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Abstract

“Although many artists and architects privilege phenomenological experience, they often offer the near-reverse: ‘experience’ handed back to us as ‘atmosphere’ or ‘affect’ - that is as environments that confuse the actual with the virtual, or feelings that are hardly our own yet interpolate us nonetheless. In the guise of our activation, some work even tends to subdue us, for the more it opts for special effects, the less it engages us as active viewers." (Foster, 2011)

The article that follows chronicles the evolution of the respective sub-fields of endeavor from the unique perspectives of the authors and their cumulative involvements and experiences. Its main purpose is to begin to bridge the gap between the affective and effective goals of architectural criticism (Attoe, 1989). In other words, the attempt will be made to connect the perceived vs. measured quality of the designed and built environment, including visual-aesthetic quality. The result is an entirely new form of criticism that is instructive as both a tool to professionals and an explication of the built environment to the layperson beyond aesthetic platitudes. Because of its cumulative nature, the 2-part literature review is not intended to be exhaustive since that can be gleaned from a sample of authoritative publications on the evolution of: 1. Architectural Criticism: On Architecture: Collected Reflections on a Century of Change by Huxtable (Walker, 2010), Why Architecture Matters by Goldberger (Yale University Press, 2003), and After the End of Art: Contemporary Art and the Pale of History by Danto (Princeton University Press, 1997); 2. Post-Occupancy Evaluation/Building Performance Evaluation: Enhancing Building Performance by Mallory-Hill, Preiser and Watson (Wiley, 2012); Learning From Our Buildings: A State-of-the-Practice Summary of Post-Occupancy Evaluation by Federal Facilities Council (National Academy Press, 2001); and, Building Evaluation Techniques by Baird et al. (McGraw-Hill, 1996).
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Introduction

By exploring 3 theses this review will demonstrate the need to substantially expand the traditional definition and role of architectural criticism:

Thesis 1: Architectural criticism in its present form is limited to visual / aesthetic concerns, such as form, composition, order, etc., but typically does not cover the addressing of needs for major stakeholders in buildings (such as occupants,
owners, facility managers, and visitors). Furthermore, it treats as taboo the factors contributing to a project's realization and/or subsequent social, technological, or spatial effects. These effects and concerns center on the three major levels of habitability: 1. Health, safety and security; function, efficiency and workflow; and social, psychological and cultural performance/satisfaction. Originally, Vitruvius (1960, translated by Morgan) poses firmness, commodity and delight to be preconditions for a successful work of architecture that are not mutually exclusive, but integral. Even now, in a contemporary context, we find the most productive projects as those whose effort is towards understandable qualities of space, not a spectacular mediated experience posing as meaning (2011, Foster).

Thesis 2: A second thesis to be elucidated is the fact that architects and major stakeholders in buildings often do not see eye to eye because of divergent and rarely discussed value systems, degree of expertise, and positions versus the designed and built environment. According to the Habitability Framework (Preiser, 1983) the above third category on aesthetic quality evaluation research is subsumed as part of the social, psychological and cultural performance and satisfaction in building user feedback. For details see Post-Occupancy Evaluation by Preiser, Rabinowitz and White (1988).

Thesis 3: For architectural criticism to be valid and comprehensive, the subjective or perceived criteria for criticism and the objective or measured criteria need to be brought together in a single coherent conceptual framework that can be communicated to others. To accomplish this, the authors propose evaluation scales featuring weighted scores for all performance aspects of the built environment that are considered to be important, including visual aesthetic quality. For a precedent see Preiser and Wang (2012) and Heerwagen (2001).

The outcome of this endeavor will be a comprehensive and future-oriented conceptualization of architectural criticism in practice.

In the following, the evolution of three major components of this project is chronicled: 1. Architectural Criticism, from traditional humanist critique to aesthetics-centered and finally, reactionary criticism. 2. Post-occupancy/building performance evaluation. Major concepts and components in post-occupancy evaluations are highlighted, and examples of outcomes presented. This consumer-oriented approach is part of a new democratic paradigm embodying autonomy, self-organization, ecology, sustainability, adaptation, and continuous improvement. Questions about the future of this field are raised, including its viability and benefits for all major stakeholders in buildings.

