

BUILDING A SUBSTANTIVE ROLE FOR THE COMMUNITY

OVERVIEW:

**WHAT SHOULD COUNCIL SPEND OUR MONEY ON TO SHAPE THE
COMMUNITY'S FUTURE?**

Overview

The City of Bendigo is required to produce a new Council Plan setting out the key strategic issues and outcomes it will focus on in its term of office and outlining the services they provide to the community by June 2017, following elections in October 2016.

Due to the common refrain from a range of incoming State and Federal governments that – upon arriving in office – they find financial affairs are not as imagined, the community has become cynical about the accuracy of that statement. It is of course true in some circumstances, but it is hard for citizens to know when. Restoring trust in that conversation with the community should be a priority, and with it will come a reduction in some citizen's Magic Pudding beliefs of any government's unending capacity to provide.

Additionally, the nature of elections and the concentrated advocacy directed at those seeking office means that spending priorities can end up directed at the squeakiest wheel rather than at services perhaps more valued by the *entire* community. This is not a critique of elected representatives, it is a critique of the system: we have built an election method which rewards painting those in elected office into a corner because of the wishlist nature of politics and the shallow nature of the vote. Our system of democracy needs a complementary counterweight which this engagement intends to provide – and the time to provide it is at the commencement of a new term of office. In a jury, we ask people to slow down their decisions and consider tradeoffs: the vote tends to be an emotional decision based around the promise of a key wish.

Bendigo presents an ideal test environment for an approach which should be widely applicable across local government. Having undertaken a highly visible and extensive portfolio of capital works in recent years the community have had a chance to experience a larger range of new services than most. The citizens' voice in this process will not be conceptual – it will be highly grounded in what they have seen, lived through and valued.

Our concept is a simple one: take a fairly small group of people through a deep experience of the work done by council and identify the areas of common ground they find. It is not an audit. It is not an expert advisory report. It is a valid and reliable summary of local views from the community which the new council (post-election) can use as a key input. Councillors will know what the impassioned and motivated advocates feel is right for the community, because they hear from them often. This is useful to know. The jury is designed to inform councillors of the informed views of people who are much less likely to ever engage with council. As a shorthand: our elected tend to hear from insisted voices. We are adding a structure to make some room for invited voices.

Deliberation is a balance of two key elements: the broadest array of information available, and an equal opportunity for participants to share their views and contribute to the discourse. We will take a small but highly representative group of citizens – old and young, blue collar/ white collar/ no-collar, men and women, rich and poor and those in-between - *and then see what they can agree on*. We will do so with enough time that all participants understand the costs and tradeoffs attached to those decisions.

It is the aspiration of NDF that at the conclusion of the process the Mayor and Councillors of the City of Bendigo value an ongoing role for randomly selected everyday people as a complementary voice in making public decisions.

Background and Context

The City of Greater Bendigo has a large urban area with approximately 85% of the population, surrounded by rural areas and small towns. In most circumstances we see, this pattern generally leads to a sense that the centre “gets everything” at the expense of the outer areas. We have no idea of the *accuracy* of that view in this situation: it is intended to capture a sentiment. The consequence is to simply highlight the need for any random draw to capture people from all parts of the area.

At a State level, an additional imperative has been created as rate-capping (limiting the rise of local rates at taxes to around CPI) constrains the freedom and flexibility of councils unless they can demonstrate genuine community support and engagement. While thin, broad methods such as surveys have traditionally been used to tick boxes of this type, the growing understanding, acceptance and valuing of “fewer and deeper” approaches as eliciting a representative and considered view means this project is fundamental to any future rate variation questions. It is critical to note that the community will have freedom to take this conversation in any direction: they are not endorsing a council position nor rubber stamp an increase: they are being asked to come to their own conclusions after being given a problem, all the relevant information and a blank sheet of paper.

Project Objective

The incoming Mayor and councillors – and the wider community – will be provided with a *considered consensus view* about the range and level of services (in the broad sense, so including capital works) across all of Greater Bendigo.

