

August 1st 2014

Attn: Arkellah Hall

Re: Citizens Jury Recruitment – Expression of Interest

Good afternoon Arkellah,

Thanks for the opportunity to respond. I have composed the following answers to the nine questions raised as per the EOI document. We would of course be happy to answer any queries you may have based on this summary.

Response to Deliverables -

1. We approach the recruitment task by firstly defining “who is the community” and then identifying and recommending whether stratification should be demographic (using Census data) or discursive (representing voices and positions). While the former is more common, we are careful not to make the assumption.

As a research foundation we have the unique track record of always publishing our recruitment methodology and explaining this to media outlets. While we aim for purely descriptive representation (the jury selected looks like a mix of everyday people) we also underpin this with a statistical backbone ensuring a confidence level match to the community of 95% allowing for a 15% confidence interval (which works because of the consensus nature of outcomes in a jury process).

We will recruit 37 jurors to allow for “on the day” dropouts – and we are successful in getting people there on the day through the use of a high degree of personal contact prior to the first meeting (phone calls, SMS and email). Equally, we would caution that juries are approximate – and 32 participants is equally as valid as 35.

Backups will be filled prior to the first jury session, but not after that point.

2. We can attend one pre-meeting in Adelaide to scope and define the parameters/ criteria for recruiting the jurors
3. newDemocracy will *not* provide a list of potential jurors for DPC team to review: we would advise against any provider doing this as any public perception that DPC holds a veto right over a random process will rapidly erode trust in the process. Other security measures during recruitment can avoid gaming of the system – and disclaimers on the invitation noting ineligibility for those in paid advocacy or political roles is a more appropriate precautionary approach.
4. We would not deem it appropriate to provide a detailed background on jurors to DPC and would demur on this requirement.

5. We can complete recruitment of a diverse group of 35 citizens and have successfully completed this for local, state and federal governments. This will involve assistance with DPC designing invitations which generate the strongest possible response rate, maintaining an independent registration tool (www.newdemocracy.com.au/rsvp), conducting the stratified random selection electronically, email and phone contact with every juror – and notification to those not selected.
6. (Covered previously in point #1)
7. We would welcome and will attend the debriefing process.
8. Our methodology will be provided in advance to DPC for approval. DPC are asked to note our requirement to publish this publicly in due course.
9. A contact list of the successfully recruited jurors will be provided with the jurors consent after the first meeting. All other pre-meeting tasks will be handled directly by newDemocracy.

Three other requirements are noted here for your consideration:

- a. Timeframe: approx. **35 days**, comprised of invitation production, approval, print and post (7 days), mail delivery (allow 2-3 days), no less than 17 days for RSVP window, 1 day draw and quality review, 7 days confirmation and personal contact.
- b. Cost: newDemocracy is not a consultancy and simply seeks a grant to assist with defraying costs. Meetings in Adelaide are done on a cost recovery basis (approx. \$400 airfare Sydney return), while delivery of entire jury recruitment process is a suggested contribution of **\$6000**. Print and postage costs should be handled directly by DPC but can be done on a transparent cost recovery only basis if requested (original print and post invoice supplied), with cost dependent on catchment area (estimate \$7000 based on available information).
- c. Database used: our preference would be for the discretionary powers available to MPs (concerning use of the electoral roll for processes related to their job as a parliamentarian). We understand this is not assured, and would suggest use of Australia Post data at cost of an additional \$2000 for data use. Reach of those under 18 will require the assistance of 4-8 local schools conducting internal draws of their student database (this can also be achieved via email).

I trust this short response is of value and look forward to being of assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Iain Walker

Executive Director