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Abstract

This research project seeks out the underlying structural and institutionalized barriers that threaten the development of a Facility Accessibility Design Standard (FADS) for Queen’s University, and focuses on processes as the unit of analysis rather than the content of a FADS itself. In essence, it is the cultural components of campus planning that are examined in depth; why it is that a FADS has been adopted and implemented at only one university in Ontario, Brock University, and what barriers have prevented other institutions and Queen’s from developing one.

Because culture is the focus of this research, two literature reviews were conducted to demonstrate how Foucauldian planning theory and the theories of disablement overlap in planning practices that contradict professional planning ethics, but are so entrenched in campus institutions that it becomes difficult to reverse. Furthermore, the research reflects findings from six key informant interviews (four with individuals in decision-making positions at Queen’s and two with individuals who led the FADS development process at Brock), a walking tour of Brock’s campus, a visioning workshop with members of the Queen’s community, and a review of key policy documents. Ultimately, this research concludes that path dependency, a theory of historical sociology, can accurately capture why decision-makers at Queen’s can say inclusivity is important but also possess a reluctance to go above and beyond provincial legislation to become more accessible than is required.

A path dependent analysis shows that the process of establishing new, more inclusive culture of accessibility may be emerging at Queen’s, with individuals in leadership positions taking charge. To make this cultural shift more than a possibility and a reality, the following are recommended courses of action: centralizing accessibility into one office for clear leadership, bettering inter-departmental communications with a knowledge transfer guide, and continuing spreading awareness and creating interest in accessibility initiatives on campus. In following these steps, the hope is that Queen’s evolves from a state of individual to institutional readiness to adopt a FADS.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Facility Accessibility Design Standards (FADS) are technical documents that outline how institutions will achieve accessibility levels greater than provincially legislated minimal benchmarks. (City of London, 2013) As institutions independently determine if they wish to prepare, approve and implement a FADS, Brock University is the only university in Ontario to have one. The absence of FADS is a sign that there is an inconsistency between societal values and the reality of practice; that is, there is value placed on inclusivity, but a reluctance to go beyond mandatory requirements to ensure its presence. (Wolpert, 2013) With forced compliance to the Built Environment Standard of the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) approaching, Queen’s has made the resources available to conduct the university’s first comprehensive accessibility audit of its campus. This is an opportunity to consider adopting a FADS at Queen’s, to critically examine the role that the built environment plays in shaping campus identity, and to better understand the culture of accessibility (Tregaskis, 2004) versus the obligation to accommodate those with disabilities. (McColl and Jongbloed, 2006)

This research project examines the underlying structural and institutionalized barriers that could threaten the development of a FADS for Queen’s, and focuses on processes as the unit of analysis rather than the content of a FADS itself. By analyzing the current campus culture through interpretations of Foucault’s understandings of power, knowledge and space (Crampton and Elden, 2007), this research explains why there is resistance at the university to go above and beyond provincial legislation, and what would be required of the institution in order for it to be ready to do so.

A point that will be made in this research is that that for there to be a meaningful change in attitudes towards accessible design, there needs to be a shift away from the underlying culture of obligation to accommodate and towards a universalistic approach to disability rights. As this research
demonstrates, the built environment can perpetuate the former or advance the latter; thus the pursuit of a FADS at Queen’s ought to be of upmost importance to planners.

The following research questions were identified as the core ideas to guide this study:

1. Where do disability rights models, critical theory and planning ethics overlap, and how could understanding their intersection guide the planning profession in addressing accessibility issues?
2. What is a FADS, and what opportunities and challenges arise in the processes of adopting and implementing one for Queen’s University?
3. What evaluative criteria and precedents could initiate these processes at Queen’s?

To respond to each of these questions, this research relied on the following methods: a literature review of the history of planning ideas, cumulating in a discussion on critical planning theory (Chapter 3), a literature review of disability rights models to show if and how planning and theories of disablement overlap (Chapter 4), and a theoretical modeling section that demonstrated that the divergence between the two fields can be explained using a theory of historical sociology called path dependency (Chapter 5).

Data were gathered from the methods identified in Chapter 2, namely interviews with individuals in leadership and decision-making positions at Queen’s and Brock Universities, a walking tour of Brock University, and a visioning workshop attended by members of the Queen’s community. Then, the findings are revealed in Chapter 7 and are analyzed through the lens of path dependency in Chapter 8. Ultimately, through understanding the Brock example, this study comments on the feasibility of the university overcoming cultural barriers to accessible design and provides practical recommendations on how to initiate the process of developing a facility accessibility design standard for Queen’s University in Chapter 9.
CHAPTER 2

Methodology

Precedents

In planning research, it is appropriate to seek out practical and methodological precedents to guide research. The following precedents were identified for the purposes of this research:

1. As the only university in Ontario with a FADS, Brock University has demonstrated the feasibility of drafting and implementing an accessibility policy framework. (Brock University, 2010) Rather than using a best practices case study, which is inappropriate given only one precedent and the dissimilar organizational structures that guided Brock’s development of a FADS from those of Queen’s, lessons learned from Brock University will be analyzed to consider why one institution can have a FADS with those at Queen’s, but others choose not to or cannot support one. Of interest will be understanding what is unique about how Brock understands disability rights from all other schools in Ontario and how Queen’s can learn from this example.

2. The City of London, Ontario, was the first municipality in Canada to formally adopt a FADS. Since its introduction in 2001, more than 50 other municipalities have used it as the model for their own. (City of London, 2013) This marked a watershed moment in the way that Canadian municipalities have proceeded to make conscious efforts to become barrier-free. Of interest will be what courses of action directed the City to a point where accessibility became a topic of interest significant enough to garner its own policy document.

Additionally, the following academic works served as methodological precedents:

3. Robert Wandell’s master of urban planning thesis (2007) demonstrated that demands on planners are forcing the profession to move towards becoming increasingly multi-disciplinary. This work exposes gaps in the way the profession seeks to regulate members’ behaviour, as ethical considerations amidst conflicting disciplines influence action. Wandell relied on qualitative
research techniques (interviews), to validate the data he collected from document and literature reviews, and to identify what processes are at play, and their implications. Similar methods will be used in this study.

4. Barbara Roberts’ doctoral thesis (2013) justifies, using the framework of a human rights model of accessibility theory, and how it is feasible and necessary to accommodate students with impairments in fieldwork settings in higher education. She argues that her model can be adapted to other areas such as employment and accessibility planning. This study will be referenced for the purpose of theoretical modelling.

Research Methods

This research project was completed using qualitative research methods, namely, literature reviews, document reviews and interviews. These methods were rooted in a theory of historical sociology called path dependency. Path dependency theory is used by political scientists and by sociologists to explain why groups in society organize in the ways that they do. The premise of this theory is that history is self-reinforcing because events can be causally linked together in long chains or sequences to explain why communities are often reluctant to change how they do things, even if better alternatives exist and/or are more efficient. (Greener, 2001) To understand how path dependency ideas directed the objectives of the interviews, see the section below, called Interviews. For a more comprehensive explanation of how path dependency was applied, please see the Theoretical Modeling chapter.

The benefit of having multiple sources is that it ensures that the data collected will be robust enough to withstand challenges of trustworthiness and validity. Triangulation of data lends credibility to findings by demonstrating that data were checked against various sources and that similar research using comparable methods could replicate the information found. (Bradshaw and Stratford, 2010) Appendix A provides an overview of the research protocol.
**Literature Review**

Two literature reviews were conducted. A planning literature review was conducted to understand the planning perspective on accessible design. Disability rights theory and the multidisciplinary constructions of disablement (Oliver, 2009) proposed in academic literature were also reviewed and analyzed in order to develop a theoretical grounding for this study. The purpose of these reviews was to help develop an understanding of whether and how planning theory and disability theory intersect and if these conceptual frameworks can be merged into a theoretical model that could guide planners to address accessibility challenges in professional practice. Ultimately, it was determined that there is sufficient overlap and a theoretical model was produced in the Theoretical Modeling section (Chapter 5).

**Document Review**

Documents that trace the progress of developing and drafting Brock University’s FADS could not be sought out online through public record searches. This was not surprising, as institutions tend to guard documents of financial nature, and rarely publish process-related documents for public consumption, preferring to share outcome-oriented information.

However, through interviewees, some documents were provided to the researcher for analysis. These records included reports to internal administrative committees, audit notes, information items and operating procedures. The documents made available for research date from as far back as 2007 when Brock first considered developing a FADS, through 2008 when a FADS was developed and adopted, to 2013 when implementation was evaluated and updates were made. They were categorized by type, and then analyzed in the Findings section (Chapter 7). These documents were evaluated using discourse analysis as outlined by Waitt (2010) and as emphasized by Foucault (i.e., Foucauldian Analysis; see Chapter 3: Planning Literature Review). Discourse is any sort of meaning being conveyed in language and therefore places importance not just on what is said or written, but also on the underlying themes, concepts, and messages implied and “the rules and structures that underpin and govern the unified, coherent and forceful statements that are produced.” (Waitt, 2010, p. 218)
The Foucauldian discourse analysis was executed according to the following six strategies, taken from Rose’s (2001) seven stages of performing Foucauldian analysis:

1. Evaluation of the source—Why is a message being communicated in this format and not in another? For whom is this message intended?
2. Reflexivity—What sorts of biases are reproduced by the author and by the researcher?
3. Familiarization—What was the context when this statement was made?
4. Truthfulness—Which actors are involved in creating this message? How is power used to persuade and by whom?
5. Inconsistencies in language or message—Consider why these are present, if they are.
6. Participation—Is there proper representation in the message of the various groups involved in the discussion?

Interviews

Interviews were utilized as a research method for four purposes: (1) to gather information on the process of developing the FADS at Brock that was not available through public record; (2) to gauge the current state of interest of a FADS at Queen’s University; (3) to determine the feasibility of developing a FADS at Queen’s University; and (4) to vet and validate the recommendations.

Interviews are a preferred source of data because they can reveal attitudes, perspectives, opinions and biases that are either not documented or taken for granted and assumed by the reader. They are also more likely to reveal process-related knowledge rather than documents, which are often outcome-oriented. Having prepared questions in an interview guide (see Appendix B) ensured a continued conversation relevant to the topic at hand, while allowing for flexibility in conversation. (Dunn, 2010)

---

1 Rose’s (2001) seven stages are: (1) compositional interpretation (organization of text); (2) content analysis (when a document is written); (3) semiology (identifying biases); (4) psychoanalysis (emotional responses to content); (5) discourse analysis (message conveyed); (6) audience study (intended audience); and (7) anthropological approach (who is and is not represented by a document).
A total of six semi-structured interviews and one walking tour with a key informant were conducted. Two interviews and the one walking interview were conducted with those involved with accessibility at Brock University. The other four were conducted at Queen’s with a member of the equity community, an administrative official, a student leader with Queen’s residence society, and a student leader with Queen’s undergraduate student government. The objective of interviewing key informants at Brock was to collect process-specific data on how accessibility is understood in the Brock campus context, and the processes that were undertaken at Brock University to produce a FADS. The individuals interviewed were influential in the process or are key actors in the implementation of FADS elements. Focus was on asking questions to uncover what sorts of challenges arose in the development of FADS at Brock, and to determine what lessons Queen’s could learn from Brock’s example. Questions on historical institutionalism and sequentialism were asked to determine what came first: new attitudes on accessibility or FADS. Asking these path dependency-related questions will help to understand the planning process at Brock. To better understand how these path dependency questions were formulated, please see the discussion on Michael Brooks’ Feedback Strategy in the Addressing Potential Limitations of Research section, below.

Interviews with the key informants from Queen’s were conducted with the objective of collecting process-specific data that was related to the Queen’s context, from the point of view of persons who are privileged to information that the average member of the community would not. The key informants were either members of the campus accessibility advocacy community or held a decision-making position within the institution. Because of scheduling conflicts, all but one interview was carried out in person. All interviews (but the two interviews with student leaders) were recorded (with consent) and transcribed. Notes were taken as the interviews were conducted in order to maintain a research log, to maintain practices of reflexivity on the part of the interviewer and in order to limit biases in data collection.
Recruitment and interview logistics

As Equity Advisor at Queen’s University, Heidi Penning is familiar with many accessibility advocates on campus, at Brock University, and the City of London. Through conversations with Ms. Penning, a purposive sample of participants was identified and recruited to be interviewed. Participants gave permission to include their names in this report and to attribute their statements to their real names; these individuals included:

- Margaret Sanderson, AODA coordinator, Brock University
- Scott Walker, Director of Campus Planning, Brock University
- Laeeque Daneshmend, Deputy Provost, Queen’s University

While this chain sample, a type of purpose sample where participants are identified based on conversations with others, may seem like a potential bias in research; however, with only one university in Ontario having a FADS, and very few individuals familiar with the process of developing one at Queen’s, the sample from which there was to draw informants from was very limited.

On Feb. 19, 2014 a trip was made to St. Catharines, Ontario to observe the Brock University campus firsthand and to conduct interviews. Scott Walker at Brock University arranged for a research tour of the university campus with Campus Project Manager, Janet Muenzenberger. In the process, an opportunity was presented to conduct a walking interview with Ms. Muenzenberger. The value in doing a mobile, rather than a sedentary interview, is that memory recall is triggered with changes in scenery and context. (Evans and Jones, 2011) This interview method was especially useful in understanding how a FADS was developed at Brock because each design is often initiated by a different catalyst, and each may have a different process in terms of its construction, implementation and maintenance.

Question types

As interviews were primarily conducted for the purpose of data collection rather than data validation, most questions were descriptive and structural in nature. Key informants at Brock were asked questions about their involvements with accessibility at the university, procedures that lead to there being
an interest in having a FADS, and the processes involved in developing, adopting and implementing it. Queen’s interviewees were asked about their involvement with accessibility at the university, past experiences involving accessibility issues on campus, procedural questions and questions regarding policy initiatives that were proposed in the past. (See Appendix B for the interview guide.)

Then, interviewees were asked opinion questions to understand community culture, whether they believed there would be a change in how accessibility is broadly understood with a FADS being implemented and what sort of challenges and opportunities arose or are anticipated.

**Sequence of interviews and interview questions**

Every interview began with a conversation about the research interests as outlined by the Letter of Information. Customized Letters of Information were prepared depending on the type of informant: internal, external, group interview (visioning workshop participants, see the section below) or student leader. (See Appendix C.) Once research expectations were made transparent, each interviewee was asked to review and sign a Consent Form. Like the Letters of Information, the Consent Forms were customized for each informant. (To see the Consent Forms, refer to Appendix D.) Interviews did not proceed if the key informant did not sign this form, as per the Queen’s University research ethics protocol. (For the researcher’s ethics approval, see Appendix E.)

Interviews began with the descriptive questions, so that the scope of key informants’ roles as advocates for accessibility at their respective institutions could be understood. The questions were provided to the interviewees beforehand. Structural questions were asked next to understand the processes involved in developing a FADS. In many cases, this information is not available online, so it was very important to understand before opinion questions were posed. Only once it was understood what sort of structures and procedures were undergone and which actors played what roles were the opinion questions asked. Having these questions asked at the very end ensured that both the interviewer and interviewees could clearly distinguish biases, thoughts, feelings and perspectives of individuals from their respective positions within the frameworks that they belong in the process of developing a FADS.
Refusals to be interviewed

In attempting to understand the culture of accommodation at Queen’s University, four student leaders were contacted via email for interviews. The four included one student leader within the residence system and three within the Alma Mater Society (AMS), the undergraduate student government. Interviews were refused, in writing, by two of these student leaders, both from the AMS. Their reasons for refusal were equally interesting as some of the input that was contributed to this research by other interviewees. As such, these emails were analyzed as well, for what they suggested about the culture of accessibility at Queen’s.

Visioning Workshop

The Equity Office periodically organizes, publicizes and hosts Accessibility Cafés, which are community forums wherein members of the Queen’s community are encouraged to provide feedback and opinions on how to make the campus as inclusive as possible. The Equity Office offered the researcher the opportunity to use one of these sessions for the purpose of collecting data for this study. On February 5th, 2014 from 11:30am-12:30pm in Stauffer Library’s Speakers’ Corner, a visioning workshop was facilitated by the researcher for the purpose of better understanding the attitudes, norms and beliefs that members of the Queen’s community have concerning accessibility on campus. These data would be specifically about the cultural components of campus design at Queen’s.

Participants were invited through emails that were circulated through the Equity Office’s ListServ (email list), word of mouth and through the Queen’s Accessibility Hub. The workshop questions, agenda and instruction booklet were made available and sent along with those who were contacted via email. Five participants attended. Each was given a package containing the workshop instructions (see Appendix G), a Letter of Information, Consent Form, marker and four post-its of varying sizes and colours.

The workshop began with an overview of the research project and its purpose, as well as the workshop objectives. There were four questions guiding the workshop, organized in two groupings. The first cluster of questions asked about the readiness of the individual and the readiness of the university to
adopt accessibility levels greater than those suggested and made obligatory by the AODA. A conversation about feasibility ensued. The second group of questions was concerned with cultural understandings about accommodation versus accessibility, with a conversation afterwards. All responses were anonymized on the post-its and then attached to a board for everyone to see and comment on during the discussion. At no point were individuals asked to identify what they wrote. The workshop was not audio-or-video-recorded.

Addressing Potential Limitations of Research

Bias is a potential limitation of this study as with any research. For example, in document revision the biases of the author might prevail. In interviews and focus groups, bias may arise from the interviewees, and throughout the data collection process and in its interpretation, from the researcher herself. (Bradshaw and Stratford, 2010) To mitigate researcher bias, data were gathered from a variety of sources (i.e., literature, documents, interviews and focus groups). Further, a research log was maintained and the researcher followed Michael Brooks’ Feedback Strategy (2002) to encourage reflexive practices. Brooks (2002) argues that effective planning begins with defining issues operationally, with planners clearly acknowledging how one’s social, political and economic position may influence a judgment. In following his strategy, planners ought to propose multiple solutions to the problems they identify through an iterative process that considers multiple stakeholders’ points of view. In this study, the researcher utilized this strategy during interviews, in order to understand how disability is understood by a community at large. This is apparent through the questions that participants were asked, and the order in which these questions were posed. For instance, at the visioning workshop, attendees were first asked how ready they were as individuals to support Queen’s in going above and beyond accessibility legislation. Then, they were asked how ready they felt the university, as a community at large, is. In differentiating the two points of view, the researcher was able to better understand the broader cultural definition of accessibility as understood by participants, and make an argument for how attitudes may act a barrier to accessible design in the planning process at Queen’s.
Generalizability may also be a limitation—of the study as a whole, and of the data collected. The scope of the study is specific to the processes at Queen’s University and therefore conclusions may not be easily transferable to schools that have different structurally-defined cultures of accessibility. However, the study’s theoretical grounding in critical theory and disability rights make it easily adaptable to other institutions and will help overcome weaknesses in external validity. (Yin, 2009)

Another bias is that despite the fact that Accessibility Cafés are open to the public most of the participants had vested interests in barrier-free design, were knowledgeable of accessibility rights theory or were affiliated with accessibility advocacy at Queen’s in some form. Therefore, it can be concluded that they were not a truly representative sample of the Queen’s community and perhaps this could skew findings. However, it is likely that certain individuals are more knowledgeable of the processes involved in developing campus policy than the average community member. Internal validity should not be compromised so long as the processes are clearly described and outlined in the study.

