

A Replicable Model for Educating Community Architects

MART DECEUNINCK

KU Leuven, Belgium

EMILIE TAYLOR WELTY

Tulane University, United States

ANGELIKI PAIDAKAKI

Harokopio University of Athens, Greece

PIETER VAN DEN BROECK

KU Leuven, Belgium

Keywords: community architecture, live projects, design build, pedagogy

Contemporary community architecture and disaster resilience scholarship have shed light on the work of community architects, highlighting the features, merits and limitations of this practice in building community/disaster resilience through participatory design processes. However, a knowledge gap not yet bridged is how these community architects are academically trained to practice community-oriented work and how Schools of Architecture - through such training - catalyze community development in the cities in which they are located. In the current era of climate change and given the disastrous consequences of unequal post-disaster recovery and redevelopment processes, it is critical to have community architects who are able to cope with this new reality. Therefore, it is important to gain knowledge on how to train community architects and in this way contribute to the formation of the future generation of architecture students into socially conscious community architects who promote a more socially just built environment.

The aim of this paper is to outline a pedagogical model for educating community architects based on an analysis of a case study in the USA, a place where much of this pedagogy is being developed, namely the Small Center. The Small Center functions as the community design center of the Tulane School of Architecture in New Orleans. The paper illustrates and reviews this pedagogical model through an analysis of a design/build studio at the Small Center that took place during the fall semester of 2021-2022. In this 14-week studio, students were challenged to design and build a 960 square foot outdoor teaching kitchen and water management strategy for a local farm to accommodate expanded educational events on site. The design team worked with the staff and stakeholders of the partnering farm on a project that connects people of all ages to their food systems and local ecologies at multiple scales within the completed project.

During one-month ethnographic research with the Small Center, empirical data was harvested through review of project materials, semi-structured interviews with students,

alumni and teachers and site visits to the farm. The paper shows how live community-based project pedagogy helps students take on some of the various multi-faceted roles of a community architect and effectively learn by doing. Students gain insight into the impact of community engagement and the challenges involved, such as a limited budget, communication within the project team and collaborating with non-designers. This research offers deeper insight into the pedagogical approach, teaching methods and the projects of community architecture programs in the USA. The paper outlines key takeaways and critical reflections from the ethnographic research and case study analysis that are relevant to Departments/Schools of Architecture across the Globe as they prepare the next generation of architects.

INTRODUCTION

Community architecture is a movement with a fundamental focus on including people in the design and production of their own built environment. Nowadays, community architecture - also commonly referred to as Public Interest Design - is frequently applied in post-disaster contexts and has been found to be effective in (re)building resilient communities. In the current era of climate change and given the disastrous consequences of conventional unequal post-disaster recovery and redevelopment processes, it is critical to train community architects who are able to cope with this new reality. Although community architecture and its positive impact has been well reported in the literature and the demand for these community architects is increasing, there is a shortage of academic programs of community architecture across the Globe. In addition, the curricula of most conventional architecture schools lack any formal classes on community architecture or disaster recovery. Architecture students are still mainly trained in conventional design studios to fit into the conventional roles of the architect as 'genius designer' or 'artistic hero', encouraged to learn from celebrity star architects and generate top-down ideas without delving deeper into relevant social, economic and political aspects

(Ester Charlesworth 2014; Boyer and Mitgang 1996; Esther Charlesworth 2006; Salama 2015). In so doing, students miss the opportunity to understand the exact socio-spatial impact of their designs. This conventional approach also keeps students away from exploring other roles architects can take on in society, such as ‘social reformer’ or ‘community facilitator,’ and prevents them from considering a career in Public Interest Design or the humanitarian field (Ester Charlesworth 2014). Therefore, it is important to gain knowledge on how Schools of Architecture can embrace their responsibility in society by teaching community architecture and, in turn, contribute to a future generation of socially conscious architects.

