

Architects

Design professionals have a well-marked trajectory towards democratic professionalism, especially since the civil rights movement of the 1960s, which inspired an explicit embrace of democratic values. In the decades since, the field has experienced reinforcing democratic influences over time as the proliferation of new methodologies and a series of civic movements within the profession influence broader practice through distributed networks of like-minded professionals. Today, democratic professionalism and its connections to sustainable communities are widely embraced by the design profession despite variation in applied practices.

The American Institute of Architects (AIA) has deepened its commitment to the civic identities and capacities of architects, as well as to collaborative community design practices, and the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) fosters the design of sustainable and climate resilient landscapes through green infrastructure, urban forestry, brownfield restoration and ecosystem rehabilitation.

Origins of democratic design

The democratic anchoring of design can be traced to the 1960s, when a group of pioneering designers began using a variety of community engagement techniques. David Lewis and Ray Gindroz co-founded Urban Design Associates in 1964 as a firm named not after its founders, but with a high ideal in mind. As Lewis described it,

a small group of us in Pittsburgh got together in February 1964 and decided that ordinary people should be enfranchised to discuss the goals for their own urban neighborhoods. We called ourselves Urban Design Associates because everyone who participated would be an associate in the urban design of their community. ... At UDA, we learned a basic lesson from the groundswell of courage that lay at the heart of the civil rights movement and its dedication to the principles of democracy. Our accountability as urban designers has always been to the voices of citizens and to their vision for the future of their communities.”

This democratic concept of design was pioneering in the 1960s, as it elevated citizens in a co-design relationship with professionals and empowered them with agency in their communities. Other professional experiments began in the 1960s and grew with the civil rights movement.

References:

Joel Mills, interview with David Lewis, 2013

Urban Design Associates, *The Urban Design Handbook: Techniques and Working Methods*, second edition (New York: Norton, 2013).

Urban Design Associates, *UDA @50: Democracy in Action* (Pittsburgh, 2015).

A Defining Moment

In 1968, civil rights leader Whitney Young, Jr. addressed the American Institute of Architects' annual meeting and issued a direct indictment of the profession. Today, many professionals can cite verbatim portions of his speech. As Young declared:

You are not a profession that has distinguished itself by your social and civic contributions to the cause of civil rights . . . You are most distinguished by your thunderous silence and your complete irrelevance. . . . But I have read about architects who had courage, who had a social sensitivity, and I can't help but wonder about an architect who designs some of the public housing that I see in the cities of this country—how he could even compromise his own profession and his own sense of values to have built 35- or 40-story buildings, these vertical slums, and not even put a restroom in the basement and leave enough recreational space for about ten kids when there must be 5,000 in the building. That architects as a profession wouldn't as a group stand up and say something about this is disturbing to me.

You share the responsibility for the mess we are in in terms of the white noose around the central city. It didn't just happen. We didn't just suddenly get this situation. It was carefully planned. It took a great deal of skill and creativity and imagination to build the kind of situation we have, and it is going to take skill and imagination and creativity to change it. We are going to have to have people as committed to doing the right thing, to “inclusiveness,” as we have in the past to exclusiveness.

Over a half century later, the now famous address serves as a defining marker and is frequently referenced as a point of inspiration for new democratic methodologies in the design profession. The AIA revisits this moment annually through its Whitney M. Young Jr. Award, which is given to individuals or firms that embody social responsibility by addressing critical societal issues through their work.

On the 50th anniversary of this historic speech, Young's daughter Marcia Cantarella addressed an AIA meeting, noting that, “Our current political environment perpetuates and reinforces a discriminatory environment and socioeconomic disparity that is both economic but also psychological and seems part of a never-ending cycle that leaves us having this same discussion 50 years after my father began it.”

References:

Whitney M. Young, Jr., “[Full Remarks](#),” AIA Annual Convention, Portland, Oregon, June 1968.

Marcia Y. Cantarella, Remarks, Opening Exhibition: “[A Call to Activism](#): Echoing Whitney Young 50 Years Later” (Center for Architecture, July 10- September 15, 2018).

Community design movement

The values of democratic professionalism were embedded in the early organizations of the community design movement as it emerged from the civil rights era in the late 1960s. New civic experiments proliferated.

