

AIBC STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

ENGAGEMENT 2.0 - FINAL REPORT

January 2015

SB COMMUNICATIONS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS LTD
422 Third Street, New Westminster, B.C. V3L 2S2
604 842 1971 bruyneel@telus.net
www.sbcommunicationsandpublicaffairs.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

I. Background

II. Methodology

III. Quantitative Summary of Results

IV. Analysis of Results

V. Conclusion

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The approach to AIBC Engagement 2.0 was based on three key learnings from the first round of engagement:

- the internal stakeholders wanted to do further engagement;
- they wanted that engagement to be interactive; and
- they wanted it to be on specific topics of interest from the first round of engagement.

The goals and objectives of AIBC Engagement 2.0 were to develop and implement a stakeholder engagement plan that built on the success of the first round and increased participation so that the AIBC could gain input into potential changes that would allow it to better serve its membership and the profession. Specific objectives were also set, including having 250 people participate in person (up from 95 in the first round of engagement) and another 250 participate on-line (up from 93).

The focus of Engagement 2.0 was on the three topic areas that were of the most interest to the membership in round one of engagement:

- About the AIBC (its role, services, and the Intern Architect Program)
- Act Review and Change (both the potential Act changes that the AIBC had been in conversation with the provincial government about, as well as other potential changes to the Act); and
- Public Outreach & Advocacy (including defining Advocacy and ideas around Promotion, Public Education and working with the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada (RAIC)).

The engagement strategy chosen to meet the goals and objectives was to make the engagement as worthwhile, interesting, accessible, and effective as possible through:

- a consistent format for all events, which included a panel presentation and facilitated Q&A;
- breaking down the engagement into three stages – About the AIBC, Act Review and Change and Public Outreach & Advocacy – over a 12 week period (15 September – 5 December); and
- multiple ways to participate, including separate events for Council, Staff, Volunteers; Open Engagement events at the AIBC and in the Lower Mainland; ‘hosted’ engagement events at Architecture firms; regional engagement in Victoria and Kelowna; events at the AIBC Annual Conference; webinars; and on-line comment cards.

A quantitative summary of the results of Engagement 2.0 revealed:

- the 29 engagement events attracted a total of **717** participants
- **335** people participated at least once, and **109** in all three stages;
- by designation, the participation results were **Architect AIBC (532)**, **Intern Architect AIBC (68)**, **Architectural Technologist AIBC (23)** and **Retired/Honorary/Staff (94)**.
- participation was highest in **Stage 1 (271)**, followed by **Stage 3 (227)** and then **Stage 2 (219)**.
- the most popular engagement formats were the regional engagement in **Victoria (137)**, the **AIBC Conference events (106)** and the **“hosted” engagement events (100)**.
- the **717** participants provided a total of **1182** comments
- All of the comments were “tagged” based on their general subject area and organized under **Advocacy (368 comments)**, the **Intern Architect Program (158 comments)**, **Act Change and Review (292 Comments)** and the **AIBC (156 comments)**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (con't)

The Engagement 2.0 results were then assessed both quantitatively and qualitatively to see if the goals and objectives had been met. The quantitative participation goals were found to have been exceeded with both overall participation of 717 – and individual participation of 335 – being above the in-person participation goal of 250. Online participation of 96 was below the goal of 250, although that may have been to do with the effectiveness of the in-person engagement.

Qualitatively, the strategy of trying to make the engagement as worthwhile, interesting, accessible, and effective as possible was a clear success. This was determined not just by the increased participation figures, but by the quality of the discussion and debate, and the overall number of comments provided.

Finally, the comments themselves were analyzed, including breaking them down into **23 sub-categories** and reviewing them for trends and conclusions. Among the key findings were:

- Strong interest in all aspects of the AIBC's Advocacy role, including general support for:
 - a clearer definition of the AIBC's advocacy role, what it can be done within it, and the best strategy for doing that;
 - a stronger and better defined working relationship with the RAIC; and
 - AIBC communications and engagement activities that focus on increasing public understanding of architecture, what architects do, and the value they offer to society.
- Strong support for the AIBC to continue pursuing many of the minor changes to the Architects Act that it has been discussing with the provincial government, including those related to:
 - decreasing the length of the Intern Architect Program from three years to two to make it consistent with national agreements;
 - decreasing the length of the Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect (BEFA) program from eight years to seven to make it consistent with national agreements;
 - allowing limited liability partnerships; and
 - adding a Duties and Objects section to the Act that would help clarify the AIBC's role with respect to advocacy
- Interest in the AIBC continuing to improve services to the membership in such areas as business programs, communications and the AIBC website.

