

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI

COMMUNITY-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP

**PAST AND PRESENT EXPERIENCES
WITH REFERENCE TO THE ISRAELI CONTEXT**

A Thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirement
for the degree of Master of Architecture

Yoav Weinberg

School of Architecture

McGill University

Montreal

August 2000



**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-70576-5

Canada

ABSTRACT

Community-university projects have been a common practice in most western countries since the 1960s. However, such projects are very rare in Israel. This thesis explores the possible methods by which architecture and urban planning schools and low-income communities can cooperate and examines the ways these methods can be implemented in Israel.

The research investigates several community-university projects practiced in North America between the 1960s and 1990s. A set of interviews conducted with directors of schools of architecture and urban planning as well as with different actors in community-based organizations in Israel enlarges, hopefully, the understanding of the eventual possibility for such projects to exist in Israel.

This research reveals that although involvement of Israeli architecture and urban planning students in community issues has been so far rather limited, there are both demand and will among schools of architecture and community-based organizations to cooperate in the future. In conclusions, basic guidelines for a community-university project are given, tailor made for the Israeli context.

RESUME

La collaboration entre établissements universitaires et communautés est couramment pratiquée dans les pays occidentaux depuis les années soixante. Ce genre de projets est, en revanche, peu fréquent en Israël. La présente recherche explorera les différentes méthodes utilisées par les écoles d'architecture et d'urbanisme pour collaborer avec les habitants des quartiers en difficultés, et vérifiera dans quelle mesure ces méthodes peuvent être adaptées en Israël.

L'étude analysera plusieurs projets de ce type réalisés en Amérique du Nord entre 1960 et 1990. Ensuite, des entretiens, menés en Israël avec des directeurs d'écoles d'architecture ainsi qu'avec différents acteurs sociaux, élargira le regard sur l'éventuelle possibilité de mener ce genre de projets dans ce pays.

Ce travail révèle que même si l'intervention des étudiants d'architecture et d'urbanisme israélien était limitée jusqu'à présent, il existe une demande et une volonté parmi ces écoles et les communautés en question de collaborer à l'avenir. Au-delà des conclusions de cette recherche, l'auteur propose un schéma de principes pour la réalisation de tel projet en Israël.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to my thesis advisor, Prof. Vikram Bhatt, for his guidance and support all through the period of my studies.

Many thanks to Prof. Joseph Baker, Terrance Galvin, and Ghislaine Trombert for their advice and care.

Particular thanks to Barbara Epstein of the Community Advocacy organization, Meital Lehavi of the Kerem Israel Neighborhood Committee, and Orit Reich of the Association for Quality of Life and Environment in Nahariya for their time and inspiring suggestions.

I extend my thanks to Prof. Elinoar Barzacchi, Head of the Tel-Aviv University School of Architecture; Prof. Zeev Druckman, Head of the Department of Architecture at the Bezalel Academy; Prof. Daniel Shefer, Dean of the Faculty of Architecture and Town Planning at the Technion-Israel Institute of Technology for their insights and willingness to help.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
RESUME	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Preface	1
1.2 Objectives and Research Question	3
1.3 Methodology	4
1.4 Scope of the Study	4
1.5 Organization of the thesis	5

CHAPTER 2: FROM PARTICIPATION TO PARTNERSHIP

2.1 On Public Participation and Eating Spinach	7
2.2 Taking Part or Being Partners	13
2.3 Advocates or Mediators	17
2.4 Building Consensus in Conflict Situation	19

CHAPTER 3: COMMUNITY UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS

3.1 The University, the Community, and the City	24
3.2 Community-University Relations	27
3.3 Past Case Studies	28
3.4 Present Case Studies	33
3.5 HUD's Community Outreach Partnership Centers	40

CHAPTER 4: THE ISRAELI CONTEXT

4.1 Community University partnership in Israel	43
4.2 Questionnaires, Interviewees, and Conversations	44
4.3 Involvement of Architecture Schools	46
4.4 Community-based Organizations Dealing with Urban Issues	55
4.5 Possible Paths for Collaboration	64

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
5.1 Summary of the Study	67
5.2 Conclusions	71
5.3 Guidelines for an Israeli Community-University Partnership	72
5.3.1 Communicative principles	73
5.3.2 Partnering with NGOs	73
5.3.3 Awareness Development	73
5.3.4 Defining Objectives	74
5.3.5 Transparency	74
5.3.6 Structure Development	74
5.3.7 Modularity	74
5.4 Recommendation for Future Research and Implementation	75
BIBLIOGRAPHY	77
APPENDIX A: Questionnaires	83
APPENDIX B: Israeli Architecture Schools Researched	85
APPENDIX C: Israeli Community Organizations Researched	86

To overcome slums, we must regard slum dwellers as people capable of understanding and acting upon their own self-interests, which they certainly are. We need to discern, respect and build upon forces for regeneration that exist in slums themselves, and that demonstrably work in real cities. This is far from trying to patronize people into better life, and it is far from what is done today.

Jane Jacobs, The Death and Life of Great American Cities, p. 271, 1961.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Preface

In recent years, the traditional role of governments and their agencies has changed. Governments are not conceived any more as the sole responsible body in the public realm (Goodwin 383-5, Marris, *Planning and Civil Society* 11-12). In many cases governments seek partners from the private sector and it seems that public-private partnerships are promoted as the answer to almost every problem.

Urban renewal is an example of a field that used to be the responsibility of the public sector; in many cases however, the public sector failed to meet this responsibility. New approaches to urban renewal emphasize public-private partnerships with the expectation that the private sector will carry out the task more successfully. Although in many cases partnerships have failed to solve these issues or have even worsened the situation of low-income population (Levine 25-28), in other cases these partnership have proven to be a successful method. The main problem in these partnerships was that the government gave up not only its organizational and financial responsibilities; it also gave up its social role in the process. While the private sector might be successful in the organizational and financial aspects of urban tasks, the extent of the public sector's interest in social issues is questionable. The result of these kind of partnerships might be that urban renewal projects, originally intended to assist the underprivileged, are becoming a commercial tool for private sector profits. However, the partnership idea in itself has many benefits; the recognition that the public sector cannot or should not operate everything by itself can blow some wind into the worn out sails of the urban ship. Nevertheless, the

accountability of the public sector to the weaker participants in the urban game should be clear. One method that may secure the interests of the disadvantaged is to involve non-governmental, non-profit, voluntary organizations in the process (Levine 28-30, Torjman 4). These organizations, which were recognized as a major force in the society to such an extent that some researchers have defined them as the 'third sector' (Wexler 1915), can balance the public-private course.¹ Keeping that in mind, partnerships could become a way to deal with complex urban issues. Partnerships between the three main sectors – the public, the private, and the third non-governmental sector – can create new approaches to solving old problems.²

Cooperation between communities and academic institutions is one example of a partnership that can contribute to urban regeneration, as well as to other urban issues. A strong involvement of universities in issues concerning local communities was a significant feature of the 1960s academia. However, involvement usually did not mean partnership or even cooperation. In many of the cases universities used the communities only as case studies. Even when there was a participatory process, the community, or individuals were not treated as equals or partners. The part they played was limited and the process was rarely reciprocal.

This paper examines methods to develop reciprocal relations between communities and universities, with a focus on cooperation between low-income communities and architecture, planning, and design schools. By evaluating and analyzing these methods, I

¹ The role of the third sector was first recognized in the Vancouver Habitat Conference in 1976. The conference declaration argues that "[a]ll persons have the right and the duty to participate, individually and collectively in the elaboration and implementation of policies and programmes of their human settlements" (Vancouver Declaration). The role of non-governmental organizations was officially recognized in the Cairo conference on population in 1994 and in the Beijing conference on women in 1996. In both these conferences NGOs took a major part in parallel to the governmental delegates (Marris, *Planning and Civil Society* 12).

² Several researchers emphasize the importance of partnerships in urban issues, see for example Atkinson, Carmon, Hastings, LeGates and Robinson, Torjman, and Wiewel and Lieber.

intend to propose guidelines for such cooperation that could be applied in the Israeli context.

1.2 Objectives and Research Question

The main objectives of the study are to learn about different partnership methods and techniques and to evaluate success and failure of past and present North American community-university partnerships in coping with urban issues. An understanding of the Israeli circumstances in regards to partnerships between low-income communities and architectural schools and an evaluation of the ways in which the North American experience can be adapted to the Israeli context form a third set of objectives.

The practical goal of the research is to propose guidelines for community-university partnership that could be implemented in Israel. However, the scope of the work, the time restriction, and the complexity of such projects will not allow these guidelines to be tested and analyzed. The proposed guidelines in chapter five are therefore draft suggestion. A well constructed and precise model might be developed following further research. Actual experience in the field will contribute the most to developing a real vital partnership model.

Four questions guided the research:

- *How can partnerships between low-income communities and schools of architecture contribute to the solving of urban issues?*
- *What is the contribution of community-university partnership to the different partners?*
- *What can be learned from past and present experiences of community-university partnerships in North America?*
- *How can partnerships between low-income communities and architecture schools be developed and implemented in Israel?*

1.3 Methodology

Theoretical research for realizing these objectives includes:

1. A literature review of participation and partnership methods and theories from the 1960s to recent studies.
2. Case studies of specific community-university partnerships are evaluated through primary and secondary sources such as university publications, web-sites, and other forms of documentation produced by the participating partners as well as evaluative studies.
3. A detailed analysis of the Community Outreach Partnership Centers Project (COPC), which was initiated in 1992 by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In-depth interviews with directors of Israeli architecture schools were carried out in order to understand the Israeli context, the reasons for universities' lack of involvement in community matters, and the possibility of developing partnerships. Topics covered included awareness to participatory methods; past and present experience of the institutions in these areas; and finally the possibility of future partnerships. Another set of interviews was conducted with directors of community-based organizations that address urban issues. The interviews touched on the organization's past partnership experiences, the actual needs of outside partners, and the community-based organization's attitude toward academic partners. The aim of these interviews is to better understand whether partnerships with architecture schools can help community-based organizations and their constituencies, if and how they can enrich the students and staff of architecture schools, and what should be done in order to enable such partnerships.

1.4 Scope of the Study

Each element of the thesis, i.e. the concept of participation and partnership, community-university partnerships, and HUD's COPC could have been the subjects of a thesis by themselves. I favored a horizontal approach since each part complements the others. An Israeli model for community-university partnerships is another subject that deserves its own comprehensive study. However, because Israel lacks almost any experience of

community-university relationships in the field of architecture, any attempt to deal with it must be based on foreign cases. The first four chapters, therefore, serve as a base on which the guidelines to an Israeli community-university partnership could be built, a base that originates in another time and place.

Time and place must therefore limit the research. A comprehensive review of community-university relations could start back in the middle ages with the first European universities. Analyzing case studies from all over the world might contribute to the quest for an Israeli model of a community-university partnership. However, this is far beyond the scope of the present study. The literature review and the case studies are hence limited to examples from the 1960s onward and are focussed mainly on the United States.

Another parameter that needs to be defined is the nature of the partners. The type of academic institution, its location, and the field of studies will influence its relations with a particular community. The character of the community, its income, its situation, and the problems the community face will influence the nature of the connection with a university. The research therefore focuses on case studies related to low-income communities in which architecture or planning schools were involved. The study is also limited to urban universities and urban communities. Since all the architecture schools in Israel are located in major cities, it is assumed that urban case studies will be the most relevant for the development of Israeli community-university partnership model.

1.5 Organization of the Thesis

The study is organized into five chapters. Chapter Two reviews the literature concerning public participation in planning and partnership theories and methods. In Chapter Three cases of community-university projects are described and evaluated. A main consideration is given to the Community Outreach Partnership Centers (COPC) program of the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The Israeli considerations regarding community-university partnerships are discussed in Chapter Four. Chapter Five summarizes the previous chapters, offers conclusions, and makes

recommendations for future research and implementation. Guidelines for an Israeli community-university partnership are proposed as part of the study conclusions.

It is the redistribution of power that enables the have-not citizens, presently excluded from the political and economic processes, to be deliberately included in the future. It is the strategy by which the have-nots join in determining how information is shared, goals and policies are set, tax resources are allocated, programs are operated, and benefits like contracts and patronage are parceled out.

Sherry R. Arnstein, A Ladder of Citizen Participation, p. 216, 1969.

CHAPTER 2: FROM PARTICIPATION TO PARTNERSHIP

The following discussion sets the conceptual framework for the thesis. It opens with a review of literature concerning public participation in planning and proceeds with partnerships and the discourse of communicative action. Although the connection between participation and partnership is not obvious, it is assumed that in relation to community-university connections they are interrelated. This connection will be explained in Chapters Three and Four. The changes in the role of planners and architects that follows the shift from advocacy planning to communicative planning are then examined. Finally, the strategies that the different partners can adopt are discussed.

2.1 On Public Participation and Eating Spinach

Public participation as a concept is rooted in the democratic tradition (Arnstein 216). Most researchers who favor public participation believe that participation is a basic right of individuals or communities, which enables them to promote their interests in a democratic system. Some researchers view the act of public participation by itself as a democratic value (Gilbert and Specht 116). Others see it as a tool of revitalization in a democratic society (Gil and Lucchetti 555).

Public participation became a well-accepted concept during the 1960s (Gilbert and Specht 190-91), as articulated for example by social scientists such as Arnstein and Sennett, who advocate for distribution of the power held by central authorities, and for the self-rule of individuals and communities. Participation did not remain a mere concept though. Architects such as Alexander, Turner, and Fathy integrated public participation into their architectural theories and practice. Public participation was integrated into governmental

housing programs like model cities in the United States, the CMHC programs in Canada, and urban renewal projects in North America and Europe. Participatory processes were also integrated into the legal system, for example the British Planning and Building Law (Turner 10), and the American Urban Renewal Act (Day 423). It seems that public participation was valued as good in itself, or as Arnstein puts it: “[t]he idea of public participation is a little like eating spinach: no one is against it in principle because it is good for you” (216). However, the voices advocating for public participation did not clearly define the meaning and benefits of the concept.

Reading through theories about the value of public participation does not make defining it less difficult. To use Gilbert and Specht’s words: “[t]here are almost as many typologies of citizen participation as there are social scientists who write on this subject” (116). The scale, methods, objectives, and the means to evaluate the success of public participation are not agreed upon (Glass 180; Day 421-23, Voogd and Woltjer 437). Several scholars tried to put some order into the concept of public participation. Arnstein suggests an eight-rung ladder of participation, which ranks several methods sorted according to the amount of control participants have on decision-making. Starting from nonparticipation levels of manipulation and therapy at the lowest rungs; through informing, consultation, and placation as degrees of tokenism; to the highest rungs: partnership, delegated power, and citizen control, which all represent degrees of citizen power. Alexander scales the participation according to the amount of user input into shaping his or her environment, from the lowest degree of helping to design the building as a client to actually building it as an ultimate act of participation (39). Turner emphasizes that participation can take place in the planning, construction, and management stages. He claims that participation in management is often as or more important than participation in the initial design (27, 146).

Objectives are probably the most controversial aspect of public participation. It sometimes seems that two opposing objectives can both be achieved by public participation. The definition of public participation might get clearer by comparing the objectives and by understanding who defines the objectives. We can divide the objectives

of public participation into two somewhat contradictory approaches. The first approach views public participation as an answer to a specific question, a solution to a definite problem that can be solved by involving the public. The second argues that public participation should be an integral part of a decision making process in order to create a fundamental change. The difference between the approaches is not only a matter of time span, or frequency, but of attitude. The first regards public participation as a tool, while the other sees it as a process.

The notion of public participation as a problem-solving tool rests on several basic assumptions. The most dominant assumption is that users know their needs better than decision-makers; therefore, better outcome is the objective of the participatory process.¹ John Turner, for example, argues that large, centralized organizations by their nature have to generalize and standardize. Generalized decisions, according to Turner, will never meet specific needs of individuals and consequently, mass production will be more expensive and wasteful. Glass defines "representative input" as a way to regard an entire community's view in order to reflect the community desires in subsequent plans (182).

Looking from the administrative perspective as Glass suggests reveals another set of objectives. Glass sees an objective in support building, which "[creates] a favorable climate for proposed policies and plans" (182). Gil and Luccheti believe that maintaining the stability of society is a social value of public participation (555). These objectives demonstrate that the purpose of participation is not necessarily change in the users or change for the users' sake. Participants are used as a vehicle to achieve an objective important to the decision-makers. Most of the tool-oriented objectives involve change in the users' environment, as opposed to a change in the users themselves. While the users will certainly be affected by the change, the effect will come through the physical change in their improved environment.

¹ The importance of public input as an integral part of decision making is also mentioned in Agenda 21, which was published after the 1992 world summit in Rio de Janeiro: "Countries, in cooperation with national institutions and groups, the media and the international community . . . should establish mechanisms for facilitating a direct exchange of information and views with the public" (*Rio* 8.11).

On the other hand, the notion of public participation as a process usually emphasizes the change in the user as well as in the user's environment. Upholding this approach does not mean that the environment is not important, on the contrary, it means that the change in the environment will be achieved through change in the users themselves. Richard Sennett's book, *The Uses of Disorder*, demonstrates this altitude clearly. Although Sennett does not talk about public participation per se, he advocates for a reconstitution of public power by preventing centralized control and promoting community action and personal change. The change in individuals, according to Sennett, is a transformation in a social order, that can create a physical change in cities (113-18, 137-42). Though not as anarchist as Sennett, Gittell shares the notion that changing the system involves redistribution of power (36-37). Gittell claims that the objective of grass-roots citizen organizations is mainly to change the system. The power redistribution process allows powerless individuals or groups to gain power, and ultimately reform the oppressing method.

