

ESF Exploratory Workshop on
**Evidence-based environmental
design for older people:
From initiation to dissemination,
enhancing the paradigm of design
research**

Portsmouth (UK), September 21st – 23rd 2009

Convened by:
**Prof. Taraneh Dean, Dr. Amy Drahota
and Prof. Christina Victor**

SCIENTIFIC REPORT

Co-sponsored by



Executive Summary:

The workshop had the aims of capacity building, ideas generation, and collaboration formation. The workshop included individuals from different disciplines of study as well as individuals at the start of their research careers and those more established in their field. Some participants were not yet specialising in both environmental design and ageing research; on this basis, the workshop aimed to encourage capacity building and cross-disciplinary collaboration formation. The workshop focused on establishing a working group of individuals to submit a collaborative proposal in the field of environment design for older people, with the specific focus of this output established over the course of the workshop.

Day one of the workshop focused on “setting the scene”, with presentations from key note speakers to address issues of involving older people in research, philosophies of environmental design, and practical issues of conducting research on environmental design. Time was spent discussing the issues raised during the presentations. The afternoon was spent sharing experiences between delegates, considering the aspects of the field that interested participants, what participants felt they had to offer to the field, and sharing concrete examples of lessons learnt from past and present projects.

Day two of the workshop focused on exploring the challenges faced by the field of research on environmental design for older people. A “world café” discussion took place, during which participants discussed a series of questions:

- In evidence-based design for older people, how can the voice of the older person best be heard?
- How can the link between generating research and implementing the findings in practice be strengthened?
- Why is researching environmental design for older people challenging and how can we best embrace these challenges?

The world café was set up such that each table had a table host and a question, and participants circulated around the tables generating new discussions, integrating ideas from previous discussions, and generating new questions and ideas. In the afternoon there followed a discussion regarding future networking activities.

Day three focused on moving forward. Participants undertook an activity whereby they considered and discussed what a future collaborative project should look like from a variety of perspectives (the older person; the carer; the person involved in creating environments; the researcher; the funder; and the policy-maker). The afternoon was spent making an action plan for continued collaborative activities. The group decided to work towards a collaborative proposal for an ESF network grant, and all participants were assigned action points to help forward this proposal.

It was agreed that everybody would work towards a networking proposal for submission to the ESF in 2010, with an initial action to brainstorm the individuals and organizations who should be invited to become involved in the network. Following the workshop a private workshop website for sharing documents and discussions was established for joint group working. This ‘Groupsite’ (<http://eurolider.groupsite.com>) has been set up to facilitate communication and collaboration of the network. Through the Groupsite, initial discussions have taken place over the name of the network, and participants have further been sharing up-coming events and opportunities for further collaboration and networking.

In summary, this workshop has proved highly successful as reflected in the continued exchange between workshop participants, who have been striving to build upon the networking and collaboration opportunities provided by the workshop, and aspire to embed the principles of cross-disciplinary, pan-European, collaborative working in the field of environmental design for older people. One workshop participant commented: “As some-one who’s still in the early stages of her career, this workshop has been a massive boost for me, and I’m really looking forward to expand upon what we’ve achieved in these few days and be part of all the exciting opportunities to come!”

Table of Contents

Scientific Content:	4
Day 1: Setting the Scene	4
Day 2: Exploring the Challenges	5
Day 3: Forward Thinking	7
Assessment of the results, contribution to the future direction of the field	8
Final programme	10
Information on participants	12
The Final list of participants	15

Scientific Content:

Day 1: Setting the Scene

The first day of the workshop was geared towards enabling participants to get to know one another better, exchanging experiences, and setting the scene for the workshop. Participants were introduced to a “mind map”, which was hung on the wall and was to be used as a space for brainstorming, reflecting, and noting ideas over the course of the workshop. The mind map included: a “PEST Analysis” of the political, economic, socio-cultural, and technological context in which the research field is operating; a map of Europe on which participants could highlight the organizations, establishments, individuals, and collaborations of people who care for evidence-based environmental design for older people; space to highlight hot topics across the disciplines (architecture, design, health & social care, technology & engineering, psychology and sociology); and space to highlight enablers and inhibitors to creating a successful multi-disciplinary pan-European collaboration.

Christina Victor gave a presentation on engaging older people in research. This presentation set the scene by providing the historical context in which public engagement with research has developed, and the changing attitudes towards engagement of older people in research. An outline was presented on the role of older people in research and the variety of ways in which people can become engaged in research-related activities. Further debate was presented on why to involve older people in research and to outline the potential benefits as well as the challenges of user involvement.