Finally, a limitation of this research is that while several students at Queen’s were contacted and two were ultimately interviewed for purposes of better understanding the culture of accessibility on campus, no students at Brock University were similarly consulted. This was owing to restrictions on the researcher’s time, and because the researcher did not have access to student contacts at the university. Given that the process of initiating the FADS at Brock was strongly influenced from the university’s staff, this should not reduce the validity of the data collected. Indeed, questions about the stakeholders involved in the planning process at Brock were asked to ensure trustworthiness of the data.
CHAPTER 3

PLANNING LITERATURE REVIEW—UNDERSTANDING FOUCAUDIAN PLANNING THEORY

As mentioned in Chapter 2 (Methodology), this research has two literature review chapters that will provide overviews of the dominant paradigms and theories within the academic disciplines of planning and disability rights. The purpose of these literature reviews is five-fold: (1) To discuss the ideas that underlie the study of each field; (2) To demonstrate how some paradigms have come to dominate over time, and inevitably produce competing ideas that critique and challenge their principles until another supersedes it; (3) To show that dominant paradigms, though widely accepted, sometimes do not accurately describe the world as it is; (4) To identify the theories that are the best at taking into account the reality of power relations in society; and finally, (5) To show that the different ideas in both fields overlap, with implications in professional planning practice. The following chapter will discuss the theories of planning, identifying Foucaudian (critical) planning theory as the most robust.

The Nature of Planning: Planning is Political

Planning literature has traditionally been defined by the parameters of two intellectual paradigms: rationalism/objectivism and reformism/normativism. Objectivism claims that early planning practice was instrumental in scope. Planners were responsible for solving infrastructural urban issues, such as managing transportation, urban development and public facilities. (Klosterman, 1978) As such, planning could be defined as the determining of where things ought to be, based on judgments on how land is best used. (Hall, 2002) Since planning was about spatial allocation, the planner’s role was to propose land uses. She would then present these to the public, who would ultimately decide the best use of a space (either directly through consultation or indirectly via elected officials). The reputation this school of thought gained was that the planning profession was firmly rooted in neutrality: separate from
government, impartial to business, free from researcher bias, and scientifically formulated, the planner was a technician rather than an advocate. (Rittel and Webber, 1973)

Over time, the definition of planning has come to be comprehensive and has broadened beyond the scope of land-use and allocation. (Hodge and Gordon, 2008) Crampton (2008) suggests that this shift has come largely because of the growing recognition that public space is linked to social justice; for instance, if one area is more welcoming to one group of people than another, the unwelcome group would suffer an injustice. In accordance with Crampton, Gibson et. al (2012) refer to the “zoning of interactions” to describe the reality that space can be used as a tool by some to confine, deter and limit the opportunities of others, since being able to fully experience a space, being able to interact with others and having the option to participate in civic life often requires the ability to physically use and navigate space with comfort, ease and dignity. For example: in order for an exchange to occur between a shopkeeper and a patron, one must be able to leave a start location, access the building, enter into the premise and traverse the store; activities that can be completed without second thought, or can be made challenging by virtue of design. Social justice discourse is a major theme in comprehensive planning because of the increasing recognition that while some can complete the abovementioned tasks with little effort, for others that journey is nearly impossible. The question then becomes: Are planners agents of social justice? Should they be?

Fischer (2009) would agree that planners do have a role to play in addressing social injustice. He writes: “[planning] can be best understood as the task of integrating technical efficiency and social equality.” (p.61) Similarly, Dikec (2009) suggests the traditional understanding of planning ought to be amended such that ‘space’ be redefined as not just physical, but social: “…the emphasis is not on spaces per se, but the processes that produce space...processes of social, economic and political relationships.” (p. 79) Likewise, to Clay (2000), planning is not only the providing, but also the nourishing of a space, real or imagined. Further, Bourdieu writes extensively about the differences between social and physical space. As he succinctly states, “…social space is so constructed that agents who occupy similar or neighbouring positions are placed in similar conditions and subjected to similar conditionings, and
therefore have every chance of having similar dispositions and interests, and thus, of producing practices that are themselves similar.” (1989, p. 17) The result is that people tend to enter into physical spaces fully aware of their social place, a construct that is culturally enforced and perpetuated, thereby informing them if they are indeed welcome somewhere without having anyone having to tell them. This unprompted (but nevertheless real) “feeling as though one out of place” is what theories of social space use to explain why physical spaces often do not need fences, gates or doors to keep certain people from using them. Thus, planners ought to be cognizant that physical and social accessibility are different factors that influence the usability of a space. Finally, a comprehensive definition of planning, as offered by the Canadian Institute of Planners suggests that planning is a process of ensuring the “...health and well-being of urban and rural communities” in regards to their “physical, economic and social efficiency.” (2003, para.1)

Reformists emphasize that the value-free role of the planner and the assumed objective approach to planning that rationalists so vehemently champion, is a questionable premise. Should their definition of planning stand, reason holds that planning cannot possibly be approached without bias: in identifying a situation as a problem, in determining how the problem is framed, researched and then presented, and finally, in judging which solutions are the most appropriate, worthwhile, effective and then shared with the public, planners have many opportunities to insert their own interests, biases and preferences. Thus, the overwhelming agreement within the reformist tradition in planning scholarship is that planning is, by its very nature, political.

Power and Planning

What is Power?

Keohane and Nye (1977) are often cited as the definitive voices in the understanding of power, defining it as the ability to control others or to get a person to act in a manner that he would not otherwise. There are two forms of power. Hard power is traditional power, according to Nye. (1990) It is measured in military strength and capability, geography, population and raw materials. On the other hand, soft power is a more contemporary understanding of power. It is the ability for one actor to get others to want
what he wants, rather than having to literally force an outcome by coercion or payment. This could be measured in persuasiveness and “tends to be associated with intangible power resources such as culture, ideology and institutions.” (Nye, 1990, p. 167)

When referring to the politics of planning, soft power is the understanding that dominates the literature of reform planning, specifically in the work of Michel Foucault and his proponents and Jurgen Habermas and his adherents. From this planning paradigm, whereas power was once understood by the planning profession as the physical zoning of interaction, more accurate and contemporary understanding of power in planning is that it is the social zoning of interactions. Thus, power in planning could be exercised in a failure to consider designing spaces to be accessible by everyone, in addition to not addressing the cultural factors like attitudes, feelings, and beliefs that may cause some spaces to feel welcoming and accessible to some, but make others feel singled-out or unwelcome.

How is Power Controlled?

Foucault and Habermas understand power to be intrinsically linked to the dissemination of knowledge and the production of truths, respectively. Foucault wrote that soft power is exercised through epistemes, or systems of language. (Foucault, 1998; Ingram, 1994) Language is a vehicle for power because people tend to communicate using words often without actually understanding what they mean, or without recognizing the underlying messages conveyed. The result is that meaning is produced and messages are circulated subliminally in what Rabinow (1984) describes as discursive regimes that produce, regenerate, distribute, and circulate language. This is soft power in action, because simply through repetition, people accept statements as truths without force.

Likewise, Habermas’ understanding of soft power is that knowledge is formulated through debate. In their writings on communicative rationality, Healey (1992) and Sandercock and Forsyth (1992) argue that valid knowledge is produced when ideas are exchanged in dialogue because carrying out a conversation requires the parties involved to collaborate, reciprocate and reflect on their own and each other’s beliefs. Through questioning and then having to rationalize every point made, expressing one’s
thoughts and feelings, and justifying one’s values, knowledge can be refined and broadened. (Healey 2006)

The reason why Foucault and Habermas’ contributions to power in planning is important to the profession is that people often communicate with one another within rather than between networks, and the individuals within each network are usually very similar to one another in personal characteristics like social (e.g. income level, educational attainment, ethnicity, etc.) and physical location (i.e. geography). Theoretically, this could be resolved if all groups are fairly represented in the planning discussions and have equal opportunities to affect the discourse within society’s decision making process, but this is not the case in practice.

Like in any discussion, some parties tend to dominate and, as a result, steer the conversation towards the topics that best suit their interests. In many cases, society’s wealthiest, who often have access to the media and other resources, unilaterally select what sort of language is used in framing planning discussions, thereby controlling the process and getting their way. Or as Arnstein (1969) points out, sometimes certain groups are excluded from discussion, or are invited for the sole purpose of being placeholders, just to fulfill an obligation, and never given a legitimate opportunity to participate in it. And so, scholars caution that power in planning is not necessarily individualistic, but classist (Allmendinger, 2001), and that power in planning can and is perpetuated by the way a political structure is organized.

With uneven power distribution a reality in the planning process, it becomes appropriate to initiate a conversation on ethics, especially since planners are often placed in decision-making positions with implications for all actors.

Power and Ethical Considerations by the Planner

“Ethics is the study of moral law... used in a somewhat broader sense to include widely approved principles of action.” (Snell, 1988, p.221) In other words, ethics is the study of what one should do and how one should act. There are three principles to understand about ethics: First is the postmodernist idea that reality is subjective, which means that a situation can be interpreted several ways by different people,
resulting in the existence of multiple realities. Secondly, from Plato (1988) is the principle that morality is relative. This means that not only do individuals understand what is real differently; they also have different definitions of what is right or wrong. Finally, is Hume’s (2003) theory of moral realism, which states that there is no objective or observable truth. Therefore, there is no way to prove that one person’s truth is better than the others. Thus, given these three principles, moral theory concludes that any set of ethics is valid, so long as it is morally rationalized. (Graham, 2004)

The three most widely accepted theories of ethics in planning, as determined by this literature review, are liberalism, utilitarianism, and social contract theory. The following sections will discuss what is written about each one and then demonstrate how each theory has framed a different understanding of what role planners are expected to play in professional practice.

Classical Liberalism

Classical liberalism has dominated Western notions of justice since the neoconservative movement of the 1980s. Liberalism champions the idea of just rewards in the free market, arguing that in a society of equal persons under the rule of law but protected liberty (a society where government powers are restricted), free, equal and autonomous individuals will collect earnings proportionate to the amount of labour they are willing to exert. As such, any hard working person can feasibly improve his economic position within society (there is no such thing as social classes because everyone is socially, if not economically, equal), while those who are lazy get what they deserve as a result of their lack of effort. Thus, redistribution policies are not only discouraged, but actually passionately opposed because they rid citizens of any incentive to be productive. As Nozick (1974) summarizes, an injustice has been committed if: there is a failure of justice in acquisition (you violated someone else’s right to own something in your pursuit of a holding) and/or a violation of justice in transfer (the person you purchased or inherited something from acquired the holding unjustly in their acquisition of it).

What this means for planning, then, is that the classical liberal tradition does not encourage a large role for the planner. This would be very much in line with the instrumental understanding of what
planning is—the planner’s role is to offer expertise and nothing else. She is therefore not morally obligated to rectify any power imbalances within the planning process, foster participation that otherwise would otherwise not happen and in fact, is encouraged to allow the system to continue as is, because uneven power distribution will eventually sort itself out through the free market, as the system has a built-in incentive to continue improving and developing its citizens through the understanding of just desserts. And so Harper and Stein (1995) conclude, liberalism is not anti-planning, but it does not promote it either. Thus, at best, liberalism tolerates the planner.

Utilitarianism

Utilitarianism is the belief that an action is good/right if it provides the greatest amount of utility (defined by Bentham as the property in any object “to produce benefit, advantage, pleasure, good or happiness” (1960, p.126)) to the greatest number of people. However, since the reality is that in every society there are individuals who do seek to cause “mischief, pain, evil and unhappiness” in others’ lives (Bentham, 1960, p.126), utilitarianism accepts that there ought to be an active government presence within society. Governments are legitimate in so far as they can create an environment where everyone is free to pursue his pleasure and no one else’s similar right to do so is infringed upon in the process. (Mill, 2007) Often this assumes deliberative democracy, a political landscape where every person has equal opportunity to participate in society’s decision making process and information is open and freely available to all, because in the pursuit of individual happiness these are necessary requirements. (Mouffe, 1999) As such, there is an egalitarian nature to utilitarianism, since the happiness of someone from one social group is indistinguishable from, and therefore, as equally valued as the happiness of someone from another. In other words, neither the economic classes that persevere through liberalism, nor do social classes exist within utilitarianism.

The impact of utilitarian thought on planning is that that the planner is required to act in whichever way benefits the most people in any given society, which means helping to create, preserve, and enhance deliberative democracies. (Fishkin, 2002) Achieving perfectly accessible information in
order for people to make informed decisions requires open discussion, debate, and opportunities for everyone to participate in the decision making process; so it is the planner’s job to create or obtain a physical space, organize the meetings and publicize the gatherings where people can assemble, share ideas and voice their thoughts and feelings. (Kapoor, 2002) When there are spaces like this, utilitarians argue that there will be no tyrannies of the majority, because the different factions in every debate will have chances to build fellowships, recruit new members, collaborate to create new parties, and debate until common ground is met.

*Social Contract Theory*

Modern social contract theory can be traced back to Rawls. The central argument in his *Theory of Justice* (1999) is that justice is fairness. Rawls proposed that if any rational person was to organize a society’s governing structure from behind a veil of ignorance (unaware of one’s social, political or economic standing), that individual would do everything he could to ensure that society was set up in a way that its institutions served everyone equally in protecting individual fundamental liberties (as per liberalist teachings), and that they ensured that “social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) to the greatest expected benefit of the least advantaged and (b) attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity.” (1999, p.72) This is because that rational person could feasibly calculate that natural inequalities exist (some people are born smarter, stronger, healthier, etc. to no fault of their own) and that once the veil of ignorance is lifted and he is subjected to the rule of that governing structure, he could very well be someone of lesser advantage. Therefore, for Rawlsians, justice is in a distribution that ensures that those members of society who are worse off by chance are not unjustly left to be oppressed in a system of merit.

McConnell (1995) relates Rawlsian justice to planning by stating that “planning decisions should be to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged.” (p.43) Rawlsian justice suggests that the planner therefore needs to go beyond that of the liberalism and utilitarianism; the liberal planner neglects the evasive nature of soft power and therefore does not change, but rather, maintains the social, economic and
political structures of inequality supported by the merit system. (McConnell, 1995) Likewise, the utilitarian planner may create opportunities for citizens to participate in the planning process, but just because a meeting or town hall is planned, it is not guaranteed that everyone who attends actually participates, or meaningfully contributes to the discussion. The public sphere, social contract theory suggests (in accordance with the reform definition of planning), is more than a physical space. It must also be a discursive one where the freedom to participate is backed up by a removal of social constraints that discourages perfect speech, and one where not just one group in a community controls the creation, dissemination, and reproduction of language. (Sandercock and Forsyth, 1992) Davidoff continues this thought in stating that: “If [a planner’s] work is not aimed at redistribution, then a presumption stands that it is amoral” (2013, p.69) and he is supported by Forester, who writes: “Despite the fact that planners have little influence on the structure of ownership and power in this society, they can influence the conditions that render citizens able (or unable) to participate, act, and organize effectively.” (1989, p. 28)

How a planner is to counter the imbalance of influence behind the production of knowledge is through her “speech acts”, practices like how a planner will present information, draft proposals, advocate for one cause or another, offer advice, and explain ideas to clients. (Forester, 1989) Thus, given the expectations of social contract theory the planner should, utilize her power as an expert, to decide if some information should be shared or withheld, and if certain planning issues should be given more importance over others. The planner is therefore obligated to not just be to mediate planning debates, but to also negotiate on behalf of a society’s underrepresented and worst off when placed in professional situations where she can reasonably determine that they are not being preferably served by a planning decision. The alternative would result in the exasperating of their disadvantage, which is morally unacceptable.

Harper and Stein (1995) caution that allowing the planner to have as much power as Rawlsians allow can be dangerous if unconstrained. They emphasize the need for the planner to be reflexive, and for a “structure or rules for particular types of situations within a particular set of value commitments” to guide professional practice. (1995, p. 50) What is encouraged, then, is that professional practice be regulated by a governing body that has the ability to strip planners of their privileges should they exploit
or misuse their power, as enforceable professional standards legitimize the planner’s role as an expert and brings integrity to the profession in the eyes of the public in a series of checks and balances. (Thomas, 1991) Professional codes are two-fold: they can arise in codes of ethics, which ensures consistency amongst planning principles, like in justice, equality and fairness, as well as in codes of conduct, which regulates behaviour. (Hendler, 1991)

Conclusion

This chapter demonstrates that the different underlying ideas that guide the study and understanding of planning have direct implications on what role a planner ought to play in decision-making processes. The most dominant paradigm in planning literature is that of objectivism/rationalism, which suggests that a planner should be a utilitarian at the very most, and a libertarian at the very least. Therefore, planners are not and should not be agents for social change. However, professional ethics codes require planners to behave like social liberals and to respond as agents of power during the planning process. (CIP, 2004; see Appendix K) Consequently, there is a disconnect between what is expected of planners by their profession and what is actually practiced and considered a culturally acceptable role of the planner by the planning community. This tension will be discussed in the context of accessibility planning in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 4

DISABILITY THEORY LITERATURE REVIEW—UNDERSTANDING DISABLEMENT

In this second literature review, the different ideas that underlie the study of disablement will be examined. As this section will demonstrate, each model of disablement produces a different definition for what disability is, with implications on the planning profession. In showing how and where disability rights and planning studies intersect, these two chapters will lay down the theoretical foundation for Chapter 5: Theoretical Modeling, where a theoretical model to guide the analysis of this research will be developed.

Theories of Disablement: What is a Disability?

According to Withers (2012) disablement can be theorized two ways: as a rights-based (minority rights) approach or as a radical (universalism) approach. Rights-based approaches to understanding disablement are, at their core, concerned with equality. According to the rights-based approach, for minorities in society to achieve the same level of “community control, empowerment and self-determination” (Joiner, 2006, p.91) as other groups in society, they must be recognized constitutionally or legislatively to ensure their rights to equal treatment and protection from discrimination.

Alternatively, there is the radical or universalism approach. This approach is concerned with equity, meaning equality in outcomes, rather than equality in opportunity, because disablement can be congenital, temporary or progressive. (Shapiro, 2011) The result is that disablement has a “multidimensional variability,” since any person could identify as disabled for any period at any point in life. (Joiner, p. 92) Therefore, the goal is for society to have structures in place, like institutions, practices, and attitudes that are ability-neutral, so that opportunities are constant no matter what ability level one is.
How Definitions of Disability Affects Planners

According to McColl and Bickenbach (1998), there are five prominent models of disability rights; each which will be discussed in turn. Each model defines disability differently, and places power in different actors’ hands, as demonstrated by the language in literature that frames each model. Therefore, each model has different implications on what is required of the planner.

I. Philosophical

The philosophical model (also called the moral, charity or religious model by Hammel (2006)) provides the oldest framework for understanding disability. From this perspective, disabilities are understood to arise as a punishment for poor behaviour or as a result of bad luck, as a means to help explain “why bad things happen to good people.” This historic definition creates several problems: first, the disabled are understood to be deserving and responsible for their disabilities; second, disability is framed as purely the individual’s concern and finally, it encouraged pitying the affected and creating a sense of altruism around those who did.

Based on this perspective, society’s most philanthropic would argue that “disabled people are people too!” as a way of drawing recognition to disabled person’s issues. From the planning point of view, this means that planners are not in any way obligated to accommodate persons with disabilities and that those who do, do so out of respect for diversity or personal interest in matters pertaining to social justice.

II. Biomedical

The most commonly cited biomedical definition of disability is based upon the original version of the World Health Organization’s *International Classifications of Impairments, Disabilities and Handicaps*. (McColl and Bickenbach, 1998) Though the WHO has since revised its definition of disablement, the biomedical model adheres to the understanding that disability is “any restriction or lack (resulting from an impairment) of ability to perform an activity in the manner or within the range considered normal for a human being.” (World Health Organization, 1980, p. 28) A disability is therefore
two things according to a biomedical model: (1) a deviation from a medical standard of normality; and (2) a product of impairment (an abnormality that does not necessarily prevent or restrict an individual) and additionally, a handicap (a “disadvantage” that either limits or prevents behaving in a way that is normal). Most problematic about this definition is that it relies on a binary framework: normal versus abnormal, advantage versus disadvantage and abled versus disabled. (Rioux and Samson, 2006) The result is that disability is defined as purely an individual concern, with no room for it to also be framed as a universal matter of importance.