COMMUNITY ARCHITECTURE-RESILIENCE NEXUS

Community architecture emerged in the 1960s-70s as a movement with a fundamental focus on giving people a voice in the design of the built environment. This movement recognizes the unique identity of each community and its own specific needs, and therefore values the knowledge of the community itself (Andriessen et al. 2021; Salama 2015; Wates and Knevt 1987). Compared to conventional architectural approaches that are autocratic, centralized and primarily focused on the end product, community architecture pursued an open and socially engaged practice that emphasizes the process, as presented in Table 1 (Salama 2015). Community architects have advocated in favor of working with communities, rather than for them, promoting interdisciplinary knowledge exchange (Andriessen et al. 2021; Salama 2015; Wates and Knevt 1987; Paidakaki et al. 2021; Petal et al. 2008).

Community architecture is commonly applied in post-disaster contexts, challenging conventional recovery strategies. The latter are typically managed top-down, involve outside experts and focus only on the physical and structural resilience of the affected area, often leading to socio-spatial inequalities, economic and social impoverishment, affordable housing crises, gentrification and marginalization, and disruption of social networks (Andriessen et al. 2021; Boano and García 2011; Ester Charlesworth 2014; Luansang, Boonmahathanakorn, and Domingo-Price 2012; Paidakaki and Moulaert 2018). By contrast, a community architecture-based approach gives equal importance to the physical and social reconstruction of devastated communities and understands resilience as an ever-changing, socially transformative process with multidirectional ‘bounce forward’ trajectories in which the unique needs and characteristics of different communities are recognized (Davoudi et al. 2012; Paidakaki 2017; Paidakaki and Moulaert 2018).

The community architecture-resilience scholarship (Boano and García 2011; Ester Charlesworth 2014; Luansang, Boonmahathanakorn, and Domingo-Price 2012; Aquilino 2011;

Community Design Approach	Conventional Approach
Democratic: Considers the architect as facilitator and/or advocate Considers clients and users in the decision-making process	Autocratic: Considers the architect as egoist or pragmatist Considers the architect and his/her consultants as the only decision makers in the process
Involves small scale projects	Involves large scale projects
Local: utilizes community resources and appropriate technology	National/international: exploits resources and utilizes high technology
Human oriented	Institution oriented
Client is redefined to include non-paying clients (users)	Single client oriented
Concerned with meaning and context	Concerned with style and ornament
Concerned with right and wrong decisions	Concerned with good and bad design decisions
Inclusive	Exclusive
Process and product oriented	Product oriented

Table 1: Comparison of the community design approach and the conventional design approach (Salama 2015).

Boano and Talocci 2017; Esther Charlesworth 2006) has extensively documented the merits of community architecture in building resilience, particularly in post-disaster contexts. Using techniques like participatory design, community mapping and collective building, community architects address design problems together with the community and build mutual trust (Andriessen et al. 2021; Ester Charlesworth 2014; Luansang, Boonmahathanakorn, and Domingo-Price 2012; Petal et al. 2008). Design is seen as a long-term, transdisciplinary and collaborative process that focuses on developing capacity in the communities, building on existing strengths and empowering people, while also addressing underlying problems such as poverty and social inequalities (Andriessen et al. 2021; Ester Charlesworth 2014; Luansang, Boonmahathanakorn, and Domingo-Price 2012; Petal et al. 2008).

Community architecture as a practice clearly expanded the conventional roles of the architect, which were centered on design aesthetics and technical issues, as well as the conventional audiences served by the profession, including high income groups, real estate developers and elitist governments. Recent literature (Andriessen et al. 2021) mapped out the different multifaceted roles community architects play in resilience-building processes, see Table 2. In addition to the conventional role as a ‘genius designer’, other more socio-political roles were uncovered (Andriessen et al. 2021). The extent to which architects can fulfill these roles depends largely on the architect’s respect and insight into the specific economic, cultural and political situation and the projects’ governance structure (e.g. top-down, bottom-up, bottom-linked) (Andriessen et al. 2021). The main limitations of practicing community architecture are the greater investment of time and effort by all parties involved, the lack of sufficient funding, and the undervalued social and physical impact of small-scale projects (Andriessen et al. 2021; Ester Charlesworth 2014). However, results are proven to be more successful in the