Alan Dilani presented on the philosophical perspectives of health and design, and showcased a series of case studies in which good design has been implemented. This presentation set out a framework for considering health and design from a salutogenic perspective (health promotion), as opposed to a traditional pathogenic outlook, which has stemmed from the medical model school of thought. Design interventions elaborated upon included: the use of colour to demarcate specific areas (e.g. to locate the toilet); orientation aids to help residents in care homes locate their bedroom; signposting aids such as wall murals to help people know where they are in a building; and appropriate handrail design to assist with mobility and reduce falls. Further results were presented from a questionnaire study which explored the importance and availability of the concepts “Vita Activa”, “Vita Contemplativa”, and “Vita Ristorativa” in the physical environment.

Amy Drahota presented on her personal experiences of setting up a pilot cluster randomised controlled trial to investigate the use of shock-absorbing flooring in elderly care wards. The presentation outlined the benefits of a multi-disciplinary steering committee, the process of obtaining funding and gaining permissions to undertake the research, as well as the challenges of working with industry, a volatile economic climate, and a continuously changing National Health Service. Following the presentations, there was time for questions and discussion, which gave other participants the opportunity to share their own related experiences and make suggestions to the presenters.

In the afternoon, participants spent time exchanging their own experiences and sharing these with the rest of the group. A wealth of participant strengths were shared which are further highlighted in the participant information section of this report.

Examples of experiences exchanged and lessons learnt from these included:

- A randomised field trial of health-visitor annual screening of older people. For this participant, lessons were learnt of the value of mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative), and team working. As well as highlighting issues around implementation of research findings, in which recommendations can be ignored despite positive results, and the power of professional and vested interests in response to research.
- The design and construction of a hospital for elderly patients, which posed complex and multifaceted problems and issues, through dealing with a lot of different interest groups. For

this participant she encountered a lack of awareness of evidence-based design, presenting a gap between research and the end design. Coupled with this was the feeling that one should not be limited by research findings and the constraints of previous best practice, but that the closer one can get to the end user when designing an environment, the better.

- A three year, multi-million euro project involving eleven partners encompassing clinicians, computer scientists, engineers, social scientists, health and social care professionals, which aimed to build upon identified unmet needs of people with mild dementia. Lessons learnt from this project related to how easy it can become for a multidisciplinary team to be unbalanced (in this example technology dominated), and the importance and necessity for a team manager/moderator to promote balance.
- A project on lifetime housing in Singapore involving focus groups to identify design typologies. This participant discussed the issues of lack of research expertise and conflicts of interests within the project, which he felt stemmed from the fact that research is not embedded in architectural education, which leads to a limited research culture in the field of architecture.
- A project exploring the use of nature sights and sounds on pain and anxiety during minor surgery. This project resulted in non-significant findings which were then difficult to get published and met with adversity during peer review. The participant felt there is a need for greater appreciation of the relevance of non-significant findings in the field, particularly where this relates to unnecessary expenditure of healthcare resources.

Day 2: Exploring the Challenges

The second day of the workshop was geared towards exploring the challenges faced in the research field of environmental design for older people, and this was achieved through the use of the World Café technique. Participants spent the morning circulating the café, and joining in discussions related to a number of preliminary questions, which had been posed to inspire conversation and debate. The café set-up involved three tables, each with a “table host” whose role was to ensure that people noted down their ideas and that new people to the table found out about previous discussions which had taken place in order that the ideas could be integrated and developed further.

One question asked: “Why is researching environmental design for older people challenging and how can we best embrace these challenges”? Themes arising from this discussion included: understanding, translating, and matching the increasing needs of older people to environmental design and dealing with preconceived notions about environments for older people; quality of research, design process, education and skills; integration with families and society, and helping people stay at home as long as possible and the role of information and communication technologies (ICT); changing models of health systems, social care, and technological context; involving all stakeholders including political engagement to influence policies, and the use of evidence-based design to drive the agenda; measurement of quality of life and demographic changes; priorities in research funding and topics; the gap between researchers, designers, and end-users and the differing mentalities of researchers, industry, and professionals; the role of applied research and increasing expectations.

