

Quality

in Canada's Built Environment:

Roadmaps to Equity, Social Value and Sustainability

Conseil de recherche en sciences humaines du Canada

(CRSH) Projet de partenariat #895-2022-1003

Éthique no: Projet #2022-2163 - CERAH-2022-015-D

Summaries and Short Extracts from 44 Reports of the Halifax Convention (2024)

“First Version of 14 roadmaps to quality in Canada’s built environment”

May 1 & May 2, 2024

Edited by:

Jean-Pierre Chupin (Scientific Director of the SSHRC Partnership on Quality)

María P. Farfán (Postdoctoral Fellow)

Morteza Hazbei (Postdoctoral Fellow)

Administrative Coordinator:

Dimitri Weibel (SSHRC Partnership Administrative Coordinator)



Authors of the summaries: (Alphabetically)

- **Alex Larose** (Carleton University)
- **Alexandre Néron** (McGill University)
- **Andrée-Ann Langevin** (Carleton University)
- **Belle Gutierrez-Kellam** (University of Calgary)
- **Ben Johnston** (Dalhousie University)
- **Benjamin Dunn** (University of Toronto)
- **Bochenek, Justine** (Toronto Metropolitan University)
- **Brendan Roworth** (Dalhousie University)
- **Brown, Brianna** (University of Waterloo)
- **Camille Simard** (Université Laval)
- **Cara Shan** (Athabasca University)
- **Cynthia San** (University of British Columbia)
- **Dener François** (Université Laval)
- **Firdous Nizar** (Université de Montréal)
- **Iris Pintiuta** (McGill University)
- **James Barrett** (Dalhousie University)
- **Kaiden Reding** (Athabasca University)
- **Kayleigh Hutt-Taylor** (Concordia University)
- **Ma Ryan Bang Yan** (Toronto Metropolitan University)
- **Maëllanne, Armstrong** (Université Laval)
- **Marc Fournier** (University of Waterloo)
- **Maria Farfan** (Université de Montréal)
- **Michaela Pratt-Tremblay** (Laurentian University)
- **Mohammad Hasan Sohaib** (University of Manitoba)
- **Narita Reyes Ico** (University of British Columbia)
- **Narita Reyes Ico** (University of British Columbia)
- **Negarsadat Rahimi** (Concordia University)
- **Nic Kuzmochka** (Dalhousie University)
- **Nicole Yu** (Concordia University)
- **Nirmal Adhikari** (Dalhousie University)
- **Paloma Castonguay-Rufino** (Université de Montréal)
- **Paniz Mousavi Samimi** (University of Calgary)
- **Panos Polyzois** (University of Manitoba)
- **Sarah Jervis** (Dalhousie University)
- **Shantanu Biswas Linkon** (Université de Montréal)
- **Sneha Mandhan** (University of Toronto)
- **TalyDawn Salyn** (University of Calgary)
- **Tatev Yesayan** (Concordia University)
- **Trishtina Godoy-Contois** (Athabasca University)
- **Victorian Thibault-Malo** (Université de Montréal)
- **Yolene Handabaka Ames** (Université de Montréal)

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	3
Workshop 1 Changing Personal Views on Quality	5
Room 1	6
Room 2	7
Room 3	9
Room 4	11
Room 5	13
Room 6	15
Room 7	18
Room 8	20
Room 9	22
Room 10	25
Workshop 2 Notable Outputs and Emerging Convergences	27
Room 1	28
Room 2	30
Room 3	32
Room 4	34
Room 5	37
Room 6	41
Room 7	44
Room 8	46
Room 9	49
Room 10	51
Workshop 3 Action Goals for Roadmaps to Quality in the Built Environment	54
Room 1	55
Room 2	58
Room 3	60
Room 4	63
Room 5	66
Room 6	68
Room 7	70
Room 8	72
Room 9	74

Room 10	76
Workshop 4 Public Debates and National Strategies	79
Room 1	80
Room 2	83
Room 3	86
Room 4	89
Room 5	91
Room 6	94
Room 7	96
Room 8	98
Room 9	100
Room 10	102
Plenaries	105
Plenary 1 - Rethinking quality through partnership design	106
Plenary 2 - Launching initiatives for a public debate on the Living Atlas of Quality in the Built Environment in Canada	108
Plenary 3 - Indigenous ways of knowing and place making	110
Plenary 4 - Open discussion on the future of a national debate on quality	112

Workshop 1

Changing Personal Views on Quality

Wednesday, May 1, 2024, from 10:00 am to 12:00 pm

Room 1

Workshop 1 - Changing Personal Views on Quality

Date of report: (to come)

Report produced by (to come)

Room1_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - Room 1202			12 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Mariana	Esponda	Carleton University	Carleton University
Brian	Sinclair	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Alanna	Thain	McGill University	McGill University
Mike	Brennan	Royal Architectural Institute of Canada	National Partners
Alex	Wesang	Royal Architectural Institute of Canada	National Partners
Éloïse	Richard-Choquette	Administration portuaire de Québec	Université Laval
Rosa	Milito	ICOMOS	Dalhousie University
Alan	Sukut	Saskatoon Public School Board	University of Manitoba
Mohammad Hasan	Sohaib	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Narita	Ico	University of British Columbia	University of British Columbia
Siba Américain	Bilivogui	Université Laval	Université Laval
Cara	Shan	Athabasca University	Athabasca University

Room 2

Workshop 1 - Changing Personal Views on Quality

Date of report: 2024-06-17

Report produced by

Pratt Tremblay, Michaela (Laurentian University)

Room2_ Location: G.H. Murray Building - G215			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Robert	Wright	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Enrica	Dall'Ara	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Izabel	Amaral	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Grace	Coulter Sherlock	AAA Representative - Lemay	Alberta
Michael	McClelland	ERA Architects	Carleton University
Robert	Balay	Town of Athabasca	Athabasca University
Talayeh	Saghatchian Shomali	Open Architecture Collaborative Canada (OACC)	Toronto Metropolitan University
Sonia	Blank	Architecture Sans Frontières Québec	McGill University
Shantanu Biswas	Linkon	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Justine	Bochenek	Toronto Metropolitan University	Toronto Metropolitan University
Michaela	Pratt-Tremblay	Laurentian University	Laurentian University
Nic	Kuzmochka	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Meg	Berry	Athabasca University	Athabasca University

Summary

The workshop began with participants introducing themselves, representing various academic institutions, municipalities, and community organizations across Canada. They discussed their roles and interests related to architectural research and community engagement. Topics ranged from urban planning and landscape architecture to accessibility, heritage conservation, and community-driven projects like affordable housing initiatives for First Nations.

Participants shared positive outcomes from their projects over the past two years. Examples included innovative research methodologies, enhanced community partnerships, and transformative impacts on neighborhoods through revitalization projects. New perspectives on inclusive design and accessibility were highlighted, emphasizing the importance of interdisciplinary collaboration and community consultation in shaping built environments.

Challenges such as balancing diverse needs in accessibility design and navigating economic pressures in urban development were also discussed. The session underscored the value of ongoing dialogue and practical outcomes in architectural practice and education, aiming to foster more inclusive and sustainable built environments across Canada.

In the recorded discussion, participants explored diverse perspectives on quality in the built environment. Shauna Mallory-Hill underscored the importance of post-occupancy evaluations and social justice in assessing building performance, especially concerning stakeholder expectations. Meg Berry emphasized stewardship and ecological considerations, highlighting conflicts between development projects and sensitive environmental and cultural sites. Michael McClelland discussed the evolving focus on ingenuity and community engagement in urban planning, integrating indigenous perspectives into design processes. Sonia Blank argued for the inclusion of activism in defining quality, advocating for diverse forms of community engagement in design. Grace Coulter Sherlock focused on the trend of retrofitting and adaptive reuse as sustainable practices amidst funding uncertainties. Izabel Amaral expanded the definition of quality beyond aesthetics to encompass environmental and social impacts, advocating for the preservation of existing buildings. Nic Kuzmochka highlighted challenges in educational infrastructure and the need for adaptable spaces that evolve with community needs. Justine Bochenek stressed the importance of maintenance and longevity in sustaining quality, particularly in urban settings where repurposing existing structures can mitigate environmental impacts. Overall, the discussion emphasized inclusivity, sustainability, and adaptability as central to redefining quality in architectural practice.

Room 3

Workshop 1 - Changing Personal Views on Quality

Date of report: 2024-05-29

*Report produced by
Simard, Camille (Université Laval)*

Room3_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - Room 1208			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Susan	Fitzgerald	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Anne	Cormier	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Stéphane	Roche	Université Laval	Université Laval
Terrance	Galvin	Laurentian University	Laurentian University
Nathalie	Dion	Provencher Roy	Université de Montréal
David	Down	City of Calgary	University of Calgary
Afsaneh	Tafazzoli	Open Architecture Collaborative Canada (OACC)	Toronto Metropolitan University
Adrien	Kazup	Vivre en Ville	Concordia University
Tatev	Yesayan	Concordia University	Concordia University
Sneha	Mandhan	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Camille	Simard	Université Laval	Université Laval
Victorian	Thibault-Malo	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Nirmal	Adhikari	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University

Summary

- Quality is more complex to define than what we originally thought. The project broadened our perspective on quality. Reflective practice increased our understanding of quality.
- We are trying to balance design excellence with a range of shared values (social, cultural, emotional, environmental).
- The multidimensionality of affect must be considered. How can feelings be qualified/quantified? What makes the building worth visiting?
- Meeting with a wide variety of people and hearing different perspectives is very important.
- Changing policies is an important part of the project, but it may also be the most difficult.
- Building a review system for construction quality (the roadmaps are already a big step in this direction).
- Awards are given when a project is freshly released. What would happen if we waited a bit to see how the materials hold up and how people really appreciate the construction/built environment? This could help us see how people really use the space versus how we thought it would be used.
- Buildings are there for a long time, so they have to be designed, not just made.
- Quality needs to be evaluated through the right scale/context/people/time.
- The primary cause of fatalities during natural disasters is not the calamity itself but the substandard quality of the infrastructure. People desire structures that are familiar and dear to them yet robust enough to maintain good quality over an extended period.
- Using advanced techniques is desired but difficult to accomplish due to materials and labour constraints.
- Adding Indigenous voices to the project: what is THEIR vision for THEIR realities?
- The involvement of the public is necessary in the process.

Room 4

Workshop 1 - Changing Personal Views on Quality

Date of report: 2024-06-17

Report produced by

Barrett, James (*Dalhousie University*)

Room4_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - B015			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Josie	Auger	Athabasca University	Athabasca University
Fatih	Sekercioglu	Toronto Metropolitan University	Toronto Metropolitan University
Gavin	McCormack	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Brian	Lilley	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Bill	Black	Calgary Construction Association	University of Calgary
Miriam	MacNeil	Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC)	National Partners
Simon	Blakeley	reThink Green	Laurentian University
Doramy	Ehling	Rick Hansen Foundation	National Partners
Steve	Bowers	Pedesting Corporation	University of Calgary
Taly-Dawn	Salyn	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Tess	Adebar	University of British Columbia	University of British Columbia
James	Barrett	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Negarsadat	Rahimi	Concordia University	Concordia University

Summary

The group concluded that quality in the built environment is a shared journey and evolving definition, shaped by the lived experiences and perspectives of the communities and individuals who live within. Quality emerges from a shared endeavor to create spaces that facilitate belonging, safety, liberation, and delight while embracing the diverse needs and aspirations of past, present and future generations.

Question 1) Can you please share one example of a positive lived experience in the built environment? In your opinion, what is the main positive research outcome of the project after two years?

- The group explored ideas of housing, indigeneity, creating space for dialogue, as well as more tangible learnings revolving around research methodologies, student and community engagement, and applicable learnings for the private sectors.

Examples include integrations of traditional knowledge in architectural practice that have been revealed throughout 2 years of research, new opportunities for cross disciplinary collaboration, and a general broadening of language and design understanding from collaborators that have no formal architectural or planning education.

Locations discussed include the rural northern Ontario, the Skyway system in Calgary, and European cities.

Question 2) What comes to mind when you think and experience quality in the built environment? How has your understanding of quality changed since you joined the project?

- The group explored themes of accessibility, user needs and participatory design, resource demands of achieving quality in the built environment, and collective knowledge. The group concluded that their understanding has changed to a position that quality cannot be defined, as its parameters change depending on the user and the context.

Examples include broadening the understanding of quality from a building centered approach to a more holistic approach that considers users, the environment, and community.

Room 5

Workshop 1 - Changing Personal Views on Quality

Date of report: 2024-06-19

Report produced by
Johnston, Ben (Dalhousie University)

Room5_ Location: G.H. Murray Building - G214			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Henry	Tsang	Athabasca University	Athabasca University
Martha	Radice	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Sara	Jacobs	University of British Columbia	University of British Columbia
Thomas	Strickland	McEwen School of Architecture	Laurentian University
Gregory	MacNeil	The Association for Preservation Technology International	Carleton University
Danielle	Catley	Royal Architectural Institute of Canada	National Partners
Isabelle	Cardinal	Société Logique	Université de Montréal
Matt	Nomura	Calgary Homeless Foundation	University of Calgary
Ben	Johnston	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Maisie	Berens	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Yolene	Handabaka	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
	Ames		
Ryan Bang	Ma	Toronto Metropolitan University	Toronto Metropolitan University
Yan			
Alex	Larose	Carleton University	Carleton University

Summary

This workshop discussed the attendee's relationship with quality in the built environment; determining what experiences they have had with quality in the built environment and what quality means to them.

- The places discussed included the Halifax Public Library, a local park in Toronto, and the Maritime Museum of the Atlantic.
- The idea of quality as a social construct and a variable entity was discussed.
- The juxtaposition and balance of quality as preservation of heritage vs quality as updating for accessibility was discussed. What gets kept and what gets changed?
- A major topic was the role of awards in the discussion of quality. With ever-changing definitions of quality, how do we objectively state quality in an award setting? Can a private home that does not serve the greater community be compared and contrasted with a library or public-facing building? With more community-centred and holistic approaches to defining quality, can a home ever be considered award-worthy?

Each attendee introduced themselves and briefly discussed what their site is working on. The top positive outcomes from the year were discussed.

Some main questions are as follows:

- How can we narrow down a concept as broad as quality into one singular definition? Is quality not an ever-changing and evolving concept?
- How can quality change over time? For instance, there were debates about the Halifax Public Library fitting into the city before it was built (lack of formal quality in keeping with its context), but now it is a very well-used and desired space (programmatic quality).

Room 6

Workshop 1 - Changing Personal Views on Quality

Date of report: 2024-05-01

Report produced by
Armstrong, Maëlanne (Université Laval)

Room6_ Location: G.H. Murray Building - G215			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Douglas	MacLeod	Athabasca University	Athabasca University
Ipek	Tureli	McGill University	McGill University
Robert	Wright	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Jonathan	Jucker	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Giovanna	Boniface	Royal Architectural Institute of Canada	National Partners
Leah	Perrin	Halifax Regional Municipality	Dalhousie University
Laura	McBride	Rick Hansen Foundation	National Partners
Sarah	Huxley	Fondation Véro & Louis	Université de Montréal
Panos	Polyzois	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Maëlanne	Armstrong	Université Laval	Université Laval
Marc-	Fournier	University of Waterloo	University of Waterloo
Andrée-Ann	Langevin	Carleton University	Carleton University

Summary

The participants had to share their understanding of positive outputs on quality after 2 years of partnership research and how their understanding of quality has changed since the beginning of the project.

- Quality and scale
- Tension between the different perspectives of quality
- Resource constraints due to the challenges of meeting diverse quality needs
- The missing middle in Urban Planning
- Quality in regard to population density

The workshop explores the themes of urban density, quality of life, and the complexities of defining and achieving quality in urban planning and housing. Participants highlight the "missing middle" in Canadian cities, referring to the lack of mid-sized urban areas that could balance the extremes of large cities and small towns. This gap contributes to urban sprawl and necessitates a car-dependent lifestyle, which negatively impacts quality of life. A key point emphasized is the distinction between high and low-quality density; quality density supports a walkable environment with accessible amenities, whereas low-quality density results in isolated living conditions despite similar population densities. The example of suburbs versus walkable city district is highlighted.

The dialogue also explores how perceptions of quality have evolved during the last two years, emphasizing that quality cannot be detached from scale—ranging from individual homes to entire cities. Quality is also considered over time, long-term sustainability and livability are crucial, especially in the 21st century where ecological concerns are apparent. Participants discuss the inherent tensions between different perspectives on quality, shaped by diverse professional and personal backgrounds. An example being the tensions between the need to reuse and readapt buildings to be accessible which often conflicts with the heritage world trying to preserve the historical aspect of buildings. These tensions highlight the complexity of achieving consensus on what constitutes quality in urban environments.