Creating a sense of community and education are another two objectives that are shared by planners and researchers. Alexander believes that participation "brings people together, [and] involves them in their world around them . . ." (40). Gil and Luccheta conceive participation as a way to reduce individual alienation. They assume that through participation, individuals increase their self-confidence in their ability to control their life and environment (555-56). All these objectives promote change that comes about through the process of participation, and not as an outcome of it. Therefore, we can say that most of the theorists who follow this approach believe that public participation is inherently good.

Both of the approaches have limits and face obstacles. Those who emphasize participant input might ignore the aspect of who finally makes the decision. A participation process that involves informing, consultation, and placating, which are third, fourth, and fifth rungs on Arnstein's ladder can easily turn into manipulation if participant input is not actually taken into consideration. If the purpose of participation is something other than

to benefit the users, and if this purpose is not approved by the participants then the participation becomes outright manipulation (Arnstein 219).

Some of the process-oriented objectives that value the very idea of participants' right to decide and manage can be located up on the highest rungs of delegated power or citizen control. However, by denying participants information or funding, it is quite easy to direct their decisions to a 'desired', pre-determined outcome. Sennett mentions the "ridiculed" U.S federal government's program of the 1960s to fund local groups for pressing demands against state agencies as an example of such manipulation. The catch in the program was that the local groups had to fight for the funding itself. By keeping the right to decide who will be funded, the government mocked the idea of power distribution (177). The participatory concept in this process crashes down from the height of the eighth rung of the Arnstein ladder to the well-known manipulation rung again. The fall, however, is more painful this time, since the initial rung was much higher. In cases where objectives are not coherent with users' will, the objective should be put on the manipulation rung as a start.

"Who decide what for whom," as John Turner asks in the first page of his 1976 book *Housing by People*, is a basic question of the participatory process. Some of the scholars evaluate participants, planners, and authorities' objectives as equal (Glass; Wolfe). Can a planner's objective be declared legitimate if it is not shared with the participants? Is it not cynical to treat the authorities' objectives sympathetically if these violate the participating public's interest?

Arnstein defines citizen participation simply as citizen power. According to her view, it is the nature of the power distribution that enables or prevents the disadvantaged citizen to be included in political and economic processes (216). The relations between power and participation resemble the relations between spinach and strength; people assume they are interconnected. Both approaches, participation as a tool and a process, define participation as a way of gaining power. The first approach considers participation as the cause and the gain in power gain as the effect; the second approach treats the act of

participation itself as an act of power. As is seen in the examples above, that does not necessarily reflect reality. The tool-oriented approach views public participation as a way of gaining or granting power often ends up serving cabbage while calling it spinach, the process-oriented approach often seems like serving canned spinach without providing the can-opener.

Arnstein is fully aware of the cabbage syndrome, which she calls “the empty ritual of participation” (216). The dangers of this empty ritual according to Arnstein is that it allows the power holder to pretend that they considered user needs while ignoring them in practice, and that it leaves participants hostile toward the power-holders. Arnstein is also aware of the missing can opener syndrome, which she describes as a “significant roadblock to achieving genuine levels of participation” (217). Arnstein only mentions this roadblock as a limitation to her ladder though, she does not offer a way to avoid or overcome this block.

In her 1980 book *Limits to Citizen Participation*, Marilyn Gittel argues that lower-class community organizations that are based on public participation have had little or no impact on public policies. Community organizations, according to Gittel, have shifted from advocacy to service functions, a shift that has limited the ability of these organizations to change the system (37-41). Gittel’s grief, quoted earlier, represents the disappointment from public participation that is common to many scholars.² The participants are themselves disappointed; people are growing tired of participation programs that did them no good (Glass 181). As it is in many other situations, the most affected by the ills of participation are the socially disadvantaged groups. Gittel does not deny the necessity of public participation, on the contrary, but she claims that in order to increase participation of low income populations there should be increase in the choices available to the community, mainly choices that will lower the cost of participation (254). Gilbert and Specht suggest that a dialectic relationship between participation, leadership,

² For more sources regarding problems and dilemmas concerning public participation see Diane Day’s literature review (425-34).

and expertise should be encouraged. Only a balance between the three and the possibility to choose between them makes each of the component valuable (196).

A lot of spinach was eaten since Arnstein wrote her influential article, and both spinach eating and public participation have been questioned since. The heydays of public participation faded along with other dreams of the 1960s. As Marilyn Gittell wrote in 1980: “advocates of citizen participation have more reason to despair now than they did ten years ago” (241). However, some aspects of public participation are still being discussed and practiced.

2.2 Taking Part or Being Partners

As valuable and important Arnstein’s ladder is, there is a problem within its basic assumption. Arnstein assumes that a shift of control is interconnected with a shift in power. Arnstein thus puts citizen control on higher rung than partnership (217). Many of the participation advocates share this view and take for granted that increased independence is necessarily a higher rank of participation compared to partnership. Alexander, for example, thinks that people who build their own houses by themselves demonstrate “[t]he fullest kind of participation” (39). If we accept Arnstein’s definition that “citizen participation is a categorical term for citizen power” (216), we should ask if those who build their own houses gained any power by doing so. In many instances this is not the case, often, increasing the interdependency is an empowering process. Cooperation can increase dependence and at the same time enlarge the influence of each party. Dependence can also free time or other resources that can be used in an empowering way (Somerville 238-39).

The understanding that cooperative strategies can strengthen the partners involved is well accepted in the business world where partnerships are powerful and successful tools, “people in business have always understood that a framework of reciprocity was crucial to their affairs” (Marris, *Politics of Uncertainty* 144). Doz, Hamel, and others refer to these as ‘strategic partnership’. These partnerships are conducted between international

corporations out of cost-benefit calculations. Doz and Hamel state three primary purposes of a strategic partnership:

1. Co-option – turning potential competitors into allies and providers of complementary goods and services that allow new business to develop.
2. Cospecialization – combining previously separated resources, positions, skills, and knowledge sources. The synergistic value is larger than the sum of the separate values.
3. Learning and internalization – of new skills, mainly core competencies that are not for sale on open market (3-4; 197-203).

Although Doz and Hamel refer to partnerships of international corporations, it is surprising that the same features seem to make partnerships an essential strategy to Microsoft, Motorola, or Toyota or to the smallest grassroots organization. Doz and Hamel claim that one of the properties that make these partnerships essential is that they can deal better with the uncertainty of the information economy (2). The capacity to deal better with uncertainty can explain the similar adoption of partnerships in different circumstances. Peter Marris's analysis of uncertainty's applications to private and public life demonstrates that uncertain situations occur in every environment. There is a contradiction between hierarchical authority and control to reciprocity and collaboration as methods to control uncertainty in private and public life alike (Marris, *Politics of Uncertainty* 88-91).

Anthony Giddens talks about *risk* in much the same way Marris talks about *uncertainty*. Giddens describes the welfare state as a "risk management system." He distinguishes between external risk and manufactured risk. Viewed in the past as 'god's will', external risk comes from the outside. Manufactured risk is a relatively modern concept; it is the outcome of man-made decisions. Global warming is a good example of manufactured risk. The understanding that uncertainty is the product of planned decisions is both frustrating and encouraging. It is frustrating to know that government and corporations consciously manufacture risks and uncertainty; yet it is encouraging because if these risks and uncertainties are man-made, it is possible to struggle to change them. Partnerships

are one form of collaborative strategy and as such they can reduce uncertain situations for both of the partners. As both Doz and Hamel from the business management side and Marris from the social planning side conclude, partnership or collaboration is a better strategy in a world of fast economic change, enormous amounts of information, and consequently greater uncertainty.

The understanding that strategies of partnerships and cooperation can be more beneficial than strategies of competition, domination and control is strongly connected to the philosophical work of Jurgen Habermas. In essence, Habermas asserts that all people share a “communicative rationality” which is “oriented to achieving, sustaining and reviewing consensus” (17). The consensus is achieved through what Habermas calls “communicative action.” “The concept of communicative action presupposes the use of language as a medium for a kind of reaching understanding, in the course of which participants, through relating to a world, reciprocally raise validity claims that can be accepted or contested” (99). Flyvbjerg summarizes the five ethical requirements, which Habermas recommends to participants who want to implement communicative rationality:

1. No affected party should be excluded from the discourse.
2. All participants should be able to present and criticize validity claims equally.
3. Participants must be empathic to each other’s validity claims.
4. No power differences should effect the creation of consensus.
5. Goals and intentions of the different participants should be transparent.

Flyvbjerg himself adds a sixth requirement: unlimited time (188). Although some of these requirements are not very realistic in a planning process and in spite of the fact that time is always limited, Habermas’ theory of communicative action has an enormous influence on the field of planning.³

The private sector partnerships, as was discussed above, are another source from which collaborative strategies penetrated the public sector discourse and physical planning in

³ Briggs, Healey, Hillier, and Innes among others applied Habermas’ theories, sometimes critically, to planning theory.

particular. The changing role of government had led it to seek new allies in the private sector, and public-private partnerships became a common answer to many urban issues (Carmon 8-13). Urban regime theory that was developed in the United States in the 1980s was the theoretical background to this tendency concerning urban issues. Urban regime theory emphasized the governmental need of cooperation with the private sector for influencing urban economic development (Haughton and While 5-7; Stoker and Mossberger 197-99).

Several researchers suggest integrating community groups into public-private partnerships in order to improve the success of these partnerships. Carmon, for example, concludes from analyzing the different generations of urban renewal that a new approach of regeneration through partnerships should be developed. Public sector, private sector, and non-governmental organizations should cooperate to develop and operate new approaches to neighborhood renewal (26). Torjman claims that the voluntary sector can complement the public sector with an "on-the-ground" way of dealing with economic and social problems (4). Empowerment of the local community as an essential, integral partner in urban renewal processes was expressed in recent partnership programs of HUD, from the modest COPC (Community Outreach Partnership Centers) program that will be further discussed in Chapter Three, to the broad Empowerment Zone initiatives of the Clinton administration. The growing importance of the non-governmental voluntary sector has made it an important actor in the game of managing uncertainty. The control of uncertainty had become more important form of domination than the accumulation of resources (Marris, *Planning and Civil Society* 13). Therefore, the public and the private sectors need the non-governmental sector to maintain the certainty they require.

If we examine Arnstein's ladder once more, it is clear that participatory strategies are essential for the voluntary sector as well. Full citizen control can be less beneficial to a community than partnering with governmental or private bodies. In some cases partnership can contribute to a greater degree of community control because tactics of reciprocity and collaboration are being used. Uncertainty is as threatening to communities as it is to governments and private investors. The ability to control this

uncertainty through partnerships is therefore essential to all. In addition to the control of uncertainty, the joined synergistic value of the partnership might be greater than what full citizen control could ever achieve.

2.3 Advocates or Mediators

What is the planner's role in the new discourse of collaboration, reciprocity, and communicative action? Long ago in the 1960s, when participation was something to fight for, some planners considered themselves as advocates of those who are not represented in the planning process. In his notable article "Advocacy Planning," Davidoff claims that since planning is always part of the public realm, planners should represent not only the governmental body that hires them, but also the public that will be effected by their decisions. Davidoff also argues that creating several alternative plans is important both as a tool to represent other sectors in society and as a way to force institutional agencies to produce more responsive plans since they have to compete with other suggestions. The seemingly obvious benefits of collaborative strategies, partnerships, and communicative planning has led some theorist to think that the age of advocacy is over. Susskind and Ozawa, for example, have concluded that the model of planner as mediator is "more satisfying" than former models of planners such as the advocate planner (5: 8-9). In his book *Planning in the face of power* John Forester analyzes the role of planners in capitalist, democratic societies. Although advocate planners addressed inequality, Forester criticized them for "ministering to the sick" while proving "unable to prevent their illnesses from occurring in the first place" (32). Forester suggests that preventing communication distortions can strengthen democratic planning. One way planners can do this is by developing mediation skills. Among the strategies that planners can use for mediating, according to Forester, are to regulate the planning process, to build trust among the parties, to anticipate the concerns of the various partners and to search for acceptable agreements (88-99). Forester claims that using mediating strategies in planning can change a confrontational process to collaborative one, improve city-developer-neighborhood relations, and create for all the participants "both-gain," or even "win-win" results.

A major difference between the role the planner plays in advocacy planning and communicative planning concerns their position in relation to other players in the planning process. The advocate-planner tries to represent the interests of people or groups that are usually excluded from the process. However, the dichotomy and hierarchy between clients and service providers is maintained. As in a trial, which is the source from which Davidoff took the advocate image, the advocate planner stands in front of those he or she represents and in metaphorical, or real opposition to the advocates of the other players. The mediator-planner does not represent any of the side. In a metaphorical mediation process the planner stands in between the parties. Some communicative action theorists have gone even farther and think of the planners as "actors" in the planning play (Innes 184). This position might seem more desirable for those who seek an equal or horizontal position for planners; however, the mediator-planner, or the communicative-planner has also a neutral position and cannot, or should not take a side in a planning debate. This neutral position may become problematic if one party is more powerful than the other. The neutral planner cannot protect the interests of the weaker party. Forester emphasizes that the strategies he proposes can be used only in situations where the power differences between the parties are minimal. When one party is strong enough to avoid the negotiation, or when there are severe inequalities between the parties, the mediation process can enhance the power imbalances (99-101). It may therefore be that the advocating role of the planner is not over yet.

Although communicative planning may not always be the preferable strategy, it is important to develop communicative discourse within the planning field. Fairclough's theory of critical discourse analysis claims not only that social change creates changes in discourse, but that changes in language can lead to social change. "There is a dialectic relations between social practice and discursive practice" (Hastings, *Analysing Power Relations* 93). When planners and architects describe communities as partners, they might consequently treat them as partners. The theory refers to more than the use of politically correct ways of speaking, it also refers to linguistic change as an outcome of political change. Hastings asserts that bringing together partners from different sectors will change the "social and discursive space" in which the partners operate; the partners

might change their objectives, values, and prejudices. Partnership can create such change, since it can be a “form of governance capable of ‘hot-housing’ social change” (Hastings, *Analysing Power Relations* 92- 93).

2.4 Building Consensus in Conflict Situation

Since partnerships are often accepted as inherently good, governments are happy to integrate them into their policies.⁴ However, governments are not that clear about the exact definition of partnership, “other than expressing hopes that greater co-ordination and synergy will focus minds and maximize resources” (Atkinson 63). The presupposition of the partnership qualities on one hand and the obscurity of the partnership concept on the other hand can make partnerships an excuse for the public sector to further absolve itself from its responsibilities.

In the 1980s, partnerships became a prominent tool in urban regeneration projects in North America and Great Britain. Most of these partnerships were of the public-private type. Although these partnerships were often presented as a way to improve the condition of disadvantaged groups, in many cases their condition had worsened. The London Docklands, for example, one of the largest British public-private urban regeneration partnerships of the 1980s raised the unemployment rates in the area, because jobs created by the project did not suit the local residents. Homelessness grew in seven years five times more than in the London area (Carmon 12-13). Peter Marris claims that governmental plans were designed to attract private investments at the expense of existing neighborhoods. “Urban planning has often increased uncertainty by condemning areas for wholesale redevelopment, without being able to recruit the resources to carry out the redevelopment” (Marris, *Politics of Uncertainty* 133). Not only did the partnerships fail

⁴ The numerous partnerships supported by the Canadian government, for example, lead it to publish in 1997 a partnership handbook (*The Partnership Handbook*; Frank and Smith) to help these partnerships and other independent partnerships that emerged in the last few years. The British government has promoted since the early 1980s multi-sectorial partnerships in various fields, and the Scottish government restricts access to some public funds to local councils that develop public-private partnerships (Hastings, *Partnership in Urban Regeneration* 253).

to reduce uncertainty it actually amplified it. Partnerships in these cases became very much what Giddens calls “man-made risks.” The government creates favored conditions for private investments, often at the expense of the most disadvantaged users of these services. Community action, according to Marris, could rarely change these conditions; the communities’ situation has consequently worsened (*Politics of Uncertainty* 133).

It is clear then, that partnerships are not always the consensus building tool they are spoken of. Partnerships do not always minimize risk and uncertainty; on the contrary, partnerships can increase uncertainty and be the source of conflicts. Involvement of community-based organizations as partners, can be one way to prevent such uncertain situation. However, power imbalances can be a barrier in this attempt; grassroots organizations might find it hard to be equal partners to strong public or private bodies (Torjman 12-13). In the hierarchical context of urban regeneration partnerships, where professionals, officers, politicians, and private sector participants are involved, the problem of power imbalances is crucial. Communities have to face situations in which they lack the necessary properties and capacities that the other partners have. If some of the parties involved in the partnership have more political power, bureaucratic or legal authority, or the control of resources, they can set the context within which weaker partners have to function (Atkinson 62). Partnerships often use business world techniques, methods, and vocabulary, since competitive market economy is assumed to be efficient and effective. This assumption does not support community participation as an empowering process. It also does not change the power relations between the partners. Therefore, partnerships can strengthen existing economic, social, and political power relations and dependency (Atkinson 63).