Another question asked: “How can the link between generating research and implementing the findings in practice be strengthened”? Themes arising from this discussion included: incorporating research findings into further education for architects and designers; integrating research into the design process, making research part of the brief; making people part of the process by carrying out research in the community (“living labs”); creativity in research and design; the cycle of practice informing research and research informing practice (chicken and egg debate); creating a culture of trust, transparency, user involvement, and accessibility of findings; gaining understanding between architects and researchers to find a common ground; “buying in” to one another’s perspectives and creating mutual relationships; involving commissioners in order that they can understand the issues; the use of prototypes and simulations; challenges created by lack of time for research in the design phase; issues with research methodology, post-occupancy evaluations, and interpreting results into transferable findings.

Another question asked: “In evidence-based design for older people, how can the voice of the older person best be heard”? Themes arising from this discussion included: appreciation that older *people* have many *voices*; the use of evidence-based design to challenge assumptions of commissioners and society at large; addressing stigmas; exploring user-friendly new ways of collecting evidence; learning from other sectors; cross-country issues and implementation of unusual ideas; maintaining involvement and management of the process; better liaison between user groups and researchers; encouraging older people to become their own researchers; allowing end-users more choice about design solutions (Japanese housing model); considering cultural contexts and current attitudes to ageing; use of intermediaries, family and friends, and anthropologies; addressing ethical issues; challenging assumptions and consulting younger people; attitudes towards technologies; engagement with groups such as Age Concern and Help the Aged; education and training.

A further group discussion was had on the potential for future networking activities as one possible direction for participants of the workshop to take in a collaborative bid. Ideas were shared of potential European partners and the framework from which the network could be built. All ideas from the days’ discussions were clustered into themes, which were then taken back and added to the “mind map” wall mural, to enable reflection and consolidation over the remainder of the workshop.



Picture: Participants engaging in the World Café

Day 3: Forward Thinking

The final day of the workshop was geared towards forward thinking and planning future collaborative opportunities. In the morning, participants engaged in a “six thinking hats” activity. This involved each participant wearing the “thinking hat” of six different stakeholder groups in turn, in order to discuss what a future collaborative project should look like from the different perspectives. The workshop participants separated into two groups for this activity and then fed back to one another at the end.

Themes arising from the perspective of “the older person” included: being listened to and influencing research, even before the proposal is written and sustained involvement throughout; how will I be involved in the project and am I bothered?; Involvement should be stress-free; researchers should tell us ideas for us to feedback on, there needs to be some focus to our involvement; we should go to their conferences and also receive feedback; there should be a co-ordinator as a contact point for us to communicate with; why should I be involved?; the findings should be applicable and of practical significance; will I be paid to do research or have my travel expenses paid?; a range of approaches are needed to reach us, in case we cannot attend a meeting; my needs are diverse; choice and homelike settings; being part of my community and in touch with family, friends, and neighbours; dignity, independence, loneliness and isolation; not wanting to be a burden; not wanting to be messed about or having too many unnecessary changes; who cares for me if my family is not able; adaptable environments to cope with changing ability and personal situations.

Themes arising from the perspective of “the carer” included: we are important too, we are also a user group; we can provide insight; we should be consulted and can also act as intermediaries to overcome ethical issues; we are not obstacles; there can be conflicts between carers and the people they care for which need resolution; we have the best interests of the older person in mind; how is this going to help me and the person I care for?; what will happen when I’m not around?; alleviating the burden of care/care respite/www.justchecking.com; carer support systems to help carers do their best, ensuring family friendly care environments, enabling flexible management in care environments.

Themes arising from the perspective of “the policy-maker” included: policies need to be responsive to changing needs and technology; there should be a scoping activity of best policies and of policy-makers across Europe and best practice should be highlighted via a network to policy makers (a vehicle for best practice/website/web 2 resource to support community); what is done should fit within existing EU and national policies; the project should understand our directions and know about our policies; there should be information to enable and inform policy making; what are we going to do about an ageing population?; strategic planning; what is the evidence for the policy?; can and when can it be implemented and will it be acceptable to the population?; how will the media and opinion makers react?; can we afford it?; will it be misinterpreted or misunderstood?; am I bothered about evidence?

Themes arising from the perspective of “the creator of environments” included: we are aspirational and creative; my creativity can be constrained; let’s not be prescriptive; value my experience; others should understand my role, we should find a common ground; evidence-based design tools can be useful; translating design into practice is fraught; help me understand and access research; what is the best environmental design which is flexible both in the short and long term and is can this be achievable?; what is the best salutogenic environmental design?; how can technology help in the most appropriate way?; how can we provide an environment that meets the needs of all users, and within budget?