Resource constraints are another critical issue, as meeting the diverse needs of all residents within limited budgets and timelines poses significant challenges. Ensuring that all voices are heard and integrated into the planning process is essential but difficult. This challenge is compounded by the commodification of housing, which prioritizes short-term economic gains over long-term quality and affordability. The discussion touches on the need for a shift towards decommodification, aiming to treat housing and related services as fundamental rights rather than speculative commodities.

Furthermore, the conversation delves into the importance of context in urban planning. Buildings must be considered within their broader urban settings to ensure they contribute positively to the overall environment. This approach counters the trend of designing isolated architectural masterpieces without considering their impact on the surrounding area.

The workshop concludes with a consensus on several key points: quality is intrinsically linked to scale, it evolves over time, it is shaped by diverse perspectives, and it is challenged by resource limitations. Addressing these issues requires a holistic and inclusive approach to urban planning that prioritizes long-term livability and sustainability over immediate economic returns. The participants recognize that while there are no easy solutions, fostering ongoing dialogue and incorporating diverse viewpoints are essential steps towards achieving better urban environments.

Room 7

Workshop 1 - Changing Personal Views on Quality

Date of report: 2024-07-08

Report produced by
Pintiuta, Iris (McGill University)

Room7_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - Room B102			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Federica	Goffi	Carleton University	Carleton University
William	Morin	Laurentian University	Laurentian University
Virginie	LaSalle	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Shannon	Bassett	McEwen School of Architecture (MSoA)	Laurentian University
Sam	Oboh	Ensignt+ AAA	University of Calgary
Susan	Speigel	Ontario Association of Architects (OAA)	National Partners
Mylène	Gauthier	Ville de Quebec	Ville de Quebec
Victor	Bouguin	Vivre en Ville	Concordia University
Marjorie	Knight	House of Friendship	University of Waterloo
Cara	Chellew	McGill University	McGill University
Cynthia	San	University of British Columbia	University of British Columbia
Brianna	Brown	University of Waterloo	University of Waterloo
Iris	Pintiuta	McGill University	McGill University
Kaiden	Reding	Athabasca University	Athabasca University

Summary

The workshop began with participants introducing themselves and sharing their affiliations, roles, and cultural backgrounds, emphasizing the diversity of perspectives in the room. Discussions on quality in the built environment revolved around lived experiences, inclusivity, and the balance between sustainability, accessibility, and heritage. Cynthia highlighted the value of lived experiences, while Will stressed the importance of engaging with community members and understanding their needs. Marjorie brought attention to the issues faced by multi-generational families and the lack of quality in social housing. Federica discussed adaptive reuse and the need for adaptability in both new and existing buildings, urging the integration of these concepts into architectural education. Multiple participants highlighted the significance of procurement practices and the inclusion of Indigenous worldviews in architectural projects. The conversation also touched on systemic challenges and the disconnect between architectural standards and real-life experiences, with a consensus on the necessity of policy support and ongoing education. Will's insights from an Indigenous perspective underscored the importance of repairing relationships and respecting different perspectives, advocating for a more holistic approach to quality that includes social, ecological, and subjective elements. The participants agreed on the need for a bottom-up approach, driven by community engagement and lived experiences, to foster a better understanding of quality in the built environment.

Key Ideas:

1. **Holistic Approach to Quality:** Quality in the built environment should encompass social, ecological, and subjective elements, transcending mere physical attributes and integrating diverse lived experiences.
2. **Importance of Community Engagement:** Engaging with community members and understanding their unique needs and perspectives is crucial for ensuring that architectural projects are inclusive and truly beneficial to those they serve. How is quality experienced rather than what is quality? as the guiding question
3. **Importance of Respect and Discomfort:** Emphasizing respect involves recognizing and valuing diverse perspectives and lived experiences, which is crucial for creating inclusive and effective architectural solutions. Furthermore, acknowledging and embracing discomfort is necessary for meaningful change, as it challenges existing power dynamics and compels those with privilege to reconsider and alter their approaches to quality in the built environment.
4. **Role of Policy and Education:** Systemic change and policy support are essential for fostering quality in architectural projects, alongside integrating adaptive reuse and Indigenous worldviews into architectural education to prepare future generations for evolving challenges.

Room 8

Workshop 1 - Changing Personal Views on Quality

Date of report: 2024-06-10

*Report produced by
Gutierrez-Kellam, Belle (University of Calgary)*

Room8_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - Room 1005			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Derek	Reilly	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Leila	Farah	Toronto Metropolitan University	Toronto Metropolitan University
Carmela	Cucuzzella	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Adrian	Blackwell	University of Waterloo	University of Waterloo
Jonathan	Monfries	AAA Representative - Stantec	University of Calgary
Jeanne	Leblanc-Trudeau	Ville de Montréal	National Partners
Michelle	Gagnon-Creeley	CRAB Park Tent City / Ay'x Village	University of British Columbia
Michael	Otchie	BAIDA - ERA Architects	Athabasca University
Sarah	Danhay	BEA-Calgary	University of Calgary
Zen	Thompson Gutierrez-	University of Winnipeg	University of Manitoba
Belle	Kellam	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Achraf	Alaoui Mdaghri	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Benjamin	Dunn	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Kayleigh	Hutt-Taylor	Concordia University	Concordia University

Summary

The workshop on day one focused on the question: how has my understanding of quality changed since the beginning of the project? The ultimate goal of the session was to uncover whether there was a consensus amongst the group as to what is or defines quality. Participants reflected on evolving perceptions of quality, critiquing its historical association with expert-driven ideologies. Instead, there was a call to prioritize lived experiences over award-winning attributes, advocating for designs that integrate accessibility seamlessly rather than as an afterthought.

Central to the discussion was the shift towards understanding quality through the lens of human experience. This approach emphasized the importance of shared resources, breaking down industry isolation, and questioning the power differentials inherent in consultation processes versus active participation. However, engaging the public effectively was noted as challenging, expensive, and often excluding marginalized voices, highlighting a need for more inclusive practices.

A recurring theme was translating community needs into tangible built qualities. This required addressing who participates in decision-making processes and how priorities are determined. Quality, participants argued, should be both tangible and understandable, transcending mere aesthetic or market-driven considerations to embrace broader concepts of social significance and equity. The group also explored the role of insecurity in analyzing quality and advocated for raising minimum standards rather than focusing solely on exceptional achievements. Participants emphasized the need for systemic changes in our current market processes and societal norms to address social disparities effectively.

Looking towards the outcome of the session, the group came up with two statements around the consensus of quality:

- There is a dissensus in quality, our project's goal is to understand these divergences.
- Priorities to quality must start with basic human needs for all who reside in Canada's built environment.

These two statements embodied the lived experience and stories shared within the group. Experience in the far northern, and rural, communities uncovered a stark absence of basic human needs prompting an important conversation on the relevance of quality and taste when need isn't being met. Ultimately the workshop underscored and advocated for a more inclusive and holistic approach that prioritizes accessibility, human experience, and social equity over traditional markers of success. Moving forward, participants emphasized the importance of reevaluating power dynamics, engaging marginalized voices, and redefining standards to foster environments that truly enhance quality of life for all.

Room 9

Workshop 1 - Changing Personal Views on Quality

Date of report: 2024-06-14

Report produced by
Mousavi Samimi, Paniz (University of Calgary)

Room9_ Location: IDEA Building - Room 1003			14 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Veronica	Madonna	Athabasca University	Athabasca University
Shirley	Thompson	Mino Bimaadziwin	University of Manitoba
Darryl	Garcia	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Fadi	Wastesicoot	York Factory First Nation	University of Manitoba
Michel	Masoud	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Lyne	de Blois	Université Laval	Université Laval
	Parent	Association des architectes en pratique privée du Québec	National Partners
Grant	Clarke	City of Calgary	University of Calgary
Dawn	Clarke	City of Calgary	University of Calgary
Marveh	Farhoodi	Open Architecture Collaborative Canada(OACC)	Toronto Metropolitan University
Chris	Wiebe	National Trust for Canada	Carleton University
Paniz	Mousavi Samimi	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Firdous	Nizar	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Sarah	Jervis	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Nicole	Yu	Concordia University	Concordia University

Summary

What are each participants' own understanding of positive outputs on quality after 2 years of partnership research and how has their understanding of quality changed since the beginning of the project?

- Defining a common quality principle is not feasible, indicating the complexity of capturing quality from different stakeholders. Despite efforts, reaching a consensus on what constitutes quality is challenging due to diverse perspectives.
- Evaluating quality solely on paper does not reflect lived experiences. Traditional metrics often overlook qualitative aspects of quality, emphasizing the need to incorporate firsthand experiences for a comprehensive understanding.
- Recognizing the influence of regulatory bodies like the Bank of Canada on urban development decisions highlights the broader socio-economic factors shaping quality in the built environment.
- Emphasizing the importance of everyday environments, not just iconic buildings, in creating a quality environment underscores the significance of inclusive design principles.
- Shifting perspective from aesthetic value to holistic values, prioritizing people at the core, reflects a paradigm shift in conceptualizing quality.
- Acknowledging challenges for singular bodies to define quality in diverse communities underscores the importance of inclusive decision-making processes.
- Breaking barriers in understanding terminology surrounding quality fosters clearer communication and collaboration among stakeholders.
- Advocating for buildings to accommodate future growth emphasizes the need for adaptive and resilient design strategies.
- Engaging with regulators and policymakers to prioritize quality in urban development promotes positive outcomes for communities.
- Recognizing the absence of certain voices, particularly from communities, underscores the importance of inclusivity and representation.
- Highlighting quality as longevity and legacy underscores the importance of considering the long-term impacts of design and development decisions.
- Establishing the nexus between social and environmental factors as intertwined recognizes the interconnectedness of human and ecological well-being.
- Understanding the impact of natural elements on mental health and everyday experiences in cities highlights the importance of biophilic design principles.

- Considering small details like grass mowing and street crossings as significant contributors to quality underscores the importance of attention to detail in design and maintenance.
- Recognizing the perpetual need to work on conscientious quality in architecture and design reflects a commitment to continuous improvement and excellence.
- Broadening the scope of quality to include the people who work in spaces, not just users, acknowledges the importance of occupant well-being and satisfaction.
- Acknowledging the role of policy and culture in shaping quality and inclusivity underscores the importance of systemic approaches to quality improvement.
- Understanding quality as multifaceted and context-dependent emphasizes the need for flexible and adaptive approaches to quality assessment and improvement.
- Emphasizing the importance of understanding community needs and conditions highlights the value of participatory approaches to quality planning and decision-making.
- Highlighting the necessity of providing context and themes to define quality in specific projects underscores the importance of specificity and relevance in quality assessments.
- Building a workforce capable of maintaining and preserving quality in buildings emphasizes the importance of investing in education, training, and professional development.
- Exploring connections between quality, heritage conservation, and cultural values highlights the intrinsic link between built heritage and quality of life.
- Considering the future adaptability and social impact of new constructions underscores the importance of forward-thinking and sustainable design practices.
- Recognizing the importance of language in articulating shared understandings of quality and future-proofing construction underscores the power of communication and discourse in shaping perceptions and priorities.

Room 10

Workshop 1 - Changing Personal Views on Quality

Date of report: 2024-06-17

Report produced by
Castonguay-Rufino, Paloma (Université de Montréal)

Room10_ Location: IDEA Building - Room 1004			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Trevor	Butler	Athabasca University	Athabasca University
Samantha	Biglieri	Toronto Metropolitan University	Toronto Metropolitan University
Mercedes	Garcia Holguera	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Bechara	Helal	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Catherine	Riddell	ERA Architects	Carleton University
Darrell	MacDonald	Nova Scotia Department of Public Works	Dalhousie University
Meaghon	Reid	Vibrant Communities Calgary	University of Calgary
Kevin	Ng	Rick Hansen Foundation (RHF)	National Partners
William	Straw	Montreal 24/24	McGill University
Paloma	Castonguay-Rufino	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Brendan	Roworth	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Alexandre	Néron	McGill University	McGill University
Paula	Rodrigues	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
	Affonso		
	Alves		

Summary

As part of the first workshop of the convention, participants were invited to discuss their personal views on quality of the built environment after two years of research on the subject. In the form of a round-table discussion, each participant shared their perspective on the issue, related to the activities of their research site as well as their own individual views.

The structure of the discussion was planned in accordance with the following guidelines: First, a brief presentation of each participant and their own understanding of quality in the built environment after two years of partnership research. Then, answering the following question: How has my understanding of quality changed since the start of the project? Finally, a wrap-up of the discussion in the form of a summary of the main ideas shared by the participants, which can be summed up as follows:

- Rethinking quality from the perspectives of various rightsholders and stakeholders.
- Quality is a complex process that involves listening to diverse, and sometimes conflicting needs, within various contexts.
- Quality is a changing notion that must be grounded in action: Some participants expressed it was important to also identify actions in the context of partnership research.
- The user is a notion to explore:
 - Be more precise when talking about including the user: how far do we want to go with that?
 - The users are not looking at quality from a building perspective, they rather notice the friction points that they find when they're in a space themselves.
 - Can the user also be an active part of producing quality in the built environment? Through their use and their feedback about space, for example.
- Some participants stressed that they had overcome certain preconceived notions of quality in the built environment thanks to the work carried out within the partnership.
- Some participants observed a shift in definitions of quality from material form, qualities, aesthetics of architecture to specific user needs and users see quality;
- Interdisciplinarity in thinking about quality in the built environment is very important. For example, if you're working on neurodiversity, you need to invite health professionals to the table.
- Focus on a broader understanding of accessibility, not limited to physical disabilities.

Quality as a notion can evolve over time: how can architects support these changes over time?

Workshop 2

Notable Outputs and Emerging Convergences

Wednesday, May 1, 2024, from 2:00 pm to 4:00 pm

Room 1

Workshop 2 - Notable Outputs and Emerging Convergences

Date of report: 2024-06-04

*Report produced by
Ico, Narita Reyes (University of British Columbia)*

Room1_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - Room 1202			12 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Mariana	Esponda	Carleton University	Carleton University
Brian	Sinclair	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Alanna	Thain	McGill University	McGill University
Mike	Brennan	Royal Architectural Institute of Canada	National Partners
Alex	Wesang	Royal Architectural Institute of Canada	National Partners
Éloïse	Richard-Choquette	Administration portuaire de Québec	Université Laval
Rosa	Milito	ICOMOS Saskatoon Public School Board	Dalhousie University
Alan	Sukut		University of Manitoba
Mohammad Hasan	Sohaib	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Narita	Ico	University of British Columbia	University of British Columbia
Siba Américain	Bilivogui	Université Laval	Université Laval
Cara	Shan	Athabasca University	Athabasca University

Summary

- How can we make this information more accessible to the community? Most of our current material is written in complex academic language, which makes it hard for many people to understand. We need to use simpler language so that more people can understand it. Each location has gained knowledge from its specific area, but as we make progress, we need to adjust this information to make it relevant to a broader audience. Our discussions have mainly been limited to small groups of people working on the project. We need to figure out how to share this information with a larger audience, including people across Canada and in specific regions.
- Over the next five years, architects will receive tools and education to help them support each other. Our main goal is to enhance the overall knowledge in the field, as there is currently a lack of research culture in architecture. It is important to create a knowledge base by studying previous cases and case studies. Unlike in many other fields where sharing information is seen as a moral duty, in architecture, information is often kept secret due to the competitive nature of the field. We need to question whether we are effectively building this knowledge base. Additionally, broadening the scope of research will contribute to the growth and advancement of knowledge in architecture.
- How can we ensure that we are listening to all relevant voices? Reconciliation is vital, but many groups, such as the unhoused, are still not being heard. While people share their stories with one another, power dynamics can leave some community members feeling marginalized. We need to find ways to minimize these power structures to create a foundation for the exchange of knowledge.
- Whenever we gather information, it is important to ensure that the insights provided by marginalized people and communities are reciprocated. They are often asked to contribute their time and knowledge, but the information they provide is used without any compensation or acknowledgment. It is crucial to ensure that their information is used to benefit them. This requires building and maintaining a relationship based on trust.
- We need to identify the target audiences for the outputs of these 14 sites. What resources are needed for this project? How can we share this information, and in what format? It is important to ensure that everyone, including those with limited access, can benefit from this research. As architects and researchers, we have a moral obligation to share our foundational knowledge. This can be done by identifying our target audience and using a comprehensive approach.

Finally, this research does not necessarily necessitate a definitive conclusion or a concrete answer. Instead, it should be a collection of easily accessible knowledge and stories.

