

TEACHING THE SOCIAL ART OF ARCHITECTURE:

The Transformation of the Studio from Object-Centered to Human-Centered Design

Benjamin Clavan, Ph.D., AIA

Coordinator, Berkeley Undergraduate Prize for Architectural Design Excellence

Benjamic@earthlink.net; info@BerkeleyPrize.org

ABSTRACT

The acknowledgement that good architecture starts with a deep and empathetic understanding of the people who will use a building or place is at the basis of Universal Design. Such an understanding is rarely part of the traditional architectural school curricula. For 17 years, an online competition, the international Berkeley Undergraduate Prize for Architectural Design Excellence, has worked to change this deficiency by directly challenging architecture students to go into their local communities for the purposes of thinking and writing about the meaning of an architecture from this broader perspective. In 2013, the PRIZE inaugurated its first Teaching Fellowship in the Social Art of Architecture, reflecting the year's competition topic: "The Architect and the Accessible City". Five undergraduate studio faculty from around the world were selected to integrate human-centered, Universal Design ideals and values into their current course syllabi. Based on the history of the PRIZE and the results of the Fellowships, the author investigates the problems and potentials of shifting the focus of architectural education away from form-driven to people-driven design. In doing so, the idea that new approaches to teaching architecture need to be adopted is examined. An outline for adoption of these approaches is proposed.

Keywords

Teaching Universal Design; Social Art of Architecture; Human-Centered Ideals

INTRODUCTION

Seventeen years ago, I was part of a group led by Raymond Lifchez, Professor of Architecture at the University of California, Berkeley's College of Environmental Design, who gathered to attempt to do something concrete about the then increasingly apparent disconnect between *human-centered* and *object-centered* architecture. We were mostly academics or practicing architects nurtured in the academic tradition. Our discussions led us to ask the basic question about where architectural value lies: clearly, despite decades of attempts to widen the discussion, the most universally accepted measure of value remained the outward appearance of buildings and places. Where was the discussion about the people who use the buildings we design? Where was the discussion about the impact of architecture on the community? Where was the discussion about the *social art of architecture*?

The problem, then and now, is how to interest young architecture students in exploring these issues for themselves. It could not be done from within the essentially moribund structure of the schools

that were using the same static Beaux Arts/Bauhaus models of architectural education that, in the end, treated building as a piece of sculpture. The idea was to provide an incentive for participation in the investigation and implementation of the social perspective in design. The result was an international essay competition aimed solely at undergraduate architecture students and conducted entirely online: the (now) international Berkeley Undergraduate Prize in Architectural Design Excellence.*

During the ensuing years there has been a large, positive and gratifying participation by a diverse population of students: over 1700 students from 61 countries have submitted essay proposals and, if selected, full-length essays. As these positive results multiplied, it became equally clear to the PRIZE committee that architecture faculty were still not encouraging much, if any, shift in the ways of looking at the art and task of design. This was an issue of *teaching*. Starting in 2013, we initiated a Teaching Fellowship in the Social Art of Architecture as a first step to encourage and foster a new approach among faculty.

As the long-time Coordinator for the PRIZE program and editor of our extensive current and archival website (www.BerkeleyPrize.org), I have been able to interact with numerous architecture students and educators, to whom my first question always is: What role does the *social art of architecture* play in learning about and teaching design? The results of the Teaching Fellowship in this regard are the focus of this paper. Most importantly, this paper explores what can and should be done to make the *social art of architecture* and human-centered, Universal Design ideals the primary focus of architectural education in the coming years.

