

PROCESS DESIGN FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT VICTORIA

DEMOCRACY IN GEELONG

OVERVIEW:

HOW DO LOCAL PEOPLE WANT TO GOVERN THEMSELVES BETTER?

Overview

In December 2015, the Minister for Local Government appointed an independent Commission of Inquiry to conduct an inquiry into the adequacy of the governance structures at Greater Geelong City Council (the council) in providing good government to the citizens of Geelong. The Commission reported to the Minister on 31 March 2016. It concluded the council was unable to provide good governance and recommended dismissal of the council along with a number of other recommendations.

In April 2016 the Parliament enacted legislation dismissing the council and providing for the appointment of administrators to act as the council until a new council is elected in October 2017.

While Geelong Council has some specific structural issues that seemingly created considerable disincentives for co-operation and this was then reportedly magnified by some personality clashes, the council's dysfunction would not be unfamiliar to citizens living in other council areas around the country and the world. In recommending a course of action few people can identify a Utopian scenario elsewhere in local government that can simply be dropped in.

The Victorian Government has committed to giving the community a say in shaping a new council for Geelong before that election is held. The Minister for Local Government has commissioned newDemocracy to design an independent process through which the people of Geelong will be able to recommend their own preferred democratic model. The process allows a discussion that is unconstrained by '*how we do things today*'. New ideas in voting, representation and public decision making are being put forward around the world, and the people of Geelong will be free to consider all of these. This process will enable more than a choice of voting/ representation structures, but to consider an overarching question of how best the people of Geelong want to make trusted public decisions. Geelong people have an opportunity to co-design a system of governance to make them the envy of every other community.

This process aims to provide the Minister for Local Government with two things: a practical solution, and an aspirational solution. This will provide the Minister with both an immediately actionable solution which is compliant with Victoria's local government legislative framework, but also a sense of other solutions which *may* provide an option for innovating in '*how we do government*' which is worthy of consideration by the Victorian Parliament.

The task being given to citizens can be summarised as designing a democratic representation model for the council that represents:

1. the community from which it is elected

2. a good governance approach in providing good government to the community

In practical terms this means recommending how the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Councillors are elected; how many councillors should be elected and also specific comment about the municipality's representative structure (i.e. whether unsubdivided or divided into wards and if wards, whether these are multi-member wards or single member wards).

As with all nDF projects, this is an area where any action taken by a state government (regardless of any party affiliations) is likely to draw criticism as people 'see the politics first and the solution second'. Our aim is to deliver a response from the community where people feel ownership of the solution proposed to the Minister. If this decision falls within parameters the government sees as acceptable the effective 'sharing' of the decision should engender greater trust in its implementation.

Background and Context

The removal of any council will be considered by a proportion of the community – obviously including those in office at the time and as such directly affected – as political. In any career, few people ever think they should have been dismissed. nDF take no view on this, except to note the added difficulty it adds in introducing a replacement electoral model.

Involving citizens in selection of a representative model for their council suffers from the 'Walkman Dilemma': when Sony originally asked focus groups if they wanted portable music the response was overwhelmingly negative as people *could only picture the status quo* (large, heavy boomboxes!). However, when allowed to see and experience the alternative their opinions radically changed. This highlights the key design challenge: a simple "pick one of these four options" plebiscite is very limiting, and given the expenditures of local government is akin to buying one's house on the internet without walking through it for an inspection.

Focusing on ensuring genuine local representation and deliberation on this task is the key design challenge. In view of the controversy attached, it also necessitates involving larger numbers of people than would otherwise be required. People from all walks of life with no other stake in the issue other than living and working in Geelong must be involved – not merely those with the most acute interest. We also need to ensure that those who formerly had elected office clearly understand how they can be heard by the wider community.

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 aim to include people from all walks of life, give them an incentive to learn about the array of options - *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. There is no 'perfect' or 'right' solution, merely one that local people see will work for them.

Project Objective

The Minister for Local Government will be provided with:

1. a practical solution agreed on by a cross section of local citizens. We define practical as “complies with Victoria’s local government legislative framework”.
2. an aspirational solution which may be non-compliant but reflects the community’s wishes after exploring a wide range of representation innovations being considered around the world.