Themes arising from the perspective of “the researcher” included: robust research design to provide high quality evidence; outcomes to reflect all stakeholders; probability of getting funding, investment of time and effort; commitment to partnership and dissemination; ethical issues and methodologies;

how can we ensure interdisciplinary research?; how can technology support the research process; need to know what designers need to know and in what format; there should be a scoping exercise of views and issues of all stakeholders; controlling for confounders; every voice in the network should be equal; should we be including the USA?; get publications from networking activity; aim to find a common ground/synergy between different disciplines and address multi-disciplinary challenges; aim to generate new proposals for further research; have an exchange programme; pan-European to further career; learning from other people's research to positively impact your own; drivers of publications and research ratings; high impact journals; capacity building research network; pan-European (and beyond) knowledge transfer; do some pilot studies across the disciplines to see how collaborating together will work out.

Themes arising from the perspective of “the funder” included: evidence-based research, participative action research, living labs, user-centred research, participative design, mobile workshops; whole composition of network (disciplines, methods, activities, etc) is unique; promoting links between established and new networks; network competence; demonstrate a track record; are there new researchers who are bringing fresh ideas?; benefits to research community and society; validated interdisciplinary approach; to fit within our timescale; moderated, coherent, interdisciplinary output; interdisciplinary and pan-European; innovation in strength of topic, holistic and coherent nature, methods of the network (web community, seeking common ground, moderated voices); output of network is new research proposals; What is our European Science Strategy- competitiveness, to be international leaders; promotion of science strategy (translate research into products and services, which are socially contextualized) and synergy; clarity in the benefit of investment (short, medium, and long term); prioritizing the research topics funding; disbursement of funds (phasing, milestones, guarantees, etc.) affecting project programme; funding a scoping exercise.

In the afternoon, participants joined a round-table discussion on the future goals and planning of our continued collaboration. It was agreed that everybody would work towards a networking proposal for submission to the ESF in 2010, with an initial action to brainstorm the individuals and organizations who should be invited to become involved in the network. A private workshop website for sharing documents and discussions would be established for joint group working. An investigation of networks already funded would be made in order to learn from other good practice as well as find a niche for the proposal. Additionally, participants were requested to consider appropriate names for the network.

Assessment of the results, contribution to the future direction of the field

The workshop had the aims of capacity building, ideas generation, and collaboration formation. The networking that this workshop facilitated has contributed to capacity building in the field, through the establishment of new links and cross-disciplinary discussions. Apart from the scientific content of the workshop, the social activities throughout the workshop also enabled further exchange of opportunities which will ultimately generate further capacity in the field. For example, discussions took place over the set-up of joint Masters Programme in the field; further education of practitioners was a key theme which arose from the World Café activity, and this idea was picked up and discussed further, and actions are already underway to try and establish this joint programme. Additionally, since the workshop discussions have taken place to collaborate on a project involving a “living lab” which could ultimately feed into the planned network proposal to be generated from the workshop. Again, the concept of “living labs” was one which was discussed through the activities of the workshop, and so it can be seen how the workshop directly contributed to the initiation of this new project (The PEOPPLE Project: Putting Evidence for Older People into Practice in Living Environments). Funding (£206,000) for The PEOPPLE Project has now been secured. Participants have also been maintaining the connections made, through for example invitations to facilitate sessions in other planned events they are organising, and notifying each other of events of interest to the group such as conferences and workshops, which present further opportunities for building on the planned network.

This workshop has facilitated contacts for new researchers with established researchers, as well as with established researchers in other areas of study but who have valuable expertise to offer this field. Following the workshop, participants have been identifying individuals and organizations to invite to join the planned network, in order that from this initial meeting the community will grow, develop, and evolve, to meet the high aspirations of the participants.