Because classification is based on medical and biological traits, opponents argue that this model ought to be critical of how it places emphasis on prevention, diagnosis, and curing, thereby championing experts, medical professionals and drug corporations rather than the persons with disabilities, themselves. (Pfeiffer, 2001) Indeed, by elevating experts to positions of power, there is a risk that persons with disabilities are seen as passive patients rather than active participants in their own care by those who are empowered.

When disability is understood only as a medical reality, the planning profession tends to back away from accepting any sort of responsibility, citing lack of credentials, expertise and arguing that it is outside the scope of their training to address the concerns of persons of disabilities. As such, in the biomedical model, only libertarian planners exist, where the obligation to accommodate is deferred to those outside of the profession.

III. Economic

In the economic model, institutions prioritize maximizing profits, and minimizing losses. In this scheme, disability is understood to be one of two things: (1) an economic cost, measured in lost production (assumed is that a disablement hinders the individual from contributing to the formal economy); or (2) an opportunity for gains, unlocked by investment. Only if the potential gain is worth more than a loss, will an institution determine if accessibility is worth addressing, or indeed should even be considered a problem. Otherwise, like the libertarian planner in the charity model, there is no
obligation to accommodate persons with disabilities. For example, if the cost of installing an elevator in an office building could be offset by the value of the labour being produced by a person who otherwise could not reach a floor above ground level, would an institution, in the economic model, seriously consider investing in one.

To determine if this is investment is worth making, institutions will undergo cost-benefit analyses to evaluate if it is appropriate to act. This is where the planner comes in. In this model, the planner acts as an impartial adviser who carries out the evaluation.

IV. Sociological

When the British Union of Physically Impaired Against Segregation released a statement in the late 1970s stating that “…it is society which disables physically impaired people” (Hammell, 2006. p. 60), the sociological model emerged. The sociological model argues that disability is a social construct, to mean any “form of human difference or deviation from the social norms of the acceptable levels of activity performance” that a society would expect from an individual. (McColl and Bickenbach, 1998, p. 7) Thus, disability, according to this model, is culturally relative unlike the medical model, which defined disability according to standardized requirements.

Revolutionary at the time, the sociological model acknowledged that the way that disability is understood could be used as a tool for oppression, designed to place importance, power and control in the hands of abled-bodied persons, while taking away the opportunities and autonomy from their disabled peers. However, a major weakness of the sociological model is that it cannot overcome the fact that it completely overlooks the relationship between disability and impairment, thereby creating a definition for disability that works with or without considering the body. (Hammell, 2006) For instance, the sociological model would fall short in addressing mental health issues, because outwardly, a person may conform to society’s expectations for behaviour, yet this individual could be struggling to function in day-to-day life.
In terms of practical implications, planners who adopt a sociological approach to disability will start to behave in a Rawlsian manner, by considering how society at large may influence the opportunities available to some groups at the expense of others. In this sense, the planner has a professional obligation to equalize in order to rectify imbalances in opportunities.

V. Sociopolitical

The sociopolitical model evolved out of the criticism leveled against the sociological model. From this perspective, disability is understood from the point of view of the individual with disabilities rather than the other four models that theorized disability from the point of view of an able-bodied person (the altruist, the medical professional, the economist, etc.). (McColl and Bickenbach, 2006) Here, disability is defined as a construct produced by the physical, social and political environment. That is to say, disability is defined by society’s different communities—medical, political, economic, social and informal—to produce a system in which a group of people are identified as different from the others.

The strength in this definition is that it is just as relative and equally sensitive to the power dynamics proposed by the sociological model, but that it recognizes that in any given society, there are multiple and equally valid epistemologies at work that overlap, reinforce, and intersect to give and produce meanings associated with every group. This is because identity politics are too complex to reduce an individual to just one trait. In politics, individuals are said to belong to several cleavages: gender, age, race, ethnicity, economic and social location, etc., which is equally true in describing how individuals self-identify outside of elections. Thus, disabled persons must be defined by more than just one type of experience, like medical or social, so the sociopolitical model argues that they should be defined by all of them.

When the theories of disability rights are matched to the planning theories discussed in the previous chapter, one can see that planners who adhere to either the sociological and the sociopolitical definition of disability will most likely behave like Rawlsians when involved in decision-making processes. However, the major difference in how disability rights and planning theory overlap is that
unlike the sociological-Rawlsian planner, sociopolitical-Rawlsian planners recognize that equalizing opportunities in order to rectify imbalances in likelihood to participate is not enough, because structurally enforced soft-power realities prevent some people from participating even if the opportunities are available to them. For example, the sociological-Rawlsian planner will invite someone in a position of lesser power to a public meeting who would traditionally not be acknowledged, however, the sociopolitical-Rawlsian planner will go above and beyond this by actively trying to remove barriers that will prevent that same person from being a spectator at the meeting to that of an active participant. Ideally, this is the advocacy role that planners should strive to play, as drivers of social change, according to the critical theorists in the planning literature that were discussed in Chapter 3, namely Arnstein (1969), Healey (1996), Sandercock and Forsyth (1992), and Forester (1989).

Table 1 (on the following page) summarizes the content of this section.
Table 1: The Intersection of Planning and Disability Rights Theories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODEL OF DISABLEMENT (from McColl and Bickenbach, 1998)</th>
<th>APPROACH (from Withers, 2012)</th>
<th>DISABILITY IS… (from McColl and Bickenbach, 1998)</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>APPLICATION</th>
<th>PLANNING IMPLICATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical (Also referred to as Moral, Religious or Charity)</td>
<td>Rights-based</td>
<td>A result of moral misconduct or bad luck</td>
<td>Individual; Disablement is the “fault” of the person afflicted. (McColl and Bickenbach, 1998)</td>
<td>Historically used to explain “why bad things happen to good people.”</td>
<td>Libertarian; responding to disability is a charity concern. The planner has no obligation to accommodate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical</td>
<td>Rights-based</td>
<td>An illness or impairment; a medical condition or problem</td>
<td>Individual; Language of passive patient versus active expert. (Barnes and Mercer, 2003)</td>
<td>Emphasis on prevention, diagnosis, and curing—homogenous solution to standardized ailment</td>
<td>Libertarian; disability is a medical, rather than a planning, issue. The planner has no obligation to accommodate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Rights-based</td>
<td>An economic loss; either burden on society at large or an unlocked potential gain</td>
<td>Individual; The disabled person is discussed in terms of lost production. (Martin Prosperity Institute, 2010)</td>
<td>Cost-benefit analysis determines if action is appropriate</td>
<td>Utilitarian, libertarian; planning policies deemed appropriate by governing institutions. The planner is an adviser.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociological</td>
<td>Rights-based</td>
<td>A social construct; Deviance from a culturally accepted norm</td>
<td>Community; Language of equality, the presence of opportunity and defiance against the norm. (Barnes and Mercer, 2003)</td>
<td>Emphasis is on normalization</td>
<td>Rawlsian; the planner is placed in a decision-making role and is obligated to equalize opportunities for minority disabled groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociopolitical</td>
<td>Radical</td>
<td>A social, political, economic and environmental construct employed to benefit some and oppress others</td>
<td>Community; Language of equity, equality of outcomes. (Joiner, 2006)</td>
<td>Critical theory and power analysis</td>
<td>Rawlsian; the planner is placed in a decision-making role and has an ethical responsibility to eliminate barriers to participation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Critique of Theories of Disablement in Practice

The Limits of Rights-Based Theory

The theory of disability rights that the Canadian Institute of Planners (CIP) has formally adopted and codified in its *Statement of Values* is closest to the sociological model. The CIP alludes to the need for dignity enabling spaces, and identifies them as an ethical requirement of planning professionals: “members shall practice in a manner that respects the diversity, needs, values and aspirations of the public and encourage discussion on these matters.” (2003, Statement of Values, para. 5) Likewise, the Ontario Professional Planners’ Institute (OPPI), which accepts the CIP’s *Statement*, reflects the same tone of importance. (2013)

These professional guidelines are very much consistent with provincial legislation regarding accessibility in Ontario, in terms of their adherence to the sociological model. The two major laws that inform planning decisions regarding accessibility are the Ontario Human Rights Commission’s Duty to Accommodate and the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA). The Ontario Human Rights Commission, in its *Human Rights Code* (2014), ensures that individuals with disabilities have the right to special arrangements from employers, educational institutions and service and housing providers, such that they can enjoy and use spaces in the same manner as their able-bodied peers.

Similarly, the AODA, which is based off the Ontario Building Code and Canadian Standards Association’s Accessibility Standard, was formally adopted in 2005. The AODA has five standards: (1) customer service (all employers must provide accommodations for its employees, train its employees to aid customers with accessibility concerns and establish a feedback mechanism to improve these services); (2) information and communications (audio, visual and tactile communication standards); (3) employment (accommodations in the hiring process and in the equitable treatment of employees); (4) transportation (accommodations in public transportation facilities); and (5) built environment (accommodations in built and public spaces). The customer service standard was the first to come into effect in January 2012 and requires all companies to have policies and procedures for providing goods and services to people with disabilities, the others are expected to follow in due course. When the AODA’s Built Environment
Standard does come into effect in 2016, it will apply only to new construction and renovated public spaces. (Ontario. Ministry of Economic Development, Employment and Infrastructure, 2014)

Dignity enabling spaces should stress design elements that: do not hinder one’s ability to form and sustain meaningful relationships. (Gibson et. Al, 2012) For instance, a planner could implement this by deciding to install a ramp next to a set of stairs to visibly create an atmosphere welcoming for all (physical), rather than hiding it in the back of a building, segregating its users from everyone else (social).

However, the sociological model of disability rights theory, like other rights-based approaches to disability rights is often criticized because it does not strive to go beyond legally recognizing the rights of minority groups. The result, critics like Arnstein (1969) would argue, is that minorities are placated, but never truly integrated into society. This is largely because equality in opportunity is a necessary but insufficient condition in achieving equality in outcomes. After all, just because a public space is dignity enabling does not mean that people of all abilities will feel comfortable enough to use them. In other words, there needs to be an acknowledgement that non-physical and perceived barriers to participation, like attitudes, may still exist and limit persons with disabilities. As Watson (1998) elaborates, rights-based theories understand citizenship in isolation, when the reality is that it should be understood in context to relationships with one’s environment, and in interactions with others, which requires that individuals have access to space.

To find examples of rights-based understandings of disability in practice, and how they are limited, one need only to look at the Duty to Accommodate and the AODA. According to the Canadian Human Rights Commission and codified by the Canadian Human Rights Act, accommodations are obligatory, but only if the individual asks for one. (2013) This is problematic because self-identification and institutional differentiation does not promote a sense of inclusivity, equity or justice. In fact, this serves to alienate and perpetuate the stigmatization of individuals with disabilities, and places blame on those who require them. Likewise, because the AODA is based upon the limited scope that is the Ontario Building Code and Accessibility Standard, not all individuals will find that their accessibility needs are
met. (AODA Alliance, 2012) For instance, a door deemed accessible by the Building Code may still not be wide enough for a larger wheelchair or stroller to pass through.

Attitudes presenting a barrier to participation are salient throughout planning literature, which tends not to identify inclusivity as a pressing concern. This is captured by Kitchen (1991) who suggests that satisfying the needs of the broadest group of clients is a planner’s greatest concern, even if it is at the expense of minority groups. More recently Wolpert concurs, stating that “it is easier to redress through public programs the gaps in the market basket of the handicapped and the needy than to create a human support system which has no casualties,” (2013, p.92) which is to say, accessible design, should it be an expense to those who do not benefit from it directly, need not be the planner’s highest priority because any inequities caused by its absence can be corrected later on with social services. And so, there exists a disconnect between professional expectation and general attitudes, as is reflected by the popular belief in literature being that accessible design is certainly worthwhile, but is more of luxury than a mandatory requirement.

Issues with the Obligation to Accommodate

Another argument against rights-based models is that they foster a sense of obligation to accommodate members of minority groups, rather than a voluntary will to be inclusive. (Roberts, 2013) In planning, this is true for accessible design because the CIP mandates that planners be mindful of disabled persons in their practices. While recognition was a major victory for the disability rights movement at the start, codifying accessible design makes it another technicality or requirement that professionals must adhere to; in other words, accessibility became yet another check on a list rather than an opportunity to have a meaningful discussion about space and power. Rights-based approaches therefore circumvent legitimate opportunities to make impactful change, by granting minority groups a quick win rather than a long-term strategy for influencing hegemonic power. (Withers, 2012) Often in planning, the Duty to Accommodate results in accommodations that are not well-designed, or given little to no consideration until the absolute last moment, rather than during the design or construction phases of building. The result
is that accessibility features are not well integrated, are poorly maintained or have little utility: handle bars are placed at heights that are not useful to those who need them, ramps are built using materials that do not match those of the surrounding area, and accessible entrances are placed in the back or to the side of a building, easily ignored.

Proponents of radical approaches therefore argue that for systematic paradigm shifts to occur that could realistically challenge dominant ways of thinking, action, rather than recognition, needs to be legislated. (Boyce, 2001) Policies are tangible and implementable. They operate as vehicles of soft power because they ensure that people change their behaviour in ways that encourage inclusivity, without them even knowing it. In literature, they are framed as social action texts because they interpret society’s values and identify clear deliverables to achieve those ends. (Titchkosky, 2006) And so, radical approaches to disability rights are about establishing cultures of inclusion, rather than obligations to accommodate.

Disability rights theory and planning ethics intersect at facility accessibility design standards in terms of packaging deliverable planning policies into design guidelines that strive to reduce barriers to participation.

Conclusion: Defining Disability in the Context of this Study

This section showed that there are many ways to answer the question, “what does it mean to be disabled?” and that each response will subsequently affect how one will answer the question, “how should a planner behave?” Having reviewed the five conceptualizations of disablement proposed by McColl and Bickenbach (1998) in relation to planning ethics, the sociopolitical model of disablement was identified as being the most compatible with the social justice values expressed by critical planning theory. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, disability will be defined as an expression of experience produced by “a complex dialectic of biological, psychological, cultural and socio-political factors, which cannot be extricated except with imprecision.” (Shakespeare and Watson, 2001, p. 22) Given the focus of this research is on accessibility of the built environment, the biological component of disability will be understood solely in the context of mobility impairments.
CHAPTER 5

THEORETICAL MODELING—THE INTERSECTION OF CRITICAL THEORY AND DISABLEMENT STUDIES

In the last two chapters, it was established that planning and disability studies overlap in practice, which necessitates a conversation on ethics because of the reality of power relations in society. In this chapter, what happens in practice will be discussed further, to show that there is a disconnect between what is expected of planners by their profession and what actually happens and is considered a culturally acceptable role of the planner by the planning community; This section will also explain why this divergence has occurred. The theoretical model that has been selected to explain the discrepancy in planning practice is a theory of historical sociology called path dependency. Path dependency, which was introduced in the previous chapter, will be explained in greater depth in this chapter and applied in the Discussions section, once all the data gathered in this study are revealed and analyzed in the Findings and Analysis sections, respectively.

Setting the Context: Facility Accessibility Design Standards (FADS) at Queen’s University

FADS are design guidelines voluntarily adopted by institutions, as a commitment to become more accessible than is required by provincial law. Unlike the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA), a FADS applies to all of an institution’s facilities—any infrastructure or open space owned, leased or used by the institution—to meet the principles of universal design. Universal design is the design of a product or environment to be used by anyone, “without the need for adaptation or specialized design.” (Center for Universal Design, 1997, Universal Design Principles, para. 1) Universal design is based on seven principles: equity (no one should have to compromise his dignity in the use of a space), multi-purposeful, multimodal (i.e. information can be accessed in different ways—audible, visual, tactile—for people with different abilities), hazard minimizing, effort-free and finally, proportionate in size to expected use.
FADS are still a fairly new concept in Canada. The only university in Canada with a FADS is Brock, who formally adopted one in 2008. It was based upon the City of London, Ontario’s FADS (the first of its kind in Canada), the Ontario Building Code and borrowed from the Canadian Standards Association’s voluntary Accessible Design for the Built Environment. (Brock University, 2008)

In 2014, Queen’s University was in the process of updating its Campus Master Plan (CMP). The most recent CMP at the time of writing is the 2002 version, which stated that: “The development of an accessible campus will require that a comprehensive guideline be prepared that defines requirements and priorities, and sets out a process to ensure participation of users.” (p.47) In other words, the CMP acknowledges the need for a FADS, but it falls short of actually proposing one. Should the university formulate one, it must incorporate the five standards outlined by the province in order to fulfill the terms of AODA and Ontario Building Code.

The Intersection of Planning and Disabilities Studies Literature

As the first literature review concluded, despite it being an ethical responsibility of the planner, and a professional requirement to incorporate universal design elements into plans, the general attitude within the profession is that accessible design is a secondary priority; and this is problematic because the result is that spaces are planned that perpetuate an attitude of obligation to accommodate which hinders the establishment of an inclusive environment.

The second literature review established that disablement is a relative term, constructed, framed and reinforced by whichever paradigm is the most dominant at the time. In the planning profession, this would be the sociological model, which means that the Ontarian Professional Planning Institute has identified that the planner should behave in a manner that is consistent with Rawlsian teachings of social equality, as a way to normalize disability. However, the fact that only one university campus has a FADS, shows that in reality, Ontarian campus planners are closer to behaving like those who belong to the economic paradigm: planners who design spaces to minimize costs in construction and maintenance of spaces, all the while maximizing utility for the greatest number of people, perhaps at the expense of the
minority’s needs. This is justified by using accommodations as a tool to bridge the gap for when what is in place does not work for everyone. To show how this disconnect has arisen in campus planning, one need not look further than the inability or resistance of all but one Ontarian university in developing and implementing FADS.

If campus planners do not behave outside of the economic-utilitarian model of disablement and planning, a FADS will not seem financially justifiable, given that only a minority of students willingly identify as having disabilities and priority will therefore be placed on catering campus designs to the majority. Ethics and professional conduct will justify this by arguing that the minority’s needs are not wholly ignored, as they can be serviced by accommodations, though critical theorists will identify these special treatments as tools for further stigmatization, alienation or perpetuation of minority oppression. However, if the campus planner was to shift from that position to one of the Rawlsian-universalistic disablement model of planning, a FADS would be seen as a policy that serves all students, and therefore has to be a priority in campus planning. When an issue is universal, it immediately becomes a matter of urgency and will receive the attention, resources and support needed to promptly find a solution. The creation of a FADS at Queen’s University, can therefore be seen as a matter of cultural shifting of perspective. But this begs the question: what comes first; the acceptance of universal framing of disablement or the FADS itself?

After all, a FADS at Queen’s University could be the contingent event that signifies the watershed moment when the school graduated from the duty to accommodate to a more progressive and equitable culture of universalism and inclusivity. It could be a statement to other universities in Canada that adhering to AODA’s minimum standards was insufficient in fulfilling the school’s vision for a universal campus, and could set Queen’s University, an institution of prestige already, apart as a leader in accessible design.
A Theoretical Model: Path Dependency

The argument that this research will make is that it is important for Queen’s to have a FADS following a model from historical sociology called “path dependency.” Path dependency, according to Mahoney, is the study of historical sequences, where “contingent events set into motion institutional patterns or event chains that have deterministic properties.” (2000, p.507) This is the understanding that history matters because one event can be causally connected to another when outcomes are traced back in time. In sociology, path dependency is used to analyze self-reinforcing sequences or institutional patterns of increasing returns. Increasing returns mean that once an institution (defined by Searle (2005) as anything that gives society structure, as concrete as laws, rules, and governing bodies, or as abstract as the family unit, cultures, attitudes and norms) is established, it becomes gradually more difficult to dissolve over time.