Traditional Architectural Criticism: Literature Review of Past and Present Trends

The Evolution of Architectural Criticism: Moralism

In 1875, Denis Diderot established himself amongst the French elite as an aesthetic and substantial critic of the Salon and its social implications. Diderot’s criticism was based primarily in an ekphrasistic method amounting to nothing more than a detailed description of the actual picture as-such, neglecting the position of the work in any sort of canon or
historical arc that would lend it greater populist significance. The description of the picture itself was a subjective reading of the work through which Diderot was able to project and instruct a variety or moralist points of view, imbuing the artwork with content greater or different than the intent of the artist (Diderot, 1765).

**The Evolution of Architectural Criticism: Humanism**

The work of Lewis Mumford, an unabashed humanist and critic of modern life, necessarily discussed the role of architecture and urbanism in that life. Amongst his oeuvre are numerous accounts and critiques of the City and its inhabitants that found a resonance in the pages of The New Yorker, Architectural Record, and Architecture magazines. What distinguishes his work at The New Yorker is that it is presented in a forum non-specific to the disciplines themselves. In other words, the existence of the architecture and urbanism discussion outside of a devoted periodical gave access to a general public that otherwise might not have had it. By the late 1950’s, Mumford’s work opened the possibility that the city and its buildings could be legible, and that the common man could learn to read it and develop opinions, tastes, and convictions around them.

“If we are to create balanced human beings, capable of entering into world-wide co-operation with all other men of good will--and that is the supreme task of our generation, and the foundation of all its other potential achievements--we must give as much weight to the arousal of the emotions and to the expression of moral and esthetic values as we now give to science, to invention, to practical organization. One without the other is impotent. And values do not come ready-made: they are achieved by a resolute attempt to square the facts of one’s own experience with the historic patterns formed in the past by those who devoted their whole lives to achieving and expressing values. If we are to express the love in our own hearts, we must also understand what love meant to Socrates and Saint Francis, to Dante and Shakespeare, to Emily Dickinson and Christina Rossetti, to the explorer Shackleton and to the intrepid physicians who deliberately exposed themselves to yellow fever. These historic manifestations of love are not recorded in the day’s newspaper or the current radio program: they are hidden to people who possess only fashionable minds. Virtue is not a chemical product, as Taine once described it: it is a historic product, like language and literature; and this means that if we cease to care about it, cease to cultivate it, cease to transmit its funded values, a large part of it will become meaningless, like a dead language to which we have lost the key. That, I submit, is what has happened in our own lifetime” (Mumford, 1938).

Therefore, it is with little surprise that Architectural criticism as a public endeavor was formalized in the early 1960’s with the appointment of Ada Louise Huxtable as the critic at the New York Times. “The Critic has to stand between the Artist and the User and be objective and fair,” Huxtable states in an interview. This extension of Mumford’s humanism is tempered by the inclusion of art-historical references proliferating during this period in which the modern conception of perception was theorized and explored in the visual and spatial arts (Sartre, 1956; Greenberg, 1961; Merleau-Ponty, 1964; Rosenberg, 1964; Sontag, 1966; Judd, 1965, et al.).

Modern art and aesthetic criticism rejected the idea of the ekphrasistic narratives entirely,
preferring (out of necessity) to provide strict formal analyses in the absence of a recognizable subject. As the formal analyses evolved, and multiple works by the same artist were examined, a language of iconography and style entered into the discussion, which elevated (or reduced) the role of artistic criticism to a market force driven by opinion and class rather than an analytical tool.

As the discussion of art from a critical standpoint started to branch out from the picture plane, it conjectured that the presence of art as a physical object actually had the ability to create space. Once this barrier of perception was crossed into the realm of inhabitation, position, and movement the analysis of art and its history lent itself as a foundation for the critique of modern architecture.

Huxtable’s situating insight that challenges the Times reader while providing an historical and technological context that educates, allowing the reader to understand why a work deserves critique, and by extension, their attention.