Room 2

Workshop 2 - Notable Outputs and Emerging Convergences

Date of report: 2024-06-17

Report produced by

Bochenek, Justine (Toronto Metropolitan University)

Room2_ Location: G.H. Murray Building - G215			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Robert	Wright	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Enrica	Dall'Ara	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Izabel	Amaral	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Grace	Coulter Sherlock	AAA Representative - Lemay	Alberta
Michael	McClelland	ERA Architects	Carleton University
Robert	Balay	Town of Athabasca	Athabasca University
Talayeh	Saghatchian Shomali	Open Architecture Collaborative Canada (OACC)	Toronto Metropolitan University
Sonia	Blank	Architecture Sans Frontières Québec	McGill University
Shantanu Biswas	Linkon	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Justine	Bochenek	Toronto Metropolitan University	Toronto Metropolitan University
Michaela	Pratt-Tremblay	Laurentian University	Laurentian University
Nic	Kuzmochka	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Meg	Berry	Athabasca University	Athabasca University

Summary

- Workshop 2 focused on celebrating the project's achievements, which covered a wide range of outputs in the knowledge mobilization plan. During the discussions, we also discussed the strengths and weaknesses of certain processes. We had interesting conversations about adjusting research goals and outputs based on community input and engagement. These adjustments became necessary when we used more casual and enjoyable engagement methods, such as gatherings with food. Gathering around food was also discussed as a useful engagement tool as it encourages cultural exchange, for example, hiring caterers from the community with which one is engaging to learn more from and celebrate their culture. The effectiveness of expert-driven discussions was also challenged, with the group conceding that questions about quality in the built environment will not be answered by those without lived experience. Therefore, the importance of co-creation and co-design was brought forward several times.
- The group also discussed the importance of sharing information about the partnership. One of the main criticisms of the knowledge mobilization plan was the lack of focus on action or activism. While the term “mobilization” implies that there will be some action, the current plan is primarily aimed at reaching the public.
- The group discussed the importance of brevity and interactivity in reaching the public. They found the Living Atlas website overwhelming and difficult to navigate due to its extensive content. The group proposed using short videos to introduce each site as the most effective way to communicate with others in the partnership. To introduce the partnership's work to the public, the group suggested releasing thought-provoking, radical, and controversial statements to grab attention (e.g., “All Architecture is Hostile to the Land”). It was also emphasized that all written materials should be audited to ensure the use of plain language by removing acronyms and jargon and discouraging academic titling on the website.

Room 3

Workshop 2 - Notable Outputs and Emerging Convergences

Date of report: 2024-06-24

Report produced by

Mandhan, Sneha (University of Toronto)

Room3_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - Room 1208			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Susan	Fitzgerald	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Anne	Cormier	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Stéphane	Roche	Université Laval	Université Laval
Terrance	Galvin	Laurentian University	Laurentian University
Nathalie	Dion	Provencher Roy	Université de Montréal
David	Down	City of Calgary	University of Calgary
Afsaneh	Tafazzoli	Open Architecture Collaborative Canada (OACC)	Toronto Metropolitan University
Adrien	Kazup	Vivre en Ville	Concordia University
Tatev	Yesayan	Concordia University	Concordia University
Sneha	Mandhan	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Camille	Simard	Université Laval	Université Laval
Victorian	Thibault-Malo	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Nirmal	Adhikari	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University

Summary

In the workshop, all group members briefly described their roadmaps, emphasizing the outputs they had produced and their future goals for their research projects over the next couple of years. The conversation focused on knowledge mobilization plans, with multiple project groups highlighting their efforts on case studies, pilot projects, literature reviews, indicators and metrics, papers/book chapters, and maps and data visualization. The long-term goals of the projects included policy recommendations and interventions, as noted by several participants.

The discussion covered each team's individual knowledge mobilization efforts and the distinction between the process and the outcome. For example, if maps were used as analytical tools, could they be considered part of the process and an outcome? We also explored whether there were outputs that better represented the process but were not currently included in the knowledge mobilization plan. Additionally, we discussed how the outputs could reflect the various scales involved in each project. We also noted that each project team had different resources, but there were synergies and overlaps, particularly in projects focusing on housing for Indigenous communities and accessibility for individuals with different abilities, including seniors and aging populations.

To make the partnership more accessible to a wider audience, the group has identified several interactive tools, such as maps and data visualizations. They also plan to conduct lunch-and-learn sessions at design firms and municipal governments. Additionally, using gaming platforms for design competitions, where participants can imagine a high-quality building or neighbourhood, is being considered as a potential method. Furthermore, to stimulate national debate around the quality of the built environment, the group has highlighted the importance of increased youth programming, including in schools, as well as broader public engagement and attendance at design and planning studios and thesis juries.

Room 4

Workshop 2 - Notable Outputs and Emerging Convergences

Date of report: 2024-06-01

Report produced by

Farfán, Maria P. (Université de Montréal)

Room4_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - B015			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Josie	Auger	Athabasca University	Athabasca University
Fatih	Sekercioglu	Toronto Metropolitan University	Toronto Metropolitan University
Gavin	McCormack	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Brian	Lilley	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Bill	Black	Calgary Construction Association	University of Calgary
Miriam	MacNeil	Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC)	National Partners
Simon	Blakeley	reThink Green	Laurentian University
Doramy	Ehling	Rick Hansen Foundation	National Partners
Steve	Bowers	Pedesting Corporation	University of Calgary
Taly-Dawn	Salyn	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Tess	Adebar	University of British Columbia	University of British Columbia
James	Barrett	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Negarsadat	Rahimi	Concordia University	Concordia University

Summary

The structure of the workshop was divided into four sections:

1. Defining outputs.
2. Explaining how outputs contribute to research objectives: Two questions related to research site outputs within a knowledge mobilization plan:
 - A. What outputs are coming out from the research site?
 - B. Which areas of the plan are currently weak, and how can they be strengthened?
3. Exploring strategies for fueling public debate on quality through citizen engagement and involvement from policymakers.
4. Emphasizing the need for concrete steps and collaboration in implementing technology solutions that address quality issues.

Points discussed:

- Citizen engagement and involvement from policymakers are crucial for driving real change.
- Make the living atlas of quality more accessible to spark a national debate on quality.
- Urgency is needed in technology innovation to stay globally competitive.
- Increased involvement from policymakers is necessary.
- Foster an inclusive environment that welcomes diverse perspectives while driving change through alternative thought processes.
- Potential for innovation and collaboration in dissemination tools, particularly in relation to accessibility and mapping technologies.
- Need to disseminate information to a broader audience.
- Consider technology as a bridge between physical environment challenges and built environment solutions: Innovative ways to manage water quality during drought conditions in Edmonton and Recognize the interconnectedness of issues.
- Develop community practice focusing on adaptation, mitigation, and incorporating indigenous knowledge with technology.
- AI is shaping society, with exponential advancements already underway. Despite differing opinions about its implications, AI will continue transforming various aspects of society at an unprecedented pace. The opportunities provided by technology were discussed.
- Prioritize lived experiences and culturally safe approaches when conducting research partnerships or projects involving Indigenous communities.
- Training and education are needed for researchers to engage diverse communities respectfully.
- Need for a holistic approach to discussions of outputs and the importance of education and policies in incorporating quality considerations in various professions.
- Discussion on the Living Atlas of Quality and its potential to stimulate a debate on quality in Canada.

- Questioning the current usage of the Living Atlas and suggestions for making it more accessible and engaging for the public.
- Emphasis on the importance of education and research in promoting awareness about the built environment's impact on health and sustainability issues.
- Highlighting municipal governments as key players in driving change.
- Suggestions for using social media platforms like Twitter, LinkedIn, and Instagram, as well as innovative videos, to reach wider audiences, including students and community partners. Strategic postings with appealing graphics and ideas would be crucial to maintaining engagement.
- The idea of a roadshow across Canada as a strategy was mentioned.
- The advantage of having 14 architecture schools across Canada can be utilized if a consistent approach is adopted.
- Indigenous people should lead in caring for lands and natural resources in Canada, aligning with recognizing unceded territories.
- Consider building tangible examples like prototype houses incorporating mapping, sustainability, and accessibility features as demonstrations of expertise.
- It was suggested that virtual conferences could be organized using interactive booths on platforms without significant financial investments to minimize environmental impacts.
- Overall, Participants mentioned that incorporating these suggestions will help deliver a compelling presentation that drives meaningful change and fosters innovation in the project.

In conclusion, the discussion underscores the importance of multifaceted approaches. Citizen engagement and policymaker involvement are critical for driving real change, and making resources like the Living Atlas of Quality more accessible can ignite national conversations on quality. The urgency of technological innovation is paramount to staying globally competitive, and there is significant potential for collaboration in developing dissemination tools focused on accessibility and mapping technologies.

An inclusive environment that embraces diverse perspectives is essential for fostering meaningful change. Dissemination efforts should leverage extensive networks and innovative platforms to reach broader audiences, including government officials, researchers, and the general public. Community practices focusing on adaptation, mitigation, and incorporating Indigenous knowledge with technology are vital. The project can drive meaningful change and foster innovation in urban environments by incorporating these comprehensive strategies.

Room 5

Workshop 2 - Notable Outputs and Emerging Convergences

Date of report: 2024-06-15

*Report produced by
Handabaka Ames, Yolene (Université de Montréal)*

Room5_ Location: G.H. Murray Building - G214			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Henry	Tsang	Athabasca University	Athabasca University
Martha	Radice	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Sara	Jacobs	University of British Columbia	University of British Columbia
Thomas	Strickland	McEwen School of Architecture	Laurentian University
Gregory	MacNeil	The Association for Preservation Technology International	Carleton University
Danielle	Catley	Royal Architectural Institute of Canada	National Partners
Isabelle	Cardinal	Société Logique	Université de Montréal
Matt	Nomura	Calgary Homeless Foundation	University of Calgary
Ben	Johnston	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Maisie	Berens	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Yolene	Handabaka Ames	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Ryan Bang Yan	Ma	Toronto Metropolitan University	Toronto Metropolitan University
Alex	Larose	Carleton University	Carleton University

Summary

Main questions:

1. What outputs are coming out from your research site and where would they fit within this knowledge mobilization plan?

Some of the outputs coming from the research sites are:

- It is understood that this is research, but Société Logique would like to have tangible results: documents, guidelines videos or visuals that they can use to give training, conferences and to implement architectural solutions (Université de Montréal).
- Traditional knowledge from research, roundtables, exchanges, methods to evaluate lived experience. Knowledge about neurodevelopment challenges and built environment (Université de Montréal).
- Inclusive design in Ateliers d'architecture (Université de Montréal).
- Community consultations that have resulted in co-creation and community collaboration with vulnerable populations (Calgary University).
- Roadmaps, conversations about policy reform, rezoning to create equitable space, actionable items to influence policy discussions and engagement of political leaders. (Calgary University).
- Design processes, case studies, papers, seminars, mapping, have been used to study and disseminate the information obtained from the implementation of the master plan of the city of Sudbury and a competition organized by the School of Architecture, called Sudbury 2050, which examined the planning of a city while addressing issues of social justice and civic design (Laurentian University).

1.1. Follow-up question: Are there areas of the KMP that are too weak at the moment based on the answers given to the previous question?

- What is weak from the KMP is the practical results for architectural inclusive and accessible design like manuals, toolkits, guidelines, etc.
- As per the First Nations, One House Many Nations is still in the process of gathering all the data from the houses that were built on Big River First Nation, but they really do not have the resources to get Wi-Fi or computers or cell phones. They would like to have the knowledge on how to run and maintain a house. Booklets, teaching on water, solar panels, plumbing are some of the areas that are weak in the KMP for the First Nations.
- Design centres, which are the dissemination to the public or to the users, are lacking a little bit in getting things out of this academic domain (Dalhousie University).
- The way we translate this knowledge to the public must be improved so that people can see themselves in the change as well. This plan does not allow us to do that (Calgary University).

- Changing design guidelines is very good and key, but it is not public facing. We should be part of the solution, adding more engagement for the solutions of the future (Dalhousie University).
- Post-occupancy evaluations and open data are weak areas now. People need them so that they can start developing more handbooks or accessible training toolkits so that any person can read them and understand what they must do (Athabasca University).
- Some of the projects lack a definition of what the objective of the work is, the product, what you're delivering and then who are you targeting? Who's your audience for that product. And without answers to those components, it is difficult to be able to define the outputs (RAIC)

2. Keeping in mind what the partnership has produced so far, how can we use the www.livingatlasofquality.ca to stimulate a debate on quality in Canada?

- The web site should be aimed at a broader audience, as it currently stands only for internal consumption, not for the public.
- There is a lack of public engagement within all the projects. Since their input is important, we should focus on finding ways to reach a larger public and engage with them.
- In our own sites, this activity has a lot more to do with us thinking about the following: What is the content we need to be generating so that we can share it with the partners in the way they need it, so they can use it on the work each site is doing.
- For any social media content to get any attention, it must fulfill three things. It must either educate, entertain or it has to inspire, or all three of the above. According to the group discussion, the content of the website now doesn't do any of those things.
- The sites need to go back to work with the partners to identify content need from the project as the road map continues forward and then we need to create digestible, entertaining, inspiring and educational content.
- We can engage other forums where people already care about this. We can take it to the other networks that we engage with and share this. We want to give credit to this partnership, but we want to take it to other places as well and other forums where people are interested in the built environments or certain aspects of it.

2.1. Follow-up question: Are there other mediums/methods that could be used to further help initiate a public

- Recordings of lived experiences, infographics that explain the world around us and the structure we all live within.
- Infographics, simple visuals, videos that explain some lived experiences from each of our projects. For example, testimonies, like the case of the University of Montreal and the work on design for neurodivergence.
- Social media campaigns like Facebook, Instagram, Tik Tok, LinkedIn, Webinars.

- Development of an interview series where we could start recording some conversations that would inform of our work and point us in the right direction.
- An easy way for us would be for example to get access to information about Heritage Management or what is going on with the Calgary Homeless Foundation and talk about these issues that have fed our research work and then allow the work of lived experience to spread.

Room 6

Workshop 2 - Notable Outputs and Emerging Convergences

Date of report: 2024-06-12

Report produced by
Polyzois, Panos (*University of Manitoba*)

Room6_ Location: G.H. Murray Building - G215			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Douglas	MacLeod	Athabasca University	Athabasca University
Ipek	Tureli	McGill University	McGill University
Robert	Wright	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Jonathan	Jucker	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Giovanna	Boniface	Royal Architectural Institute of Canada	National Partners
Leah	Perrin	Halifax Regional Municipality	Dalhousie University
Laura	McBride	Rick Hansen Foundation	National Partners
Sarah	Huxley	Fondation Véro & Louis	Université de Montréal
Panos	Polyzois	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Maëllanne	Armstrong	Université Laval	Université Laval
Marc-	Fournier	University of Waterloo	University of Waterloo
Andrée-Ann	Langevin	Carleton University	Carleton University

Summary

Guiding Questions:

- 1) What outputs are coming out from your research site and where would they fit within this knowledge mobilization plan? Are there areas of the KMP that are too weak at the moment based on the answers given to the previous question?
- 2) Keeping in mind what the partnership has produced so far, how can we use the www.livingatlasofquality.ca to stimulate a debate on quality in Canada? Are there other mediums/methods that could be used to further help initiate a public debate on quality?

Themes of discussion:

In discussing the Quality Partnership's knowledge mobilization plan (KMP), and dissemination strategies for reaching a wider audience, our group highlighted a range of opportunities and potential challenges. Topics of discussion included: participatory approaches and decision-making, post-occupancy evaluation, intersection among the university projects, outputs and tangibility, education and training, divergent perspectives on quality, and intergenerational knowledge transfer. A clear pathway to intersection across all 14 university partners remains unclear after our short discussion.

Nonetheless, opportunities for supporting meaningful participation by citizens, student researchers, academics, practitioners, cities, and a wider public were discussed. Adopting a participatory research paradigm was brought up to empower the voices of citizen and student participants, especially as it pertains to decision-making. Post-occupancy evaluations also came up in discussions to challenge the assumptions made by practitioners and academics, and ultimately improve the process. Funding incentives for academic and citizen researchers, such as through MITACS, was discussed as another avenue to empower participation in design-related research projects. Enhanced educational strategies making use of artificial intelligence (AI), computer-generated imagery (CGI) software, and virtual-augmented reality (A/VR) could also help promote youth participation. With regards to dissemination of the Living Atlas Website to a wider audience, one opportunity discussed was improving efforts towards managing various social media accounts and thinking more outside of the academic box (e.g., short/funny/educational TikTok posts). Video and design competitions, as well as training module development, were brought up to engage participants and the general public in conversations on quality and design. These could even be held virtually, in ROBLOX or Minecraft, to reach even younger audiences – from whom we, as researchers, still have a lot to learn.

