

Workshop Notes: Investigating the Living Lab Model Through Scoping Reviews

When: Thursday, November 21st @ 3-5pm EST

Where: On-Site at Sustainable Food Systems Lab (PACI, 2001) or on Zoom

Zoom Recording Link:

https://lakeheadu.zoom.us/recording/share/JUXD90SdMJ0zxx6DmcWX-1IDHjbgssy_BGV5sIsEOuWwlumekTziMw

Introduction

On November 21st, 2019 the Thunder Bay hub of the Lake Superior Living Labs Network hosted a workshop for network members to share about (1) the purpose and process of conducting scoping reviews, (2) our intentions for conducting a scoping review of the literature written about living labs, and (3) consult with network members about the directions of this research and the research questions to examine. During the course of the workshop, the group discussed the following questions:

Discussion Questions:

1. Living Labs center learning/experimentation, co-creation and collaboration. Are there questions that you have about the challenge you're working to solve that could be answered through collaboration within the LSELLN? In your case, what would be the best way to facilitate this kind of collaboration and co-creation of knowledge/action?
2. What does the term Living Lab mean to you?
3. What are three key characteristics of a living lab project?
4. Is there anything you don't understand about Living Labs?
5. What would you like to learn from the scoping review process (what would help to advance your work)?
6. Which of the following preliminary scoping review questions is most relevant to you and your work?
 - a. How are Living Labs used?
 - b. How are Living Labs governed?
 - c. How is equity and justice integrated into Living Labs work?
 - d. What tools and processes are used to facilitate collaboration and co-creation within living labs?

Break-Out Group #1 (Online Participants)

Who: Brian McLaren (Nat Resources Mngmt Faculty, LU), Kevin Moris (Eco-Entrepreneurship, LSC), Mike Mageau (Eco-Entrepreneurship, LSC), Kristi Heintz (Sustainability, LSC), Glenn Merrick (Eco-Entrepreneurship, LSC), Kathryn Milun (Anthropology Faculty, UMD), Meg Little (Pharmacy Faculty, UMD), Nairne Cameron (Geography faculty, AU), Randy Hanson (Eco-Entrepreneurship Program, LSC), Veronica Calderon (Health Sci student, LU), David Greenwood (Education faculty, LU), David Thompson (RAIN), Charles Levkoe (Health Sci

Faculty, LU), Kelsey Jones-Casey (Health Sci Student, LU) Joseph Bauerkemper (American Indian Studies Faculty, UMD), Mindy Granley (Sustainability, UMD)

- There is potential for several scoping reviews! Including scoping reviews that examine the intersection of related/parallel topics (i.e. community-based research partnerships/living labs, or sustainability/regeneration).
- Scoping reviews are helpful academic exercises to get the “lay of the land,” but what is their ultimate purpose? Possibility of “doing these cool things” together. How can scoping review be used for the benefit of work happening on the ground.
- How can we leverage institution(s) for social/ecological change, and de-silo the ivory tower?
- This grant (and the scoping review process) offers the opportunity to make time to reflect on the work that we’re doing, and to use those reflections to do the work better.
- How can we share more deeply about the projects that we’re all working on, and then conduct a more targeted literature review on the kinds of projects we’re working on?
- How might or projects be iterated across the watershed? E.g. Could a university make a guide for how to implement a community dialogue on energy transition (using Duluth examples of bringing community theater groups into these dialogues to make them more accessible)?
- But what about literature about how **living labs work**? Can this knowledge be useful for specific hubs and specific projects on the ground?
- Governance is an important issue, and we have something to contribute there. How we do learn about how to move from “expert domains” to communities’ expertise.
- Sharing stories is most helpful. It seems really difficult to categorize and organize all these different projects, but would be helpful to share stories between and across these projects.
- Indigenous methods, other ways of knowing, and questions of sovereignty (see: OCAP) have a lot of contribute to these questions.
- ..which is why centering relationships in this work is so important.
- There is not just clinical knowledge and cultural knowledge, but also community knowledge.
- Living labs can include decolonized methodologies, community-based methods, etc. There is a network of scholars - Diálogo de Saberes - from different countries sharing their works as a new way to build knowledge.

If you had to choose between these scoping review research questions (see below), which would you choose?

- How are Living Labs used?
 - How are Living Labs governed?
 - How is equity and justice integrated into Living Labs work?
 - What tools and processes are used to facilitate collaboration and co-creation within living labs?
- What **are** the projects? I.e. what are people using labs to do?

