



Associate Professor of Architecture
School of Architecture and Planning
University of New Mexico

KRAMER E WOODARD

CONTACT INFORMATION kwoodard@unm.edu | email
PH 505 277 2903 | office
505 277 0075 | fax
www.kewarchitects.com

COURSES Graduate Design Studio, Graduate Seminars

EDUCATION M.S., Columbia University, 1988
B.A., University of New Mexico, 1984

BIO Professor Woodard is a practicing architect with his firm Kramer E Woodard Architect. He is also the founder and principal designer of S³ (Slider Structure Systems), the prefabrication research arm of his practice.

Growing up in Los Alamos, New Mexico, he began his career working as a designer and draftsman for various architects in Santa Fe, New Mexico. Notable was his tutelage under John McHugh, who had apprenticed under John Gaw Meem. Obtaining a BA in architecture in 1984, from the University of New Mexico, he began work for Antoine Predock on several major projects. Woodard subsequently attended Washington University in St. Louis, going on to complete his master's at Columbia University in 1988. That year, he began teaching at the University of New Mexico, and in 1989 he launched Kramer E. Woodard Architect. In 2001 he collaborated with Steven Holl Architects on the Turbulence House, in Abiquiu, New Mexico. In 2008 he founded S³, a research entity that uses various components of his patented invention, to create housing, schools and medical clinics, based on principles of sustainability.

He has lectured throughout the U.S. and has held teaching positions at The Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, Columbia University, Rice University, (Cullinan Chair, 2000), University of Texas at Austin, (McDermott Chair, 2000), and The Pratt Institute.

His work has won many awards and has been widely published in both books and magazines throughout the world.

TEACHING PHILOSOPHY The central tenet of my teaching philosophy is that students are exposed to both theoretical and practical problems. For this reason I value my role as both teacher and practitioner. My creative work is essential to my teaching and students benefit from my experience as a practicing architect. My teaching experience began in the beginning design studio, which as the coordinator, I developed the curriculum based on how I practice architecture through a rigorous process of research at multiple levels, from the physical aspects of site, materials and methods of construction through texts based on theories of social, economic and cultural concerns. This is now carried out at the graduate level where I have taught for the past 16 years. The project briefs in these studios are of a greater complexity, however maintain a similar creative inception. I use three archetypal forms to demonstrate the potentials of space that hold the promise of communicating with a greater audience, the Court, Tower & Bridge translate to point, line & plane, the fundamental building blocks of spatial composition. Now with computational processes directing the formal/spatial outcomes through parametric programming, a new understanding of these archetypal forms challenges the designer to reconnect to basic sculptural elements while simultaneously charging the outcome with a "precision" of execution. I must say however, that this perception of obtaining precision through a machine is faulty and the outcome of any process remains with human actions.

As in all my scholarship and creative work, I emphasize that architecture is an art and science that has the potential to communicate to a wider audience, (through abstraction) but at its best responds to the specifics of the cultures that inhabit, define and create place.

ON PRACTICE



Anasazi Ruins



Carreta de la Muerte



Los Alamos National Laboratory

As technology further distances us from our organic physical self and former modes of human expression are becoming obsolete, our design response to urbanity needs reconsideration. If we are to understand our cities and preserve the variety of forces found there, building foils or complements and not mere reflections of the past is imperative in the cause of resolving a wide variety of conflicts, both physically and intellectually.

The work, that I've produced over the past 20+ years as a sole practitioner of architecture, exemplifies this attitude toward the making of built form. These projects question the relationship between landscapes and itineraries for dwelling in general and specific contexts. Paradoxical, or complementary, reason has guided my work in both the academy and profession. I attribute this in part to my experience of being raised in Los Alamos - birthplace of nuclear weaponry and site of many Anasazi pueblos and Spanish colonies - where artifice, landscape, and mysticism commingle in a dynamic irony. I resist the urge to reconcile landscape and artifice largely because circumstances are always shifting: Landscape encompasses all the forces that affect and are affected by the action of building, and vice versa.

Attempts to repair or "steward" our environment through human effort must begin not only by exploring the fragile balance of "natural" ecosystems, but also by recognizing the city as a complex system that sustains humanity. Without this understanding of the complexity of natural and built systems as necessary synergistic partners, human expression will continue to suffer from the belief in technological solutions solely. The projects I've undertaken, serve to describe an attempt at balancing both built and natural phenomenological systems.

Much of the work has not been built, it remains as idea. To one who believes in the final test of architecture as space that can be experienced, this has been a dilemma. I do believe however, that architecture isn't limited to that criteria, rather it is a powerful vehicle to make change, regardless of rendered in stone or on paper. Throughout my career I have encouraged each individual I've worked with, be it in the classroom or office to pursue their own unique "vision" of architecture and design. Collaboration in my office is paramount and while I initiate the direction and character of the designs, without the discussion and criticism of so many throughout the years, the work would have fallen short of its aim.

Sketch Book 1999 on the design of the Robins House, Santa Fe