Role of the architect	Description	Factors fostering or hindering resilience at two scales	
		Community level	Housing level
The genius designer	These professionals design autonomously, without considering the interdisciplinary character of the post-disaster context or the pre-existing political conditions (Boano and Hunter 2012). These architects seldom include community participation in the design. They, however, sometimes attempt to make a socially appropriate design through their own research initiatives	Since the community is not actively involved in the design process, the recovery outcome is oftentimes sociopolitically inappropriate because livelihood activities, stakeholder relations, and local dwelling culture are not integrated into post-disaster urban design	While the structural resilience of the physical structures can be adapted to the local building regulations, architects can neither incorporate the process of “home-making” (Zetter and Boano 2009) into the design process nor foster a two-way knowledge exchange between themselves and the community
The building teacher	These architects strive for long-term sustainable solutions through knowledge transfers with the involved community in an easily understandable language. At the same time, these architects use locally available materials so that local people can easily purchase them in their future construction additions	By teaching the locals about construction techniques and using local materials, the economic activities of the community are promoted. The local dwelling culture is, however, not transferred to the architects to improve the urban layout	Long-term structural resilience is fostered because the community is taught to rebuild safely. In this role, nevertheless, the architect does not integrate the local specificities into the design
The attentive student	These professionals know that local communities have often designed their houses for generations (Luansang, Boonmahathanakorn, and Domingo-Price 2012). As a result, they are open to learn from the local community through participatory processes that establish exchanges and incorporate such local knowledge into the design	The local dwelling culture is integrated into the urban layout, the knowledge of economic activities and the existing adaptive capacity are utilized to provide livelihood activities, and pre-disaster social relations of the community are accounted for	This one-way knowledge exchange fosters the process of “home-making” (Zetter and Boano 2009) and integrates traditional building techniques, although these may be forgotten because of modernization
The compassionate friend	These architects wish to bridge the professional-people gap by cultivating a comfortable environment within the community. Once a bond is built between inhabitants and professionals, conflicts that exist in the heterogeneous community can be efficiently tackled throughout the design phase (Zetter and Boano 2009)	The knowledge of the power relations inside the community and their conflicts can ensure an equitable urban design, taking the vulnerability of people into account	Collaboration between architects and community members is enhanced when a bond is formed, fostering the process of “home-making” (Zetter and Boano 2009) and learning from each other

Table 2: Overview of community architects’ multifaceted roles in post-disaster resilience-building processes (Andriessen et al. 2021, 134–36)

The involved facilitator	These professionals combine aspects of the attentive student and the building teacher to design together with the community, establishing a two-way knowledge exchange (community-professional and the other way round) through participatory processes. Considering the community as the most important actor in the post-disaster context, the involved facilitator helps to envision their possible futures	The location and layout of the site are codetermined by the community through participation processes, livelihood activities are nurtured, and pre-disaster adaptive capacities are identified and taken into consideration	Proper construction techniques within the local dwelling culture can lead to long-term sustainable, socioculturally adequate houses
The interfering mediator	These professionals negotiate between the affected community and other possibly involved stakeholders (e.g., government agencies, donors, NGOs). Using the reconstruction project to bring conflictive parties to the table, these architects serve as intermediaries in their effort to solve controversial views in tangible ways (Esther Charlesworth 2007)	Through multilevel negotiations, the affected community becomes more integrated into larger governance structures, increasing its involvement in the wider society	In this role, architects mostly focus on the community scale
The radical reformer	In this role, architects encourage the community to oppose current dominant powers, instigating changes toward a more equal society. Rather than including the excluded, they attempt to render current hegemonic powers inoperative (Boano and Talocci 2017) and strive toward an urban reality based on equity. Radical reformers are politically involved and engage in critical urban issues (Esther Charlesworth 2007), striving for a reinvention of current architectural-design practices through their creativity (Aquilino 2011)	The existing relations between the community and other stakeholders change through the architects' advocacy efforts toward decision- and policy- makers, which leads to the empowerment of the community	In this role, architects mostly focus on the community scale
The assisting architect	When the community is considered the architect of a reconstruction project, the roles of professionally trained architects are limited to providing trauma-healing projects (e.g., community mapping, cash for work initiatives) and technical assistance, empowering the community to strive for more inclusion into the wider society and creating networks in multilevel governance structures	This role attempts to incorporate all factors that foster resilience at this level	The house design by the inhabitants with the technical advice of building professionals fosters architecture for resilience at the housing level in all the previously mentioned factors: the structural resilience, the process of house-making, and a two-way knowledge exchange

Table 2 continued: Overview of community architects' multifaceted roles in post-disaster resilience-building processes (Andriessen et al. 2021)

long run, especially for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged communities (Luansang, Boonmahathanakorn, and Domingo-Price 2012; Petal et al. 2008).