It seems as if the participation obstacles that were raised in the 1960s are still relevant. Partnerships thus, became the “spinach” of the 1990s. Turner’s question of “who decides what for whom” is as relevant today as it ever was. Who defines the cause of the problem to be addressed in the process remained a central issue. In partnerships each group may define the cause based on its knowledge, policy, and interests. Therefore this definition is selective and can influence the process if one partner’s definition is preferred on the other

(Hastings, *Analysing Power Relations* 95). Atkinson claims that although central governments declare that they assume the role of partner, they set the partnership's rules. The other parties have no choice but to accept the rules if they want to access the diminishing funds. Partnerships thus become a "more subtle form of central control" (Atkinson 63).

The problem of partnerships is not only one of power imbalances and the ability to define the objectives or set the rules. The need to cooperate with new a partner and to take into consideration the partner's abilities and needs bring unknown parameters into the partners' considerations. In other words, it increases the uncertainties both parties face. Therefore, an attempt to create consensus through a participatory process might end up exposing conflicting positions both between the parties and within the participating communities (Goodwin 397).

Although the partnership process can insure that some of the benefits of urban regeneration reach the disadvantaged, they may also reinforce existing relations of domination and control. The discourse of partnership can legitimize "a particular representation of reality which defines what is 'reasonable' and the language in which demands can be made" (Atkinson 70). If our intention is to improve the situation of disadvantaged groups in a conflict situation, what then should be done? How can we overcome power relations of domination and control? Should we turn back to advocacy models? It may be that despite what Habermas would like to believe, in some situations consensus cannot be achieved. In these situations disputes about class, race, gender, and culture are so deep that only power struggle may improve the position of the weaker party (Healey, *Planning through Debate* 151).

As discussed earlier, although advocacy-planning methods help the disadvantaged they are sometimes unable to change the power imbalances on their own. An attempt to overcome this problem is offered by Bateman who differentiates between "citizen advocacy," which is the advocacy Davidoff talks about and "self-advocacy," in which individuals or communities, "speak or act on their own behalf in pursuit of their own

needs and interests" (Bateman 4). Planning and housing are often viewed as complicated issues that should be left to professionals to resolve. That might be one of the reasons why advocacy models in these fields tend to be of the citizen advocacy type. However, Bateman suggests that individuals or grass roots groups advocating for themselves may also "have outside input from associated professionals who wish to work in *partnership*" (7, emphasis added). Bateman views the advocate and the client as partners, which is completely different from Davidoff's advocacy that reinforces the hierarchy of client – service-provider relations. Bateman thinks of these relations as "instructional," which means that the ability to learn from them is mutual (8). In other words, the advocacy component is built into a reciprocal connection that may create a more balanced and fair relationship. Another bridge between advocacy and mediation or between power struggle and conflict resolution lies within the mediation process itself. A mediation process starts with a conflict; only when there is a power struggle, building consensus may be needed. As a matter of fact, a party who is in an inferior position often has to create a conflict in order to get the attention of the stronger parties.

Conflict, power struggle, and advocacy planning are sometimes the only alternative available to the have-nots. There are situations in which disputes cannot be resolved through building consensus. The division between the parties is so deep and the power relations are so unbalanced that they can be confronted only by power struggle (Healey, *Planning through Debate* 151). Planners and architects who want to deal with these situations must take a side and act as advocates. In spite of all the problems connected with the partnership discourse, one cannot avoid its successes. More than that, the belief that it is possible to solve conflicts in a consensual way is hard to give up. Collaborative strategies "depend upon patience, mutual understanding, [and] farsightedness" (Marris, *Politics of Uncertainty* 148). If such patience, understanding, and farsightedness exist, consensus building, partnerships, and communicative planning can be better approaches for communities to improve their situation. Planners and architects cannot abandon their mediating communicative role, which is essential to their constituencies. Planners and architects, therefore, may be partners, mediators, or advocates in different situations. They may be partners of one party and advocates of other parties; they may advocate in

the early stages of a planning process and turn into mediators in later stages; or they can mediate within their constituency and be a partner of the same constituency as a whole. What will be argued in the next chapters is that universities may be better equipped to adapt their role to such changing situations. Universities may accordingly have a major role to play in an urban regeneration process.

Objectivity, like the claim that one is nonpartisan or reasonable, is usually a defensive posture used by those who fear involvement in the passions, partisanship, conflicts, and changes that make up life; they fear life. An "objective" decision is generally lifeless. It is academic and the word "academic" is a synonym for irrelevant

Saul D. Alinsky, Reveille for Radicals, Introduction to Vintage Edition, p. ix, 1969.

CHAPTER 3: COMMUNITY-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS

Chapter Three focuses on community-university relations in the urban context. It starts with a discussion of the university and the community as urban entities. A brief review of community-university relations follows. The core of the chapter is a comparative analysis of community-university partnership case studies from the 1960s onwards. A critical description of HUD's Community Outreach Partnership Centers (COPC) program is provided as an example for the pro and cons of federally funded community-university projects.

3.1 The University, the Community, and the City

The relations between universities, the cities in which they are located and their inhabitants can be traced back to the medieval universities of Europe. The early European universities were usually located in cities (Wusten 4, Seaberry and Davis 5-6), and although the image of these universities was of isolated self-contained institutions, they were responding to the needs of their communities in various fields such as law and medicine (Seaberry and Davis 6). During the early modern time the university developed as a distinct entity. As such, the university has become one of the institutions that has shaped western society through its free intellectual debate and professional education (Wusten 1). The university therefore has enjoyed reciprocal relations with society. Its present shape is partially a result of its response to society's needs and at the same time it had a part in reforming society by affecting its values and educating its future experts.

Therefore the university as an institutional urban entity has had an enormous influence on the city within which it is located and hence on the city's population.¹

Unlike universities that in spite of their changing role remained well-organized, influential institutions, communities are illusive entities. Although the idea of community in the context of planning can be traced to the days of Ebenezer Howard (Gordon and Low 5), the concept of community and mainly of the urban community as a social entity is very much the outcome of the 1950s and the early 1960s.² As was discussed in the second chapter, public participation had become an accepted idea by mid-century when communities of participants turned into organized entities. U.S. governmental programs that sponsored community planning in cities reinforced the community concept. This tendency was accompanied by the establishment of community oriented professions, due mainly to the work of Saul Alinsky, both in his writings and by its personal contribution to community based organizations such as TWO, which is discussed later in this chapter.

In the late 1960s after the failure of the war on poverty in the United States, the belief in community planning declined (Briggs 2). However, the community concept itself remained and communities were accepted as self-evident entities. Davidoff, for example, in his 1965 article speaks about "community development," "community growth," and "community plans." He doesn't explain what he means by community other than an alternative interest group to the government, one that an advocate planner should represent. Arnstein in a later article from 1969 is more careful in using the term community. She prefers to talk about "citizens," "have-nots," and "neighborhood."

¹ Unlike the European universities, the early American university was usually located outside the city with the notion of the 'campus on the green field site'. However, with the university and the city growth the universities became part of the city (Wusten 4).

² The concept of rural community is in itself a problematic one, the acceptance of the village community as a moral order is "as much romantic illusion as historical fact" (Williams as quoted in Healy, Collaborative Planning 123). Yet it is harder to talk about urban populations as distinct groups since they are much more heterogeneous in nature and usually more dependent on local authorities (Hamdi and Goethert 29-30).

When the term community does appear, it is used to identify specific groups such as “poor community” or “black community.” However, Arnstein herself is described in the AIP Journal as the director of a non-profit research institute called “Community Development Studies for The Commons.” Therefore, by the end of the 1960s the community idea had become a distinct research field, a fact that may represent a validity stamp for this abstract, intangible entity.

After some vicissitudes through the 1970s and 1980s, the community concept had enjoyed a revival in the 1990s. Recent research claims that contemporary social problems, are an outcome of the breakdown of community (Healy, *Collaborative Planning* 122-23). One of the most prominent of this research is Etzioni’s “Communitarian Agenda,” which proposes community values as an alternative to both individualism and governmental power. However, other current research has questioned the very existence of communities as a socio-spatial entity. Harvey, for instance, argues that community is merely a “mythical social entity” (425). Other research goes farther to claim that community or rather “community” is increasingly used to describe “what states can no longer do for citizens” (Gordon and Low 11). Although representing two opposing dogmas, both opinions originate from the same phenomena that were discussed earlier: the decline of the state’s responsibilities and the rise of the non-governmental sectors. While some see community power as the answer to the problems caused by this tendency, others think the tendency itself should be criticized.

What is a community then? Checkoway defines it as “a process of people acting collectively with others who share some common concerns, whether on the basis of a place where they live, of interests or interest groups that are similar, or of relationships that have some cohesion or continuity” (308). Checkoway’s definition is a partial one; he proposes a functional definition that has no ideological value. Yet what Checkoway contributes is the reference to the community as a process. Community is not a defined and stable entity; it is an ongoing changing process. The creation of numerous community-based non-governmental groups can be understood as a way to give the community process more stability and sustainability. Whether one accepts or rejects the

communitarian concept, it is hard to deny the role of NGOs in uncertain situations. Even Harvey agrees that what is most likely “stopping riots or total social breakdown in many cities are the intricate networks of social solidarities, the power and dedication of community organizations, and the hundreds of voluntary groups” (425).

3.2 Community-University Relations

Throughout the years universities have developed economic, political, and cultural relations with the cities within which they are located. Economically, the university is an important customer; some of the goods and services it consumes are from local businesses; the university is also a major taxpayer. University staff and students play an important economic role in the city; they consume goods, use services, and affect the housing market. The university is often a significant employer as well as a major trainer of the city’s qualified workers. The university has had a prominent affect on the city’s physical planning issues, since the university is both land user and landowner. Universities also create political personnel and are in many cases the starting point of political movements and ideologies. Culturally, universities nurture activities in the art fields; they also provide the audiences, critics, and sometimes performers of the city’s cultural activities. Universities have, of course, enormous educational influence on cities both by providing degree-granting programs and by offering their facilities to other educational institutions (Moneta 72-76, Wusten 4-5).

Despite the University’s involvement in city life throughout the years, it was only in 1862, with the creation of Land Grant Colleges in the United States, that the idea of direct service to the community was introduced as one of the university’s duties beside its teaching and research functions. This idea became widely accepted to the extent that in the late 1960s non-applicable forms of research were often criticized as the cause of all the university’s ills (CERI 36-37). By the mid-1960s, universities established institutions, launched projects, and initiated numerous community-oriented programs. These were focused on inner-city communities and the ways they can be helped (Bok 236-7). This tendency did not last long; only a few of the initiatives survived the 1970s. In some of the cases these initiatives not only failed to improve the community-university relations but

also worsened the negative feelings of the local residents toward the university (Bok 237).

The same difficulties that characterized the community concept throughout the 1970s and 1980s were typical of the community-university relations. The enthusiastic extra-curricular initiatives of the 1960s were replaced by clinical programs in which students helped low-income communities under the supervision of staff-members in for-credit activities (Bok 241). However, the number and scope of these activities were much smaller in comparison to the many enterprises of the 1960s.

The dichotomous references to the community concept in the 1990s are reflected in the kind of relations universities have had recently with community issues. Some universities have no direct community service whatsoever. However, an increasing number of American universities are rediscovering the world outside the ivory tower and community-university relationships and partnerships are growing in number (Palm and Toma 57).

Although relations between universities and communities are complicated, it seems that there is a desire to reevaluate the university position or even, as Checkoway claims, to reinvent the research institutions. There is an understanding that the university should not or even cannot afford ignoring the new circumstances. The same economic and cultural changes of the globalization process are effecting universities as much as they effect cities (Wusten 6-7). Universities may soon find out that "doing good may be the best way for universities to do well" (Harkavy 334).

3.3 Past Case Studies

The 1960s were the heyday of community-university relations. However, the relations between universities and their nearby communities did not always originate from good will. Often, if there were any relations, they were hostile and distrustful. For example, in the early 1960s the University of Chicago was involved in massive urban renewal projects in the Hyde Park-Kenwood neighborhood. As part of the renewal plans a poor

black community was forced to move out of the neighborhood, and the university stand led to hostile relations with the remaining black community (Nash 9-11). In another case, Columbia University violated the urban renewal plans of the adjacent Morning Heights neighborhood. The plans limited the institutional expansion into the neighborhood. However, Columbia demolished, evacuated, and converted 58 of the 309 residential buildings in the neighborhood. Twenty of these buildings were out of the limits defined by the renewal plan for institutional land use (Price 95-103). The universities position as landlord, developer, or employer often conflicted with the interests of the neighborhood's residents, many of whom were the university tenants or employees. Peter Marris describes the events in Berkley in 1969, when some residents spontaneously transformed a vacant lot owned by the University of California into a small park. Consequently, the university administration erected an eight-foot fence around the lot (Marris, *Politics of Uncertainty* 76-78). Fences, either physical or metaphorical, marked the kind of relations many universities had with their surrounding neighborhoods.

In all the above cases, the university changed its attitude to a certain degree. The reasons for doing so varied. In the case of the University of Chicago, it was a neighborhood based organization, The Woodlawn Organization (TWO), that approached the university in 1968 asking for help to modify the Model Cities plan that was proposed by the municipality. How did the hostile relations between the university and TWO turn into cooperative relations? It seems that the main reason is that TWO was an established, powerful coalition of community groups with strong leadership and financial support from the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago. The universities approach was first similar to the Hyde Park-Kenwood renewal plans. However, the strong reaction of TWO forced the university to take the neighborhood needs into consideration and to develop more reciprocal relationships with the neighborhood residents. On the university side, the reason for the change can be attributed to the pragmatic administration that learned from past experience. The university's official justification for serving the community was that it could help in developing innovative methods for service development in other urban areas (Nash 9-13). A group of students from the Center for Urban Studies at the University of Chicago started to accumulate information on the community for the

planning process. Faculty and students were organized by the Center for Urban Studies to advise the community on problems selected by The Woodlawn Organization. TWO had its own committees of neighborhood residents that met with the student-faculty committees on a weekly basis. The Woodlawn Organization generated community participation and the university provided technical assistance. The community had the power to accept or reject the university's suggestions. However, because of the reciprocal nature of the process, the final plans usually matched the needs of the community and plans were seldom rejected. The plan of the university covered issues of health, social services, law, environmental planning, housing, education, and economic development (Nash 13-14). In all these fields several projects were initiated by the university and modified by the neighborhood organization to serve the community better. The residents played a major role by determining what was needed. They had a say in how the services should be provided, were employed as fully as possible in the delivery of services, and helped to evaluate the program by serving on advisory boards. In the field of housing some projects were designed and modified based on the neighborhood's needs, and new housing units were built in response to the residents' demands. The university made temporary loans to TWO, and private foundations provided complementary financial support. Over all the Model Cities plan was revised based on public input and provided a comprehensive approach to the needs of the community (Nash 13-26).

In the case of Columbia University, the catalyst for the new attitude was a Ford Foundation grant that the University received in 1966. The Grant was designated for new programs in urban and minority affairs. A process of evaluating the few existing programs in this field started in order to revise the curriculum. A Center for Urban-minority Affairs was established to coordinate and evaluate all the existing and proposed programs. The most progressive divisions to adopt new curricular programs were the School of Architecture and the School of Social Work. In 1968 the School of Architecture created the East Harlem Urban Planning Studio. Students were involved in actual planning activities such as planning and designing a storefront community center and designing a plaza and festival center in the East Harlem marketing area. Other

activities of the Architecture School included establishing a six-week course in cost estimating for a Harlem-based professional association of minority contractors and publishing a procedural handbook on the use of vacant buildings, storefronts, and lots by community groups. By 1969, one quarter of the students were involved in community groups activities. Although there were several changes in the university curriculum, the Urban Center itself had an uncertain future once the Ford money was depleted (Price 95-123).

In the case of the University of California, the university students joined the residents and confronted the police that guarded the fence. The demonstration soon turned into clashes with the police who opened fire – one man was killed and another blinded. For weeks the demonstration continued and hundreds of students were arrested. Finally, the Department of Landscape Architecture offered to sponsor the park, an offer they had made when the incident had begun. This time the university accepted the offer (Marris, *Politics of Uncertainty* 77-78).

All three examples demonstrate community-university cooperation. Although of different kind and scale, what is common to all of them is that the university's faculty or administration did not take the first steps – initiate the dialogue. In the case of Chicago, the strong community organization approached the University. In Berkley, constant student pressure most likely forced the university's administration to give up. In the Columbia example, although the University did initiate the process, the main motivation for the departments to change their approach was an outside, private grant. When the grant's money vanished, so did the new initiatives.

A Canadian example of a community-university project is the Community Design Workshop (CDW) that was conducted by Professor Joseph Baker in the early 1970s. The CDW was an attempt to involve McGill architectural students in various neighborhoods in Montreal, working together with community organizations that lacked the money for professional private architects. There are some differences between this example and the three other cases mentioned before. McGill's CDW was started by faculty members of

the School of Architecture. Most of the communities the CDW dealt with were not adjacent to the university and the university was not involved as a directly interested party in the issues these communities faced. The CDW was active for a few years. One of its main activities focussed on the Point St. Charles neighborhood in Montreal; the CDW assisted a non-profit organization that was offered a one million Canadian dollars loan for a rehabilitation project from the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. The CDW students collected information about the housing stock in the neighborhood, prepared renovation plans for the units that were bought, and took part in some of the actual renovations of the units. The students also helped some other local non-profit organizations, these activities included renovation of a health clinic, design and construction of a portable clinic, and planning day care centers (Baker 33-36).

