



## **National Roundtable on Heritage Education 2012**

**Thursday, October 11, 2012**

**Parish Hall, St. George's Anglican Church**

**1101 Stanley Street, Montreal, Quebec**

**Sponsored by the Canadian Forum for Public Research on Heritage (CFPRH)**

**Present:**

Victoria Angel (Willowbank), Ronald Bean (Conestoga College), Lyse Blanchet (ICOMOS Canada), Christina Cameron (Université de Montréal), Walter Cholewa (Centennial College), Shelley Crawford (Centennial College), Claudine Déom (Université de Montréal), Helen Edwards (HCF Governor, BC), Masha Etkind (Ryerson University), Mehdi Ghafouri (Vanier College), Julia Gersovitz (McGill University), Barb Hogan (Yukon Government), Andrew Jeanes (Ontario Ministry of Culture), Marcus Letourneau (Carleton University), Andrew MacAdam (Nova Scotia Community College), Richard MacKinnon (Cape Breton University), Nancy Oakley (Carleton University), Robert Pajot (PWGSC), Fernando Pellicer (CAHP), Gregory Ramshaw (Clemson University), Amélie Renouf (Heritage Montreal), Susan Ross (Carleton University), Françoise Saliou (Stained Glass Conservator), Robert Shipley (University of Waterloo), Julian Smith (Willowbank), Laurie Smith (CAHP), Angela Specht (Athabasca University), Kathy Stacey (Heritage Mill Historic Building Conservation), Rod Stutt (SIAST), Christienne Uchiyama (Stantec Consulting), Hilary Vaillancourt (ACO NextGen), Donald Wetherell (Athabasca University), Tom Urbaniak (Cape Breton University), Cristina Ureche-Trifu (Carleton University), Chris Wiebe (Heritage Canada Foundation).

**1. Introductions** – Roundtable Chair Déom welcomed participants to the 7<sup>th</sup> annual meeting of the Roundtable and summarized its mandate and history. The format of this year's meeting has a particular cast in order to feed into HCF's National Heritage Summit general reflections on understanding and responding to changes in the heritage conservation sphere. A panel format was considered most appropriate for this and while their perspectives on education are different they will hopefully be complementary.

**2. Panel Presentations on Key Questions**

- What are the tangible impacts arising from the apparent shift we are witnessing in the field of heritage conservation? Is the workforce demand changing, are new skills required, where do traditional skills fit in?
- How do heritage educators respond to this shift and contribute to the revitalization of the Canadian heritage conservation movement?

a. Victoria Angel (Willowbank) – An Educator’s Perspective

While I now work at Willowbank, I taught at Carleton for two years, as well as at the University of Victoria and courses within the federal government. I am only expressing my own views in this talk, and I’m looking forward to being a bit provocative during the Summit. We have a wonderful opportunity for debate and discussion are at a critical juncture in heritage conservation and conservation education and so I am going out on a limb today with what I’m saying.

I think one point which has particular consensus is that in the broader conservation movement we are in a period of significant flux as a result of changing societal values, ways of life, economics, cultural practices, technologies, etc. Major areas of impact are changing ideas of development. We are starting to see tendency toward more holistic frameworks and strategies across disciplines. Gustavo Araoz says that these changes are so significant that they represent a paradigm shift in the field of conservation; there has been much debate about whether that is true, what that means, and how the conservation field should respond. As a practitioner and educator, my own position is that we are seeing a paradigm shift; they are profound and deeply meaningful. I’ve had this reinforced by my interactions with students whose approach to and understanding of heritage is very different from a generation ago. In the past I have worked within some very traditional conservation education frameworks and I’ve found it very challenging to make these traditional courses make sense within our world. We can only pack so much into these courses before they break apart, but it is very difficult to make these courses relevant to the new generation.

We are seeing a breaking down of barriers between silos. This is a great opportunity and I would like to see this go further: breaking down barriers between theory and practice; design and craftsmanship; tangible and intangible; and between the historic environment and contemporary layers. To do this requires new linkages, new collaborations between institutions, public and private, academics, and stakeholders. This gives the heritage discipline an opportunity to re-theorize its practice, incorporating more critical approaches and perspectives. The field has moved to a series of processes, procedures and tools and we aren’t thinking critically enough. The fields of Critical Heritage studies and heritage conservation need to be brought into dialogue. It is not just a matter of creating new courses, but of rethinking and retooling our conservation programs. This will be a long process, but we are looking at some fundamental shifts in where conservation sits within conservation institutions and where those institutions may be. We are already starting to see new types of programs, like those of the Prince’s Regeneration Trust are showing these new directions. A new program in the US called the American College of Building Arts bringing trades right into academic programs. I think there will be a much closer relationship in the future between practice and theory.

