Interreg Europe

Co-funded by the European Union

CIVITEC

Good practice detailed information

Short summary of the practice: This short text works as a preview for the good practice and it will appear at card level. [160 characters]	A community-engaged studio at the University of Cyprus links academia, practice, and society in designing Nicosia's public spaces, fostering sustainability and diversity.
Detailed information on the practice: Please provide here a consolidated overview of the practice covering main points of the sub-sections 1 (Civic engagement/ public participation case) and 2 (Good Practice of the use of ICT tools/solutions) - What is the problem addressed and the context which triggered the introduction of the practice? - How does the practice reach its objectives and how it is implemented? - Who are the main stakeholders and beneficiaries of the practice? [max 1500 characters].	The co-creation studio (https://www.instagram.com/cocreationstudio.ucy/) was established and implemented in 2021 in an attempt to put a higher priority on social sustainability issues during the architectural design studio and systematize research and its relationship with pedagogy. It embraces a transdisciplinary framework and incorporates community-engaged approaches and situated learning. Simultaneously, it examines the impact of the approach through participatory action research and knowledge co-production with stakeholders outside of academia, linking research with teaching and learning. Since 2021, the studio has been implementing co-creation activities in different Nicosia neighbourhoods including co-designing and implementing a public space in a neighborhood in Latsia Municipality and co-designing and building an outdoor "classroom" in Latsia's high school yard. Co-creation activities included a series of collaborative workshops from challenges identification, needs prioritisation to joined proposals and implementation of the proposals/interventions (design and build) and final events once the constructions were implemented. In the co-creation studio collaborative mapping through either Padlet or Google maps is used as well as collaborative work on Miro boards. As a result, citizens feel the sense of ownership, being part of local development; students have gained experience in designing on real conditions/environments, and many more.

1. *Civic engagement/ public participation case - brief summary* ● what was the aim of civic engagement/ public participation ● who were the main stakeholders and beneficiaries ● what were the main activities carried out ● was the aim achieved? Were there any difficulties in the engagement/participation process? What lessons were learned?	- By participating in real-world projects and initiatives, students on one hand, are provided with valuable opportunities to apply their skills and knowledge in community-driven projects, gaining a deeper understanding of the urban environment's intricate dynamics and their potential future role within it. They are given the opportunity to understand the collaborative dynamics between academia, local governments, professionals, and citizens, to foster synergies and to promote the co-creation of knowledge. Co-created knowledge presents a powerful synergy between community engagement and the urban planning and design process. It is the product of a collaborative effort between citizens, professionals, and public authorities to generate insights that inform urban decision-making. The concept of co-creation emphasizes inclusivity and active involvement, acknowledging that urban challenges are best addressed by those who experience them daily. One of the core features of co-created evidence-based knowledge is the democratization of the decision-making process. Citizens are no longer passive recipients of urban policies but actively participate in shaping their urban environments. By participating in data collection, analysis, and interpretation, citizens contribute to a shared knowledge base that goes beyond traditional expert-driven approaches. In the co-creation studio collaborative mapping through either Padlet or Google maps is used as well as collaborative work on Miro boards. -the main stakeholders were architecture students and tutors, high school students, neighbours (through an open call), representatives of the municipality, local craftsmen. - Several outcomes about the co-creation framework as a participation, teaching, and learning process, its impact on students, and the design result(s) have emerged incrementally over the three years of research, with the process being updated through improvement actions from year to year. Co-creation activities included a series of collaborative workshops from challenges identification, needs prioritisation to joined proposals and implementation of the proposals/interventions (design and build) and final events once the constructions were implemented. The aims were to a high extent achieved. Students' exposure to real-life settings and engagement with other people enabled them to explore their role in a diverse team and view negotiation and conflict as opportunities for productive and fruitful discussion. The participation of