We have no expectation citizens will become experts. We have full confidence that they will be able to weigh competing viewpoints, identify experts of their own choosing, integrate other sources and reach agreement on fair tradeoffs and who should pay for what. We have confidence that the recruitment and operations of the jury will defy a cynical view that they are somehow ‘staged’ as jury selection is visibly hard to cheat – and the participants themselves are the proof. Communicating this from the outset needs to be a shared objective.

Council should expect to receive clarity of intent and direction from these citizens. Importantly, we give citizens considerable latitude in how to solve the issue – we start from a blank sheet of paper and encourage them not to be limited by “how we’ve always done things”.

There is one key measure of success from a community process: ***is the final decision taken by the elected representatives different from the decision you would otherwise have taken?***

Our implicit related objective is to design a process with sufficient rigour as to withstand (understandable) sceptical scrutiny: one which visibly cannot be influenced by a single politician, an interest group, financial interest, or ‘people who know people’. Equally, those active interests must be engaged sufficiently early and substantively as to see the process as worthy of an investment of their time.

Transparency of method is one part of this: the design itself must be shared prior to the commencement of the jury’s deliberations – and we conduct explanatory sessions of the methodology to every possible active stakeholder known to Council.

Equally, the role of NDF as non-partisan operators with no interest in the issue nor a desire for ongoing work with Council must be emphasised. Citizens have grown wary of consultants and experts delivering the result which government pays for in order to earn further work. The Foundation’s own brutal self-interest – *to prove that citizens can solve problems for themselves if given the scope to do so* – should be openly and actively shared.

NDF’s self interest in this process is to demonstrate the desirability of a structural role for randomly selected everyday citizens in helping elected representatives take decisions which earn widespread public trust. We hold the view that the first council to take this step will take an iconic step in a transformative change to how we “do” democracy.

About The newDemocracy Foundation

The newDemocracy Foundation (NDF) is a not-for-profit research group, with a particular focus on best practice citizen engagement and innovations in democratic structures. NDF believes that many consultation processes consist of feedback forum events largely attended by interest groups and hyper-interested individuals.

Such processes do not result in communities feeling they have had a say. In contrast, NDF’s proposal is to provide a jury-style process which enables a more representative section of the community to deliberate and find a consensus response. By combining the three elements of random selection, the provision of time and access to all information, and independently facilitated forums for dialogue, a much more robust and publicly trusted outcome can be obtained which can assist governments in achieving public acceptance of hard tradeoffs.

NDF provides design frameworks for public deliberation and overall innovation in democratic models. **Our research and advocacy is focussed on identifying less adversarial, more deliberative and more inclusive public decision-making processes.** Our services are provided on a cost recovery basis - consistent with our structure as a not-for-profit research Foundation, with services provided pro bono on occasion. We are not a think tank and hold no policy views. We also commission independent third-party research which occurs in parallel to the process in order to ensure robustness and to capture the potential for improvements to existing democratic processes.

Rationale: Growing Trust through Public Accountability and Transparency

The newDemocracy Foundation contends that if the local community was told that a random mix of 20-30 of their fellow citizens had reached consensus around the need to change a particular level of service, then they immediately have a greater chance of being trusted that someone in elected office, a public service role or an appointed capacity delivering that message.

If we can successfully convey to the wider community that citizens like them are being given *complete* access to council's information assets, are studying detailed information and hearing from people of their own choosing who know about the topic then the community's faith should increase still further.

In a murder trial, public trust is placed in a jury's verdict, without looking at each piece of evidence, because a trusted group of citizens was given sufficient time and access to information – and was free from outside influences (or even the perception of such influences). There is ample research evidence that supports that this same model can be applied to public decisions in general. More than 1100 case studies have shown that, by giving a representative panel time and information upon which to deliberate, stronger public engagement is achieved – as well as higher quality decisions

Equally, we respect the need of industry and advocacy groups to hold the view *“if you haven't heard from person X then how can you possibly be well informed”*. For this reason, we strongly recommend convening stakeholder sessions to allow that mix of interests to agree a baseline of expert speakers to present the introduction to the topic.