DESIGN STUDIO PEDAGOGY

Worldwide, conventional architectural education has been primarily shaped by two schools of thought: the Beaux-Arts and the Bauhaus (Boyer and Mitgang 1996; Salama 2015; Salazar Ferro et al. 2020). Founded in the early 17th century, the Ecole des Beaux Arts was the first academic institution to offer formal education in architecture. Its philosophy reached the United States in the mid-19th century, and soon became the dominant educational system there as well (Boyer and Mitgang 1996; Salama 2015). For more than 200 years, the Beaux-Arts model remained the only pedagogical approach to architectural education in Europe, until the beginning of the 20th century, when the Bauhaus was founded by Walter Gropius in Germany. The Bauhaus only existed for a short time and made its way to the United States in the 1930s (Salama 2015). Since the École des Beaux-Arts adhered to neo-classicism and the Bauhaus adhered to modernism, their vision on architecture and program content were completely different. However, these two models showed many similarities in the structure of their educational program and teaching methods and laid the foundation for conventional architectural education with at its core the ‘atelier’, currently the design studio, based on a master-apprentice teaching model, which is still used today (Salama 2015). Every architecture student had to join an ‘atelier’ led by a teacher or ‘patron’ - typically an accomplished practicing architect - where the core of the training, the design exercises, took place (Salama 2015).

Since the 1950s, the conventional design studio has been criticized (Salama 2015). The instructor-centered teaching method tends towards a ‘show and tell’ interaction; the teacher telling

the student what and how to do it, with little room for critical thinking (Salama 2015). In addition, it has been observed that the conventional design studio culture is commonly characterized by individualism and competition (Boyer and Mitgang 1996; Salama 2015), which is in stark contrast to the practice of architecture today that involves intensive group work and collaboration with many different professionals (Cuff 1992; Salama 2015). Most importantly, the design process in the conventional studio is oversimplified and students design in a ‘vacuum’, i.e., without context. There is an ongoing growing disconnection in the design studio between current social, cultural, economic, and political issues and real human needs (Cuff 1992; Salama 2015; Boyer and Mitgang 1996).

This criticism reached a peak in the late 1960s and 1970s, in part due to the social revolution driven by radical youth (Colomina et al. 2022; Salama 2015). In architectural education, this resulted in the emergence of a variety of alternative approaches to the design studio (Colomina et al. 2022; Salama 2015). An early example is the ‘community-based design learning’ model by Henry Sanoff in the late 1960 (Salama 2015). Sanoff’s model supported the idea central to community architecture that “the design experience should examine architecture through the direct involvement of the client/user in design decision-making” (Salama 2015). Students engage in a collaborative process, solving design problems using participatory methods such as simulation experiences/games and structured group decision-making. The interaction between student and client/user is understood as the most important factor in the process. Students also work in teams, which promotes a non-individualistic and non-competitive sphere (Salama 2015).

Similar to the community-based design model, two other pedagogical models were developed: design/build and live projects (Salama 2015). In the literature and in the field, these three

Conventional Design Studio	Community-Based Design Studio
Teacher-centered: master-apprentice teaching <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk crit • Hierarchical, subjective and intuitive teaching 	Student-centered <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active teaching and experiential learning • Service-learning
Individual work and competition	Teamwork, collaboration and community engagement
Simplified design process: focus on initial sketch and final product and presentation	Design process from programming to final product: focus on the process and engagement
Focus on aesthetics and formal aspects	Focus on context, in-depth research and its application in practice
Focus on drawing and design skills	Focus on interpersonal and practical skills
Learning from precedents and star architects	Learning from different types of knowledge and perspectives