Most of the projects from the 1960s have been poorly documented; the university activists were too busy saving the world, and writing about it was often considered a luxury. Therefore, documentation of the Universities' activities is scarce. An evaluation of the program and its long-term impact are even scarcer. Danhui You's thesis, *Long-Term Results of User Participation in Housing Rehabilitation: The Community Design Workshop in Pointe St. Charles*, is one of these rare researches. In his thesis, You interviewed some of the inhabitants of Pointe St. Charles that were involved in Prof. Baker's Community Design Workshop activities. You concludes that the project improved the housing situation and inhabitants' attitude toward user participation both as a way to better their housing conditions and as an opportunity for individual development (You 100-105). You's focus on user participation is typical of many of the projects from the 1960s onward. The success or failure of the project was often measured by the amount of user participation in it. To what extent the change in the housing conditions of the Point St. Charles residents is related to participation in the CDW activities is questionable. It might be the fact that some of the housing units turned into co-ops, for example, had a greater influence on the housing situation in the neighborhood. However, had the CDW not been running the project in Pointe St. Charles, co-ops would not have come about. The activities of the CDW in the neighborhood, therefore, played an important role in the process of the rehabilitation itself. The project's second input was its

impact on the participating students, some of whom continued in socially oriented activities after their graduation (You 18).

One of the reasons Baker gives for the CDW's limited impact is the lack of a "skilled community organizer to work with the residents – to define their goals and appropriate strategies and to train local residents to take over the task of organization" (Baker 39). Although in the Point St. Charles project there was a community organizer involved, in most of the other projects of the CDW the undergraduate students had to function as community organizers, a role for which they did not have the skills. Prof. Baker's critique makes clear that the issue is not whether the user participated or not. What is important is that the users as individuals or as a group be able to define what they want to achieve in the process and know the possible ways to achieve their targets. Community organizing in which common goals are defined should be by itself a participatory process, yet it doesn't mean that the participatory process is necessarily the best approach to achieve the defined goals (Brager, Specht, and Torczyner 62).

Many of the community-university projects vanished during the 1980s. Few of the projects have been maintained and are still active today, and some of these have changed forms, targets, and players. There have been initiatives for new projects. However, it is hard to define these projects as movements or trends. There were various reasons for the decline of community-university projects. Faculty that was involved got tired, lost interest, or simply moved to other directions or positions. It was hard to maintain a continuous scheme when there was an ongoing turnover of students. Both public and private funds grew scarcer and harder to access. Still, it might be that the main reason for the decline of the 1960s spirit is a change in the political climate in the 1980s. Nevertheless, many of the revolutionary ideas of the 1960s penetrated the institutional mainstream (Brager, Specht, and Torczyner 1-3).

3.4 Present Case Studies

This mainstreaming is apparent also in contemporary community-university programs. Many of these programs are well integrated into the university curriculum and activities.

Three examples for such programs are the Pratt Institute Center for Community Environmental Development (PICCED),³ the Community Design Center (CDC) which is operated by the Boston Architectural Center (BAC),⁴ and the East St. Louis Action Research Project (ESLARP) of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.⁵ A comparative analysis of the three programs is summarized in table 1 on page 35.⁶

PICCED is one of the few community-university projects that survived through the 1980s. It was established in 1963 and it claims to be the oldest university-based advocacy planning and technical assistance organization in the U.S. PICCED, which is therefore the oldest among the three, is also the biggest: it has the largest staff, budget, and number of projects. PICCED engages ten planners and architects who are involved altogether in about eighty projects each year. The BAC's CDC is another long-lived community-university program operating since 1977. The CDC is on a completely different scale compared to the PICCED; its annual budget in 1995 was \$28,000 US (exactly one percent of the PICCED \$2,800,000 budget for that year). Although ten to fifteen people are engaged in the CDC's activities, most of them participate as part of their other activities in the BAC or in their private practices. The CDC is involved in about twelve projects each year. However, the scope of these projects is usually much smaller

³ All the information about the PICCED in this chapter is based on the center's web site: <<http://www.picced.org>> and on a personal interview with Prof. Brian Sullivan, Associate Director of the PICCED. As was the case with the 1960s projects, all the 1990s partnerships are poorly documented. The web sites of the institution are, of course, a biased source. However, it can indicate the intended approach of the institutions. The actual work of each institution should be studied further for a better analysis of their activities.

⁴ All the information about the BAC in this chapter is based on the center's publications and web site: <<http://www.the-bac.edu>> and on a personal interview with Prof. Don Brown, Director of Practice Curriculum at the BAC.

⁵ All the Information about ESLARP in this chapter, unless specified otherwise is based on the ESLARP web site: <<http://www.imlab.uiuc.edu/eslarp/index.html>> and on personal e-mail from Dr. Kenneth Reardon, the Program Coordinator, from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

⁶ Besides the sources already mentioned, the information in the table concerning PICCED and BAC is also from the Association for Community Design web site: <<http://www.communitydesign.org>>

	PICCED (1995 data)	CDC (1995 data)	ESLARP (1999 data)
Established	1963	1977	1990
Staff	33	10-15**	10
Architect	5	8**	3
Planners	5		4
Budget (US \$)	2,800,000	28,000	550,000
Annual Number of Projects (average)	80	12	40
Research and Analysis Services	Neighborhood surveys Zoning analyses Site identification services Feasibility studies	Surveys and analysis activities Feasibility studies	Feasibility studies Housing market analysis Policy issue research Legal research
Design and Planning Services	Housing rehabilitation planing Environmental planning Program development Financial packaging Architectural design	Rehab of existing structures New buildings designs Interior design Urban design	Housing designs Development planning assistance Low-cost housing repairs New housing construction
Training and Educational Services	Community development programs Staff capacity building training Strategic planing program Financial Management		Adult education Youth development programs Community planning training
Advocacy and Community Organizing	Leadership development seminars		Community organizing
Departments involved	*	Architecture Interior Design	Architecture Landscape Architecture Urban and Regional Planning Law
Students Involved for Credit	*	30	300
Students Involved as Volunteers	*		100
Academic Activities	*	Design studios	Studio classes Service-learning class Graduate research projects
Area Served	New York metropolitan area	Boston metropolitan area and rural communities.	East St. Louis
* The PICCED is not an academic program; the center is not part of any department in the university. Therefore, there are no department or students involved in the center's activities. However, four of the center's staff member teach at the urban planning department. Altogether, two-hundred students attend their courses, ** This figure indicates the number of staff members involved in the CDC's activities, most of them do not do it full-time.			

Table 1. Comparison of PICCED, BAC's CDC, and ESLARP

than that of the projects the PICCED usually deals with. The ESLARP is the most recent of the three. It was set up in 1990 as an undertaking of the School of Architecture, Department of Landscape Architecture, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, and the Cooperative Extension Service at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. ESLARP was started when one faculty member and eleven graduate students created a community stabilization plan for residential neighborhoods in East St. Louis. Ten years later about three-hundred students together with seven full-time staff members, four in East St. Louis and three on campus, and eight to twelve quarter-time Graduate Research Assistants are working each year on more than forty projects requested by community-based organizations in East St. Louis. The origins of the project date back to 1987 when some civil rights leaders criticized the University of Illinois for not being responsive to the needs of racial minorities. Few articles in the Chicago-Tribune questioned the university's policy of focussing on basic research at the expense of service activities. Another important influence was a State Representative from East St. Louis that challenged the university to demonstrate its commitment to low-income, minority communities. The fact that the same representative was also the Co-Chairperson of the State Legislature's Higher Education Finance Committee was, of course, a major consideration for the university (Reardon 48). The way the ESLARP started shows that although community issues have found their way into the academic mainstream, it is not the university itself, at least in the ESLARP case, who initiates actual community-university projects.

All three institutions offer technical assistance both in research, surveys, and analysis services and in actual design and planning. PICCED assists community-based nonprofit organizations in the areas of housing, health care, employment, and other related issues. The Pratt Planning Architectural Collaborative (PPAC), which is a related but independent entity, helps community groups in specific architectural projects from surveys and needs assessments through schematic design and construction documents to construction phase monitoring. PPAC's staff includes architects, planners, and financial packaging specialists. The CDC offer services to clients that otherwise would not be able to pay for such services. Twenty-three percent of the projects the center deals with are

for low-income, non-profit, or minority client groups. Other clients include museums, churches, government agencies, and commercial organizations. Unlike the PICCED and the CDC which do not restrict their services to specific areas, the ESLARP limits its activities to East St. Louis which has a largely African-American population with high unemployment rates and a high percentage of the residents living below the poverty level (1990 data). ESLARP assists East St. Louis residents, usually by working with local NGOs, to devise solutions for the environmental, economic, and social problems the community faces. The services ESLARP offers vary in their scope and character from neighborhood beautification through job creation to comprehensive neighborhood plans.

Both PICCED and ESLARP offer training and education services. PICCED offers community development programs for low-income neighborhood residents, community organizers, and members and staff of community-based organizations. The training programs include workshops, short courses, and a one-year certificate program. PICCED, under a HUD contract, also provides free training sessions for Community Housing Development Organizations. ESLARP defines as part of its goals the improvement of the planning and development capacity of both community-based organizations and municipal agencies such as the City Planning Commission. ESLARP also offers training courses that are open to the public such as adult education and youth development programs. The CDC is not involved in any such training and educational services. The BAC is a much smaller academic institution compared to the Pratt Institute and the University of Illinois. The BAC's main focus is on architecture and interior design, and it offers courses only to the school's students.

Both PICCED and ESLARP deal with public policy analysis, advocacy, and community organizing. PICCED tries to create public awareness and encourage integrative planning. Although it is not involved directly in community organizing, it aims through its other activities to strengthen the role of community-based nonprofit organizations as key players in the community development process. PICCED does all this through working with communities and empowering them to advocate for themselves in the community development process, fostering innovative housing plans, and sponsoring conferences and

seminars dealing with these issues. Like PICCED, ESLARP also wishes to create awareness. However, in ESLARP's case this is done through developing the participatory planning and design skills of its students, which are considered the next generation of community development professionals. ESLARP whose stated mission is to contribute to the development of a science of American democratic planning arts (Reardon 47-48), is also involved in direct community organizing activities. These activities take up about ten percent of the program's activities. Although services to low-income communities are part of the CDC mission, the CDC is not involved in the organizational tasks of these communities. The main target is to empower students; community empowerment is a welcomed byproduct.

What is common to all three examples is the fact that they have managed to sustain themselves. In the PICCED case, the center, which was part of the planning department when it was established, turned into a separate unit in the Pratt institute. Therefore, the center could develop its own structure without the additional difficulties of following an academic year timetable, student turnover, and changing curricular priorities. The autonomy of PICCED also means that it has to raise its operating funds. Besides the usual funds and grants, the PICCED has to offer for-fee services. Some of these services are paid for directly by clients who can afford it, but a large portion of these services are paid for through federal government agencies that directly finance the center as a service provider of specific programs. The funds from these agencies enable the PICCED to employ trained professionals and to specialize as a center in these fields. The continuity and the stability of the CDC can be explained by the structure of the BAC. The school's curriculum is divided between academic and practical curriculums. The more traditional academic lectures are conducted in the evenings, while students work in a 'real world' job during the daytime. Students receive academic credit for their practical work, and in this structure, academic credit is guaranteed to the students participating in the CDC activities. In the structure of the practice curriculum, practicing architects supervise and evaluate the students who work in their office, while some of these architects volunteer as instructors and visiting critics of the CDC's design studios. Because the CDC does not offer any community services that are not directly related to the students' academic needs, the

community related activities are well integrated in the BAC's structure. Unlike the PICCED, the sustainability secret here is full integration into the 'hosting' academic body and not autonomy from it. ESLARP is a combination of the two. The service to the community is not limited to physical aspects or to student curricular activities; community organizing and community training and education are parts of the program's activities. Still, most of these activities are well integrated into the school's curriculum as for-credit courses, seminars, and design studios⁷. An important component of the ESLARP case is the university's commitment to the project expressed both in the curriculum and in the funds that the university provides. The university funded ESLARP during its first 5 years. In 1995 the annual support from the university was almost \$250,000 US (Reardon 48).

The strength of these programs can also be their weak points. The PICCED services are so professional that it is mainly the center's staff that carry them out. Therefore, students are hardly involved in the center's activities. The BAC represents the opposite approach. The focus is on student training; the community is just another client that does not have enough money to hire 'real' professionals. By analyzing the pros and cons of each model, the intention is not to devalue its importance. Both of the models are valid; however, it seems that the ESLARP model combines both academic and service concerns. Unfortunately, because ESLARP is connected to the university both financially and academically, it is exposed to the same dangers of the 1960s projects. When the university support to the program ends, or when academic priorities are changed, the continuation of the program will be questioned. Nevertheless ESLARP has proven to be an effective fund raising tool. The project is supported by several private and public funds. In 1995, for example, the Community Outreach Partnership Center Program of the Office of University Partnerships (OUP) gave the program \$500,000. Therefore, the program is an asset to the university not only because of its academic value but also

⁷ A detailed outline of these courses can be found at the school's web site:
<<http://www.imlab.uiuc.edu/eslarp/research/index.htm>>

because of its abilities to bring money to the university. As long as the ESLARP attracts funds, its existence will most likely not be questioned.

3.5 HUD's Community Outreach Partnership Centers

The Office of University partnerships (OUP), which is part of the U.S Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), runs a large number of projects with the goal to develop partnerships between colleges and universities and lower income neighborhoods. The Community Outreach Partnerships Centers (COPC) program is an OUP initiative that was established in 1992. Originally, it was a five year program whose aim was to determine the feasibility of university-community partnerships. However, the original five year trial period was extended and in 1999 HUD provided \$7 million for COPC grants. The program's target is to deal with urban issues through research, outreach, and the exchange of information (United States HUD 1-9). Although relatively new, the COPC program funded seventy-seven institutions of higher education between 1994 and 1997. The university grantees are scattered throughout the U.S., and the partnerships deals with various issues such as economic development, environmental health, job training, design of low-cost housing, family and youth development, and much more. Moreover, both PICCED and ESLARP are grantees of the COPC program.

COPC gives grants of up to \$400,000⁸ for two or three years, and the universities match these funds by 25-50 percent. The grantees can choose how to invest the grants. There are, however, a few limitations: HUD grants should not be used to fund physical development activities such as construction work; the nature and extent of research that can be undertaken with COPC funds is limited; the communities and the community organizations should be more than an object of study; the COPC activities should be based on the goals of the neighborhood residents rather than on the university's concept of what is appropriate for the neighborhood (United States HUD 9-12). The first two limitations are relatively clear and easy to follow. However, how does one check whether

⁸ The discrepancy between this figure to the grant given to ESLARP is unclear. Both of the figures appear in official publications of HUD.

the community is more than an object of study or not? How can one make certain that the neighborhood residents' goals have top priority? How can one determine what these goals are? The HUD regulations for the grants try to propose a practical way for achieving these targets. First, research activities should not cost more than 25 percent of total project cost. Secondly, every COPC must have a community advisory committee. Community based organizations must form partnerships at every stage. Finally, research must have direct applications to actual community problems. Again, these regulations are quite vague. It is relatively easy to limit the research cost of the total project cost; however, the extent of the authority of the advisory committee is not clear. It is essential that community based organizations be part of the partnership; however, it is the university that has the right to choose which community organization to work with and not the other way. The main question remains unsolved; who defines the actual community problems? Turner's statement "who decides what for whom" is again a key question.

It is beyond the scope of this work to make a comprehensive study of the HUD model or to analyze some of the partnerships as case studies. However, there are basic concerns in relation to these partnerships. The first concerns the power to decide in the partnership. It seems that the community or the community organization is empowered to be an equal partner. However, the partnership is not an equal one. Only the university can apply for the money, and only the university has the right to choose the other party. The community organization can only agree to join the partnership. In one of the HUD's publications, it is mentioned that "COPC empowers universities by placing relatively few restrictions on the activities they may pursue with grant funds" (United States HUD 10). Isn't there some confusion concerning who is it that should be empowered? There is nothing wrong with empowering universities. Yet is this what the COPC grant was designed for?

A second concern directly relates to the connection between the government and the university. The same question of "who decides what for whom?" can be asked in this context as well. Although the university has the right to decide how to use the money, the

government decides whether the university gets the money in the first place. A third concern perceives support of these partnerships as a hidden attempt of the government to discourage university staff and students from reacting against government policies. In fact this problem is explicitly addressed in the regulations for using Federal grant money (any grant, not only the COPC grant). Applicants of Federal grants must sign the "Certification of Payments to Influence Federal Transactions." The form requires that applicants not use the grant money "for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of an agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress" (United States HUD form 50071). It is quite difficult to advocate for policy change if one is not allowed to influence a policy-maker.

Marris compares the global economy of subcontracting to the use of block grants or to privatizing public services. He claims that this process decentralizes or even disclaims state responsibility; i.e. governments free themselves from direct responsibility. In fact, financial control is even more centralized, since government can cut the grants or the budget for the private supplier of the service (Marris, *Planning and Civil Society* 13). Marris's remark describes very much what happens with the COPC grant. The same matter that was discussed in the introduction regarding the private control in public-private partnerships applies here as well. The government avoids criticism first by delivering accountability to the university and second by financing the activities of potential critics.

It is not suggested here that these concerns actually take place in the COPC projects. And it must be said that this criticism is not addressed to any specific initiative granted by COPC. Each partnership may be a good example of the way community-university cooperation helps the community and enriches the student experience. However, one should be aware of these aspects both when taking part in these projects and when evaluating them.