Some potential challenges to meaningful engagement in our research and across all 14 of the universities' projects were also discussed. These include the potential misappropriation of power in decision-making, limitations posed by our own disciplinary biases as researchers, a potential lack of replicability in our collective approaches, the

problematization of quality (i.e., examining it once it's a problem, rather than through a preventative or promotional lens), a potential lack of place-based or land-based contextualization in a wider convergence amongst projects, unclear incentive structures (i.e., of benefit to researchers vs of benefit to citizens). The tangibility of research outputs was also discussed as a potential barrier – as less-tangible outputs might receive less attention. These could include outputs such as participant empowerment or the relationships and trust that are built. Regarding making changes to the Living Atlas website to reach a wider audience, some potential challenges were discussed. These include the current heavy academic focus, rather than one that is centered around social media development and public outreach, which requires time, money, and expertise. The question that was brought up was how participants or non-participants would be drawn to the Living ATLAS of Quality website, and how can they engage with it in a way that makes sense to them. Lecture-style presentations without timestamps or key sections highlighted may not be able to reach audiences beyond academics. Lastly, it would be helpful to provide a supportive platform to enable debate of contentious ideas among project partners. Without it sparking a national debate around quality might be a challenge.

Room 7

Workshop 2 - Notable Outputs and Emerging Convergences

Date of report: 2024-06-17

*Report produced by
Brown, Brianna (University of Waterloo)*

Room7_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - Room B102			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Federica	Goffi	Carleton University	Carleton University
William	Morin	Laurentian University	Laurentian University
Virginie	LaSalle	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Shannon	Bassett	McEwen School of Architecture (MSoA)	Laurentian University
Sam	Oboh	Ensignt+ AAA	University of Calgary
Susan	Speigel	Ontario Association of Architects (OAA)	National Partners
Mylène	Gauthier	Ville de Quebec	Ville de Quebec
Victor	Bouguin	Vivre en Ville	Concordia University
Marjorie	Knight	House of Friendship	University of Waterloo
Cara	Chellew	McGill University	McGill University
Cynthia	San	University of British Columbia	University of British Columbia
Brianna	Brown	University of Waterloo	University of Waterloo
Iris	Pintiuta	McGill University	McGill University
Kaiden	Reding	Athabasca University	Athabasca University

Summary

The discussion in Room 7, centered on notable outputs and emerging convergences, was punctuated by conversations concerning how the quality of one's environment, comprised of both built structures and ecological surroundings, is the greatest prognostication of one's quality of life and future well-being. The group found convergences in the following areas, including safety in the public realm, the importance of post-occupant assessments, fostering infrastructures of care and respect, and addressing ecological and social forms of alienation. Within this context, each group's collective endeavour to promote inclusion, concurrently across policy, practice, and education, despite the pervasive biases of our society, was evident.

- Research sites shared their team's progress with the group to convey the notable outputs made thus far, including draft research papers, community night-walks, film screenings, and post-occupancy, resident surveys. The group provided each present research site with advice concerning research methodologies and projected outcomes.
- Subsequently, the group discussed potential points of convergence across research sites. One significant point of convergence was the notion of housing and architecture as commodities. This emphasized the tension between capital-driven development and the moral obligation to ensure that adequate housing is a right for all. A related convergence among research sites dealt with the treatment of unhoused individuals in public spaces. Furthermore, the development of robust systems of food production to facilitate food sovereignty was a topic that was also discussed.
- The conversation readily discussed the importance of designing spaces of care that are founded on inclusion, respect, and a willingness to understand those who are different from us.
- A recurring theme in the discussions was the integral role of communication among various project stakeholders. This extends beyond the designers to include those who will be the primary users of these designed spaces. The importance of post-occupancy evaluations was emphasized, as these assessments compare current achievements with original objectives while identifying areas for future improvement.
- Within this context, the group collaborated on how holistic approaches could positively change the built environment, acknowledging that a paradigm shift is necessary in a society rife with biases that have led to the current state of the built environment.

Room 8

Workshop 2 - Notable Outputs and Emerging Convergences

Date of report: 2024-07-17

*Report produced by
Dunn, Benjamin (University of Toronto)*

Room8_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - Room 1005			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Derek	Reilly	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Leila	Farah	Toronto Metropolitan University	Toronto Metropolitan University
Carmela	Cucuzzella	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Adrian	Blackwell	University of Waterloo	University of Waterloo
Jonathan	Monfries	AAA Representative - Stantec	University of Calgary
Jeanne	Leblanc-Trudeau	Ville de Montréal	National Partners
Michelle	Gagnon-Creeley	CRAB Park Tent City / Ay'x Village	University of British Columbia
Michael	Otchie	BAIDA - ERA Architects	Athabasca University
Sarah	Danhay	BEA-Calgary	University of Calgary
Zen	Thompson Gutierrez-	University of Winnipeg	University of Manitoba
Belle	Kellam	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Achraf	Alaoui Mdaghri	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Benjamin	Dunn	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Kayleigh	Hutt-Taylor	Concordia University	Concordia University

Summary

We began by going around to present our posters and discuss notable outputs from our road maps, methods of knowledge dissemination used thus far, and intended next steps. We were lucky in having Jean-Pierre join us to provide a direction with the conversation, and instead of a simple presentation of our posters, the conversation was re-directed to consider actionable outcomes that our collective research could produce, and what the road toward that looked like, whether it be a podcast, journal, radio show, or some other form of media.

Much time was spent in the abstract discussing quality. Quality by what standards, in what part of the environment, who are the ones responsible and who are the ones suffering. With 14 sites studying such different topics, they need individual attention - it was not clear after the discussion that there was a wide enough definition of quality to cover everyone's work without simply being generic. That said, there were common threads such as prioritizing intervention, working with the local community, measurable criteria, lived experiences, etc.

A big topic of discussion was prioritizing intervention to those who are truly experiencing the worst of the worst of quality in the built environment; namely, northern indigenous communities living on reserves with no clean drinking water, moldy homes, and leaky roofs. As researchers, and citizens, in urban environments, our ideas and research methodologies are often biased to cities, but we cannot forget the diverse environments that people live in.

Ideas shared to disseminate our work:

- Zines
- Community focus groups
- Offering embodied educational opportunities for accessibility/disabilities
 - e.g. spending a day in a wheelchair to truly understand what poor accessibility design means to those who experience it daily
 - weight vest to mimic what it feels like to be old with less musculature
 - Get politicians to live on a res for a week
- Directing your message to a very specific audience
- Come together as research sites and lobby policy makers, institutions, law makers, etc.
- Public interventions:
 - artwork, performances, expos
 - Curating guided 'walks' that tell a story of quality, or that will improve your well-being
 - Board games or other pedagogical/serious games (Pokemon Go collab?)
- The power of storytelling
- Online tools:
 - maps, websites

Some ideas shared with regard to improving quality:

- Influencing public policy
- Inspiring locally community
- Organizing community groups
- Updating architecture/landscape examinations to new standards
- Updating educational programs
- Tool kits + guides for the public to use
- QR codes in the public for citizens to report on the quality of spaces
- Updating arch/landscape arch award systems to reward those doing important work, not just the biggest and flashiest projects.
- More opportunity within educational spheres for interdisciplinary work
- Improving CCE criteria for arch/landscape professionals
- Putting well-being first

Room 9

Workshop 2 - Notable Outputs and Emerging Convergences

Date of report: 2024-06-10

*Report produced by
Jervis, Sarah (Dalhousie University)*

Room9_ Location: IDEA Building - Room 1003			14 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Veronica	Madonna	Athabasca University	Athabasca University
Shirley	Thompson	Mino Bimaadziwin	University of Manitoba
Darryl	Garcia	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Fadi	Wastesicoot	York Factory First Nation	University of Manitoba
Michel	Masoud	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Lyne	de Blois	Université Laval	Université Laval
Grant	Parent	Association des architectes en pratique privée du Québec	National Partners
Dawn	Clarke	City of Calgary	University of Calgary
Marveh	Farhoodi	Open Architecture Collaborative Canada (OACC)	Toronto Metropolitan University
Chris	Wiebe	National Trust for Canada	Carleton University
Paniz	Mousavi Samimi	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Firdous	Nizar	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Sarah	Jervis	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Nicole	Yu	Concordia University	Concordia University

Summary

In this workshop, we discussed potential outputs for the research project and how those outputs can be translated to spark a national debate on quality. Most participants foresaw outputs as updated planning and design materials, toolkits, and policy change. Participants were unsatisfied with the current state of outreach, and we brainstormed some ways to better engage the public.

- Participants wanted to change what we saw as colonial ways of interacting with the environment (i.e. Privately owned 'public' parks, restrictions and regulations on use of 'public space', close mown lawns, etc.). Outputs were targeted at re-establishing a relationship and/or ownership between people and their environments.
- Current engagement strategies, such as the Living Atlas, Roadmaps, Scholarly reports, LinkedIn, are targeted toward an overly professionalized audience. We should enlist communications experts to help us target the general public more effectively.
- To spark a debate, we should be focused on continual engagement, and putting things on the public's radar through YouTube and social media.
- In general, participants felt like the 'partnership' aspect of this project was de-emphasized, and it felt more like an academic research project.

Room 10

Workshop 2 - Notable Outputs and Emerging Convergences

Date of report: 2024-06-14

Report produced by
Roworth, Brendan (Dalhousie University)

Room10_ Location: IDEA Building - Room 1004			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Trevor	Butler	Athabasca University	Athabasca University
Samantha	Biglieri	Toronto Metropolitan University	Toronto Metropolitan University
Mercedes	Garcia Holguera	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Bechara	Helal	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Catherine	Riddell	ERA Architects	Carleton University
Darrell	MacDonald	Nova Scotia Department of Public Works	Dalhousie University
Meaghon	Reid	Vibrant Communities Calgary	University of Calgary
Kevin	Ng	Rick Hansen Foundation (RHF)	National Partners
William	Straw	Montreal 24/24	McGill University
Paloma	Castonguay-Rufino	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Brendan	Roworth	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Alexandre	Néron	McGill University	McGill University
Paula	Rodrigues	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
	Affonso		
	Alves		

Summary

Workshop 2 focused on the following main questions.

- 1- What are the main notable outputs of the research sites to date
- 2- How do these compare to the original outputs of the research partnership
- 3- What are the emerging convergences between research sites.

Knowledge Mobilization Methods

Several research sites, particularly the University of Manitoba and Athabasca University are focused on developing pilot projects to test developing knowledge within their communities of focus and incorporate user needs, experiences, and feedback. The Toronto Metropolitan University and Dalhousie University sites are primarily looking at making policy recommendations based on their developing knowledge. Concordia, McGill, and Carleton are developing educational tools and guidelines to disseminate knowledge developed within their area of study. The University of Montreal is developing three timescales of knowledge mobilization, moving from educational to professional and political.

The knowledge mobilization methods that were absent across the sites present in Room 10 were Ideas competitions, Newsletters and podcasts, and Didactic exhibitions. There is a general focus on developing expert knowledge for use within the professional and post-secondary education environments, with community user engagement being underdeveloped at this stage in the research partnership.

“Stakeholders”, “Rightsholders”, and Community Engagement

A question was raised surrounding methods for including stakeholders that do not currently have a voice in the research partnership and outreach activities, and whether it is still viable to add missing stakeholders at this point in the project. This raised the point that it may be more equitable to shift the language of “stakeholder” to “rightsholder” as a way of considering the inclusion of diverse voices within the project a necessity and to ground their involvement as an inherent right, not something that is the partnerships to give. Additionally, the expert knowledge brought to consultations with rightsholders by researchers can at times make them feel unqualified to speak on a subject, and unwilling to present their own perspectives.

Dissemination Strategy

Workshop 2 concluded with discussion of each site as well as the overall partnerships dissemination strategy. Conversation focused on the effectiveness of the *Living Atlas of Quality* website as an effective dissemination tool and liked for possible ways to improve the reach of the partnership beyond those already directly involved with its

activities. The following points were put forward with respect to possible next steps.

- 1) Users of the Built Environment are mainly consuming news through other avenues, tv, newspaper, social media, etc. The website may not be the most accessible avenue for dissemination
- 2) Look to developing a communication strategy moving forward that direct toward the website.
- 3) Possibly look toward developing social media strategy for the project.
- 4) Stimulating debates on quality through the website may require identification of the stakeholders and rightsholders that we are trying to reach.
- 5) Different demographics consume information through varying media and the dissemination process could be directed through a focused approach toward the target audience.

Workshop 3

Action Goals for Roadmaps to Quality in the Built Environment

Thursday, May 2, 2024, from 10:00 am to 12:00 pm

Room 1

Workshop 3 - Action Goals for Roadmaps to quality in the built Environment

Date of report: 2024-06-20

*Report produced by
Sohaib, Mohammad Hasan (University of Manitoba)*

Room1_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - Room 1202			12 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Mariana	Esponda	Carleton University	Carleton University
Brian	Sinclair	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Alanna	Thain	McGill University	McGill University
Mike	Brennan	Royal Architectural Institute of Canada	National Partners
Alex	Wesang	Royal Architectural Institute of Canada	National Partners
Éloïse	Richard-Choquette	Administration portuaire de Québec	Université Laval
Rosa	Milito	ICOMOS	Dalhousie University
Alan	Sukut	Saskatoon Public School Board	University of Manitoba
Mohammad Hasan	Sohaib	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Narita	Ico	University of British Columbia	University of British Columbia
Siba Américain	Bilivogui	Université Laval	Université Laval
Cara	Shan	Athabasca University	Athabasca University

Summary

- *Defining action goals and communication strategy for the roadmaps to quality.*
- *Defining the best methods for these goals (long terms, medium terms, etc.), with KPIs.*
- *Summary of main perceptions exchanged by participants.*

The Café-Workshop 3 (Day 2 – 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM) discussed the complexities and various approaches to improve built environments, focusing on community engagement, policy navigation, and quality of life enhancement.

- The University of Calgary's research site work on healthy cities emphasizes integrating health, equity, and sustainability, using an intersectoral and transdisciplinary approach. The discussion highlighted the importance of gradually building trust with community partners, leading to better-lived experiences. The University of Calgary hosted workshops and round tables to engage builders and contractors, signalling a shift from consultation to collaboration. The discussion also emphasized the need for strategic catalyzation to address issues with enacted policies.
- Carleton University research site focused on the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings, emphasizing four main issues: bias in heritage awards, policy barriers, embodied energy, and accessibility. The discussion highlighted the importance of identifying and creating a catalogue for heritage buildings and the need for policy flexibility to allow their adaptive reuse. They employed case studies and post-occupancy evaluations to assess reuse projects' social, cultural, economic, and environmental impacts. In conclusion, they emphasized the importance of identifying heritage buildings by engaging with stakeholders, developers, and policymakers.
- The University of Manitoba team focused on community engagement and housing in First Nations communities. They organized round table discussions to encourage dialogue about housing quality and conducted activities such as building projects and photo elicitation exercises. Additionally, the team highlighted the connection between trade education and housing and discussed integrating interdisciplinary education and training to enhance young people's skills. They also discussed the complexities of navigating policies. Ultimately, the approach emphasized overcoming rigid policies through direct community involvement and hands-on projects, including building homes and creating educational opportunities.
- The University of British Columbia research site discussed issues related to urban parks and the marginalization of unhoused communities. They focused on Crab Park, the only legal encampment in Vancouver, and examined how it was formed and maintained. The team's approach involved mapping parks, identifying inequities, and critiquing the city's decision-making process. They aimed to increase information transparency and advocate for better resource allocation, considering all alternatives thoroughly. The discussion also highlighted the importance of addressing historical land ownership.

- The University of Toronto research site initiated its exploration through the intersection of parks, equity, and quality of life. They used quantitative data to identify underserved areas and proposed specific interventions based on criteria such as surface temperature, canopy cover, and income levels. They further narrowed down to specific parks and developed measurable quality criteria to guide future park development and maintenance.
- Finally, Athabasca University focused on revitalizing rural communities through food systems. They emphasized the loss of agrarian culture and the importance of mutual aid and cooperatives, as discussed previously. Projects like the passive solar greenhouse in Athabasca aimed to re-skill communities and foster local food production. In conclusion, the team advocated leveraging food systems to rebuild social ties and economic resilience in rural areas.

The Café-Workshop 3 highly emphasized the diverse yet interconnected approaches to enhancing quality in built environments. Key themes included the importance of community engagement, the challenges of navigating and influencing policy, and the need for sustainable and inclusive development. Policies that make the housing process rigid also have complexities and challenges. Also, building codes and other policies are rigid in terms of energy performance.