Table 3: Comparing the characteristics of the conventional design studio to the community-based design studio, based on the literature. (Source: Author)



Figure 1: Discussion with young students early in the Small Center design process about the project vision and ideas.

terms are often used interchangeably. Design/build pedagogy especially emphasizes learning by making and involves students in the process of designing and building a project (Salama 2015). Students experience a project from inception to completion including budgeting, scheduling, contacting contractors and more, and develop construction skills (Salama 2015). Live project pedagogy is similarly described as “a model of design teaching that involves a community-situated design response to real-time challenges or community problems, thereby offering students valuable opportunities to experience key characteristics of architectural practice, and thus gain more ‘practice-ready’ capabilities” (Harris, 2012 in Salama 2015). A few concrete examples are the Bridge Studio at Iowa State University by Nadia M. Anderson (USA), Rural Studio at Auburn University by Samuel Mockbee (USA), The Neighborhood Design Build Studio at the University of Washington by Steve Badanes (USA) and the Walking the Talk model based on live projects by Esther Charlesworth (Australia, travelling design studios) (Anderson 2014; 2012; Esther Charlesworth 2018; Salama 2015).

Table 3 summarizes the main characteristics of the conventional design studio and compares it to the community-based design studio.

TEACHING COMMUNITY ARCHITECTURE AT THE SMALL CENTER

The Albert and Tina Small Center for Collaborative Design, the Small Center for short, is the community design center of the Tulane University School of Architecture (TSA) in New Orleans. Founded in early 2005, the Small Center’s initial mission was to teach students through real-world applied design projects. After Hurricane Katrina struck New Orleans in August 2005 and destroyed the city, this post-disaster context clarified the center’s mission which was informed by the belief that “all residents should have the right to shape the city in which they live, work, and play” (Yoachim, Welty, and Jenisch 2020). Over the past 17 years, the Small Center contributed significantly to the recovery of New Orleans with over 140 local projects (Small Center, n.d.).

Today, the Small Center is run by a team of four staff members, also drawing on the knowledge and skills of the Tulane School of Architecture faculty and students. Their pedagogical approach involves bringing students into live (real-world) community-based projects and involving them in both engagement with project stakeholders and in designing and fabricating the final

project. This learning-by-doing method of teaching architecture requires students to contend with a budget, timeline, tools, and each other as they collaborate on designing and realizing a project in 15 weeks. The center offers pro bono design services to local organizations and nonprofits, situating their work at the intersection of design, social equity, and civic engagement (Small Center RFP 2022). Projects are primarily selected through an annual ‘Request for Proposals’ process where potential beneficiaries are invited to submit their project ideas, are small-scale and can vary widely (from pavilions and skateparks to playgrounds). In this way, the Small Center ensures their work responds to real needs identified by communities themselves, rather than imposing their ideas or giving unwanted advice. E. Taylor Welty, personal communication, February 2, 2022, Welty et al., 2016, A. Morris, personal communication, May 5, 2022). The project scale is usually small, targeting a specific goal and strongly influencing the lives of the stakeholders involved. One type of service offered is design/build, which concerns small/medium-scale projects that can be designed and built within an academic semester (Small Center RFP 2022). Calling it ‘radical incrementalism’, the Small Center also believes in the power of these small projects and their cumulative impact on the city (Etheridge and Taylor 2013).

The Small Center works through collaborative design processes with strong community engagement, aiming to include as many voices as possible to produce thoughtful outcomes that are well-integrated into the context (Etheridge and Taylor 2013; Welty 2018). An essential step is the preparatory work by the staff with the community partner, before the academic semester starts, resulting in a clear project definition and setting realistic expectations. The Small Center staff then develops the design exercise for the students and outlines the community engagement process (A. Yoachim, personal communication, February 7, 2022; E. Taylor Welty, personal communication, February 2, 2022, Welty 2018).



Figure 2: Small Center students lead an engagement session at Sugar Roots Farm to discuss the final design options

When the academic semester begins, a team of 10-20 students takes the lead on the project, supported by staff members. Students are encouraged to take on the role of the involved facilitator - combining aspects of the attentive student and the building teacher - and the compassionate friend throughout the process.