If we accept the notion that there is an established body of knowledge, the question of its transmission from pragmatic point of view, can be subdivided into a series of questions: Who transmits learning? What is transmitted? To whom? Through what medium? In what form? With what effect? A university policy is formed by a coherent set of answers to these questions.

Jean François Lyotard, The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge, p. 49, 1984.

CHAPTER 4: THE ISRAELI CONTEXT

The fourth chapter deals with community-university partnerships in Israel. Most of the chapter is dedicated to interviews conducted by the author with the directors of schools of architecture and community-based organizations. Each set of interviews is studied in detail, and a comparison between the two groups of interviewees' beliefs, attitudes, and action follows.

4.1 Community-University Partnership in Israel

In contrast to the U.S. experience, Israeli communities and universities have no tradition of partnering or cooperation. Very little has been written on the subject and the lack of literature represents the scarcity of actual joint projects. Although almost all the universities in Israel operate community-oriented projects, these projects do not represent over-all policies of the universities or faculties. An exception of this is the Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, which is probably the leading university in Israel in community oriented activities. Examples of these activities include an adult education school, an academic training program for community activists, and a youth education program. Students of the university can also get free or subsidized apartments in exchange for volunteer work in low-income neighborhoods in which the apartments are located (Hadari and Tal 127-28).

The most extensive community service project run by Israeli universities is the Perach project. Perach, which is a tutorial project for children with special needs, was initiated in 1972. In the project, children are matched to student tutors. In exchange for reduced tuition fees, the student is required to meet the child twice a week, throughout the school year each time for two hours. The pilot program that started with fifty students at the

Weizmann Institute of Science has expanded to involve thousands of students in all universities and most colleges in Israel. The Ministry of Education, public and private funds, and the universities and colleges involved finance the program (Eisenberg, Fresko, and Carmeli 7-14).

Although the Perach project is successful one benefiting both students and children, it is limited to an individual one-on-one level of relations. The students function independently and work with individual children and not with the community as a whole or with particular groups. Moreover, because the students' activities have nothing to do with their fields of study, the benefit they derive from the project is limited. Professional and community-oriented projects do exist in Israel, mainly in the fields of social work, medicine, and law, however, these are more limited in scope and are mainly considered as training or internships. As will be discussed later in this chapter, architecture and planning schools are not involved in community oriented activities even to this limited extent. Yet on the declarative level, understanding that community matters should be part of the architecture school's agenda does exist. For example, the mission statement of the Faculty of Architecture and Town Planning of the Technion, which is the oldest and the most established architecture school in Israel, claims that "since its inception, the Faculty of Architecture and Town Planning has served as a focal point for community-oriented activities in architecture." However, the Technion web-site examples of these activities, "hosting several exhibitions each year on subjects or design and holding public lectures and symposia" may indicate that the mission is not translated into actual community service.

4.2 Questionnaires, Interviewees and Conversations

In order to better understand the position of architecture schools and community-based organizations toward partnerships, six interviews with the directors of schools of architecture and community-based organizations that deal with housing issues were conducted. The objectives of these interviews were primarily to learn more about present and past activities of architecture schools and community organizations that could be related to community-university partnerships. The second objective was to examine the

attitude of interviewees toward the possibility of such future partnerships. The third objective was to better understand if and how partnerships with architecture schools could help community-based organizations, how they could contribute to the students and staff of the school, and what should be done to enable such partnerships. It was hoped that the information gathered in these interviews would help in defining guidelines for an Israeli community-university partnership.

Both the university questionnaires and the community questionnaires consist of three parts. The first part explores the position of the interviewees towards public participation, their definition of public participation and their position regarding the possible outcome of it. The second part is about the way in which public participation is integrated into the university's curriculum or the community organization's activities either theoretically or practically. The last part deals with community-university partnerships per se, their importance, the possible partners and the ways to carry it out.

It might seem odd that public participation plays a fundamental role in the interview. However, as was discussed in the second chapter, this subject is one of the bases from which community partnerships emerged. Another reason for choosing to concentrate on public participation rather than partnerships is that, as was mentioned before, community-university partnerships in the field of architecture and physical planning are not very common in Israel. Therefore, it is hoped that the interviewees will relate to the idea of participation, which is a more common topic, both as a concept and as a practice. The last reason for the focus on public participation, mainly in the first part of the interview, is to check whether the personal experience of the interviewees with public participation affects their attitude toward the possibility of partnering with communities or university.

The interviewees are all directors of schools of architecture or community organizations. The decision not to interview other faculty members and students from the university side or activists and community organizers from the community side is based on the understanding that the directors are in a position to decide their institutional strategies and practices. Although in many cases bottom up activities can create a change, it seems that

top down initiatives are usually more successful and last longer. This tendency is demonstrated by the case studies analyzed in chapter three; in all the recent case studies the partnership is integrated into the institutional policy, which is decided in a top down manner. Cases such as the University of California at Berkeley, where students joined local residents are too sparse and singular to form a comprehensive model. The desirability of a comprehensive model may not be obvious, after all, the sight of furious students marching across the university's lawns still appeals to some. It is the author's belief that unlike the American case, in which comprehensive programs have developed on the base of long tradition of academic activism and a strong civil society, in Israel the process will be the other way around. It may be that stronger community-based organizations and more socially oriented activities should be encouraged first through comprehensive university initiatives.

A large portion of each interview was conducted as an open-ended dialogue and the questions served as a base for discussion. The first part consisted of a closed questionnaire where the interviewees were asked to grade their positions on the possible outcome of public participation. This part of the interview served as a base for a comparative analysis of the interviewees' answers to the open interview. Because the interviews were conducted as an open conversation, some questions were not answered by all the interviewees. However, issues such as pedagogic positions, use of professional and local knowledge, the role of the academic institution, and other related topics that were not initially intended to be raised were discussed and contributed to the interview. The conversational character of the interviews made the choice of words and the way things were phrased significant. There was, therefore, a preference to quote the interviewees and not to rephrase them.

4.2 Involvement of Architecture Schools

Three interviews were conducted with the directors of three academic institutions authorized to instruct undergraduate architecture studies in Israel¹. The three interviewees were Prof. Elinor Barzacchi of the Tel-Aviv University, Prof. Zeev

¹ A short description of the schools is provided in Appendix B.

Druckman of the Bezalel Academy of Art and Design in Jerusalem, and Prof. Daniel Shefer of the Technion – Israel Institute of Technology in Haifa. All interviewees have been practicing architects, planners, or consultants. All the interviews were conducted in Hebrew, and the quotations were translated by the author.²

As a starting point, the interviewees were asked to define public participation. The three answers quoted below show that defining public participation remained as hard as it was in Arnstein's days:

[Public participation] is important and necessary when an architect or a planner designs for people whom he [sic] doesn't know, without knowing their preference, culture, or life style. [Otherwise] the design will be irrelevant, and disconnected from the people, and its chances to succeed are lower. (Shefer)

The basic condition for public participation is that you [the planner] determine its agenda so that it is not some kind of vague concept to which everyone can give whatever substance. (Druckman)

I think that by using the term participation it means that there are two parties, or two people who are partners. . . . If you say that there is one [party] that gives and one that receives there is an inner contradiction. Therefore I think that when you define participation, the parameters should be defined first. . . . I think that there is a problem with defining the word participation. Maybe involvement is a better term. (Barzacchi)

The three interviewees present three perspectives on public participation. Shefer presents a point of view that focuses on the public since its input is needed for a successful planning process. Druckman does not define public participation at all. Instead he emphasizes the role of the planner, who sets the rules for the process. Barzacchi sees the inherent problem in the term and looks for a more reciprocal definition.³ In spite of the differences, all the interviewees expressed support and faith in participatory processes.

² The questionnaires are presented in full in Appendix A.

³ There are two Hebrew words for 'participation': *hishtatfut*, which means taking part in, and *shituf*, which means that one party enables the participation of the other party. In the questionnaire the more common term *shituf* was used.

The interviewees were asked to scale the effectiveness of public participation as a method to achieve possible objectives (these objectives are based on Alterman, Law-Yone, and Churchman 10). The scale is from 1 to 5, where 1 is fully agree, 2 – somewhat agree, 3 – have no opinion, 4 – somewhat don't agree, and 5 – don't agree. The interviewees' responses are summarized in table 2 below:

Public participation is an effective method to	Barzacchi	Druckman	Shefer
Promote democratic values	3*	1	1
Get public input	2	4	1
Attain design which reflects user's needs	3	2	1
Educate the public	1	1**	1
Educate decision makers	3	1	1
Educate planners	2	5	1
Create social change in the participating community	2	1	3***
Create personal change among the participants	2	2	1
Mobilize support for the planning	3	3	1
Mobilize political change	2	1	1
Shorten and reduce the cost of the planning processes	5	5	1
* Barzacchi's marks refer to the actual outcome and not the desired objectives of participatory process.			
** Druckman prefers 'raise an awareness' instead of 'educate' for the three following objectives.			
*** Shefer sees social change not as a process but as change of opinion.			

Table 2. Comparison of architecture schools attitudes toward public participation objectives

It is apparent that Barzacchi and Druckman have somewhat similar answers. However, the objectives on which they differ, and the remarks they give in addition to the numeric answers may show that the differences are bigger than they seem. Shefer gives a continuous 'fully agree' mark to all the possible objectives. Again, the words between the numbers may be more important.

The basic difference between Barzacchi and Druckman can be understood from the first three objectives. When asked if public participation is an effective method to promote democratic values Druckman fully agrees while Barzacchi is more skeptical. Barzacchi is more convinced of the possibility of receiving public input through the participatory process, while Druckman is less convinced. Shefer agrees that public participation is a good method for obtaining public input, yet he clarifies that it does not mean that public desires can and should always be realized: "people are often selfish. They see only their own good and not the public good. The planner doesn't necessarily know the public good either, [but] he [sic] has the ability to integrate the different desires." In spite of the fact that Druckman is not convinced that public participation is an effective way to get public input, he believes that it can encourage design which reflects the public's needs. Barzacchi presents an opposite view. Although she is positive that public input can be gained through participation, she is not so sure that the final design will reflect the user's needs. Barzacchi explains that the marks she gives do not reflect indifference to the objective. On the contrary, the marks reflect the awareness that "in democratic procedures and in the planning process, we do not often achieve the desired outcome . . . citizen's participation in a certain project does not necessarily fulfill their desires ." Therefore, although she believes in the desirability of these objectives, she does not believe in the possibility of attaining them in practice. The difference among the three that is apparent in their definition of public participation is enhanced here. Druckman represents the specialist who does not depend on local wisdom and needs not raise self-awareness. Shefer supports the public's principal role in the process but seems to avoid the real-life experience. Barzacchi, although very much in favor of increasing public role, claims that in practice, the public is not involved. Given the expert oriented definitions of all three interviewees, it is not surprising that the only objective all agreed upon was that public participation is an effective way to educate the public.

The interviewees' opinions cannot always be traced through numeric answers. An example of this is Druckman's response to the possibility of political change through public participation:

Y.W: Do you think that public participation is a good way to mobilize political change?

Z.D: I believe so, but I oppose it.

Y.W: Why?

Z.D: I wouldn't like political manipulation to be made through planning. No one should accumulate power in this process or as an outcome of the process.

Y.W: Does 'no one' include the clients?

Z.D: Yes.

Barzacchi's reaction to the same question, although she gave it a lower mark was: "I think it is an important way [to promote political change]. I don't know if it's a good way, but it is an important one." Shefer's positive attitude to all the objectives is another example of the problems of numeric answers. For example, he fully agrees that public participation can create personal change among the participants. However, Shefer's definition for personal change is "change of opinion." Barzacchi, on the other hand, sees the effect of public participation on personal change in a broader way and believes that "it will train them to be more involved more thoughtful citizens." Shefer's agreement to the claim that public participation can shorten and reduce the cost of planning demonstrates again the incompatibility between marks and remarks and in this case between theoretical evaluation and practical experience: "[T]he public, through the legislature, had started to stop and prevent plans. It created damages to the entrepreneur. The entrepreneur *wants* to participate with the public to avoid these additional damages" (emphasis added). However, Shefer can not cite a single example of a participatory process initiated by an entrepreneur. Druckman and Barzacchi are more down to earth; as Barzacchi puts it: "Dictatorships make the fastest planning, no doubt."

Moreover, public participation as a topic plays a very limited role in the schools' curriculum. Needless to say that none of the schools have any kind of partnership with a community. Both Shefer and Druckman claim that the subject has an indirect part in much of the studies: "A project is not relevant if it does not have the potential for cooperation [with the public]" (Druckman); "I believe it [public participation] is a consistent thread that runs through all the subjects" (Shefer). Yet they differ in their reaction to this situation. Druckman believes that the university "should really experience

it, not as a comprehensive plan, but as part of the academic alternatives offered by the school to the students.” Shefer, on the other hand, sees public participation as a technical tool, “the same as mathematical tools, or models. It is an important planning tool that can make a better plan . . . we don’t consider it as a subject by itself .” The Tel Aviv University offers an annual course, “Community and its Organization,” a forth year introductory course for town planning. The course does not deal exclusively with public participation; however, the topic plays a major role. In the course a target area is chosen, and during the first semester students analyze different aspects of this area through interviews with the various stakeholders involved: the residents of local communities, the merchants, and the municipal representatives. Several lectures on related topics, including public participation are given as background. Using data collected in the first semester, students work on divers plans for the area in the second. “The student should internalize the idea that the community is as important as the topography. It is unseparable from the decision making process, like the economic aspect of the project, like the physical aspect of the project. The community is part of the data you should consider” (Barzacchi). Nevertheless, the course offered by the Tel-Aviv University has no actual impact on the local community. Barzacchi admits that the “community gains nothing.” She believes that an annual course is too short since “projects of that kind are very, very long.” The only gain the community, or rather society in general can have is “if one out of ten students will take it as its leading light.” In spite of this and although she sees many problems with public participation, Barzacchi claims “I am for [public participation] since I know no better way.”

Druckman thinks that the university “should choose a place with a significant value and deal with it; we should choose the specific community in this place.” Barzacchi believes that “when a community wants to have a dialogue, the academy must be there.” She emphasizes that “the community should want it first so it wouldn’t be an intellectual paternalism.” The difference is not only in the side that initiates the partnership but is also connected to the rationale behind it. Whereas Druckman sees the partnership as a way “to put a subject on the Israeli public agenda,” Barzacchi sees the role of the university as an advocate:

I think that the academy can be on the side [of the community] that gets the information and tells [the community]: 'Look, I know you don't believe the information, because it was given by an institutional body. I'll explain it to you in simple words, not in the architects' words'. . . . The academy can put itself on the community's side and ask questions that the community may not be able to ask. [The academy] can give information, and it can turn the information into knowledge.

It is here that the connection between attitude towards public participation and community-university partnerships can be clearly seen. The attitude that Druckman presents toward public participation that "we," i.e. the architects and planners, should set the agenda is repeated here. The academy's role is to decide on issues that should be raised. Barzacchi, on the other hand, moves one step further. It is not enough that the participating sides should be "on the same eye level," as she puts it; the university should take a side and advocate for the community.

Who could be a potential partner for the university? All interviewees' first choices of partners were institutional ones. Druckman and Shefer considered the municipality or elected political figures as possible partners, while Barzacchi and Druckman offered school principals and community center directors. All these partners are semi or full institutional partners since governmental or municipal corporations run community centers in Israel, and almost all schools in Israel are public schools and thus have little autonomy in their policy-making. However, both Barzacchi and Druckman agreed that non-governmental, community-based organizations could be partners. Shefer was a little less enthusiastic about cooperation with an NGO:

Y.W: Do you think that you can find a partner who is not an elected public figure?

D.S: Like whom?

Y.W: Let's say that the municipality of Haifa declares that a certain neighborhood is going to be evacuated, and a group of residents asks for your help.

D.S: That's a tough question. There are among us those who are ready to do it. I don't know if as a decision-maker and a dean I would say, yes, we'd do it. If a person does it as a professional . . . I wouldn't mind. But if the institution has to do it, I don't know. I really don't know. I don't know. I have never faced this dilemma and I don't know what to tell you. I don't know.

Y.W: The American model [of the COPC] is exactly about this kind of thing, partnerships with NGOs.

- D.S: But in the case you presented, it was the underdog. When the municipality, which is a stronger body, has ideas and declares [plans] that the local population thinks may be harmful, and they want professional help, I would say that as individuals we have the commitment or the ability to help.
- Y.W: But not as an academic institution?
- D.S: As an academic institution one of our problems is that the government supports us [financially]....
- Y.W: I will try to check your limits. If we consider an NGO, but with much more recognition, such as the Society for the Protection of Nature, that may oppose a municipal plan for building on Mount Carmel, and they ask you to cooperate, you will give the academic background...
- D.S: I would also tell them to ask individuals, not the faculty, which is not the address for that. You move slowly to a point that we may [cooperate] but it is problematic. I wouldn't [do it]. The faculty is composed of different people. You don't know all these people's opinions. So as a dean I cannot decide on way or another without knowing all the faculty's opinions.