Two vignettes:

I am a university Teaching Associate, responsible for desk critiques in a course that serves as an introduction to Technical and Graphic Communications (a.k.a., working drawings). This is a short time before the computers dominated the studio. The students are all hunched over their drawing except for one student, a young man very close to my age, who is in a wheelchair. He is at the rear of his desk, awkwardly trying to draw upside down at the top of the sheet. It is clear why he is doing this: the top of the sheet is out of his reach from the wheelchair if he tries working from the front of the desk. To make matters worse, his control over the pencil is not that secure due to an apparent muscular issue. I am at a complete loss: how to deal with this student with different needs is a completely new issue for me. My first instinct is to locate the building maintenance manager and together we offer to essentially break the table mechanism, so that at least the top will lie flat, cut the legs so that the table will be lower and more accessible for him, and jerry-rig a roller device at the bottom of the board to collect the portion of the sheet he is not using. He refuses all these offers and angrily asks me why I am treating him any differently from any of the other students. For the rest of the semester I try to do exactly that. He receives just a passing grade in the course: the result not of the appearance of the drawings, but what he communicated...or failed to communicate.

Years later, I was vividly reminded of this personal learning moment as I read the introduction to a book about an architect named Paul Williams. Williams was a fashionable architect of the 1930s through the 1950s, primarily practicing in Los Angeles. He completed hundreds of house and building commissions, many for

* See, Lifchez and Clavan, 2005; and Clavan and Lifchez, 2006 for a full history.

famous movie stars, and major public commissions in Southern California, including parts of the Beverly Hills hotel. It was a hotel at which he himself could not think of spending the night. Paul Williams was African-American, the first to become a member of the American Institute of Architects. His grand-daughter reports that as a Negro at that time in the United States, Williams was acutely aware of the cultural norms. He knew that he could not always assume that it was acceptable for a black man to sit shoulder to shoulder with a white woman even in a business situation. Since he often had to review drawings with the lady of the house and draw alternatives on the spot he always positioned himself across the table from his client – and drew *upside down* so that his client would fully understand his suggestions or corrections. He, in fact, taught himself how to draw upside down for the exact purpose of a social propriety that is now recognized as highly offensive.

Setting the Context

Knowledge in architecture has always been highly suspect with regard to accuracy. Knowledge means that one thing is right and its opposite is wrong. Or, one thing is good and its opposite is bad. Setting aside some specific issues of tectonics, most people do not believe that architecture ever has, can, or should be evaluated in this sort of objective manner. We have heard all the arguments. From the side of commodity: Architecture is about providing a specific solution for a specific use. From the side of firmness: Architecture is about harnessing technology to create constructible solutions. From the side of delight: Architecture is about creating pleasure.

Depending on the era, depending on the practitioner, depending on the wider real-world context – the product of architecture bends one way or the other against the head winds of these (too often) seemingly conflicting demands. The reality is a vast majority of poorly conceived and even more poorly executed designs. Worse, the result is not just poor buildings, but whole populations inadequately served in their housing, in their offices, in their public facilities, and in the towns and regions in which they spend their lives. Rarely are the results based on values. On good and bad. On right or wrong. Or even, more acceptable/less acceptable.

Why does it have to be this way? The proponents of modern architecture as it developed at the close of the 19th and through the first half of the 20th century looked around them and saw need. Need for basic housing for vast portions of their under-served populations. Need for altogether new and hugely expanded architectural components of public services. Need for re-organization of the urban landscape to facilitate the enormous growth in cities. Need for individuals at whatever social stratum to be able to express and experience pleasure in their built environment.

Thus started a vast experiment in re-making architecture: transforming the community and artisan basis of architecture into a technical profession. The core idea was the harnessing of science and technology to aid the building process. The outward result was the stripping of the visible portions of buildings bare of centuries of accumulated – and to many, useless – ornament and debris. And the sub-text? Talking in new ways not just about form, and to some extent function, but about the place of people in architecture.

The derivation of the term, the *social art of architecture*, an idea reflected even in the ancient writings of Vitruvius, can be traced in modern times to the mid-nineteenth century. Victor Hugo, writing about the art of writing in the *Hunchback of Notre Dame* (1831) is quoted as saying, “Architecture will no longer be the *social art*, the collective art, the dominating art...” John Ruskin, working in the following decades and whose art and architecture criticism were to transform the

way people looked at art, insisted that art and architecture are the direct expression of the social conditions in which they are produced. The International Congress of Modern Architecture (CIAM) founded in 1928 and the most influential advocate of a new architecture into the early 1950s, vigorously promoted the cause of "architecture as a social art." Simultaneously, the new architects were to assume an active role in changing the world around them.