In large part, increasing returns are realized because institutions, even those that are not as efficient as alternatives, are reproductive. (Collins, 1999) Actors may find that maintaining an institution is easier than having to divorce from and then to create a new one. Likewise, a functional argument is that the consequences of an institutional collapse may not justify the repercussions experienced by a society. A political argument is that institutions are controlled by those in society with the most power, whose interests prevail in conflicts with those of lesser power. Finally, a legitimacy argument states that institutions prevail because actors may simply just believe in them.

If an event, Z, is said to have been caused by event Y, which was caused by event X, then, the chain of events can be traced all the way back to an initial, contingent event, itself a conjuncture of two or more previous chains. Contingent events are often watershed moments in history that initiate chains of reactions, and reshape how a culture approaches an issue.

Conclusion

In this section, it was demonstrated through the near-universal inability or resistance of Ontarian universities to develop and implement a FADS, what is actually practiced by planners falls short of their
professional obligations to address inaccessibility on campuses. Path dependency explains that this divergence occurs because institutions tend to self-reinforce through increasing returns that make it difficult to reverse course once a series of events have already begun.

However, path dependency demonstrates that since events self-reinforce, it is important to have a FADS at Queen’s because having a formally drafted and adopted standard on campus may aid in creating a culture of inclusiveness, which, like soft power, would be accepted as the norm, once institutionalized over time. A FADS could be therefore be the contingent event that initiates a new way of understanding accessibility on campus, from a language of obligation to that of universalism.
CHAPTER 6

FINDINGS

This chapter presents findings gathered from the field research and document review that were conducted. As noted, interviews were conducted with informants from Queen’s University, who will be referred to as ‘internal informants.” Interviews with representatives from Brock University, where a Facility Accessibility Design Standard (FADS) has been implemented, will be referred to as “external informants.” In addition, the findings from the visioning workshop with Queen’s University staff, faculty and students will be discussed. Finally, the interview informants shared information and access to documents, which were not accessible to the researcher at the time when the literature reviews were conducted. For this reason, it was possible for the researcher to review and analyze documents, internal to Queen’s and documents from Brock University that highlight aspects about the process that was undertaken to launch at their FADS process. As these documents were obtained through interviews, their review and analysis is in the context and knowledge of the fieldwork conducted, which was a time during the research when a much stronger sense of the culture of campus accessibility planning was established. Further analysis of the interviews and documents are then shared in Chapter 7 (Discussion), where the key themes that emerged from the findings in relation to the literature review, theory, and researcher’s interpretation of how this information assisted in answering the key research questions at the core of this thesis.

In order to allow for some comparison of Queen’s with Brock (where a FADS in place), the findings are organized by first presenting all the data gathered from Queen’s University and then from Brock University. Then, because there is a possibility for comparison of some Queen’s documents with documents from Brock University, a descriptive content analysis was conducted to allow for a direct comparison of findings from several documents. These documents are then analyzed in greater detail in Chapter 7.
Findings Gathered from Queen’s University

Interviews: Internal Informants

Internal informants are the individuals who were interviewed who identify with Queen’s University. In total, this research involved speaking to the following four internal informants: Heidi Penning, Equity Advisor, Laeeque Daneshmend, Deputy Provost, and two student leaders who will remain unnamed. It should be noted that four Queen’s student leaders were contacted for interviews: three from the Alma Mater Society (AMS), the undergraduate student government and subsequently, largest student organization on campus, and one from the Residence Society (the Residence Society is the organization of students who live on campus in Queen’s residences; all residents are voting members of the Society and the executives are tasked with planning events and non-academic discipline). The invitations that were sent to these students clearly stated that their identities would remain anonymous and that the purpose of interviewing them was for the researcher to better understand the student perspective on campus culture surrounding accessibility. Two students from the AMS declined, stating that he/she did not feel qualified to speak about accessibility on campus or that he/she did not feel comfortable speaking on behalf of the undergraduate student body as a whole.

Three themes emerged from these interviews with internal informants. The first idea that consistently came up was that there is a perceived sense that Queen’s, as an institution, is run like a corporation. As such, its goal is to maximize profits and minimize expenses. Because of this business-model approach to institutional organization and behaviour, all four interviewees expressed the idea that the university does the absolute bare minimum when it comes to accessibility. The interviewees suspected this is largely because accessibility is generally seen to be a cost that only affects a fair few. Therefore, it makes no sense for the university to go out of its way to ensure that the environment is more barrier-free than is mandated by legislation. After all: it makes very little business-sense to invest in something that only a few individuals may face repercussions. Ms. Penning, in particular, had this to say about addressing the challenges of accessibility in a business-orientated environment:
We need to be culturally aware and speak the language. I always find that when there is pushback to adopting something that is new, or different, or will change the landscape, it’s always good to use the words spoken already. With going above and beyond the AODA, the first thing that comes to peoples’ minds is, ‘how much is this going to cost financially.’ We need to change the channel. There are two sides to this. Business case, so return on investment…and then there’s a social return on investment…maybe it is recognition, increased reputation. The moral imperative can only get you so far. (H. Penning, personal communication, January 13, 2014)

When asked if going above and beyond the AODA at Queen’s would be “the right thing to do,” all four interview respondents agreed; this is the second major theme that emerged from the interviews. However, the consensus was that priority will, more often than not, go towards addressing matters of urgency rather than importance. Acting on an issue like accessibility may be a meaningful statement on what Queen’s believes ought to be a priority, but in a period of fiscal restraint and financial austerity, focus inevitably turns to the health and safety of as many students as possible, pushing minorities to the fringe—not as a matter of principle, but based on monetary, structural and cultural constraints and the reality of having multiple, sometimes competing interests in such a large institution. A sentiment voiced by Mr. Daneshmend captures the thought that only when a situation comes to a watershed moment will institutions break with cultural norms and finally address a problem: “If people of goodwill keep on filling in the [resource] gaps the best they can, then the system keeps limping along. It’s a bit paradoxical because in some ways, you need some things to come to a crisis to get focus and direction.” (L. Daneshmend, personal communication, February 5, 2014)

The final point that all four interviewees addressed was that the university operates by-the-book, meaning according to many processes, protocols and procedures. This was made as a statement of fact rather than as an accolade or as a criticism by the informants. As a business, this is meant to ensure accountability in the institution and the way that it is run. An example that the student informant from Residence Society brought up was an instance of a student had asked a professor for an accommodation for a learning disability. The professor followed protocol and referred the student to the Disability Services Office. There, the student was asked to fill out the requisite paperwork, demonstrate medical disablement, return, have the forms reviewed by administrative staff, have his/her name added to a
registry, and then present approval papers to the professor, who said he would have obliged regardless, but had to follow the due process. (Anonymized Student, personal communication, March 16, 2014)

Likewise, the procedures that need to be undergone in order to simplify—or even modify—these types of accommodations could be considered as tedious, and was described as such by the student informant from Residence Society. The process of appealing or submitting a formal complaint is quite lengthy, calls for a lot of effort (especially if signatures or approval are required), and requires the know-how on how to navigate the system (i.e., in terms of how the university structure is organized), which the average person probably may find complicated. (Anonymized Student, personal communication, March 16, 2014)

An interesting point that both the student leaders brought up was that the university, as a business, caters to a transient market. As such, the idea of instigating such a process is especially unattractive if the benefit reaped will only be for a short term, or if change is expected to happen only after the student has graduated. The student leader from the AMS also spoke about how every year, student governments experience a turnaround and that a challenge faced by the AMS is in transferring values and knowledge from one leadership cycle to another. The lack of continuity and different prioritization from leaders also means that sustained interest in the same issues across the student body is a barrier to accessibility initiatives because each student government has different items on their agenda that they wish to address in their limited time in office. (Anonymized Student, personal communication, July 22, 2014) And so, just as the university is utility maximizing, students behave similarly in a business-like environment: expecting service delivery, but accepting of the fact that priorities may prevent them from receiving them.

From speaking to Mr. Daneshmend, it was learned that Queen’s had commissioned an Accessibility Scan which was meant to evaluate the built environment for accessibility. Mr. Daneshmend did not know the details of what came out of the scan, but he had this to say: “We have a deferred maintenance backlog—what about our accessibility backlog? We don’t have a very good handle on that. We’ve never had an accessibility audit. I think we had a scan about five years ago, which [Campus Planning and Development described as]…really rather inadequate.” (L. Daneshmend, personal
communication, March 16, 2014) The scan report document is described and analyzed later in this study (see Chapter 7) alongside a number of other similar documents from Brock and Wilfrid Laurier Universities.

Visioning Workshop at Queen’s

Five individuals attended the visioning workshop on February 5, 2014 in the Speaker’s Corner of Stauffer Library: four identified as university staff, one, as a student. The purpose of the workshop was to get an understanding of where the participants, as individuals and members of the Queen’s community, stood in terms of their willingness to support the university in going above and beyond the baseline requirements of the AODA. Further, the participants were asked if they thought the university was, at the time of the workshop, ready and in a position to go above and beyond the baseline requirements of the AODA. Two key findings emerged.

First, the group was overwhelmingly supportive of the university becoming more barrier-free than required by law, for reasons of social justice, inclusivity and fairness. When asked to rank their positions on a scale between 1 (absolutely not) and 10 (yes, absolutely), the group unanimously responded with 10s. (To see photos from the visioning workshop, see Appendix F.) However, when asked if they thought the university was actually ready to go above and beyond the AODA, there were mixed results. On the same 1 to 10 scale, two individuals replied with 5s, two answered 3, and one participant said he/she would be “optimistic” and gave a 7.5.

The visioning workshop, like the one-on-one interviews with internal informants, showed that as individuals, members of the Queen’s community are supportive of going above and beyond the AODA to ensure that the campus is more accessible than legislation mandates, than the institution as a whole. The participants identified process as a barrier to accessibility at Queen’s as the interviewees did. However, unlike the interviewees, they also seemed to believe that it was the greatest opportunity as well. The need for policy, they said, was that it lends legitimacy to implementation: to the service itself in the eyes of the customer, as well as to the deliverer, in acknowledging that a service is somehow important or meaningful.
to the institution that they work for. Thus, from the workshop, the overwhelming theme was that for a cultural barrier to accessibility to be overcome, there needs to be buy-in from decision makers at the university; that change that begins from the top down can make a meaningful impact.

In terms of how process serves as a barrier, one participant summarized the point succinctly in commenting that the workshop was the first time that representatives from each stakeholder group from within the university had been gathered together to speak about accessibility as an issue on campus. Further, the participant noted that it was also the first time a conversation was conducted about how to design, adopt and implement campus-wide policy as a solution. The adjectives participants used to describe the relationship between the different departments at Queen’s included “competitive” and “territorial”; overall, the participants unanimously agreed that collaboration rarely occurs at the university. (Anonymized Workshop Participant, personal communication, February 5, 2014)

Participants asserted that the built environment at Queen’s is not a sole department or governing body’s jurisdiction: many stakeholders must come together, collaborate and buy-in to accessibility initiatives in order for a policy to come to life. Further, that teamwork and willingness to share resources, responsibility and potential spotlight would have to continue in perpetuity in order to sustain and implement that barrier-free vision for Queen’s. At the moment, the different departments within the institution operate in isolation from one another, and the culture amongst them was described as territorial, in the sense that not one wishes to intrude on the jurisdiction of another, so the result, a possibly unintentional outcome, is that all groups refrain from acting. (Anonymized Workshop Participant, personal communication, February 5, 2014)

*Internal Document Review*

On March 28, 2012, the Equity Office at Queen’s hosted a Town Hall meeting to gather community input for the university’s annual Accessibility Plan. The report that summarizes the findings of that meeting, *Accessibility Town Hall Report: “Together We Are Stronger,”* (Queen’s University, 2013) is available to the public online.
The first section of the report reads as follows:

The Accessibility Town Hall’s theme—“Together We Are Stronger”—was inspired by the current situation at the university; many exceptional staff, students and faculty are contributing towards accessibility at Queen’s, but there is a gap in the area of collaboration… [Thus, the intention of the meeting was to] address this gap by creating a space where participants could suggest strategies towards creating an inclusive and accessible Queen’s community where collaboration is key. (Queen’s University, 2013, p. 1)

The meeting was open to everyone and 50 students, staff, faculty and community members attended. Two important themes emerged from the group discussion: the first was that the participants, as representatives of the Queen’s community at large, recognized that the prevailing attitudes, norms and culture on campus “is most likely the hardest [barrier] to overcome.” (2013, p.11) Secondly, what was learned from the town hall was that there is a need for a centralized authority on accessibility on campus owing to the fact that “different department are working separately on similar issues and there is a lack of communication between them.” (2013, p.11) When an institution cannot effectively communicate ideas internally from one actor to another, one can say that it has an issue with knowledge transfer. Typically, knowledge transfer is the result of one of two things: an inability to communicate, or an unwillingness to communicate.

Other themes that came out of the meeting were: understanding the difference between training (a one-off situation) versus education (an on-going process) in creating an environment of understanding accessibility as an issue, the need to develop some sort of feedback system to report inaccessibility and a desire to have accessibility play a role or be emphasized during student Orientation Week.

Findings Gathered from Brock University

Interviews: External Informants

External informants are the interviewees who identify with any institution other than Queen’s. In total, two external informants were interviewed with Margaret Sanderson, AODA Coordinator at Brock University, and Scott Walker, Director of Campus Planning at Brock University. A walking interview
with Janet Muenzberger, Project Manager with Facilities Management at Brock University was also conducted.

Both Margaret Sanderson and Scott Walker were not only involved in, but also played key leadership roles in the development of a FADS at Brock University. These interviews were process-specific, in order to learn how Brock has been the only university in Ontario with a FADS. Both Ms. Sanderson and Mr. Walker were asked about what got the process started, what was fundamental to that process, what changes the interviewee would make if he/she could do it over again, and what sort of challenges and how they were overcome came out of having a campus FADS. (See Appendix B) Both interviewees agreed that having a centralized leader in the AODA Coordinator position was critical to ensuring that the FADS projection at Brock was a success for many reasons. First, there was a clear sense of accountability between actors, as a direct result of designating one leader to oversee the project. Second, communication was made easier, and there was a lot less confusion and debate because there was an individual who could mediate and clarify points between different stakeholders. And finally, because there was only one voice taking the lead, there was only one vision presented (though many were considered and multiple groups were able to contribute to it). The greatest opportunity that came out of the FADS, the interviewees said, was that it provided Brock with an opportunity to adopt a proactive rather than a reactive role in accessibility advocacy, because AODA requires that all universities fulfill certain accessibility criteria.

The biggest challenge that was identified was that change was hard. Pushback is inevitable when people are used to doing things a certain way and are told that they need to change. To combat attitudes of “why do we have to do this?” Ms. Sanderson spoke of education as being the key. Making sure every action was clearly explained using language that everyone could understand and framing accessibility in a way that could be relatable to the entire community made it possible for administration and staff to buy-in to the FADS. Once made into policy, and it was clear that there was a real commitment to accessibility that was not going to go away, it was easier to get the entire community on-board. (M. Sanderson, personal communication, February 19, 2014)
Brock seems to have been successful in not just producing a FADS, but also implementing one because the language used to frame accessibility was deliberately chosen to make the topic as understanding as possible for everyone, by ensuring that the ideas being communicated were relatable. In large part this was done through a conscious decision to move away from the medical model of disablement, which is usually weighed down by medical terms and concepts that are not reachable to everyone, either because they come across as intimidating or because people simply are not interested. By foregoing medical language, conversations of accommodation are naturally removed from the equation, leaving behind the idea that accessibility can occur on a spectrum, affect anyone at any time, and that it ought to matter to entire communities, not just groups within them. The following anecdote stood out:

One of the things I remember being called about was, we were building an addition and we needed to build a ramp. Somebody on the Board [of Trustees] was concerned about the cost of that ramp, how many students were actually going to use this ramp. So I said, ‘well, actually, let’s take a look at this from a universal design perspective: this is what it is, here’s who benefits. Sure, students with disabilities, but we have no idea who else is walking around campus. Pretend you don’t know who’s walking through your doors. That’s what accessibility is.’

Queen’s needs to pitch it [FADS] beyond accommodation…shifting it to the environment. Make it about the environment and not people…make it about accessible environments. People catch onto the word ‘disability’ and they ask, ‘can’t we just accommodate?’ This is about being proactive, not reactive. (M. Sanderson, personal communication, February 19, 2014)

In investing in accessibility education, understanding accessibility is accentuated and self-reinforcing. From speaking to Mr. Walker, it was learned that for many members of Brock’s staff, it is a surprise that Brock is seen as a leader in accessibility because on campus and in their facilities management office, having a FADS is nothing extraordinary. When it was mentioned to Mr. Walker that Brock is a leader in accessibility planning, he said,

There’s a lot of things the university does, because they do it. Cultural things. The impression you get on campus, how people behave and what’s important… The way I think about it is, ‘well, what’s the big deal? That’s the way it is, the way it’s done. I don’t see it as a big deal…’

Other institutions, when I go to other universities they’re not up to where we are, sort of surprises me... We take a lot of pride in what we’ve done with fairly limited funds. We’d like to do more. I don’t think a lot of people at Brock realize we’re leaders in this respect. At a meeting of accessibility coordinators last year, I gave a presentation. It wasn’t until the end, peoples’ comments; we realized we’ve done things or are doing things the other institutions are just beginning to do. The fact that they look to our FADS and maybe even use it as an example? They go, ‘well, maybe that’s what one looks like, a FADS document’…and in the absence of their own,
they use the Brock one. That was pretty surprising. (S. Walker, personal communication, March 3, 2014)

The walking interview with Ms. Muenzberger began in Schmon Tower, on February 19, 2014. The buildings visited included: MacKenzie Chown Complex (blocks A through D), Taro Hall, the Student Alumni Centre, the Cairns Family Health and Biosciences Complex, the Thistle Complex, the Walker Complex, Welch Hall, Faculty of Education and the David. S. Howes theatre. The tour included trips to auditoriums, theatres, classrooms, computer labs, washrooms, a library, a food court, retail outlets, the athletics complex (changing rooms, pool and exercise areas), administrative offices, parking lots, cross walks and outdoor paths, and drew attention to Brock’s accessible elevators, stairs, ramps, corridors, wayfinding features, and indoor and outdoor seating areas. The tour was contained to the indoors because it was chilly that afternoon, and was made possible because Brock’s central buildings are designed to be linked through skywalks. (For a description of the walking tour and a map of the places seen, please refer to Appendix H and I.)