For instance, the Architects Renewal Committee in Harlem (ARCH) organized teams of architects and planners to provide technical assistance that might help improve local living conditions. Initially they described their role as “advocate technician, community organizer, and community spokesman.” They then expanded it to include “community information and training services, advocacy planning, the development of neighborhood corporations, and activities and education for the development of new career roles for poor in urban environmental related professions.”

In Baltimore, the [Neighborhood Design Center](#) began to form in 1968 with support from the American Institute of Architects (AIA) and American Planning Association (APA). As they described it, “a group of architects in Baltimore took this challenge and began working with low and moderate income communities to rebuild after the riots and white flight that swept the city in the wake of Martin Luther King’s assassination. The volunteer architects started simply, working with residents and a few nonprofits to develop plans for community centers, playgrounds, affordable housing, and neighborhood master plans. The goals of the architects were to use the projects as a community organizing tool, a means of advocating for urban development, and as a tool for increasing investment in Baltimore’s neighborhoods.”

Today, the [Association for Community Design](#) reports that over five dozen community design centers across the country continue to fuel this movement. As they define it, “Community design is a movement focused on the creation and management of environments for people. This process promotes change to the built environment from the neighborhood to regional scale, and aims to meet community needs through participatory decision-making at all levels.”

References:

Bill Lennertz and Aarin Lutzenhiser, *The Charrette Handbook: The Essential Guide to Design-Based Public Involvement*, second edition (Chicago: APA Planners Press, 2014), 15-24.

Changes in design education

The community design movement of the 1960s was also nurtured by universities. In North Carolina, Henry Sanoff created the Community Development Group within the Master of Architecture program at North Carolina State University. As one account relates, the CDG was a response to the growing calls for change:

Sparked by the free speech movement students across the country are also beginning to question the aims, methods, and content of higher education. The buzzword of the day is “relevance.” Like their counterparts at other universities, students in the School of Design at

North Carolina Students are raising fundamental questions about their education. “What is the relevance of the courses we are required to take to the great issues of our time?” “How is my education as an architect relevant to the needs of poor whites in Appalachia, or African-Americans in the inner cities? Is it even possible for architects to make a better and more beautiful world, or is architecture nothing more than a mask for power, a means of covering up the harsh realities of inequity and injustice that plague American society?”

In 1963, Carnegie Mellon University launched the first urban studio program in the country. As founder David Lewis explained, “Our purpose was to educate students in the living language of the city all around us, and to develop contemporary urban design and architectural responses that were appropriate to local contexts.” The philosophy behind the first program was simple:

I asked my students to choose any project in the city – it had to be a real project, not a studio project – they had to go out and find a real project; something that either they felt had to be done, or something that was already talked about to be done. They were to take that project and I would assist them in all the realities of the city. And so I gathered around me city planners, developers, economists, political people, to come and help me in the studio, to deal with these real projects, and that was the birth of something we then called the urban laboratory. It would be a program in which we did not, from top downwards, teach the way that urban design should be done, but we’d start from the bottom up and begin to resolve problems that were real and tangible in the city all around us.

Other universities, from Ball State University in Indiana to Yale University in Connecticut, were also beginning to launch community programs. The experimentation had a profound impact on inculcating tenets of democratic professionalism in design education. Today, almost every architecture school includes some version of an urban studio program.

References:

Henry Sanoff, *Three Decades of Design and Community: History of the Community Development Group* (North Carolina State University, School of Architecture, College of Design, 2003).

Institutional contributions to practice

The American Institute of Architects’ Regional/Urban Design Assistance Team (R/UDAT) program played a pivotal early role in the development of democratic methodologies by providing a national hub to influence broader practice. Begun in 1967, the program combined pro bono service, interdisciplinary professional teams, and community-driven public processes to spark transformations in a number of communities. Within a decade, the R/UDAT program had worked in almost 50 communities, and AIA had become the leading national institution promoting participatory work.

As one leader remarked, “R/UDATs demonstrated over and over again that citizens, when they are openly enfranchised, are well able to team up with specialists in defining mutual goals, and in striving for urban quality.” In the mid-1980s, David Lewis and Peter Batchelor co-authored

Urban Design in Action, tracing the history of the R/UDAT program and related participatory design approaches. As they maintained, “The R/UDAT Program, apart from its impact on the nation’s cities, is an important threshold within the architectural profession. The AIA can no longer deny that its most successful public demonstration is in urban design, not architecture.”