Core Methodology – A Funnel of Key Engagement Activities

A jury process does not exist in isolation: there are many ways citizens like to get involved, and a good way to think of this is as a funnel. Those who drop to council, those who write letters, have a proposal or use an online tool get the promise that all this feedback will be heard not just by councillors and council staff – but also by a jury of people just like them.



Deliberative processes around the world have been extensively adapted and localised. NDF's have tended toward slightly larger numbers of participants with considerably greater amounts of time for in-person meetings (5-6 days spread across three months). The principles of deliberation can be applied in a range of formats and are customised to the topic and the community.

NDF make a conscious decision to pursue a format skewed to in-person meetings and larger number of participants. We value the importance of achieving "people like me" descriptive (visual) representativeness while ensuring that sufficient time is spent on the issue and exploring it in enough depth to own the final group decision – a disaster is people 'just raising their hand' to get it over with. Our goal (one achieved in every past project) is that the participants feel so invested in their recommendations that they will take the hard step of standing alongside councillors to advocate for implementation.

Alignment and Integration Key Dates for Council

<p>Phase 1</p> <p><i>Until June 2016</i></p>	<p>Agree plan, timings and budget.</p> <p>Conduct training workshop with councillors and executive staff. <i>This educational component is a pre-condition of NDF's involvement. (One day, 2-3 hours per audience, to ensure sufficient understanding of process. Content will be repeated for any incoming councillors after the October election).</i></p> <p>NDF communicate to community stakeholders who we are and role/ value of jury.</p> <p>Stakeholders understand and value opportunity to present their view to this group as well as council directly via submissions.</p> <p>Jury recruitment and pre-reading period.</p>
<p>Phase 2</p> <p><i>July – late September</i></p>	<p>Jury meeting and deliberation period.</p> <p>This allows sufficient time for council's materials preparation as well as for external stakeholders to understand the process then be able to contribute. "Shared ownership" is a core idea – they should seek to own this as much as council.</p> <p>Report will become public but with no expectation of response until new council have had time to review.</p>
<p>Phase 3</p> <p><i>February</i></p>	<p>Incoming Mayor (essential) and councillors meet with Jury to offer initial responses, and possibly seek additional clarity in some areas.</p>

<p>Phase 4</p> <p><i>March 2017</i></p>	<p>Formal response to jury recommendations prior to draft release of council’s plan.</p>
--	--

Selection

We will operate a jury of approximately 24 citizens meeting for a mix of weekdays and weekends across 6 meetings.

The participant count is slightly fluid to allow for the statistical profile match to the Census to be maintained even if there is a shortfall in a single category. The more citizens can identify with an individual participant and see “people like me” making a decision rather than government “telling them what to do” the greater the chance of success both in enabling a decision and in having the wider community amenable to its content.

There is negligible statistical impact (in confidence level and confidence interval) on representation within that range. It is notable that recent research from Princeton on the ‘wisdom of crowds’ highlights the greater capacity of small groups rather than large in complex situations (read more: <http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/281/1784/20133305>)

In order to achieve a descriptively representative sample, nDF has considered a range of stratification options. Our recommendation is to proceed with only basic variables (age, gender) and leave it to the statistical benefit of randomisation and probability to deliver people across a range of professions, lifestyles, ethnic and cultural backgrounds etc. The household type variable (owner occupier or tenant) is used as an effective surrogate indicator of income and education which may otherwise prove unlikely to be accurately disclosed – and we are particularly mindful of the need to have the broadest possible range of educational backgrounds in the room. Finally, we will stratify by postcode to ensure that at least 15% of participants come from outside the Bendigo urban area

Selection – Operational Detail

Random selection is the key tool used to identify participants as a means of securing a descriptively representative sample of the community. Stratification will be used to ensure a mix (matched to Census data) by the variables described above. This is not claimed as a “perfect” method, but it delivers a more representative sample than any other community process.

In a comparatively small jury sample, the wider community will clearly see “people like me” in a sample drawn evenly in this way. Descriptively, we will secure people from all walks of life.