b. Christienne Uchiyama (Stantec Consulting) – A Recent Graduate’s Perspective

I am approaching the discussion from the perspective of a young professional and recent graduate. The questions I am raising come out of finishing my Masters in Conservation at Carleton University and my quest to find mentorship in the field. There is a need to move beyond a more architectural bias in the conservation field. How do we stop talking to ourselves about the place, and provide advice to non-heritage decision-makers so they can address their problems on more than a building-by-building basis? Decision-makers are increasingly seeing the message that heritage is vital to their communities, or at the very least seeing heritage as a necessary evil in the development process. What they aren’t necessarily getting are tangible solutions and guidance for their long-term strategies. There is no unified voice or organized heritage sector in Canada.

So where are the gaps in heritage education? Heritage conservation was developed mid-century as a government process: identification, recognition, and management. These old frameworks are no longer adequate. Heritage is no longer just about historic sites and monuments, but students are still taught how to identify value in these kinds of places without the push to go further. To continue to focus on the best of the best and heritage designation plays into elitist and small market perceptions of the field.

In building ties with the green movement, we need to emphasize the importance of heritage to vital communities, the importance of adaptive reuse, and to dispel universal myths old buildings as inefficient energy users. Heritage and natural conservation have been linked from their infancy and reinforced in the 1987 report, *Our Common Future*. We have been unable to reconcile the separation between these two movements and they remain separated in theory and practice. As a result, heritage conservation is difficult to translate into environmental assessment and planning processes in a way that sounds as equally scientific or authoritative. At the same time we are living in a culture of consumption and disposal that results in millions of tons of demolition waste each year. We are not making ties with energy management sectors in Canada which are also in their infancy and struggling to find their processes.

There is currently a disconnect between academia, public policy, and heritage conservation practice. Public policy is increasingly moving to a system which is offloading responsibility to the private sector and students are leaving universities unprepared for this. From an educator’s perspective, where do your students go after graduation and where do they go in the conservation field? In recent years colleges have been increasing capacity in skilled trades but there is still a gap in project managers and developers who are heritage-minded. There is a need for an influx of people who can build an inclusive heritage practice. There is a need for skills development for conservation workers involving environmental and planning training in which conservation is increasingly operating. For instance, a student studying the natural sciences might take a course on environment assessment or public consultation, but would a heritage student? How many schools teach project management?

More internship programs may help bridge this gap during the move from public to private sectors.

There also remains a lack of published materials on heritage impact assessment, which remains wildly unregulated across the country, but increasingly required. The Ontario Renewable Energy Act requires Heritage Impact Assessments be completed for new projects and requiring an unprepared private sector to respond even though the Ministry of Culture has not had the opportunity to provide guidance documents or to determine how they are reviewing these assessments. With so much responsibility for heritage being downloaded to professionals and advocacy groups, there is a huge need for continuing education for continued skills development.

c. Kathy Stacey (Heritage Mill) – A Trades Perspective

My perspective comes from working in the UK for 20 years and running my own conservation practice. I often call myself an immigrant in my own country. I want to speak from my experience as a construction manager and give you the perspective from the construction site level.

We currently have a work framework that doesn't reward excellence or education and a higher calling. In Ontario we have a bidding process, so if you want to bid low you will probably not be investing in education for your workers, etc. There is still a frequent disconnection between the specifications we receive from architects and what can be done. Often if a project goes to a low bid, it is low because they aren't qualified to do the work and then the architect may have written specifications which they can't complete.

One of the questions we get asked, is how do you know all of this? It comes from 30 years of experience, it didn't come from one program or course. Short course programs then definitely have a place. I see Canada as struggling to provide a conservation field; there are people with very good intentions, but people haven't gotten around the table, they aren't connected with what really goes on. Working with the trades is important, often programs work solely with architects and engineers. The S&Gs are great, but we don't necessarily follow it through, in the execution because it comes down to the education and experience of the trades. How do we find our next generation of workers? We need to educate our children in arts and culture because if we don't we may not get the wonderful stone mason at the other end of the process.

d. Julia Gersovitz (FGMDA & Associates, Architects) – A Professional's View

I'm wearing two hats here. I've been an adjunct professor at McGill for 32 years teaching conservation related courses and architectural history; since conservation is often called "applied history" I see the two as inextricably linked. I also taught for about 13 years at UdeM. But I'm also a founding partner in an architectural office now 80 people strong, so I'm also here as a potential employer. Almost all of the people in our office are architects, we haven't yet hired engineers, and most of these architects have Masters of Conservation or

years of experience in conservation, and we also have interior designers experienced in historic interiors. We could have a whole other discussion about historic interiors – which are being massacred, across this county – and where the decision-making rests with a new group called interior designers who have zero qualifications in heritage conservation.