They further expounded on how practice had changed during the past 20 years, writing, “So much has changed in the past twenty years in the way architecture is taught and practiced that much of this can be taken for granted now. But in the 60s and early 70s it was not. Architects and other professionals twenty years ago didn’t think that anything was to be gained from listening to ordinary citizens. R/UDAT has made an important contribution to the task of bringing about this change.”

As *Urban Design in Action* reported, “Almost every planning and architectural office in the nation which practices urban design, whether in the public or private domain, has been directly impacted by R/UDAT.” The program has since worked in hundreds of communities in North America and has been replicated and adapted all over the world, spreading democratic values more broadly.

Today, AIA’s Center for Communities by Design typically proceeds in the following manner:

- *application by community*: the form prompts serious reflection on goals, barriers, prior failures, local partners, and diverse stakeholders.
- *letters of support*: from neighborhood groups, civic associations, and educational institutions, as well as elected officials, public agencies, businesses, and the local (or state) AIA chapter. Letters are a prerequisite for the acceptance of an application.
- *call for volunteers*: after receiving a request, the AIA national office puts out a call for volunteers to work as a pro bono team, which then prepares research for several months in advance, including one-on-one and group interviews and oral histories. The teams are multi-disciplinary and, in addition to architects, can include planners, sociologists, economists, engineers, political scientists, and others).
- *funding*: AIA provides up to \$15,000 towards the cost of the process and requires a match of \$5,000 from the community (for a service whose estimated value is over \$180,000).
- *charrette*: the team then visits the city or town over four intensive days of multi-stakeholder design charrettes. These are typically accompanied by two open town meetings of several hundred citizens, as well as by participation of elected city officials, planning and design staff, and private developers. Local knowledge by everyday citizens is viewed as vital to good design with rich meaning reflecting community values.

The charrettes have a dual governance structure: public meetings are the responsibility of a citizens’ steering committee, while design workshops and reports are the joint responsibility of this committee and the visiting team.

- *design book*: by the fourth day, the joint group produces a book, typically 60-100 pages, for release at a news conference and further discussion at the second town meeting, with a presentation of key recommendations and drawings.
- *formal channels*: the recommendations then proceed through established channels in each city or town, though with strong normative force of the participatory process and further team visits, if needed, to help move the process along

References:

AIA's [Center for Communities by Design](#).

Peter Batchelor and David Lewis, eds., *Urban Design in Action: The History, Theory and Development of the American Institute of Architects' Regional/Urban Design Assistance Teams Program* (Raleigh: American Institute of Architects and the Student Publication of the School of Design, North Carolina State University, 1986).

AIA Communities by Design, *The Rockaways R/UDAT: Bay to Beach* (AIA, 2013). This 116-page report describes the R/UDAT process that was conducted in this South Queens neighborhood of New York City in the wake of Hurricane Sandy in October 2012.

Evolving self-conception

In 1977, an edition of *Process: Architecture* was dedicated to the shift in democratic design practice. Titled “Community Design: By the People,” the edition featured case studies from the previous decade. The preface to the edition was authored by Ching-Yu Chang, and featured a telling narrative concerning the impact of democratic professionalism on design practice. As he wrote:

The true meaning of design process is usually misunderstood by architects and designers themselves. They interpret it as a means of self-expression, or justification for the “individual” approach. Nevertheless, in this special issue we take the whole community (people) as the designer. The key design issue in many different projects in the United States is an attempt to find how the design process involves people in making design decisions.

In today's communities, especially in big cities, the decisions are too often made only by planners and architects who are insensitive to the social and cultural traditions of the people who live in the area. The voice of the people is never taken into account. As a result, many newly planned communities have quickly deteriorated, but recently in the United States there are efforts to share the design responsibility.

More and more citizens are becoming members of the design team in the creation and rehabilitation of their own environment. The magazine feels a strong responsibility toward these new citizen designers. We want to inform the people how they can participate in the design of their own communities and they can design a physical solution to their

environment. The professional and the public will then function together, thus redefining the design process.