We will post invitations to a random sample of 3,000 physical addresses (not billing addresses) drawn from land titles information or named data in the event Council is able to provide access to an appropriate dataset such as the electoral roll (this has proven to be variable/ subject to interpretation). We need to ensure that tenants are reached – in short, the widest possible catchment.

Recipients of the invitation will be invited to register electronically with NDF to indicate that they are available for the final selection (as a fallback, we also provide a phone number for people who prefer to contact us to register). We will also provide a telephone based registration option to ensure those without access to electronic means are not excluded. Based on those available, a second round stratified random draw is then conducted which seeks to randomly match to the stratification detail set out above.

The response list is then checked against the original invitation list. NDF has previously used unique security codes on each invitation to prevent the invitations being passed on (defeating the random element), but in practice the simple measure of automatically ensuring addresses registered match to one where we sent an invitation has proven sufficient – it is very easy to call to confirm a registration and ask where they received it if we can see we didn't post one. (We make these calls as occasionally a business owner will receive one at a work address and register from a home address.)

NDF will not provide any juror information to Council (personal or contact details). Public cynicism around potential "vetting" is sufficiently high that our goal of public trust is threatened by any perception that lists are reviewed. Council will meet the participants for the first time on the first day of the jury.

Just as in juries payment of per diems is **strongly** advised so as to avoid excluding participants who may find this a hardship: this is proposed as \$400 per participant in total.

Invitations will clearly note that this payment will be made for time, and that meals are provided.

Invitations should come from the Mayor and Council to emphasise to potential participants the likely importance and impact of their involvement in the task. We emphasise the newDemocracy name to note the independence of a selection process which is outside the control of government. They will explain the process and ask the recipient to decide to confirm availability for selection.

From the positive responses, a sample is drawn electronically based on the pre-agreed stratification goals referred to above. The aim is to achieve a group descriptively representative of the community even if one subset of the community responds disproportionately to the initial invitation. The key measure of success is partly subjective: do council, elected representatives, the wider community and the media see a group that looks like who they see in their daily lives?

The sample drawn is contacted by email seeking a confirmation in writing from the participant, and NDF also contacts each participant twice by phone prior to the first meeting to build a personal commitment to participating: once underway we can't backfill for non-attendees so those selected need to feel sufficiently engaged to attend on the first day regardless of other circumstances.

Stakeholder Involvement

The stakeholder tier which underpins the jury session will commence with an earlier session of stakeholders and interest groups spanning the full spectrum of views to allow them to be briefed in detail on the process and interrogate our methodology (and neutrality): this is essential to building confidence in the process.

To be blunt: the more people attend this first session the greater the likelihood of trust and adoption. People trust that which they have had a chance to see firsthand, and this is borne out by a UTS research finding on an earlier NDF project with City of Sydney and the Premier's Office. Stakeholders who came to the first session grew in trust of government: those who remained absent actually became more hostile to government and the jury concept (rather than remain neutral).

It is proposed that this group would be given the opportunity to prepare written/ video materials for the citizens' jury **and** to work together to agree on a number of the panel of experts the jurors should be exposed to in the first two sessions. This is designed to address the obvious, simple criticism "*if you haven't heard from person X, how can the process be well informed?*" (This emerged from the above research report following the process conducted with the City of Sydney and NSW Premiers' Office).

In addition to the process above, the successful facilitator will be strongly encouraged to include a specific Speed Dialogue session to open the jury process. This allows for key stakeholders from industry, advocacy and community to present their views and engage in Q&A in an 8-10 person two-way conversational setting. The use of speed dialogue (small groups rotating among all participants for ~5-8 minutes each) encourages the sharing of a wide range of perspectives and experiences and a high volume of juror questioning which accelerates their learning and understanding. Equally importantly, the two way exchange increases trust for all parties who see a jury that really is representative of their community and is asking insightful questions.

Preparation and Information Process

Information and judgement are required in equal parts to reach decisions. newDemocracy advocates these processes because the judgement of random samples (or mini-publics) has been shown to achieve very high levels of public trust because they are non-partisan. It is thus imperative that the method of provision of information to the policy jury does not erode that trust.