I'm speaking as an office that will largely hire people with professional degrees. The question is do you want to position yourself as an office as doing the prime design work and some material conservation, or whether you want to develop your practice as a firm that only does materials conservation and therefore will always be working as a consultant to an architect who may have no background in historic buildings. That would be the first decision, because each approach would entail a very different approach to the education of those individuals. Two things lacking in conservation education in Canada now are materials conservation at a very serious level, and conservation theory. Theory is crucial, because there is no reason having a person out there who knows what to do but not the reason why.

I just came from the APT conference in Charleston and they are in the same turmoil about how to get the professionals and the craftspeople together. And we had a very powerful talk by Gerald Lynch about traditional craft. In talking about the alliances between professionals and craftsman, another important discussion is the relationship between the craftsman and the contractor. Contractors don't know how to deal with new conservation workers who talk about collaboration or refer to a kind of medieval guild approach. Contractors are trying to understand how these individuals fit within the very narrow roles the other subtrades work within – this is a problem.

Some final thoughts: we need materials conservation in this country and it may involve partnerships between universities. But do not allow your graduates out the door without a strong understanding of conservation theory, otherwise you will be doing great damage. Finally, what do we do with conservation in the new government frameworks – short time horizons, design-build, contracting through PPPs – and what is the impact of those kinds of frameworks in a conservation context.

e. Robert Pajot (PWGSC) – A Government Perspective

The federal government by necessity moves slowly in its changes. What I'm going to present is a particular perspective from the Department of Public Works but also the Heritage Conservation Directorate (HCD) in which I work, which provides technical advice and services to the other departments. So it's not the Parks Canada policy perspective, but rather the perspective of a department that owns heritage assets and hires private contractors to work on them.

Looking at the Roundtable theme, it is not clear how the federal government's role will play out in this paradigm shift toward building sustainable communities. It would be fair to say federal departments are unclear about the role they should play in the communities around them; the heritage buildings it has are kept only because they have an ongoing use, so their integration into communities outside is slightly different. In these days of budgetary

restraint, federal departments are increasingly focused on their prime mandates – health, RCMP, etc. One of the results is that maintenance budgets declining: money is often only available when things fall apart. And so, an odd result is that the projects we are dealing with are much larger projects with more complicated mandates, and these require large, multi-disciplinary teams. Given tight budgets, any kind of lateral thinking is quite difficult. The procurement process is a complicated, byzantine process. This is partially a result of efforts to be transparent –all documentation needs to be very complete – and the fact that the public sector is held to very high standards, whether it be in health and safety or heritage conservation.

So if the field is evolving, I don't see a time when the federal government will not need highly skilled technical expertise in conservation, which leaves us with the same issues we have had for years. There is extremely uneven capacity in the private sector: many regions only have a limited supply of workers and one or two large projects can busy them all. This is exacerbated by the fact that governments are increasingly diminishing their own internal capacity and pushing things out to the private sector. There is also the issue of nationally consistent accreditation for consultants; at the moment there is no simple way of quantifying experience.

As architects, engineers, and technicians in HCD, we need to make sure our technical expertise stays up-to-date and relevant, but because we are doing less actual projects ourselves this is becoming a challenge? Thus the themes of collaboration, partnerships, memorandums of understanding with other organizations, these are difficult, but we need to be creative in how we continue to stay current. We see the need to integrate our office with our client's processes, we need to understand their financial planning processes, understanding their constraints and trying to influence them in the ways open to us. So HCD is growing into a kind of general interest role, recognizing that broader role is critical to spreading heritage influence. Also, we absolutely need to record, after each project, thorough lessons learned and thereby quantify the demonstrable elements we bring to projects. One of the most challenging things is often the heritage conservation attitude, that high-road attitude that we often have when people are not, say, following the correct conservation approach. We need to understand the compromises that have to be made, and how that process requires us to work together and understand and respect each other.

In conclusion, the procurement role of the federal government is not going to change significantly in the short term: we will continue to need to obtain highly technical specialized conservation skills from the private sector. On the policy side of things, the Heritage Canada's need to put more pressure on the federal government to consider community interests in their planning.