I. BACKGROUND

The AIBC Council decided to pursue a second round of internal stakeholder engagement – called Engagement 2.0 – to follow up and build on what was learned in the first round of engagement in the spring of 2014.

The same Consultant who designed and facilitated the first round of engagement – SB Communications & Public Affairs Ltd – was hired to design, help implement and facilitate Engagement 2.0.

II. METHODOLOGY

The approach to AIBC Engagement 2.0 was based on three key learnings from the first round of engagement:

- the internal stakeholders wanted to do further engagement;
- they wanted that engagement to be interactive; and
- they wanted it to be on specific topics of interest from the first round of engagement.

SB Communications & Public Affairs used these key learnings – as well as past experience and best practices – to design Engagement 2.0 for the AIBC.

1. Purpose

The purpose of AIBC Engagement 2.0 was to use interactive engagement approaches to get more specific feedback on the subject areas that were of the most interest to internal stakeholders during the first round of engagement. That input would then be available to the AIBC Council to help make changes to the AIBC that would help it better serve the membership and the profession.

2. Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives for AIBC Engagement 2.0 were:

- develop and implement a stakeholder engagement plan that builds on the success of the first round and increases participation so that the AIBC can gain input into potential changes that will allow it to better service its membership and the profession;
- Specific goals were:
 - to have 250 people participate in person (up from 95 in the first round of engagement); and
 - another 250 participate on-line (up from 93).

II. METHODOLOGY

3. Engagement Strategy

In order to achieve the goals and objectives, an engagement strategy was developed which focused on making the second round of engagement as worthwhile, interesting, accessible, and effective as possible.

a) Worthwhile

Based on discussions with the AIBC Council and Staff (and past experience), three elements were considered to help make Engagement 2.0 worthwhile for the membership to get involved:

- *It was made clear that changes were coming to the AIBC* – the membership has provided feedback that there are things about the AIBC they want to talk about/potentially change to make the organization function better; Engagement 2.0 is the next step in defining those changes
- *A commitment was made that membership input would help shape those changes* – the engagement process was the way for the membership to have its “say”, and their input *would* be used in those changes
- *“Learning units” were offered for participation* – it was hoped this would send a strong message about the importance of engagement and the value of input. Given there would be an educational component to the engagement, it was also deemed an appropriate offer.

b) Interesting

To make then next round of engagement interesting, the focus needed to be on the areas that the membership said it wanted to talk more about and/or potentially change. Based on the results of the last engagement, the recommended topics were:

- *About the AIBC* (its role, services, and the Intern Architect Program)
- *Act Review and Change* (both the potential Act changes that the AIBC had been in conversation with the provincial government about, as well as other potential changes to the Act); and
- *Public Outreach & Advocacy* (including defining Advocacy and ideas around Promotion, Public Education and working with the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada (RAIC)).

c) Effective

Engagement 2.0 also needed to be effective, both from the stakeholder perspective and that of the AIBC. *Effective* meant events that were well organized, easy to participate in and conducted consistent with AIBC values (to ensure fair and equal participation). To help ensure this was the case, the following approach was used:

- advance sign up for events (except for the AIBC Conference and regional engagement);
- small group sessions i.e. < 20 people (except for the AIBC Conference and regional engagement);
- employment of a strong facilitator; and
- use of consistent, formal agendas featuring:
 - introduction (by Facilitator)
 - information/education presentation by a Panel of Council/senior AIBC Staff
 - Q&A facilitated and documented by the Consultant
 - wrap up/documentation (via transcribed comments and comment cards)

II. METHODOLOGY

3. Engagement Strategy (con't)

d) Accessible

The two key components of accessibility are to provide *enough time* to discuss the various topics and a *variety of engagement options* so that stakeholders have flexibility with respect to when and how they engage. With that in mind, the following was implemented:

- Engagement on one topic at a time – in order to deal with the issue of time, all topics were not engaged on at the same time (except at the Annual Conference and in the regions). Given the topics and time available, the stages were:
 - *Stage 1* – The AIBC (15 September – 10 October)
 - *Stage 2* – Act Review and Change (13 October – 7 November)
 - *Stage 3* – Advocacy and Public Outreach (10 November – 5 December)
- Offer multiple engagement formats – a variety of engagement formats were proposed to provide stakeholders with the flexibility required to meet their needs. These included:
 - *AIBC Council Engagement Sessions* – to allow Council members to provide their own input to the Engagement 2.0
 - *AIBC Staff Engagement Sessions* – to provide similar opportunities for AIBC Staff
 - *AIBC Volunteer Engagement Sessions* - The AIBC has a significant volunteer contingent, without whom it would be nearly impossible to function. They are dedicated, interested and generally supportive of the AIBC. As such, volunteers represented an excellent audience to interact with and get feedback from.
 - *Open Engagement at the AIBC* – offered at the AIBC Boardroom in Vancouver and open to all (i.e. members, associates, volunteers and AIBC staff)
 - *Open Engagement in the Lower Mainland* – sessions in more informal settings outside of downtown Vancouver
 - *“Hosted” Engagement Sessions* – large and small architectural firms would host sessions for their own staff and those from other firms in the vicinity.
 - *AIBC Annual Conference* – separate sessions on each of the three general topic areas for attendees. Given the opportunity here (i.e. having so many internal stakeholders in one place at one time) the restrictions on advance sign up and attendance levels were lifted.
 - *Regional Engagement* – separate sessions on each of the three general topic areas for attendees in Victoria (for Vancouver Island) and Kelowna (for the Okanagan). For cost and efficiency reasons, restrictions on advance sign up and attendance levels were lifted.
 - *Webinars* - to allow opportunities for those who were not able to attend in person
 - *On-line* – finally, a Survey Monkey application offered the ability to provide feedback on line.

II. METHODOLOGY (con't)

4. Communications Strategy, Plan and Materials

To help support – and manage – AIBC Engagement 2.0, a Communications Strategy and Plan (as well as associated materials and activities) was put in place. It contained the following key elements:

a) Goal

- Provide messaging, communications materials and activities that help increase awareness of, and effective participation in, the upcoming engagement process.

b) Strategy

- Focus information and activities from a “stakeholder perspective” to help increase awareness, interest and effective participation
- Develop and provide support materials and activities that allow for an easy, seamless and worthwhile engagement experience

c) Materials and Activities

- Panel Presentations - these were prepared for Stage 1, 2 and 3. They were provided (along with speaking notes) to the presenters. The same presentations (without the speaking notes) were provided to attendees of all the Engagement 2.0 sessions, and subsequently placed on the AIBC website.
- Handouts – a one page, double-sided handout was prepared for Stage 1, 2 and 3 that provided additional information on the topic being covered. They were provided to attendees of all the Engagement 2.0 sessions, and subsequently placed on the AIBC website.
- Comment Cards - Comment cards were also provided to all attendees, who had the option of filling them out/handing them in to the facilitator after the sessions or doing them on-line. The on-line versions were the same as those handed out in person. All comment cards were viewed only by the Consultant to address any concerns about confidentiality/anonymity.

d) Sign In Sheets

- Sign in sheets were used at every session, and attendees needed to sign in order to get their “LU”. For the webinars, participants had to actually log into the webinar in order to qualify for their LU.

e) AIBC Annual Conference Support

- Delegate package - information on the engagement was developed and included in the AIBC Conference delegate package
- Static Display – a static display on the overall engagement program was developed for the AIBC Conference and set up in a high traffic area
- Council identification – Council members had identification which prominently identified them to further encourage discussion

f) Regional Liaison

- AIBC worked closely with key representatives in Victoria and Kelowna on both locations for the engagement and to help increase attendance. This was particularly successful because of the efforts of Don Lovell in Victoria and Nick Bevanda in Kelowna.

III. QUANTITATIVE SUMMARY OF RESULTS

1. Participation

a) Overall

There were a total of **717**¹ participants in Engagement 2.0. Participation is defined as attending “live” engagement events, webinars or doing so on-line via the comment cards.

b) By Individual

A review of the participants showed that **335**² people participated at least once in Engagement 2.0. A total of **109** participated in all three stages.

c) By Designation

All participants were asked to identify themselves, including with their designation³.