Picture: Group photo of participants

Final programme

Sunday, 20th September 2009

Afternoon *Arrival*

18.00 *Dinner*

Monday, 21st September 2009

Location: **The Boardroom, ExPERT Centre, James Watson Building**

09.00-09.20 **Welcome by Convenor**

Prof. Taraneh Dean (University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, UK)

09.20-09.40 **Presentation of the European Science Foundation (ESF)**

Prof. Akile Gürsoy (ESF Standing Committee for Social Sciences (SCSS))

09.40-12.30 Morning Session: Setting the scene

09.40-10.10 **“Engaging older people in research: Experiences from the UK”**

Prof. Christina Victor (University of Reading, Reading, UK)

10.10-10.55 **“A philosophical framework of design and health: a multi-disciplinary perspective”**

Prof. Alan Dilani (International Academy for Design and Health, Sweden)

10.55-11.15 *Coffee / Tea Break*

11.15-11.45 **“Trials and tribulations of evidence based design”**

Dr. Amy Drahota (University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, UK)

11.45-12.30 **Discussion**

12.30-13.30 *Lunch*

13.30-15.45 Afternoon Session: Sharing experiences

13.30-14.30 **Experience exchange**

All participants

14.30-15.00 *Coffee / tea break*

15.00-15.45 **Discussion**

15.50- *Tour of the Isle of Wight and dinner*

Tuesday, 22nd September 2009

Location: **The Hub, Dennis Sciama Building**

09.00-12.30 Morning Session: Exploring the challenges

09.00-09.30 **“Introduction to the session”**

Prof. Taraneh Dean (University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, UK)

09.30-10.45 **“World café: Key issues in environmental design for older people”**

All participants

10.45-11.15 *Coffee / Tea Break*

11.15-12.30 **“World café: Key issues in environmental design for older people”**

All participants

12.30-14.00	<i>Lunch</i>
14.00-16.30	Afternoon Session: Round-up and reflections
14.00-15.30	"What is emerging here?" All participants
15.30-16.00	<i>Coffee / tea break</i>
16.00-16.30	Building on the mind-map (Location: The Boardroom, James Watson Building) All participants
16.30-	<i>Viewing from the Spinnaker Tower at Gun Wharf Quays and dinner</i>

Wednesday, 23rd September 2009

Location: **The Boardroom, ExPERT Centre, James Watson Building**

09.00-12.30 **Morning Session: Round-table discussion**

09.00-09.30 **"Introduction to the session"**
Prof. Taraneh Dean (University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, UK)

09.30-10.30 **"Six thinking hats"**
All participants

10.30-11.00 *Coffee / Tea Break*

11.00-12.00 **"Six thinking hats"**
All participants

12.00-12.30 **"Group discussion"**
All participants

12.30-13.30 *Lunch*

13.30-16.00 **Afternoon Session: Round-up and reflections**

13.30-15.30 **"Setting objectives and forward thinking"**
All participants

15.30-16.00 *Coffee / tea*

16.00 **Workshop close**

Information on participants

This workshop included 14 participants (including a representative from the ESF). An additional 2 participants sent their apologies as they could not make the meeting for reasons beyond their control. This purposefully select group of people was small enough to support productive group working and large enough to gain representation from a range of fields, countries, and outlooks. Five participants were in the early stages of their research careers, and 9 were more established in their fields. Two of the participants (Cathy Dalton and Boštjan Kerbler) were nominated early-career researchers by other invited members of the workshop.

Participants were from England (N = 5), Italy (N = 1), Netherlands (N = 1), Northern Ireland (N = 1), Republic of Ireland (N = 2), Slovenia (N = 2), Sweden (N = 1), and Turkey (N = 1). The age structure of the group ranged from 29 to 65 years old (mean = 45.4, SD = 10.4). There were 8 females and 6 males.

Participants represented a range of disciplines and specialist expertise, briefly summarized below:

Roberto Bologna: Architect, PhD in Architectural Technology, Associate Professor of Architectural Technology, Faculty of Architecture, University of Florence; Head of the Department of Architectural Technology and Design “Pierluigi Spadolini” (Dip. TAD); Member of the Teaching Board of the Degree in Architecture; Member of the managing committee of the Teaching Board of the Research Doctorate in Architectural Technology at the Dept. TAD; Entered on the Register of the Official Peer Reviewers of the CRUI for the national university quality evaluation system; Member of the University Board for quality and degree course evaluation; Dean's delegate for quality and certification of the undergraduate and postgraduate courses of the Faculty of Architecture of Florence; Member of the Interuniversity Research Centre TESIS "Systems and Technologies for Health Care Buildings (University of Florence, University of Rome "La Sapienza", University of Milan); Member of the International Advisory Board of the International Academy for Design and Health; Member of the Centre for Research, Transfer and High Education for the Study of Risk Condition and Safety and for the development of Activity of Civil and Environmental Protection (CESPRO); Member of the CIB TG63 task group "Disaster and the built environments" and, until 2006, the CIB W82 commission "Future studies in construction" (now cancelled); Member of the international research network I-rec "Post disaster reconstruction"; Fields of experience Development of technical rules and design guidelines for ministerial bodies and public administration at a national and regional level: health care buildings (hospital for the treatment of infective pathologies, Alzheimer's centers), buildings for civil protection (shelters areas and shelters for emergency), university buildings (student housing), school buildings, judicial buildings; Project development and project consultancy: temporary architecture (temporary housing, shelters for emergency), university architecture (housing for students, educational and research buildings), social and health care architecture (hospitals, centers for Alzheimer's patient care).