As we now know, this experiment in "modern," international design is universally considered, in many ways, a failure. Documentation and analysis of this failure of modern architecture has become a mini-industry in the publishing world. At worst, it was simply an excuse to exercise creativity in the name of a new style. At best, it was a well-intentioned mash-up of dozens of new intellectual currents. People still suffered in the new building order. Living conditions slowly improved for some, but often at a cost to the social conditions of their lives and the life of the community.

Fast-forward to the 1960s. In a combination of a rising tide of prosperity, more thoughtful education leading to new levels of social investigation and awareness, an accumulation of new breakthroughs in science and technology, and the overall expansion of human population (more minds looking at more questions producing more answers), every intellectual discipline was re-examined for relevancy, productivity, and contribution to the human good. Many were found lacking. Re-organization, re-thinking, re-creating was the task of the day and of the time. Experiments in living were matched with experiments in building; architecture reportedly re-found its social roots.

This time around, the results would be different. Architectural theorists scrambled to apply the lessons and findings of sociologists, environmental psychologists, anthropologists, and the religious (notably the Buddhists and their special awareness of the power of the *reflective mind*) to building. Evidence-based design – a phrase that actually did not gain traction for another thirty years – was the goal. Learn not only from the lessons of the past, but from the burgeoning data fields being created by armies of social investigators going out into the world, asking questions, recording answers, and stirring the pot. *Architecture for people* seemed to be not only an actual possibility, but became a mantra for a new generation of students...and faculty wanting to explore the outer dimensions of the new discipline of architecture. Regrettably, no new lasting pedagogy emerged.

Today

There is wide-spread agreement that the architecture of the new millennium – despite all of the above – is also barely different from decades past. The edges have been blurred a bit, there is acknowledgement that there is something else out there that needs to be addressed, but if anything, architecture today is more form-driven and less people-driven than even at the beginning of the 1970s. What makes this state of affairs even more perplexing is the growing list of colleges and universities who sponsor socially-conscious projects outside the campus, whether it be housing for the poor, experiments in sustainable design, or attempts at positing radical changes in traditional building types. These enterprises are matched in the profession by a small, but growing number of those who, as in the titles of the most widely received recent books on the subject, provide their services *pro bono*, and design as if they "give a damn". (Cary, J. and Public Architecture, eds., 2010; *Architecture for Humanity*, ed., 2006 and 2012) All of this ferment is stacked against an equally evident return to design for design sake's object-driven architectural education that seems to be primarily motivated by the potentials of computer-aided design technologies.

Part of the problem has been that, however committed to the goals of social justice, architects and architecture schools do not know what to do with seemingly extraneous theoretical, experimental, and/or practical social information bubbling up, or more succinctly lying fallow, around them.

Architecture has even begun to look a bit different: less brutal, more sinuous, using a variety of often, “softer” natural materials. But then, architecture always begins to look a bit different over time, sometimes slowly, sometimes more quickly.

The actual *how*, not to mention the questionable *why* of applying the findings and lessons of the social sciences to architecture remain unanswered. If anything, not only the social sciences, but science itself has become, if not discredited, then somewhat suspect. From the roots of the counter-culture claims of the ‘60s that scientists created a world gone amuck, we have entered a new age where the very definition of the truths, or as some see it, the untruths, of science are debated. The result is that the study of the “vertical mammal”* in all its idiosyncratic complexity is still, even at this late date, only in its infancy.

