COMMUNITY DESIGN CENTERS (CDCs) ON THE UPSURGE: INVESTIGATING PERCEPTIONS AMONGST CDC LEADERS AND ADMINISTRATORS IN TEXAS

RODRIGUEZ, ROBERT KEVIN
The University of Texas at Arlington, kevin.rodriguez@mavs.uta.edu

OZDIL, TANER R.
The University of Texas at Arlington, tozdil@uta.edu

AUDIRAC, IVONNE
The University of Texas at Arlington, audirac@uta.edu

1 ABSTRACT

For decades, community design centers (CDCs) have specialized in providing professional design and planning assistance to non-profit groups and individuals that lack the funding or resources to otherwise receive such services (ACD 2016). Since the year 2000, the number of these CDCs has nearly tripled in North America, from just under 70, to over 200 organizations, covering ever-expanding disciplinary, and strategic territories (ACSA 2014). The purpose of this research was to explore the recent surge of CDCs in North America, and specifically Texas. This study attempted to elucidate, from the perspective of CDC directors in the state of Texas, what economic, environmental, and social factors underlie such growth. Furthermore, this study sought to answer what roles do landscape architecture, architecture, and urban planning play in the operation of CDCs. This research utilized qualitative methods informed by the "research act" of Gaber and Gaber (2007). Semi-structured interviews were conducted using open-ended questions to build upon respondents' current knowledge of community design practices. The information obtained was analyzed to draw themes (Taylor and Bogdan 1984) explaining the upsurge of CDCs and to gain insight regarding the continued spread of CDCs and their practices. The findings of this research illustrate an increased economic, environmental, and social need for the services CDCs offer in Texas. The findings suggest an increased humanitarian awareness through service-learning and community-engaged design practice and education, and an open appreciation for multi-disciplinary practices which blend disciplinary boundaries amongst landscape architecture, planning, and architecture, under the unifying identity of urban design.

1.1 Keywords

Community Design Centers, Administration And Leadership, Multi-Disciplinary Practice, Texas, Project Typologies

2   INTRODUCTION

2.1   Community Design Centers: Then and Now

The advent of community design centers (CDCs) can be synonymously "...linked to the community-based struggles of the 1960s that took place in the context of the civil rights movement, the rise of women's liberation, the anti-war movement, and the challenges of alternative cultures... all of which represented an upheaval of civil society" (Sanoff 2000, 2). Influenced in this manner, CDCs rose up in the 1960s as dedicated providers of planning, design, and development services to low and moderate-income communities (ACD 2016) which were documented and often explored amongst both professional and academic communities alike (Blake 2015; Curry 2004; Dorgan 2012; Sanoff 2003).

Entering the 1980s, however, national politics began to shift and widespread support of CDCs wavered, losing favor to a less government-funded, perceivably more business-led, economic development strategy (Taylor 1998). At this time, "in response to the economic and political pressures of the 1980s some community design centers remained..." (Sanoff 2000, 5) although their numbers eventually tapered.

Within the past few decades though, CDCs have once again experienced a resurgence. Since the year 2000, the number of CDCs in North America has grown from around 70, to over 200 organizations of various structures and capacities (ACSA 2014). Despite this growth, "little is known about the normative underpinnings of CDCs, how successful these centers have been, which factors have contributed to or impeded their success, and how they have responded to the changes in social, political, professional and economic contexts" (Tural 2011, 2).

2.2   Purpose of this Research

The purpose of this research is to document the current state of affairs for Texas CDCs, at a time when their increased presence demands attention (Tam 2011; Tural 2011; Zhou 2011). Specifically, this research sought to determine if economic, environmental, or social factors are underlying this growth. Simultaneously, this research attempted to interpret disciplinary boundaries within CDCs to determine what role, if any, the professions of architecture, landscape architecture, and urban planning play in the spread of CDCs in Texas, and by extension North America.

3   LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1   Community Design Origins

Throughout the urbanization and cultural development of the United States, a rich history of not only physical, but social and political change has followed (Hartshorn 1992; Mehrhoff 1999). In much the same way, through numerous paradigm shifts of planning and design, community design evolved within both the historical and theoretical environment of the 1960s and 70s, "...in the context of a general upheaval of civil society in the USA which included the civil rights movement, the rise of women's liberation, the anti-war movement, the student protest, together with more militant labour demands and the challenge of alternative cultures which were destroying the myth of a conflict-free, post-industrial society, and shaking the basic mechanisms of social control" (Castells 1983, 49).

By its own definition, community design is its own movement, focused on giving that control back, through the creation and management of built environments for people, *by* the people. Ranging from the neighborhood to regional scale, community design embraces a variety of practices, which can be summarized as addressing the needs of the people, their everyday environments, and highlighting their empowerment and participation to leverage environmental justice (Hester 1990). Motivated by these goals, community designers work towards addressing social, economic, and political issues in relation to the built environment (ACD 2016). In doing this, "the study of cities is a dynamic, multifaceted area of inquiry that combines a number of disciplines, perspectives, time periods, and actors" (Mehrhoff 1999, vii). As a result, the professional roots of community design lie not within a few, but several disciplines: architecture, landscape architecture, city planning, social work and environmental psychology (Hester 1990).

3.2   Community Design Centers

Brought about during the 1960s, community design centers were created in dedication to the provision of planning, design, and development services in low - and moderate - income communities which would normally lack the funding or general accessibility to receive such services (ACD 2016). Since its first inception, however, a number of CDC models have been incorporated throughout North America which either build upon or narrow the scope of such services. An understanding that CDCs can also be differentiated by typology is important, as "the CDC typology sets up the framework for understanding and classifying the plethora of CDCs that have proliferated since the 1990s" (Tam 2012, 7). These typologies include private for-profit CDCs, university-based CDCs, NGO's and non-profit CDCs, municipal-based CDCs, as well as an assortment of hybrid CDCs which adopt some form of organization from the other typologies (ACD 2016).

With these infrastructures, CDCs of the 1960's expanded in numbers well into the 1970s before social and political changes inhibited their reach. Yet, the distinct decline of active CDCs in the 1980's, only brought with it a new era of burgeoning growth in the 1990's. According to Cary in an Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture's (ACSA) survey (2000), over fifty percent of current university-based community design programs were initiated during the 1990s. Accordingly, many authors specifically noted the practice of community design/build education throughout the United States to have grown since the 1990's as well, although the reasons for this are not completely understood (Goodman 2014; Schuman 2000). As such, considering the current inventory of CDCs across not only North America but the state of Texas, this resurgence would appear worthy of further research. In doing so, "knowing why the practice becomes popular at particular historic moments is key to understanding its utility for the profession and for the communities it claims to serve" (Goodman 2014, 504). With a history of less than fifty years, the CDC model remains open to study and interpretation, and in particular to examining the role of architecture, landscape architecture, and urban planning professions to the development and growth of CDCs (Pitera 2015).