The Technion is a scientific technical institution, and as such it conducts applied research for the use of governmental and private bodies. It is therefore surprising to discover that professional activity for an NGO is assigned to the sphere of opinion and hence considered controversial, while the same activity for a governmental or private body is deemed scientific research. It might be that the attitude that Shefer projects here is related to the character of the Technion. Its strong institutional connections may make it harder to side with the "underdog." Shefer knows that this approach creates some problems if the university decides to cooperate with the community after all. He believes that there is mutual mistrust between communities and the academy. "The community members often suspect and they may be right, that academics are snobs. They don't talk to them properly, they don't behave properly, and they don't value them enough." On the other side, "academics don't consider this challenge [partnering with the community] interesting enough compared to other things they can do." Therefore, Shefer concludes, "both sides don't really want to cooperate." Barzacchi raises other problems that must be taken into consideration: "Every society or community reaches its inner maturity at different time. An institution has one timetable." The problem is not only one of timing. The community's intellectual, social, emotional, political, and cultural situation, according to Barzacchi, is changing: "The ability of an institution to read the situation [of a community] in a certain moment is not very high."

What do the interviewees believe the university can gain from such a partnership? Barzacchi believes that "students can learn to listen and to speak. . . . [they can] learn other processes, a different language." Druckman defines the university's gain as "relevancy, which means that [the university] acts in the real cultural fabric of the society." According to Druckman, students can also obtain "professional experience which is part of student awareness." What can the community gain? "Not much" says Barzacchi, despite her earlier optimism. She bases this view on an historical example: "In 1968 students wanted to get involved, to work with the community. I think it contributed a lot to the students. I don't know to what extent it contributed to the community." Druckman believes that the academy "can offer [the community] ideas to think about, not concrete solutions." The academy can also "offer a better conceptual tool to deal with the establishment." However, Druckman does not consider planning services as something the academy should offer the community: "We shouldn't compete with private offices. It is not the school's job." Shefer, on the other hand, thinks that more can be done in this field by the university: "I know that UCLA used to have a unit that was conducted by some of their professors. This unit provided services to the community. We don't have it. When people refer to us, it's on a personal basis. . . . It is clear that [as a faculty] we do much less than we should."

If a successful community-university partnership model is indeed desired, then the most positive aspect that can be concluded from these interviews is that all three interviewees express support for wider involvement of their institutions in community matters. They all agree that this involvement can be carried out through some form of cooperation with the actual community. Another conclusion is that the interviewees' perspectives and personal experience effect their attitudes toward the idea of partnering with a community. Barzacchi explains some of her views by saying: "I believe I'm a product of the 1960s." If one accepts the significant role directors have in implementing a partnership, then their views, experience and personality should be considered. The interviewees also have different perspectives on the components of community-university partnerships. For example, there is no agreement on who should initiate and set the rules: the community, the university, or one of the professors. How should it be carried out? Barzacchi is "ready

to introduce such a seminar to the curriculum.” She would also “encourage students to do their final project on the subject.” Druckman thinks it should be done through a “design studio, which is the main matter in every architecture school.” Should students get credit for their activities? Shefer claims that “it is a technical skill, so we don’t want to credit it.” Druckman, on the other hand, thinks such activity should be credited. What should be the balance between service to the community and students’ learning, i.e. can these two be combined? All these questions should be taken into consideration. If a partnership model is to be proposed it should be flexible enough to be adapted to the different needs and desires of the different partners.

4.4 Community-based Organizations Dealing with Urban Issues

A similar set of interviews was conducted with three directors of Israeli NGOs. Since there were more than three NGO’s presently active in Israel, the choice of directors to interview was more complicated. Therefore, a few guidelines were established in choosing the organizations. First, the organization had to be community-based and grassroots-oriented. Second, urban matters had to be on the agenda of the organization. Third, the organization had to have an elected or nominated director. And finally, it was preferred that each of the three NGOs be located at points corresponding to the schools of architecture in Jerusalem, Tel-Aviv, and Haifa.

It was difficult to locate organizations that meet all the guidelines. There are almost no organizations in Israel whose urban issues per se form a major part of their agenda and that are community based. Since the focus of the research is on community-university relations, the requirement for being community based was favored with the assumption that organizations that are located within cities will deal with urban matters even if they define their agenda in a different way. The three organizations that were chosen are Community Advocacy (CA), an organization that deals with social rights both on the local and on the national level and is located in Jerusalem; Kerem Israel Neighborhood Committee (KINC), a local organization of residents in a low-income neighborhood in the center of Tel-Aviv; and the Association for the Quality of Life and Environment in

Nahariya (AQLEN), an organization that focuses on environmental issues in Nahariya, which is a satellite town of Haifa.⁴

The three interviewees are Barbara Epstein from CA, Meital Lehavi from KINC, and Orit Reich from AQLEN. Ms. Epstein is the only professional social worker and community organizer among the three. Ms. Lehavi is a producer and Ms. Reich is a music therapist. All the interviews were conducted in Hebrew and translated by the author.

The starting point for the interviews was the same as that of the university set of interviews; the interviewees were asked to define public participation. Their definitions are as diverse as the other group of interviewees' definitions:

I don't like that much the term 'participation'. I think that in participation there is no commitment to consider [the participants' input as part of the decision making process]. Therefore, I believe that there should be a statutory status for the participation process for it to have a real effect. . . . For a partnership to be genuine, there should also be considerations for the capability of the residents to be real partners. (Epstein)

Every community should define its issues by itself and should activate as many residents as possible Someone from the outside would not know what to bring [to a planning process]. An outsider wouldn't know the culture of the place, its unique structure, the dreams and aspirations of the residents. (Lehavi)

Participation means that the municipality reveals future plans for the area, opens the plans to discussion. Being transparent, that's one thing. The other thing is the service that associations like ours can get from architects who live in the city . . . and give some service to the public who seek help. That is something we never got. (Reich)

These responses show the differences between the three organizations. Epstein, who is the most experienced director and whose organization is the most established among the three, focuses on the problematic aspect of participation. The emphasis on the imparting of skills before the participation process begins is an outcome of the organization's philosophy of personal and communal empowerment. Lehavi, who is a community member and not a paid professional emphasizes the need for self-organization and the

⁴ More details on these organizations can be found in Appendix C.

incapability of non-community members professionals to deal with the community's needs. Reich, whose organization is less socially oriented, emphasizes the need for cooperative planning authorities and help from professional planners.

The interviewees were asked to scale the effectiveness of public participation in the same manner as that of the architecture schools' directors: from 1 to 5, where 1 is fully agree and 5 – don't agree. The responses have been summarized in table 3 below:

Public participation is an effective method to	Epstein	Lehavi	Reich
Promote democratic values	1	1	1
Get public input	2	1	1
Attain design which reflects user's needs	1	1	1
Educate the public	3*	2	1
Educate decision makers	4	2	1
Educate planners	4	2	1
Create social change in the participating community	4	1	1
Create personal change among the participants	4	2	3
Mobilize support for the planning	1	2	1
Mobilize political change	3	1	1
Shorten and reduce the cost of the planning processes	2	3**	1
* Epstein believes that although people learn through the participation process, the changes should happen prior to the process itself. This remark applies to all parties involved in the process.			
** Lehavi thinks that the process may be more expansive, but it will save costs in the long run.			

Table 3. Comparison of NGOs directors' attitudes toward public participation objectives

Once more, responses demonstrate differences between organizations. For example, Epstein does not consider public participation a process that is inherently good:

I believe that participation in planning is a very unwieldy process. It can be very disempowering, very unhelpful to achieve change if there is nothing that happens before, after, and through [the participation process]. It can be very frustrating and it can be a process that gives the people the feeling they don't understand On one hand, this tool [participation] has a potential. On the other hand, if it's done without support, provision of

capacities, knowledge and skills, then it is worthless. It becomes a tool for people who understand anyway. (Epstein)

Reich, on the other hand, is a true believer in the benefits of public participation. Since the organization she represents is in an ongoing fight with the planning authorities for information and inclusion in the decision-making process, any kind of participation is perceived as a step forward. The only time Reich does not consider public participation an effective method is when personal change is the objective. This is because personal issues are “not as essential” as public issues. Although Epstein scales personal change even lower, her reasons for doing so are quite the opposite. It is not because personal change is not an essential objective that Epstein does not approve it, but because it is too essential to be left to the participation process alone. Lehavi is somewhere in the middle. Like Reich she considers participation an achievement for the public or the community, and like Reich she herself is a part of the public or the community while Epstein is a salaried professional with a wider view of things. Yet what is common to Lehavi and Epstein is that they both see the problem and limitations of participation as a social and educational process.

Education through participation is another objective the interviewees did not agree upon. Reich thinks that “when you participate with [the public], you also educate it. You give [the public] a chance to see both sides, to learn how to make decisions, mainly to understand the other side, not only their side . . . Education means to mediate.” Again, Epstein and Lehavi are more skeptical. “I don’t think you educate the public by an intended decision to educate and not because you want to let the public participate” Epstein says. Lehavi thinks that “it should be the other way around – to educate the public to be a partner and not that the participation process educates the public.” Nevertheless, Lehavi believes “it can be a good method to educate for democracy, self management, commitment, and responsibilities.”

The interviewees, however, did agree about some of the objectives. All three fully agreed that public participation is an effective method to promote democratic values; all three fully agreed that it is an effective method to attain designs which reflect the user’s needs.

These two objectives may prove that in spite of their criticism the interviewees do believe in public participation. As discussed in chapter two, attaining designs that reflect the user's need is part of the core of objectives attributed to public participation as a tool, and promoting democratic values represents the essence of public participation as an end in itself. All three also agree that public participation is an effective method for the pragmatic objective of mobilizing support. Epstein, for example, claims that "when one lets people participate in a decision-making process . . . and the things they say are taken into consideration, what turns out is the outcome of their ideas or at least a compromise that includes what they say, the decision can pass without objections".

The positive approach of the interviewees toward public participation is not surprising since the three organizations they represent try to influence decisions or policies that at present are formulated without involving or consulting the public at all. KINC was created because municipal bodies consistently avoid the residents who want to take part in decision-making processes that effect their neighborhood. CA apparently deals with social rights. However, Epstein claims that "almost all of our activities have a part in letting people overlook an existing policy, examine it in relation to their life . . . and try to influence [the promotion of] alternative policy." Although social rights can be advocated through other means than public participation, the grassroots orientation of the organization and its mission oblige the community to advocate for itself. AQLAN has no choice but participation: "we were partners in many processes," Reich says. "However, we did it the critical way and sometimes negatively." Again, environmental issues can be promoted in various ways. Yet because the official bodies refuse to cooperate with AQLAN, they have often had to force their involvement on those institutions in order to be heard.

The three organizations operate in a climate that does not encourage participation. Empowerment or self-empowerment is therefore part of what these organizations have to do either ideologically or as a way of survival. For CA, empowerment is part of the organization's mission. Epstein views empowerment as directly related to physical aspects: "If I turn to empowerment terms, if I cannot control my immediate physical

environment, how can I control other aspects of my life.” Reich refers to empowering the organization itself: “Our problem is how much power we take to ourselves. I believe we do not yet understand what we have in our hands.”

Both CA and AQLAN have contacts with academic institutions. CA has established relations with both the Social Work School and the Faculty of Law of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Social Work and Law students are involved in the organization as part of their academic requirements. The Social Work students are committed to from twelve to twenty hours per week throughout the academic year. They take part in all the activities and function in many aspects as staff members. The Law students dedicate six hours per week to the organization. Because they cannot yet practice law, their work is limited mainly to research for the organization. CA is responsible for tutoring the students and is authorized to evaluate the students at the end of each semester. AQLAN's relations with academic institutions are more sporadic and not as institutionalized. The organization's activists give lectures in a local college, and students from the fields of law and planning have written several research papers on AQLAN and its activities during the past years. However, the initiatives originate in the academic institutions or come from the individual students. Although the students get help and some supervision from AQLAN (for which the students are charged a symbolic fee of less than \$13 US) all that AQLAN gets is the students' papers. “While most of our means were dedicated to the students,” Reich complains, “we could not use it for practical or actual causes.” KINC does not have any contacts with academic institutions and Lehavi admits that she has never thought of the possibility. However, KINC or Lehavi can hardly be accused of ignorance. The lack of awareness of the possibility of seeking help or cooperation with an academic institution can be explained by the scarcity of such activities in Israel. This may explain the fact that although AQLAN has strong ties with some colleges and universities, Reich claims she has never give much thought to the practical advantages of such relations.

However, Reich concedes that AQLAN has derived certain benefits from its academic partners. “We get perspective and understanding of our fight through the students' papers, and it is also the best way to publicize ourselves,” Reich says. “The publicity we

get for our fight is in fact what we gain.” In contrast, CA benefits are much more tangible. The number of students and the duration and scope of their involvement are well organized. Hence, the organization can plan ahead to define students’ tasks and roles within its regular activities. AQLAN, on the other hand, cannot control when and where the students approach the organization and it has little influence on their research besides occasionally rejecting their requests for help. “I think that I have to better understand my ability to use the students,” Reich remarks.

Although AQLAN’s benefits from the students are less structured and defined, it seems that their input has certain peculiar value that is less apparent in the work students do in CA. As Epstein points out, students in CA “function in many aspects as staff members,” and the main benefit from their student status is that they cost less. The students input to AQLAN is related to their unique position as outsiders and to their research work that would not be done otherwise. However, the CA model of working with students does not contradict the AQLAN approach. Students, even when involved in the organization as semi-staff members, may have the qualities of idealism, originality, and neutrality, as was discussed in Chapter Three. Indeed, the reasons for CA to involve students in its activities are certainly not only financial:

Y.W: Do you see the involvement of social work students only as an unpaid work force?

B.E: I believe we have other [objectives], it is even mentioned in the organization’s mission statement. We see ourselves as a place that trains social workers or future professionals to perform according to the social work style that we favor, which is human rights based and is more radical than what is usually being taught. . . In relation to the law students, we want more lawyers to know how to work with people in distress, to talk their language, and to know their needs.

Lehavi emphasizes that professional planners cannot replace the benefit derived from student work. She claims that “a group of students that flow through a place and have a dialogue with [local residents] . . . will attain candor from people in the field. This is completely different from what an [official] planner gets, [because] his [sic] time is limited and he [sic] is only one, and he [sic] uses maps, and he [sic] makes top-down decisions.” In other words, Lehavi sees student’s work as an alternative to the work of

professionals. The benefits, however, are more than the savings on planning costs. Lehavi expects that students face less suspiciousness and therefore are able to suggest alternatives that better reflect the users' needs. Lehavi also thinks that certain individuals in the community might benefit from academic involvement. She hopes that academy involvement "will give an opportunity, to someone talented, with understanding or abilities in architecture who may have a role in the project and may become [a student] in the university."

Unlike CA, which sees as part of its role to influence the future generation of professionals, KINC and AQLAN do not aspire to any academic or professional field. Yet both Lehavi and Reich claim that involvement in the organization's work will enrich the students. Reich for instance believes that "an architect that has worked with a group of people and is aware of environmental needs . . . will be more broad-minded and more sensitive." She also gathers that if an architect involves the public "the planning he [sic] does will be better" (Reich).

These benefits are, of course, the benefits of the organization and the community as much as they are the benefits of the academic institution and the students themselves. When asked what their organizations can offer to an academic institution, the three interviewees referred to the first hand connections their organizations have with the community: "What we can offer for a planning project is the direct contact with the community. We can represent many of its immediate needs. We have real hands-on contact that I doubt they can get in other places because we know the problems of the place" (Reich). Epstein, whose organization is oriented toward more low-income and socially excluded communities, emphasizes the unique real life experience which she believes is important for student education. "It is a chance for students to see a different world that deals with populations that they don't know, or didn't see as their clients. It can show different aspects of the profession" (Epstein). Tutoring is something that both Epstein and Reich agree students should get from the organization. In Epstein's point of view it is one of the organization's obligations when cooperating with an academic institution.

The interviewees define several preliminary requirements for a successful involvement of the university in the organization. Lehari stresses that there should be a real commitment to social problems on the university side: It should be a top down decision, from the system that decides on the policies of the university and the architecture department. They should decide to reach out to the community; they should declare a socially oriented policy; and they should make community issues part of students' work." Epstein thinks that commitment is not enough: "It must be part of a for-credit course. Students must have field experience, and their field time should be credited. It shouldn't be voluntary, and it is recommended that it be extensive. I mean two hours per week is not enough." Both Lehari and Epstein refer to the moves the university should make to demonstrate its commitment. Reich does not mention such moves: "I believe it [partnership with university] can work very well. We have personal relations with lecturers who send students to us. They care about us since they followed us for several years. I don't think there will be any objection. Maybe we should define more precisely our objectives." Epstein agrees, she thinks that in the case of architectural students, it is particularly important that the organization define its needs: "Lawyers and social workers can work on a wide range of issues . . . architecture is a field of expertise that the organization should decide [how to use] If it is not one of the priorities of the residents or the organizations priorities I don't think the organization should change its priorities just because it gets architecture students."

The interviewees represent organizations that differ in their operational methods, the kind of issues they deal with, their constituencies, and the experience they have had in partnering with universities. Yet all of them are quite positive that their organization has a lot to gain from the interaction with schools of architecture. None of them seems to have reservations about sharing joint projects with an academic institution. And finally, all the interviewees believe that both academic institutions and the individual student can benefit from a partnership with their communities and their organizations.