Following Huxtable, Paul Goldberger assumed the role of critic at the Times, reminding the readership that in light of the establishing of bubble economies, technological innovation, and sound bite punditry at all levels of popular culture, architecture cannot, and should not, be reduced to an image.

“But of course no building can be viewed solely through the lens of aesthetics anyway, or at least it should not. Architecture criticism is aesthetics and it is politics and it is sociology and it is culture, and if you do not accept the notion that all of these things are intimately intertwined, then you fail to understand what has to be the foundation of all writing about design, which is that every object has an aesthetic presence and a social one at the same time, or, to put it another way, every object is both a physical thing and a political thing, and it has to be understood and criticized as both. It is not one or the other, but both, all the time.” (Goldberger, 2003)

**The Evolution of Architectural Criticism: Populism**

Goldberger’s departure, viewed in retrospect, provides insight into the nature of evaluative methods for architecture and urbanism during the early 21’s century. His successor, Nicolai Ouroussof, embodies perfectly the blind optimism and self-congratulatory technocracy of the first decade. In place of the education and humanist bent of the earlier critics, we find in Ouroussof an enthusiastic fan of architecture, who has tapped to speak for those he wishes to impress. Much in the same way that the art criticism of Greenberg, Fried, et al. became divisive in the late 60’s because of personal preference and championing of individual artists, Ouroussof has his favorites (or they have him) and is content to provide critique in the same vein as Diderot; the ramifications and position of a work is abandoned for a florid description of the building itself. However, Ourousoff does not exhibit the moralistic or ethical undertones of Diderot. Just as the tough socioeconomic, political, or global implications of a given project are broached, Ourousoff pulls back as if not wanting to embarrass his captive celebrity. On the 2011 opening of CCTV, the massive example par excellence of spectacle architecture:

“After Rem Koolhaas, the project’s architect — along with his former Beijing partner, Ole Scheeren — unveiled the design in 2003 he was
pilloried by Western journalists for glorifying a propaganda organ of the Chinese government. Several years later a fire at the site nearly burned down a neighboring building, also designed by Mr. Koolhaas, landing the director of the project and 19 others in prison for negligence and significantly delaying construction. And then there’s something about the building’s appearance that seems to unsettle people. Just when things got back on track after the fire, a Chinese critic published an article saying that the building’s contorted form, which frames an enormous void at its center, was modeled on a pornographic image of a naked woman on her hands and knees. The piece ignited a storm of negative press, forcing Mr. Koolhaas to issue a denial.

Yet for all that, the CCTV headquarters may be the greatest work of architecture built in this century. Mr. Koolhaas, of the Office for Metropolitan Architecture, has always been interested in making buildings that expose the conflicting energies at work in society, and the CCTV building is the ultimate expression of that aim, beginning with the slippery symbolism of its exterior. At moments monumental and combative, at others strangely elusive, almost retiring, it is one of the most beguiling and powerful works I’ve seen in a lifetime of looking at architecture.” (Ourousoff, 2011)

**The Evolution of Architectural Criticism: Backlash**

Perhaps the most outspoken (if under-appreciated) voice in contemporary architecture criticism is that of historian Hal Foster. Foster, a Ph.D. candidate under Rosalind Krauss at the City University of New York, attempts with his work to bend the arc of history back towards a critical path by pointedly and aggressively dismantling the imagistic culture around us. Framing his work is the belief that the historicist polemic has been rendered impotent by the contemporary preoccupation with spectacle over quality of experience (Hughes, 2002). His most recent work, The Art-Architecture Complex (Verso, 2011), attempts to further explicate the crisis of contemporary perception by examining the work of well-known architects and drawing a distinction between affective and actual experiences. The affective experience, also present in contemporary art practice, short circuits the responsibility of the viewer/user by providing a mediated experience force-fed as meaning. The actual experience comes from the legibility of certain design languages that are present and repeated throughout the works of architects Foster, Piano, Rogers, et al (Verso, 2011) who have come to define the prevailing global “brand” of contemporary modernism.