4   METHODOLOGY

This study followed a qualitative research design consisting of several sequential steps. These steps included: establishing research questions, defining a study population and location, data collection, organizing and analyzing data for its observations of reality, identifying data limitations, and presenting the research results (Gaber and Gaber 2007).

As such, spanning across the state, this study population was decidedly limited to Texas for reasons of not only accessibility, but practicality, and potential diversity of both rural and urban perspectives. Once this was determined, the study concentrated on fifteen recognized CDCs which currently exist in the state of Texas (ACD 2016; ACSA 2015). Data for this research was based on semi-structured interviews that allowed the researcher to ask exploratory and descriptive questions (Gaber and Gaber 2007) which sought the input of these CDC leaders and administrators due to their current position and knowledge of CDC operations in their practice. Designed to elicit open-ended responses, a set of secondary interview questions were consequently meant to elaborate upon the original research questions, and were formulated and heavily influenced by findings from the literature review. These interview questions specifically asked:

- How long have you been in your profession, and how long have you served in your current position?
- What is your educational background, and how, if at all, do you feel it may have helped prepare you for this position?
- Can you briefly describe some of your previous work experience which you feel may have prepared you for your current position?
- Can you provide a brief history of why this organization was established?
- Can you briefly describe the organization's scope of work or type of projects it undertakes?
- Who would you say composes the most significant portion of your clientele?
- What percentage (%) of your project portfolio would you say emphasize primarily: economic, environmental, or social issues?
- What percentage (%) of your project portfolio would you categorize as primarily:

architecture, landscape architecture, or urban planning-based services?
- How would you rate or assess the importance of architecture, landscape architecture, and urban planning, as applied to your organization's practices and why?
- What do you feel is causing the recent increase of CDCs across North America?

The interviews were audio recorded. Phone interviews were also scheduled at the participants' convenience and (conducted over speakerphone) and audio recorded. Each of these interviews were later transcribed verbatim into electronic text. Once the transcription process was complete, data obtained from each of the respective interviews were then organized by interview questions and then analyzed through the process of content analysis (Gaber and Gaber 2007). Differences and commonalities were noted and compiled to draw themes for studying the upsurge of CDCs and to gain insight regarding the continued establishment and practices of CDCs in Texas and nationwide.

It is important to note that the conclusions drawn from the interview data were subject to particular limitations and biases, as analysis of the data was based upon certain assumptions that were inherently part of the research process. For instance, the results of the interviews were based upon a sampling of CDC leaders and administrators in Texas who responded to the interview questions based upon their own unique perspectives. These respondents vary not only in their personal and educational backgrounds, but by the particular geographic locations and the human populations that they serve as well. Their responses, therefore, may not fully be representative of the majority of CDCs across Texas nor North America.

5   ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

5.1   Participants' Profiles

Out of 15 recognized CDCs located throughout the state of Texas, this study interviewed 11 leaders and administrators (7 male, 4 female) representing all but 3 CDC organizations. These participants currently operate under a variety of titles, including, but not limited to: director, co-director, program coordinator, manager, founder, and co-founder. In addition to this, 27% of respondents actually hold these titles *concurrently*, within multiple CDC organizations. This is important to note, as respondents' views and opinions may ultimately be representative of more than one CDC organization.

5.1.1 Participants by Profession. That said, all participants were asked the same series of questions regarding their professional, educational, and experiential backgrounds. In response, 46% of the participants identified their profession as planning, and 36% stated it to be architecture. Meanwhile, somewhat unexpectedly, 18% of participants actually self-identified themselves as professors. This is of particular interest, as upon further investigation, 46% of the remaining participants currently teach in academic institutions as well. This infers a minimum of 64% of participants have academic connections, as opposed to being strictly a working professional.

5.1.2 Participants by Years of Experience. In terms of professional experience, a relatively diverse sampling seems to be represented as well. With an average number of 25 years experience, 36% of participants fall between 9-12 years, while 36% have over 40 years professional experience. Once compared by profession, however, those numbers seem to skew considerably. By years, those in architecture seem to have the most experience overall, with an average of 39 years in the profession. While planners, on the other hand, had an average of 16 years experience; less than half the average as those in architecture. By professional comparison, this trend holds true similarly in regards to the number of years each participant has held their current CDC position as well. For those in architecture, the average was significantly higher at 13 years in their current position, versus those in planning at 3 years.

5.1.3 Participants by Educational Attainment. In regards to educational attainment, 100% of participants hold a bachelor's degree from their respective fields of study. Of them, nearly 50% obtained their professional degree in architecture (B.Arch). Moreover, out of all participants, 82% also hold master's degrees. Similarly, nearly 50% of those with master's degrees have it in urban planning. Educationally speaking, why is architecture the dominant bachelor's, yet urban planning a dominantly held master's?

From the interviews, two possible answers to this question are revealed. For one, 27% of participants identified their degree in urban planning as complementary to an architectural background, particularly as applied to community design processes. Regarding this topic, participant 1 (P1) explains, "I have this background where I know a fair amount about design... but also, I have the planning background and municipal experience of how cities operate, that all pull together so that I run this interdisciplinary

center with all those things combined." Furthermore, coming to urban planning with a design background offered an advantageous opportunity for participants to bring their design skills and to look at urban issues from not only a policy perspective, but in terms of micro-scale urban design issues (P7). Not the least of which, participant 5 simply states it to be an educational combination which provides both the administrative and design background useful for planning positions (P5).

Besides being professionally practical, however, the other reason 27% of participants cite is of a more personal nature. "I've always taken a sort of environmental slant, sustainability slant - in my personal interests and in work. And pursuing my master's in planning, really was a great way for me to look deeper into issues I cared about - about spaces, and community, and sustainability" (P4). For these participants, there was a desire to work more with the community. Seeking opportunities to do more community engaged work in their careers or profession, some participants found such work architecturally less accessible to come by (P8). In other words, "I just felt that it should be more... as an architect practicing, for me the question was how can I be relevant to the place I live, and how do I have my work not be disconnected from that" (P9). Seeking this sense of purpose and satisfaction, participants expressed an appreciation for architecture school as having prepared them as a designer (P8), "but as far as being able to actually work with people... (laughter) and, you know, consider all of those other things, outside the walls of a building, I think planning school was really essential for that" (P8).