The fallback position is that architecture has always been about form – the object. The manipulation of form is fun and has the added status of being seen as an artistic endeavor. Since you have to go to school anyway to get your credentials (part of the scheme of professionalism), you might as well learn about it. Study form long enough and you develop theories about form itself. Architecture is replete with them. So many, in fact, that most of these theories amount to little more than a new or new/old style. Style is usually easy to duplicate and even if it is not, today you can digitize it and create a simulacrum. In contrast, social theory is a product of the (suspect) scientists and difficult if not impossible to implement: be gone with it and them!

The PRIZE and Teaching Fellowship

The format for the BERKELEY PRIZE is straightforward. Each year we select a topic integral to the *social art of architecture* and pose a question, really a prompt, to which the students respond. From the first topic, “The Architect Meets the Nursing Home” to this year’s, “The Architect Confronts Poverty,” we have strived to encourage these young architects to go out into their communities and explore the world in which they live in light of the topic and question.[#] A substantial cash award is given for the best essays. It is often a mind-boggling task for the student, made all the more difficult by most schools of architecture’s reluctance to see – and teach – social purpose as a subject that is as important a concern as the assembly of the building facade.

The idea is sound and the history is there: good architecture starts with an understanding of the people who will use a building or a place. If you do not have an idea about how seniors actually lead their lives or want to lead their lives, your design for a nursing home will fail, however handsome the structure. If you do not have an idea about how a town, or a city, or a region can integrate the lessons of dealing with the underprivileged into its building program, your design for that town or city or region will fail, however dramatic or visually astounding. The need for beautiful architecture is a given. The basis for that beauty starts with human-centered design.

The primary goal of the BERKELEY PRIZE Teaching Fellowship is to support innovative thinking by architecture faculty as they work to focus their students’ attention on the social, behavioral, and

* A term favored by Dr. Richard Hayes, Director of Knowledge Resources for the American Institute of Architects to (un-) distinguish us from the rest of the living population of the earth in the pursuit of truly Universal Design.

[#] Students are given a further incentive to compete: each year the selected 25 or more semifinalists are given the opportunity to propose a study trip outside of their home country that is linked to that year’s topic. This trip, the BERKELEY PRIZE Travel Fellowship, is hopefully part of a social service event or conference. Twenty-five students have been awarded Travel Fellowships over the last eleven years. Their travelogues speak to the extent to which on-site, face-to-face investigations transform the landscape of architectural inquiry.

physical characteristics of the *users* of the buildings and spaces they design. This is simultaneously a curriculum-development project and a teaching-development project. One major element is to actually implement/teach a specifically designed syllabus. What the PRIZE Committee is ultimately seeking are Fellows able to reflect upon and articulate for other interested faculty what they have learned from teaching the subject and who, at the same time, are able to describe how to replicate their efforts in other schools and potentially to a wider audience. More than this, the Teaching Fellowship presents a unique opportunity to investigate the specifics of teaching the *social art of architecture* and to explore why it is overwhelmingly not taught.

Teaching Universal Design

The first BERKELEY PRIZE Teaching Fellowship coincided with the 2013 PRIZE topic of the “Architect and the Accessible City.” All of the selected Fellows agree on one principle: accessibility is about Universal Design, about an inclusive architecture that does not develop special, code-related responses for one client group or another, but that creates a built environment in which everyone is equal. This is, at heart, a definition for human-centered design. Within this community of agreement is a great range of perspectives, all of which are informed by the special context in which the Fellows’ courses were taught.

The group of inaugural 2013 Fellows included five undergraduate faculty from around the world, representing widely varying backgrounds and experiences, who have attempted to teach Universal Design reflective of their own unique situations. All worked in different settings, some alone and some as part of a team of teachers.