**Post Occupancy Evaluation/Building Performance Evaluation: Literature Review of Past and Present Trends**

**The Evolution of Post-Occupancy Evaluation (POE)**

In the late 60s, evaluation case studies of university dormitories were carried out by Sim van der Ryn (1967) of the University of California, Berkeley, and Victor Hsia (1967) of the University of Utah. While not called post-occupancy evaluations (POEs), these evaluations were the precursors for the first systematic attempts at assessing building performance from the building users’ point of view, for example, one of those early POEs dealt with military postal
Inspired by van der Ryn and Hsia, one of the authors’ (Preiser, 1969) Master’s thesis also focused on evaluating dormitory performance, i.e., at Virginia Tech it employed political science rating scales (the Thurstone Scale of Equal Appearing Intervals) in innovative ways, which have an error rate of no more than 3% to 5%. These rating scales were used to create quality profiles, as perceived by the students living in three very different types of dormitories. The newest ones looked like high-rise prisons, and the oldest looked like Oxford-style, two-story walk-up structures, and not surprisingly, they scored highest.

By the mid-1970s, the first publications with term “POE” in their title appeared: according to Preiser’s extensive literature searches, the very first one was authored by Herb McLaughlin of KMD Architecture in San Francisco in the AIA Journal issue of January 1975. He and a team of consultants had done POEs on hospitals in Utah and in San Francisco. Over the past 30 years, McLaughlin has been an ardent supporter of POE as a tool for in-house knowledge building in architecture and design firms (McLaughlin, 1997). Then there was the first methodological review of POE techniques that was also commissioned by the AIA Corporation (Connell & Ostrander, 1976). In the 80s, a great number of POEs were carried out in the UK, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and the US focusing primarily on public works projects, government buildings, airports, and similar facility types.

In the mid-1980s, the National Academy of Sciences (1987) established committees on opportunities for improvement in the practices of programming, post-occupancy evaluation and data base development, which links the two conceptually. What is really interesting to know is: have the recommendations of the reports have come true over the past 35 years? Yes, indeed they have, especially in the information technology arena, which was in its infancy at that time. A seminal and first POE textbook was published by Preiser, Rabinowitz & White (1988). The appendix of that book is perhaps the most interesting part, because it presents measurement techniques for getting feedback on the quality of facilities. Considered to be a companion volume to Post-Occupancy Evaluation, the book Building Evaluation was published a year after it (Preiser, 1989), with case studies from around the world. A more recent case study example of POE evaluations of architecture school facilities utilizing the same methodology was carried out by Nasar, Preiser & Fisher (2007).

The early POE framework (Preiser, Rabinowitz and White, 1988) provided for three levels of effort, degrees of sophistication and data-gathering techniques, cost, manpower, etc.: indicative, investigative and diagnostic POEs. The 3 POE phases with 3 steps each were: (1) Planning: reconnaissance and feasibility, resource planning, research planning; (2) Conducting: initiating on-site data collection process, monitoring and managing data collection procedures, analyzing data; and, (3) Applying: reporting findings, recommending actions, reviewing outcomes. Finally, the three categorizations in carrying out POEs were people (individuals, groups and organizations); scales of settings (rooms, buildings and building...
complexes); and, 3 levels of performance (according to the habitability framework). Later on, this framework was considered to be quite simplistic, and, in many ways, inadequate.

**Toward Building Performance Evaluation (BPE)**

In the mid-90s, issues pertaining to the building delivery cycle, as well as the life cycle of a building – a meta level approach to building evaluation, were investigated by Preiser and Schramm (1997), and subsequently, an integrative framework/process model for building performance evaluation was developed. In it, post-occupancy evaluation represents only one of six internal review loops, and the framework focuses on the entire life of a building, as well as the notion of feed-forward into the next building cycle.

The key concept was a gradually evolving knowledge base that is translated into building performance criteria. They cover: issues like health, safety, security; issues addressed by building codes; functionality and guideline materials; and last, but not least, the social, psychological, and cultural aspects of building performance.