Designation	Number
Architect AIBC	532
Intern Architect AIBC	68
Architectural Technologist AIBC	23
Other (Retired, Honorary, Staff)	94
TOTAL	717

d) By Format and Stage

Format	Number	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Total
AIBC Council	1 ⁴	20 ⁵	n/a	n/a	20
AIBC Volunteers	1 ⁴	12	n/a	n/a	12
AIBC Staff	3	17	18	13	48
Open at AIBC	3	17	18	17	52
Open in the regions	1 ⁴	11	n/a	n/a	11
Hosted	6 (2 per stage)	38	34	28	100
Webinars	5 (2/1/2)	28	11	48	87
Regional - Victoria	1 (3 events)	43	49	45	137
Regional - Kelowna	1 (3 events)	17	16	15	48
AIBC Conference	1 (3 events)	23	45	38	106
Online	n/a	45	28	23	96
TOTALS	29	271	219	227	717

¹ These numbers include those who attended one or more events or filled out one or more on-line comment card. Multiple participation was encouraged because there were three stages to Engagement 2.0, and the membership could earn an LU for each stage (except for using the on-line comment cards, which did not qualify for LUs).

² These numbers reflect the number of individual members, associates and staff who participated at least once.

³ These numbers represent a breakdown of the overall number of members, associates and staff that participated.

⁴ There only ended up being one Council, Volunteer and Open in the Regions event. For Council, it was a logistical issue. For the others, there was not sufficient sign up in advance to justify the time and/or expense so they were cancelled.

⁵ This meeting included 6 senior staff in attendance.

III. QUANTITATIVE SUMMARY OF RESULTS (con't)

2. Comments

“Comments” are defined as questions or comments provided at the engagement events -- either verbally (in which case they were recorded or via submitted comment cards), electronically during the webinars, or via the on-line comment cards. All of the comments were “tagged” based on their general subject area and organized in tables, and placed in an Appendix that went along with the AIBC Council Report¹.

a) Overall

A total of **1182** comments were received through the engagement process.

b) By Topic Area

Below are the most popular topics raised during the engagement. Note that some topic areas (eg. Advocacy) came up in all three stages.

General Area	Specific Topic	Number	
Advocacy	Advocacy	121	
	RAIC	73	
	Promotion	44	
	Public Education	84	
	Municipal Outreach	19	
	Outreach	4	
	Schools	23	
	TOTAL ADVOCACY		368
Intern Architect Program	TOTAL INTERN ARCHITECT PROGRAM	158	
Act Review & Change	Duties & Objects	33	
	Sections 6, 8, 12, 15	5	
	Act: Section 26	33	
	Act: Section 36	50	
	Act: Section 37	30	
	Act: Sections 46 - 50	29	
	Act: Sections 59 & 60	11	
	Act: Section 60	12	
	Act: Section 61 - 63	13	
	General Act Review	76	
	TOTAL ACT REVIEW & CHANGE		292
	AIBC	Regulatory Role	20
		AIBC Services	71
AIBC Services/Regions		5	
Communications		21	
Engagement		20	
Fees		19	
TOTAL AIBC		156	
TOTAL		1182	

¹The Appendix of verbatim comments is not included in the AIBC membership report in order to deal with any issues related to anonymity and confidentiality.

IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

1. Engagement goals

The vast majority of the goals set out at the beginning of Engagement 2.0 were met, and in fact surpassed. Overall participation was up significantly at **717**, (exceeding the Engagement 2.0 goal of 500 and the 188 figure in the first round of engagement). Individual participation was also up at **335** (compared to the Engagement 2.0 goal of 250 and figure of 95 in the first round of engagement). These figures mean that almost 25 per cent of the total AIBC membership participated at least once in Engagement 2.0.

The only quantitative measure not met was the on-line engagement goal of 250, as only 96 participated one-line. However, the fact that so many more participated in person more than made up for that deficit.

2. Engagement strategy

Judging by the participation levels and tone of the discussions, virtually all aspects of the Engagement 2.0 strategy were successful. Participants appeared to find the engagement events worthwhile, interesting, accessible, and effective. There were only a couple of minor issues regarding participation early on, and both were well managed by the facilitator and the group.

The offering of a “Learning Unit” (LU) in each stage may have played a big part in the success of the strategy, and should be considered in the future.