- Allan Birabi (Makerere University, Uganda): Birabi’s project emphasizes the first principles of teaching Universal Design: accessibility within the context of a heavily-impacted and minimally-serviced environment; investigating how best to confront lack of knowledge, disinterest, and/or disregard for the subject.
- Ajay Khare (School of Planning and Architecture, Bhopal, India) with Rachna Khare: From within a more supportive, but still advancing, environment, the Khares provide a discussion of how global initiatives can be turned into local successes; providing thoughts on how the requirement for culturally-significant approaches and responses might affect the overall teaching of Universal Design.
- Alex MacLaren (Edinburgh School of Architecture, United Kingdom): MacLaren focuses on how Universal Design can be integrated into real-time projects that start – and sometimes stop – as a result of well-intentioned community and student interaction.
- Josh Safdie (Massachusetts College of Art and Design, USA): Given the freedom allowed by an already well-“codified” environment, Safdie reflects on the meaning of Universal Design on the larger, urban scale; and personal reflections on what this means for his teaching.
- Eve Edelstein (University of Arizona, USA): Building on her background in neuroscience, and with the use of emerging simulation and behavioral tracking technologies, Edelstein explores the neural bases for attributing value to architectural design, and uses such advances to develop principles that may be applied in design thinking and in practice.

Reports from four of the five Fellows are included in the Proceedings of this Conference. (Alex MacLaren, who could not participate, has a full report at www.BerkeleyPrize.org.) What is especially interesting is the introspective nature of these studies. The focus is not the student work and the student achievement, although that is significant and holds lessons of its own. It is about how, faced with talking about architecture in non-traditional ways, not only does the process of teaching change, but the lives of the faculty themselves change. The subject of “The Architect and the

Accessible City” puts these issues in stark relief, but they are the same issues that can be asked in any human-centered design process.

A Basis for Change

There is now a half-century of ground-breaking studies of the sociology of architecture by such figures as MacKinnon, Blau, Larson, Gutman, Ghirado, Cuff, Crawford, Jenkins, etc. All of these researchers have attempted in one way or another to apply the lessons of the social sciences to the development of (an) architectural theory. Gary Stevens, one of the leading figures in the field, capsulizes the problem of applying scientific research to architecture: “Research, as envisaged by scientists, is simply not a natural function of the architectural education system of the English-speaking world, and never has been. ‘Research’ implies that a discipline produces knowledge and nothing more. Architecture also produces taste and ways of valorizing buildings. As a result, its production bears scant resemblance to those from other areas.” (Stevens, G., 1998, p. 222)

The difficult questions posed by this conclusion are being examined by other academics as we gather today at this international symposium to talk about applying Universal Design research to design. Is it even possible? Whatever the results of their studies, the over-riding objective must be to discover ways to discharge the false dualism that has emerged in architecture between social concerns and creative design and between human-driven design and object-driven design

Lessons from the Universal Design Education Project, as reported in length in *Strategies for Teaching Universal Design* (Welch, P., ed., 1995), are a basis for talking about and debating the requirements of a new teaching model. But *new* faculty – prominent among them the BERKELEY PRIZE Teaching Fellows – are agreed that the new model for teaching undergraduate design must be, above all, one in which the *social art of architecture* is treated as an essential belief. As Fellow Safdie suggests, it must be “a fundamental tenet by which all design thinking is measured and by which all outcomes are evaluated.” This is not an easy and certainly not a straightforward goal. Measurement and evaluation has as much to do with power and politics as it has to do with humanism and aesthetics.

The experiences of the Fellows and the history behind their teaching suggests the need to more systematically investigate a series of large-scale changes that would be required to fully implement the teaching of the *social art of architecture*. There are four that are most apparent:

1. The emphasis must be on place, not studio;
2. User/experts must become an integral part of the learning environment;
3. Different standards must be adopted for course outcomes; and
4. Social scientists must be (re-)integrated into the design process.

Place, not Studio: The issue here is the need to reverse the current vast majority amount of time a student spends drawing at a table in the studio with on-the-ground design, in real time, with the users. Hearing from and walking with a person who uses a motor chair in their own environment is different from hearing from and interacting with a person who has studied those using motor chairs, however detailed or extensive the observations. Extend that lesson to any of the multiple tasks involved in designing a building and the result is the same. The faulty member must not only be prepared to deal with teaching on-site, but also be prepared to deal with a completely new array of issues that result from such direct community involvement. Fellow MacLaren’s report on one such effort pinpoints not only the day-to-day logistical problems, but also the need to address her administrator’s concerns, and the students’ bewilderment as to what to do when residents make clear that slipshod trash collection is more of an issue for the local residents than is building design.