Along the way, Ms. Muenzberger pointed out the multiple accessibility projects that the university have either been undergone in compliance of Brock’s FADS or were incorporated into the initial design of facilities, and she noted some of the challenges that came with each one. For instance, at one washroom, she noted how the stalls could be wider to provide for more turning room for an individual in a scooter, but that a consideration that had to be made was how many stalls each washroom should have. In an auditorium, she pointed out how the colour-contrast stripes on the stairs and rails were purchased and installed in bulk to ensure uniformity across campus and to save money. Finally, she pointed out how the washrooms outside the athletics centre were designed to have privacy walls built at 90 degrees that made it impossible for passersby to look in. When it came time to make the washrooms accessible for their FADS, Brock did not have to invest any money into rebuilding the room; all they did was take off the doors. (J. Muenzberger, personal communication, February 19, 2014) To see photos from this tour, see Appendix I.
Owing to time restrictions, residence buildings were not a part of the tour. However, the value of a walking tour was not just in being able to see how Brock’s FADS is implemented, but also how individuals interacted with their built environment. The walking tour was scheduled during Reading Week, but many Brock students were nevertheless on campus because many faculties scheduled their spring break a week later. Thus, there were still many students around, but not nearly as many if the interview was scheduled for a week before.

A point of interest to this research was in watching how students related to their campus because most individuals who do not experience disablement first hand or through their studies are often unaware of or care very little about the accessibility features that surround them. Indeed, because accessibility planning at Brock is so well integrated into the school’s overall planning strategy, accessibility features blend in seamlessly with the built environment. For instance, unlike the ramps at Queen’s that have been placed at the back of buildings or in corridors that are rarely used, thus giving the impression that they are wholly out of place with the surrounding area, those at Brock are highly visible and constructed using the same materials as everything around them, creating a sense of welcoming and invitation. (Please refer to Appendix I for photos from the Brock tour and Appendix J for a demonstration of poor accessible design at Queen’s.)

During the brief visit to Brock’s campus, the researcher noticed that students who seemingly did not require the use of accessibility features (individuals who did not have any obvious physical impairments, may obviously, nevertheless identify as disabled) did not use them at all, and in fact, hardly acknowledged that they were there or had the option to do so. If given the choice between a couple of steps or the ramp next to it, able-bodied students consistently took the stairs. They did not misuse the automatic door openers, occupy the seats that were identified as accessibility designated in the cafeteria or classrooms, or loiter in the areas of refuge that were clearly marked by accessibility signs.

Ms. Muenzberger agreed with this observation, saying that given that a lot of these features have been around for a while, most students were probably just used to them and were respecting that they should not abuse them because they are needed by others. She did, however, point out that it was
sometimes an issue in crowded lecture halls that students will occupy the designated accessible seating areas, but that this was becoming more and more of an anomaly that will soon be a non-issue.

(J. Muenzberger, personal communication, February 19, 2014)

External Document Review

Margaret Sanderson provided several documents relating to the accessibility audit at Brock, which are also searchable online. The one that reveals the most process-related information about how Brock University plans, prioritizes, implements and funds accessibility projects for their campus is an internal protocol document called *Brock University Facilities Management Operating Procedures: Accessibility Audit Implementation*. (2010)

The document starts off by explaining what the accessibility audit entailed and why it was commissioned: “The outcomes of the project allow Brock University to systematically plan for the elimination of physical and architectural barriers for those with disabilities, and to design new buildings and facilities that will meet the needs of all members of the university community.” (2010, p. 1) Later on “the university community” is defined as students, faculty and staff. The introduction mentions the necessity “for Facilities Management to have in place an agile and quick-response capability for the assessment of those requirements and their delivery,” (Brock University, 2010, p.1) which calls for a clear implementation and funding strategy.

Which department implements an accessibility project is determined by its scope. Projects that are projected to cost less than $10,000 are financed through the Maintenance and Operations Services unit (structural, mechanical, electrical or grounds team). On the other hand, projects that are more expensive than $10,000 are financed through Minor Capital Project requests as part of the Budget Development process, as an Out-of-Cycle Minor Capital Project if Student Services funding or if another source of stand-alone funding are freed up during a current fiscal year. (Brock University, 2010, p.2-3)

Implementation of these projects are carried out by the Campus Planning, Design and Construction Services unit using coordinated or assigned resources funding from money set aside for architectural and
engineering agreements, project maintenance and operations or consulting savings. (Brock University, 2010, p. 4) In other words, most of these projects are not financed by just one department; each stakeholder contributes and the resources are pooled together from multiple budgets. In both cases, the AODA Coordinator works closely with the Project Manager and Facilities Management to oversee the financing and implementation of projects.

For new construction and renovations, accessibility projects are incorporated from the onset through the AODA Coordinator collaborating with whichever Faculty or Department is providing the funding for the project, along with the Project Director.

**Three Accessibility Assessment Reports from Brock University, Queen’s University, And Wilfrid Laurier University**

*Descriptive Content Analysis*

During the interview, Ms. Sanderson provided the researcher with a copy of the *Brock University Refresher Accessibility Audit Project: Accessibility Audit Final Report* (The Herrington Group, 2012), a report written by the third-party external auditor who evaluated Brock’s campus for accessibility. Furthermore, through a summer internship opportunity with Queen’s University’s Campus Planning and Development, the researcher was granted access to the *Queen’s University Campus Accessibility Project: Project Summary Report* (SPH Planning and Consulting 2010), which compiles the findings discovered by the accessibility scan that Mr. Daneshmand mentioned during his interview. Finally, through an online search, a summary report from an accessibility audit conducted at Wilfrid Laurier University, called *Wilfrid Laurier University Built Environment Audit* (AccessAbility Advantage, 2012) was found. Given that these three documents are all about accessibility assessment, they will be compared to one another, using Rose’s Foucauldian discourse analysis for data and content analysis below.

The three documents were analyzed for content using the framework of who, what, when, where and why, as indicated by the following table in order to facilitate a Foucauldian analysis of the documents (see Chapter 7). The reason for selecting these three documents was because Brock, Queen’s and Wilfrid
Laurier were the only three universities in Ontario that had undergone accessibility assessments of their built environments at the time of writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Document Review—Descriptive Analysis of Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who…</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>...is written about?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen’s University Campus Accessibility Project: Project Summary Report (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock University Refresher Accessibility Audit Project: Accessibility Audit Final Report (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilfrid Laurier University Built Environment Audit (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most obvious observation when comparing the three documents was how accessibility is defined according to each institution’s understanding of disablement. In Chapter 7, a foundational Foucauldian analysis of these documents is conducted in order to determine which approach to disablement is undertaken by each university. This type of analysis is of utmost importance because how accessibility is framed directly correlates to what sort of methods would be used in order to evaluate accessibility on each campus. Although Wilfrid Laurier University is not an integral part of this thesis, it was thought of as worthy of inclusion here, as a means for comparing and better understanding the

Table 2: Document Review—Descriptive Analysis of Content (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>Why…</th>
<th>How…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queen’s University Campus Accessibility Project:</td>
<td>…was this document commissioned? To steer future projects at Queen’s</td>
<td>…was this researched? The university hired reviewers to conduct an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Summary Report (2010)</td>
<td>’s and because the institution is required to.</td>
<td>audit (p.2), evaluating (using the necessary tools): 1) What barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>are there and where 2) How they can or should be removed 3) What</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>resources would be necessary 4) Cost analysis 5) Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assessment was based on Brock University’s Facility Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock University Refresher Accessibility Audit</td>
<td>…was this document commissioned? To steer future projects at Brock.</td>
<td>Three specialized audit teams (signage, communication and built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project: Accessibility Audit Final Report (2013)</td>
<td>(p.2)</td>
<td>environment) evaluated (using the necessary tools) facilities based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on a checklist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Ontario Building Code (edition not stated) 2) AODA (2009 draft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Human Rights Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) Canadian Standards Association’s “Accessible Design for the Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environment” (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) Reviewers’ judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilfrid Laurier University Built Environment Audit</td>
<td>…was this document commissioned? To steer future projects at Laurier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2012)</td>
<td>(p.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...was this researched? The university hired reviewers to conduct an audit (p.2), evaluating (using the necessary tools): 1) What barriers exist and where 2) How they can or should be removed 3) What resources would be necessary 4) Cost analysis 5) Accessibility assessment was based on Brock University’s Facility Accessibility Design Standard (2007).
approaches undertaken at Queen’s and Brock. By looking at three universities, the research can also get a snapshot of how Ontario universities address accessibility as a larger group.

Conclusion

In this section, all the findings gathered from the field research and document reviews that were conducted were revealed. This chapter was purely descriptive. To understand all the data using the theoretical model, explained by the theories learned in the literature reviews, analysis was conducted in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 7

DISCUSSION

When linked to the literature review and the theories of planning and disability, the findings that were gathered through the field research informing this study reveal five key themes. These themes shed light on the structural and institutionalized barriers, as well as the related cultural components to campus planning that threaten the development of a Facility Accessibility Design Standard (FADS) for Queen’s University.

Bridging Planning and Disability Rights Frameworks: Culture of Ethics in Planning for Accessibility

From the planning literature review (see Chapter 2), it is evident that the nature of planning is inevitably political, given that planners have many opportunities within the planning process to insert their own interests, biases and preferences into how problems are framed, researched and presented, as well as what solutions are proposed, endorsed or rejected. Planners play a role in the inclusion and exclusion of stakeholders in the decision-making process, meaning that they are soft-power actors who can manipulate—intentionally or not—how certain groups in society identify to spaces because social relations are established, maintained and fostered in them.

As planners are uniquely capable of zoning interaction through their actions (whether libertarian, utilitarian or Rawlsian), professional associations have acknowledged that there are certain ethical considerations for which planners must abide by, in order to keep their power in check and to legitimize the profession (see Canadian Institute of Planners Code of Ethics in Appendix K). If planners in Ontario were to follow these ethical considerations, they should likely behave as Rawlsians, meaning that they would do everything within their power to ensure fairness in outcomes, not just opportunity. (McConnell, 1995) However, the reality is that planners are constrained by societal structures, like institutional culture, which justifies inaction and systematically encourages adhering to the status quo, regardless of whether or
not it is a best practice. An example of how institutional culture can act to constrain planners is campus accessibility planning, where only one university in Ontario has a FADS, despite the fact that inclusive planning practices are ethically required of the planner.

Though the ethics requirements set forth by the planning profession may claim to produce planners that should (or must) behave like Rawlsians, it is clear by looking at theories of disablement that planners in Ontario more often adopt a utilitarian mindset, and follow the economic model, where disability is understood as a potential economic loss. (McColl and Bickenbach, 1998) Thus, there is disconnect between what is asked of planners and what is actually being done, which as discussed earlier, is a product of societal restraints.

As noted in the literature review, McColl and Bickenback (1998) have outlined five ways of understanding what it means to have a disability:

a) Disability is a result of moral misconduct—Philosophical;

b) Disability is the result of a deviance from a norm and impairment—Biomedical;

c) Disability is a potential economic loss—Economic;

d) Disability is a product of culture—Sociological;

e) Disability is a combination of medical and social constructs—Sociopolitical.

These models can be further divided into two general approaches: rights-based approaches, which are centred on the principles of equality and universal approaches, which are concerned with matters pertaining to equity. In essence, the difference between the two approaches is that the universal school recognizes that planners are political actors in systems amongst many others, whereas the rights-based sees planners as not being power holders, in environments where structures do not play a role in shaping how people behave. In pairing critical planning theory with the models of disablement, it becomes evident that not all Rawlsian planners are the same; some could understand disability from the sociological point of view, making them equalizers of opportunities, while others may be interpreting disablement from the sociopolitical perspective, meaning these planners are social advocates for systematic change—equalizers of outcomes.
If planners were to conduct themselves in the manner required by professional ethics guidelines, they might recognize that they are in positions of relative power compared to the public and could utilize their soft-power abilities in the decision-making process to assist in systematically eliminating barriers that prevent oppressed groups in society from actively participating in the planning process. By this standard, sociological planners simply are not doing enough, even if they are Rawlsians, because normalization does not truly address the reality that there are culturally imposed barriers that prevent meaningful participation in decision-making processes. For instance, attending a meeting may be a first step to meaningful recognition of a traditionally oppressed group, however, it does not guarantee that that group is given a voice, or indeed, that its position is being legitimately considered in the decision-making process. Thus, in order to fully incorporate accessibility into campus planning there is a need for planners to move beyond the sociological and towards the sociopolitical understandings of disablement to direct their work.

Lessons from Brock University’s Facility Accessibility Design Standard (FADS): Process and Structure

From Brock’s process of developing and implementing a FADS, one can see that it was accessibility policy that came before a campus-wide attitude shift. Thus, it makes sense for Queen’s to try to learn as much as it can from Brock’s FADS policy implementation document, the *Brock University Facilities Management Operating Procedures: Accessibility Audit Implementation.* (2010)

The most obvious theme from the *Brock University Facilities Management Operating Procedures* is the central role played by the school’s Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) Coordinator. The AODA Coordinator is the clear leader in all matters pertaining to campus accessibility, whose role is to advise all of the institution’s administrative arms. From the procedures, it is obvious that throughout the entire process of funding and implementing accessibility projects, the AODA Coordinator, Facilities Management, Campus Planning, Design and Construction and Faculty or Departments all work very closely together and communicate frequently with one another. Though the document is technical (it is, after all, an operating procedure), it is, at the same time, very practical and
clearly outlines how to move from an idea to an actualized stage. What is most telling is that this document is not a promise of something being done one day, but rather a step-by-step how-to (an operations procedure, as the title suggests), on getting a project constructed and thoroughly outlines who does what and how collaborators will interact with one another. The fact that it is available to the public provides the protocol a sense of transparency and demonstrates an institutional will to be accountable in their practices. Finally, the document explains that the projects being constructed are for everyone; that not just one group is expected to benefit from it, but that it will be used by all members of the Brock community.

It would seem that the biggest gain of being the first university with a FADS for Brock University is that they are now the one and only ‘best practice/case study’ that all other universities will look to as an example. Brock’s proactivity means that they essentially now have, more or less, full control over their own fate regarding their accessibility design as an institution (barring major changes to the AODA). Indeed, they do not have to look to other universities to understand what needs to be done to become more accessible, because they have already done it. In fact, because they are the sole precedent, Brock is the institution that has set the tone on what sort of language, goals, and vision will ultimately to define all campus FADS, as policy statements. Thus, so long as Brock continues to act as a leader in campus accessibility initiatives, they will have significant influence on all other universities’ in that all others will be modeling their built environments to look like theirs.

Approaches to Disablement in University Policy: A Comparison of Three Universities

In the last theme, it was noted that Brock is unique amongst the universities in Ontario for not only having the ability to create a FADS, but in its institutional willingness to actually implement accessible design. The fact that Brock can see their FADS pass the planning stage and into a state of actualization is a testament to its campus culture, where the norm is to frame disablement as a universal issue, defined by the parameters of the sociopolitical model. But as the date for forced compliance to the AODA’s Built Environment Standard nears, where do other schools locate themselves in terms of their
willingness to implement accessible design? In this document review, Queen’s, Laurier’s and Brock’s accessibility assessment documents were compared and analyzed using Rose’s Foucauldian review method (2001) to unravel which disablement models these institutions use to understand disablement. The reason for picking Laurier as the third university was because at the time of writing, it was the only institution to have completed an assessment. As the table below demonstrates, Brock University’s culture of accessibility had adopted the most radical (universalistic) approach to disablement, while Queen’s is comparable to Wilfrid Laurier’s and is mostly economic and utilitarian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Document Review—Foucauldian Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflexivity (tone of author)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period of time:</strong> Evaluative criteria was based on the most up-to-date legislation and accessibility standards at the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Truthfulness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inconsistencies</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This document comparison of three university accessibility assessment summary reports demonstrated that the culture of accessibility at Queen’s is one where the institution and its community frame disablement according to the economic-utilitarian model. As a result, accessibility at Queen’s University is interpreted to be a fringe issue that affects only a small group within the campus community, and in turn does not make economic sense for decision-makers to actively pursue initiatives that exceed the bare minimum. Whereas the Queen’s document suggests that the university is content with doing the bare minimum, Brock University’s frames accessibility as a universal issue and suggests institution-wide readiness to do more than is legislated. In this three-school comparison, Brock appears to be the outlier in this regard: Wilfrid Laurier University’s document (though the school was willing to
commit to a thorough accessibility audit—more than the superficial scan that Queen’s conducted), frames disablement as an economic issue as well, where cost is highlighted as the most significant consideration.

These attitudes have become a barrier to the drafting, adopting and implementing of a FADS at Queen’s University. However, there is evidence to suggest that the institution is ready for a shift in culture from being rights-based to universalistic in how disablement is understood, which may provide a window of opportunity to see meaningful progress be made in addressing accessibility on campus. A study of path dependence reveals more about the possibility for Queen’s to develop and implement a FADS through campus planning.

Institutional Cultures of Campus Accessibility at Queen’s University

Culture, an institution in and of itself, constructs how individuals think, thereby influencing how they behave, which contributes to how they come to understand things to be true. At Queen’s, the knowledge-to-action cycle (the process of spotting an accessibility problem to the time it takes to have it meaningfully addressed) is purposefully designed to be stop-and-go, with frequent administrative checks and balances; and this is revealing of the institutional culture. For instance, in doing this study, it was well within the rights of any individual who was contacted for an interview to decline; however, from the reasons that the student leaders gave about why they opted against being a part of this study, a lot of knowledge can be gained about student leadership on accessibility within the context of the university as a corporate and organizational entity.

A Corporate Culture of Accessibility

At Queen’s, campus culture is one where accessibility is seen as something nice, but not something that is necessary because it is understood to be a special interest that only affects a small group of people. This is made apparent by the fact that action is undertaken only when a student (or client or customer) explicitly asks for it in the form of an accommodation. And because accommodation is a legal right, this creates an understanding that it is a special treatment. Special treatments come with the implicit
understanding that they must guarded by tedious processes, because the fear is that otherwise students will exploit them. While the system may ensure credibility and accountability (in the sense that there is a clear trail and way of tracing which actors do what, and what is contributed to the discussion by whom), the reality is that they act as double-edged sword because these checks dissuade changes to the status quo, by being designed to be difficult.

While members of the Queen’s community were supportive of going beyond the parameters of the AODA to ensure that the campus is more accessible than legislation mandates, it is evident that there is no clear-cut leader, as accessibility is a multi-facetted issue that requires the know-how of multiple departments to feasibly address. When an institution cannot effectively communicate ideas from person to person, group to group or from department to department, one can say that it has difficulty with a phenomenon called knowledge transfer. With little-to-no communication (making coordination difficult—sometimes impossible), initiatives undergone by one department can sometimes go completely unknown to all others. In some other cases, departmental projects may even contradict in purpose or deliverables, creating conflict, confusion and frustration for all parties involved. Finally, resources, being as limited as they are, must be carefully considered before being allocated. Thus, the idea of committing personnel and money to a project that is not well organized cannot be justified when there are other issues that need to be addressed, which may be less risky.

As a snapshot in time, the Queen’s Equity Office’s *Accessibility Town Hall Report: “Together We Are Stronger,”* (2013) serves as a rather comprehensive look at what the culture of accessibility was at Queen’s in 2012. The most obvious conclusion to be made from the document is that the university has recognized, acknowledged and has expressed a willingness to overcome its cultural norm, which is to pursue accessibility projects in isolation, rather than collaborating with like-minded individuals to create a larger, systematic change in how accessibility is addressed on campus. This is demonstrated by the fact that the institution (through the Equity Office) has formally admitted that accessibility is a problem by organizing and facilitating a Town Hall on the topic of working together to improve accessibility.
Most telling about the Town Hall document, however, was that the Queen’s community, in 2012, was aware that attitudes create a barrier to removing barriers to inclusivity on campus, issues with the university’s knowledge transfer system (also referred to as knowledge infrastructure), and that there is a “need to create and foster a ‘Climate of Openness.’” (Queen’s University, p.11) In other words, the university community is reaching a turning point or critical junction where a shift in understanding accessibility as merely the removal of physical barriers to framing accessibility as the removal of cultural barriers in addition to the physical. Admitting an issue exists, however, is one thing; acting on the recommendations that were made at the Town Hall is another; and Queen’s is beginning to do exactly that. In 2013, the university created the Accessibility Hub, an online compilation of accessibility resources for students (current and incoming) as well as faculty and staff, as per the suggestion of the Town Hall. This willingness to act on recommendations is very promising if the university is to pursue a FADS in the near future.