5.1.4 Participants by Work Experience. Still, as one participant gave credit, "I basically learned in the School of Reality" (P2). More to this point, the practical work experience of these participants was also considered. Amongst the most common, approximately 64% of participants described working in the private sector; spanning from entry-level or research positions, to firm principals and founders. These participants shared a variety of ways in which this influenced them in their current position.

For some, this may have been distinguished by the work they did, mostly in regards to the public arena and on public buildings (P8). For others, it was noted for the practical skills that they learned, which included budgeting a project, scoping a timeline, and really just managing a project from beginning to end (P4). Such experiences in the private sector, as being provided with a set of parameters, billing rates, and other very prescriptive information, were cited as being of the most value to participants, as applied to their current CDC position.

Besides this, 36% of participants had experience in other public-sector planning ventures, both long and short term, dealing with transportation related projects, transit oriented development (TODs), traffic congestion, and issues of walkability (P7). By and large though, most common amongst 73% of participants was experience in the classroom. Reminiscent of the first question, this implies teaching may play a special role amongst the participants; significant enough for them to not only mention, but completely define their profession by it.

5.2   Findings: Themes from the Data

Through learning about the participants' backgrounds, the goal is to promote a more insightful and enhanced outlook for analyzing the remainder of the interviews.

5.2.1   Organizations by Purpose. For example, when asked to describe why their organization was established, 45% of participants responded specifically in regards to students' engagement. "We had to find a way to do projects that would be interesting for students and useful for the community" (P2). Here, a very direct connection may be made linking the participants' experience teaching, to that of their organizational mission. Many of these CDCs, at least partially, started off to get the students out of the studio and into the community (P2) and in some instances, were "...established circumstantially, by accident really, as a means of getting graduate students involved in hands-on construction of buildings - to learn more by making buildings at full scale" (P11). These CDCs offer opportunities where students can actually get out into the community and have real world projects and real world clients (P2). In addition, through the processes and services they offer, university interns, for instance, are gaining invaluable real-world experience which they can in turn put into their portfolios, and resumes, and utilize for future employment purposes (P1).

Academically, this goes beyond just student engagement. Research is cited amongst 27% of participants as another primary goal of their existence. For those organizations, their main purpose is to function as a home for research to be discussed, initiated, and distributed to others of common interests

and mindsets (P4). In such a way, these organizations work to foster, develop, and execute sponsored research projects within their respective academic institute or department (P6).

Also, in the case of some CDCs, their creation was spearheaded by a private group of stakeholders engaged in downtown redevelopment (P10) or in developing design guidelines for downtown (P5). Twenty-seven percent of participants identified private sector development to be a primary concern; "...to provide some professional expertise to help facilitate private-sector issues to do with integration of new development into neighborhoods, like infill development" (P5).

Despite this fact, whether downtown focused or not, community engagement is what was cited as really instrumental here (P10). The overwhelming majority of participants (91%) specifically stated their purpose as just trying to be more of a community resource for design (P8). "I always thought it would be great to have a design-oriented practice that was based in communities" (P9). In such a manner, CDCs may lend themselves to offer a variety of planning, research, and design services that a particular community needs.

5.2.2   Organizations by Scope of Services. Indeed, the scope of services offered by several of these organizations would appear relatively extensive. A total of 73% of participants, through their respective organizations, offer design services, as well as 82% offer planning services. In one aspect, design services may address common, everyday needs by offering private, local businesses assistance with business facade renovations, landscaping, site plans, or even interior design work (P1). Working with neighborhoods, "we help them with visioning different things... sprucing up their neighborhood... landscape improvements to their entryway, or signage design for their entry, or street toppers, or open space improvements" (P1). In terms of planning, however, these services have a broad range of implications, which includes analysis of regional planning activities, regarding projects of over 10,000 sq. miles, to urban design scale projects, and everything in between (P6). As evidenced, by a number of projects both big and small (P7), the scope of these services may include aspects of a more administrative nature as well. Examples of this would include the evaluation of design proposals for historic preservation and design review purposes, as well as for downtown overlays where a particular design criteria is desired or required (P5). Through this sort of design assessment, the disciplines of planning and design combine to produce master plans, comprehensive plans, redevelopment plans, transportation plans, and economic analysis (P7) while attempting to address questions of appropriate building materials and urban design (P6).

This leads into research aspects, which 45% of participants acknowledge as vital to their operations. By collecting data, providing data cleanup services, and further processing that data for analysis, these services are invaluable to give back to a city or community which may use the findings from that research as the basis for future decision-making (P7). In a similar fashion, grant writing for faculty and staff is equally important (P4). Administratively overseeing research opportunities, a number of projects looked at downtown walkability qualities, high speed rail, and quality of life impacts, and lead to further research on affordable housing and a slew of other related topics (P7). In this light, over half the participants also placed an emphasis on affordable housing options, working in some cases "to develop accessory dwelling units (ADUs), which are like a second house, basically, in the backyard of a single family lot. We help homeowners and community organizations develop ADUs as an affordable housing option in the neighborhood" (P8). In many circumstances, this leads into policy work as well. Lobbying and collaborating with different city agencies, CDCs can impact and influence changes in development ordinances, making it more accessible or cheaper to build" (P8). Forty-five percent of respondents similarly cite policy work, oftentimes such work is related to public health, for example, the impacts of infill development on air quality (P3, P8). Such a multitude of activities cover the gamut of services which CDCs are currently offering throughout Texas. As perhaps best expressed by participant 9, "there are times when we can look like an architecture firm... but you'll discover that there are things that we do, that are outside, far, *far* outside, what would be basic services within the [architecture] manual."

5.2.3   Organizations by Impact Area. In addition, the work that these organizations are doing, may oftentimes go beyond their local jurisdiction. Stretching across the entirety of the state, 45% of participants take on projects in an ongoing capacity, as well as project by project basis. Taking this even further, across state boundaries, 36% take on national endeavors, while 27% of participants cite ongoing or previously completed projects of an international nature. This begs the question, who in fact are these community design centers serving?

5.2.4 Most Significant Clients by Sector. When asked who constitutes the most significant portion of their clientele, this inquiry becomes more intriguing. "That's hard because the public is our client. And the public has a broad cross-section" (P9). Understandably, based upon a project's geography, "that context helps to define sort of thresholds of more immediate stakeholders or immediate clients" (P9). Therefore, clients can range anywhere from non-profit organizations, to municipal governments, neighborhood organizations, or even a modest family (P9).