3. Engagement formats

a) General

The general approach to Engagement 2.0 events (sign up in advance, 20 person maximum attendance except for the Conference and Regional Engagement) and event format (introduction, short panel presentation, three handouts – presentation, topic “one-pager” and comment card -- and facilitated Q&A based on a set of rules) appeared to work very well. The former allowed for effective planning in advance and helped ensure the events ran on time. And the consistent event format meant that all participants understood the process “up front”, the presentation was kept short enough (8 – 15 minutes) to maximize the opportunities for input; and the rules/facilitated Q&A allowed for optimum, equal and fair participation.

The last point regarding the rules/facilitated Q&A was of particular importance, particularly in the early stages of Engagement 2.0. At the first two events, there were attempts to disrupt the process, but they were effectively shut down by a combination of the facilitator and the group itself. They did not re-occur in the remaining stages.

IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

4. Engagement formats (con't)

b) AIBC Council Engagement

Council only had one separate opportunity for engagement in Stage 1. However, it was very involved all the way through, and the individual members who attended the different events had opportunities to provide input at those events.

c) AIBC Volunteer Engagement

Attempts to engage AIBC Volunteers were only successful in Stage 1. Pre-event sign up in the other two stages was so low that they were cancelled in advance. Reasons for this lack of success may include the fact that the Volunteers were also eligible to participate in the other events, as many appeared to do so.

d) AIBC Staff Engagement

AIBC Staff engagement events were well attended in all three stages and participation during the Q&A was good. The Staff seemed to appreciate gaining a better understanding of Engagement 2.0, as well as the opportunity to provide input from their perspective.

e) Open at the AIBC

The “Open” events at the AIBC were fairly well attended, although never reached their maximum enrolment. Their timing (5:00 – 6:30) seemed to work well for participants, who were able to come after work but not have to stay for the whole evening.

f) Open in the Regions

This format was not successful and was cancelled after the first attempt in North Vancouver. The location – a restaurant/pub – proved to be too loud and difficult in which to do engagement successfully. More problematic, however, there was little interest in attending from the membership, with the event only attracting 11 attendees (including AIBC Council members and staff). The other two events planned for Surrey and Langley ended up being cancelled when only two people signed up in advance.

This experience was similar to what happened in the first round of engagement (less than ten people showed up for an event in Surrey) and therefore calls into question whether Lower Mainland regional events like these should be done in the future given their expense and the time it takes for Council/Staff to support them.

IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

4. Engagement formats (con't)

g) Hosted Events

The “hosted” events proved very successful. Most came close to the maximum attendance levels, and there was a good mix of people from different firms at each event. Most importantly, the familiar environment seemed to increase the quality of engagement significantly, with very strong participation and a significant amount of input (often 10 – 15 pages of flip chart comments and questions per event).

There were only minor logistical issues with these events, related to the fact that the host firm was responsible for ensuring attendance. That put additional work on the person at the firm responsible and also necessitated more follow up by AIBC staff to ensure numbers, logistics, etc. These issues were overcome, however, and should not impact whether this kind of event is used in the future.

h) Webinars

The webinars also proved both popular and successful. From a technology point of view, the Adobe Connect approach worked very well and met the needs of the engagement. There were a couple of “kinks” (losing sound, for example), but those were overcome during the sessions themselves and the participants were very patient. The presentations and facilitated Q&A appeared to work just as well in a webinar format as in person. One interesting challenge was that the actual number of attendees was never as high as was RSVP'd. While this happened at most events, it was most evident at the webinars. Overall, many participants – particularly those in other parts of the province – expressed their appreciation for being able to participate in this manner. This approach should therefore be used again.

i) Regional Engagement

- Victoria – the Vancouver Island regional engagement in Victoria was an overwhelming success. Almost 20 per cent of the total participants in Engagement 2.0 came from the one day spent in Victoria, with most people staying for all three sessions. Having all three stages in one day – back to back – also worked fine, as did as not putting limits on attendance. The discussion and feedback at the sessions was also excellent, with significant passion but no participation issues. A big part of the credit for the participation numbers goes to Don Lovell, who personally help ensure a large turnout. The only real issue was logistical – weather impacted travel for some Council members coming from Vancouver. Given this success, Vancouver Island should continue to be a focus for AIBC engagement in the future.
- Kelowna – after initial logistical difficulties (i.e. finding a venue, getting contact information, etc.), Kelowna regional engagement was also relatively successful. Although the costs are higher to do events in Kelowna – and the potential audience base lower – attendees did appreciate seeing the AIBC there. Given AIBC's provincial mandated, Kelowna should be considered again in the future.

IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

4. Engagement formats (con't)

j) AIBC Annual Conference

The three Engagement 2.0 sessions held at the 2014 AIBC Annual Conference were a great success. Turnout of 106 (23/45/38) was excellent, with no problems facilitating the larger numbers per session. The tone and content of the discussions were also excellent, including a frank but fair and open discussion on Act Review. All of this was done with somewhat limited promotion in advance (given the late decision to hold the sessions at the Conference). Based on these results, the AIBC Annual Conference should definitely be a focal point for engagement in the future.

k) On-line (Comment Cards)

Finally, the on-line participation (via Comment Cards) did not meet the original goals (96 vs 250), but since that was more than made up for by the “in-person” engagement success, that is acceptable. Those who did participate on-line tended to provide more detailed and/or specific comments, which were often helpful in defining themes and trends.

5. Engagement Logistics

Overall logistics once again went very well, mainly because of the excellent work by Tracy Tough at the AIBC. There were some minor challenges with getting Council members “signed up” to participate at the Engagement sessions, but those were overcome. The same was the case with finding external venues for engagement. The other piece that worked well was the pre-registration for engagement events. That allowed for better advance preparation and the ability to cancel sessions if necessary (to avoid unnecessary costs)

6. Engagement Communications

Engagement 2.0 communications was once again done via the AIBC eBlast process, usually on Mondays. Each eBlast focussed on the opportunities in the two weeks ahead and there was nearly always a “jump” in sign-up right after the eBlast. The process taken for the eBlasts - the Consultant writing the first draft with Grace Battiston coordinating approvals and Jennie Reckon sending them out – was very efficient as well.

7. Engagement by Designation

As was the case with the first round of engagement, the vast majority of attendees in Engagement 2.0 were Architects AIBC (532 of 717), followed by Intern Architects (68) and Architectural Technologists (23). Since “members” were a major focus, this can be considered a success. A caution, however, is that because the Intern Architect program is such an important issue, there may need for more tailored/focused events for Interns in the future.

IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

8. Engagement Comments

After a review of the **1182** comments and questions received during Engagement 2.0, a number of themes and/or conclusions emerged. What follows is a summary of those, broken down by general category of comments.

a) Advocacy (368)

i) General

Of the 121 general comments related to the topic of Advocacy, there were a total of 24 that made explicit reference to support or opposition to an Advocacy role for the AIBC. Of those 24 comments, 18 were specifically in favour and 6 outright against an advocacy role for the AIBC.

Among the themes or trends that emerged from the general Advocacy comments were:

- *Separate Advocacy organization* – There was potential interest in a separate organization doing Advocacy (separate from the AIBC)
- *Advocacy definition* - If the AIBC is going to do Advocacy, the need to:
 - define what Advocacy actually is;
 - develop a strategy for Advocacy; and
 - have Advocacy be focused ‘on behalf of the public interest/public safety’
- *Costs/payment for advocacy* – This was raised with respect to:
 - a fee (either to the AIBC or RAIC); and
 - an assessment/breakdown of how much is currently being spent on Advocacy by the AIBC

ii) RAIC

Of the 73 comments related specifically to the RAIC, there were only 3 that were explicitly against working together on Advocacy

Other themes and trends related to the RAIC included:

- *The funding issue* - Specifically the fact that the RAIC was underfunded, how to deal with that, but some concerns about “our money going east”, “no control of what is done with our money” and “don’t increase my fees to pay for it”
- *Define the AIBC/RAIC relationship* – There was little understanding of this, and strong interest in defining “who does what” so there isn’t overlap in effort and cost
- *RAIC taking lead on Advocacy* – Finally, there was moderate interest in the idea of the RAIC taking on all of the Advocacy role for the AIBC, as long as some of the above conditions were met.

IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

8. Engagement Comments

a) Advocacy (con't)

iii) Promotion

Of the 44 comments directly related to promotion, none specifically said there should be no promotion activity on the part of the AIBC.