Cathy Dalton: Cathy is an architect of over 20 years' professional experience, predominantly in the area of healthcare and special needs buildings, with a specific interest in the use of colour in healthcare environments. She has recently been accepted as a PhD student in Architecture by Cork Centre for Architectural Education. Her thesis aims to develop and test a single-room prototype for an elderly patient/ resident that utilises sensor-activated networks to deliver an adaptive and optimal healing environment by varying environmental characteristics of the room, to include, but not limited to colour, lighting, images, temperature, and sound. The research will take place in the context of the existing NEMBES project. NEMBES is an inter-institutional and multi-disciplinary research programme investigating a "whole system" approach to the design of networked embedded systems (www.nembes.org).

Taraneh Dean: Tara has led research a number of research projects in the area of allergy and has published widely in leading medical and scientific journals and over the years has raised over £3,000,000 for her research. Although environmental design for older people is not her primary area of research, she does have a keen interest in this topic, and has been a co-author of two systematic reviews in the area, and supervisor of PhD students working in this field. Currently she is Professor of Health Sciences, Associate Head [Research] of University of Portsmouth School of Health Sciences and Social Work, and Associate Dean [Research] for the Science Faculty. She is also the Portsmouth lead for the Department of Health funded Research Design Service, providing support to all health care professionals undertaking R&D in South Central England. She is a strong advocate of evidence based practice and has written number of articles on this area. She has been an external tutor on the internationally recognised multi-disciplinary Masters programme in Evidence Based Health Care run at the University of Oxford. She has led on the development of a continued professional development course on “Putting Evidence into Practice” which is offered to healthcare professionals in the South Central region.

Karin Dijkstra: Karin Dijkstra is an assistant professor at the department of Marketing Communication and Consumer Psychology at the University of Twente. From an environmental psychological perspective, she studies how the built environment affects the way users of those environments feel, think, and act. Most of her research focuses on effects of the physical healthcare environment on health and well-being of patients and healthcare personnel.

Alan Dilani: Professor Alan Dilani is a founder and General Director of the International Academy for Design and Health (IADH). He is co-founder of the Journal "World Health Design". He has been engaged worldwide in several universities in the field of Design and Health developing "Psychosocially Supportive Design Program", both in Medical and Design institutions. He holds a Ph.D. in Health Facility Design from the Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm and a Masters of Architecture in Environmental Design from the Polytechnic of Turin, Italy. His research at Karolinska Institutet, Medical University, developed a multidisciplinary research approach, leads to the new definition of design that not only fosters functional efficiency, but also improves health processes. He is the author of numerous articles and books in the field of Design and Health including "Design and Care in Hospital Planning" and editor of the several books within "Design and Health".

Amy Drahota: Amy was awarded her PhD in 2007 on the influence of healthcare environments on patient health-related outcomes. Using a mixed-methods approach, this project included a randomised controlled trial of nature sights and sounds to reduce pain and anxiety during minor surgery, one-to-one interviews with clinical staff, and focus groups with patients. Amy is now seconded part-time to the UK Cochrane Centre, where she is involved in the training of Cochrane review authors and the development of interactive online learning materials. Amy has a keen interest in the evidence-based design of healthcare environments. Her current research includes ‘The HIP-HOP Flooring Study: Helping Injury Prevention in Hospitalised Older People’. This is a national pilot cluster randomised controlled trial, funded by The Dunhill Medical Trust, exploring the effectiveness of shock-absorbing flooring for reducing injuries from falls in elderly care wards. Amy has secured over £600,000 for various research and knowledge transfer projects in the fields of healthcare design and evidence-based practice.