First, the context is explored through readings and discussions, design exercises, and conversations with partners, creating an open, comfortable atmosphere at the beginning of the project. Next, the students organize community engagement with stakeholders to generate initial design concepts and establish a two-way knowledge exchange. In the following phase, ideas are refined and checked with the partners to finalize the design direction. Finally, the students build the project, which is usually their first experience in construction (Small Center RFP 2022). Throughout the process, students face challenges such as working within a limited budget and adhering to a strict schedule. Teamwork skills are essential, students learn how to work together effectively and communicate clearly with various stakeholders who are not designers (N. Jenisch, personal communication, February 24, 2022; E. Taylor Welty, personal communication, February 2, 2022). Throughout this process, the staff and faculty act in the roles of interfering mediator and sometimes radical reformer pushing for change within typical project hierarchies and within their local communities.

An example of one of the Small Center’s recent projects is the design/build studio (fall semester 2021-2022) in partnership with Sugar Roots Farm, a local farm with the mission to connect people to the food system. In this 14-week studio, students were challenged to design and build a 960 square foot outdoor teaching kitchen to accommodate expanded educational events and develop a water management strategy. The student design team worked with the staff and stakeholders of the partnering farm on a project that connects people of all ages to their food systems and local ecologies at multiple scales within the completed project. Several engagement moments with the farm staff, visitors, volunteers and visiting school groups were organized on the farm, as shown in Fig.1-2. The continuous feedback cycle between the design team and the farm staff shaped the final design, which was then built by the students, Fig.3-4.

The impact of the outdoor teaching kitchen is not yet fully known since only a year has passed since project completion. The short history includes wins in water management on site with a noticeable difference in flooding during rain events. There has also been an increase in school groups, tours, and events held in the outdoor kitchen, see Fig.5 - however the long term impacts will take several years to become evident. Despite the in-process project specific outcomes, the Small Center team hired a third party consultant from the London School of Economics in 2021 to conduct qualitative research on the body of work done by the community design center. This was centered on the impacts of live community-based projects on the community partners

and their staffs and stakeholders and included interviews, in-person site visits and observations across 50 past project sites and included input from community partners, their staff, and faculty involved in the project. Participation was voluntary and anonymous (de-identified), in addition, interviews were coded and themes were identified by Dr. Jeanne Firth. An important emerging theme was strong relationships that grew from the method of teaching community architects - a process that broke down some of the barriers that communities of color have historically seen between design professionals and themselves. Non-profit partners also reported increased access to graphics and vision-based documents that helped them gain legitimacy and assisted in planning long term futures for their organizations. Finally, some saw the design and construction process as a capacity building moment for their organizations that increased their ability to fulfill their mission.

For example, according to one respondent,

“For me, design has layers. So certainly, the whole notion of collaborative design, I feel like it really speaks to layers... And you share that with these community collaborative designers, with this design team. And they get it, right? They absolutely get it. And that articulation, that vision, was transferred and it manifested in the design that they came up with. So to me, those are those layers. So you have that vision, the expression of the vision, the listening — I felt like that team really listened, they listened to what the community members were sharing during that charrette and they translated it into that design. So that was fricking awesome to me. Cause they got it.”

Additionally, a 2019 study on learning outcomes of students in these studios showed that this pedagogy is a valuable way to teach collaboration, collaborative problem solving and offers transferable lessons that young designers can take with them into the profession (Welty, Yoachim, and Hogans 2019).

“I enjoyed getting to work directly with clients on projects that had very local impact. I learned the value of staying flexible and fluid, and that oftentimes the best ideas come from collaboration and active listening.” - alumni survey response, 2018

The successful implementation of community-based live project pedagogy requires intensive work by designers and project partners, including fundraising, maintaining relationships with community partners and adhering to a strict academic calendar, which is why the Small Center has permanent staff. The center’s staff also have to balance a responsibility for educating students with a responsibility to its partner organizations, ensuring both parties benefit (Welty, Hansen, and Mobley 2016). Therefore, critical self-evaluation is key to constantly improving their work and pedagogy.



