth's perceptions, culture, 'swag' or lived experience of the city, especially key gathering spaces, and collective places, commonly known in western terminology as 'public space'. It questioned how the youth negotiate the city and situated where they 'hang out'. Social mapping and community engagement offered a methodology to describe socio-spatial emergence and conflict, previously unmapped.

Two aspects formed part of the exploration through mapping. Gugulethu *urban walks*[5] were an element of participant observation on the ground through different site visits to the north and the south of Gugulethu. The urban walks were guided by local fieldwork tutors and youth members. Collective local knowledge and insights changed the way the students noticed, sketched, and photographed the environment. Gugulethu *urban talks*[6] were a series of small focus groups and heated discussions around a map at a local venue. These occurred both before or after an urban walk to debrief or ignite discussion. The focus was to understand the changing micro-spaces, off-grid, or unmapped spaces of the city via plans, diagrams, video, music, poetry and so on, bringing insights gained into creative play. The outcome was a series of theme-based maps on *everyday culture, education,* and *safety*. These maps however, raised more questions than answers.

DISRUPT: LEARNING TO NEGOTIATE DIFFERENCE AND COPRODUCE KNOWLEDGE

Design-research as a tool and practice towards scenario planning is a neglected field of study (Prominski & Seggern, 2019; Selin, Kimbell, Ramirez, & Bhatti, 2015). As promoted by Angelil & Hebel (2016),

---

[5] The concept of 'urban walks' was adapted from engagement with Dar-es-Salaam City Lab – Dr Priscila Izar on a course in 2020 entitled Urban Design Theory II. The intention into 2021 is to create a collaboration of urban walks between Cape Town and Dar-es-Salaam, sharing live information from the ground.

[6] The concept of 'urban talks' was an outcome of the Studio Hope project to be taken forward into 2021. This includes a series of podcasts and live interviews with community representatives in Gugulethu and students.

scenario-orientated design-research includes "… a workshop setting in which concepts are tested through specific design propositions, aiming for a synthesis of findings from an array of fields." Gugulethu is seen as a studio design-research laboratory, working with the youth and key stakeholders. Friedmann (2007) argues that the strength of a region is its people and their ways of life and "engaging local citizens in a common effort by giving them a stake in society of which they are a part". The idea was that young people were part of the integrated process from the university and the community, coming together in spaces of learning to conceive transformative places. Studio Hope varied workshops taking place within Gugulethu and on campus. This allowed for the group work to be action-orientated, whilst sharing knowledge through local ideas to create solutions for public space development.

The core concept of *disrupt* was highlighted in a co-design workshop on campus. This involved 45 students, 6 youth, 2 fieldwork tutors, 6 staff facilitators on 06 March 2020. The workshop crossed vertically with honours and masters students, and staff within APG; and horizontally within the disciplines of urban design, landscape architecture, planning and architecture, divided into five groups. The urban design students remained constant at the centre of each group as key change-makers or group leaders, in preparation for practice. Each group also consisted of a youth representative and either a fieldwork tutor and/or facilitator/s. The planning and landscape architecture students linked to their theory groups from their studio project and were also joined by architectural students from the urban design representation elective. Hereby, forming an interdisciplinary and collaborative co-design workshop setting.

Three challenges delivered throughout the day unhinged the dialogue into a series of dynamic outputs represented in a large 3-D model format. There were five 'slices' of context, one for each group, that in the end formed one extensive map / model of Gugulethu. The first challenge opened the day with design upfront – dreaming of the design of public space. The groups were given specific details around each slice (for example one group were given a budget from a local councillor and so on). The task was to brainstorm ideas and make quick decisions by 'doing'. The second challenge brought the notion of risks to the table. Each group was given a separate scenario (for example one group had to design a temporary event space to entertain the president for a day and so on). The third task in the afternoon required each group to review the design and create a network of public space when they brought the slices together as one neighbourhood. The five groups needed to negotiate and trade space for their designs to link, integrate or even upset their neighbours. The outcome focused on the design of a strategic spatial and active framework for Gugulethu. The making of the framework involved an exploration into both timeless qualities, unknown probabilities, and contextually relevant factors through scenario planning. It unsettled the debate on urban issues beyond the academy in a quest to co-produce knowledge through the workshop and collectively imagine an activated and layered local network.