In terms and themes and trends around Promotion:

- *No promotion of specific Architects* – There was strong support for the AIBC not promoting specific Architects or firms, as this was seen to provide an unfair advantage.
- *Potential media/advertising campaigns* – There was interest in media (traditional/social) and advertising to promote the profession, “the work we do”, specific projects, and “our value to society”
- *AIBC Awards Program* – A number of people commented on this, wondering what role the Program played/could play in Promotion

iv) Public Education

Of the 24 comments directly related to Public Education, there was only 1 comment against public education/increased public education activity

Other trends and themes included:

- *Lack of public understanding* – There was complete agreement that the general public knows little or nothing about “what we do/the services we offer/the value we add”
- *Overlap with promotion* – As was the case in round one of engagement, there was a lot of overlap between public education and promotion, with some people not distinguishing between the two
- *Public engagement* – A number of people emphasized the need to not just “tell the public” what architecture is, but to involve them through things like lecture series’, events and even the potential resurrection of the “Ask an Architect” program
- *Use of media* - Comments included trying to engage media to explain how projects work, or having them cover/critique/debate architecture

v) Municipal Outreach/Outreach

Of the 19 comments directly related to this topic, all were in support of the AIBC doing something with municipal planning departments to increase knowledge/understanding of the role and importance of an architect on projects. Some also extending this comment to the AIBC reaching out to developers and other stakeholders to explain “our role”.

vi) Schools

All 23 of the comments referencing schools were in support of the AIBC doing more, both at the high school and post-secondary levels. There were also a number of references about the previous Architects in Schools program, including bringing it back.

IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

8. Engagement Comments (con't)

b) Intern Architect Program (158)

Of the 158 comments directly related to the Intern Architect program, all were in support of the AIBC doing something to improve it. However, there was no clear consensus on how to improve it.

Among the issues and trends were:

- *No clear benefits to becoming an architect* – While there were a range of reasons for becoming an Architect (“pride, finishing, just getting it done”), there were just as many issues (no real increase in compensation, fear of increased responsibility eg. using the seal, liability)
- *Construction Administration experience a big issue* – This was confirmed by many Intern Architects as the major challenge
- *Issues with mentors* – There were many comments related to in-adequate mentor support as well as a disconnect between the mentor and employer
- *Lack of Intern-friendly firms* – Similarly, there were references to firms that weren’t that supportive of Interns, including not valuing them and/or seeing them as the future of the firm or profession
- *Disconnect between Universities and Practice* – there were a number of comments that not enough focus is provided at university on what an architect actually needs/does in the “real world”

On the question of “what the AIBC could do about these and other issues, some of the solutions included:

- Allow on-line logging of hours
 - Go to more of a web-based approach, including for exams
 - Look at some kind of wage scale for Interns to deal with the compensation issue
 - AIBC taking a stronger advocacy role with mentors and firms eg. mentor training, policies for firms to follow with Interns, etc.

Finally, there were also a small but very thoughtful number of comments related to “not making it too easy for Interns”. These were in relation to the need to be qualified and the changing nature of architecture and projects i.e. “it is getting more complicated out there, so need to be even more equipped and trained than ever before”.

IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

8. Engagement Comments (con't)

c) Act Review and Change (292)

Comments on Act Change and Review occurred in two general ways. One was specific to the “minor” amendments/changes that the AIBC has had discussion with the provincial government about already (and which were specifically referenced in both the Panel presentation and Comment Cards). The responses to these offer important quantitative and qualitative information that could be used with the government regarding memberships support for these changes.

The other kinds of comments were more general. However, they do provide information (mostly qualitative) regarding the interest of the membership in Act Change and Review activities.

i) General

Of the 76 general comments related to Act Review and Change, there was no clear consensus on whether the AIBC should be spending a lot of time and effort on large changes related to the Act.

Most of the comments and questions were around wanting more information on this topic i.e. “what would be specifically done, how it would be done (including engaging the membership), and what is the strategy and timeline”. There were also many comments regarding the risks and potential impacts (including references to the past) and the need to work closely with the government on this area.

ii) Duties & Objects

Of the 33 comments specifically mentioning the addition of a Duties and Objects section to the Act, 24 were specifically in favour of it and none were outright opposed.