Governmental, institutional, or municipal-based work was most common amongst 45% of participants, who cited projects for public elementary and middle school campuses alongside works with the city parks department (P11). In addition to this, several participants acknowledged Texas cities to be a huge part of their daily clientele (P4). Lastly, "in regards to funding through the center - if you look at it by dollars - the largest stakeholder funder has been the US Department of Housing and Development (HUD), followed by various State of Texas agencies. We've also had funding through other things: the US EDA, the US Department of Defense, the Department of Energy - we do a lot of studies with CITY 6 and COUNTY 6" (P6).

For the remainder of participants, "I'd say it's split pretty evenly between non-profit affordable housing providers, and long-time homeowners who are on a restricted income" (P8). Along with non-profits that are engaged in the community (P10) the private sector would appear equally important amongst participants. "Well, the thing is, not necessarily financially, but we *always* have ongoing work in regards to downtown redevelopment. That's central to our mission" (P10).

What is perhaps more notable though, was what was learned regarding the value that participants place upon *creating* projects. Twenty-seven percent of participants remarked "...what we have found is that it's also necessary for us to reach out on our own, to generate the kind of projects that need to be done, rather than just waiting for other non-profits to come to us" (P3). By this, "...in some cases we actually are *inventing* a project to help us do a level of R&D around a particular segment of work" (P9). At the same time, "there have been other, sometimes entirely opportunistic projects that come along, because it's always difficult to keep a private, non-profit floating" (P3). For this reason, over half the participants (64%) stress the benefit of partnerships, not only for projects, but for overall organizational support and success. "We couldn't do what we're doing if we didn't have the university's assistance and buy-in to the program and support of it. So it's very important that you reach out to your community partners and get them involved because that way it's just a stronger operation over all" (P1). Collaboration, therefore, helps to facilitate projects and build clientele. Once these relationships are formed, "instead of us going to the community to get projects, *they* call us! They call us and ask for help, for a particular project, or design, or research. And we evaluate their needs and we see if this is something that we can do at CDC 7 and then we get back to them" (P7).

5.2.5 Project Portfolios by Emphasis. In such a manner, these organizations' project streams are dependent upon a variety of factors. Firstly involving the client, this may heavily influence and produce project portfolios of a particular nature. Keeping this in mind, the next question is influenced by Scott Campbell's Sustainability Triangle (1996) and seeks to understand what percentage of these organizations' projects emphasize primarily economic, environmental, or social issues. Undoubtedly, in posing this question, there was a notable amount of respondents (36%) who found this question difficult to answer. "That's hard to say... it's so mixed up, it's hard to separate it" (P2). Along with long pauses, "...oh, that's a hard question..." (P4) and "Well, it would be hard to put into percentages…" (P7) were very common initial responses. In this manner, for the majority 64% of these participants, they were emphatic that "every project does all of the above… I mean, they're just part of what we do" (P2). Adding onto this, "I would say most of our projects are a combination of all" (P7) and "one of the things *you* should understand… every project we should be doing all 3 of those things, simultaneously" (P3). Therefore, what was stated definitively in response to this question, "I can't do it...I can't really separate these. So what I would tell you, is in our work, the economic, environmental, and social issues, all of them come to bear in different weighted emphasis, based on context" (P9).

Correspondingly, 27% of the participants corroborate this notion; acknowledging a certain amount of subjectivity based upon both client and context. "It depends though, as certain clients are more heavy on the environmental piece. Some clients are more heavy on the economic piece. So, it sort of depends on who we work with" (P8). Still, for those participants who responded in terms of percentages, these values tended to vary all across the board.

Interesting in this regard, these spanning percentages would appear strongly divergent, in part, due to the typology and circumstances of the particular organization. As previously determined from the literature review, CDCs may be differentiated by a number of variables, based upon context, mission, organizational structure, budget, its scope of work, as well as position on Campbell's Sustainability Triangle regarding its economic, environmental, and social interests (Campbell 1996; Tam 2012). As evidenced by participants' responses, it would also appear that by taking the average of these percentages, a more-or-less equivalent outcome was the result. Even with a slight economic emphasis, these findings would in fact seem to confirm what participants have stated that "those are obviously very intertwined issues" (P4) and that despite a number of variables, it is in totality by the sum of its parts, that "it can be weighted, but ideally all 3 are always present, in every project" (P9). To this affect, as participant 2 put it, "I mean basically its design, so... everything else is secondary to design."

5.2.6   Project Portfolios by Discipline. This begs the following question as to which of the traditional design disciplines might be most prevalent or represented by their works. Accordingly, participants were asked what percentage (%) of their project portfolio would be categorized as primarily architecture, landscape architecture, or urban planning-based services. Similar to the last question, however, "I try to not have them be so clearly separated" (P9). Rather, 36% of participants emphasized cross-discipline or the interdisciplinary nature of what they do. "What we're seeing right now... is the funding streams, the projects, and the need, aren't really falling into one of these categories. So, I think that what I am seeing in terms of funding opportunities, and just in the opportunities that we are interested in pursuing because they are exciting and bigger projects… are really more and more interdisciplinary in nature, where they want teams from different disciplines coming together to tackle a problem" (P4). This sentiment was echoed by others, in that "our practice language isn't around those disciplines... they're more around storytelling, mapping... and these terms that are about what we are doing, and ideally its cross discipline... it's about having all the skills and talents present, not talking about it as one or the other" (P9).

Still, in terms of percentages of their organizations' project portfolios, several participants shared their insight, and based upon the findings, a variety of practice models are clearly demonstrated. Yet, when calculating the average of these percentages amongst CDC organizations, architecture made up an estimated average of 44% of project portfolios, while urban planning-based projects accounted for about 38% and landscape architecture projects came in at about 18%.

These percentages may possibly indicate a number of things. "If you asked me this question 3 years ago, I would say we were probably 85 to 90% urban planning based services... that's really changed a lot lately (P4). Similarly stated, "when I came here, our projects were almost all of them planning-based. But I'm so glad to see that now, we are bringing projects that are more interdisciplinary" (P7). Based upon input from these participants, and without any previous knowledge of the researcher, those organizations previously offering primarily urban planning-based services, are now (at least here in Texas) expanding into other fields. This revelation, if at all represented through these percentages, would then lend credence to the interdisciplinary nature referenced by a majority of participants. Putting that aside, however, participant 11 remarked of their project portfolio that "100% have a strong urban design component," while participant 10 corroborates "all these form and address the urban design."