DISCOVER: LEARNING TO DESIGN A NETWORK OF SAFE SPACES

The pandemic had a major impact on the urban studio conducted in 2020, although the outcomes from interactions and co-design from the first term in Part A were used (partially) as a catalyst for knowledge production going forward. The second phase of Studio Hope, Part B – Remote Learning in Term 2, moved to the emergency-remote teaching space online during the midst of the first wave of the pandemic lockdown. The five urban design students were joined by six colleagues from the Master of Landscape Architecture programme to form one interdisciplinary team to *discover* the process of design. The idea was that the urban design students carried the knowledge from the first phase and were encouraged to form a collaborative platform with the landscape students, simulating a form of practice.

The studio moved down in scales to a more focused area in the south of Gugulethu adjacent to the Nyanga Junction Railway Station. Three groups were formed around overlapping, yet unique context areas (yellow, blue, and red). Each student worked on an area in detail related to an interest or theme or contextual setting. This also allowed for smaller groups for studio design engagement on zoom on Mondays. This stage ran for six weeks, with six mini-presentations or bite-sized products for collective review as one studio group on Friday mornings on zoom.

We maintained connection, although sparse, with the youth and fieldwork tutors into the second phase of the work. A what's app group allowed for exchange of stories and photographs of life in Gugulethu during lockdown. However, extreme conditions of lockdown in Level 4 and 5, lack of connection, expensive data and limited access to technology hampered a more engaged design outcome in July. The final phase of the studio focused on individual student work and outputs towards an online exam portfolio as the final product Studio Hope.

CONCLUSION: Turning Point

The experiences and consequences from the Studio Hope space of learning provoked a turning point to critically rethink the pedagogy, curriculum, and context for the urban design programme, beyond the two courses. Two concluding reference points are offered as a frame for further review. *Firstly*, Studio Hope embraced experiential, collaborative design as part of the process of critical thinking, understanding change and transformation in our city from reality. This builds on Longo's (2013) concept of a deliberative pedagogy. The hope was for "students to become more sensitive to the everyday hardships faced by many residents in the cities we study" (Winkler, 2013)(p.215), whilst also crafting creativity through an integrated design progression. "As cities are in a constant state of flux, the design of anticipated developments offers a viable means of identifying, and possibly directing, forthcoming urban transformations" (Angelil & Hebel, 2016) (p. 18). The impact of Covid-19 amplified the urgency of understanding viable alternative solutions for the design of resilient places in Gugulethu, but spaces that are also designed with empathy and care in a time of confusion. *Secondly*, after the implications of lockdown, the implementation of technological change allowed for project-based learning to produce creative works as digital outputs, including film, animation, virtual portfolios, and online studio reviews. The view was to harness the power of technology, whilst acknowledging the invasion and inaccessibility of the virtual world. Lessons, both positive and challenging, from each design progression of *explore, disrupt,* and *discover* have been partially digested and filtered in preparation for a new studio to be held in 2021.

Nevertheless, even though the initial component of Studio Hope was participatory and involved processes that questioned progressions of design, the *urban voices* were lost in translation from the change to a new way of engaging online. The co-produced knowledge felt displaced between Part A and Part B. Context, representation, and language matter, whether that is online or in a studio setting. Sensitive translation and miscommunication or the result of misunderstanding of design input resulted in mixed messages and a multitude of interpretation in Part B of the studio, even though the creative outcomes were of high quality and good design. Conclusions from the social mappings and urban walks and community narratives from the urban talks of the design progressions explore were further neglected. The adaptation to online learning distracted the dynamic inputs from the co-design workshop. The outcomes of the workshop were not spatialised onto 2D drawings as this occurred at the crux of lockdown, leaving the large 3D model in the studio on campus, inaccessible other than photographs from the day. The students also quickly moved out of the collective group work from Part A into the

individual space online in Part B. The intended Gugulethu exhibition or representation of creative works never materialised, not even in an online format. Both the studio and representation courses ended in virtual exam presentations, excluding the community from participation due to lack of technology, resources, and funding during lockdown. The design of the Wall of Hope public space project did not emerge from the process, but not forgotten or as Xolile recently said in a zoom session, "lets co-create spaces that have meaning".