### **3. Discussion**

**Cameron:** I was struck by how project-oriented Public Works interventions were, that we only intervene when they're falling down. I was thinking of the upstream processes, and how much

Claudine and I worked together at the University of Montreal and most of the damage is done by the guys who do repairs. I was thinking about maintenance – custodians or homeowners. Is there a place in heritage training institutions or universities for heritage maintenance training? What would that look like and who would be involved? It's about fostering a culture of conservation. The projects themselves, then, are a minuscule part of the big picture.

**Gersovitz:** A lot of universities are now increasingly aware of the maintenance men who are trained to do caulking are not the same guys who do the masonry. There is an increasing sensibility to the market that this is needed. There are first indications that that is being done. There is a sense that this should be pursued at the level of administration. Work that Heritage Montreal has been doing now for 30 years or more is the education of the homeowner. Every maintenance person is a homeowner too. If you can get them young and embed that kind of sensitivity into whether you're taking care of your home or a building you're being paid to take care of. It's an issue that goes across many boundaries, not just the maintenance men but the homeowner too.

**Stacey:** Speaking in the trades, one of the things we as trades people do with the building owner is we try to help them understand their building. So if they understand then hopefully they won't make the same mistake twice. It's preventative maintenance. It's the education of the building owner to put that in place, that maybe it isn't just a regular maintenance man that you want, more of a specialist. Maybe it comes down to just a handout or pamphlet.

**Uchiyama:** It's also related to pride of ownership. I don't think maintenance or home owners that don't want to know the heritage of the buildings they're working on, that don't want to take care of their building to help it last as long as it can. Introducing the standards and guidelines is what's needed, and I think that's the sort of thing that a lot of institutions lack.

**Gramshaw:** Victoria Angel mentioned the challenge of critical heritage studies and conservation, which have taken aim at heritage conservation. Some of these are major arguments that have been around for a while, some are more recent; heritage conservation through legislation fossilizes places; heritage is a dynamic fluid process; heritage conservation is political; and the idea that maybe in terms of built environment we have been too successful as a movement and have too much heritage. We have very few resources to keep what we have and maybe let future generations add to the canon. How might these be used in heritage conservation education or heritage education in general?

**Gersovitz:** If we put aside the 10 commandments, everything else is written by a human who has some sense of self interest. The comments I hear in the critical theory about how we have too much heritage conservation or let's just let the marketplace determine we can all take care of what we think has value, generally architects who wish to have free hand over a project, and are developing a critical theory to do that. Who's saying this? Without understanding where is

comes from, it's very difficult to debate it. I think it's always a sense of understanding who is speaking.

**Angel:** This is an issue I think that's increasingly being discussed because theoretical discussion in critical heritage studies and heritage conservation (taught as an applied discipline), there's no bridge between them and right now they function as these polar extremes that are both weakened by not speaking to the other and at the moment, in terms of societal shifts and shifts within heritage conservation that we're living through right now, I think some of the questions and debates within critical heritage studies, we need to be asking those within the practice of conservation.

**Gersovitz:** I do want to say that if a lot of them lead to the same question and when you come into the presentation to ask how a building like the West Block on Parliament Hill will be conserved, and someone stands up and says "why are we keeping this anyway, it has no value let's tear it down". I don't respond in the collaborative way, I think to myself how do I get out of this room now before I do some serious damage. So you might be getting to a point where I'm frustrated by the idea of spending more energy re-debating a lot of the issues we now need to move to another level to deal with them. I think the whole issue about how much you conserve is a perfectly valid question, but I don't know if we should sideline ourselves. Should we ourselves as people dedicated to this allow ourselves to be derailed into some other conversation?

**Déom:** Je pense que ça soulève un point intéressant, je pense qu'il y a un certain intérêt dans les ombres les plus grises. Je comprends la frustration, mais la propension à ouvrir de façon latérale pour inclure d'autres points de vue, ça devient important quand on est dans les endroits qui sont pas nécessairement facilement associables.

**Crawford:** My colleague, Walter Cholewa, and I are new to the Summit, and we come from a program, and we're going to ask if we fit. At Centennial College, it's a new program, cultural site heritage management, eight month program. So I noticed that there's sort of the use of the two terms conservation education and heritage education and I'm not sure how closely they're tied together. We look very holistically at the term heritage education and we're looking at students who are learning about national historic sites, municipal planning, theory in cultural policy, collections, conservation, but they're also looking at marketing and fundraising and management. So do we fit? Are we talking broadly about heritage education, or is this a more focused group that doesn't cut across all disciplines. I was recently at a conference and over the past 20 years management has cut across all those silos and it's always a gap, something that needs to be developed. Is this something you're looking at in your field of study and work here?