The following key points were discussed for the roadmaps to quality in the built environment:

- Roadmaps to quality should break linearity.
- Similarities among roadmaps can be discussed for future collaborations.
- Roadmaps should also include processes, and there should be transparency in roadmaps.

Room 2

Workshop 3 - Action Goals for Roadmaps to quality in the built Environment

Date of report: 2024-06-25

Report produced by
Ico, Narita Reyes (University of British Columbia)

Room2_ Location: G.H. Murray Building - G215			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Robert	Wright	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Enrica	Dall'Ara	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Izabel	Amaral	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Grace	Coulter Sherlock	AAA Representative - Lemay	Alberta
Michael	McClelland	ERA Architects	Carleton University
Robert	Balay	Town of Athabasca	Athabasca University
Talayeh	Saghatchian Shomali	Open Architecture Collaborative Canada (OACC)	Toronto Metropolitan University
Sonia	Blank	Architecture Sans Frontières Québec	McGill University
Shantanu Biswas	Linkon	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Justine	Bochenek	Toronto Metropolitan University	Toronto Metropolitan University
Michaela	Pratt-Tremblay	Laurentian University	Laurentian University
Nic	Kuzmochka	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Meg	Berry	Athabasca University	Athabasca University

Summary

- The roadmap is a form of storytelling and should demonstrate the constraints of time, the network of actors, processes, changes, and lessons learned from experiences. How can we improve these roadmaps so that they can be applied to other sites and communities? Although each site has its own specific characteristics in relation to place and community, the key points should capture the lessons learned from project experiences.
- When creating documents such as roadmaps, we are often motivated to produce something that appears finalized and definite. However, it is important to understand that the value of this work lies in its non-linear and incomplete nature. The structure of roadmaps should acknowledge that the research is ongoing and should be open to changes. Therefore, our goal should be to document a process, rather than a solution. What tools can help us achieve continuity? This is an open-ended process.
- The roadmaps could involve different types of funding to explain how to obtain resources, develop strategies to attain them and communicate with government levels, granting institutions, or other public sectors. They can also help identify key stakeholders who can help eliminate barriers or roadblocks.
- A portion of the roadmap could be in the form of a toolkit or a booklet. This toolkit or booklet should provide a step-by-step process that can be tailored to the specific needs of the project, similar to a business plan. It should also include financial strategies and case studies. Key Process Indicators (KPIs) were discussed as a way to ensure accountability, but they should not dictate the entire process. They should be open to revisions, clearly defined, related to project milestones, and based on a combination of short, medium, and long-term goals.
- Possibly add progress indicators to show the value of what has been produced. Progress indicators help promote action and ensure accountability, and they can translate into advocacy. They ensure we are on the right path and can be adjusted as the project develops.

Room 3

Workshop 3 - Action Goals for Roadmaps to quality in the built Environment

Date of report: 2024-06-17

*Report produced by
Nirmal Adhikari (Dalhousie University)*

Room3_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - Room 1208			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Susan	Fitzgerald	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Anne	Cormier	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Stéphane	Roche	Université Laval	Université Laval
Terrance	Galvin	Laurentian University	Laurentian University
Nathalie	Dion	Provencher Roy	Université de Montréal
David	Down	City of Calgary	University of Calgary
Afsaneh	Tafazzoli	Open Architecture Collaborative Canada (OACC)	Toronto Metropolitan University
Adrien	Kazup	Vivre en Ville	Concordia University
Tatev	Yesayan	Concordia University	Concordia University
Sneha	Mandhan	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Camille	Simard	Université Laval	Université Laval
Victorian	Thibault-Malo	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Nirmal	Adhikari	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University

Summary

Workshop 3 focused on reviewing and refining the roadmaps prepared by various research sites, discussing their main impressions and insights, and identifying key components of an effective roadmap. Participants underscored the necessity of clear, structured, and visually engaging roadmaps encompassing guiding principles, action plans, and standard graphical elements. The workshop underscored challenges such as the misalignment between government processes and project objectives and the significance of integrating indigenous knowledge. Suggestions for enhancement encompassed establishing a unified framework for roadmaps and the promotion of genuine co-creation among all stakeholders.

Main Questions:

1. What are the main impressions and insights about the roadmaps?
2. What are the key components that make an effective roadmap?

Topics Discussed:

1. Review of Road Maps:
 - Discussion on the 14 roadmaps and their actionable steps and principles.
 - Emphasis on visualization for quality information.
2. Objectives of the Workshop:
 - Sharing impressions and insights.
 - Identifying key components of an effective road map.
 - Defining common knowledge and action goals.
 - Establishing methods for achieving goals (short, medium, long term).
3. Main Insights and Impressions:
 - Need for multiple discussions to fully understand roadmaps.
 - Importance of clear and structured roadmaps.
 - Inclusion of narratives for engagement.
4. Key Components of an Effective Roadmap:
 - Clear structure with action plans and goals.
 - Identification of barriers and opportunities (inhibitors and enablers).
 - Guiding values and principles.
 - Visual elements and diagrams.
 - Consideration of short, medium, and long-term goals.
 - Common graphical elements and legend for consistency.
5. Discussion on Specific Roadmaps:
 - Sharing strengths and areas for improvement.
 - Suggestions for clearer communication and more co-creation.
 - Inclusion of prospective future outcomes.
6. Challenges Highlighted:
 - Disconnect between government processes and project goals.
 - Need for better integration of indigenous knowledge.
 - Difficulty in achieving equal communication and Co-creation.

7. Proposals for Improvement:
 - Establishing a common grammar or template while allowing creative freedom.
 - Ensuring roadmaps have a clear narrative and are easy to read.
 - Defining common knowledge and action goals with progress indicators.
8. Future Steps:
 - Ongoing discussions to refine road maps.
 - Structured and comprehensive guidelines for effective and aligned roadmaps.

Room 4

Workshop 3 - Action Goals for Roadmaps to quality in the built Environment

Date of report: 2024-05-02

*Report produced by
Rahimi, Negarsadat (Concordia University)*

Room4_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - B015			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Josie	Auger	Athabasca University	Athabasca University
Fatih	Sekercioglu	Toronto Metropolitan University	Toronto Metropolitan University
Gavin	McCormack	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Brian	Lilley	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Bill	Black	Calgary Construction Association	University of Calgary
Miriam	MacNeil	Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC)	National Partners
Simon	Blakeley	reThink Green	Laurentian University
Doramy	Ehling	Rick Hansen Foundation	National Partners
Steve	Bowers	Pedesting Corporation	University of Calgary
Taly-Dawn	Salyn	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Tess	Adebar	University of British Columbia	University of British Columbia
James	Barrett	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Negarsadat	Rahimi	Concordia University	Concordia University

Summary

During our discussion, we identified the need for improved communication between teams and partners as the most crucial action item. Furthermore, we acknowledged the importance of establishing a unified methodology or set of guidelines for all teams to adhere to throughout the process. Here are the detailed points:

- Enhance connections between universities: Strengthen collaborative links between universities to minimize redundant efforts across sites. Sharing successful practices and insights helps improve efficiency and effectiveness in projects.
- Develop a comprehensive roadmap: Create a unified roadmap encompassing the activities and goals of all 14 universities. This mega roadmap will provide a clear overview of the project's status and future direction, helping each university understand its role and coordinate its efforts more effectively.
- Share resources, including a comprehensive set of documents from all thesis programs across Canada: Facilitate the exchange of resources and documentation from thesis programs nationwide. This extensive collection of academic work can serve as a valuable reference, promoting knowledge sharing and ensuring that valuable research is accessible to all participants.
- Introduce awards to encourage more students to be involved: Establish a series of awards and recognitions to motivate and reward students for their participation and contributions. This can include scholarships, certificates, or public acknowledgments to boost student engagement and commitment.
- Share case studies between research sites: Facilitate the exchange of detailed case studies among different research sites. This fosters collaboration by allowing sites to learn from each other's successes and challenges, ultimately enhancing the overall quality of research through shared experiences.
- Implement pre-design assessments and systems data analysis: Conduct thorough assessments and analyze system data before starting new projects. This helps determine the most applicable technologies and methodologies for each specific site, ensuring a more tailored and effective approach.
- Establish consensus-building frameworks: Develop structured frameworks to build consensus among stakeholders. This involves identifying and compiling the strengths and weaknesses observed during various roundtable sessions, which aids in making informed decisions and enhancing collaboration.
- Define community criteria requirements: Clearly outline the criteria and requirements for community engagement and participation. This ensures that all

partners understand expectations and standards, promoting a more inclusive and effective community involvement.

- Create open data sets for sustainable design: Develop and share data sets that include crucial information such as embodied energy. This transparency facilitates sustainable design practices by providing researchers and practitioners with the necessary data to make informed decisions.
- Provide policy recommendations, educational resources, and accessible content: Offer comprehensive policy recommendations, educational resources, and easily accessible content. This supports stakeholders in understanding and implementing best practices, promoting a broader adoption of innovative solutions.
- Focus on site-specific studies, community involvement, and living maps: Prioritize research and studies specific to individual sites, actively involve the local community, and utilize the living maps. This approach ensures that solutions are tailored to each site's unique needs and characteristics, enhancing their relevance and impact.
- Explore ways to incentivize innovation: Investigate and implement various methods to encourage innovation. This could include financial incentives, recognition programs, or resources and support to foster creative solutions and advancements.
- Address isolation at some sites by forming smaller groups: Mitigate the sense of isolation at certain research sites by organizing smaller, focused groups. These groups can discuss processes and manage research teams more effectively, fostering a sense of community and collaboration.
- Share methodologies between teams from different cities: Promote the sharing of research methodologies and practices between teams in different cities. This exchange of knowledge and techniques can lead to improved research outcomes and the adoption of best practices across various locations.

Room 5

Workshop 3 - Action Goals for Roadmaps to quality in the built Environment

Date of report: 2024-05-26

*Report produced by
Larose, Alex (Carleton University)*

Room5_ Location: G.H. Murray Building - G214			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Henry	Tsang	Athabasca University	Athabasca University
Martha	Radice	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Sara	Jacobs	University of British Columbia	University of British Columbia
Thomas	Strickland	McEwen School of Architecture	Laurentian University
Gregory	MacNeil	The Association for Preservation Technology International	Carleton University
Danielle	Catley	Royal Architectural Institute of Canada	National Partners
Isabelle	Cardinal	Société Logique	Université de Montréal
Matt	Nomura	Calgary Homeless Foundation	University of Calgary
Ben	Johnston	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Maisie	Berens	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Yolene	Handabaka Ames	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Ryan Bang Yan	Ma	Toronto Metropolitan University	Toronto Metropolitan University
Alex	Larose	Carleton University	Carleton University

Summary

The group discussed the initial question, which encouraged thinking about the key components that made the roadmaps successful. There were a few key takeaways:

- We need to determine who the roadmaps are for to tailor the roadmap to that specific group. To this point, there were discussions about who was choosing the audience. Is that a steering committee, or does this happen at the level of each site?
- Will there be a collective roadmap at the end of the research? If so, perhaps a shared audience could be helpful.
- There was feedback that, at this point, the roadmaps are still a little bit confusing and that including more images or diagrams instead of text could help to clarify this. It is best to present the information in the simplest way possible. It was acknowledged that this is challenging to do at this stage because it is hard to summarize research that is not yet complete.
- There were discussions about the inclusion of process in the roadmap and if including process could help provide clarity.
- Defining audience and purpose is essential to the success and effectiveness of a roadmap.

When discussing shared knowledge or common goals, participants covered the following points:

- The audience could become a powerful connection across research sites if we were to target a similar player, such as local municipal governments or education and training.
- This question potentially identified a missed opportunity to share resources and make more connections across the research sites.
- SMART goals could be employed by each of the research sites to understand better if the goals we are embedding into the roadmaps are achievable.
- There were some mixed discussions about the feasibility of traditional progress indicators in the roadmaps and what those indicators would look like, but overall, people agreed that if they are possible, they would be useful. In many ways, they would be useful, but they can present problems for roadmaps that extend beyond the life of the grant. Specific guidance for long-term goals could be an indicator of future success.
- Shared learning is a commonality across sites that is essential to all of our research.

This is an opportunity for collaborative learning with partners and across research sites.

Room 6

Workshop 3 - Action Goals for Roadmaps to quality in the built Environment

Date of report: 2024-06-28

Report produced by
Langevin, Andrée-Ann (Carleton University)

Room6_ Location: G.H. Murray Building - G215			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Douglas	MacLeod	Athabasca University	Athabasca University
Ipek	Tureli	McGill University	McGill University
Robert	Wright	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Jonathan	Jucker	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Giovanna	Boniface	Royal Architectural Institute of Canada	National Partners
Leah	Perrin	Halifax Regional Municipality	Dalhousie University
Laura	McBride	Rick Hansen Foundation	National Partners
Sarah	Huxley	Fondation Véro & Louis	Université de Montréal
Panos	Polyzois	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Maëllanne	Armstrong	Université Laval	Université Laval
Marc-	Fournier	University of Waterloo	University of Waterloo
Andrée-Ann	Langevin	Carleton University	Carleton University

Summary

Workshop number three focuses on the best dissemination way and how the roadmaps could be the best adapted to be easily digestible for the reader. It brings questions about the target audience of the projects and precisions to be done about the outcomes.

- Representatives of citizen groups and the city were asked about their impression of the roadmaps, and what they would need from academia. For now, the roadmaps presented are considered too dense and academic-oriented.
- The need for education about participating design process where mentioned, to raise awareness about its importance, and information about how to process it, to reduce its timeline.
- The group discussed the importance of educating the public about the different issues but also integrated all levels of Government to be able to make some change. To do so, the dissemination strategy should be sophisticated. Capturing attention is a hard challenge in our present time, and the user experience of the reader is important.
- Ideas about getting inspirational people to present the project in a short video were mentioned.
- The need for specialist graphic designers (UX and UI) is considered a necessity to be able to deliver the outcomes efficiently. The task of making efficient and digestible content is not the specialty of researchers about Build Quality.
- The dissemination by itself will be an important part that we should start to plan now.
- For the best way to present the roadmaps, a layering of the information is determined to be the best. As you explore the website, you should be able to get digestible information, and then a bit more precision, and then, specific information (link on policies by example).
- Different types of users should be able to enjoy the information, from the public to professionals.
- A certain uniformization would be desirable through the different roadmaps, but difficult to reach, as the different projects have specific goals, scales, and target audiences, often driven by the partnership specific to each research site.
- Those three words were mentioned to promote traction: Inspire, Inform, and Change.

Room 7

Workshop 3 - Action Goals for Roadmaps to quality in the built Environment

Date of report: 2024-06-05

*Report produced by
Reding, Kaiden (Athabasca University)*

Room7_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - Room B102			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Federica	Goffi	Carleton University	Carleton University
William	Morin	Laurentian University	Laurentian University
Virginie	LaSalle	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Shannon	Bassett	McEwen School of Architecture (MSoA)	Laurentian University
Sam	Oboh	Ensignt+ AAA	University of Calgary
Susan	Speigel	Ontario Association of Architects (OAA)	National Partners
Mylène	Gauthier	Ville de Quebec	Ville de Quebec
Victor	Bouguin	Vivre en Ville	Concordia University
Marjorie	Knight	House of Friendship	University of Waterloo
Cara	Chellew	McGill University	McGill University
Cynthia	San	University of British Columbia	University of British Columbia
Brianna	Brown	University of Waterloo	University of Waterloo
Iris	Pintiuta	McGill University	McGill University
Kaiden	Reding	Athabasca University	Athabasca University

Summary

The discussion in Room 7 focused primarily on long-term, large-scale goals, including the initiation of a society-wide shift in the way value is defined and measured. Participants emphasized the need for broad cultural change if the project's goals are to be fully and meaningfully achieved, namely an overall "paradigm shift" that changes the way wealth is conceptualised to centre aspects of equity, sustainability, and social value over purely monetary/financial valuations. The need for this change is becoming more urgent as we become increasingly aware of the interconnectedness of physical, mental, social, and environmental health.

Several possible ways of achieving this paradigm shift were discussed, such as introducing guidelines or requirements for every new architectural project to contribute in some manner to community health and wellbeing, accessibility, diversity, etc. Ultimately, introducing these requirements would aim to decouple financial capital and decision-making power in the architectural design and development process. This was brought up repeatedly in relation to residential housing, where construction projects under the current monetary-value bidding system enter a 'race to the bottom' that may encourage developers to use shoddy or unsafe materials or otherwise cut corners in their work; furthermore, our monetary-based values have led to the current national housing crisis due to the commodification of real estate and concentration of rental property ownership.