By the late 1980s, as the Brundtland Commission's report was ushering in a focus on sustainable communities, a new conception of the architect's professional role was being offered to counter traditional notions. In 1988, at the seminal Remaking Cities Conference, Ted Pappas, President of the AIA, described the "citizen architect." As Pappas framed it,

We architects cannot and should not impose our dreams on the public. We do not serve by dreaming our private dreams; we serve by dreaming the dreams of the community. For that sharing of dreams to be possible, we need the public – as sponsors, clients and allies. What kind of architect is able to do this? Not the egoist sort that Ayn Rand wrote about in *The Fountainhead*. We've had too many architects and urban designers who imposed their visions on communities, and communities that were made worse on account of it. That's not the kind of design professional we need or mean to encourage at this conference.

Down with the masterbuilder, and up with the partnership. That's the real key to the future. To get to the future from where we are now, we must make room for, and nurture, what I call the "citizen architect." What does this citizen architect look like? This person is committed to universal enfranchisement, and works to see that everyone in the community is given a meaningful stake in, and a part in directing, the future. The citizen architect is committed to seeing that, at the drafting table, the public's hand exerts at least as much force as the developer's or banker's. The practice of architecture must no longer be seen as a luxury that only the wealthy can afford. The public must be a vital part of the process. Architecture is the most public of the arts. It should be collaborative.

The evolving self-conception of the profession and its values was reflected in institutional changes at the AIA as well. The organization's mission was re-written to emphasize the public service role of the architect, stating that the Institute "is the voice of the architectural profession and the resource for its members in service to society." Its professional ethics and manuals of professional practice were updated repeatedly over the years to incorporate the values of democratic professionalism.

In 2010, the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) recognized the AIA as its Organization of the Year, noting that it demonstrated "A replicable set of values and a process that can be broadly applied to urban design and sustainable communities; and the development of a participatory culture and applied values that explicitly recognize the central place of the public in the design of the built environment."

Despite varying applied practices in the field today, the design professions are now dominated by an affinity for democratic professionalism as a path for more sustainable communities. In 2013, the Center for Public Interest Design conducted a study that found 75% of AIA members think that "architects should advocate for underrepresented groups, engage local stakeholders in decision-making, and conserve resources." In 2013, another broad survey of professionals found that 80 percent identified their work with "putting their creative abilities to use to improve quality of life in communities."

References:

Barbara Davis, ed., *Remaking Cities: Proceedings of the 1988 International Conference in Pittsburgh* (University of Pittsburgh Press, 1989).

IAP2, *State of the Practice Report 2010* (Thornton, CO: 2010).

Roberta M. Feldman, Sergio Palleroni, David Perkes, and Bryan Bell, *Wisdom from the Field: Public Interest Architecture in Practice: A Guide to Public Interest Practices in Architecture* (American Institute of Architects, 2013).

Jules Gregory and David Lewis, guest editors, *Community Design: By the People. Process: Architecture*, No. 3 (1977).

A new vocabulary and design ethos

As the field has matured, it has developed its own vocabulary to describe democratic notions that share similar values, including “Community design,” “community-engaged design,” “public interest design,” and “social impact design.” Despite semantic differences, these design philosophies are all based in notions of democratic professionalism.

Expanding traditional notions of architecture and design lie at the heart of these philosophies. They promote an integrative role for the architect in sustainability by emphasizing a “triple bottom line” incorporating economic, environmental, and social outcomes. They also seek to democratize design by expanding access through an explicit focus on public interest outcomes that are inclusive of traditionally marginalized voices.

In 2013, *Wisdom from the Field: Public Interest Architecture in Practice*, presented outcomes of a broad survey of the field and key interviews with professionals. As the study’s authors noted,

Although public interest design is known by various terminology and meanings, there appears to be some consensus among the interviewed practitioners. “Community design” and “public interest design” were the most frequently used terms. “Serving the under-served,” that is, those people and communities that cannot afford to pay for architectural and related services, and “design for the broader public good” are consistent public interest design values that were expressed. Public interest practitioners are guided by the conviction that access to design is not just a privilege—it is a public right.”

The more recent addition of the “design justice” movement further expands democratic notions by seeking to explicitly center historically marginalized voices in democratic contexts to achieve more equitable outcomes than traditional design processes.

References:

Roberta M. Feldman, Sergio Palleroni, David Perkes, and Bryan Bell, [*Wisdom from the Field: Public Interest Architecture in Practice: A Guide to Public Interest Practices in Architecture*](#) (American Institute of Architects, 2013).