All of this is even more critical in a case like Fellow Birabi's, whose students were hampered by the fact that, "To date, most Ugandan cultures view disability as a curse allegedly emanating from witchcraft, maternal promiscuity or displeasure of the gods or some tribal or ancestral spirits and hence creating limited social acceptance of people with disabilities." Nothing will change this reality – or make any design intervention workable - until the populace becomes familiar with the issues. To the extent that architecture students can help change this particular dynamic or any other similar cultural dynamic, it is not going to happen by students sitting at their desks within the studio.

User/Experts: BERKELEY PRIZE Teaching Fellowship Coordinator, Elaine Ostroff, developed this term and has done significant work to establish the use of user/experts in the design studio. The idea is that the people who know the most about the any design requirement are the users – who, by definition, are therefore experts in defining and evaluating their own interactions with specific environments. Too often, experts brought into the studio are solely accredited academically in the subject and/or have a range of practical experiences in providing answers for others. Neither qualification is sufficient for fostering human-centered design. User/experts help to identify issues that help to frame design problems in new ways. "No survey research, ergonomic study or focus group can substitute for direct interaction with potential users during the design process." (Ostroff, 1997)

In reality, the Fellows had varying degrees of difficulty putting into operation the use of users/experts, starting with the use of the term itself – experts should have credentials and titles, rather than be simply people leading their diverse lives in the community. There was the issue of how to identify and qualify such a person, how to attract them to the studio, and how their expertise could be tapped once they were there. The use of user/experts raises questions of comfort for all parties: students, faculty, and the user/experts themselves; confidence regarding the information given and gathered in this situation; and complexity in terms of how specific the design response can or should be when generated by a third party. In reflection, the BERKELEY PRIZE staff could have provided more guidance in addressing these questions.

Course outcomes: MaLaren notes that, "The contrasting requirement of demonstrating technical academic ability versus effectively communicating with community members had polarized, meaning that a substantial amount of work produced was at cross-purposes to the interests of the audience." This kind of observation is indicative of an entire category of significant needed changes in design education. One of the most important ideas is abandoning orthogonal drawings – almost indecipherable to most *users* - as the baseline for design and substituting other kinds of investigative and graphic methods. The use of setting/scenario diagrams portrayed in a photograph and model collage that allows students to tell stories linked to a place, extensively developed by Lifchez in his breakthrough work on bringing Universal Design into the architecture studio and to the forefront of students' thought (Lifchez, R. 1984; Lifchez, R. and Winslow, B. 1979), is one primary "new" approach. Telling stories is critical: people understand stories and people are persuaded by real stories. Plans and elevations, statistics and graphs, however well-executed and well-researched, have limited persuasive and almost no visceral value in creating places for living.

Avoiding didactic, formal presentations; helping students to learn how to deal with ambiguity and contradiction; abandoning the deeply-rooted, engineering-based idea that the only true way to evaluate a building is to confirm that it performs (remains standing) or fails (falls down); and placing as much emphasis and academic acknowledgement on creative on-the-ground solutions as on drawing – these are all needed changes. They can and do contradict well-developed means of evaluating student performance and, in many cases, contradict the syllabus requirements put into place to meet current academic credentialing by governing boards. Both also need to be reviewed.

Social Scientists: Social scientists have been more-or-less missing from the studio and classroom since the 1980s as studies in form once again became the focus of most architecture schools. Even at Berkeley as well-known “social” hires of the 60s and 70s, for instance, William “Russ” Ellis and Claire Cooper Marcus, have become professor emeriti, they have not been replaced. Without their input, an informed *social art of architecture* is literally impossible. How to directly apply the findings of social scientists to the design task is a primary consideration. As a result of her efforts during the Fellowship year, Edelstein concludes, “Similar to an integrated project delivery processes consultants (neuroscientific, clinical, physiological, and psycho-social specialists) should supplement the design team to search for and interpret the rigorous findings into terms that can be translated into design.”