**Déom:** I think you cannot *not* fit. But, jokes aside, I think from what we've heard from our panelists is we need to go toward the silo breaking process. The "we" we are always talking about ourselves that way and the panel reinforced that we need to talk to others more. It was



Christenine who said we have to talk to others and communicate. But how do we all the while maintain our ground, we don't want to lose what we've worked hard over the past 20-25 years over Canada. I think we have to strive to reach it somehow.

**Crawford:** I noticed in the Standards and Guidelines it doesn't address how to get funding and support and partnerships to complete many of the projects.

**Uchiyama:** We sit and talk about heritage, where there could be programs that touch on heritage without focusing entirely on it, and we don't know how to raise funds or work with certain types of technology. We're not going to engineering programs and saying maybe you could talk about heritage for a term, and foster a sense of heritage. Rather than work with an engineer or fundraiser ally who has a heritage inkling and those types of programs where we're fostering that sense of a broader concept of heritage. It's important to have programs focussing on conservation techniques but also including maintenance with a heritage section and fostering a sense of understanding rather than a rigid inflexible "we're saving this building".

**Ross:** I couldn't help but think about the loss of the FHBRO maintenance course, this was definitely a model. Think of all those years of training and powering and I had the opportunity to help teach those people the Standards and Guidelines and why it's important to clean gutters and how that impacts the building you're saving. I'd like to take this opportunity to speak to a paradigm shift I'm noticing here. It's not just about heritage but also in education, there's a big change happening in education. One of the ones I'm enjoying is paying attention to the students and what the students have to say. This community based way of looking at heritage education and wanting to hear what the teachers have to teach us. To the students here, I don't think you should be too discouraged because it's not just in heritage that we have these challenges in finding reasonable and appropriate employment. When I graduated it was a similar time, really difficult to get work, you got a job and you held onto it as long as you could. And because of that, you did a lot of continuing education. Someone else said how important is it that we take all kinds of education into consideration. They're all good, continuing education for professionals, workshops at conferences, they're all useful. So I don't think we should be too negative, I think we're in a good time but we need to encourage you that there is actually a lot out there. It's all good to try – there isn't a single solution.

**Angel:** In terms of education, I was reading the recent series in the Globe and Mail about universities and this huge shift in education and to experience-based learning. These shifts are ideal for the heritage field; it really could actually be a golden age for us given certain directions right now. So I think there

**Déom:** Le « experience-based learning » est peut-être associé de façons plus traditionnelles dans l'enseignement de conservation dans tous ce qui est matériaux des technique. Sa commence avec un entraînement pratique. Alors sa commence avec « experience-based learning. »

**McKinnon:** We have a program in folklore and multidisciplinary programs. Victoria's comments about paradigm shift, and Chris's call for great interdisciplinarity and I agree, but it's difficult to do that in practice, our academy is built in silos, so it's very difficult to breakout of those silos. And that's why I like these kinds of conferences where there are a lot of disciplines represented, where you can hear different points of view. I find this round table very interesting from that perspective. I think there are challenges but we can do it, and there are models than do work – Montessori approach to teaching. But we may not see that in universities for a long time. I'm the editor of a journal called "Material Culture Review" and we welcome interdisciplinary debates and articles. Were not just for historians or architects, we welcome a variety of perspectives; we welcome new submissions regarding paradigm shifts.

**Jeanes:** I'm wondering about the role of post-secondary education in a broader sense, not specifically heritage conservation education, but how it fits into society in terms of creating opposition discourse, creating questioning and critical thinking. My perspective is there are a lot of baseline assumptions that are grounded in neo-liberalism, and grounded in different ideas about what the relationship is between citizens and their government, a very strong emphasis on the citizen as a customer rather than citizen, and the idea of customer service, because it's part of the way the governments interact with their citizens and the people are becoming more alienated than ever in the way government affects them. So I think heritage conservation taught now can be bent to fit into a neoliberal framework. It can work with the kinds of approaches favoured in public works or government services Canada. I don't think it's a comfortable fit; I think that a focus on objective performance measures and quantitative analysis of decision making without consideration of qualitative factors really doesn't leave heritage conservation and the kinds of ideas that heritage conservation has evolved in a good position. It leaves it in a subordinate position and just plain old "let's find efficiency where we can." Sometimes finding efficiencies and focusing on quantitative decision making leads to bad outcomes, and we don't see the result of those bad outcomes until the people who made those decisions have moved on. So I guess I'm wondering, can we still see heritage education at a post-secondary level as a place where critical thinking an opposition t some of the underlying position in society is possible, or are we more focused on training people to find work? There are some tensions there; if you want to train people to fit into the system and do their jobs and be rewarded in the way it's not such a great thing for them to be questioning these underlying assumptions that sort of surround us in society today. So where do we go? Are we focused on training the workforce or creating a cadre of students and young professionals who are trying to change the underlying mechanics of society?