4.5 Possible Paths for Collaboration

The responses of each set of interviewees should also be studied in relation to the other group of interviewees. A comparison between the two groups can give some idea of the differences and similarities in their perspectives and attitudes. It may also help to define ways of cooperation or obstacles in creating partnerships. Although the questionnaires have no statistical significance, the responses to the first part of the questionnaire, as summarized in table 4 below, can reveal some of these differences and similarities:

NGOs Directors			Public participation is an effective method to	Architecture Schools Directors		
Epstein	Lehavi	Reich		Barzacchi	Druckman	Sheffier
1	1	1	Promote democratic values	3	1	1
2	1	1	Get public input	2	4	1
1	1	1	Attain design which reflects needs	3	2	1
3	2	1	Educate the public	1	1	1
4	2	1	Educate decision makers	3	1	1
4	2	1	Educate planners	2	5	1
4	1	1	Create social change	2	1	3
4	2	3	Create personal change	2	2	1
1	2	1	Mobilize support of the planning	3	3	1
3	1	1	Mobilize political change	2	1	1
2	3	1	Shorten and reduce costs	5	5	1
2.6	1.6	1.2	Average mark	2.5	2.4	1.2

Table 4. Comparison of architecture schools attitude toward public participation objectives

In each group there are differences between the interviewees' average marks; these vary between 1.2 to 2.6 on a similar continuum in both of the groups. Another similarity is that all the interviewees agree that public participation is an effective method to promote democratic values (with the exception of Barzacchi who agrees that this a desired outcome, but not a realistic one).

However, there are some principal differences between the responses of the two groups. The NGOs' directors all agree that public participation is a good method to attain designs that reflect user needs. The directors of the schools of architecture do not have a consensus on this statement. However, they agree that public participation is a good method to educate the public, a point on which the NGOs' directors do not agree. This difference is a prominent one. Both of these statements relate to the users or the public but from different angles. The NGOs' directors give importance to the influence of the process on the design outcome; directors of Schools emphasize the influence on the participants themselves. The source of the change in attaining designs, which reflects needs, is the participating public, while the source of the change when the public is being educated is the planner. The NGO's directors are consistent in their approach to public participation as an educational process in reference to all the participating players – the public, the decision-makers, and the planners. The Schools directors are no longer unanimous when decision-makers and planners are discussed. These differences refer to public participation. However, the same approaches find expression in the interviewees' references to community-university relations. Directors tend to keep the leadership role within the academic institution, which should then set the projects' agenda. The NGOs' directors, on the other hand, have signified that the organization or the community is the one which should set the academic institution's role in the partnership. Whereas Schools directors see their role as educators of both students and the public; NGOs' directors think of the encounter with the community as an educational process for the students.

The differences between the two groups' approaches may cause a conflict in an attempt to build a joint project. The attempt of one party to define the partnership's agenda may clash with the other party's needs or priorities. Nevertheless, each side should have its own agenda, goals, and objectives as long as it does not harm the other side. It is even recommended that each party define its needs in the partnership prior to the joint work. This may help the party socialization and self-determination process and strengthen it in its interaction with other parties. However, in the partnership building process, the parties should define the joint agenda, goals, and objectives that would be acceptable by all.

What is common to all interviewees is their positive attitude to the possibility of joint projects. Both sides could see the importance of such projects and their advantages to their organizations. Epstein and Barzacchi, who are the most skeptical interviewees, are also the most experienced in community-oriented activities and participatory practices in their group. Their knowledge on these issues is the reason for their awareness of the problems, obstacles, and disadvantages of public participation and community partnerships. Yet they both think there is no other alternative, or as Barzacchi puts it:

"In spite of all I'm for it [partnering with a community], since I know no better way. If I know a better way, I'll recommend it. I think that in all these ways the most important thing is hope. The most important thing to give to the community is hope, that tomorrow is going to be better, and that I can make the change."

The persistence today of the idea of technical rationality is obvious in the hunger of students for technique. Perhaps one of the most difficult tasks of planning educators is to teach the limits of technical rationality, to demonstrate that the scope of technical expertise is limited by situations of great uncertainty, instability, uniqueness, and conflict.

Leonie Sandercock, Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for Multicultural Cities, p. 64, 1998.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fifth chapter concludes the thesis and discusses the possibility of joint projects between schools of architecture and community-based organizations in the Israeli context. The chapter begins with a summery and lessons of the former chapters – lessons of participatory processes and partnership models; lessons of past and present projects of community-university partnerships; and the findings of the interviews with directors of Israeli schools of architecture and NGOs. Based on these findings guidelines for an Israeli community-university partnership are proposed as part of the study's conclusions. The chapter ends with recommendations for future research and implementations.

5.1 Summary of the Study

Community-university relationships are one aspect of the discussion of power relations in society. Participatory processes that often claims to change the power balance between stronger and weaker parties are, therefore, the starting point for the thesis. Although claiming to change the power balance, the participatory process can perpetuate the power relations of the involved parties or even worsen the situation of the disadvantaged parties. The participatory process, in which superiority of power is used to manipulate the weaker party, would be at best what Arnstein calls an "empty ritual," and at worst, could be destructive. Community-university projects fit well into the context of participation. Many of these projects were initiated during the 1960s when participation was the buzzword, and participatory principles are still used in many such projects. It is not surprising then that the power issue is reflected in community-university projects as well. The university is usually stronger financially, professionally, and organizationally than most communities or community-based organizations. Therefore, community-university projects may face the same power related problems. The issue of objectives is another

problematic aspect of participatory processes. The intended outcomes of the participation or the belief that participation should be an end in itself determine the character of the process and its effect on the participants. Projects in which the university defines the objectives may not serve the needs of the community. Participatory processes in which the participants are the objects may turn again into a manipulative empty ritual. If community-university projects are aimed to better the community situation, power differences should be considered. The academic institution, which is usually the more powerful of the two parties should not use its advantages in a way that do not serve the interests of the community; the participation objectives should be defined *by* the community or in cooperation *with* the community, but certainly not *for* the community by an outside party.

The transition to terms of partnership is an intention to solve some of the obstacles in the participatory process. In partnerships the power relations should be balanced or at best approved by all the parties involved. Unlike participation, partnerships are not a process in which one side can define the objectives of the other side. Rather the parties agree to the objectives of the partnership, and each party is expected to use its own resources to achieve these common objectives. The attempt to describe community-university projects as partnerships derive from the same reasons. It intends to avoid patronization by the university and to encourage empowerment of the parties involved. In some cases, the partnership title is just a cover for the same old projects in which one side holds the power and the other is expected to participate. However, even when the partnership models are sincere, new problems may surface. In partnerships each party must relinquish some of its independence, yet all parties are entitled to influence the decision-making process and to manage the project. Hence, there are more chances for conflicts to arise; a partnership that is proposed as a process to minimize uncertainties, may be itself a source for uncertainty. In the case of community-university partnerships, the uncertainty may derive from the character of the partners. The community is sometimes a vague entity composed of various opinions and interests and the university, although more organized, has a continuous turnover of students, professional concerns of the academic staff, and administrative complexity. Both the community and the university may have

their own interests, and these may not necessarily correspond to the objectives of the partnership. If there exists an intention to create community-university partnerships, both parties should define their needs and objectives; each side should also define the resources and means that would be invested in the partnership. The objectives and means of each party should be clear and transparent from the first stages.

The role of the architect or the planner in a planning process is important to community-university projects on two levels. First, it is relevant to the role the university plays. The university can propose planning services per se, yet the university can also give advocacy and mediating services, i.e. the university can advocate for the community or mediate between the community and other bodies. Both roles of mediation or advocacy are appropriate to the university. Neutrality can make the university staff or students good mediators, and the willingness to take sides can make them competent advocates. The university can also change its role as advocate to mediator relatively easily. The second level in which the planner's role is relevant to community-university project involves the educational process of the students. If advocacy and mediating skills are important to the future architects and planners, then the university should provide its students with the possibility to learn and practice it. A community-university joint project may be a good opportunity to do so. These two levels are interconnected; a planning process that involves the student is a learning process, and a process in which certain skills are needed may train students to use these skills. If a university intends to become involved in a partnership, and if the partnership involves student work, the university needs to define which prerequisite skills students need to perform in such a partnership and which skills they are expected to acquire in the process.

During the 1960s, collaboration between communities and universities became a common phenomenon in the U.S. and Canada. Although community-university relations have gone through vicissitudes of popularity since then, there was always an awareness of the possibility of joint projects and partnerships. The study presented community-university projects of different scopes and substance, from student demonstrators joining forces with residents fighting for a park to projects such as PICCED, which is an established institution with a professional and organizational staff. The two key conditions that

enable community-university projects to maintain themselves are first, an organized partner on the community side, and second, support and commitment to the project on the university side. If the community partner is an established body with organizational capacities, it will be easier to create continuous, long-term connections. When such a body does not exist, the university may have to assume the organizational tasks of the community, a role it is often incapable of assuming. University support and commitment is not limited to the financial aspects. Academic support, which means that student work is integrated into the curricular activities and as such credited, is just as or even more important. Students need an incentive to continue with their activities after the first enthusiasm declines. Such a commitment by the university also demonstrates the university's recognition of the project's importance and it strengthens the prospect of its continuous support for it. The study does not suggest that projects such as PICCED are a better form of collaboration than ad-hoc 'spontaneous' undertakings. The advantage of ad-hoc community-university projects is their ability to tackle urgent issues. Yet such projects can rarely confront complicated urban issues for which established, long-term community-university projects are suitable. An established connection between a community-based organization and a university support system can also make ad-hoc undertakings possible. Such undertakings can occur only if there is an awareness on the part of academic institutions of both the possibility of reacting against social injustice and the institution's civic duty to do so.

Unlike the U.S., there is very little experience of community-university projects in Israel; schools of architecture in particular are not committed to or aware of actual social issues nor are they open to the possibility of cooperation with the communities in which they are located. This lack of awareness is not only limited to the practice of cooperation; the theoretical aspects of participatory processes or advocacy planning, for example, play a marginal role in curricula of Israeli architecture schools. The interviews with architecture school and NGO directors confirmed these conclusions – lack of awareness of the possibility of joint projects was apparent on both sides. On the university side, for example, one interviewee did not know that there were any community-based NGOs dealing with urban issues, another had difficulty accepting a situation of institutional

cooperation with such an organization. The third, although aware of their existence and despite her willingness to cooperate, could not point to any contact the school had ever had with an NGO. The architecture and planning schools directors had limited knowledge about community-based NGOs, and were not familiar with partnership methods. On the community side there was little understanding of the role schools of architecture could play in NGO activities, and NGOs directors were often unfamiliar with the university structure and key-personnel. For example, one director had never thought of the possibility of cooperating with the academic institution, while the other, although she has had continuous contact with universities, claimed she had never thought of the benefits the organization could derive from such a contact. However, when the possibility of cooperation was proposed to them, they were all positive to the idea and showed optimism concerning the possibility of its realization. Although the degree of enthusiasm and the willingness to commit to such projects varied, none of the interviewees rejected the idea of joint projects and all declared that such projects were important to students, community members, and the organizations they headed.

5.2 Conclusions

Community-university partnerships cannot solve urban problems. The belief that such partnerships can be made responsible for complicated urban issues is misleading, and the attempt to transfer the accountability for such issues to the community, the university, or project joining the two can be destructive. However, the American experience has proven that in many cases university involvement has helped communities to get better urban renewal projects, improve housing conditions, and develop local initiatives. Higher education institutions offer the community technical expertise which otherwise would not be available to low-budget, community-based organizations. Student idealism and the capacity to innovate are some of the advantages universities provide regardless of the cost of their services. What can the university get from the partnership? Practical experience for students is the most obvious advantage. Yet what makes this experience significant is the personal development of the student. Assistance to communities, involvement in advocacy planning, or other socially oriented activities can shape and form the values of future professionals. It is assumed that students who are involved in these projects will be

aware or committed to such issues after their graduation. A partnership with a community can also influence the research carried out in universities and make it more responsive to community needs. The synergistic value of combining resources, skills, and knowledge is the biggest advantage to both the university and the community in performing a partnership. Communities and grassroots organizations provide knowledge that students and researchers cannot gain from any other source. The same applies to the kind of knowledge universities furnish, which can be of great importance to community needs. Prestige, public relations, and accessibility to funds that otherwise would not be available are other more concrete synergistic benefits that are created by the partnership.

The study describes and evaluates community-university joint projects of varying scale, scope, and nature. For example, there is a great difference between service-oriented activities and community action projects. However, in the Israeli context there are almost no community-university projects whatsoever. Therefore, the main issues concern the way community-university relations can be established rather than the nature of these projects. The interviews with NGO and architecture school directors suggest that there is a need for both sides to cooperate and that there is a readiness on both sides to conduct such projects. For community-university partnerships to take place in Israel there is a need for a few pilot projects to be conducted. The scope of such projects can be limited; however, the pilot projects should be conducted with the intention to become an integral part of architecture and urban planning curricula in Israel.

5.3 Guidelines for an Israeli Community-University Partnership

The guidelines for community-university partnerships that follow are based on different aspects of the research conclusions. The intention of these guidelines is to suggest a way to initiate community-university partnerships and to describe the conditions needed for its sustainability. These conclusions suggest general guidelines for projects that may be accomplished rather than ways to implement them. Some of the guidelines are specific to the Israeli context, while others are relevant to any community-university partnership.

5.3.1 Communicative principles

Although conflict situations occur between universities and communities, community-university partnerships should be consensus-oriented projects. As such, the partnerships could be based on communicative principles that claim that no affected party should be excluded, all parties should be able to present their claims equally, and power differences should not effect the process. These principles are ethical rather than practical guidelines. However, the practical aspects of the partnership should follow these ethical guidelines.

5.3.2 Partnering with NGOs

Partnerships should be formed between organized partners. The university is a strong organizational party; communities on the other hand, are not always organized entities. If one party lacks an organizational mechanism, there is a chance that the more organized party, i.e. the university, will control the partnership. Academic staff and students are not always capable to assume the organizational tasks of the community, especially when their professional expertise is in fields other than the social sciences. If a university decides to become involved in community-related issues where there is no community organization it should try to create an organizational structure within the community. These problems can be resolved when the university's partner is a Community-based NGOs because these organizations can assume the organizational tasks of the community.

5.3.3 Awareness Development

Because architecture and planning school curricula lack socially oriented topics, students are usually unaware of social issues. Knowledge and understanding of social issues and their place in the planning process are essential for student work in a community-university project. It is also important that the student be familiar with community oriented planning methods such as advocacy planning and communicative planning. Awareness should be developed among architecture schools and NGOs directors as well. They should gain knowledge and understanding of partnership methods and concepts. They should also be familiar with the other party on the organizational, professional, and personal levels prior to the partnership process.

5.3.4 Defining Objectives

All parties involved in the partnership should first work separately in order to identify problems, develop agenda, and define objectives. The agenda and objectives of one party should not contradict those of the other party. The need to define the objective prior to the partnership process is essential mainly to the community organization. The process of defining goals and objectives is part of the community socialization process that should be carried out prior to partnering with any other group. Only in the second stage, should all the parties involved define the joint agenda and common objectives.

5.3.5 Transparency

Each party's agenda and objectives should be transparent to the other party. The financial means and the professional and organizational resources each side can invest in the partnership should also be clear to the other side. These are important both for effective use of the resources available to the partnership and as a way to increase mutual trust and reciprocal relationships. Hidden agendas, besides being unethical, may be destructive to the partnership process.

5.3.6 Structure Development

Student idealism, university awareness, and defined objectives are not enough for partnerships to be realized. As was discussed above, partnerships are complicated organizational entities. For partnerships to last, structured procedures and support systems need to be developed. Structured procedures may include integration of student activities into the university curricula, crediting the students for their activities, and developing a reward system for academic staff work. The support systems include, for example, stable funding sources, university organizational support, and community networking of the NGO.

5.3.7 Modularity

Although procedures and support systems are needed, these should not be too structured and rigid. It is important that the partnerships be implemented in a way that will enable adaptability to the changing circumstances. The partnership process, for example, should be constructed of several stages that may be implemented separately. The partnership

should be an open-ended process; goals and objectives can be redefined as long as all parties agree on the changes.

5.4 Recommendation for Future Research and Implementation

Evaluative research on community-university partnerships is scarce and partial. Most of the available literature consists of primary documents produced by universities or documentation of an ongoing process. The literature lacks evaluation of the long-term results of the projects and of the effect the project has had on the parties involved. For example, the assumption that students involved in community-oriented activities are more committed to such issues after their graduation needs to be proved. A study of these issues can contribute to the many recent community-university initiatives. An analysis of a particular community-university project or comparative study of several projects, for example, can examine the project's effect on the participating communities and academic institutions and of its impact on the involved individual community members and students. The physical changes in the participants' environment can also be evaluated and studied. Such research should be based on more than the school's web sites and publications and the articles of the involved faculty, which may be one-sided and therefore biased. Such research can also be carried out on projects that have failed. The lessons to be learned from unsuccessful projects may be of greater value than from those considered successful.

This study has not given much attention to the organizational and financial aspects of community-university partnerships. Who finances the partnership and who controls and inspects the budget are important issues in a partnership. These issues can have a great influence on the partnership power relations, on the role each party has in the partnership, and therefore, on the partnership outcome. Further research should be conducted concerning these issues as well.

A study of an Israeli pilot project can contribute a great deal to the understanding of the Israeli context. Such research can identify changes of opinions among the different partners concerning the issues the partnership tackles, as well as changes in opinion

towards the idea of partnership itself. Future research can examine whether conclusions of the present study – that a pilot project can develop an awareness of partnerships and hence, enable other such projects – is valid.

The changing conditions and rules of the global age make the rethinking, redefinition, and reinvention of accepted notions essential. This process, among other things, leads to the reevaluation of the roles academic institutions and non-governmental organizations can perform under the new circumstances. In Israel, this global rethinking process is an opportunity to set the grounds for community-university cooperation. It is an opportunity to start thinking about the commitment of the university to disadvantaged communities and to develop the processes and methods by which such commitment can be carried out.