Contemporary design movements

In the last two decades, design methodologies embedded with democratic professionalism have proliferated across the field as a new generation of leaders emerge. Much of the energy behind these movements has been driven by a critique of traditional practice lacking accessibility to all but wealthy clientele. Therefore, it has intentionally focused around democratizing the profession, expanding notions of architecture and designing for a broader public good.

Most of the contemporary democratic methodologies have been based in design movements that have emerged out of distributed networks of professionals working locally and espousing similar values and techniques, responding to common needs and challenges across unique local contexts. Influential new organizations and related design initiatives have emerged as a result.

Growth of community design

In 2000, the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture published *The Sourcebook of Community Design Programs at Schools of Architecture in North America*, identifying over 70 university-based and independent organizations dedicated to community design. An update of the resource in 2014 declared that “the landscape has changed,” cataloguing “two hundred active organizations, covering ever expanding geographic, disciplinary, and strategic territories.” It also noted that these centers had an interdisciplinary orientation that incorporated architecture, urban design and planning, landscape architecture, environmental design, engineering, and other disciplines.

The growth of the field can be traced to increased resources from federal funding mechanisms as well as philanthropic investments.

For instance, the Surdna Foundation made investments in local organizations promoting community-engaged design during the past decade, noting that, “For too many years, low-income communities and communities of color have been excluded from discussions about the future of their own neighborhoods. More often than not, decisions about the shaping of their physical surroundings, and social and economic realities, are made without their participation. Planning and development happen to them, not with them. Surdna is challenging these top-down methods through its support of planning, design, and architectural processes that are guided by democratic decision making, empowerment, and engagement.”

Community Design Centers continue to play important roles locally in jurisdictions throughout the United States and provide a professional home for the promotion of democratic methodologies in the design professions.

References:

Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture, [Community Design Directory](#) (ASCSA, 2014).

Surdna Foundation, [2013 Annual Report](#).

Public interest design

Many contemporary movements have been motivated by a frustration with the fact that marginalized communities so often lack access to design services and that traditional client-based business models have led to a perception that design mainly serves a wealthy, exclusive clientele. A key goal of the movement is the transformation of the profession. As articulated by *Wisdom From the Field*, this vision for the role of design is expansive:

Conventional architectural practice depends upon clients to pay for needed professional services, thus limiting the architect's obligation to address public needs unmet by the private market. Much of the work of public interest design practices is to figure out ways to serve people who cannot afford the services of our profession and to address systemic problems in the built environment that create the needs in the first place. In other words, the transformation of architectural practice to a more public interest model can be seen as a wide-spread response to the nagging concern that the conventional model of practice responds solely to the paying client, thus limiting the profession's capacity to address the problems of our time.

Some examples of such practice:

- [Public Architecture](#) has been one of the leading non-profit organizations in this movement. As they claim, "We frame social and environmental problems in the built environment and facilitate solutions in circumstances where both clients and financing must be imagined in new ways." Through their 1+ initiative, described as the "largest pro bono service network within the architecture and design professions," they challenge the broader design community to dedicate one percent or more of working hours to pro bono service. Public Architecture reports that the initiative generates \$56.3 million in design services annually. As they claim, "Institutionalizing pro bono service is only the first step in a much larger vision for Public Architecture's impact. Our highest goal is to leverage design of the built environment to strengthen communities and solve chronic societal problems."
- [Architecture for Humanity](#) (AFH): from 1999-2015, AFH represented one of the broadest organizations in the public interest design field. Founded on the mantra, "design like you give a damn," the organization built a global network with over 60

chapters that worked in 45 countries. AFH provided pro bono design for humanitarian projects around the world. It also developed the Open Architecture Network, the “first open source system for supporting sustainable and humanitarian design and architecture.” The network included file sharing and online collaborative design tools among other features.

AFH was dissolved in 2015 and was replaced by the [Open Architecture Collaborative](#), which continues to promote democratic professionalism through co-design practices.

- [Design Corps](#): has also made important contributions to broadening democratic practices among emerging professionals through its initiatives, which include the Public Interest Design Institutes, Social Economic Environmental Design (SEED) Network and Structures for Inclusion events.

Formed in 2005, the [Social Economic Environmental Design \(SEED\) Network](#) is made up of hundreds of organizations that represent “a principle-based network of individuals and organizations dedicated to building and supporting a culture of civic responsibility and engagement in the built environment and the public realm.” The network seeks to leverage a set of clearly articulated shared values to “connect the general public with designers from the fields of Architecture, Communication Design, Industrial Design, Landscape Architecture, Urban Design, and Urban Planning, who have an interest in community-based design practice.”