**Conclusions**

**The role of evaluations**

Socio-critical, post-occupancy, and aesthetic evaluations have been largely abandoned in recent years in favor of the faux-affirmation of pseudo-scientific data porn and diagrammatic “meaning” writ-large. In the recent past and other times of economic prosperity, little attention is paid (or more tolerance is given) to the production of spectacular artifice as a direct sign of the times. The belief and faith in an unreasoned and ad hoc creativity asserts a certain smug superiority over the fears of our preceding epochs. Given the current crisis, it is too easy to mimic Oscar Newman and seek causality between appearance and global/social affect. Architecture does not operate in the causal realm; rather it is many steps removed and part of a corollary production of visual and spatial culture. Whereas causality would presume a much simpler analytical ratio, a corollary approach to architectural criticism and practice would reinsert these evaluative methods into one into another to continually produce new and valuable systems of feedback. If evaluations are by definition empirically sound, why does criticism fall so far behind to mere populism? Why are quantitative measures of user experience omitted from the design process? When “austerity” is approaching brand-status, what reconfiguration of critical tools can position architecture on a more empirically sound and more conceptually rich trajectory? Far from being mutually exclusive, the combination of observed data as a tool, not a picture, and practical willingness to integrate criticism into the design process as a dynamic tool for evaluation; architecture can reclaim a critical stance grounded in the unmediated user experience as the highest aspirations for beauty, technology, and space. In other words, the most powerful tool we can exercise as architects is that our buildings engage directly and sometimes unpredictably with our users. The architectural imperative then is to produce work that holds the user in high enough esteem to allow them to both form and communicate judgment.

**Conceptual/theoretical implications**

Descriptive criticism does not seek to judge nor
even intend to interpret, but to help people see what is actually there (Attoe, 1978). In all of its types it does not offer judgments, but merely depicts what exists; such as, how people move through space and/or provides information about the social, political, and economic context within which built environments are designed and created.

**Methodological implications**

The expanded, three-prong approach to architectural criticism advocated here implies direct feedback on the experienced quality of built environments involving all major stakeholders. Measuring stakeholders’ responses through the use of adjective descriptor scales or rating scales ranging from very satisfied to neutral to very unsatisfied means that respondents need to be presented with data gathering instruments, whether through web surveys or hard copy surveys. Furthermore, a panel consisting of laypersons and expert judges will establish the agreed upon weightings of environmental attributes ranging from health, safety and security issues to cultural and aesthetic ones. Once again, the objective of these somewhat more complicated measurements is to move from highly subjective to more objective criticism.

**Impact on future facility programming and design**

It is hypothesized that the above, more balanced approach to assessing the ingredients that constitute the quality of experienced architecture will lead to better and more architectural programs and designs that advance the field way beyond what meets the eye. It will be superior in quality by considering the entire range of human experience in the built environment.

**Impact on emerging and future architectural practice**

With a newly empowered clientele, a more savvy cadre of practitioners, and the communication/production opportunities provided by a globally networked profession, the potential impacts on practice cannot be overstated. The insertion of an informed client base into the design process will ensure more strategic designs from schematic phases through building commissioning. Held accountable and responsible for defending and justifying costly design moves, emerging professionals will be continually challenged to engage with existing and emerging manufacturing technologies that allow their visions to be operative and cost-effective. Beyond the trite and mannerism of “digital fabrication, “revolutions and evolutions can be made in standard building practices from normative material dimensions to interoperability between distinct disciplines and trades. The trades and manufacturers therefore will evolve to provide cost-effective means of enabling ambitious design because both clients and architects are working together to normalize the previously “ambitious”. This loop is continuous and is based on each party driving for a synthesis of their interests, ultimately furthering the efficiency, quality, and satisfaction from the built environment.