**Stacey:** When you talk about critical thinking, where do we start back with that? Because I certainly know we're going speak very specifically to construction or carpentry, the Ontario ministry curriculum is not supportive at all of critical thinking or problem solving, so when I went to the instructors and asked why they were teaching this to the children, they said this is what the ministry sets out. So then we were told that that's the aptitude, that's the level we're

going to go to. So I guess it could be your grade 10 math class, if you're going to go to a certain level, too bad if you're the one who could have aspired to higher than that level. What happens from there is those children go out to the construction programs or postsecondary trades, and their critical thinking isn't there. It's been squashed right from the get go. Which is why we need these interactive programs, we have to keep going with this education and have people who are going to stand up and be critical and they might be wrong or have a different opinion, but it doesn't mean what they're bringing to the table isn't valuable.

**Saliou:** Je suis restauratrice en vitrail. Effectivement, le patrimoine c'est un dossier politique. Des protecteurs de notre héritage patrimoniale, sois dans les édifices religieux ou le culture du passé. On va chercher des intervenants de protection du patrimoine, et on demande souvent de signer des pétitions pour sauvegarder le patrimoine. Je vois sa tous les jours, et nous on est vraiment choqué de voir des manques de sensibilité et la seule moyen d'avoir plus d'argent dans les arrondissements c'est de démolir. J'ai vu des églises se faire démolir en plein jour. Alors moi je suis très heureuse d'être ici. Je viens de France où le patrimoine est riche; on est toujours dans notre tien du patrimoine, mais je vois ici depuis quelques années c'est beaucoup plus exercé, mais il y a encore des travailles énormes a faire. Les gens veulent conserver leur vitrail et les inspecteurs leurs dis que sa vaux pas la peine. C'est très difficile parce qu'il y a pas un discours uniforme. Après le travaille, la collaboration dans le patrimoine religieux, au niveau de la formation et la collaboration sur chacun des métiers, ils sont beaucoup plus pointu dans le monde de patrimoine.

**Déom :** Les interventions sont en effet, mais ses bien soulever la France, une très grande différence dans l'architecture au Canada, dans la spécialisation pour l'intervention sur les monuments de France, et très rapidement distinguable de la formation de l'architecte. Donc depuis le 19ieme siècle ya une formation très accès sur l'intervention particulière. On développe ces spécialités.

**Saliou:** Comme j'ai eu la chance de voir deux cultures, c'est souvent travaille sur le terrain ici différent de la formation académique, je la trouve très riche et intéressant parce qu'il y a un certain dynamique évolué et beaucoup plus interactive et ouverte qu'on a en Europe. On est bien au Québec. Y'a une écoute, une sensibilité, comment on va faire pour le mieux. Mais avec une tres grande écoute et sensibilité. Ces traditions sont pas les mêmes, ils on leur droit de mérite. Mais je pense qu'on a du travaille à faire.

**Blanchet:** Je voudrais juste renforcer quelques points concernant l'expérience que le Canada semble vivre. Je vois ce qui ce passe sur la planète, et je dois dire partout ou on peut regarder, la formation de l'éducation ressorti de tout part, tous le monde est très conscient, développer des initiatives. Des ressources de différent niveau. Si y en a qui veulent, je suis prête à partager concernant les point la. On vien de découvrir avec UNESCO, UQAM, et ICOMOS, c'est un point qui est très important pour le moment, « capacity building. » On va travailler pas juste au niveau des intervenant, mais aux institutions et gouvernement; les gens qui peuvent conserver le

patrimoine. De plus en plus nos professionnelles ne réfléchissent plus, et je pense qu'au niveau d'éducation on a arrêté de demander aux jeunes de réfléchir et questionner. On a oublié d'identifier l'intention. L'esprit d'un concept. Il y a toujours une intention derrière une loi, politique, ou code, et on s'est habitué dans les 20 dernières années. C'est très important de revenir à la source de définir des moyens d'évaluer et d'améliorer la capacité de la réflexion du questionnement des gens. C'est « on time, on budget; » ils ne voient rien d'autre. La revue des qualités sont vues comme des éléments qui sont exclusivement là pour retarder un projet. Il faut vraiment revoir le tout.