- B & C (B = How are living labs governed? C = How is equity and justice integrated into living labs work?)
- What are the organically-grown ideas within our own network? How can we draw themes from the projects within our own network. (Meg) And then how do these learnings relate back to the research?
- D best captures his interests (D=What tools and processes are used to facilitate collaboration and co-creation within living labs?). We want to be a group of doers!
- Just wanted to say that I'm interested in the scoping question D (tools and processes). Being from UMD, we've tried to use our campus as a sort of living lab to try some -- but I laugh about how we pride ourselves in trying new things, but we have actually more barriers to implementation in some cases than others. We might have ideas/skills here, but also comes with bureaucracy, code requirements, things take longer, things cost MORE, not less, etc. I'm inspired by people who can do things in a way that might be faster, lighter, cheaper...to try new sustainable options.
- What does a supportive network look and feel like?

Break-Out Group #2 (Onsite Participants)

Who: Lindsay Galway (Faculty, LU), Shadiya Aidid (Health Sci Student, LU), Rachel Portinga (Forest Sci Student, LU), Aynsley Klassen (Staff, Ecosuperior), Michaela Bohunicky (Health Sci Student, LU), Courtney Strutt (Education Student, LU)

Living Labs center learning/experimentation, co-creation and collaboration. Are there questions that you have about the challenge you're working to solve that could be answered through collaboration within the LSLLN? In your case, what would be the best way to facilitate this kind of collaboration and co-creation of knowledge/action?

- The need to listen to all the voices in the room, this is often very hard to do in practice
- Valuing everyone at the table and the experiences that they can bring
- Be prepared for the unexpected
- How do we GET diverse voices to the table. This is so hard to do in community eco-action work
- There is a need to continuously check in with people, this is hard and time consuming
- Language, the words we use and don't use, is very important. Words are tools, they effect change and have impacts. We need to spend a lot of time exploring what we mean by words/concepts when working with diverse people

What does the term Living Lab mean to you?

- Getting together and trying new things together. Unanswered questions about how to do these things together.
- Evolving, constantly changing, responsive
- Being connected
- A way to teach, moreso that an approach to doing things (grounded in teaching in particular). Particularly a place/physical site where we can teach
- The two terms "living" and "lab" feel/seem to be contradictory. Living is reflective of social sciences work and approaches while "lab" is reflective of sterile hard sciences work

Commented [1]: +lgalway@lakeheadu.ca note that I've added David's comment back in here.
Assigned to Lindsay Galway

Commented [2]: OK - thanks!

Is there anything you don't understand about Living Labs?

- Would like more clarity about our project itself . What is my role? What is the purpose?

What would you like to learn from the scoping review process (what would help to advance your work)?

- What is the history of the concept
- What is it (how are people describing it)? An approach, methodology, model?
- WHERE. Are there examples that don't have physical site/place in the literature?
- Interest in exploring scale. Seems to be a focus on local (or even lower scales such as small physical sites). Is this true in the literature or just what I am seeing/noticing
- What about "grey" literature. Can we think of a way to include that (or explore later, in a different way)? What are the impacts of excluding the grey literature from a scoping review?
- "Sustainability" of living labs projects themselves? How to foster lasting relationships beyond the life of individual projects
- How to make work "live on"
- WHAT is being co-created? (what are outputs?)
- WHO are the people doing living labs work? Who is participating and involved (and who is not)?
- What are key relationships? How are relationships supported? How do they emerge?
- Power dynamics associated with CO (-creation). How to address power dynamics when co-creating
- Collaboration VS co-creation.
- Are there any theories supporting co-creation (theoretical orientations, cited theories/frameworks)
- What do living labs look like outside of large urban centers?
- Other networks?

Which of the following preliminary scoping review questions is most relevant to you and your work?

- Consensus that the preliminary set of questions is a good start.
- General features such as scale/place/setting/objectives/intended outcomes
- Large interest in HOW (processes). In particular how processes converge with questions of equity
- Interest in questions about Who (who is involved, who has access etc.)

Workshop Take-Aways and Conclusions

Two key themes that emerged from the break-out group conversations were (1) the importance of relationships between network members, and (2) the importance of understanding the "who" and "how" questions through our scoping review (i.e. how do living labs help us move further towards our goals around just sustainabilities; how do living labs support co-creation?).

Generally workshop participants were interested in learning from what other people/groups/organizations (within and beyond the network) were doing, how they were doing it, and what was working. And relatedly, they were interested in exploring the best ways for sharing these experiences with one another. The scoping review process should contribute to this emerging collective desire from the group.

Next Steps

The LSSLN will continue to explore opportunities that can support us in our efforts towards gathering and sharing stories, including through workshops like these, the survey sent to all members in November, case-study templates, summits held in Thunder Bay, Sault Saint Marie, and Duluth etc. The information collected through this research will be shared back with members in accessible formats.

Kelsey, Rachel, Lindsay and Charles will continue to move forward with the scoping review process. Next steps include: 1) finalizing the scoping review questions and search terms; 2) beginning the process of extracting and reviewing literature (by January 2019); and 3) analyzing the body of literature using a data extraction chart. The scoping review team will continue to consult with LSSLN members and share preliminary lessons that we are learning from the scoping review process.