Thus, Queen’s appears to be coming to an important crossroads. Because action and knowledge belong to the same cycle, the question becomes: which comes first? If the goal is to change how which model of disablement the institution adopts in understanding accessibility, at some point, a decision on how to proceed needs to be made. At the moment, the chosen model is economic-utilitarian and the administrative structures perpetuate this understanding. To move from economic to sociopolitical model, does the institution need to first have an accessibility framework? Or does an attitude shift become the catalyst?

**Student Leadership on Accessibility**

The Alma Mater Society of Queen’s University (AMS) is the most influential student organization at Queen’s. Student leaders elected to the AMS are seated at various administrative committees (including the Campus Planning Advisory Committee), boards and the University Senate meetings and therefore have a lot of influence in decisions regarding the fate and direction of the university takes, as well as what sort of activities are organized for the student body. One of these events
is faculty Orientation Week, which is significant because incoming first-years are introduced to the university, its mandate and expectations for student conduct, at this time. Thus, the AMS can affect campus culture formally through university governance and service delivery training of staff, or project funding, and informally (through Orientation, which sets the tone for how students are expected to behave while belonging to the community).

Indeed, the AMS contributes to many accessibility initiatives at Queen’s, through awarding grants that are directly funded through mandatory annual undergraduate student membership fees and collected in the AMS Accessibility Fund. (AMS, 2013a) Examples of projects that have been financed through the Fund include the Accessibility Hub, and the diversity speaker series organized by the Equity Office to bring in lecturers to Accessibility Cafes. The AMS also contributes to disability awareness on campus through funding student-run accessibility clubs like InvisAbilities, which serves to create awareness, educate and provide support for students on campus with invisible illnesses. (AMS, 2013b)

Three things can be deduced from the AMS representatives’ refusal to participate in this study. First, just as there exists a disconnect within the culture of accessibility in the planning profession (see Chapter 3 for more details) one can see that there is an inconsistency between values and practice within the student body. Where this incongruence lies is that the AMS obviously supports accessibility initiatives, as evidenced by the presence of its Accessibility Fund (which its contributors are not given the opportunity to opt-out of), yet, some of its important student leaders—important actors within the decision-making process at Queen’s who are capable of influencing student culture—do not always discuss them, even when given the opportunity. If student leaders are not more consistently vocal, the knowledge that the AMS has an accessibility fund could potentially escape the average Queen’s student, unless he/she sought out that information on his/her own by looking up how mandatory fees are divided. Further, knowledge of what the Accessibility Fund contributes to would only be known by those involved with student government, as an online search of the AMS website came up with no data. Second, what the leaders’ refusal made apparent is that the AMS experiences the same kind of organizational lag that the University’s governance network does; that is, individuals in positions to speak out about an issue do not,
without first going through the motions of checks, for the sake of self-preservation. Student leadership positions at Queen’s are highly regarded and the hiring and elections processes, are often very competitive. (Note: the individuals that were contacted and refused interviews occupied hired positions.) Because of their prestige and the knowledge that one could be easily replaced, the consequences of a misstep while occupying one of these positions are great. What some AMS leaders’ refusal to participate in this study shows is that there is a culture of self-preservation within student governments at Queen’s that prevents leaders from being vocal advocates for change or critics of the system; and that this is similar to the corporate culture engrained in the way that Queen’s administrative arms operate. Therefore, one could say that campus-wide culture, as it exists in the economic-utilitarian framing of accessibility, is a barrier to the development of a FADS.

Finally, the general attitude is that in order to speak about campus culture on accessibility, one must be an expert on the matter. What this says about the culture at Queen’s itself is that students may be hesitant to take a leadership role in addressing accessibility, believing it to be outside their realm of influence because the built environment and campus is something that seems to be under the sole jurisdiction of the university. Therefore, despite the fact that change can be initiated from the bottom-up, the expectation from students is that it will trickle down from above. With neither student nor university governance willing to make a first move, the culture is one that has created a standoff in terms of what is to be done about accessibility.

**Developing a FADS at Queen’s University: A Model of Path Dependency**

In the Theoretical Modeling section (see Chapter 5), path dependency was explained as the theory of historical sociology that argues that history matters because events are self-reinforcing: one event will prompt or be causally related to another, then another. The sequences become institutions, defined as any structure that gives a society order, and are “sticky” (Jones et. al., 2003)—once a pattern is established and people are used to doing things a certain way, it becomes very difficult to reverse them. In other words, institutions like laws, rules, governing bodies, and informal institutions like family units, cultures,
attitudes and norms are increasing returns that self-reinforce. From the perspective of critical planning theory, what path dependency suggests is that institutions form “mutually consistent expectations that permit coordination of individual agents’ behaviours without centralized direction.” (David, 1994, p. 205) In other words, path dependency creates the tools, institutions, which make it possible for some actors exercise power and oppress others, without most people even realizing it (soft power). Path dependency can therefore be used to understand how, despite inclusivity being universally lauded as one of the identifiers of Queen’s, is nevertheless still not a priority when it comes time to finance accessibility initiatives for the campus because institutional culture is one that does not interpret inaccessible facilities as an issue. The economic model that is generally accepted and prevails through the procedures in which the university is organized understands accommodation to be enough to address accessibility. But, as more and more people are beginning to understand accessibility from the sociopolitical and radical universalistic perspectives, the opportunity for a watershed moment where the shift from economic to sociopolitical is closer than before.

To understand how an institution like Brock has a FADS, while others like Queen’s do not, one need only to trace the evolution of their respective campus cultures back through history, since historical sequences can be linked to present events, according to path dependency. Figure 1 is derived from data collected over the course of this research and compares the trajectories of the two universities. What it demonstrates is that at Queen’s, unlike Brock, there has not been a clear watershed moment where the culture of accessibility has shifted from human rights to universal, the contingent event that will set in motion policy, procedures and implementation processes that will establish a new institutional framework that will reinforce and perpetuate a new understanding of disablement that promotes equity. The result is that at Queen’s, there has been a continuation of the same-old: accepting accommodation as being “accessible enough”.

As of July 2014, Queen’s is in the process of hiring a consultant to audit its facilities for compliance to the AODA. This should be understood as an important stepping stone for the development of a FADS on campus because custom design solutions to inaccessible facilities cannot be proposed until
the university thoroughly understands what sort of barriers exist, where they exist and how to best address them. And, as the Brock precedent has demonstrated, a FADS is a natural progression from an accessibility audit of the built environment. However, as the interviews, literature reviews and Brock precedent have showed, a willingness to go above and beyond legislation must also require a watershed moment where accessibility is reframed from human rights to universal approaches. The time appears to be right for this: as the timeline in Figure 1 shows, the Town Hall meeting organized by the Equity Office has created significant momentum, awareness and interest in accessibility on campus. Thus, the next section will discuss recommendations that will hopefully aid in bringing about that culture shift that may prompt the FADS from coming to light.
Figure 1: Comparing Path Dependent Timelines of Brock and Queen’s Universities

**BROCK**

- 2005: AODA passes, becomes provincial law.
  - Forced compliance with accessibility standards.
- 2005: Establishment of the Office of the AODA Coordinator on campus
  - Watershed moment: turning point from human rights to universalistic approach.
- 2006: First accessible built environment audit, process begins to create a FADS
  - Issues of concern brought to attention, development of FADS suggests desire to go above and beyond the AODA.
- 2006: Development of accessibility working group
  - Commitment to collaboration and institution building to sustain chain of action.
- 2006: First draft of FADS released, ready for internal review by university stakeholders
- 2007: Implementation of FADS
  - Identifying facility renewal projects and establishing operating procedures--backing up promises with action.
- 2008: FADS finalized, adopted as a procedure rather than a campus-wide policy
- 2009: FADS updates made
  - Demonstrates continued importance of accessibility
- 2012: Refresher audit project

**QUEEN’S**

- 2005: AODA passes, becomes provincial law
  - Forced compliance with accessibility standards.
- 2009: Queen's hires a consultant to conduct an accessibility scan
  - Choice of doing a scan suggests University is not yet committed to accessibility as universal issue; placation
- 2010: Accessibility scan complete
  - Consultant recommends adopting a FADS and conducting a real audit.
- 2011: Creation of Accessibility Database
  - Because of significant knowledge gaps in the scan, data cannot be reliable.
- 2011: Accessibility framework approved by the Vice Principle's Operations Committee.
  - Committee established to ensure baseline compliance with AODA
- 2012: Accessibility Town Hall, "Together We are Stronger," aims to address barriers to collaboration
  - Decentralization identified as an issue; beginning to recognize cultural change is needed to overcome accessibility issues
- 2013: Accessibility Hub, online accessibility resource centre, launched
  - Awareness of accessibility as an issue on campus grows.
- 2014: The process to hire a consultant for an accessible built environment audit begins
  - Queen's beginning to take inventory on what projects may need to be undergone, however this is not an indication action will be made to rectify inaccessibility
Conclusion

In this chapter, the theories drawn from the literature review sections (Chapters 3 and 4) and theoretical modeling chapter (Chapter 5) were used to understand the data collected for this study. In all, five themes were teased out:

(1) For a contingent event to happen in order for Queen’s to set in motion the process of developing a FADS, there needs to be a shift in cultural understanding of disablement from one that is economic to a definition that is sociopolitical.

(2) From Brock University, it has been demonstrated that in the chicken or the egg/what came first dilemma, policy came before widespread attitude changes.

(3) At the moment, Queen’s culture of accessibility is fairly consistent with that of Laurier, where both schools appear to conform to the parameters of the economic model and approach accessibility from the perspective of a utilitarian. Conversely, Brock’s approach to disablement is that of universalism.

(4) This process of establishing a new, more inclusive accessibility culture may already be on its way, given that there are signs that the corporate culture adopted by the administrative and governing bodies within the institution are being challenged in community meetings like the Equity Office’s 2012 Town Hall. However, in order to really make this cultural shift, there is a need for student leaders to buy-into an inclusive vision for the campus.

(5) Path dependency ties all the themes together and could make a case that a FADS at Queen’s could help to create a culture of inclusiveness on campus, which will self-reinforce, to become the norm. A FADS could be the contingent event that initiates a new way of understanding accessibility on campus, from a language of obligation to that of universalism.
CHAPTER 8

RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 7 provided a comparison of the timelines of accessibility projects at Brock University and at Queen’s University, respectively, and showed that if path dependency is to be believed, events can be causally related to those that predated it. Further, it was discussed that if a cultural shift on how disablement is understood and occurs in conjunction with the presence of a governance or leadership structure that supports it, a FADS could very well be a reality at Queen’s. However, while the latter appears to be in the process of fruition—Queen’s is currently in the early stages of hiring a consultant to conduct a facility accessibility audit and has the resources to do so—the former, the cultural shift, does not seem to be as prevalent. The following three recommendations may help to facilitate the watershed moment, where disablement is framed as a universal rather than a human rights issue, by addressing barriers to change.

I. Institutional Leadership

**Barrier:** Decentralization of implementation offices attempting to resolve a multi-faceted issue like accessibility results in the emergence of departmental territoriality and unwillingness to take action. This enables an environment where it becomes engrained in community culture that doing the bare minimum for accessibility is acceptable.

**Recommendation:** Clearly designate one office or position within the university, whose mandate is to serve the entire Queen’s community rather than just one group within it, to take leadership of accessibility (in the built environment) on campus. At Brock, this individual is the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) Coordinator. This action could achieve several goals. First, it would signify that accessibility is no longer a fringe issue, but rather, a matter of importance to the entire institution; this
would be a major turning point in institutional culture. Second, it would create a process framework and location in which resources, responsibility and knowledge can be coordinated amongst stakeholders. Third, having a centralized office provides institutional stability, mitigates risk of conflicting or competing service delivery, and unifies department goals and messages. Fourth, having a centralized office for accessibility changes the university’s approach from a position of reactivity to proactive decision-makers, and legitimizes the task of promoting inclusivity. And finally, a single office acts as a mediator amongst stakeholders and encourages cooperation.

**Feasibility:** The window of opportunity to select a formal or *de facto* leader is open, with the campus master plan being drafted, the AODA’s Built Environment Standard coming into effect, and attention to the built environment that comes with a project of this magnitude. Further, with the audit process underway and the launch of the Accessibility Hub, interest in accessibility is at an all-time high.

II. **Institutional Knowledge Management**

**Barrier:** Despite the fact that Queen’s is an institution of higher learning, where research is conducted and knowledge is constantly being generated, the university has a very weak knowledge infrastructure (defined by Gold et al., as any institution’s ability to communicate ideas from person to person, or group to group through “technology, structure, and culture along with a knowledge process…of acquisition, conversion, application and protection.” (2001, p. 186)) Simply put, administrative departments either chose not to (cultural issue that can be addressed through the first recommendation) or cannot communicate with one another, creating misunderstanding and conflict.

**Recommendation:** Establish an institution-wide knowledge management guide or communications standard to enable knowledge transfer. This guide should go above and beyond Queen’s only communications manual, *The Queen’s University Style Guide*, which fixates, as its name suggests, on linguistic style: when to abbreviate or use acronyms, capitalizes words, present numbers, use punctuation,
correct spelling and how to refer to in-house technology like websites and databases. The recommended knowledge transfer guide would build on the *Style Guide* and focus more on the actual communicating of ideas (not just the appearance of the message).

A useful example is the *Government of New Brunswick Knowledge Transfer Guide* (2010), which outlines the thought process for how to communicate ideas from a sender to receiver: (1) Identify what knowledge is to be communicated; (2) Identify where the knowledge is currently located and what sort of language is used within that department that may be difficult to understand for those outside of it; (3) Identify to whom the knowledge is transferring to, noting if there may be any interpretation barriers (words that mean different things to each party); (4) Select the most appropriate method to capture and transfer the knowledge and (5) follow up to ensure that the communication has been received, understood and knowledge is gained by the recipient. (GNB, 2010) The main takeaway is that both sender and receiver should be communicating before and after the actual knowledge transfer.

Another tool that would aid in knowledge transfer, that a guide could incorporate, is to institutionally standardize communications. For instance, at the Centre for Research on Inner City Health in Toronto (Murphy and Holton, 2011), all reports must be presented as 1, 3 or 25 page documents that must be organized in a way that they can be read in less than 5, 15, or 45 minutes, respectively. Every report must be formatted identically, following a specific series of headings. The first heading is always the conclusion (most salient facts that need to be transferred), for clear communication of the message. This would be extremely helpful at Queen’s, where internal documents are not standardized and therefore vary from individual to individual, even within the same departments.

**Feasibility:** Queen’s already has a *Style Guide* and many knowledge transfer guides are available online. Given that the university has many in-house communications experts within the newly established University Relations portfolio (headed by the Chief Communications Officer and encompassing departments of University Communications, Marketing and Government and Institutional Relations), the university already has the human resources and expertise to implement this recommendation.
III. Promote Awareness and Action Campus-Wide

**Barrier:** Lack awareness or interest of accessibility initiatives on campus.

**Recommendation:** Continue spreading awareness and create interest in accessibility on campus. It is important to recognize that Queen’s student population is continually changing, with new students being introduced to the campus every year, who may not be familiar with the school’s accessibility initiatives or projects and new student leaders assuming their offices for the year. Further, staff and faculty may not be aware of changes to accessibility legislation or campus projects either, or may be in need of refreshers. This can be achieved three ways: (1) Emphasizing the importance of inclusivity on campus during Orientation Week and during staff and faculty training; (2) Continuing with the Equity Office’s Accessibility Cafes or public forums that encourage discussion about equity issues on campus; and finally, (3) Acknowledging and rewarding efforts by members of the Queen’s community who serve to make the campus more accessible with regularity, rather than once a year.

**Feasibility:** How any issue is framed will either help to generate interest, disinterest or apathy. Using universal language, and presenting accessibility as a matter of institutional urgency and community importance will increase the likelihood of fostering passion in the community. This is of upmost importance because with every year is the potential to get the attention of potential accessibility leaders, and advocates whose determination, drive and assets could mean all the difference between a project succeeding or failing.
CHAPTER 9

CONCLUSION

From this study, it can be concluded that though Queen’s University has many leaders and persons in decision-making positions that have demonstrated individual readiness for a campus Facility Accessibility Design Standard (FADS), the institution, as a whole, has not yet caught up. As such, the dominant culture at Queen’s remains one that supports an economic-utilitarian acceptance of accommodations as a solution to inaccessibility, which was identified as a barrier to the accessible design planning process. However, there are signs that Queen’s is on its way towards a FADS, based on a path dependent analysis and comparison of Queen’s campus culture to the trajectory undertaken by Brock University, the only university in Ontario that has successfully adopted one. In this last section, two final considerations will discussed. The first provides direction for future research and the second is about the broader implications of a Queen’s FADS on the Ontario university community.

Future Directions for Accessibility Culture Research at Queen’s

This study was about the ethics and feasibility of developing a FADS for Queen’s University, however, an important consideration that it did not address is what the university should do with a FADS if one was to come to fruition. If the goal is for Queen’s University to make a permanent cultural shift in the way that accessibility is understood campus-wide, drafting and adopting a planning document like a FADS, in-and-of itself, is a necessary but far from a sufficient step. To demonstrate how this is true, one need only to look as far as the planning Code of Professional Practice (CIP, 2004) which mandates that planners be as inclusive as possible in their work but how planning culture enables them to practice in a manner that is inconsistent with what they say they value. Therefore, a FADS cannot simply be prepared to appease those who are most vocal or serve the university’s reputation and then forgotten. Policies embody societal values, but they are legitimized in their implementation. A policy statement that is not acted on does little more than act as lip-service; Therefore, a FADS at Queen’s should be the launching
point for further policy documents, as it was at Brock where operating procedures were developed to address the accessibility goals identified in their FADS. There will inevitably be many challenges in developing a FADS operating procedure for Queen’s built environment, which could produce opportunities for future research. Two potential conflicts that come to mind include: (1) the complex nature of addressing inaccessibility of facilities on a campus that has properties with options for heritage preservation; and (2) the debate between accessibility and public health advocates who encourage built environments that promote physical activity.

Another two considerations that could direct future research are worthy of mention. Firstly, this study was conducted before Queen’s University updated its campus master plan, though, by the time this was written, a newer version was made public. Second, this research was completed without interviewing students at the universities (Brock and Wilfrid Laurier) to which Queen’s campus culture was compared. As such, if a similar study is conducted in the future or if this research is to be replicated later on, these gaps should be addressed.

The Impact of a Queen’s FADS in the Ontarian University Community

In analyzing accessibility assessment reports from not just Brock, but also Wilfrid Laurier University, and speaking to informants in- and outside of the Queen’s community, one of the things this study showed is that Queen’s is not the only institution within the broader Ontarian university community to adopt a corporate culture of operation. With only so many grants available, talent to employ, students looking to enroll in post-secondary education, and faculty to recruit, it is natural that the university community be competitive. The result is that individual institutions are inclined to take on certain projects in the hopes of setting themselves apart from the others and there is a huge incentive (reputation), if not be the first, to at least ensure that one is not the absolute last. Brock University has showed that by having a FADS, accessibility is an area where universities can make themselves stand out for the better. Subsequently, Brock’s proactivity in this regard has made them a community leader and the example in which many others have sought to follow. A cultural shift in the framing of accessibility (from economic-
utilitarian to sociopolitical-Rawlsian) within a competitive environment has tremendous potential for improving the accessibility of the built environments in the broader university community, and Queen’s could be a part of this process by developing a FADS of their own. The belief is that alone, Queen’s will not independently change the broader university community; other universities would have to act in a similar manner towards developing their FADS as well. As it happens, current circumstances have opened the window for exactly this to happen.