**Etkind :** I would like to support Andrew and what he was saying. The shift of a paradigm, the change of context and the role of graduate and post-graduate education, from my point of view, we are in a shift on a huge scale. Not only we are in a multi-disciplinary discussion post-national, if you wish post-cultural, post anything, time, but to also deal with the development with a new development, where heritage is really the only informing tool. Everything else is available and accessible and the adaptive reuse of industrial in a contemporary urban setting, and the abandoned infrastructure of the city and transportation means, take us to the level of heritage conservation theory and practice, where unless we are very clear on the universal value of it, we will find ourselves I'm afraid with younger generation doing phenomenal things without any concept of the next step. With the next generation, the people we are educating today will have to deal with a lot of, not only material, but a lot of intangible questions which we don't answer for them, and to some extent leaving a void. In addition to that, the presence of digital tools makes this task doable, and to some extent accessible and therefore even more complex. So this combination of abandoned industry, abandoned infrastructure, aging modern built heritage, aging concrete and rusting reinforcement, I think that unfortunately I don't think we have the luxury of teaching trades in the traditional manner. I think what we see in today's young people who are attracted to digital media and contemporary means of communication will have to find a way for them to apply that new knowledge and bring that new tools and skills and perception in relationship to the surrounding world, to the context of that, which is for us something recent. So unless we focus on values and fundamental principles, I'm afraid that on all levels we will lose control of the process. And I'm very supportive of your concern of how to deal with a trade but I'm afraid that we don't have the time or the means of controlling it unless we take it on a much different or greater scale of larger paradigm shift, then we can. Otherwise, we won't see the end of it.

**Déom:** I think it ties in a bit with sustainability and some of what Christine was saying about thinking about other reasons, other ways to convince and certainly all that discussion that we're not really having about "we" again, embodied energy for instance.

**Wetherell:** A lot of talk here about silos and architectural bias and whatnot, and I'm going to a lot of museums conferences and everybody there uses the word heritage all the time there as well, and I appreciate the differences of practice we're talking about here. But there is a whole sector there that really is quite isolated from us, that I think is one that we need to think about in

terms of our practice and yes, they're involved with cultural property on the whole, but at the same time they're dealing with many of the same issues in terms of assessments of value, all of those things have different applications and perspectives but come from the same base in a lot of ways. I would invite people to not forget that there's that whole other side to heritage practice, and surely Richard McKinnon can talk about cultural bulletin is moving in that direction, as were you folks, about a management program. So I'm encouraging people to think a little bit outside of the silo here where we're very much concerned with landscapes and architecture and to realize that there's that other side, and architectural bias is part of that. Inclusivity is not always possible, but in what we're doing and I think many points of political strength are a part of it. The federal government has abandoned cultural heritage because nobody makes it worth their time, politically. Stephen Harper isn't going to be defeated because he doesn't like heritage. In many ways these things do become political issues.

**Oakley:** This topic, this roundtable brings up so many ideas and thoughts that I'm not going to touch on. What I find interesting, listening to the discussions, it's the heritage education roundtable but maybe it would be more apt to rename it the Project-Based Architectural Conservation Education Roundtable. I guess I have a background in history, social not architectural, so im not necessarily focused on buildings, but different types of heritage, and how to integrate different approaches and how natural and cultural heritage conservation philosophies conflict and come together and that knitting together of tangible and intangible. This conversation is very focused on post-secondary education and graduate programs, my question is, what about other types of education? What about public education, and I think talking about this being a fundamentally political thing, how are we educating outsiders to what this field does? Not only that, where is this fitting into high school education, elementary school education, also more informal ways of being educated. We talk about nurturing the culture of conservation. Where can homeowners access those workshops and learn how to restore their windows and how can we educate them on when they need to bring in an expert? There's an architect in Illinois who teacher grade 7-8 kids during a day camp, where he has them building architectural things and recordings. It's those types of opportunities that create receptors in people, which when they grow up they have the eye to look at heritage courses, they would be interested in that. What are we doing to promote cross-disciplinary education in terms of we are a type of conservation, what about natural types of conservation. Are there any self-identified natural conservationists in the room today? Another brief comment, in the past our education has been very open and very openly shared through universities and the government, and as we're seeing increasingly privatized industry, the tendency to not share knowledge, to hold on to that, to give ourselves competitive advantages, that's something we're going to be coming up against as well. To put education into a broader context, we're seeing a full on attack on social sciences and art education in the west. The governor of Florida says we don't need more archaeologists; the governor of Texas cut the library budget for the state by 88%. We need to look at how we can take our education to the public, to different publics and build that conservation, also building ourselves a market of people willing to buy these services and

nurturing private industries. What are we going to do, how are we carrying this conversation forward outside of this room once we wrap up the day?