Relatedly, it was noted that cultural shifts are often brought about by young people and youth culture, as in the case of recycling and the green movement. As such, it was decided that there should be a concerted effort to engage and involve young people in the project goals, using both formal and informal education as vectors to more quickly achieve the necessary paradigm shift. Further discussion centred around accessibility and inclusion (physical and cognitive) as communal good – allowing marginalised people to participate fully in society without being immediately othered (e.g. categorised as 'special needs') while also making the built environment better and more pleasant for everyone regardless of identity.

Finally, the group also discussed achievable short-term goals and outputs that might be applicable to each individual site (of those represented by those in the room). Strategies focused on concrete ways of positively contributing to the communities in which the projects are based, resisting the often extractives approach of academia to instead work collaboratively and develop strong, mutually beneficial relationships inclusive of all community members. The notion of Two-Eyed Seeing was discussed at length and suggested as a way for each participant to incorporate different perspectives, lived experiences, and forms of expertise in their worldview and in their ongoing projects.

Room 8

Workshop 3 - Action Goals for Roadmaps to quality in the built Environment

Date of report: 2024-06-18

*Report produced by
Hutt-Taylor, Kayleigh (Concordia University)*

Room8_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - Room 1005			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Derek	Reilly	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Leila	Farah	Toronto Metropolitan University	Toronto Metropolitan University
Carmela	Cucuzzella	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Adrian	Blackwell	University of Waterloo	University of Waterloo
Jonathan	Monfries	AAA Representative - Stantec	University of Calgary
Jeanne	Leblanc-Trudeau	Ville de Montréal	National Partners
Michelle	Gagnon-Creeley	CRAB Park Tent City / Ay'x Village	University of British Columbia
Michael	Otchie	BAIDA - ERA Architects	Athabasca University
Sarah	Danhay	BEA-Calgary	University of Calgary
Zen	Thompson Gutierrez-	University of Winnipeg	University of Manitoba
Belle	Kellam	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Achraf	Alaoui Mdaghri	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Benjamin	Dunn	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Kayleigh	Hutt-Taylor	Concordia University	Concordia University

Summary

Generally, the group felt that roadmaps need to move farther away from methodologies and processes while still maintaining a connection/context to the work. The audience wants to feel connected to the project and understand questions of: where does it take place? Why is it important? Who is involved etc. Several group members felt that emerging principles of research could be a useful link between process and action.

All participants identified key issues to moving forward (communicating interdisciplinary work, translating research into action modes, projects changing hands etc.) however, everyone is also struggling with how exactly we move towards change. Synthesizing the complexity of research projects into transferable actions has been a universal struggle across research sites. Perhaps we need more mediums to reach our audience. For example, through video, a graphic novel etc.

Overall, the group felt we must strike a balance between providing context to our research (through connection and buy in) while also offering actions that go beyond a singular context (don't go too broad).

- Themes of striking the right balance or tension between research and action
- If roadmaps move too quickly to generalization, then we lose contact not only with the research but also with credibility
- Roadmaps should consider accessibility in how they are designed (e.g., fonts, colours)

Are we missing audience members? If the idea is to reach anyone (without knowledge of our project) maybe we need their input. Maybe that audience changes slightly for each project.

Room 9

Workshop 3 - Action Goals for Roadmaps to quality in the built Environment

Date of report: 2024-06-17

*Report produced by
Yu, Nicole (Concordia University)*

Room9_ Location: IDEA Building - Room 1003			14 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Veronica	Madonna	Athabasca University Mino Bimaadziwin	Athabasca University
Shirley	Thompson Garcia	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Darryl	Wastesicoot	York Factory First Nation	University of Manitoba
Fadi	Masoud	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Michel	de Blois	Université Laval	Université Laval
Lyne	Parent	Association des architectes en pratique privée du Québec	National Partners
Grant	Clarke	City of Calgary	University of Calgary
Dawn	Clarke	City of Calgary	University of Calgary
Marveh	Farhoodi	Open Architecture Collaborative Canada(OACC)	Toronto Metropolitan University
Chris	Wiebe	National Trust for Canada	Carleton University
Paniz	Mousavi Samimi	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Firdous	Nizar	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Sarah	Jervis	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Nicole	Yu	Concordia University	Concordia University

Summary

The general impressions of the road maps and their goals, as well as the pathway to achieving the goals of the roadmap were discussed. Three main aspects were brought up, 1) the roles of the different actors in the process of the roadmaps, 2) the need to adapt the current roadmaps for broad communication, and 3) factors for making feasible recommendations for successful policy implementation.

Through sharing the experience and thoughts when working on the roadmap, the roadmap process was discussed where it was agreed it should be an iterative and cyclical process, rather than linear. This brings the question of the role of the different players involved, specifically practitioners, the public, policymakers, and researchers. The researchers in the group deliberated their role in the roadmap, pointing out that researchers are able to contribute to knowledge creation, innovation, as well as monitoring the outcome of policies. They can also be brought back to the process after implementation of policy for such purposes. However, they are not trained or equipped to make on-the-ground changes, so practitioners and policymakers are crucial in the implementation stage whilst researchers serve as a bridge between knowledge and action. The public, users of the space, should be at the centre of the whole roadmap process as their lived experience is crucial to understanding how to design for better quality in the built environment. The project should therefore ensure open discussion with the public to make sure results are creating positive and desired impacts.

Where the roadmaps are currently at 2024 at the mid-point of the project, an end point is not yet in sight. Now, communication with partners is key to make sure the roadmaps are involving the users and partners to co-create the final goals, where adapting the roadmaps to the language of the audience is vital. As there are diverse stakeholders involved in the roadmaps, the group discussed how the current roadmaps were not in the best format or “language” to be communicating the project to non-research partners and stakeholders of the targeted subject matter. There was a consensus that adapting the research findings and goals into the language of the audience would be important for communication. A strategic communication plan was suggested to make the roadmaps accessible to diverse audiences, potentially with multiple versions of the roadmaps to speak to practitioners, policymakers and the public.

As there was a resounding consensus that policymakers were important players to carry out the recommendations from the roadmaps, the discussion circled around how to make feasible recommendations and action-goals in the roadmaps to bring about change in policy. Ultimately, the goals of the roadmap should be future-thinking and holistic, coalesce shared values, and consider the interrelatedness of the diverse factors and drivers within contexts. They need to be regenerative and equitable, and ultimately centred around primary participants and involve adaptable tools for practitioners and policymakers. To persuade and motivate the change, goals should also be envisioned and visualized with demonstrable precedents or international examples.

Room 10

Workshop 3 - Action Goals for Roadmaps to quality in the built Environment

Date of report: 2024-05-02

Report produced by
François, Dener (Université Laval)

Room10_ Location: IDEA Building - Room 1004			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Trevor	Butler	Athabasca University	Athabasca University
Samantha	Biglieri	Toronto Metropolitan University	Toronto Metropolitan University
Mercedes	Garcia Holguera	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Bechara	Helal	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Catherine	Riddell	ERA Architects	Carleton University
Darrell	MacDonald	Nova Scotia Department of Public Works	Dalhousie University
Meaghon	Reid	Vibrant Communities Calgary	University of Calgary
Kevin	Ng	Rick Hansen Foundation (RHF)	National Partners
William	Straw	Montreal 24/24	McGill University
Paloma	Castonguay-Rufino	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Brendan	Roworth	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Alexandre	Néron	McGill University	McGill University
Paula	Rodrigues	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
	Affonso		
	Alves		

Summary

Very often we are confused on the first step to do and continuous way to follow when conducting complex intervention, initiative, action, project, politic, or programs. We require then a guideline as a reference framework to lead us through a set of well-designed and organized action accepted by each other expressing clearly where we are going and met more sense at the end.

So, insight maybe about the roadmaps as a tool built on some key components to make it effectively happen. Based on that, Roadmap as a tool and guideline must be approached as an iterative (Agile) and collaborative process with enough flexibility to identify key objectives, steps, actions, results, communication, dissemination initiatives and smart indicators. When correctly built, Roadmap should help us raise, understand, and answer to some critical questions: how do we get there? How do we go from where we are to the results?

For workshop participants, roadmap, and research strategies different somewhere in the sense that Research is more going from a problem, a question and trying to build knowledge out of it. In other hand, knowledge is only part of the roadmap. So, that the roadmap is more active, is more invested in action, in fact, instead of knowledge as the road map is mainly dedicated to telling us how to get to the place where we can change things.

Potential diversity of roadmap is aligned on the fact that context is typical and specific to addressed problems included actors, constraints, risks, and favorable factors. In fact, we intercept differently phenomenon, get different thought system, practical and scientific culture impossible to be applied everywhere in the same format or perspective.

In this perspective, roadmap could be a convergence point between multiple partners working together in a very versatile way, dynamic and complex environment where all steps are graphically integrated to guide visually.

According to the participants of workshop #3 day 2, the roadmap should contain elements necessary for proper management of the next stages for an intervention. Knowing that each actor has their own vision of the process of co-definition and co-construction of quality, we should expect multitude of roadmaps anticipating several results and associated indicators. That said, it is difficult to expect a single roadmap with one set of results. In addition, the roadmap must integrate the needs of all stakeholders including the end user who must feel comfortable.

These differences of view were quite visible and palpable during this session considering the way in which certain participants who disagreed with the roadmap approach tried to make themselves hardly heard and understood. Some participants openly expressed their frustration with the focus assigned to the roadmap strategy or methodology as guideline, saying that minority groups such as Indigenous nations have their needs elsewhere in this process. For them, programs mobilizing as many resources should rather address the

primary needs of these portions of the territory such as access to quality drinking water, access to effective education, access to homes to protect themselves, particularly during the summer season "Winter.

The criticisms directed at this roadmap-oriented approach have also highlighted the fact that there is a sort of dichotomy in the levels of language used. For example, they mentioned that the content of the exchanges is too scholarly to be easily understood by representatives of this social category who constantly struggle to access quality training. At the same time, the approach used to identify and select the representatives of this layer of the vulnerable population does not seem sufficiently representative to them.

Naturally, this dynamic involving such many actors whose organizational processes are so specific and complex induces a certain level of complexity and uncertainty. Ultimately, by defining sufficiently well-defined key indicators, it will be much more obvious to obtain tangible results in the short, medium, and long term. It's very important to think about defining the public target of such a roadmap: Researcher? Final User? Promotor?

Workshop 4

Public Debates and National Strategies

Thursday, May 2, 2024, from 2:00 pm to 3:30pm

Room 1

Workshop 4 - Public Debates and National Strategies

Date of report: 2024-06-12

Report produced by
Shan, Cara (Athabasca University)

Room1_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - Room 1202			12 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Mariana	Esponda	Carleton University	Carleton University
Brian	Sinclair	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Alanna	Thain	McGill University	McGill University
Mike	Brennan	Royal Architectural Institute of Canada	National Partners
Alex	Wesang	Royal Architectural Institute of Canada	National Partners
Éloïse	Richard-Choquette	Administration portuaire de Québec	Université Laval
Rosa	Milito	ICOMOS	Dalhousie University
Alan	Sukut	Saskatoon Public School Board	University of Manitoba
Mohammad Hasan	Sohaib	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Narita	Ico	University of British Columbia	University of British Columbia
Siba Américain	Bilivogui	Université Laval	Université Laval
Cara	Shan	Athabasca University	Athabasca University

Summary

- *Do we need to redefine the strategic outputs of the research partnership?*
- *What are the best means for dissemination?*
- *What future national actions should or could be undertaken by the research partnership in 2024 – 2025?*

Individual site strategies

- Insurance, bankers, and politicians are absent from Carleton discussions. Mapping abandoned buildings in Ottawa and considering strategic accessibility for Carleton.
- Developing a sense of ownership strategy for Big River tiny houses.
- Expanding perspective on heritage strategy for ICOMOS.
- Representation and cataloguing of African and Mi'kmaw heritage strategy for CAHP. CAHP is trying to discover its priorities based on a survey and using regional chapters to disseminate.
- Increasing trade capacity and restoring housing autonomy are strategic goals for U. Manitoba's research site tiny houses. There may be ways to leverage the relationship between the architecture firm and the university to reach more students.
- A shift towards more community-based values is crucial for the University of British Columbia research site policy direction. It is essential to align planners and designers with shared values and to bridge the gap between communities and municipalities.
- How to engage in community conversations and reach the people affected by the project – a national approach would be too broad.
- RAIC has expressed a short-term goal of strengthening network connections outside of conferences. Without a stronger network, we will have to reevaluate everything annually. We also need to disseminate information at an appropriate rate, tailored to specific needs rather than using a one-size-fits-all approach.

Unclear project strategic goals

- The following question was discussed: Do we need to redefine strategic outputs of partnership? What were they anyway?
- There was some concern that the trajectory suggests the project will not be as big, bold, and celebrated as it needs to be.
- The simple fact that we are having conversations across disciplines and sectors of society is an achievement. Connections may lead to tangible outputs.
- Does the project have goalposts? Do we know what the expectations are?
- Alternate funding groups have difficulty describing the project and conveying value to firms.

Reflections on the project

- First year – academics took the lead. Community partners emphasized the need to establish trust, cultivate relationships, and truly understand each other's values before moving forward with production.
- The unplanned relationship that developed from the project to assist with poverty alleviation is the unexpected strategic outcome.

- Time is limited for the project, but the work must continue beyond that.
- Do not strive for nationally shared values; instead, find strength in accepting uniqueness.

Suggestions for the project

- More focus is suggested on governments, deciding whether to be collaborative or antagonistic.
- The focus area may be developing political acuity and understanding how policy is enacted. Process mapping was used to effect change—grassroots, laterally, and top-down academics.
- The project can advocate from within. The government already supports the project. We can embed ourselves in a place where decisions are made.
- We are trying to sell a product or service. We don't have a marketing and communication strategy in place, and we believe it would be beneficial to bring in experts who can guide us and advise us on the best course of action, especially when it comes to targeting academic audiences.

Room 2

Workshop 4 - Public Debates and National Strategies

Date of report: 2024-06-05

Report produced by
Kuzmochka, Nic (Dalhousie University)

Room2_ Location: G.H. Murray Building - G215			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Robert	Wright	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Enrica	Dall'Ara	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Izabel	Amaral	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Grace	Coulter Sherlock	AAA Representative - Lemay	Alberta
Michael	McClelland	ERA Architects	Carleton University
Robert	Balay	Town of Athabasca	Athabasca University
Talayeh	Saghatchian Shomali	Open Architecture Collaborative Canada (OACC)	Toronto Metropolitan University
Sonia	Blank	Architecture Sans Frontières Québec	McGill University
Shantanu Biswas	Linkon	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Justine	Bochenek	Toronto Metropolitan University	Toronto Metropolitan University
Michaela	Pratt-Tremblay	Laurentian University	Laurentian University
Nic	Kuzmochka	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Meg	Berry	Athabasca University	Athabasca University

Summary

During the workshop, it was discussed two main points: 1) how to initiate a national debate and 2) who the target audience is for this initiative. We concluded that we need to better define the concept of a national debate to effectively engage with it. When involving others in our efforts, we should strive to create more inclusive and varied forms of participation, such as art competitions and accessible dialogue sessions. Additionally, it's important to reassess the relationship between our work and the people it serves, with the goal of providing meaningful contributions rather than assuming the needs of the community.

- Completing summary of the morning session.

Projects should consider their audience and adjust work and reporting to meet their needs. Priority audiences include:

- Policymakers/ politicians
- Professional organizations
- Educational institutions
- Rightsholders or stakeholder groups (i.e. Indigenous communities)
- The public
- Those in related professions that are not already in the discussion (i.e. planners, trades)
- Other academic/ professional disciplines
- Advocacy/ activism organizations

- Making change is a challenging and intricate process that involves engaging with various levels and interacting with systems that are often unclear and remain opaque to us. Factors such as funding, public policy, and organizational procedures make it uncertain how change occurs. Additionally, the timing for making a change may not align with the timing of the system; for example, some organizations have waiting periods of several years before reassessing their policies.
- We need to engage people in more accessible and interesting ways. Arts-based contests, design competitions, etc., may be productive ways of doing this, moving participation to a less academically focused environment.
- As the project stands, we feel quite disconnected from the groups for whom we are executing the projects. It would be beneficial to have more representatives from these groups attend the next convention and provide a dedicated space to discuss the impacts that the projects have had during a plenary session.
- We need to proceed with an understanding of the organizations we work with and their needs and wants. When working with Indigenous communities, we should make space for their leadership and knowledge production. This may involve incorporating methods such as land-based learning, which may not neatly align with our academic approaches.

- It is crucial to have a national discussion about quality in the built environment, but we need to have a better understanding of what “national” means. We should decide if this discussion is intended for those with established interests or for everyone. If it is for everyone, we need to ensure that it is clear and accessible and recognize that not everyone will have the means to participate.