**Impact on future architectural and design education**

The pedagogical implications are already established but have not found traction in the profession as it exists today. The willingness to experiment with new technologies and design methodologies is the foundation of any design
program given that the architectural process is cumulative over a lifetime. Furthermore, facility with software, awareness of social networks at all scales, and mental acuity and flexibility define the baseline curricular demands of contemporary universities. Once in the workforce, these tools are traded for top-down demands of older generations. With an increased expertise, and a concise way for all parties to communicate, students can emerge into the workforce with a refined sensitivity to clients and the profession that will minimize the “shock” of entering real-world practice.

Table 1: Major Phases in the Evolution of Architectural Criticism in the United States and its European Antecedents in Aesthetic Criticism (Source: authors).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Work(s)</th>
<th>Contribution to the Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Diderot</td>
<td>Salon of 1765 &amp; Notes on Painting</td>
<td>Art/Aesthetic Criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930's-50's</td>
<td>Mumford</td>
<td>Criticism at The New Yorker Magazine</td>
<td>Architecture and Urbanism Criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Lewis Mumford</td>
<td>The Culture of Cities</td>
<td>Manifesto on the urban effect on contemporary life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Greenberg</td>
<td>&quot;Avant-Garde and Kitsch.&quot;</td>
<td>Art/Aesthetic Criticism vis-à-vis contemporary culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Sartre</td>
<td>&quot;Existentialism is a Humanism&quot;</td>
<td>Art/Aesthetic Criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Greenberg</td>
<td>Art and Culture</td>
<td>Art/Aesthetic Criticism vis-à-vis contemporary culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Merleau-Ponty</td>
<td>&quot;Eye and Mind&quot;, The Primacy of Perception,</td>
<td>Theorizing of perception and its role in aesthetic judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Judd</td>
<td>&quot;Specific Objects&quot;</td>
<td>Creates a separate categorization from painting and sculpture, whose descriptive quality resembles architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Lewitt</td>
<td>&quot;Paragraphs on Conceptual Art&quot;,</td>
<td>Description of Conceptual Art mimics architecture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Sontag</td>
<td>&quot;Against Interpretation&quot;</td>
<td>Critique and distinction of content and aesthetics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title/Description</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Steinberg</td>
<td>&quot;Other Criteria&quot;</td>
<td>Expands and theorizes the role of the critic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Rosenberg</td>
<td>&quot;Criticism and Its Premises&quot;, Art on the Edge: Creators and Situations</td>
<td>Draws distinctions between history and criticism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Alloway</td>
<td>&quot;The Use and Limits of Art Criticism&quot; Topics in American Art Since 1945</td>
<td>Expands and theorizes the role of criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Kuspit</td>
<td>&quot;Art Criticism: Where's the Depth?&quot;</td>
<td>Compartmentalizes Criticism by Medium and typology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Attoe</td>
<td>&quot;Architecture and Critical Imagination&quot;</td>
<td>Categorizes critique into three main types: Normative, Interpretive, and Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Krauss</td>
<td>&quot;Sculpture in the Expanded Field&quot;</td>
<td>Discusses two types of modern sculpture, &quot;Architecture&quot; and &quot;Not Architecture&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Brenson</td>
<td>&quot;Resisting the Dangerous Journey: The Crisis in Journalistic Criticism&quot;</td>
<td>Criticizing critics and criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Danto</td>
<td>After the End of Art: Contemporary Art and the Pale of History.</td>
<td>Examines the disjointed value of criticism relative to the speed of contemporary culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>&quot;Danto and His Critics: Art After the End of Art History&quot;</td>
<td>Criticism of Critics and a search for a way forward for art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>&quot;The End of Art?&quot;</td>
<td>Criticism of Critics and a search for a way forward for art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Fried</td>
<td>&quot;Shape as Form: Frank Stella’s Irregular Polygons&quot;, Art and Objecthood</td>
<td>Fine art examined as a producer/contributor of architectural space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Kelley</td>
<td>&quot;Essentialism and Historicism in Danto’s Philosophy of Art&quot;</td>
<td>Discusses schism between essentialism and historicism in modern criticism and the visual arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Kuspit</td>
<td>Redeeming Art: Critical Reveries</td>
<td>Further explication of art/aesthetic criticism’s identity crisis relating to modernity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Goldberger</td>
<td>Architecture Criticism: Does It Matter? Lecture at Butler University,</td>
<td>Outlines peripherally the failure of contemporary criticism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>Design and Crime (and Other Diatribes)</td>
