

### Methodology Outline – Cycling in the City Jury

It is proposed that a **Citizens' Jury** (CJ) of approximately 35 participants will be convened for three months for five face-to-face meetings. The participant count is fluid to allow for the statistical profile match to Census to be maintained even if there is a shortfall in a single category. There is negligible statistical impact (in confidence level and confidence interval) on representation within that range.

The participant number is based on relying on a 95% confidence level and a 15% confidence interval. These statistical labels simply mean that, firstly, we can be 95% sure that the 'descriptive match' to the community would be repeated on any random sample. The latter figure is large as we work on consensus, generally unanimous but occasionally with a noted minority report made: with a simple majority an interval of +-2% would change a 51-49 decision. With a consensus process with 95% of people agreeing to recommendations, +-15% still represents a compelling supermajority. (Statistical tools and definitions are available here: <http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm> )

The jury will be complemented by an exponentially scalable online process. This encourages self-selected groups to discuss and share with a view to making a submission to be considered by the jury of their peers. The online platform thus serves a dual role as a gathering place for finished ideas, or as the forum space for disparate groups who may have been missed in a given selection situation still being able to contribute.

Random selection is a 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 age, gender and location. We also stratify by whether a respondent is an owner or a tenant where they live and match this to Census profile: we have found this to be a highly effective surrogate indicator of income and education level. Representation by disability and self-identified ethnic identity is achieved naturally by the randomisation element as these groups tend to participate in the same proportion as any other group.

ABS data (Report 3235.0, August 2012) indicates that the voting age population in South Australia is 9.2% in the 20-24 bracket, 17.3% 25-34, 17.7% 35-44, 18.5% 45-54, 16.3% 55-64 and 21% over 65.

Invitations to participate in the CJ will be extended to a randomly selected sample of 6,000 citizens ideally taken from the electoral roll, however, the commercially available Australia Post address database is a simple fallback. They will be invited to register electronically with nDF to indicate that they are available for the final selection. Based on those available, a further stratified random draw is conducted. The response list is checked against the original invitation list.

Just as in juries per diems and/or reimbursement of transport costs is advised so as to avoid excluding lower income participants who may find this a hardship – provision of transport tickets to each participant is an effective way of delivering this in part.

### Selection of Participants

This section is based on an estimated population for SA of 1.65m (ABS 1345.4 - SA Stats, Jun 2011), a maximum of 1.2m of whom reside in greater Adelaide. As this is explicitly a city/ metropolitan topic

we will limit the invitation sample to a 100km radius of the CBD and not stratify for regional representation.

Invitations should be bipartisan and should come from the Premier on behalf of the Parliament. They will explain the process and ask the citizen to decide to confirm eligibility for selection in the Policy Panel.

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 sample (which incorporates a number of reserves) will be sent a comprehensive schedule and explanatory kit of pre-reading (generally an online private forum with a library of documents and submissions), with a request of the citizen to provide a final acceptance allowing nDF to finalise the panels.

It is strongly recommended a modest per diem payment be announced *after* this final confirmation and provided at the conclusion of the process.

The group is convened solely for this process: any future Jury would recommence a fresh selection process.

### Rationale

Random selection of citizens' juries delivers the *most* representative cross section of the community found in any engagement process, while ensuring that the voice heard is one of considered public judgment rather than simplistic public opinion.

While a degree of self-selection naturally occurs (in agreeing to RSVP in the first place) we invite people to consider what would otherwise occur in the absence of a jury. We contend this would be consultation only with the passionate voices (frequently with polarised views) and very few everyday people not tied to an organisation.

In contrast, random selection actively seeks individual **invited** voices instead of hearing solely from **insisted** voices. Community groups and advocacy groups are a substantially less representative method of hearing from communities as they are totally self-selected.

Randomly selected juries operated by NDF have proven successful at reaching highly diverse groups by occupation, living status (including newly arrived refugees, and those with uncertain housing), income and education. We have found a notably high success rate at seeing participation from people with disabilities declared to us (wheelchair bound, blind, deaf) who have noted the structure of our process with a defined schedule and structure of small group discussion makes participation accessible and attractive to them in contrast to a normal town hall meeting. While we acknowledge the need for those with less visible (eg psychological) disability to participate we have chosen thus far not to seek this information for fear of the collection exercise dissuading participation. There is no reason to think they do not participate at a rate proportional to the population

NDF also seeks to challenge the singular nature of representation and contrast that with a descriptively representative ("I see someone like me") notion. A person with one visible notion of "identity" is also

likely to identify with other traits found in people. For example, I may not see someone there of my ethnic identity – but if I see other ethnic identities and people in similar jobs or living circumstances we would argue that the goal of descriptive representation is substantively met.

NDF notes that the key challenge with deliberative processes remains with the recruitment of two groups. Firstly, people in the 18-24 category respond at lower rates, and – once confirmed as participants – dominate the dropout rate (which is essentially non-existent for other age groups). Secondly, we are mindful that the newly arrived (<2 years) migrants from China specifically respond at disproportionately low rates which we ascribe to a culture of not challenging government. In each case we seek to redress this by using over-sampling in the initial invitation process by adding a complementary random draw from university enrolment records to the Australia Post sample.