But segregating their efforts in another academy far removed from the studio makes the task that much more difficult, if not impossible. Securing a place for the social sciences in the architectural curricula is, perhaps, a starting point, but the real task is to finally implement face-to-face interdisciplinary investigations that have a real chance at success. Making linkages between critical theory and the building enterprise is clearly the role and expertise of sociologists, anthropologists, and psychologists; architects are not trained and cannot be expected to do it alone. Directly integrating the social sciences into their Fellowship year was not part of the original charge, but upon reflection, the work of all of the Fellows would have benefited from such interaction.

All that being said, there is a fifth and more critical, over-riding requirement for teaching the *social art of architecture*: consciously incorporating the idea of empathy into the architectural studio and classroom. Welch describes the shortcomings of the empathic technique itself as a teaching device: “Despite its intrinsic fascination for students, the empathic exercise risks misrepresenting the real issue...” (Welch, P., ed. 1995, p. 256) What you can NOT do is to ignore the issue. In the end, there is simply conversation: Whom are we designing for? How, if at all, do they differ from us? Why is it more important for us to have a satisfied user than a project that will receive a peer-reviewed prize for uniqueness? (Or, is it possible that we can do both?) Most importantly: Why are we architects and what are our goals? In this regard, how many schools actually offer or require a course in the Philosophy of Architecture, let alone other courses in social and behavioral factors in design?

I am reminded once again of the student who learned how to draw upside down and the architect who taught himself how to draw upside down, both out of the necessity to confront widely different forces stacked against them to succeed. Fortunately, neither would likely be required to do so today. But, unfortunately, all of the forces that existed then to impede their progress survive today. The idea of the “other,” the person different from ourselves, the individual who because of *our* often limited perspective is not part of the equation of designing and building – that still prevails. It might not be as visible. It might not be as much of an impediment. It remains, however, as part of our unconscious reality, whether in the classroom or in the field. And until we lessen its grip on all of us, a true *social art of architecture* will never be possible.

CONCLUSION

If architecture is to ever truly reflect its importance as a social art, and if Universal Design is to be accepted as a prerequisite for good design, a completely different approach to the teaching of architecture and the preparation of teachers of architecture is required. First and foremost, we must open the door to the question of value, of what works and what does not, of what is good and bad. Inside the academy, the new approach questions the accepted dogma of subjectivity and neutrality in traditional teaching, particularly as it applies to subjects of taste and perception in

architecture. Outside the academy, the new approach requires a willingness to engage with the community in ways much different than traditionally accepted. The result is a different and more sensitive relationship between the teacher and the student, and between the student and their peers, and yes, between teachers and their peers. These relationships require a seminal change in the way we look at the production of architecture as a whole.






These are not new ideas. They are, perhaps, newer ideas to this generation of teachers and students. What was hinted at the turn of the 20th century, demanded in the 1960s, and now re-awakened at the start of the 21st century is the recognition that architecture is ultimately, at its very core, a social art. It is also a discipline, like any other, capable of rules and ways of *doing* that can be shared, tested, and re-tested in the field to obtain the best possible outcomes. Nothing is lost: not beauty, not individuality, not academic liberties, nor the freedom to experiment. The wonder is that there is everything to gain.