Figure 3: Top to Bottom: Students working on the construction of the outdoor teaching space; Final project in use at Sugar Roots Farm; The final project as a functioning ecosystem and education space with children catching crawfish in the water retention pond.

CONCLUSIONS

The case of the Small Center shows that educating architecture students in community architecture while fostering resilient communities is possible and effective. Using the pedagogical model of live community-based projects, the center is able to create tangible results that are meaningful to the community members involved and train students in the basic principles of community architecture. Students mainly learn to adopt and switch between the specific roles of the involved facilitator - combining aspects of the attentive student and the building teacher - and the compassionate friend and learn to set aside the role of 'genius designer' that they are used to by the conventional design studios. Since the teacher-student hierarchy is also largely absent in the projects by the Small Center, the students are forced to get out of their comfort zone as they are immediately introduced to the field of public interest design and community engagement and learn in an experiential and active way. They learn by doing and immediately gain hands-on experience. This is viewed as a very significant and effective way of learning. This is in contrast to the conventional design studios, where projects are hypothetical 'designs on paper' and the social and other contextual aspects are mostly omitted, where students mostly work alone and interpersonal skills are not being learned or taught through role-playing at best.

Through the various local small-scale projects rooted in ideas by community groups themselves, the Small Center contributes incrementally to building a resilient city. The paper shows that Schools of Architecture can take up their responsibility in society and educate their students as community architects who promote a more socially just built environment.