James Harrison: Dr. Jim Harrison joined the Cork Centre for Architectural Education in April 2007 to teach on the new BSc (Hons) Architecture programme. Prior to this he taught First Year Architectural Design at Queen's University in Belfast for three years. Jim graduated with BArch (Hons) from the University of Sheffield and is a Qualified UK Architect. He started his practical experience at Peterborough New Town in England and worked in practice in Zambia and Malawi. He began teaching design at the Portsmouth School of Architecture and then had 18 years at the School of Architecture, National University of Singapore, where he was Associate Professor, teaching studio design and lecturing at all levels in both Bachelors and Masters courses. When his contract with NUS

ended he took a 'gap year', travelling in Asia and lecturing in Australia, Pakistan and Vietnam. Having particular research interests in user-friendly design for ageing and disability, Jim is proud to have played a part in promoting these topics in Southeast Asia; he has regularly been an invited United Nations Expert for the Economic and Social Commission for the Asia Pacific Region in Bangkok, running regional training programmes for design professionals as well as advising the Singapore Construction Authority on their Code on accessible buildings. Over the years he has published and researched widely on these topics and, on the strength of related publications, he was awarded a Higher Doctorate (LittD) by the University of Sheffield in 2003.

Valentina Hlebec: Valentina holds a doctorate in sociology, and is an associate professor in the field of statistics, employed at the University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences. She is interested in social network analysis, creation of questionnaires, and social gerontology. Her research is focused on methodological and substantive areas such as systems analysis, questionnaire design, social gerontology and methodology of comparative research.

Boštjan Kerbler: A post-doctorial researcher investigating remote home care (telecare) for elderly people. The goal of this research is to theoretically evaluate a potential remote home care system (telecare) as part of the regular or general health and social care system for the elderly, with a special emphasis on caring for the elderly population in peripheral areas of Slovenia. He has previously been involved in the following projects: (1) 6th EU framework program international project, 2007–2009: LivingAll: Free movements and equal living opportunities for all; (2) European Territorial Cooperation – Alpine Space Programme, 2009–2012: DEMOCHANGE: Demographic change in the Alps: adaptation strategies to spatial planning and regional development; (3) National projects: 2008: Measures for the realisation of the rights of the disabled to barrier-free access in Slovenia; 2009–2011: Measures for the realisation of the rights of the disabled to barrier-free access: identification of present barriers in the built environment and in major public buildings in Slovenia.

Maurice Mulvenna: Maurice is Professor of Computer Science in the TRAIL living lab at the University of Ulster, researching pervasive computing in the policy areas of social inclusion, to support ageing, disabled and other vulnerable groups in society. He is a member of the Monitoring Committee for Northern Ireland's Competitiveness and Employment European Union Structural Funds Programme and has carried out the role of independent expert to the European Economic and Social Committee on Ambient Assisted Living Technologies. He is Editor-in-Chief of the International Journal of Computers in Healthcare, an Editorial Review Board member for several other journals including the Journal of Assistive Technology and the International Journal of Ad Hoc and Ubiquitous Computing. He was appointed to the UK Office of Communications (Ofcom) Advisory Committee on Older and Disabled People in 2008. He is a past winner of the European IST Grand Prize in 2001 and holds grants on pervasive computing research and innovation projects worth over €30M. He has over 190 publications in pervasive computing and has served on over 60 program committees, including IEEE Pervasive Computing, IEEE Pervasive Computing and Applications, Pervasive Systems and Computing and IEEE-ACM Web Intelligence. He is a senior member of both the IEEE and Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), and is a chartered member of the British Computer Society (BCS).

Michael Phiri: Senior Research Fellow in the School of Architecture, The University of Sheffield and has been responsible for many studies on healthcare environments and settings. Michael is interested in developing tools to aid designers including manual and electronic literature searches. He has compiled the substantial database of architectural environment research for NHS Estates and Department of Health. The Sheffield Architectural Healthcare Environment and Patient Outcomes Database is available as an interactive CD-ROM and also accessible directly via the Department of Health KIP (Knowledge Information) portal. The evidence from the database has been progressively collated, summarised and engineered into a series of tools for Trust clients and their designers to use. AEDET (Achieving Excellence Design Evaluation Toolkit) Evolution and ASPECT (A Staff/Patient Environment Calibration Tool) are now both in common usage for the assessment of existing and new

buildings. IDEAs (Inspiring Design Excellence and Achievements) is still under development and is designed for use at the briefing stage. IDEAs is intended to aid Trusts, healthcare architects and design consultants by providing inspiration and informing design briefs. Using the latest evidence, it gives design tips based on the movement of patients, staff and visitors through a hospital. Some activities featured in the tool at the moment include: arriving, beds, circulating, consulting, sanctuary, shopping, social and waiting. The IDEAs website is related to a gallery of photographs/images of healthcare buildings.