However, there were other interests and/or concerns regarding this topic. They included:

- *Membership engagement on the specifics* – There is strong interest in finding out more about the wording and having input into that
- *Focus on public interest, clarifying advocacy* – These were the primary reasons for supporting the addition of a Duties and Objects section

iii) Sections 6, 8, 12, 15

There were too few comments (5) on these potential minor Act Changes related to Council Governance to come to any conclusions

IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

8. Engagement Comments

c) Act Review (con't)

iv) Section 36

Of the 34 comments regarding the potential to change Section 26 to allow Limited Liability Partnerships, 22 were specifically in favour of it and none were outright opposed.

Other interests and/or concerns related to this topic including the lack of information regarding what “limited liability partnerships” actually means. Addressing those could increase even further the support for the change.

v) Section 36

Of the 50 comments specifically regarding changing Section 36 to reduce the term of the Intern Architect Program from 3 years to 2 (to make it consistent with national agreements), 40 were specifically in favour of it and 10 were outright opposed.

Reasons for support for the change included the need for consistency across the country and helping increase the speed at which Interns can get through the program and become registered architects.

Those opposed to this change referenced the concern that decreasing the time could decrease the training/preparation for new architects. These comments were made against a backdrop of references to a “more complicated world”, not making it “too easy to become an architect”, diluting qualifications, and the ability of BC to do what is right for our province.

vi) Section 37

Of the 30 comments regard the potential to change Section 37 to make the BEFA program consistent with national agreements, 23 were specifically in favour and there were none that were outright opposed.

The only questions or concerns raised with this potential change were around whether the change to meet national standards would impact BC being able to be in control of what it needed to do here in the province.

IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

8. Engagement Comments

c) Act Review (con't)

vii) Sections 46 – 50

Of the 29 comments specifically mentioning these sections, there were 13 specifically about the changes to dealing with Continuing Education requirements. Of those, 11 supported changes to make it more of an administrative issue and 2 were opposed to them.

Support for the proposed changes on how to deal with Continuing Education requirements were based on simplifying the rules and making things easier to regulate and enforce. Those opposed to the changes thought things were going well right now, so there was no need to change. Interestingly, there were also a number of comments suggesting the AIBC “farm out” Continuing Education to another organization (like the RAIC).

viii) Sections 59/60

Of the 11 comments related to these Sections, only 2 supported the AIBC moving ahead to get clarification from the government. While none were specifically opposed, there were not any common elements or themes to them.

ix) Section 60

There were only 12 comments related specifically to Section 60 and no consensus one way or another as to what the AIBC should do. There were a number of questions and comments regarding what changes might look like, and how they would be pursued with members and government.

x) Sections 61 – 63

There was no consensus in the 13 comments on change related to making it easier for municipalities to enforce the Act. The majority of the comments were questions related to needing more information.

IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

8. Engagement Comments (con't)

d) AIBC

i) Regulatory Role

There was strong support for AIBC's current regulatory role in the 20 comments related to the AIBC's regulatory role.

ii) AIBC Services

While there were 71 comments in this category, it was hard to find consensus or strong themes.

There were a number of references to:

- the need for “business courses”
- providing more on-line access for the membership; and
- general comments around “supporting architects to be more successful”

iii) Services/Regions

Interestingly, all of these comments (5) came from the Kelowna session. The common theme was that the AIBC did not serve the interests of the Okanagan very well and should do more.

iv) Communications

Most of the 21 comments here related either to the AIBC website (the need to make it more accessible, easier to find things, etc.) or to the general theme of easier access to information. There were also a few comments related to the Strategic Plan that were specific to the Mission/Vision/Values.

v) Engagement

Of the 20 comments related to engagement, 8 were very supportive of Engagement 2.0 and there were no criticisms of the process. There were a number of questions about “what next?”, however.

Another interesting theme was that architects need to work better with each other and that “we seem to be our own worst enemy sometimes”.

vi) Fees

There were 19 comments related to the fees that Architects charge, and most related to the issue of “undercutting” and “lowballing”. Interestingly, a common theme was that “we are doing this to ourselves”.

V. CONCLUSION

By all measures, the AIBC Engagement 2.0 has been a success. The membership has shown a dramatic increase in both their participation and interest, and the AIBC Council has responded with open and honest dialogue around issues and opportunities.

The next step for the AIBC is to try and build on this by using the input received to make changes that will better serve the membership and the profession.

Best practice companies make engagement part of their culture by embedding it in a cycle – engage, document, report, and repeat. Given the response to Engagement 2.0, the AIBC has the opportunity to do just that.