Room 3

Workshop 4 - Public Debates and National Strategies

Date of report: 2024-06-17

Report produced by
Yesayan, Tatev (Concordia University)

Room3_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - Room 1208			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Susan	Fitzgerald	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Anne	Cormier	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Stéphane	Roche	Université Laval	Université Laval
Terrance	Galvin	Laurentian University	Laurentian University
Nathalie	Dion	Provencher Roy	Université de Montréal
David	Down	City of Calgary	University of Calgary
Afsaneh	Tafazzoli	Open Architecture Collaborative Canada (OACC)	Toronto Metropolitan University
Adrien	Kazup	Vivre en Ville	Concordia University
Tatev	Yesayan	Concordia University	Concordia University
Sneha	Mandhan	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Camille	Simard	Université Laval	Université Laval
Victorian	Thibault-Malo	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Nirmal	Adhikari	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University

Summary

The purpose of the first question of Café-workshop 4 was to establish the missing strategic outputs of the partnership and how each site's research fits within those strategic outputs. The conversation also began with a call from the moderator to consider the involvement of national partners like the Rick Hansen Foundation, RAIC and PSPC, as they have expressed confusion as to where their involvement is required. The discussion turned to the confusion around the meaning of the term "strategic output". The strategic outcomes are meant to determine the bigger outcome goals of each site, such as improved accessibility, procurement, etc.

- Part of looking at strategic outputs is about determining ways of communicating the goals of the project to the bigger public.
 - Narratives and storytelling as a method of communicating to the broader public. This is where indigenous knowledge can come in and play a bigger role in each site of the partnership.
- Restating the bigger goal, the "final what": redefining quality that moves us to heightened equity, social value and sustainability.
- Suggestion to go around the table and summarize what the goals of each local projects is, in the context of boarder project, in plain language, so that anyone can find the content of the living atlas accessible.
 - Toronto: Looking for opportunities to build equitable parks in the city of Toronto by layering of various components of quality (environmental/ ecological, infrastructural/ spatial, social/ cultural).
 - UdeM: Looking at awarded designed spaces to determine what quality they offer to people with special needs, such as people on autism spectrum, in a way that that benefits everyone and enhances the global quality of the built environment. (Universal Design)
 - Concordia: Build a ground-up and integrated approach to quality (integrating livability, biodiversity and decarbonization) that centers around the real needs of the aging population in Montreal.
 - ULaval: Looking at each type of actor involved in a design process and see how their perceptions on the same components of a project vary, applied in the context of the project Quartier la Canardière innovation zone.
- UdeM's project sparks discussion about building for the needs of tomorrow. Is it even possible to consider future needs or is the future to nebulous? What are the pitfalls of "perfectism"?
 - Preventive design considering future floods for example, still needs to be implemented.
 - Indigenous knowledge highlights the importance of thinking 7 generation into the future. Short-term thinking is the true pitfall.
 - Western view: short-term problem-solving thinking, vs Indigenous view: focus on not creating problems in the first place.
- How to make the broader public understand the role of quality in the built environment to get more engagement from them?

- There are trade-offs in design, and sometimes design excellence needs to be sacrificed to the benefit of more grounded actual needs of the population, such as maintenance. This points to giving a greater role for the public in the design of the built environment.

Final thoughts: (1) The public's understanding of what is important makes them demand more. (2) Quality is the relation between many layers – information, design, metrics, etc.

Room 4

Workshop 4 - Public Debates and National Strategies

Date of report: 2024-06-26

Report produced by:

Salyn, TalyDawn (University of Calgary)

Room4_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - B015			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Josie	Auger	Athabasca University	Athabasca University
Fatih	Sekercioglu	Toronto Metropolitan University	Toronto Metropolitan University
Gavin	McCormack	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Brian	Lilley	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Bill	Black	Calgary Construction Association	University of Calgary
Miriam	MacNeil	Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC)	National Partners
Simon	Blakeley	reThink Green	Laurentian University
Doramy	Ehling	Rick Hansen Foundation	National Partners
Steve	Bowers	Pedesting Corporation	University of Calgary
Taly-Dawn	Salyn	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Tess	Adebar	University of British Columbia	University of British Columbia
James	Barrett	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Negarsadat	Rahimi	Concordia University	Concordia University

Summary

Guiding Questions:

1. Do we need to redefine the strategic outputs of the research partnership?
2. What are the best means for dissemination?
3. What are the future national actions that need or could be undertaken by the research partnership in 2024 – 2025?

This workshop focused on strategic outputs, information dissemination, and future actions for the research partnership. A key discussion point was the need to change "public debates" into more collaborative "public conversations," indicating an advance toward inclusivity and cooperation. This will promote meaningful discussion among research groups, thereby improving collaborative problem-solving. As well, participants believed that structured advocacy and public involvement were critical for influencing policy and engaging the public. Suggestions included holding town halls and open forums across cities and provinces to share research findings and seek public feedback. The workshop also emphasized the need for a comprehensive communication strategy with heart-centred messaging to connect with diverse audiences. This involves organizing public forums and creating engaging content, such as short videos and infographics, to make information more digestible through plain language and visual tools. Personal stories and lived experiences were suggested as ways to engage a wider audience.

Participants discussed utilizing various platforms, including social media, podcasts, and videos, for broad and effective dissemination of information. The idea of research sites preparing short videos for the November 2024 online convention was proposed. These videos would feature powerful statements and visual storytelling to highlight the project's impact and relevance. Various creative approaches were discussed, such as having multiple people say one word to create a statement or preparing individuals to discuss topics like parks and accessibility, then finding statements from those interviews. The communication strategy should cater to both the general public and the academic audience. For the general public, the focus would be on simplified language and visually appealing content to raise awareness and understanding. For the academic and professional audience, the strategy would involve detailed educational tools and resources integrated into university curricula and professional training programs. Overall, the workshop set a clear direction for future actions, emphasizing collaborative efforts, structured advocacy, and a comprehensive communication strategy to advance the goals of the research partnership.

Room 5

Workshop 4 - Public Debates and National Strategies

Date of report: 2024-07-03

Report produced by

Ma, Ryan Bang Yan Ma (Toronto Metropolitan University)

Larose, Alex (Carleton University)

Room5_ Location: G.H. Murray Building - G214			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Henry	Tsang	Athabasca University	Athabasca University
Martha	Radice	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Sara	Jacobs	University of British Columbia	University of British Columbia
Thomas	Strickland	McEwen School of Architecture	Laurentian University
Gregory	MacNeil	The Association for Preservation Technology International	Carleton University
Danielle	Catley	Royal Architectural Institute of Canada	National Partners
Isabelle	Cardinal	Société Logique	Université de Montréal
Matt	Nomura	Calgary Homeless Foundation	University of Calgary
Ben	Johnston	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Maisie	Berens	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Yolene	Handabaka Ames	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Ryan Bang Yan	Ma	Toronto Metropolitan University	Toronto Metropolitan University
Alex	Larose	Carleton University	Carleton University

Summary

The workshop focused on discussing national actions to be undertaken by the partnership to spark a national debate on quality in the built environment. The conversation revolved around defining quality, engaging various audiences, and strategizing effective communication methods. The themes discussed included the importance of inclusivity, collaboration, and the need for clear and simplified language in national actions. Additionally, the conversation highlighted the significance of storytelling and narrative in engaging the public and professionals.

Main Questions:

1. What national actions should the partnership undertake in the coming year to spark a national debate on quality?
2. Who are we trying to target with these actions?
4. How can we involve voices currently unheard or not at the table?
5. What mediums should be used to communicate these actions in a meaningful way?
6. How do we redefine or add to the current definitions of quality in the built environment?

List of Topics Discussed:

1. National Actions and Audience:
 - Defining quality in plain language.
 - Targeting a broader audience beyond the partnership.
 - Engaging voices not currently involved in the conversation.
2. Communication and Collaboration:
 - Strategies for disseminating information and sparking debates.
 - The role of frameworks and simplification in communication.
 - Collaboration across different groups and communities.
3. Inclusivity and Equity:
 - Ensuring inclusivity in defining quality.
 - Considering the perspectives of users and communities.
 - Addressing issues of accessibility and social value.
4. Storytelling and Narrative:
 - Importance of narrative and storytelling in engaging the public.
 - Use stories to illustrate the impact of design and quality on people's lives.
 - Engaging with media outlets and platforms for broader reach.
5. Local and National Engagement:
 - Acting locally while thinking globally.
 - Leveraging local initiatives and examples to inform national actions.
 - Engaging with national partners and professional organizations.
6. Educational and Professional Development:
 - Involving students from various disciplines in the conversation.

- Promoting interdisciplinary collaboration.
- Educating future professionals on the importance of quality and social value in design.

Room 6

Workshop 4 - Public Debates and National Strategies

Date of report: 2024-06-03

Report produced by

Fournier, Marc- (University of Waterloo)

Room6_ Location: G.H. Murray Building - G215			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Douglas	MacLeod	Athabasca University	Athabasca University
Ipek	Tureli	McGill University	McGill University
Robert	Wright	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Jonathan	Jucker	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Giovanna	Boniface	Royal Architectural Institute of Canada	National Partners
Leah	Perrin	Halifax Regional Municipality	Dalhousie University
Laura	McBride	Rick Hansen Foundation	National Partners
Sarah	Huxley	Fondation Véro & Louis	Université de Montréal
Panos	Polyzois	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Maëllanne	Armstrong	Université Laval	Université Laval
Marc-	Fournier	University of Waterloo	University of Waterloo
Andrée-Ann	Langevin	Carleton University	Carleton University

Summary

- A uniform graphic language between sites would facilitate comparison and the identification of convergences and divergences across research projects. Standardized layouts could make the information quicker to grasp at a glance.
- Recurring definitions should be harmonized so that the partnership can develop a common understanding of the key studied concepts and principles.
- Lived experiences could be disseminated as a way to engage the general public.
- The partnership should employ a range of diverse media (both physical and digital) to disseminate the research to the various target audiences. Specific groups require specific media and content.
- The partnership outputs should be clear, precise, and prescriptive to raise the bar on quality in the built environment. They should be as concrete as possible, rather than general statements of goodwill regarding sustainability, equity, and social value.
- The professional expertise of communications and social media experts is necessary to ensure a coherent communications and dissemination plan.

Room 7

Workshop 4 - Public Debates and National Strategies

Date of report: 2024-06-17

Report produced by

San, Cynthia (*University of British Columbia*)

Room7_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - Room B102			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Federica	Goffi	Carleton University	Carleton University
William	Morin	Laurentian University	Laurentian University
Virginie	LaSalle	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Shannon	Bassett	McEwen School of Architecture (MSoA)	Laurentian University
Sam	Oboh	Ensignt+ AAA	University of Calgary
Susan	Speigel	Ontario Association of Architects (OAA)	National Partners
Mylène	Gauthier	Ville de Quebec	Ville de Quebec
Victor	Bouguin	Vivre en Ville	Concordia University
Marjorie	Knight	House of Friendship	University of Waterloo
Cara	Chellew	McGill University	McGill University
Cynthia	San	University of British Columbia	University of British Columbia
Brianna	Brown	University of Waterloo	University of Waterloo
Iris	Pintiuta	McGill University	McGill University
Kaiden	Reding	Athabasca University	Athabasca University

Summary

The overarching theme of public debates and national actions brought forth three key questions in our group: Who is the audience for this research? What is quality in the built environment? What are our foundational principles to guide the next few years of research?

We need to determine who is the audience of this research in quality, and how to create digestible information for these audiences before we disseminate. Adapting the platform using the principle of “the medium is the message” in accordance with the main audience will create a stronger end result. As opposed to creating a paper that will potentially sit on a shelf in a library, we agreed that using multiple innovative methods of dissemination will enable greater conversations between generations and different demographics. There should be a nudge to expose this work to people in power who are uncomfortable with change in policy and those who have not embraced a decolonial, two eyed seeing perspective of Turtle Island.

While it may seem apparent as to what quality means at an individual scale, we must define what “quality” is in a broader sense to explain our purpose to the broader audience. While this research has been interdisciplinary, there are still members of the community and experts who are not attending these conversations to share their lived experiences. Quantifying social quality in the built environment can be informed through foundational principles shared among everyone.

To move forward into our goals of national action, we must determine our foundational principles that guide our 14 different research sites and projects. There are multiple convergences between each project, creating an interconnectedness that inherently shares overarching ideas of what quality is. These principles, whatever they may be, will then continue to inform policy change from all levels; the town, the gown and the crown. This will create a template for all site, although it is “a” model, not “the” model. They should encompass compassion and empathy, balancing the pragmatic and social aspects of our goals for creating quality in the built environment. These principals can be guided through the respect for humans, the land and all living things and to repair relationships to achieve quality for all. Respect and repair were the key words used to describe the foundational principles throughout the group. With set principles, it will be easier to enact change at a legislative level.

- Overarching principle: Repair and repair all to create mutual benefit.
- Marshal McLarin: “the medium is the message” and innovate how we disseminate this dialogue to a broader audience
- Continue to integrate voices of experts from the community and invest in fostering wealth of relationships and lived experiences, which will then inform quality.
- Roadmaps should not be linear but be intricate and converge with one another.

Room 8

Workshop 4 - Public Debates and National Strategies

Date of report: 2024-06-18

Report produced by

Hutt-Taylor, Kayleigh (Concordia University)

Linkon, Shantanu Biswas (Université de Montréal)

Room8_ Location: Medjuck Architecture Building - Room 1005			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Derek	Reilly	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University Toronto Metropolitan University
Leila	Farah	Toronto Metropolitan University	University of Waterloo
Carmela	Cucuzzella	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Adrian	Blackwell	University of Waterloo	University of Waterloo
Jonathan	Monfries	AAA Representative - Stantec	University of Calgary
Jeanne	Leblanc-Trudeau	Ville de Montréal	National Partners
Michelle	Gagnon-Creeley	CRAB Park Tent City / Ay'x Village	University of British Columbia
Michael	Otchie	BAIDA - ERA Architects	Athabasca University
Sarah	Danhay	BEA-Calgary	University of Calgary
Zen	Thompson Gutierrez-	University of Winnipeg	University of Manitoba
Belle	Kellam	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Achraf	Alaoui Mdaghri	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Benjamin	Dunn	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Kayleigh	Hutt-Taylor	Concordia University	Concordia University

Summary

Overall, our group saw a large theme in priorities and existing frictions in quality. For example, how can we discuss changing award systems in design, while also hearing that housing is completely inaccessible or unsafe for much of our population? We need to meet the basic needs and human rights of our communities. And then there's another piece to the roadmaps of how do we prioritize the remaining aspects of quality and output? How do we hold reducing carbon, climate resiliency, accessibility while also a significant portion of the population has no access to clean drinking water. The group feels we need to frame these two "types" of priorities to create a collective vision moving forward for Canada.

Most groups saw a common theme that following a linear movement felt slightly uncomfortable in the roadmaps. Many research sites specifically mentioned how they tried (and failed) to create a non-linear path or even feedback loop that could more accurately visualize the process or learning.

- Dialogue around who isn't at the table right now? Who are we missing? Some people felt that there are as many people missing from the conversation as are involved.
- Noticing many groups used icons in their roadmaps. Could this be a universal language across sites? Need to also acknowledge the harmful stereotypes that icons can perpetuate if they are generic and not well thought-out. For example, showing a cartoon home with a traditional mother and father. Are these representative? No as they are currently.
- Seems like we have a good grasp/influence on changing education systems based on our outputs, however policy seems is not well defined and we haven't yet identified the policies that are preventing quality. This needs to be a priority looking ahead.
- Could we use the knowledge from all research sites to create a meta-roadmap or meta-analysis to highlight common themes, distinct differences from the partnership
- We are lacking strong representation from professionals. And most participants agree in this group they are a huge target for change. They could help identify barriers to implementation.
- We need to focus on innovation and incentivization rather than changing old systems. We need new attempts at solving the problem. How can the partnership support creativity and innovation to enhance mobility for example?