REFERENCES

- Architecture for Humanity (ed.) 2006. *Design Like You Give a Damn*, Metropolis Books, New York.
- Architecture for Humanity (ed.) 2012. *Design Like You Give a Damn (2)*, Abrams, New York.
- Cary, J. and Public Architecture (eds.) 2010. *The Power of Pro Bono*, Metropolis Books.
- Clavan, B. and Lifchez, R. 2006. "The Berkeley Prize: Those Who Make it Work." In *Places Journal*, 18(2).
- Dutton, T. A. 1996. "Cultural Studies and Critical Pedagogy: Cultural Pedagogy and Architecture," In Dutton, T. A. and Mann, L.H. (eds.), *Reconstructing Architecture: Critical Discourses and Social Patterns*, University of Minnesota Press.
- Hatch, C. R. (ed.) 1984. *The Scope of Social Architecture*, Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York.
- Hudson, K. E. 1993. *Paul R. Williams: A Legacy of Style*, Rizzoli, New York.
- Lifchez, R. 1987. *Rethinking Architecture: Design Students and Physically Disabled People*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Lifchez, R. and Clavan, B. 2005. "Competing to Learn: The Berkeley Prize and the Social Art of Architecture," In *Places Journal*, 17(1).
- Lifchez, R. and Winslow, B. 1979. *Design for Independent Living: The Environment and Physically Disabled People*, Whitney Library of Design, New York.
- Ockman, J. (ed.) 2012. *Architecture School: Three centuries of educating architects in North America*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Ostroff, E. 1997. "Mining Our Natural Resources: The User as Expert." In *Innovation*, the Quarterly Journal of the Industrial Designers Society of America, 16(1).
- Stevens, G. 1998. *The Favored Circle: The Social Foundations of Architectural Distinction*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Welch, P. (ed.) 1995. *Strategies for Teaching Universal Design*, Adaptive Environments, Boston, Massachusetts and MIG Communications, Berkeley, California.

(OPTIONAL ILLUSTRATION for graphic purposes only: Not referenced in paper, not required for consideration of content, and additional to the maximum 10 pages.)

The screenshot shows the Berkeley Prize website for the 2014 competition. The header includes navigation links: home | administration | my portfolio | logout. The main navigation bar lists: ABOUT THE PRIZE, ESSAY PRIZE, TRAVEL FELLOWSHIP, TEACHING FELLOWSHIP (highlighted), and DESIGN FELLOWSHIP. The page title is 'THE SIXTEENTH ANNUAL BERKELEY UNDERGRADUATE PRIZE FOR ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN EXCELLENCE 2014'. Below the navigation, there are links for '2014' and '2013'. The main heading is 'THE 2013 TEACHING FELLOWSHIP COMPETITION'. A button says 'Visit the 2013 Teaching Fellowship Competition'. A sub-heading is 'Teaching Fellowship Competition'. The text describes the fellowship: 'Starting last year, a new BERKELEY PRIZE Teaching Fellowship is offered to undergraduate architecture studio design faculty from around the world. The primary goal of this Fellowship is to support innovative thinking by faculty as they work to focus their students' attention on the social, behavioral, and physical characteristics of the users of the buildings and spaces being designed. The 2014 Teaching Fellowship proposals, based on this year's PRIZE topic, Healthful Architecture, are due on May 31, 2014. Students, be sure to tell your teachers about this opportunity.' Below this text are five profiles of the 2013 Teaching Fellows, each with a photo, name, title, institution, and a 'read proposal' link.

2013	2013	2013	2013	2013
				
Allan K. Birabi, Ph.D. Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda	Eve A. Edelstein, Ph.D. University of Arizona, Tucson, USA	Ajay Khare, Ph.D. School of Planning and Architecture, Bhopal, India	Alex MacLaren, RIBA Edinburgh School of Architecture, UK	Josh Safdie, Assoc. AIA Massachusetts College of Art and Design, USA
read proposal »	read proposal »	read proposal »	read proposal »	read proposal »

© 1998-2014 BERKELEY PRIZE Endowment. sitemap | privacy policy | web development

For permission for any form of re-use of any of the contents, please contact info@berkeleyprize.org.
The BERKELEY PRIZE is endorsed by the Department of Architecture, University of California, Berkeley.

Figure 1. A page from the BERKELEY PRIZE website, www.BerkeleyPrize.org, documenting the selected, inaugural Teaching Fellows.