5.2.7   Prominence of Disciplines. This statement brings up yet another point of inquiry. Are any of these design disciplines more important than another? As applied to their own organizations' practices, participants provided insight into this question. Insight which unapologetically led down a familiar path. "Again I can't rate one more important than another - it depends on what the situation is" (P9). Once more, "well, I see them all... (laughter) as the same thing. It's like a figure ground, what's more important, the figure or the ground? You know, you don't have one without the other" (P10). Thirty-six percent of participants made similar comments of "... we don't make any real distinctions between those - all of it is design. So whether you are designing a landscape, or a building, or a city, it's the same kind of process of design... I can't really separate those specifically" (P2). Decidedly put, "they're the basis for the lens at which we look at issues and try and address things. So, I wouldn't pick one over another, because again, I think they're very interrelated" (P4).

Not unlike previous questions, cross-discipline or interdisciplinary practices were coveted by 45% of participants as being key to their organizations' practices. "Bringing that kind of expertise in urban design, and architecture... the person we had who was in charge of the office had degrees in both landscape and architecture and also planning, so they were able to bring that combination of skills to the

situations" (P5). This level of expansive knowledge and expertise finds much appreciation by others as well. "When you look at the skill in CDC 9 today, we have architects, landscape architects, planners. We also have individuals related to urban studies, urban geography. We have folks with backgrounds in history, anthropology... and so, it's cross discipline, even beyond the design professions" (P9). From a community design perspective, this makes both logical and practical sense as "each of the various disciplines brings a lens to the work, that can help round out our work activities to be more complete and more responsive to the public's interest. And also to incubate variations of ideas, because they're informed by these kinds of different trainings and backgrounds and interests" (P9). For this reason "I think they are important individually, but the best possible scenario happens when they work together... we come up with outcomes that are more comprehensive and are more ready to be implemented by practitioners" (P7).

Similarly, 27% of participants cite urban design as a unifier. "Urban design puts it all together, and I think that's the most important. It's not helpful to practice landscape nor architecture separate" (P10) because "they all rely on an urban design expertise to integrate specific site design decisions into the larger urban design strategies" (P11).

So it is, considering these responses, that 73% of participants cite either urban design or interdisciplinary practices as most important to their organizational operations. Yet, this overall perspective aside, participants were still able to identify for a variety of reasons why particular disciplines played a unique and essential role in their practices.

From their responses, 36% of participants cited architecture. "So, I think architecture still is a little more prominent, maybe partly because I'm an architect. But we work to try and balance that significantly" (P9). Almost out of obligation, it would appear 18% of participants cited landscape architecture, in combined support of architecture. "The vast majority of our clients are looking for visual representations of projects that they need help with. So it's kind of by default that architecture and landscape architecture skills kind of rise to the top... without the rendering and actual hard design skills of the architecture and landscape architecture interns, we wouldn't be able to run the center. So those are probably the most practical, most important skills" (P1). In further words of sharing, "our work is fundamentally architectural works, but they rely on the integration of landscape architecture in most projects due to the site constraints" (P11).

Another, 36% of participants cited urban planning services to be the most relevant and critical to helping communities define their own needs (P3). For financial reasons, as well, "...if we simply do it by the dollars (laughter)... the urban planning programs are most important" (P6). In relation to the other disciplines, though, "...I would say that an undercurrent of all of that is definitely tied to themes that come out of urban planning. So it's almost like the urban planning element is operating in the background, tying everything together. So it's a little bit harder to quantify it... it's not as obvious that we use that skill, but it is still really an important skill" (P1). When asked why, "I think that because the skills that planners bring to the table, really make the other pieces work much better... a lot of the things that we run into with the architectural side of our practice, are really related to city policy and zoning and different regulations around what you are allowed to build, where and how... you need a level of education or experience with the planning field, to be able to interact in that sphere" (P8). So it is supplementary, as well as independently that "I think that design centers would benefit from more people having that planning and policy, and urban design scale knowledge and experience" (P7). Considering what motive, it is because "when you get into this work... you find more and more ripples. And to really get in and understand those ripples, you need to have a perspective that can jump across scales that I think planning really helps with" (P8). Figuratively speaking, participant 6 further interprets "importance" as in relation to oneself, in terms of both scale and influence:

> I think that there's a different way, in terms of importance - and I tell my students this - all of them will be asked in their professional lives to *choose* how they want to spend their influence. How they want to execute and make use of the influence they have as a professional. And you can imagine that as a spectrum between influencing *a few people a lot*, and influencing *a lot of people a little*. So if you want to influence a few people a lot, go and design their house. Because they'll spend a lot of time there, they'll raise their kids there, it's where they'll wake up in the morning, it will be part of who they are. If you want to influence a lot of people a little, then you work more planning scale. Where people might not visit or pay attention to everything about a city in a given day, but there are parts of the city that kind of filter out through ambiance and impact their lives.

Deeply rooted and contemplative, this response thoughtfully leads into the heart of this research and to the final question at hand: what are the reasons for the recent increase of CDCs across Texas and North America?

5.2.8   Increased Presence of CDCs. With insight from these leaders and administrators, 55% believed that the need for these services CDCs provide is imperative. "There is a huge need" (P4) and the possible reasons for this are multi-faceted. "The role of municipal governments to not plan and to not have design skill, that's one. So you need to find a way to augment that" (P9). On more of a political level, as participant 3 states, "government has taken a serious turn to the right, both at the federal level and state and local level. And so it leaves people who are the most vulnerable at risk... so there is a greater need" (P3). How this view might compare currently in relation to the rise and fall of CDCs historically, is not at this point verifiable. But certainly "there are things that community groups need that design firms cannot deliver... and in part, they can't deliver because of the way cost structures in firms work. There are many communities that cannot afford to pay for, we'll call it retail design fees (P6). Economically then, lie several challenges. In response, CDCs may provide services to these groups but "...have cost structures which allow quality work to be done with different kinds of overhead" (P6). Indeed, in order to meet the demand, a number of participants utilize alternative operating and funding processes in their daily practices. Some charge nothing for their services. "By not charging anything for our work... providing a free service to the community… helps people save money... that's how we provide our value" (P1). Others charge at a reduced rate. "We still charge them to pay our GRA's salaries, but that's *all* we charge. So we provide them with a service that costs them a *fraction* of what a planning firm would charge them... So because of that, many of our clients are from small cities or towns that they can't afford to hire a planning firm to do the job for them" (P7). Although some organizations receive funding from the state, on a yearly basis, to provide services to the community (P7), others "...subsidize our design fees with grants and donations and other ways to pay ourselves. And we participate in a program with the city that reduces or eliminates all the development fees on their end, so our clients don't pay for like permit fees, or other things like that. So that helps reduce the costs. And then we work with contractors and engineers that help reduce the cost further, so that people can afford to build these units and rent them out at an affordable rate for a certain period of time" (P8).