With forced compliance to accessibility legislation around the corner (the Built Environment Standard of the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act is enforceable in 2016), many universities in Ontario, including Queen’s, are beginning to see campus accessibility as a matter of not just importance, but urgency. In fact, based on a survey of all the Ontarian universities’ campus planning, facilities management and equity offices (conducted during a summer internship opportunity with Queen’s Campus Planning and Development), at least a quarter of the universities in Ontario are in the process of developing FADS, or are in the beginning stages of assessing their facilities based on compliance to the AODA, which this research has showed may be one of the steps that could lead to a FADS. If Queen’s followed in this trend and those universities who are already on their way to a FADS continued on course, there would be a shift in the university community where instead of Brock being the outlier with a FADS, those institutions without a FADS or are not on track to have a FADS would become the outlier. In a competitive environment, the pressure to either move ahead or remain step-for-step with one’s competitors will impact an institution’s decision-making because it is damaging to one’s reputation in both the short and long term to get left behind.

One benefit to a group of universities being in the beginning stages of developing similar policies around the same time is that institutions will push one another to innovate, to think creatively and to collaborate, even in an environment that is competitive, because of the possibility of shared rewards and benefits. Indeed, this is happening with Queen’s University’s accessibility audit. Currently, Queen’s is leading a collaboration with a handful of other universities in order to approach audit service providers with more square footage to get a obtain prices for services for all the institutions who are involved.
Ultimately, however, the greatest benefit to university facilities becoming more accessible will be felt by those who experience campuses first hand and by all members of these university communities. Accessibility, both physical and social, is a basic requirement to participate in everyday activities. It is imperative from a perspective of planning ethics and a universalistic position on disablement that improvements are made to campus accessibility in order to promote a sense of institutional inclusivity, and equity.
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Research Protocol

The objective of the research is to develop theoretical model to explain why planning ideas and disability rights models overlap at critical planning theory when it comes to addressing accessible design.

Figure 2: Research Objectives

Figure 3: Methodology of Research Protocol
APPENDIX B

Interview Guide

Internal Interviews
Objective: To collect process-specific data that are related to the Queen’s context, from the point of view of someone who is privileged to information that the average member of the community would not.

Individuals are involved with campus accessibility or campus planning. I can assume they will know what a FADS is—if they do not already know, it was in my letter of information, interview request email and mentioned on my consent form.

Directive questions for key informants
1. It is the norm amongst Ontarian universities to go without a campus FADS. Could you speak to why you believe Queen’s, specifically, has followed this trend?
2. To your knowledge, has Queen’s ever tried to develop a FADS? Are you familiar with some of the challenges that arose? (probing: competing priorities, lack of awareness, interest or leadership, seemed unnecessary, etc?)
3. What are some of the ways of overcoming these challenges?
4. Do you believe FADS could change how accessibility is understood on campus? (probing: For instance, would it heighten awareness, reframe it as a universal design or accommodations issue)
5. What sort of implications, if any, do you think having a FADS on campus would have in affect community culture (probing: What effect would there be on the challenges stated before? You mentioned, X, Y and Z…)

Directive questions for student leaders
1. How often do you think the average Queen’s student thinks about campus accessibility?
2. Do you think the average Queen’s student cares about accessibility?
3. Do you think the student body would be supportive of a campus accessibility design standard?

Accessibility Café (Feb. 5, 2014 from 11:30am-12:30pm at Stauffer’s Speakers’ Corner)
Objective: To collect data to support my chosen theoretical model (path dependency).

Goal: Try to stay away from FADS itself. The conversation should be focused around campus culture, rather than on technical documents that not everyone may be familiar with. This should be a general
survey on attitudes and understandings, since everyone else I speak to will already be familiar with accessibility issues at Queen’s, and this will no doubt impact their biases.

**Visioning questions:**
1. What is the first word that comes to mind when you think about accommodation?
2. What is the first word that comes to mind when you think about accessibility?
3. What are the challenges to building a more accessible campus at Queen’s University? (probing: Can you think of any community/cultural, procedural, attitudinal?)

**External Interviews**

Objective: To collect process-specific data that are related to the Brock University context. The persons I will speak to will have been influential in the process of developing the FADS.

**Directive questions:**
1. Is there a particular reason why your institution decided to pursue a FADS? If so, what is it?
2. What got the process for developing a FADS started?
3. What was fundamental to the process of developing the FADS?
4. What sort of challenges arose?
5. Is there anything you would change or do differently about that process?

**Brock University Campus Tour**

Objective: To collect data related to process implications. The discussion should not be on the process itself, as the person I speak to may not have been involved in it, however he/she will know what a FADS is because of his/her association with campus planning /Scott Walker. This interview will be related to Brock’s campus culture and attitudes towards accessibility.

**Directive questions:**
1. How would you describe the present campus culture towards accessibility at Brock? (Relate back to Queen’s as a way to probe: For instance, at Queen’s, we understand accessibility to mean…)
2. Do you feel that the culture is any way shaped by the built form on campus?
3. Have there been challenges that come from having a FADS? If so, what are they? If not, then why do you think this would be the case?
4. The obvious questions is: why? Why have a FADS at all? Has it impacted certain groups more than others? If so, could you name them?
APPENDIX C

Letters of Information

Letter of Information: Key Informant Interviews or Walking Tour

The Ethics, Feasibility, Opportunities and Challenges of Adopting a Facility Accessibility Design Standard (FADS) for the Queen’s University Campus Master Plan

Masters of Planning Candidate: Rebecca K. Tan
School of Urban and Regional Planning
Queen’s University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada
tan.rebecca@queensu.ca

Research Supervisor: Professor Leela Viswanathan
School of Urban and Regional Planning, Queen’s University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada
(613) 533-6000 X 75038
leela.viswanathan@queensu.ca

Affiliated Research Institution: Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada

About this letter

In reading this letter, you will be provided a full overview of the research project conducted by Rebecca Tan under the supervision of Professor Leela Viswanathan of the School of Urban and Regional Planning at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario, Canada. The information it reveals will help you in deciding whether or not you wish to participate in the aforementioned project.

What is the study about?

Facility Accessibility Design Standards (FADS) are functionally-minded documents that outline how institutions will make changes to existing and future infrastructure to be more accessible than is required by law. FADS are voluntary, so some institutions have them, while most others (including Queen’s University) do not. This study is about the feasibility of developing a FADS for Queen’s University. It will examine the underlying structural and institutionalized barriers that could threaten the development of a FADS for Queen’s, but also highlight the opportunities having one could bring. Ultimately, processes will be the unit of analysis rather than the content of a FADS itself.
What are you asking me to do?

As someone who is involved with accessibility planning, I would like for you to participate in an interview.

Interviews will be 45 to 90 minutes. They can be conducted in Ronald Sutherland Hall, room 548, in your office or in an alternative location that will be arranged if you so desire. In the consent form attached, you will be able to signify if you permit for our conversation to be recorded. Should our conversation be in a public space, I may photograph existing facilities. These photographs will be taken with the intention of demonstrating accessible design principles in practice and you will not be asked to appear in them. Should you not permit to be recorded, an interview can still proceed under that condition. Any recordings or photographs taken will be available only to the researchers involved in the study and will be destroyed within 5 years of completion.

Some questions you may be asked include:
1. How familiar are you with the FADS as a tool for enhancing campus accessibility?
2. What are the opportunities that a campus FADS could produce?
3. What do you believe are the challenges to developing a FADS on campus?
4. What would be fundamental to a process to develop a FADS on campus?

Are there any risks to participating?

You will be given the opportunity to select how you would like to be presented in the research: by professional title only or by both name and title. It is possible that you may be recognized in publications due to the fact that your professional title and involvement in accessibility planning has been made public by your employer; therefore anonymity cannot be guaranteed. As such, every effort will be made to ensure that your opinions have been correctly interpreted. Additionally, any section of the report that quotes you directly will be sent to you for review.

Are there any benefits to participating?

Interviews are a preferred source of data because they can reveal attitudes, perspectives, opinions and biases that are either not documented or taken for granted and assumed. They are also more likely to reveal process-related knowledge rather than documents which are often outcome-oriented.

The information you may reveal may also provide the basis for theory development as this study seeks to determine if and where disability rights models, critical theory and planning ethics overlap. This could help guide the planning profession in addressing accessibility issues, in critically examining the role that the built environment plays in shaping campus identity, and to better understand the culture of accessibility versus the obligation to accommodate those with disabilities. The ultimate goal is to help create a campus culture of inclusivity through barrier-free design.

What if I change my mind about being in the study?

Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated. The understanding is that your involvement in this study is entirely voluntary. Any questions you do not feel comfortable answering may be skipped and at any point of the interview you may ask to take a break or leave.
You may withdraw from the study at any time, even if you have signed the consent form below. There will not be any consequences and any data you may have provided will be destroyed unless you permit otherwise. To withdraw from the study, inform Rebecca Tan or Prof. Viswanathan that you no longer wish to participate. You may do this by phone or email, at the addresses listed on the previous page.

**Who will know what I said in the interview?**

The only individuals with access to the audio files (should you permit recording) and transcripts from interviews will be the candidate, Rebecca Tan, and supervisor, Prof. Viswanathan. They will be contained in audio and Word files that are password protected. All files will be destroyed in 5 years when all publication opportunities have been exhausted.

The study will be published as a Masters thesis, and may be in journals or presented at conferences. Full effort will be made to ensure that any data you share is interpreted correctly as you may be identified.

Should you be quoted directly, you will be provided an opportunity to see those quotes in full context and then decide if you wish to have it attributed to you, left anonymous or removed.

**How do I find out what was learned in the study?**

This study should be complete by August 2014. If you would like a summary, please contact Rebecca Tan.

**What if I have concerns?**

Any questions or concerns may be directed to the researcher, Rebecca Tan, or to the research supervisor, Prof. Viswanathan. Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board at chair.GREB@queensu.ca or 613-533-6081.

Rebecca K. Tan  
Masters of Planning Candidate  
School of Urban and Regional Planning  
Queen’s University  
tan.rebecca@queensu.ca

Professor Leela Viswanathan  
Research Supervisor  
School of Urban and Regional Planning  
Queen’s University  
(613) 533-6000 X 75038  
leela.viswanathan@queensu.ca

Thank you. Your interest in participating in this study is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
Rebecca K. Tan

*This study has been granted clearance by Queen’s University, according to the recommended principles of Canadian ethics guidelines.*
Letter of Information: Key Informant Interviews with Student Leaders

The Ethics, Feasibility, Opportunities and Challenges of Adopting a Facility Accessibility Design Standard (FADS) for the Queen’s University Campus Master Plan

Masters of Planning Candidate: Rebecca K. Tan
School of Urban and Regional Planning
Queen’s University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada
tan.rebecca@queensu.ca

Research Supervisor: Professor Leela Viswanathan
School of Urban and Regional Planning, Queen’s University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada
(613) 533-6000 X 75038
leela.viswanathan@queensu.ca

About this letter

In reading this letter, you will be provided a full overview of the research project conducted by Rebecca Tan under the supervision of Professor Leela Viswanathan of the School of Urban and Regional Planning at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario, Canada. The information it reveals will help you in deciding whether or not you wish to participate in the aforementioned project.

What is the study about?

Facility Accessibility Design Standards (FADS) are functionally-minded documents that outline how institutions will make changes to existing and future infrastructure to be more accessible than is required by law. FADS are voluntary, so some institutions have them, while most others (including Queen’s University) do not. This study is about the feasibility of developing a FADS for Queen’s University. It will examine the underlying structural and institutionalized barriers that could threaten the development of a FADS for Queen’s, but also highlight the opportunities having one could bring. Ultimately, processes will be the unit of analysis rather than the content of a FADS itself.

What are you asking me to do?

As someone who is involved with accessibility planning, I would like for you to participate in an interview.

Interviews will be 45 to 90 minutes. They can be conducted in Ronald Sutherland Hall, room 548, in your office or in an alternative location that will be arranged if you so desire. In the consent form attached, you will be able to signify if you permit for our conversation to be recorded. Should our conversation be in a
public space, I may photograph existing facilities. These photographs will be taken with the intention of demonstrating accessible design principles in practice and you will not be asked to appear in them. Should you not permit to be recorded, an interview can still proceed under that condition. Any recordings or photographs taken will be available only to the researchers involved in the study and will be destroyed within 5 years of completion.

Some questions you may be asked include:

4. How often do you think the average Queen’s student thinks about campus accessibility?
5. Do you think the average Queen’s student cares about accessibility?
6. Do you think the student body would be supportive of a campus accessibility design standard?

Are there any risks to participating?

It is not possible that you may be recognized in publications due to the fact that your responses will be anonymized.

Are there any benefits to participating?

Interviews are a preferred source of data because they can reveal attitudes, perspectives, opinions and biases that are either not documented or taken for granted and assumed. They are also more likely to reveal process-related knowledge rather than documents which are often outcome-oriented.

The information you may reveal may also provide the basis for theory development as this study seeks to determine if and where disability rights models, critical theory and planning ethics overlap. This could help guide the planning profession in addressing accessibility issues, in critically examining the role that the built environment plays in shaping campus identity, and to better understand the culture of accessibility versus the obligation to accommodate those with disabilities. The ultimate goal is to help create a campus culture of inclusivity through barrier-free design.

What if I change my mind about being in the study?

Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated. The understanding is that your involvement in this study is entirely voluntary. Any questions you do not feel comfortable answering may be skipped and at any point of the interview you may ask to take a break or leave.

You may withdraw from the study at any time, even if you have signed the consent form below. There will not be any consequences and any data you may have provided will be destroyed unless you permit otherwise. To withdraw from the study, inform Rebecca Tan or Prof. Viswanathan that you no longer wish to participate. You may do this by phone or email, at the addresses listed on the previous page.

Who will know what I said in the interview?

The only individuals with access to the audio files (should you permit recording) and transcripts from interviews will be the candidate, Rebecca Tan, and supervisor, Prof. Viswanathan. They will be contained in audio and Word files that are password protected. All files will be destroyed in 5 years when all publication opportunities have been exhausted.
The study will be published as a Masters thesis, and may be in journals or presented at conferences. Full effort will be made to ensure that any data you share is interpreted correctly as you may be identified.

Should you be quoted directly, you will be provided an opportunity to see those quotes in full context and then decide if you wish to have it attributed to you, left anonymous or removed.

**How do I find out what was learned in the study?**

This study should be complete by August 2014. If you would like a summary, please contact Rebecca Tan.

**What if I have concerns?**

Any questions or concerns may be directed to the researcher, Rebecca Tan, or to the research supervisor, Prof. Viswanathan. Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board at chair.GREB@queensu.ca or 613-533-6081.

Rebecca K. Tan  
Masters of Planning Candidate  
School of Urban and Regional Planning  
Queen’s University  
Kingston, Ontario, Canada  
tan.rebecca@queensu.ca

Professor Leela Viswanathan  
Research Supervisor  
School of Urban and Regional Planning  
Queen’s University  
Kingston, Ontario, Canada  
(613) 533-6000 X 75038  
leela.viswanathan@queensu.ca

Thank you. Your interest in participating in this study is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
Rebecca K. Tan

*This study has been granted clearance by Queen’s University, according to the recommended principles of Canadian ethics guidelines.*
Letter of Information: Accessibility Café Attendees

The Ethics, Feasibility, Opportunities and Challenges of Adopting a Facility Accessibility Design Standard (FADS) for the Queen’s University Campus Master Plan

Masters of Planning Candidate: Rebecca K. Tan
School of Urban and Regional Planning
Queen’s University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada
tan.rebecca@queensu.ca

Research Supervisor: Professor Leela Viswanathan
School of Urban and Regional Planning,
Queen’s University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada
(613) 533-6000 X 75038
leela.viswanathan@queensu.ca

Affiliated Research Institution: Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada

About this letter

In reading this letter, you will be provided a full overview of the research project conducted by Rebecca Tan under the supervision of Professor Leela Viswanathan of the School of Urban and Regional Planning at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario, Canada. The information it reveals will help you in deciding whether or not you wish to participate in the aforementioned project.

What is the study about?

Facility Accessibility Design Standards (FADS) are functionally-minded documents that outline how institutions will make changes to existing and future infrastructure to be more accessible than is required by law. FADS are voluntary, so some institutions have them, while most others (including Queen’s University) do not. This study is about the feasibility of developing a FADS for Queen’s University. It will examine the underlying structural and institutionalized barriers that could threaten the development of a FADS for Queen’s, but also highlight the opportunities having one could bring. Ultimately, processes will be the unit of analysis rather than the content of a FADS itself.

What are you asking me to do?

As someone who is interested in accessibility planning, I would like for you to participate in a visioning workshop.

The workshop will be 60 minutes. It will be conducted in Stauffer Library’s Speaker’s Corner on February 4, 2014.
Some questions you may be asked include:

4. What is the first word that comes to mind when you think about campus accessibility?
5. What are the challenges to building a more accessible campus at Queen’s University? (probing: Can you think of any community/cultural, procedural, attitudinal?)
6. What are some of the ways of overcoming these challenges?
7. Do you believe a facility accessibility design standard (FADS) could change how accessibility is understood on campus? If so, then in what way(s)?
8. What sort of implications, if any, do you think having a FADS on campus would have in affect community culture (probing: What effect would there be on the challenges stated before?)

**Are there any risks to participating?**

It is not possible that you may be recognized in publications due to the fact that your responses will be anonymized.

**Are there any benefits to participating?**

The information you may reveal may also provide the basis for theory development as this study seeks to determine if and where disability rights models, critical theory and planning ethics overlap. This could help guide the planning profession in addressing accessibility issues, in critically examining the role that the built environment plays in shaping campus identity, and to better understand the culture of accessibility versus the obligation to accommodate those with disabilities. The ultimate goal is to help create a campus culture of inclusivity through barrier-free design.

**What if I change my mind about being in the study?**

Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated. The understanding is that your involvement in this study is entirely voluntary. Any questions you do not feel comfortable answering may be skipped and at any point of the visioning workshop you may ask to take a break or leave.

You may withdraw from the study at any time, even if you have signed the consent form below. There will not be any consequences.

**Who will know what I said in the interview?**

The only individuals with access to the notes taken during the workshop will be the researcher, Rebecca Tan, and supervisor, Prof. Viswanathan. They will be contained in Word files that are password protected. All files will be destroyed in 5 years when all publication opportunities have been exhausted. Your identity cannot be associated with responses as all data collected is anonymized, then categorized.

The study will be published as a Masters thesis, and may be in journals or presented at conferences.
How do I find out what was learned in the study?

This study should be complete by August 2014. If you would like a summary, please contact Rebecca Tan.

What if I have concerns?

Any questions or concerns may be directed to the researcher, Rebecca Tan, or to the research supervisor, Prof. Viswanathan. Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board at chair.GREB@queensu.ca or 613-533-6081.