There is a cautious intention to revisit the content and products of the studio, including the 3D model and social maps and collect this information into digital format to reauthor and revive the work in 2021. Since there has been time to adapt to the idea that we are living and continue to live in a pandemic, there had been a mind shift from fieldwork tutors, students, and facilitators to allow for a flexible framework around a deliberate pedagogy. Further, questioning the concept of collaboration between communities and the academy in the 21st century space of learning. These approaches require a deeper understanding of the relationships between students, community, and the academy in addressing issues of vulnerability, access, and resources.

The lessons have guided the urban design approach into a more blended or mixed teaching model under the term used by UCT of physically distanced learning (PDL) within a post graduate teaching and learning framework. The motivation is to reframe urban design teaching as a *just pedagogy* with a *contextually relevant* and *socially engaged curriculum*. At the core of the urban design learning approach is an expanded socio-spatial and critically reflective practice interested in the co-production of places and spaces, practically, ethically, and theoretically. There is renewed emphasis to embrace the technology on offer and review learning and representation in a digital format within and beyond the programme. This expands to engaging with technology in the community. The idea is to continue local mapping by the community but using smart phone apps and recording of the local context and urban voices to a live, digital platform, continuing the Gugulethu walks and talks, but with a difference.

REFERENCES

Angelil, M. M., & Hebel, D. (2016). *Cities of change, Addis Ababa: Transformation strategies for urban territories in the 21st century* (Second and revised edition. ed.). Basel, Switzerland: Birkhäuser.

Atmodiwirjo, P., Johanes, M., & Yatmo, Y. A. (2019). Mapping stories: Representing urban everyday narratives and operations. *Urban design international (London, England), 24*(4), 225-240. doi:10.1057/s41289-019-00100-x

Badat, S. (2013). *Eleven theses on community engagement and universities (transcript).* Paper presented at the The Social Responsibility of Universities: Community and Civic Engagement – Context and Big Picture. The 4th International Exhibition and Conference on Higher Education (4-IECHE), Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, 16-19 April 2013.

Bourner, T. (2010). A compatible partnership?: Student-community engagement and traditional university education. *Gateways (Sydney, N.S.W.), 3*, 139-154. doi:10.5130/ijcre.v3i0.1415

Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 49*(7), 18-33.

Brown-Luthango, M. (2013). Community-university engagement and the Philippi CityLab in Cape Town and the challenge of collaboration across boundaries. *Higher education, 65*(3), 309-324. doi:10.1007/s10734-012-9546-z

Campbell, H. (2012). Planning to change the world: Between knowledge and action lies synthesis. *Journal of planning education and research, 32*(2), 135-146. doi:10.1177/0739456X11436347

Driscoll, A., & Sandmann, L. R. (2016). From maverick to mainstream: The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 20*(1), 83-94.

Eatman, T. K., Ivory, G., Saltmarsh, J., Middleton, M., Wittman, A., & Dolgon, C. (2018). Co-constructing knowledge spheres in the academy: Developing frameworks and tools for advancing publicly engaged scholarship. *Urban education (Beverly Hills, Calif.), 53*(4), 532-561. doi:10.1177/0042085918762590

Fainstein, S. S. (2010). *The just city*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Friedmann, J. (1987). *Planning in the public domain: From knowledge to action*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.

Friedmann, J. (2007). *The wealth of cities: Towards an assets-based development of newly urbanizing regions*. Nairobi: United Nations Human Settlements Programme.

Gehl, J. (2013). *How to study public life*. Washington: Island Press.