The network’s principles illustrate explicit alignment with the ethos of democratic professionalism and its focus on achieving more equitable outcomes by working with communities more effectively.

The SEED Network offers a formal process and evaluator program to follow in order to achieve its mission. In the past decade, Public Interest Design Institutes have been held in dozens of cities, certifying professionals in the SEED methodology. Among the core components of its curriculum are participatory design methods and an emphasis on “moving beyond LEED to measure positive social, economic, and environmental impact.” In fact, the US Green Building Council updated its LEED certification to incorporate the SEED process.

[MASS Design](#) represents another contemporary non-profit model involving “over 140 architects, landscape architects, engineers, builders, furniture designers, writers, filmmakers, and researchers representing 20 countries across the globe.” It has sought to impact architectural practice by focusing on social justice projects and demonstrating the viability of such design practice. Its projects have received recognition around the world, including a National Design Award in Architecture from Cooper Hewitt in 2017.

Multiple universities are now developing certificate programs in public interest design as well.

References:

Roberta M. Feldman, Sergio Palleroni, David Perkes, and Bryan Bell, [*Wisdom from the Field: Public Interest Architecture in Practice: A Guide to Public Interest Practices in Architecture*](#) (American Institute of Architects, 2013).

Lisa M. Abendroth and Bryan Bell, eds., [*Public Interest Design Education Guidebook: Curricula, Strategies, and SEED Academic Case Studies*](#) (New York: Routledge, 2019).

Design justice movement

During the past several years, the design justice movement has grown out of existing critiques of contemporary community design practice and emphasizes prioritizing the voice of marginalized communities to address systemic inequality. As one definition characterizes it, “Design justice is an approach to design that is led by marginalized communities and that aims explicitly to challenge, rather than reproduce, structural inequalities. It has emerged from a growing community of designers in various fields who work closely with social movements and community-based organizations around the world.”

In landscape architecture, a new mantra of democratic reclamation has risen: Black Landscapes Matter. Scholars and practitioners are revisiting racial justice and its interconnectedness with sustainability and equitable communities within historical contexts and evaluating their influence on contemporary practices.

[Design Justice Network](#): represents a distributed network of professionals committed to this practice and describes itself as “an international community of people and organizations who are committed to rethinking design processes so that they center people who are too often marginalized by design. We work according to a set of principles that were generated and collaboratively edited by our network.”

References:

Sasha Costanza-Chock, [*Design Justice: Community-Led Practices to Build the Worlds We Need*](#) (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2020).

Directions for the future

Democratic professionalism is not only coming of age but is now widely embraced in design professions. Its representation is broader, more interdisciplinary and connected today than it has ever been. Its major underpinnings remain profoundly simple: Design is about people and should always have a democratic mission and orientation.

However, applied practice continues to vary in method and impact. The defining contemporary issues will further drive practice toward democratic professionalism. The pandemic has brought healthy communities to the forefront of design dialogues again and America’s racial justice

movement and increasing climate crisis will continue to influence how professional designers view their role and the impact that design of the built environment can have on achieving societal aspirations.

Further reading:

American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA), [*Smart Policies for a Changing Climate: The Report and Recommendation for the ASLA Blue Ribbon Panel on Climate Change and Resilience*](#) (ASLA, 2018).

David de la Peña, Diane Jones Allen, Randolph T. Hester Jr, Jeffrey Hou, Laura J. Lawson, and Marcia J. McNally, eds., [*Design as Democracy: Techniques for Collective Creativity*](#) (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2017).

Bryan Bell, Katie Wakeford, Steve Badanes, Roberta Feldman, Sergio Palleroni, Katie Swenson, Thomas Fisher, and John Peterson, [*Expanding Architecture: Design as Activism*](#)(New York: Metropolis Books, 2008).

Darius Sollohub, [*Millennials in Architecture: Generations, Disruption, and the Legacy of a Profession*](#) (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2019).

Henk Ovink, ed. [*Too Big: Rebuild by Design's Transformative Response to Climate Change*](#) (Rotterdam: nai010 publishers, 2018).

Last updated: 11/16/20

We welcome suggestions and comments to help improve this entry: civicgreen@tufts.edu.