Rebecca K. Tan  
Masters of Planning Candidate  
School of Urban and Regional Planning  
Queen’s University  
tan.rebecca@queensu.ca

Professor Leela Viswanathan  
Research Supervisor  
School of Urban and Regional Planning  
Queen’s University  
(613) 533-6000 X 75038  
leela.viswanathan@queensu.ca

Thank you. Your interest in participating in this study is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
Rebecca K. Tan

This study has been granted clearance by Queen’s University, according to the recommended principles of Canadian ethics guidelines.
APPENDIX D

Consent Forms

Consent Form for Key Informant Interviews and Walking Tour

The Ethics, Feasibility, Opportunities and Challenges of Adopting a Facility Accessibility Design Standard (FADS) for the Queen’s University Campus Master Plan

1. I have read and understand the information letter about the study entitled, The Ethics, Feasibility, Opportunities and Challenges of Adopting a Facility Accessibility Design Standard (FADS) for the Queen’s University Campus Master Plan, being conducted by Rebecca Tan and Prof. Leela Viswanathan, of Queen’s University.

2. I understand this means that I will be asked to participate in an interview that is 45-90 minutes long.

3. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about participating in this study and have received the additional details I requested.

4. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may withdraw from the study at any time.

5. I understand that if I have concerns or complaints, I may contact

   Rebecca K. Tan  Professor Leela Viswanathan
   Masters of Planning Candidate  Research Supervisor
   School of Urban and Regional Planning  School of Urban and Regional Planning
   Queen’s University  Queen’s University
   Kingston, Ontario, Canada  Kingston, Ontario, Canada
   tan.rebecca@queensu.ca  (613) 533-6000 X 75038
                           leela.viswanathan@queensu.ca

   By placing my initials in this box, I give permission to the researcher to record the interview with a digital voice recording device.

   This form continues on the reverse
By placing my initials in this box, I request a summary of the study’s results to be emailed to me at the following address:

________________________________________________________

By placing my initials in this box, I request to be anonymized by being referred only by my professional title. I understand this may not keep my identity confidential. (If this box is left unsigned, the researcher may identify me by name and professional title.)

I agree to be contacted about follow-up interviews. I understand that I may decline the request.

I have read the above statements and freely consent to participate in this research:

Name of participant (printed): ____________________________________________

Signature: _____________________________________________________________

Date: _______________________________
Consent Form for Student Leader Interviews

The Ethics, Feasibility, Opportunities and Challenges of Adopting a Facility Accessibility Design Standard (FADS) for the Queen’s University Campus Master Plan

1. I have read and understand the information letter about the study entitled, The Ethics, Feasibility, Opportunities and Challenges of Adopting a Facility Accessibility Design Standard (FADS) for the Queen’s University Campus Master Plan, being conducted by Rebecca Tan and Prof. Leela Viswanathan, of Queen’s University.

2. I understand this means that I will be asked to participate in an interview that is one (1) hour long.

3. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about participating in this study and have received the additional details I requested.

4. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may withdraw from the study at any time.

5. I understand that if I have concerns or complaints, I may contact

   Rebecca K. Tan
   Masters of Planning Candidate
   School of Urban and Regional Planning
   Queen’s University
   Kingston, Ontario, Canada
   tan.rebecca@queensu.ca

   Professor Leela Viswanathan
   Research Supervisor
   School of Urban and Regional Planning
   Queen’s University
   Kingston, Ontario, Canada
   (613) 533-6000 X 75038
   leela.viswanathan@queensu.ca

By placing my initials in this box, I request a summary of the study’s results to be emailed to me at the following address:

_______________________________________________________

This form continues on the reverse
By placing my initials in this box, I request to be anonymized by being referred *only* by my professional title. I understand this may not keep my identity confidential. (If this box is left unsigned, the researcher may identify me by name and professional title.)

I agree to be contacted about follow-up interviews. I understand that I may decline the request.

I have read the above statements and freely consent to participate in this research:

Name of participant (printed): ______________________________________________

Signature: _______________________________________________________________

Date: ___________________________________________________________________
Consent Form for Visioning Workshop Participants

The Ethics, Feasibility, Opportunities and Challenges of Adopting a Facility Accessibility Design Standard (FADS) for the Queen’s University Campus Master Plan

1. I have read and understand the information letter about the study entitled, The Ethics, Feasibility, Opportunities and Challenges of Adopting a Facility Accessibility Design Standard (FADS) for the Queen’s University Campus Master Plan, being conducted by Rebecca Tan and Prof. Leela Viswanathan, of Queen’s University.

2. I understand this means that I will be asked to participate in a visioning workshop that is one (1) hour long.

3. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about participating in this study and have received the additional details I requested.

4. I understand that in participating in this study, my identity will not be revealed as all responses I may give will be anonymized.

5. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may withdraw from the study at any time.

6. I understand that if I have concerns or complaints, I may contact

   Rebecca K. Tan
   Masters of Planning Candidate
   School of Urban and Regional Planning
   Queen’s University
   Kingston, Ontario, Canada
   tan.rebecca@queensu.ca

   Professor Leela Viswanathan
   Research Supervisor
   School of Urban and Regional Planning
   Queen’s University
   Kingston, Ontario, Canada
   (613) 533-6000 X 75038
   leela.viswanathan@queensu.ca

I have read the above statements and freely consent to participate in this research:

Signature: ______________________________ Date: ______________________________
APPENDIX E

Research Ethics

November 13, 2013

Miss Rebecca Tan
Master’s Student
School of Urban and Regional Planning
Queen's University
Kingston, ON, K7L 3N6

GREB Ref #: GSURP-181-13; Romeo # 6011162
Title: “GSURP-181-13 The Ethics, Feasibility, Opportunities and Challenges of Adopting a Facility Accessibility Design Standard (FADS) for the Queen’s University Campus Master Plan”

Dear Miss Tan:

The General Research Ethics Board (GREB), by means of a delegated board review, has cleared your proposal entitled "GSURP-181-13 The Ethics, Feasibility, Opportunities and Challenges of Adopting a Facility Accessibility Design Standard (FADS) for the Queen’s University Campus Master Plan” for ethical compliance with the Tri-Council Guidelines (TCPS) and Queen's ethics policies. In accordance with the Tri-Council Guidelines (article D 1.6) and Senate Terms of Reference (article G), your project has been cleared for one year. At the end of each year, the GREB will ask if your project has been completed and if not, what changes have occurred or will occur in the next year.

You are reminded of your obligation to advise the GREB, with a copy to your unit REB, of any adverse event(s) that occur during this one year period (access this form at https://eservices.queensu.ca/romeo_researcher/ and click Events - GREB Adverse Event Report). An adverse event includes, but is not limited to, a complaint, a change or unexpected event that alters the level of risk for the researcher or participants or situation that requires a substantial change in approach to a participant(s). You are also advised that all adverse events must be reported to the GREB within 48 hours.

You are also reminded that all changes that might affect human participants must be cleared by the GREB. For example you must report changes to the level of risk, applicant characteristics, and implementation of new procedures. To make an amendment, access the application at https://eservices.queensu.ca/romeo_researcher/ and click Events - GREB Amendment to Approved Study Form. These changes will automatically be sent to the Ethics Coordinator, Gail Irving, at the Office of Research Services or irvinga@queensu.ca for further review and clearance by the GREB or GREB Chair.

On behalf of the General Research Ethics Board, I wish you continued success in your research.

Yours sincerely,

Joan Stevenson, Ph.D.
Chair
General Research Ethics Board

c: Dr. Leela Viswanathan, Faculty Supervisor
Dr. Leela Viswanathan, Chair, Unit REB
Certificate of Completion

This document certifies that

Rebecca Tan has completed the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans Course on Research Ethics (TCPS 2: CORE)

Date of Issue: 16 September, 2012
APPENDIX F

Photos from the Visioning Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visioning workshop participants were asked to indicate on the orange post-it where, as an individual, they stand in supporting the Queen’s in going above and beyond the baseline requirements of the AODA, and based on a scale between 1 (absolutely not) and 10 (yes, absolutely). The responses were unanimous: 5 responded with 10s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Then, participants were asked to indicate on the blue post-it if they think that Queen’s is ready to go above and beyond the baseline requirements of the AODA, based on a scale between 1 (absolutely not) and 10 (yes, absolutely). The responses were mixed: two voted 3, two voted 5 and one voted 7.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When asked what was the first word that came to mind when each participant thought about accommodation, the responses were: “Removing barriers”, “reactive”, “dignity”, “no access”, “barrier” and “place of comfort.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When asked what was the first word that came to mind when each participant thought about accessibility, the responses were: “Inclusive”, “justice”, “everyone” “access for all” and “socio/cultural and economic sensitivities.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

Visioning Workshop Materials

ACCESSIBILITY CAFÉ VISIONING WORKSHOP

A workshop facilitated by Rebecca K. Tan, MPL Candidate School of Urban and Regional Planning, Queen’s University

_The Ethics, Feasibility, Opportunities and Challenges of Developing a Facility Accessibility Design Standard for the Queen’s University Master Plan_

February 5, 2014. 11:30am to 12:30pm
Speaker’s Corner, Stauffer Library
Queen’s University
Kingston, Ontario
Workshop Notes

Objectives of this workshop

• To engage in an open discussion about how accessibility is understood on campus by the Queen’s community as a whole;
• To learn from each other, and generate ideas and actions.

Outcomes of this workshop

The workshop facilitator, Rebecca Tan, is studying the cultural components of campus planning, such as the attitudes, beliefs, thoughts and feelings that make a policy acceptable in one community, but unacceptable in another. This workshop will inform her research about the feasibility of developing a technical design document called a Facility Accessibility Design Standard (FADS) for Queen’s campus. While this workshop will not be about a FADS itself, your ideas, feedback and thoughts will help to determine how ready Queen’s, as a community and as a campus culture, is to develop, adopt and implement a policy that would entail going above and beyond the baseline requirements of the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA).

Instructions for this workshop

Please read through the Letter of Information and Consent Form included in this package to decide if you would like to participate in this workshop. If you wish to participate, please sign the consent form and return it to someone in the facilitation team by the end of the session.

You are welcome to participate for all or part of the workshop. If you do not wish to participate in this workshop, or change your mind about participating at anytime during the session, please free to leave whenever you like. The Form will be collected at the very end of this workshop, as well as this booklet.

You have been given a marker and four (4) Post-Its of varying sizes and colours that correspond with each question. Answer the discussion questions as accurately as you can when prompted by the Facilitator and fill out the last page, to the best of your ability.
Agenda

11:30—11:40: Welcome and Introductions
Rebecca Tan, MPL Candidate, School of Urban and Regional Planning and the facilitation team

Distribution of workshop materials and overview of the Consent Form and booklet

11:40 –11:50: Let’s talk about the AODA
Using the small orange Post-It, indicate…
1. Would you, as an individual, support the University going above and beyond the baseline requirements of the AODA?

Using the small blue Post-It, indicate…
2. Where do you think the University stands in terms of its readiness to go above and beyond the baseline requirements of the AODA?

11:50—12:25: Let’s talk about Accessibility
On the larger yellow Post-it, respond to the following question:
3. What is the first word that comes to mind when you think about accommodation?

On the larger green Post-it, respond to the following question:
4. What is the first word that comes to mind when you think about accessibility?

What is going to happen to the ideas you shared today?
Post-Workshop Questions

Please return this completed workbook before you leave. The responses on this form will be aggregated and anonymized; the contents of this page are therefore confidential.

Place a check in the box that best relates to you.

I am a…

☐ Student  ☐ Faculty/Staff Member  ☐ Other:________

Things that I heard…

Other ideas I would like to share…
APPENDIX H

Brock University Walking Tour: Map

On Feb. 19, 2014, I travelled to St. Catharines, Ontario, for a walking tour of Brock University. I began by meeting my tour guide, Janet Muenzberger in the lobby of Schmon Tower. We went up the main elevators to level 300 MacKenzie Chown, A-Block. From there, we walked through Taro Hall, across the Canadian Tire Bridge to the Student Alumni Center and into the Plaza Building. From the Plaza Building, we walked through the Cairns Family Health and Biosciences Complex, across another bridge to MacKenzie Chown D-Block. From the D-Block, it was a short walk to the C-Block to the B-Block, and returned to the A-Block, in essence, making one large loop. From the A-Block, we went to the Thistle Complex (where there is a large cafeteria and retail space) and looked at several classrooms on the 200 and 300 levels. Next, we saw the Walker Complex pool, gyms and lobby. Then, we visited Welch Hall and a large lecture room in the Howes Theatre. Finally, we returned back to the start: Schmon Tower. This map was provided to me by Ms. Muenzberger via personal communication. (February 20, 2014)
APPENDIX I

Brock University Walking Tour: Photos

Brock University’s facilities began formal construction in 1965.¹

Designated area of refuge between two lecture halls.

A lecture hall where a seat has been removed for ease of access to the desk.

Example of how accessibility was quickly achieved by removing a door because of comprehensive initial design.

Example of a ramp that is so well integrated into the environment, that many would not notice it. Indeed, it could be seen by some as a floor with an incline.

Example of accessible door handles that were purchased and installed in bulk for cost savings to ensure uniformity in both apparatus and identical placement on doors.

APPENDIX J

Accessibility at Queen’s: Photos

An example of poorly integrated accessibility features at Queen’s University: Dunning Hall.

The front entrance of Dunning Hall is inaccessible because of the stairs leading to the door.

This diagram from the Queen’s Accessibility Guide\(^1\) shows that the three accessible entrances are separate from the main entrance, demonstrating poor integration of accessible elements with the building’s main features. Dunning Hall was constructed in 1960.

This is the accessible back entrance to Dunning Hall. As one can see, it is poorly maintained, segregated from other uses and poorly lit, creating a safety hazard. This is an example of accommodation, rather than good accessible design, since it does not encourage use by everyone; just those who need it.

CIP Statement of Values

To respect and integrate the needs of future generations.
CIP Members recognize that their work has cumulative and long-term implications. When addressing short-term needs, CIP members acknowledge the future needs of people, other species and their environments, and are to avoid committing resources that are irretrievable or irreplaceable.

To overcome or compensate for jurisdictional limitations.
CIP Members understand that their work has a potential impact on many jurisdictions and interests. They must therefore practice in a holistic manner, recognizing the need to overcome the limitations of administrative boundaries.

To value the natural and cultural environment.
CIP Members believe that both natural and cultural environments must be valued. They assume roles as stewards of these environments, balancing preservation with sustainable development.

To recognize and react positively to uncertainty.
CIP Members believe that the long-term future is unpredictable and that adaptable and flexible responses to deal positively with this uncertainty must be developed.

To respect diversity.
CIP Members respect and protect diversity in values, cultures, economics, ecosystems, built environments and distinct places.

To balance the needs of communities and individuals.
CIP Members seek to balance the interests of communities with the interests of individuals, and recognize that communities include both geographic communities and communities of interest.

To foster public participation.
CIP Members believe in meaningful public participation by all individuals and groups and seek to articulate the needs of those whose interests have not been represented.

To articulate and communicate values.
CIP Members believe in applying these values explicitly to their work and communicating their importance to clients, employers, colleagues and the public.

Professional Code of Practice

1.0 The Planner's Responsibility to the Public Interest

Members have a primary responsibility to define and serve the interests of the public. This requires the use of theories and techniques of planning that inform and structure debate, facilitate communication, and foster understanding. Accordingly, a Member shall:
1.1 practice in a manner that respects the diversity, needs, values and aspirations of the public and encourages discussion on these matters;

1.2 provide full, clear and accurate information on planning matters to decision makers and members of the public, while recognizing both the client's right to confidentiality and the importance of timely recommendations;

1.3 acknowledge the inter-related nature of planning decisions and their consequences for individuals, the natural and built environment, and the broader public interest; and

1.4 identify and promote opportunities for meaningful participation in the planning process to all interested parties.

2.0 The Planner's Responsibility to Clients and Employers

Members must provide diligent, creative, independent, and competent performance of work in pursuit of the client's or employer's interest. Accordingly, a Member shall:

2.1 impart independent professional opinion to clients, employers, the public, and tribunals;

2.2 work with integrity and professionalism;

2.3 not perform work outside of his/her professional competence;

2.4 not neglect planning services which he/she has agreed to perform, nor render services without adequate preparation;

2.5 acknowledge the values held by the client or employer in work performed, unless such values conflict with other aspects of this Code;

2.6 respect the client or employer right to confidentiality of information gathered through a professional relationship;

2.7 inform the client or employer in the event of a conflict between the values or actions of the client or employer and those of this Code, in a timely manner;

2.8 ensure full disclosure to a client or employer of a possible conflict of interest arising from the Member's private or professional activities, in a timely manner;

2.9 inform all relevant parties and provide the Member's professional recommendation in situations that may adversely affect the public interest;

2.10 reject and not offer any financial or other inducements, including prospective employment, that could influence or affect professional opportunities or planning advice;

2.11 not as an employee of a public planning agency, give professional planning advice for compensation to a private client or employer within the jurisdiction of the public agency without written consent and disclosure to the agency;

2.12 not, as a consultant to a public planning agency during the period of contract with the agency, give
professional planning advice for compensation to others within the jurisdiction of the agency without written consent and disclosure to the agency in situations where there is the possibility of a conflict of interest arising;

2.13 not, as a salaried employee of or consultant to any public planning agency, directly or indirectly advise the agency on the granting or refusal of an application which the Member has submitted or has an interest in to the agency; however, the Member may present the application;

2.14 not accept anything of value, or the promise of anything of value, including prospective employment, from any person when it could appear that the offer is made for the purpose of influencing the Member's actions as an advisor to a public planning agency; and

2.15 not, in order to obtain professional work, present himself/herself as, or permit himself/herself to be presented as, prepared to provide planning services where the quality of work is less than reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances.

3.0 The Planner's Responsibility to the Profession and Other Members

The vitality and credibility of the planning profession and of the Institute are reflective of the quality of the Membership. To further the profession, Members will be expected to attain and maintain a high standard of professional competence and conduct, which extends to their relationship with other Members. Accordingly, Members shall:

3.1 take all reasonable steps to maintain their professional competence throughout their working lives and shall respect OPPI's continuing professional learning requirements as amended from time to time;

3.2 encourage healthy and constructive criticism about theory and practice of planning among colleagues and share the results of experience and research that contributes to the evolving body of planning knowledge;

3.3 maintain an appropriate awareness of contemporary planning philosophy, theory, and practice by seeking and receiving professional education throughout a planning career:

3.4 contribute to the professional education, mentoring, and development of planning students, Members, and other colleagues;

3.5 not in professional practice, extra-professional activities or private life, engage in dishonourable or questionable conduct that may cast doubt on the Member's professional competence or integrity or that may reflect adversely on the integrity of the profession;

3.6 ensure that advertising or promotional activities fairly and accurately communicate the expertise and skills offered;

3.7 advertise professional planning services in a manner that enhances the credibility of the profession;

3.8 accurately represent his or her professional qualifications and affiliations, education and experience, and those of colleagues;

3.9 act toward other Members and other colleagues in a spirit of fairness and consideration and not falsely or maliciously injure the professional reputation, prospects or practice of another Member and other colleagues;
3.10 respect the Member's colleagues in their professional capacity. and when evaluating the work of another Member, show objectivity and fairness and avoid ill-considered or uninformed criticism of the competence, conduct or advice of the Member;

3.11 not attempt to supplant another Member once the Planner has knowledge that definite steps have been taken toward the other's employment;

3.12 not sign or seal a final drawing, specification, plan, report or other document not actually prepared or checked by the Member;

3.13 not directly or indirectly discriminate against any person because of said person's race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability in any aspect of job recruitment, hiring, conditions of employment, training, advancement or termination of employment;

3.14 report to the Institute the behavior of any Member believed to be in breach of this Code;

3.15 not make public statements on behalf of the Institute's Members unless authorized to do so;

3.16 comply with any reasonable request of the Institute for information or for the co-operation of the Member in pursuit of any Institute objective; and

3.17 implement and give full effect to the disposition of any discipline proceeding affecting the Member.