There is no such thing as "perfectly impartial" information: the facilitator will explain to the participants that *all* sources have a point of view and that some bias is inevitable. Deliberation gives them the time to identify this and provide balance. It is the jury's own diversity that is the most effective counterbalance to bias (real and perceived).

There are three key sources of information to inform the deliberations:

1. A baseline information kit provided by council. This is a plain English exercise in **candidly describing** – and where possible **mapping** – the status quo *and* any problem areas as council sees it, and also the 'levers' available for taking action.

This cannot be a brochure. Shallow materials simply push the citizens' questions later in the meeting schedule and skew the allocated time more toward information collection rather than assessment, deliberation and discussion of the materials. Where there is doubt, council is strongly advised to miss on the side of too much detail rather than too little. (Samples from previous projects can be provided on request. Briefing books are commonly 90-120 pages.)

Council is entitled to “present a view”. All parties always have a view: our recommendation is not to obscure this in faux neutrality, but to clearly differentiate the purely factual component from the subjective. Please note that individual councillors should feel free to present a view as well, and this is done through the submissions process.

2. Submissions from active stakeholders and interest groups will provide a complementary set of information to round out perspectives on the topic. These are to be provided unedited (bar redacting of contact details for individuals, and where this occurs NDF will note an edit has occurred), and should be made public in chronological order to avoid a perception of bias which comes with other forms of categorisation – i.e. do not imply one submission is “better” or “more important” or cluster *Proposal A* ahead of *Proposal B*.
3. Responses to juror questions. Central to the open, non-leading nature of what we do is to simply ask participants “*What do you need to know and who do you trust to inform you?*”. Some of these will be questions of fact to be responded to by council with supporting primary sources. Others will require NDF to source the person specified by the jury. Facilitators and NDF ensure there is no ambiguity (and thus room for subjectivity) in these requests.

What Does the Citizens’ Jury Decide?

It is of central importance that the limit of the group’s decision-making authority is pre-agreed and clearly conveyed. This must be expressed simply, broadly and openly so as not to be interpreted as directing a particular decision. It will serve to focus their discussions.

It is proposed that the remit of the panel is to reach agreement on a recommended approach to the following:

What should Council spend our money on to shape the community’s future?”.

In terms of authority, it is proposed that:

The unedited recommendations of the jury will be published by Council.

A response to your recommendations will be given in person by the incoming Mayor and Councillors.

A detailed written response to your recommendations will be provided by March 2017.

In short, this needs to pass the test of being the single best offer to participate in a shared public decision that a citizen can ever expect to receive - and this is central to the very high positive response rates we are able to achieve for jury invitations of this type.

What Constitutes a Decision?

In order to shift the public mindset from adversarial, two-party, either/or contests and convey a message of broad-based support for the recommendations, NDF recommends an 80% supermajority be required for a final decision from the jury. In practice, citizens’ juries tend to reach consensus (or

group consent) positions, with minority voices included in any report; they rarely need to go to a vote. Decisions are frequently unanimous.

Facilitators are advised to note the value of recording dissenting views (minority reports) in recommendations as the objective is to most accurately reflect the view of the room. For example:

Recommendation: we should go outside in the sun.

Minority view: 8% of the room were of the view we should not go out in the middle of the day but other times were fine.

The addition of the minority view serves to create a statement that more of the room can agree accurately reflects the discussion, however, the core recommendation always needs to have 80% support.

Core Operations

Skilled facilitators, experienced with deliberative methods, will be required.

The newDemocracy Foundation will operate the jury selection process to ensure there is the highest public confidence in the rigour and independence of the randomisation of invitations (and by extension as to why a given individual was not selected). As we have experienced in other processes, the public will accept our 'rejection' far more easily than if this is required to come from government, as principal.

NDF maintains ongoing oversight and also manages speaker recruitment. A dedicated project management liaison within council is essential.

Subject to discussion with council, provision could be made for a short tour which allows citizens to gain a firsthand appreciation for the differing communities and assets outside the urban centre.

Media Role

The role of the media in supplying information about the exercise is crucial. We have noted in other processes that the community should have the chance to see and identify with the people involved: an evoked response of "*people like me made the decision*" will see the recommendation earn widespread trust.