Hale, C. R. (2008). *Engaging contradictions: Theory, politics, and methods of activist scholarship*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hamdi, N. (2004). *Small change: About the art of practice and the limits of planning in cities*. London: Earthscan.

Harrison, P., & Zack, T. (2014). Between the ordinary and the extraordinary: Socio-spatial transformations in the 'Old South' of Johannesburg. *South African Geographical Journal, 96*(2), 180-197. doi:10.1080/03736245.2014.924863

Joosse, S., Powell, S., Bergeå, H., Böhm, S., Calderón, C., Caselunghe, E., . . . Westin, M. (2020). Critical, engaged and change-oriented scholarship in environmental communication. Six methodological dilemmas to think with. *Environmental communication, 14*(6), 758-771. doi:10.1080/17524032.2020.1725588

Longo, N. (2013). Deliberative pedagogy in the community: Connecting deliberative dialogue, community engagement, and democratic education. *Journal of public deliberation, 9*(2).

Lynch, K. (1960). *The image of the city*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

McMillan, J. (2017). I understand that infrastructure affects people's lives: Deliberative pedagogy and community-engaged learning in a South African engineering curriculum. In T. J. Shaffer, N. V. Longo, I. Manosevitch, & M. S. Thomas (Eds.), *Deliberative pedagogy: Teaching and learning for democractic engagement* (pp. 159-168): Michigan State University Press.

Mehrotra, R., Vera, F., & Mayoral, J. (2017). *Ephemeral urbanism*: ListLab.

Mogel, L., & Bhagat, A. (2008). *An atlas of radical cartography*: Journal of Aesthetics & Protest Press Los Angeles.

Myers, G. A. (2006). The unauthorized city: Late colonial Lusaka and postcolonial geography. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography, 27*(3), 289-308. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9493.2006.00263.x

Nagar, R. (2002). Footloose researchers, 'traveling' theories, and the politics of transnational feminist praxis. *Gender, place and culture : a journal of feminist geography, 9*(2), 179-186. doi:10.1080/09663960220139699

Oldfield, S. (2007). Making sense of multiple conversations: Research, teaching and activism in and with communities in South African cities. *South African Geographical Journal, 89*(2), 104-110. doi:10.1080/03736245.2007.9713879

Oldfield, S. (2015). Between activism and the academy: The urban as political terrain. *Urban Studies, 52*(11), 2072-2086. doi:10.1177/0042098013515942

Owen, C., Dovey, K., & Raharjo, W. (2013). Teaching informal urbanism: Simulating informal settlement practices in the design studio. *Journal of architectural education (1984), 67*(2), 214-223. doi:10.1080/10464883.2013.817164

Prominski, M., & Seggern, H. (2019). *Design Research for Urban Landscapes: Theories and Methods* (1 ed.). Milton: Routledge.

Sandercock, L. (2003). *Cosmopolis II: Mongrel cities of the 21st century*. London: Continuum.

Sandmann, L. R. (2009). Placing scholarly engagement "on the desk". Retrieved from http://www.compact.org/initiatives/trucen/trucen-toolkit/

Schön, D. A. (1995). Knowing-in-action: The new scholarship requires a new epistemology. *Change (New Rochelle, N.Y.), 27*(6), 27-34. doi:10.1080/00091383.1995.10544673

Scott Brown, D. (1990). *Urban concepts*. London: Academy.

Selin, C., Kimbell, L., Ramirez, R., & Bhatti, Y. (2015). Scenarios and design: Scoping the dialogue space. *Futures, 74*, 4-17. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2015.06.002

Soja, E. W. (2010). *Seeking spatial justice*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Vaughan, L. (2018). *Mapping society: The spatial dimensions of social cartography*. London: UCL Press.

Vis, B. N. (2018). *Cities made of boundaries: Mapping social life in urban form*: UCL Press.

Winkler, T. (2013). At the coalface: Community–university engagements and planning education. *Journal of planning education and research, 33*(2), 215-227. doi:10.1177/0739456X12474312