In mitigating financial barriers, however, these organizations also attempt to address a multitude of environmental and social issues. Depending upon circumstances, the work of CDCs may also serve dual purposes in "being able to supplement people's income with this rental piece, but also develop affordable housing for other families" (P8). Pursuing extensive issues such as homelessness (P10), "what we're trying to do is to construe - help people understand that CDC 3 is not just about housing. It's also then about providing environmental services to the broader community... and we do that by creating energy, by sequestering water, and by allowing the people to walk or ride the bus to work, rather than driving. Those all have consequences for public health as a whole community, not just those of modest means" (P3). These issues are on the table for many CDCs, with simultaneous goals of mitigating gentrification and "making sure our neighborhoods have opportunities for everyone. And that we maintain a diverse body in that neighborhood" (P8).

In addition, 36% of participants also mentioned that the growth of CDCs had something to do with age. "I think that younger people are much more interested in social implications of architecture now, and it's just a good way to channel your energy" (P2). In the words of participant 3, "I think people of *your* age have an awakened political consciousness and a recognition that design really should be for the public health and welfare... not just design for the rich" (P3). In some ways, by this statement, CDCs "both grow from a critique of postmodernism and elitism in architectural practice" (P11). And so, "it's both increased capacity of the young people and the greater need, I think, that's one of the things that has made the public interest design movement as successful as its been" (P3). Still, "I don't know that this is purely a generational thing. Most of the guys, like me, aren't millenials, right? And we're kind of the old guys now, I would say, in this movement, but we're still not that old" (P9). Echoing this sentiment, "I'm old enough that I was part of the original movement for community design centers... there are also community development corporations and I was involved with one of those in the 1970s" (P3).

In such a way, it would perhaps seem that rather than being specifically age-related, or a generational factor, it is indeed a certain consciousness, an *awareness*, which is more so the unifying motivation. Collectively, "I also think there is just more of an awareness of how connected we all are, and

how nobody really benefits from people being held down in different ways, in different parts of their community" (P8). Whether professionally or educationally, participants cite a variety of experiences and events which have influenced them in their current position. For instance, "I mentioned that I had been in the Peace Corps, specifically, because I think that was certainly one of the biggest parts of my education. In other words, it gave me some insight at looking back at American culture from a very, very different perspective... it taught me a lot about what our culture is to others abroad. And so it gave me a new way to see it" (P3). Along with having influential professors and engaging in community-based projects (P9, P11), other experiences such as disaster recovery and relief (P2, P8), and the type of exposure where "I remember seeing first-hand, severe poverty, rural poverty" (P9), would seem very influential to the formation of humanitarian awareness. "So, I think that creates a sense of empathy, or at least an approach where empathy is a core value" (P9). A value which many participants undoubtedly employ while working with "home owners who had lost their homes, who were low-income... working in a neighborhood that was majority African American and Vietnamese families" (P8), and with "the Southern Ute Indian Tribe... trying to overcome what the government had done through the Bureau of Indian Affairs" (P9). These are but a few examples participants shared which harkens back to the original tenets of community design, addressing the needs of the people and striving for a more equitably just environment. Requiring qualities of a more insightful and cultural awareness, "...I quickly found out that you don't only need an architecture degree to do that, you also need some humility and relationship-building skills" (P8). Learning from those experiences, "the most valuable part of that work experience was… just sort of knowing your limitations, and respecting other people's experiences, and their own knowledge and their own expertise on what they need, the way they live, and what the priorities should be" (P8). By this, "I think this idea of designing and creating *with* a community, and amplifying their voice - not talking over them- and amplifying their expertise on the project or the issue at hand, is really, really important" (P4).

Likewise, undertaking private projects of a specific nature may help to raise the profile and awareness of their organizations (P7). One of the ways these CDCs are gaining more awareness is by marketing. "Well publicized programs... put it on the radar screen" (P10) because "you know, when one program is successful, another school looks" (P2). In this manner, universities are pushing it. "Within the university environment, from the upper administration of the university, there's support for and desire for community engagement. So it tacks (resonates) well within the university. You get perks a college or university likes. Alumni like it" (P10).

As such, universities also play a role in the expansion of CDCs across North America. From an academic perspective, providing practice-based, educational opportunities to its students (P1; P9; P11) offers the benefit of gaining experiential knowledge through service to communities. These are community engagement opportunities which, as previously mentioned, potentially drove a number of participants (48%) to obtain their master's degrees in urban planning. Likewise, "the publication of the 1996 Boyer Report (Building Community: A New Future for Architecture Education and Practice) was very influential and recommended the incorporation of hands-on learning and service learning into all architectural programs" (P11). To this extent, the services offered by CDCs are equally considered to be in service to private firms and practices as the eventual recipients of students being both knowledgeable and competitive in the employment arena (P9).

However, "I do think that because universities have engaged design centers within their curriculums, there are a large number of students that come out and they would like to do this. That said, they don't know how to make money - they don't know how to pay themselves doing it" (P9). Needless to say, this does not stop job searchers from aggressively seeking such opportunities. Speaking in further regards to employment, many private firms are now looking into the work of CDCs as well. "I think that new people entering the field... like emerging leaders and generations of people in *every* field are looking to have more of a social impact or a social cause behind what they spend their time doing. So I think there is just more demand from people graduating from school and people looking for career opportunities to have more of an impact and reason behind what they are doing" (P8). This is an employment demand that firms more and more want to meet. "I think that shows in the fact that not only are there more community design centers, but that these larger architectural practices, specifically, have now a social impact or community engagement piece to their practice. So there's FIRM 1, FIRM 2, FIRM 3... all of these ginormous firms are now trying to compete to provide opportunities to people coming out of school, or people starting to get licensed, and wondering what they want to do for a long time, trying to provide that fulfillment there as well" (P8). Participant 9 affirms this, citing "...a growing interest from firms to want to

participate more in public engaged projects, because their employees want to do it. Right? They want to do something beyond just design... so they're trying to figure out how they can engage projects that are engaging people in communities, because its more meaningful work" (P9). Understanding the market, "one of the reasons they want to focus on that, is that they're losing some of their most talented designers, because they are leaving to go to smaller firms or community organizations that aren't necessarily architecturally-based, because they are seeking those more fulfilling opportunities. And they feel like it is one way that they can retain the talent that they need, to be able to provide that opportunity in the firm" (P8). So it is, that an individual's awareness and desire creates a demand in the job market "and I think CDCs are an *absolute* reflection of that" (P4).