Julie Udell: Julie graduated from a BSc (Hons) Psychology degree in 2005 and completed her MSc in Psychological Research Methods in 2006. She is also a Graduate member of the British Psychological Society. Prior to moving to SHSSW, Julie was a researcher in the Psychology department for several years and worked on numerous research projects during this time. These projects included investigating the first career destinations of psychology students, exploring the experiences and perceptions of first year psychology students, as well as research investigating memory and the transmission of stories. Using a mixed method approach, Julie is currently researching the relationship between the effectiveness of environmental strategies in reducing falls injury, and the psychosocial effects (particularly acceptability and quality of life issues) of these strategies for those at risk of falls and fracture. This PhD project is funded by the National Osteoporosis Society.

Christina Victor: Christina Victor is Professor of Social Gerontology and Health Services Research. After obtaining her first degree in geography at Swansea, she studied for an M Phil in medical geography at Nottingham University. She developed her interests in ageing and later life and public health whilst on the staff at the Welsh National School of Medicine where she obtained her PhD. Her main research interests are in the areas of health status in later life, social networks and social relationships in later life and with developing a population perspective on ageing and later life. She has published widely in peer reviewed journals, has held research grants from a variety of funding sources including ESRC and the Department of Health and is the author/editor of eight books in the field of ageing and later life. Her most recent book, *The Social Context of Ageing*, was published by Routledge in 2005.

The Final list of participants

Convenor:

1. **Taraneh DEAN**
School of Health Science and Social Work
Faculty of Science
University of Portsmouth
James Watson West
2 King Richard 1st Road
Portsmouth PO1 2FR
UK
tara.dean@port.ac.uk

Co-Convenor:

2. **Amy DRAHOTA**
School of Health Science and Social Work
Faculty of Science
University of Portsmouth
James Watson West
2 King Richard 1st Road
Portsmouth PO1 2FR
UK
amy.drahota@port.ac.uk

3. **Christina VICTOR**
School of Health and Social Care
University of Reading
Bulmershe Court
Reading
RG6 1HY
UK
c.r.victor@reading.ac.uk

ESF Representative:

4. **Akile GÜR SOY**
Anthropology Department
Faculty of Arts and Sciences
Yeditepe University
26 Agustos Campus – Kayisdagi
81120 Kayisdagi
Istanbul
Turkey
akile@yeditepe.edu.tr

Participants:

5. **Roberto BOLOGNA**
Dipartimento di Tecnologie dell'Architettura
e Design "Pierluigi Spadolini"
University of Florence
Via San Niccolò 93
50125 Firenze
Italy
roberto.bologna@taed.unifi.it
6. **Cathy DALTON**
Cork Centre for Architectural Education
University College Cork
9/10 Copley Street
Cork
Ireland
cathy.dalton@student.ucc.ie
7. **Alan DILANI**
International Academy for Design and
Health
Box 7196.
103 88 Stockholm
Sweden
dilani@designandhealth.com
8. **Karin DIJKSTRA**
Department of Marketing Communication
and Consumer Psychology
Faculty of Behavioural Sciences
University of Twente
PO Box 217
7500 AE Ensched
Netherlands
k.dijkstra@utwente.nl
9. **James HARRISON**
Cork Centre for Architectural Education
Ballyre Cottage
Killeagh
Co. Cork
Ireland
akiharri@yahoo.co.uk
10. **Valentina HLEBEC**
Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Ljubljana
Kardeljeva pl. 5
1000 Ljubljana
Slovenia
valentina.hlebec@fdv.uni-lj.si
11. **Boštjan KERBLER**
Urban Planning Institute of the Republic of
Slovenia
Trnovski pristan 2
SI-1000 Ljubljana
Slovenia
bostjan.kerbler@uirsi.si
12. **Maurice MULVENNA**
TRAIL Living Lab
School of Computing and Mathematics
University of Ulster
Shore Road
BT37 0QB
UK
md.mulvenna@ulster.ac.uk
13. **Michael PHIRI**
School of Architecture
The University of Sheffield
Crookesmoor Building, Conduit Road
Sheffield
S10 1FL
UK
M.Phiri@sheffield.ac.uk
14. **Julie UDELL**
School of Health Science and Social Work
Faculty of Science
University of Portsmouth
2 King Richard 1st Road, Portsmouth
PO1 2FR
UK
julie.udell@port.ac.uk