Room 9

Workshop 4 - Public Debates and National Strategies

Date of report: 2024-06-24

*Report produced by
Nizar, Firdous (Université de Montréal)*

Room9_ Location: IDEA Building - Room 1003			14 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Veronica	Madonna	Athabasca University	Athabasca University
Shirley	Thompson	Mino Bimaadziwin	University of Manitoba
Darryl	Garcia	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Fadi	Wastesicoot	York Factory First Nation	University of Manitoba
Michel	Masoud	University of Toronto	University of Toronto
Lyne	de Blois	Université Laval	Université Laval
	Parent	Association des architectes en pratique privée du Québec	National Partners
Grant	Clarke	City of Calgary	University of Calgary
Dawn	Clarke	City of Calgary	University of Calgary
Marveh	Farhoodi	Open Architecture Collaborative Canada (OACC)	Toronto Metropolitan University
Chris	Wiebe	National Trust for Canada	Carleton University
Paniz	Mousavi Samimi	University of Calgary	University of Calgary
Firdous	Nizar	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Sarah	Jervis	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Nicole	Yu	Concordia University	Concordia University

Summary

The group worked their way through several topics pertinent to a national debate, who are the potential actors for this debate and what could be the potential benefits of such a debate. The session kickstarted with the premise that housing crisis is a topic worthy of national reflection, which then moved into zoning laws and definitions of land ownership and values. Canadian attitudes to the built environment, both governance and the general public, were discussed and bringing more awareness to issues such as access to basic quality through education reforms, campaigns, etc. were also proposed. Comparative studies with other countries (other than US which is the normal point of comparison for Canada) on public vs private spaces, land rights and zoning laws, climate crisis, homelessness, aging populations, etc. were collectively agreed by the group is innovative strategies at the national level.

- Using the term crisis for housing has misrepresented the systemic issue as something recent when in reality it has been affecting Canada for almost a century now. Rephrasing it to a right to housing perspective could shift people's attitudes and points of action toward potential solutions.
- Who owns the land and how do they influence the use of the land by developers, for example, who are profit-oriented vs those who are denied rights to affordable housing?
- How do we resolve the tensions between public and private spaces in countries like Canada where occupying parks for protests and dissenting voices, for example, are seen as inconveniences that need to be eliminated?
- What are the overarching values of Canada as a country who has ample resources? Why does Canadian attitude toward quality in the built environment continue with the mindset of self-inflicted scarcity? How can we effectively mobilize existing resources to the right causes?
- What do we stand to gain from eliciting a national debate on quality in the built environment? What are the benchmarks for discussion? Are we assuming that people are already aware of what is missing and what could be done better in the spaces they live and/or frequent?
- Data (particularly collecting lived experiences before, during and after projects) is vital to informing stakeholders on outdated building practices through evidence-based communication of the long-term benefits of alternative interventions. Notable example in this discussion is the mixing of affordable housing units with condominiums which faces resistance from people who think their properties will drop in value when the reverse is the outcome.
- Embedding the values of co-creation is imperative to improved quality in the built environment in Canada, where the focus should be on increased transdisciplinary action on major issues such as public transportation, land use, housing, access to healthcare, etc.
- The Rebuilding Haiti journalistic piece has potential on ways to engage people on the complexity of addressing housing, land, policy, etc. while also providing realistic calls to action such as contacting and/or collaborating with the right stakeholders for change in the built environment.

Room 10

Workshop 4 - Public Debates and National Strategies

Date of report: 2024-06-14

Report produced by
Néron, Alexandre (McGill University)

Room10_ Location: IDEA Building - Room 1004			13 Participants
First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Research Site
Trevor	Butler	Athabasca University	Athabasca University
Samantha	Biglieri	Toronto Metropolitan University	Toronto Metropolitan University
Mercedes	Garcia Holguera	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba
Bechara	Helal	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Catherine	Riddell	ERA Architects	Carleton University
Darrell	MacDonald	Nova Scotia Department of Public Works	Dalhousie University
Meaghon	Reid	Vibrant Communities Calgary	University of Calgary
Kevin	Ng	Rick Hansen Foundation (RHF)	National Partners
William	Straw	Montreal 24/24	McGill University
Paloma	Castonguay-Rufino	Université de Montréal	Université de Montréal
Brendan	Roworth	Dalhousie University	Dalhousie University
Alexandre	Néron	McGill University	McGill University
Paula	Rodrigues Affonso Alves	University of Manitoba	University of Manitoba

Summary

Variety of outputs across sites:

- Recognize each group's specificity when thinking out the outcomes. Some groups will have overlapping output strategies, and some will have their own.
- What are thematic clusters of overlap across sites?
- Which blind spots do we need to overcome to have a holistic approach to quality?
- How can we make room for new themes to emerge and challenge our biases?

Policy Influence and Advocacy:

- Policy is crucial for driving change and impacting quality.
- Clear, accessible policy briefs are essential for influencing senior policymakers.
- Need to distill complex information into concise, impactful briefs.
- Disseminate distilled information on social media, media interviews, etc.
- Need to sustain relationships with policymakers. Make them part of the team to understand what they need to implement change.

Community Engagement:

- All sites have a component of community engagement we should capitalize on.
- Importance of sharing engagement tools and strategies across projects.
- Explore and share innovative tools like zines, interactive mapping, storytelling platforms. (consider impact, scalability, and involvement/resources requirements).
- Leveraging existing tools and adapting them across diverse projects.

Collaboration and sharing opportunities:

- Limited resources call for greater sharing of the tools each sites develop in silo.
- Go further than the monthly forums. Identify targeted elements to share and create contexts to share them.
- Share methodologies, tools, training, goals, and community organization expertise.
- Each site has its area of excellence they could distill for other sites to use.
- Students could play a crucial role in exchanging across sites and maintaining overlaps between projects.
- Create opportunities for graduate students with publications (journals, books) and teaching (workshops).

Skill development and training:

- Organize workshops to learn/share from one another or learn together on common needs. (policy skills, engagement tools, dissemination practices, changing curriculum strategies, etc.)
- Consider opening these workshops to/with/by community actors.

Data and Storytelling:

- Qualitative data through storytelling is powerful in understanding community needs.
- What should we do with the data we collect? How could we create a forum for the data to live on and continue to impact change?

Conference critique:

- Criticism of unequal treatment and compensation for Indigenous participants compared to others at the conference.
- Inadequate and racist practices include wrongful name tags, dehumanizing interactions, and tokenism.
- Emphasis on valuing Indigenous knowledge and labor beyond symbolic gestures.
- The imbalance inherent in the convention format favors researchers over participants with lived experience, creating a power disparity.
- We have a responsibility to educate ourselves about the realities of the participants we invite and be sensible to center and valorize their input rather than make them feel inadequate.

Proposal for guiding principles:

- Establish clear partnership guidelines across sites for fair and equivalent compensation and inclusive practices. (For partners, students, researchers, etc.).
- Advocate for inclusive practices that accommodate diverse personal situations to enhance participation (diversity of actors present).

Plenaries

- **Plenary 1** - Rethinking quality through partnership design
- **Plenary 2** - Launching initiatives for a public debate on the Living Atlas of Quality in the Built Environment in Canada
- **Plenary 3** - Indigenous ways of knowing and place making
- **Plenary 4** - Open discussion on the future of a national debate on quality

Plenary 1 - Rethinking quality through partnership design

Date of report: 2024-06-21

*Report produced by
Thibault-Malo, Victorian (Université de Montréal)*

Summary

Part 1: Work plan for the 3-day convention

- The plenary began with Jennifer Bain's recognition of the Mi'kmaq Aboriginal Territory.
- Jennifer Bain also recognized African Nova Scotians as a distinct people whose history, heritage and contributions have enriched Nova Scotian culture.
- Bain addressed the issue of the rapid growth of the city of Halifax and that, through this precipitous growth, it is paramount to ensure the human quality of the new buildings that occupy and will occupy the city.
- The plenary then took a more logistical turn with a presentation of the convention proceedings, beginning with the site and rooms, followed by the presentation of the convention's closing activity, the boat tour. The detailed program for the three-day convention was then presented.

Part 2: Rethinking quality through partnership design

- Jean-Pierre Chupin and Carmela Cucuzzella then moved on to the second part of the plenary, beginning with a review of certain concepts, such as “quality” in the built environment. Quality is often considered from a disciplinary point of view, with architects and designers’ viewpoints predominating (global definition, expert point of view). However, the vision of quality varies from a user to a public representative, to a civil worker, etc. In general, and from a professional point of view, excellence is awarded without being properly able to define quality.
- When asked to define quality, experts consider it cannot be measured.
- If we rely solely on the definition provided by the experts, we are witnessing an elitism of expertise, i.e. the belief that, as an architect, we hold the definition of quality. This vision of quality in relation to the building's aesthetics, solidity and practicality is often disconnected from users and their needs, while at the same time not being refutable.

Quality is currently the subject of debate among experts in the design discipline.

- When judging the value of architecture, what about social value?
- The definition of quality has value when it is collectively defined.
- Where do citizens fit into the process of defining quality, and what impact does their participation have on architectural quality?
- Cucuzzella presented Arnstein scale of citizen participation (1969): a scale with 2 extremes: citizen non-participation 1 (opinion) and citizen control 8. The project would be at level 6 (co-design/co-creation).

- 4 of our research partnership goals are based on Arnstein's scale:

- Leave no one behind
- Articulate goals beyond expert knowledge
- Understanding needs through lived experience
- Solidarity through lived experience

- We should now speak of “qualitative quality”, beyond what can be measured.

- It's important to share research projects, to listen to others, to identify convergence and divergence, and to help projects evolve through discussion. Otherwise, a research partnership is not really a partnership as it does not involved a co-construction of knowledge.

Plenary 2 - Launching initiatives for a public debate on the Living Atlas of Quality in the Built Environment in Canada

Date of report: 2024-06-21

*Report produced by
Linkon, Shantanu Biswas (Université de Montréal)*

Summary

At the beginning of this plenary session, students from 10 rooms presented their summary on Café-Workshop 01 and 02. The most commonly discussed outcome from two workshop sessions was that quality in the built environment is a shared journey and definition of Quality, which is evolving always, shaped by the lived experiences and perspectives of the communities and stakeholders. Moreover, it was also discussed, also a key and mandatory to the process, for rethinking and fostering quality in the built environment it is important to include various rights of all stakeholders. Furthermore, it was also discussed that to define long-term quality and have a lasting effect it is important to include every scale of space and time.

Overall, this plenary session mainly focused on the discussion on how to launch initiatives for a public debate on the Living Atlas of Quality in the Built Environment in Canada. Members of the Dissemination and Outreach Committee started the discussion on who are the potential audiences and how to integrate their voices. Throughout the discussions concerns and opinions, from different students, organizations, and experts, were expressed on how to minimize or curtail the violent and hateful comments of the unconcerned people. Then, it shifted to whether it would be good or bad to have a controversy for the partnership. Is it healthy and if it is then to what extent? In the end, it was discussed that the mismatch between expectations and outcomes happens, which mainly induces violent or hateful comments, mainly due to the lack of inclusion of people and actual users in the process. And, obviously, incorporating lived experiences can be a feasible and long-lasting solution to that.

List of topics discussed:

- Who are the audiences for this research partnership project, and do we need to reach and why?
- Whose values matter? We need to figure out who is missing that we're not thinking of and consider understanding and positively impacting quality in the built environment.
- How do we move out and reach a greater audience as a formal research mode throughout this project?
- Is it possible to have a common culture of a vast and large country like Canada, as small countries possess, that we're promoting, and can this project do that?
- How can we better engage in a multi-way dialogue with those who are not seen and heard? What will motivate them to lend their voice? And are we providing safe conditions and ethical spaces for dialogue?

- How can more people and diverse communities feel ownership in our conversations and outcomes? How do we create that sense of not just belonging, but ownership and the whole process of the partnership?
- Only consultation, like earlier, is not enough rather it is important to promote an active collaboration with the people and have them on the table; how we begin to do that?
- What are the different methods to incorporate the lived experiences of users?
- What are your pain points in the process? What are the challenges in trying to engage these diverse voices?
- How can more people and diverse communities feel ownership in our conversations and outcomes of this project?

Plenary 3 - Indigenous ways of knowing and place making

Date of report: 2024-06-13

*Report produced by
Farfán, María P. (Université de Montréal)*

Summary

The speaker, Josie Auger, introduces herself and mentions that she will talk about Albert Marshall and the concept of the “Two Eyed Seeing”. The speaker also mentions that Indigenous students from various nations have been invited to the plenary. The plenary involves a video by Albert Marshall, an analysis of the concept of Two Eyed Seeing, a round of comments, and a conclusion.

- The “Two Eyed Seeing” concept was mentioned as a guiding principle emphasizing the importance of understanding multiple perspectives and consciousness of the world.
- Land-based training is crucial for connecting with nature and preserving the Indigenous language. Indigenous language guides and reminds us of our responsibilities - to use our gifts to benefit all, not just humans but other life forms too.
- The importance of elders and children in Indigenous communities was discussed, emphasizing the teachings of kindness and honesty. The concept of "Two Eyed Seeing" was mentioned, and how it connects to spider webs symbolizes interconnection.
- A speaker mentioned the importance of “Two Eyed Seeing,” which involves accepting and participating in the unique way Indigenous cultures see the world.
- It was discussed various cultural traditions such as Christmas tree decorations, Beltane ceremonies, winter solstice celebrations, dream catchers, and interconnections with nature. To illustrate this concept, an analogy involving Jack Frost and Beltane ceremonies was used.
- Dream catchers were explained as symbols of interconnectedness in Indigenous cultures, representing star maps and natural patterns.
- The panel participants mentioned that they are there to broaden their understanding and deepen their vision by learning from Indigenous perspectives.

Participants shared their thoughts concerning the following questions:

- What have you observed and what have you noticed in this process of coming to this convention?
- If you're more longer-term attached to the project, what are you observing as to where we currently are, what are your thoughts, and where do we need to

redirect ourselves for a future direction that's more aligned with following the path of truth and understanding?

- Certain values, like respect, equity, and accessibility, were frequently mentioned in discussions about quality and prompt questions. However, they pointed out that there is a lack of discussion about the values and beliefs of decision-makers in the built environment.
- It was emphasized the importance of reflecting on the trust given by sharing personal experiences and knowledge at the conference. They highlighted the need for future outcomes to align with this trust.
- It was discussed their experience working with First Nations communities and emphasized how current systems are generating crises on reserves due to limited funding allocation. They called for deeper relationships and addressing underlying issues when discussing reconciliation in cities.
- It was expressed their shyness but urged attendees to do their own research on residential schools, emphasizing that it is not up to Indigenous people to educate others about their history. They shared personal experiences of living without drinking water in Canada's extreme cold temperatures.
- Living conditions on reserves, including issues with water quality and housing conditions, were also discussed. However, some questioned whether these conditions could be considered quality living standards.
- It was highlighted that personal experiences should be recognized and valued. Time must be considered when planning for change and addressing problems on a larger scale.

In summary, the participants highlighted the importance of recognizing personal experiences and becoming more inclusive. They also discussed the need to unlearn certain values imposed on society and learn from different experiences. The speaker encourages bilingual thinking to be more open-minded and understanding towards others.

Plenary 4 - Open discussion on the future of a national debate on quality

Date of report: 2024-06-23

*Report produced by
Nizar, Firdous (Université de Montréal)*

Summary

The panel members and few members of the audience participated in the discussion on what is a national debate, if the partnership is ready to have one and what would the potential topics of debate be. Panel members reflected on their personal experiences within the partnership so far and the challenges associated with how to best communicate the core principles and values of this project to people outside the partnership, particularly at a national level. The Arnstein's ladder of participation was revisited to understand where the partnership truly lies now and how certain issues may need total citizen control approach over others, for example. The session openly invited participants to reflect on the role of architects, clients, etc. in the larger system of the built environment in Canada that could do with a more positive mindset of co-creation, abundance, interdisciplinarity, ethics of care, reconciliation of mistakes made in the past, centering future generations, among others.

- Conversation could be a better term than debate as the latter implies, we have some answers to provide to the larger public. Also, how do we convince people outside the partnership about the big unknowns of research when there is apparently less tolerance for it, particularly among experts? Furthermore, how do we develop a culture of open discussions on architecture as seen in other countries that host exhibitions, events, etc. centered on the built environment and its impact on people's lives?
- It is important to collectively work on a strategic charter or one-pager description of the project with key representatives from each site so that everyone has a common framework for communication regarding the project. After which, at the next convention/event, the partnership could invite more people from the public and test the ability to communicate it to them clearly using the developed framework.
- How do we address the needs of indigenous communities and their basic rights to housing and land in Canada, within this partnership and the national-level conversation? How do we unpack the tensions between architects and indigenous communities and their duty to consult in ongoing projects in Canada? How can we inspire more indigenous practitioners to be a part of the conversation for the future generations?
- There is a need to leverage storytelling and narrative techniques in communicating basic notions regarding how design affects all of us and why it is important to talk about the built environment with respect to everyone's lived experiences. How are we incorporating our community partner's and citizen groups' needs into the research site projects? How can we formulate a national

strategy that is still site specific and accessible to address these needs?

- Canada is a rich country with rich cultures and resources and yet there is an apparent self-inflicted scarcity in the approaches toward development and addressing the overall quality of life. How can we question current practices in the profession, red tape, etc. toward an attitude shift of abundance? How can we move away from our siloed approaches and incorporate best practices from other countries in our research for quality in Canada?