Similarly, "when you have a successful organization they inspire somebody else to do it. So they kind of accumulate. They grow because they *work*" (P2). In so much as these organizations actually *do* work or are considered successful, this in part would seem to inspire confidence. "More communities are now feeling empowered or wanting to have more of their own say about what happens in their areas" (P6). In search of this, "communities, obviously some more than others, are finding ways of finding their voices and identifying resources and people who are willing to work *with* them, and not *for* them... and I feel like, for me, in planning and in public engagement... getting out there the *with*, not *for*, is a huge distinction" (P4). Accordingly, through mutual learning and communication processes, CDCs are often able "to look at things a little bit differently and to lend a different voice to some issues. To not just be... you know, it's big brother, it's the government, it's some expert in an ivory tower, telling me what to do. But no, I'm at the table and I'm helping decide what happens to my space" (P4). Thus, by building such a rapport, "I think, maybe sometimes people have their own biases against city officials and government and everything. But they are *happily* working with CDCs - they can *trust* CDCs" (P7). This is an important distinction to make. "And so I think there is both a push by community members, and a pull by the economics of the situations, that allows CDCs to exist and to expand" (P6).

In some ways, it could be described as the "maturity of place" (P9) which accounts for this expansion. By this term, cities will naturally evolve over time, and shape themselves in accordance to a variety of factors. As a living and breathing organism, these cities have had to adapt "...to deal with more complex issues and find more dynamic ways to be able to deal with those complex issues" (P9). In response, the operations of CDCs "...necessarily keeps changing. And that's because we keep learning new things. And new people get involved - and *uninvolved* - and the conditions around us keep changing. In other words, urban cities are always incredibly dynamic. And you really... you can try to plan the future, but you never *really* can" (P3). Here in Texas, "...I also think it has to do with the civil rights movement and the relationship of the civil rights movement to the south, versus to the north, or east or west coast. It's a very different context. So, the idea of social justice, of what we call *design* justice, is even further removed and so I think we are more able today to engage the work, constructively, and have the resources to do it. Because the places have matured in their sophistication of how they're going to deal with issues. That's what I think" (P9).

6   CONCLUSION

6.1   Overview of Research Findings

Concerning the primary question of this research, a commonly perceived reason for the increase of CDCs across Texas and by extension, North America, is that there is a definite need for their services. Everyday environments in cities and counties throughout Texas exist in less than ideal conditions, suffering from aging infrastructure, and lacking both social and economic opportunities for sustainable redevelopment.

Often falling under the economic, environmental, and social tenets of sustainability, these various needs exist in seeming perpetuity. Although driving the growth of CDCs across the nation, as evidenced by this study, no one tenet proved to be more influential than another in regards to CDC operations. No doubt, based upon the particular goals and objectives of a given CDC, emphasis on particular tenets may exist, but are largely based upon the scope of services being offered. Findings from this research thus tend to confirm the opinion of multiple participants: overall, the economic, environmental and social tenets are held to be "equal."

Acknowledging that CDCs are driven in part by a psychological and physical awareness of these needs, it is then important to consider how this consciousness is developed. Whether it be through past

experiences, both personal and professional, it would seem that through awareness of these issues, an individual desire or determination is instilled. This was again, discussed previously in regards to why participants pursued a master's degree in planning; out of a passion or desire to make a difference. This might explain why 27% of participants were also involved in multiple CDC operations. In many ways, it is this unique individual desire and determination which drives CDCs to be not only started, but consistently operated and supported. Because there is a need for their services, and because individuals are either made aware of their economic, environmental, or social need, they start to care. Care enough that they get individually invested and demand these opportunities in their careers to empower others and even themselves through the processes of community design. "The reason why CDC 9 was established was because, number one, I saw we had a need for this function here, and selfishly, it's the kind of work I wanted to do" (P9).

Therefore, while the increase of CDCs in Texas (as well as in North America), may be commonly believed to be generationally motivated, it is also a movement which cuts across both generational and disciplinary boundaries. Inspired by an ever-present need, professionals in the fields of architecture, landscape architecture, and urban planning, are each called upon by the ethics of their respective professions to respond to this need. More to the point, it is the interdisciplinary actions of these professions in collaboration and totality, which most impacts the operations of CDCs in Texas. Individually, "the practices are... subverted... they're really not meant to be in charge. They're meant to be an enabler" (P9). Yet, in terms of enabling, it would seem an underlying connection between all of these disciplines is teaching. While collectively, the practices are strengthened by each other, particularly in pursuit of urban design issues, it is through teaching and the mutual learning process that 64% of participants ultimately connect that knowledge to others. Provided such a platform, an individual's passion and desire may then influence and be passed on to others. Asked why their organization was started, "actually 2 of my former students decided that what the world - or- the world and *CITY 3* needed, was a community design center. And so they were the 2 co-founders" (P3). Outside of an individual's experiences, it is in the realm of academia, therefore, with irrelevance to discipline, that the cycle of awareness is potentially continued. No doubt, there are limitations to what an academic institution can do. However, providing an educational and experiential knowledge to individuals may not only empower them with an awareness, but also the potential capability to help address the economic, environmental, and social issues which afflict any given community.

6.2   Relevance to the Professions of Landscape Architecture, Planning, and Architecture

While there is no direct benefit as a result of participation in the interview, participants have contributed to new knowledge about CDCs and why and how they are growing in Texas. These findings correspondingly carry with it several implications for the professions of landscape architecture, planning, and architecture.

To begin, in terms of CDC leaders and administrators in Texas, the results of this study would seem to imply an overall architectural dominance, both in terms of professional experience as well as longevity in their current positions. This authority is continued on academically, as 100% of participants who self-identified their profession as architecture, have teaching experience in their respective field as well. In addition, while 27% of the entire pool of participants concurrently hold titles with multiple CDCs in Texas, the entirety of these participants come from the profession of architecture. Altogether, these pieces of information suggests an elevated level of leadership, expertise, and social entrepreneurship, most common amongst those in architecture. Interesting to note, this is perhaps understandable, as community design practices can be traced historically to the profession of architecture via literature review (Bell 2004, Dorgan 2012). In such a manner, having nurtured the community design movement during its early stages in the 1960s and 70s, the current rise of the public interest design movement since the 1990s could appear to reaffirm this motivation. No doubt, as demonstrated by the results of this study, these strong professional connections are still evident and influential today.