	communities and actors beyond academia in architectural research and pedagogy proved significant, involving civil society in conceptualizing and participating in the shaping of their built environment. A major challenge was changing student cohorts through the process as well as sustained stakeholders' engagement. Proper documentation of the process is crucial to ensure long-term access to information such as activity dates, review dates, participant numbers, research year, theme, and more
2. Good Practice of the use of ICT tools/solutions - detailed description ● problem/context - what is the problem addressed and the context which triggered the introduction of the practice - why was ICT tool/ solution preferred? ● outcome - what were the expected outcomes of the use of ICT tools/ solutions? Have the expected outcomes of the practice been met? ● implementation - how did the practice reach its objectives and how it was implemented - what tasks were carried out and which ICT tools/ solutions were produced? ●	N/A
Timescale (start/end date): e.g., June 2012 – May 2014 / ongoing	January - June each year
Resources needed: Please specify the number of funding/financial resources used and/or the human resources required to set up and to run the practice.	3 tutors/funding varies depending on the project (from 5000euro-70000euro)

Evidence of success (results achieved):

- *Effectiveness using the good practice* - How effective has the practice been in general terms and specifically in terms of benefiting groups or communities where it was implemented?
- *How was the success of the practice measured* - which methods were used for monitoring and evaluating results of implementing the practice? Please provide factual evidence that demonstrates its success or failure (e.g., measurable outputs/results).
- *What are the benefits of good practice* - main idea that you want to stand - why is this practice considered as good practice in your view? What is the added value that the use of ICT tools/ solutions provided vs "traditional" non-technological approach to civic engagement/ public participation? *See criteria for selection in section 2.1. in above.*

Through participatory action research methodology (par), the studio aims to bring together architectural research, architectural pedagogy, and society, aiming for improvement and change through 'self-reflective teaching" and continuous co-evaluation. To achieve this, the data gathering procedure includes the data collected by the educators-researchers as active participants throughout the process, as well as data from the students and external stakeholders outside academia, such as citizens. Through observation and reflective writing, the researchers keep records of what is happening in order to be reflective and suggest improvements. Observation is structured around three axes: the methodology of the studio, the impact on students and design results, and the research methodology. Students and other stakeholders participate in co-evaluation with focus group discussions, questionnaires, and interviews, these take place before the process starts and at the end to evaluate the impact on perception of all stakeholders.

To measure the success of the practice, participants engaged were asked to evaluate their participation in the process (through questionnaires), and the results were very positive:

Citizens' main benefits recorded:

- sense of ownership of the final deliverable
- feeling of being part of local development
- willingness to participate again
- increased interest for common affairs

Students' main benefits recorded:

- importance of hearing others' opinion and express yours
- gain experience in designing on real conditions/environments
- kept engaged and committed
- willingness to participate again
- from passive listeners to more active members of a team

	- exploring the multiplicity of the roles of an architect - understanding the importance, complexity and limitations of design in a real setting and the diversity of the stakeholders involved - improvement on students' confidence related to their soft and practical skills - new knowledge and experience - confidence for the design result UCY co-creation studio: • gave students the opportunity to gain valuable experiences, develop transversal skills and competencies and recognize their multidimensional role as architects. • promoted cooperation between the quadruple-helix: - by encouraging residents to engage in activities about their environment. - by providing future decision-makers, stakeholders at municipal - planning levels and enterprises, the competences, skills and tools to encourage co-creation by creating a ground for an integrated, shared framework for the creation of public spaces with participatory approaches in Cyprus
Potential for learning or transfer: • *Upscaling/ Replication* - Could the practice be replicated or scaled up in a different setting? If yes, then please explain why you consider this practice (or some aspects of this practice) as being potentially interesting for other regions to learn from. This can be done e.g., through information on key success factors for a transfer or on, factors that can hamper a transfer. Information on transfer(s) that already took place can also be provided (if possible, specify the country, the region – NUTS 2 – and organisation to which the practice was transferred) Are there already plans to scale up the practice? What would	the project: - developed a framework for community engagement in urban decision making - promoted cooperation between academia, society and practice. - gave students the opportunity to gain valuable experiences, to develop practical and soft skills and recognize their multidimensional role as future architects The practice refers to an applied methodology. No special equipment or infrastructure is required; therefore, it is easily transferable and replicable to any interested region or other locality. This transdisciplinary learning environment:

be the possible challenges in implementing this practice? How can these challenges be addressed most efficiently?
• *Lessons learned*
  • What worked really well? What facilitated this?
  • What did not work and why did it not work? How did you overcome the difficulties?
  • What are three key recommendations/conclusions you would make for others who intend to adopt the best practice?
	- lays the basis for a long-term collaboration between the municipality, the community, professional practitioners in the sector, and academia.
	- establishes both the University and local municipalities as open and vital actors in local/regional urban development, working to ensure a transparent, inclusive, and reasonable process of urban development.
	- introduces an alternative approach to urban government and urban commons

External website (optional): *Link to website or other media where further information can be found, PLEASE give an explanation in English of the content of the website/media*	(https://www.instagram.com/cocreationstudio.ucy/)
Tags related to your practice (optional): *Add keywords from the file* https://www.interregeurope.eu/sites/default/files/Tags.xlsx	*Cocreation, codesign, collaboration, community, citizen engagement,* cities, *sustainability, participation, collaborative mapping*
Documents (optional): *Add documents to support your good practice*	
Video (optional): *Add a video to support your good practice*	

Images (optional):

Add images to support your good practice (1440 pix width minimum, recommended dimensions: 440 x 450 pixels, 1MB). It would appear in the header of your good practice page.

Quality of civic engagement and public participation

When you are selecting Good Practices, please check and briefly comment also whether all or several of the following steps have been passed in process of civic engagement and public participation in decision making (based on OECD Guidelines for Citizen Participation Processes):

Step	Did you pass this step - Yes/ No	Brief comment

1. Identifying the problem to solve and the moment for participation	YES	The problem that the public can help address is identified, and citizens participate in three out of five stages of the policy cycle: issue identification, policy formulation, and decision-making.
2. Defining the expected objectives and results	YES	The methodology for this good practice is highly direct, clearly defining the expected outcomes of the participation process from an early stage. It is designed to ensure that citizens' input is both meaningful and effectively integrated into implementation.
3. Identifying the relevant group of people to involve and recruiting participants	YES	The main stakeholders were architecture students and tutors, high school students, neighbours (through an open call), representatives of the municipality and local craftsmen.
4. Choosing the participation method	YES	In this good practice, a combination of participatory methods is used, including information and communication, open meetings/town hall meetings, civic monitoring, public consultation, and open innovation.
5. Choosing the right digital tools *(covered already with Good Practice report, see in above section 2.3)*	NO	N/A
6. Communicating about the process	YES	One of the main challenges faced was to sustain stakeholders' engagement. Proper documentation and communication of the process was crucial to ensure long-term access to information such as activity dates, review dates, participant numbers, research year, theme, and more.
7. Implementing a participatory process	YES	To successfully implement the process, all key factors were carefully considered, and thorough initial preparation was conducted. Specifically, the team developed a well-structured timeline, identified necessary resources, ensured inclusivity and accessibility, and thoughtfully designed the citizens' journey throughout the participatory process.
8. Using citizen input and providing feedback	YES	The data gathering procedure includes the data collected by the educators-researchers as active participants throughout the process, as well as data from the students and external stakeholders outside academia, such as citizens.

			Through observation and reflective writing, the researchers keep records of what is happening in order to be reflective and suggest improvements.
9.	Evaluating the participation process	YES	Students and other stakeholders participate in co-evaluation with focus group discussions, questionnaires, and interviews, these take place before the process starts and at the end to evaluate the impact on perception of all stakeholders
10.	Fostering a culture of participation	NO	N/A