As part of this study, I have met with directors of Israeli schools of architecture, professors, and students. I met also with NGO directors, community organizers and community members. The ties I have made with people will probably follow me long after the submission date of this thesis. The first result of this have been a recent proposal by the author to the Bezalel Academy of Art and Design to create a community-oriented design studio that will be conducted in cooperation with a community-based organization. The proposal has been approved and in the academic year 2000-2001 such a design studio will be established in the Bezalel Academy for the first time. It is not clear whether or not the suggestion for future research of the Israeli context will be realized with this initiative. However, I hope that this project will be another step in making partnerships between architecture schools and communities more common in Israel.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Christopher, Murray Silverstein, Shlomo Angel, Sara Ishikawa, and Denny Abrams. *The Oregon Experiment*. New York: Oxford UP, 1975.
- Alterman, Rachel, Hubert Law-Yone, and Arza Churchman. *Madrich Leshituf Hazibur Batichnun* [A Guide for Public Participation in Planning]. Haifa: Michlol, 1987.
- Arnstein, R. Sherry. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation." *Journal of the American Institute of Planner* 35 (1969): 216-24.
- Association for Community Design. <<http://www.communitydesign.org>> (10 April 1999).
- Atkinson, Rob. "Discourse of Partnership and Empowerment in Contemporary British Urban Regeneration." *Urban Studies* 36.1 (1999): 59-72.
- Baker, Joseph. "An Experiment in Architecture." *The Canadian Architect* October (1973): 30-41.
- Barzacchi, Elinoar. Personal Interview. 8 January 2000.
- Bateman, Neil. *Advocacy Skills: A Handbook for Human Service Professionals*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing, 1995.
- Bok, Derek. *Beyond the Ivory Tower: Social Responsibilities of the Modern University*. Cambridge: Harvard U P, 1982.
- Boston Architectural Center. "Community Design Center." <<http://www.the-bac.edu/resources/commundesignctr/body%5Fcommundesignctr.html>> (16 May 1999).
- Brager, George, Harry Specht, and James L. Torczyner. *Community organizing*. New York: Columbia UP, 1987.
- Briggs, Xavier de Souza. "Doing Democracy Up-Close: culture, power, and Communication in community Building." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 18 (1998): 1-13.
- Brown Don R. Personal Interview. 16 March 1999.
- Carmon, Naomi. *Urban Renewal and Neighborhood Regeneration: Past experience and Lessons for the Future*. Haifa, Israel: Technion, 1996.
- CERI (Centre for Educational Research and Innovation). *The University and the Community: The problems of Changing Relationships*. Paris: OECD, 1982.

- Checkoway, Barry. "Reinventing the Research University for Public Service." *Journal of Planning Literature*. 11 (1997): 307-19.
- Davidoff, Paul. "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31.4 (1965): 1-9.
- Day, Diane. "Citizen Participation in the Planning Process: An Essentially Contested Concept?" *Journal of Planning Literature* 11 (1997): 421-34.
- Dietz, Larry H. and Vicky L. Triponey, eds. *Serving Students at Metropolitan Universities: The Unique Opportunities and Challenges*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.
- Doz, Yves L. and Gary Hamel. *Alliance Advantage: The Art of Creating Value through Partnering*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1998.
- Druckman, Zeev. Personal Interview. 23 December 1999.
- The East St. Louis Action Research Project.
<http://www.imlab.uiuc.edu/eslarp/index.html> (25 May 1999).
- Eisenberg, Theodore, Barbara Fresko, and Miriam Carmeli. *A Tutorial Project for Disadvantaged Children: An Evaluation of the Perach Project*. Rehovot, Israel: Weizmann Institute, 1980.
- Etzioni, Amitai. *The Spirit of Community: Rights, Responsibilities, and the Communitarian Agenda*. New York: Crown, 1993.
- Epstein, Barbara. Personal Interview. 2 March 2000.
- Fathy, Hassan. *Architecture for the Poor: an Experiment in Rural Egypt*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- Flyvbjerg, Bent. "Empowering Civil Society: Habermas, Foucault and the Question of Conflict." *Cities for Citizens: planning and the Rise of Civil Society in a Global Age*. Ed. Mike Douglass and John Friedman. Chichester, Eng: John Wiley, 1998. 185-211.
- Forester, John. *Planning in the Face of Power*. Berkley: Univ. of Cal. Press, 1989.
- Frank, Flo and Anne Smith. *The Partnership Handbook*. Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, 1997.
- Giddens, Anthony. "Risk." *The BBC Reith Lectures 1999*. 1999.
http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/static/events/reith_99 (28 Apr. 1999).

- Gil, Efraim, and Enid Luccheti. "Citizen Participation in planning." Ed. Frank S. So et al. *The Practice of Local Government Planning*. Washington D.C.: Int. City Management Association.
- Gilbert, Neil, and Harry Specht. *Dimensions of Social Welfare Policy*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974.
- Gittel, Marilyn, Bruce Hoffacker, Eleanor Rollins, Samuel Foster, and Mark Hoffacker. *Limits to Citizen Participation: The Decline of Community Organization*. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1980.
- Glass, James J. "Citizen Participation in the planning: the Relationship between Objectives and Techniques." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 45 (1979): 180-9
- Goodwin, P. Philip. "The End of Consensus? The Impact of participatory initiatives on Conceptions of conservation and the Countryside in the United Kingdom." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 17 (1999): 383-401.
- Gordon, Ian and Murray Low. "Community, Locality and Urban research." *European Planning studies* 6 (1998): 5-16.
- Hadari, Zeev Vania, and Hila Tal. *Prakim Betoldot Haoniversita*. Beer-Sheva, Israel: Ben Gurion, 1984.
- Harkavy, Ira. "The Demands of the Times and the American Research University." *Journal of Planning Literature*. 11 (1997): 333-336.
- Hamdi, Nabeel, and Reinhard Goethert. *Action Planning for Cities: A Guide to Community Practice*. Chichester, Eng: John Wiley, 1997.
- Harvey, David. *Justice, Nature & the Geography of Difference*. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1996.
- Hastings, Annette. "Analysing Power Relations in Partnerships: Is There a Role for Discourse Analysis?" *Urban Studies* 36 (1999): 91-106.
- - -. "Unravelling the Process of 'Partnership' in urban Regeneration Policy" *Urban Studies* 33 (1996): 253-68.
- Haughton, Graham, and Aidan While. "From Corporate city to Citizens City? Urban leadership After Local Entrepreneurialism in the United Kingdom." *Urban Affairs Review* 35.1 (1999): 3-23.

Healey, Patsy. "Planning through Debate: The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory." *Town Planning Review* 63 (1992): 143-62.

---. *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*. London: Macmillan, 1997.

Hillier, Jean. "Beyond confused Noise: Ideas Toward Communicative Procedural Justice." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 18 (1998): 14-24.

Innes, Judith. "Planning Theory's Emerging paradigm: Communicative Action and Interactive Practice." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 14 (1995): 183-90.

Jacobs, Jane. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. 1961. New York: Vintage Books, 1992.

Keating, Dennis, Norman Krumholz, and John Metzger. "Cleveland: Post Populist Public-Private Partnerships." *Unequal Partnerships: The Political Economy of Urban Redevelopment in Postwar America*. Ed. Gregory D. Squires. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1989. 121-141.

LeGates, T. Richard, and Gib Robinson. "Institutionalizing University-Community Partnerships." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 17 (1997): 312-22.

Lehavi, Meital. Personal Interview. 9 March 2000.

Levine, Mark V. "The Politics of Partnership: Urban Redevelopment Since 1945." *Unequal Partnerships: The Political Economy of Urban Redevelopment in Postwar America*. Ed. Gregory D. Squires. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1989. 12-34.

Liotard, Jean François. Trans. Geoff Bennigton and Brian Massumi. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Marris, Peter. "Planning and Civil Society in the Twentieth Century: An Introduction." *Cities for Citizens: planning and the Rise of Civil Society in a Global Age*. Ed. Mike Douglass and John Friedman. Chichester, Eng: John Wiley, 1998. 9-17.

---. *The Politics of Uncertainty: Attachment in private and Public Life*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Moneta, Larry. "Future Challenges and Priorities." *Dietz and Triponey* 67-77.

- Nash, George. *The University and the City: Eight Cases of Involvement*. Berkeley: McGraw – hill, 1973.
- Palm, Richard L. and J. Douglas Toma. "Community Relationships and Partnerships." Dietz and Triponey 57-65.
- Pratt Institute Center for Community Environmental Development. "Home Page." <<http://www.picced.org>> (5 June 1999).
- Price, Robert E. "Columbia: Turning the University Around." *The University and the City: Eight Cases of Involvement*. Ed. Nash George. Berkeley: McGraw – hill, 1973. 95-123.
- Reardon, M. Kenneth. "Creating a Community/University Partnership that Works: The Case of the East St. Louis Action Research Project." *Metropolitan Universities* 4 (1995): 47-59.
- - -. <kmr22@cornell.edu> "Re: Information about ESLARP." Personal e-mail.
- Reich, Orit. Personal Interview. 27 March 2000.
- Sandercock, Leonie. *Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for Multicultural Cities*. Chichester Eng: John Wiley, 1998.
- Seaberry, Jeannette, and Joe L. Davis. "The Metropolitan University: History, Mission, and Defining Characteristics." Dietz and Triponey 5-13.
- Sennett, Richard. *The Uses of Disorder: Personal Identity & City Life*. New York: Knopf. 1970.
- Shefer, Daniel. Personal Interview. 8 January 2000.
- Shiran, Viki. "Hapesha ken mishtalem [The Crime Does Pay off]." *Yediot Aharonot* [Tel Aviv] 27 Jan. 2000: 5.
- Stoker, G. and M. Mossberger. "Urban Regime Theory in Comparative Perspective." *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 12 (1994): 195-212.
- Somersville, Peter. "Empowerment through Residence." *Housing Studies* 13 (1998): 233-57.
- Sullivan, Brian T. Personal Interview. 24 June 1999.
- Susskind, Lawrence, and Connie Ozawa. "Mediated Negotiation in the Public Sector: The Planner as Mediator." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 3 (1984): 5-15.

- Technion - Israel Institute of Technology. "History and Mission." *The Faculty of Architecture and Town Planning*. <<http://architecture.technion.ac.il/faculty/>> (5 Apr. 1994).
- Torjman, Sherri. *Partnerships: The Good, The Bad and The Uncertain*. Ottawa: Caledon Institute of Social Policy, 1998.
- Turner, John F. C. *Housing by People; Towards Autonomy in Building Environment*. 1976. New York: Pantheon Books, 1977.
- United States. HUD. *Colleges and Communities - Partners in Urban Revitalization: A Report on the Community Outreach Partnership Centers Program*. Washington: GPO, 1998.
- United States. HUD. Certification of payments to Influence Federal Transactions. Form 50071(3/98).
- The Vancouver Declaration on Human Settlements. *The Report of Habitat: United Nations Conference on Human Settlements, Vancouver, Canada, 1976*. <<http://www.undp.org/un/habitat/back/van-decl.html>> (19 June 2000).
- Voogd, V. and J. Woltjer. "The Communicative Ideology in Spatial Planning: Some Critical Reflections Based on the Dutch Experience." *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 26 (1999): 835-54.
- Wexler, E. Martin. "A Comparison of Canadian and American Housing Policies." *Urban Studies* 33 (1996): 1909-1921.
- Wiewel, Wim, and Michael Lieber. "Goal Achievement, Relation Building, and Incrementalism: The Challenge of University-Community Partnerships." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 17 (1997): 291-301.
- Wolfe, Jackie. "Evaluation of Objective: A Case Study and Commentary on Public Participation." *Plan Canada*,
- Wusten, Herman van der. *The Urban University and its Identity: Roots, Location, Roles*. Dordrecht, Neth: Kluwer, 1998.
- You, Danhui. "Long-Term Results of User Participation in housing Rehabilitation: The Community Design Workshop in Pointe St. Charles." Thesis. McGill U, 1998.

APENDIX A - Questionnaire to Architecture School Director

Public Participation

How would you define public participation?

What is your position concerning public participation?

On a Scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is fully agree, 2 – somewhat agree, 3 – have no opinion, 4 – somewhat don't agree, and 5 – don't agree; do you think that public participation is an effective method to:

1. Promote democratic values.....	1	2	3	4	5
2. Get public input	1	2	3	4	5
3. Attain designs which reflects user needs	1	2	3	4	5
4. Educate the public	1	2	3	4	5
5. Educate decision makers	1	2	3	4	5
6. Educate planners	1	2	3	4	5
7. Create social change in the participating community.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Create personal change among the participants	1	2	3	4	5
9. Mobilize support for the planning.....	1	2	3	4	5
10. Mobilize political change.....	1	2	3	4	5
11. Shorten and reduce the cost of the planning processes	1	2	3	4	5

What is the ideological background to these positions?

What is the professional background to these opinions?

Public Participation in the University Curriculum

What is your position concerning the inclusion of public participation as a theoretical or practical subject in your school's curriculum?

Was it ever included in the school's curriculum (when, how)?

Can it be carried out through a: theoretical course, seminar, design studio, short term projects, technical assistance, community training and education?

Community – University Partnerships

What significance could community – university partnerships have?

How would you define a partnership with a community?

Who can be a potential partner?

What can the university offer to the community?

What can the university get from the community?

How can a partnership with a community be initiated?

What resources would you allot to the partnership (financial resources, academic credit)?

Questionnaire to Community-based Organization Director

Public Participation

How would you define public participation?

What is your position concerning public participation?

On a Scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is fully agree, 2 – somewhat agree, 3 – have no opinion, 4 – somewhat don't agree, and 5 – don't agree; do you think that public participation is an effective method to:

1. Promote democratic values.....	1	2	3	4	5
2. Get public input	1	2	3	4	5
3. Attain designs which reflects user needs	1	2	3	4	5
4. Educate the public	1	2	3	4	5
5. Educate decision makers	1	2	3	4	5
6. Educate planners	1	2	3	4	5
7. Create social change in the participating community.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Create personal change among the participants	1	2	3	4	5
9. Mobilize support for the planning.....	1	2	3	4	5
10. Mobilize political change.....	1	2	3	4	5
11. Shorten and reduce the cost of the planning processes	1	2	3	4	5

What is the ideological background to these positions?

What is the professional background to these opinions?

Public Participation in the Organization's Activities

What is your position concerning the inclusion of public participation as part of your organization's activities?

Was it ever included in the organization's activities (when, how)?

Can it be carried out through community organizing or outreach activities?

Community – University Partnerships

Does your organization have any connection with an academic institution?

What significance could community – university partnerships have?

How would you define the character a partnership with an architecture school could have?

Who can be a potential partner?

What can the university get from the community?

What can the university offer to the community?

How can a partnership with a community be initiated?

What resources would you allot to the partnership (financial resources, positions)?

APENDIX B – Israeli Architecture Schools Studied

There are currently three institutions in Israel that have an undergraduate program in architecture: the Faculty of Architecture and Town Planning at the Technion in Haifa, the School of Architecture at the Bezalel Academy in Jerusalem, and the School of Architecture in the Tel-Aviv University.

Technion – Israel Institute of Technology

The Faculty of Architecture and Town Planning was founded in 1924 and is the oldest architecture school in Israel. Today, the faculty offers four programs: architecture, landscape architecture, urban and regional planning, and industrial design (the last two, at the post-graduate level). 750 students are currently studying various programs at the faculty.

Dean of the Faculty - Prof. Daniel Shefer

Bezalel Academy of Art and design

The Department of Architecture was established in 1990. 310 students study at the department. Other programs of the academy are offered by the Fine Arts, the Industrial Design, and the Graphic Design Departments.

Head of the Department - Prof. Zeev Druckman

Tel Aviv University

Established in 1994, the School of Architecture is part of the Faculty of the Arts. The procedures for the school's recognition by the Israeli council of higher education were finalized by 1998, and in 1999 the school was authorized to give an undergraduate degree in architecture.

Head of the School - Prof. Elinoar Barzacchi

APENDIX C – Israeli NGOs Studied

The three community-based NGOs studied represent a range of voluntary organizations of different scale and characteristics. All three organizations are active in an urban context, and their interests are in urban issues that concern their constituencies.

Community Advocacy

Community Advocacy is a non-profit organization, whose goal is to empower citizens to know, protect, and advocate for their social rights. The organization operates two storefront advocacy centers in Jerusalem and in Beer-Sheva. It offers individual services as well as community organizing of advocacy groups.

Director - Ms. Barbara Epstein

Kerem Israel Neighborhood Committee

Kerem Israel Neighborhood Committee (KINC) is a local organization of residents in a low-income neighborhood in the center of Tel-Aviv. It started in 1998 when a few residents organized to negotiate with the Tel-Aviv municipality on maintenance and traffic issues. KINC successes in the last years include promotion of the renovation of a community park, and shifting a noisy public transportation route out of the neighborhood.

Director - Ms. Meital Lehavi

The Association for the Quality of Life and Environment in Nahariya

The Association for the Quality of Life and Environment in Nahariya (AQLEN) was established in 1994. The organization's aim is to raise the awareness of environmental issues of the town residents as well as the municipal bodies. Some of the organization's activities include a suit against the Naharia municipality plan to build an amusement park on an asbestos polluted area, which the AOLEN won, and a campaign against the construction of a marina on the town's waterfront.

Director - Ms. Orit Reich