ENDNOTES

- Anderson, Nadia M. 2012. "Public Interest Design: A Vehicle for Change in Architectural Education and Practice." *CHANGE: Architecture, Education, Practices*, 268–74. https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/arch_conf.
- . 2014. "Public Interest Design as Praxis." *Journal of Architectural Education* 68 (1): 16–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10464883.2014.864896>.
- Andriessen, Anouck, Angeliki Paidakaki, Cynthia Susilo, and Pieter van den Broeck. 2021. "Architects' Multifaceted Roles in Enhancing Resilience after Disasters." In *Enhancing Disaster Preparedness*, 129–48. Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-819078-4.00007-1>.
- Aquilino, Marie J. 2011. *Beyond Shelter: Architecture for Crisis*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Boano, Camillo, and Marisol García. 2011. "Lost in Translation? The Challenges of an Equitable Post-Disaster Reconstruction Process: Lessons from Chile." *Environmental Hazards* 10 (3): 293–309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17477891.2011.594493>.
- Boano, Camillo, and William Hunter. 2012. "Architecture at Risk (?): The Ambivalent Nature of Post-Disaster Practice." *Architectoni.ca* 1 (1): 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.5618/arch.2012.v1.n1.1>.
- Boano, Camillo, and Giorgio Talocci. 2017. "Inoperative Design: 'Not Doing' and the Experience of the Community Architects Network." *City* 21 (6): 860–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2017.1412649>.
- Boyer, Ernest L., and Lee D. Mitgang. 1996. *Building Community: A New Future for Architectural Education and Practice: A Special Report. Building Community a New Future for Architectural Education and Practice: A Special Report*. 2nd print. New Jersey: Carnegie foundation for the advancement of teaching.
- Charlesworth, Ester. 2014. *Humanitarian Architecture: 15 Stories of Architects Working after Disaster*. Routledge.
- Charlesworth, Esther. 2006. *Architects Without Frontiers: War, Reconstruction and Design Responsibility*. London: Elsevier.
- . 2007. *Architects Without Frontiers*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780080465449>.
- . 2018. "Walking The Talk: From Theory to Practice in Delivering Community Based Design Education." *International Journal of Art and Design Education* 37 (2): 253–64. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jade.12049>.
- Colomina, Beatriz, Ignacio González Galán, Evangelos Kotsioris, and Anna-Maria Meister. 2022. "Radical Pedagogies." *The Educational Complex*. <http://radical-pedagogies.com/>.
- Cuff, Dana. 1992. *Architecture: The Story of Practice*. Architecture the Story of Practice. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT.
- Davoudi, Simin, Keith Shaw, L. Jamila Haider, Allyson E. Quinlan, Garry D. Peterson, Cathy Wilkinson, Hartmut Fünfgeld, Darryn McEvoy, Libby Porter, and Simin Davoudi. 2012. "Resilience: A Bridging Concept or a Dead End? 'Reframing' Resilience: Challenges for Planning Theory and Practice Interacting Traps: Resilience Assessment of a Pasture Management System in Northern Afghanistan Urban Resilience: What Does It Mean in Planning Practice? Resilience as a Useful Concept for Climate Change Adaptation? The Politics of Resilience for Planning: A Cautionary Note." *Planning Theory & Practice* 13 (2): 299–333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2012.677124>.
- Etheridge, Dan, and Emilie Taylor. 2013. "Radical Incrementalism: An Open Letter in Defense of the Small." *Oz* 35 (1). <https://doi.org/10.4148/2378-5853.1512>.
- Luansang, Chawanad, Supawut Boonmahathanakorn, and Maria Lourdes Domingo-Price. 2012. "The Role of Community Architects in Upgrading; Reflecting on the Experience in Asia." *Environment and Urbanization* 24 (2): 497–512. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247812456125>.
- Paidakaki, Angeliki. 2017. "Uncovering the Housing-Resilience Nexus: Social Resilience Cells, Governance Hybridities and (Hetero-) Production of Post-Disaster 'Egalitarian' Urbanities. The Case Study of Post-Katrina New Orleans." *Archnet-IJAR* 15 (3): 800–822. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ARCH-11-2020-0276>.
- Paidakaki, Angeliki, Rani De Becker, Yana De Reu, Febe Viaene, Shareen Elnaschie, and Pieter Van den Broeck. 2021. "How Can Community Architects Build Socially Resilient Refugee Camps? Lessons from the Office of Displaced Designers in Lesbos, Greece." *Archnet-IJAR* 15 (3): 800–822. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ARCH-11-2020-0276>.
- Paidakaki, Angeliki, and Frank Moolaert. 2018. "Disaster Resilience into Which Direction(s)? Competing Discursive and Material Practices in Post-Katrina New Orleans." *Housing, Theory and Society* 35 (4): 432–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14036096.2017.1308434>.
- Petal, M., R. Green, I. Kelman, R. Shaw, and A Dixit. 2008. "Community-Based Construction for Disaster Risk Reduction." In *Hazards and the Built Environment*, edited by Lee Boshier, 191–217. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203938720>.
- Salama, Ashraf M. 2015. *Spatial Design Education - New Directions for Pedagogy in Architecture and Beyond*. New York: Routledge.
- Salazar Ferro, Camilo, Isabel Artega Arredondo, Carolina M. Rodriguez, and Daniel H. Nadal. 2020. "Active Learning in Architectural Education: A Participatory Design Experience (PDE) in Colombia." *International Journal of Art and Design Education* 39 (2): 346–66. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jade.12280>.
- Small Center. n.d. "Our History." Accessed July 18, 2022. <https://small.tulane.edu/our-story/our-history/>.
- Small Center RFP. 2022. "Request For Proposals."
- Wates, Nick, and Charles Kneivitt. 1987. *Community Architecture. How People Are Creating Their Own Environment*. Penguin Books.
- Welty, Emilie Taylor. 2018. "Refining Process, Expanding Practice: Public Interest Design Fieldnotes from the South." In *ACSA Annual Meeting Conference*, 37–42.
- Welty, Emilie Taylor, Maggie Hansen, and Suzanne-Juliette Mobley. 2016. "Designers, Citizens, and Citizen-Designers." In *ACSA Annual Meeting*.
- Welty, Emilie Taylor, Ann Yoachim, and Austin Hogans. 2019. "Design-Build Studio Outcomes; Researching Potential vs Practice." In *Teachers Conference Proceedings*, 1–8.
- Yoachim, Ann, Emilie Taylor Welty, and Nick Jenisch. 2020. "Public Interest Design, Pragmatism, and Potentials in a Postdiluvian City." *Journal of Architectural Education* 74 (1): 110–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10464883.2020.1693834>.
- Zetter, Roger, and Camillo Boano. 2009. "Space and Place after Natural Disasters and Forced Displacement." In *Rebuilding After Disasters*, 216–40. Routledge.