It is critically important that the Mayor and a cross section of councillors visibly endorse the process *at the outset before any results are known*. Prior projects demonstrate that those willing to take the risk at the outset of very publicly agreeing to listen to any result earn greater scope for action when the recommendations are presented.

Costing Estimate/ Outline

[This section should be redacted for the facilitator RFQ process and reinstated at the conclusion of procurement as part of NDF's full disclosure of project design and methodology]

Key cost areas within the direct NDF scope of responsibilities are outlined below. Where these costs are incurred by NDF we only seek actual cost recovery and original invoicing will be supplied. Our preference is for costs to be handled directly by council wherever possible.

- a. Printing and postage estimated at \$5,600 (3,000 pieces).
- b. Database access costs nil (council GIS or electoral roll).
- c. Participant per diems (24 x \$400 pp) of \$9,600
- d. Facilitator (1 person is sufficient, plus planning and preparation days) of \$35,000
- e. Catering (26 x 6 days x \$50pppd) of \$7,800
- f. Licensing of online discussion tools and moderation: assuming access to existing tool (BangTheTable or equivalent).
- g. Provision should be made within the budget for a reasonable level of expenses for nDF representatives (air, accomm, car hire): estimated at \$5,000.
- h. Costs for stakeholder briefings are embedded in items (d) and (g)
- i. Venues (with AV capability) are assumed to be available in council buildings.

Items a-i amount to \$63,000. All figures ex GST.

Process design, selection administration, advisory and oversight will be provided by the Foundation on the cost recovery basis included in point 'k' below.

As a research institute the Foundation requests:

j. that Council contributes to a research fund which will capture what is learned through the innovation process up to the value of **\$10,000**. As part of our ATO compliance, the topic of research will be set by the Research Committee of The newDemocracy Foundation.

k. that a services grant of **\$25,000** is made to the newDemocracy Fund which contributes to the operation of the Foundation and to the future of improving democracy in Australia.

These research items amount to an additional \$35,000. The total estimated project cost is thus \$98,000.

Key Issues to be managed:

- Mayor and Councillors reach agreement as to process – most specifically and explicitly the remit and authority, as once announced this cannot be changed, and the requirement for Councillors and staff to participate in a training workshop.
- Interface with internal subject matter experts to generate high quality baseline information kit.
- Active engagement of stakeholder contributors for briefing and submissions.
- Local media briefing: goal is an explanatory feature about “innovating in doing government” rather than a sole (narrow) focus on topic alone.
- Allocation of responsibilities for communications task (this is also an education campaign for the broader community for a new concept, and needs to be approached as such).
- Early securing of venues.
- Early recruitment of facilitator, and facilitator’s review and contribution to this process design at an early stage.

TIMELINE FOR 2016 JURY PROCESS:

CITY OF GREATER BENDIGO

PROJECT: A SUBSTANTIVE ROLE FOR THE COMMUNITY

WHAT SHOULD COUNCIL SPEND OUR MONEY ON TO SHAPE THE COMMUNITY'S FUTURE?"

The unedited recommendations of the jury will be published by Council.

A response to your recommendations will be given in person by the incoming Mayor and Councillors.

A detailed written response to your recommendations will be provided by March 2017.

The Citizens' Jury is tasked with making make specific, measurable and actionable requests.

<p>Kickoff</p> <p>March/ April 2016</p>	<p>Council, nDF and partners preparatory planning session.</p> <p>Key topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Identify required background materials and expert/ contributor program for inclusion. Agree document co-ordinator and delivery date. ➤ Identify key council speaker or nominee for "set the scene" opening presentation on Day 1: this is a key role. ➤ Single point of contact council Project Manager. ➤ List stakeholder communication targets for submissions and contributions (interest group involvement). ➤ Identify critical media partners and seek early briefing. ➤ Revise/ amend/ review these program dates and goals. ➤ Agree media and communications protocols – how we work together. ("Managing independence") ➤ Final budget approval by all parties. ➤ Finalise date specifics – check for major event clashes. ➤ Finalise venue bookings. ➤ Dataset confirmed and supplied.
<p>April</p>	<p>Selection of online platform services – Apr 12th.</p> <p>Councillor and key staff training workshops – mid April (afternoon, 3hrs per audience)</p> <p><u>Deadline</u> for recruitment and briefing of independent, skilled lead facilitator – April 8th (this document and 3-way briefing call or in-person mtg)</p>
<p>May</p>	<p>Media briefing (date tbc), invitation to stakeholder briefings (week 1 invitations) and call for submissions commence (week 3 May)</p>