**Angel:** First of all, something interesting that I don't understand myself not being of this generation, in terms of what to do about the place of traditional craftsmanship, traditional trades, and where that fits within education, it's an interesting issue because something that we have seen at Willobank is actually among younger people there seems to be a growing interest in this, and the idea of working with one's hands and one's head seems to be very much part of a paradigm shift, and this sort of gets to my point; I myself am trying to observe this paradigm shift and trying to understand it, but I learn the most about it by working with students and trying to understand their preoccupations and values. So as we continue with this discussion I think getting a range of viewpoints from students in the room is really a critical component because there seems to be such a shift in values and perspectives at this point.

**Pellicer:** My frustration dealing with many engineers, in terms of lack of sensitivity in heritage built environment and what it is, and having to teach them . It's a lack of sensitivity of the engineers and knowing you don't necessarily have to replace a structure with steel, but it's the only thing they know. They don't know wood restoration. I've had to fight this, and it's unfortunate and the issue of values. Education in terms of the engineering side, bringing the subject of historic structures, that needs to be brought forth in the engineering field, and in projects for building managers for people who manage buildings, who only look at the bottom line, not at how heritage structure can be destroyed. Having professionals involved that are knowledgeable in how heritage structures work and what kind of damage can be done by poor maintenance and other bad practices, needs to be brought at the ground level at the training of these people for building managers, but it's not fair. The other point is the issue of what is heritage; at what point does something become heritage? We ask that because something buildings built as temporary or poor quality buildings or low value buildings, just because they've been around long enough automatically becomes heritage; that is a problem because we want to preserve appropriate heritage. If it's been around long enough it becomes a character defining issue, but sometimes buildings are inappropriately built, and we need to evolve. Our built environment evolves over time. We built and we move forward. Buildings are not static elements, they are dynamic, and they change in time, and as they change in time, how to adapt current standards, yet conserving our heritage is the challenge. How to conserve the heritage character defining elements yet introduce modern facilities and amendments? It's a difficult balancing act to achieve. Future professionals need to look at that particular question.

**Stacey:** In response to the questions about trades. I don't think we'll be able to let our heritage trades disappear, and there is a great interest with young people, including young children. They want to do this hands on work, so when I said that in 15 years we don't want to be having the same conversations, hopefully we'll be seeing a lot more people in the heritage trades. But I think the problem is how much do we value that? So when the child goes into their high school guidance councilor and says I want to be a carpenter, what does the councilor say? At my

daughter's school, they made a big celebration of a carpentry graduate's success, and I was delighted to see that, and so proud of that boy. He's always going to have a job, so just the fact that maybe he didn't complete a four year university degree doesn't mean he's not valuable. Make sure what we're telling our children is valuable.

**Ureche-Trifu:** The students seem to be asking "how". Coming back into talking about interdisciplinary and how this seems to be very much focused in architecture, my question is how do we teach heritage in an interdisciplinary way. My own person opinion is you can't teach it the same way when talking about architecture, intangible, engineering. When you're starting to expand the field, you want to talk about heritage and museum studies and cultural studies. How do we do this?

**Pajot:** There are examples happening now I think not only in specific programs, but you look around the range of what's happening in different institutions of what's happening in this room, there is a more serious technical focus in certain areas. It's the discussion between the programs at that level and breaking down the barriers between our academic institutions, a sharing of students and programs. Because overall when you look at it, we have a fairly healthy heritage education system when you look at the range of what's available. It's a matter of speaking to each other perhaps. There are many options for students to go through the various programs. The range of ways you can get to heritage conservation are multiple, and I think if we have more people with that kind of range of background, can bring that.

**Esponda:** At Carleton in architecture, I'm going to have students from engineering, architects, historians and planners in my class, so for me, I'm very challenging right now to see how I'm going to teach heritage in the same class of 80 students all together. So it's going to be students not knowing anything but the basics, so it's going to be challenging for me to work with them.