<td>Systematically links our perceptions of value and architecture to a manipulated perception of capital and branding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Kuspit</td>
<td>The End of Art</td>
<td>Art/Aesthetic Criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>The Art-Architecture Complex.</td>
<td>Examines how our perceptions are often projected effects of buildings rather than authentic physiological stimulations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Milestones in the Evolution of Post Occupancy Evaluation - Building Performance Evaluation (Source: authors).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Building Type(s)</th>
<th>Contribution to the Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Van der Ryn &amp; Silverstein</td>
<td>Student dormitories</td>
<td>Environmental analysis; concept and methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Manning</td>
<td>Offices &amp; Schools</td>
<td>Comprehensive building appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Sanoff</td>
<td>Any facility type</td>
<td>“Evaluation Techniques for Designers” – first monograph on POE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Preiser</td>
<td>Student dormitories</td>
<td>Environmental performance profiles; correlation of subjective and objective performance measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Field, et al</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>Multi-method approach to data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Becker</td>
<td>Public housing</td>
<td>Cross-sectional comparative approach to data collection and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>McLaughlin</td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>“Evaluation of Hospitals” – first article published on POE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Veterans Administration</td>
<td>Veterans Hospitals</td>
<td>POE of the Veterans Administration Hospital in San Diego (Building Research Board, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Goodrich</td>
<td>Public Square</td>
<td>Observational POE Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Connell &amp; Ostrander</td>
<td>Government facilities</td>
<td>“POEs of Postal and Enlisted Housing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Bechtel and Srivastava</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Comprehensive review of POEs of Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Facility Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Public Works – Canada</td>
<td>Government facilities</td>
<td>POE incorporated into project delivery system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Daish, et al</td>
<td>Military facilities</td>
<td>POE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Marans</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Evaluation model linking perceptual and objective attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td>Any facility type</td>
<td>Programming linked to POE methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Parshall/Pena</td>
<td>Any facility type</td>
<td>Simplified and standardized evaluation methodology for practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Duffy &amp; Chandor</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Orbit 1: Systems design standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Brill, et al</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Linking worker productivity and office design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Davis, et al</td>
<td>Orbit 2 Study</td>
<td>Rating Process on Organizations, Buildings and Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Preiser, Rabinowitz &amp; White</td>
<td>Any facility type</td>
<td>“Post-Occupancy Evaluation” – first book on POE Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Farbstein</td>
<td>U.S. Postal Service</td>
<td>POE &amp; organizational development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Preiser</td>
<td>Any facility type</td>
<td>“Building Evaluation” – POE case studies from around the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Sanoff</td>
<td>Any facility type</td>
<td>Integrating programming, POE and user participation in design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Preiser &amp; Schramm</td>
<td>Any facility type</td>
<td>“Building Performance Evaluation” - conceptual BPE framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Federal Facilities Council</td>
<td>Any facility type</td>
<td>“Learning From Our Buildings” – Federal POE/BPE overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Facility Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>National Clearinghouse for Education Facilities</td>
<td>Educational facilities</td>
<td>Feedback-based design standards for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>NCARB</td>
<td>Any facility type</td>
<td>“Improving Building Performance” – a study guide for architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Szigeti &amp; Davis</td>
<td>Any facility type</td>
<td>Performance based building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Nasar, Preiser &amp; Fisher</td>
<td>Any facility type</td>
<td>“Designing for Designers: Lessons Learned from Schools of Architecture”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Educational Facilities</td>
<td>First coordinated European effort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Each examination room has a unique view. Some of the sky, others the parking lot (Source: Insomniart.com).

Figure 2: Imagine having to wash all those windows after a sand storm (Source: buildipedia.com).

Photo Credits noted for the Cleveland Clinic Lou Ruvo Center for Brain Health.
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