	<p>Stakeholder briefing sessions end May (offer three sessions at different time slots on one day)</p> <p>(Note at announcement submissions accepted until second Jury meeting mid July 2016.)</p> <p>Printed invitations designed and approved Monday May 2nd (explore alternative recruitment options if locally suitable – discuss with Prue)</p> <p>Printed invitation posted Friday May 6th ** watch for shifting Federal Budget date as indicator of election dates before sending ** RSVP final close (soft date) Friday May 27th</p>
Mid March	<p>First round selection to secure jury representatives. (Complete by Friday June 3rd)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Seeking approx. 26 citizens (24 plus reserves). ➤ Email explanation of commitment required: attendance at all elements of process, active (and measured) reading and discussion online. ➤ Stratified random sample to deliver descriptive match to community (NDF to provide technology/ expertise and to call each selected participant). <i>N.B. List of attendees will <u>not</u> be provided to council as part of neutrality promise. Cynics will suggest these people are handpicked favorites of government: the best counter argument is to encourage an FOI request which returns zero contact with this jury.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Online environment/ forum tested and loaded with submissions. ➤ Council ready to provide final Information Baseline kit (online and hard copy) Week 1 June
Week 1 June	<p>Finalisation of Jury. Provision of welcome kit of materials (via email, and on request by hard copy in post/ pickup).</p>
Online Step 1 Week 2 June <i>15-30 minutes</i>	<p>Immersion, Familiarisation & Norms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Invitation to register for online reading tool – provision of log in details on email and companion reminder SMS. ➤ Pre-load with names and email addresses to smooth entry point. ➤ Simple first exercise “<i>Say hello and tell us a little about yourself</i>” ➤ Starting point survey: measure initial attitudes, preconceptions and beliefs. Transformation/ change in viewpoint is worthy of measurement. ➤ Checkpoint: how many have successfully logged in and posted comment
Online Step 2	<p>Read, Share and Question</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Open up new forum/ discussion topic.

<p><u>Week 3 June</u></p> <p>2-5 hours reading</p> <p>30 min posting time.</p> <p>30 min read posts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Focus question: <i>What two things did you find most surprising or interesting when you read Council’s information kit? What did you learn that you would like to share with the group?</i> ➤ Focus question: <i>Who could we ask for help to better inform us? What is it we need to know, and who do we trust to give us a fair answer?</i>
<p>Day 1</p> <p><u>Saturday July 9th</u></p> <p><i>(Full day required)</i></p> <p><i>Watch for election date. Amend for clash.</i></p>	<p>Opening day: The First Deliberation– The Learning Phase</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Introduction of the topic upon which they will deliberate: understanding remit and authority. Explanation of influence and context: what will be done with the results the Jury produces. ➤ Introduction of the process, and its precedents; understanding the inevitability of bias & importance of constructive, critical thinking/doing. ➤ Agreement on Jury guidelines for participation. ➤ Key content: Panel sessions with up to 8 expert speakers agreed by stakeholders. ➤ “Landscape Session” from council staff– an introduction to the range of council’s services and hard issues. ➤ Key deliverable: Jury to identify <u>speakers and information</u> sought for future assemblies. <p>Welcome from Mayor and a cross section of councillors strongly recommended if possible. (9-10am)</p>
<p>Day 2</p> <p><u>Thursday July 28th</u></p> <p><i>(evening session 5:30-9:00pm – discuss local context)</i></p>	<p>The Second Deliberation – Understanding and Immersion</p> <p>Jury will still be exploring content from background materials and ‘learning what they don’t know’ to generate further requests for information and expertise.</p> <p>Extensive involvement of third party speakers requested by the jury.</p> <p>Ongoing online discourse among the panellists is encouraged during the “away” period.</p> <p>Purpose of meeting is to continue broadening of the topic rather than a rush to solutions.</p>
<p>Day 3</p> <p><u>Thursday August 11th</u></p> <p><i>(evening session 5:30-9:00pm)</i></p>	<p>The Third Deliberation – Focus</p> <p>Early clustering of major ideas and any clear “in/out” decisions commences. No templates or pre-written content is provided – it is important they start from a blank sheet of paper rather than endorsing a Draft document produced by Council.</p> <p>Further speakers requested by jury, and potentially a technical session (i.e. what is <i>legally</i> possible), are likely at this meeting. A panel discussion may be scheduled to maximise knowledge/ perspective sharing opportunity.</p>