On the other hand, planners still made up the slight majority of participants in this study and accounted for the highest percentage of master's degrees attained. In terms of percentages, planning services were also amongst the most offered across CDC organizations and composed a corresponding amount of these organizations' project portfolios, comparable to that of architecture. Likewise, in comparing the two professions, planning was held in equal esteem to architecture in regards to its

disciplinary relevance and application to daily CDC practices and operations. All this considered, as cited by participants, the profession of urban planning was also credited not only for its stand-alone benefits, but for multi-scalar visioning capabilities, and for its supplementary value to cross-disciplinary collaboration.

In comparison to architecture and urban planning, landscape architecture, it would seem, yielded an overall lower representation amongst not only self-identified professionals, but in terms of educational backgrounds as well. Even more noticeable, project portfolios of these organizations in addition to the discipline's perceived relevance to CDC practices in Texas show similarly lower percentages for landscape architecture projects, as estimated by the participants of this study.

For this reason, it is important to reassess the current environments in which CDCs operate, and the role that landscape architecture plays within it. Some participants mentioned landscape architecture elements: "we're doing architecture right now with a community group and that includes all the landscape, so…" (P10) maybe it's that "I'd say... landscape architecture is only a part of it, of any project" (P2). Participant 11 discussed the centrality of landscape architecture to their practice though, "all our works have an orientation toward enhancing the stakeholder community through promotion of social gathering, and outdoor education, where appropriate, and by knitting the new gathering space into the existing institutions" (P11). This indicates, there could clearly be implications for landscape architecture, provided those type of projects referred to above are realized. Some CDCs may lack landscape architecture expertise: "I don't really have a lot of experience with landscape... I think that it plays in - sort of as the in-between scale between architecture and planning" (P8); or "we don't really do any landscape, mostly because we don't really have that expertise in-house" (P8). Indeed, as these statements are backed up by corroborating percentages from the research, it appears that a lacking, *active* presence of landscape architects in CDCs might be held accountable. If so, it is profoundly interesting to consider if the sum of these statements could imply a slightly diminished value of landscape architecture to current CDC practices in Texas.

Therefore, while new knowledge resulting from this research may be of benefit to participants and their respective organizations, this research also has the possibility to promote a deeper understanding of community design practices as they engage the profession of landscape architecture, in addition to urban planning, architecture, and other professions regarding community design and CDCs.

6.3   Suggestions for Future Research

Although this research was partly inspired to build upon the knowledge of previous studies (Tam 2012; Tural 2011; Zhou 2011), through the findings of this research, several shortcomings were also identified. Therefore, in order to expand upon the breadth of this research, topics which can be recommended for future research include:

- Assessing the value of social entrepreneurship to CDC practices
- Assessing the impact of new governance arrangements between the public and non-profit sectors (e.g., network governance) upon CDC operations in Texas
- Exploring the role of urban design as promoting cross-disciplinary collaboration
- Investigating quantitative methods for evaluating CDC practices, productivity, and outcomes
- Evaluating opportunities for the role of landscape architecture in the operation and practices of Texas CDCs

Overall, although CDCs have continued to sustain themselves throughout Texas and North America, "they have not been effective chroniclers of their own times and work" (Curry 2004, 69). As such, it is up to others to analyze their practices inclusively and comprehensively for future outcomes. In doing so, each of these general topics could expand upon key components of this research, while simultaneously emphasizing research as a communal undertaking which relies upon the continued work of others for future study (Dandekar 2003).

7   REFERENCES

Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture. (2014). *Community design directory*. http://www.acsa-arch.org (accessed February 7, 2016).

Association for Community Design. (2016). Frequently asked questions. http://www.communitydesign.org/about (accessed January 28, 2016).

Bell, Bryan. (2004). Good deeds, good design: community service through architecture. New
York: Princeton Architectural Press.

Blake, Sheri. (2015). Defining/redefining community design: A history of community design
centers. In *Activist architecture: Philosophy and practice of community design centers*, ed. Dan
Pitera and Craig Wilkins, 50-67.

Campbell, Scott. (1996). Green cities, growing cities, just cities?: Urban planning and the
contradictions of sustainable development. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 62, no.
3 (Summer): 296-312.

Cary, J. Jr. (2000). *The ACSA sourcebook of community design programs at schools of
architecture in North America*. Washington, D.C.: Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture
Press.

Castells, Manuel. (1983). The city and the grassroots: A cross-cultural theory of urban social
movements. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Curry, Rex. (2004). Community design centers. In *Good deeds, good design: Community service
through architecture*, ed. Bryan Bell, 60-70. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.

Dandekar, Hemalata. (2003). The planner's use of information. Chicago: Planners Press.

Dorgan, Kathleen. (2012). The seventh generation: Is the AIA a place for design that matters?.
Progressive Planning, no.193 (Fall): 2-11.

Gaber, John, and Sharon Gaber. (2007). *Qualitative analysis for planning and policy: Beyond the
numbers*. Chicago: Planners Press.

Goodman, Anna Gloria. (2014). A history of community design/build in the United States in four
moments. *Globalizing Architecture/Flows and Disruptions: Proceedings of the 102nd ACSA
Meeting* (May): 503-512.

Hartshorn, Truman A. (1992). *Interpreting the city: An urban geography. (2nd ed.*) New York: John
Wiley &   Sons, Inc.

Hester, Randolph T. (1990). *Community Design Primer.* Caspar, CA: Ridge Times Press.

Mehrhoff, Arthur. (1999). *Community design: A team approach to dynamic community systems*.
Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Pitera, Dan, and Craig Wilkins. (2015). *Activist architecture: Philosophy and practice of the
community design center*. Detroit Collaborative Design Center: University of Detroit Mercy School
of Architecture.

Sanoff, Henry. (2000). *Community participation methods in design and planning*. New York: John
Wiley & Sons, Inc.

—. (2003). *Three decades of design and community*. Raleigh: North Carolina State University.

Schuman, Anthony W. (2000). History of community design. In *The ACSA sourcebook of
community design programs at schools of architecture in North America*, ed. J. Cary Jr.
Washington, D.C.: Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture Press.

Tam, Wai Ian. (2012). Exploring the typologies of community design centers: Learning from north
central texas case studies. Master's thesis, University of Texas at Arlington.

Taylor, Nigel. (1998). *Urban planning theory since 1945*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Taylor, Steven J., and Robert Bogdan. (1984). *Introduction to qualitative research methods*. New
York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Tural, Elif. (2011). Public service, activist architecture or social justice? A typology for university-
based community design centers and success lessons from different models. PhD diss., Arizona
State University.

Zhou, Yunhui. (2011). Evaluating the design and planning services of the Arlington Urban Design
Center: Client's perspectives. Master's thesis, University of Texas at Arlington.