	<p>Three key checkpoint questions of value can be put to assess progress:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>How does our understanding of this issue help answer the question?</i> 2. <i>Why is it critical to the success of setting our priorities?</i> 3. <i>What else do we need to understand about this issue to best advise the council and the wider community?</i>
Monday following	<p><i>Convenors' Review: do the participants need more time or assistance to come to a full understanding of their choices? Potential to extend meeting schedule at this point while still meeting final date requirement.</i></p>
<p>Day 4</p> <p><u>Thursday August 25th</u></p> <p><i>(evening session 5:30-9:00pm – discuss local context)</i></p>	<p>The Fourth Deliberation – Reflect. Discuss. Deliberate.</p> <p>The goal is to provide a face-to-face forum for the jurors to reconvene to discuss their views in small groups. The facilitator should encourage groups to move toward commencing the prioritisation task and end the day with a “long list” of priorities. The draft report has form but will still have rough edges.</p> <p>An Executive Summary of 5-7 top priorities needs to be agreed but specific action items within those areas can still be amended.</p> <p>Time for discussion among participants (rather than parades of scheduled speakers) is key to allowing sharing of views and genuine deliberation. A handful of council staff able to answer data questions is often required to be on hand.</p>
<p>Day 5</p> <p><u>Saturday September 10th</u></p>	<p>The Fifth Deliberation – Shared Goals</p> <p>Consensus session which may incorporate new information to reinforce or support the recommendations. A writing and read-through session to finalise the draft report.</p> <p>Stress testing can occur. NDF can play devil’s advocate to note where recommendations are open to subjective interpretation or are in cross-conflict. This does not (must not) redirect the jury’s intent, but is simply an exercise in critical thinking. Expert speakers (including council staff) may be invited by the jury to assist with the stress testing exercise.</p> <p>Recommendation(s) must be Specific, Measurable, Actionable, Realistic and with a Time horizon. NDF and facilitators will enforce this requirement.</p> <p>Report should be effectively final today.</p>
<p>Day 6</p> <p><u>Thursday September 22nd</u></p> <p><i>Evening session</i></p>	<p>The Final Deliberation</p> <p>Can we live with it? <i>Will we stand shoulder to shoulder in the media to explain our decision?</i></p> <p>Juries frequently reflect on what they should have done. The facilitator will push them to complete in five days: this day is held knowing that they will have felt rushed to hit that deadline and will want a chance to revisit what they have written.</p>

	The extra time to settle creates greater confidence in their own recommendations and there remains scope for refinement to ensure that their Clarity of Intent has been captured in the final document.
<i>Wednesday Sept 28th or Oct 5th</i>	Councillor Workshop Briefing
<i>Wednesday October 12th</i>	Council Meeting Report is received and acknowledged.
<i>February 2017</i>	Shared Decisions – Discussion with Mayor Councillors A discussion with the Jury having had a chance to review the report and consider the outlines of a response. Formal written position not essential at this time, but a guideline date to provide this is a reasonable expectation. A chance for a number councillors to speak frankly and also gain a deeper understanding (and perhaps seek clarification) on the rationale behind decisions.
	Process debrief and agreement on Action Items.