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 what they view as fair and workable. 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.

The Minister 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”.

As with all jury-style processes, our implicit related objective is to design a process with sufficient rigour as to withstand (understandable) sceptical scrutiny: one which visibly cannot be disproportionately influenced by a politician, an interest group or financial interest. Equally, those active interests must be engaged sufficiently early and substantively as to see the process as worthy of cooperative investment of their time.

Transparency of method is one part of this: the design itself must be shared prior to the commencement of the entire engagement process – and we conduct explanatory sessions of the methodology to every possible active stakeholder known to Greater Geelong City Council.

Equally, the role of NDF as non-partisan operators with no interest in the outcome 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 project objective aligns to our desire to deliver public decisions earning widespread public trust.

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 public was told that 100 of their fellow citizens had found some common ground around the need to proceed with a given democratic structure, 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 access to information which is *as good as or better than a Ministerial briefing*, who are studying detailed information and hearing from subject-matter experts of their own choosing, 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 (Diversity Theorem).

Equally, we respect the need of 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. It is also recommended they are accorded input into the briefing book.

Core Methodology – Linked, Cascading Engagement Activities

The engagement commences with an early briefing to all known active stakeholders in the local community to explain the entire process from today until the jury report to the Minister. This will commonly involve invitations to ~100 contacts known to government/council complemented by media release messaging.

Broad Tier

- Feedback against a starter kit of predefined **Democratic Options for Geelong**. Document is co-ordinated by Local Government Victoria but with input from a variety of universities suggesting alternate models. The source of each would be clearly highlighted.
- Neighbourhood meetings, BBQs and public speaking events operated to generate generalised feedback on community feeling about possible options. It respects the right of citizens to offer a 'wishlist' point of view but gives them confidence that other citizens just like them will look at it in greater detail.
- Specific community events organised to target CALD, Indigenous, youth and low income groups who are usually under-represented in wider engagement.
- Major media role in helping to disseminate Options ideas.
- **These activities are done as juries often ask for this community data point.**

Stakeholder Tier

- A single "What We Heard" feedback report is produced. Care should be taken to highlight this is simply a starting point.
- Key promise in this phase: if you can make your case to a jury of 100 everyday people from around Greater Geelong then they have a visible commitment from the Minister to get a direct response. You'll get a break from the normal back and forth of dealing with government and instead deal with everyday people hearing what you have to say.
- **Adds both additional baseline information for the random jury AND should engender trust among most cynical audience by being visibly transparent and incredibly hard to manipulate.**

Jury Tier

- A jury will be composed by addressing "who is the community?" - a mix of residential ratepayers, commercial ratepayers, tenants
- Have a detailed exploration of the topic over 3 days.
- Use of poll on entry to measure transformation in views (if any).
- Objective of having 100 people in a single location.
- 3 days: one alone for immersion in the topic with presentations from main model proponents and key stakeholders (stakeholder process for nominations)
- Output: jury will produce a short report with a recommended course of action (practical and aspirational) which goes to the Minister.
- **Result: community ownership of recommendations to Minister, rather than an imposed decision.**

Deliberative processes around the world have been extensively adapted and localised. NDF's have tended toward slightly larger numbers of participants (35-43 rather than 12-24) 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. This is an example of this: the local situation demands customisation to get more local people involved. As a result we are drawing on our experience with larger format juries such as that delivered for VicHealth in 2015 and recommending this less common approach.

Our conscious decision to pursue this format is based on the importance of achieving “*people like me*” descriptive (visual) representativeness while ensuring that sufficient time is spent on the issue.

Overview of Phases and Timing

<p>Phase 1 <i>Until August 2016</i></p>	<p>NDF communicate to community stakeholders who we are and role/ value of jury within this process. This design is made public and provided to media.</p> <p>Procurement and planning in June. Key operational planning completed mid-July. Completion of briefing materials.</p> <p>Goal: Stakeholders understand and value opportunity to present their view to this group, and see wide community involvement.</p>
<p>Phase 2 <i>Sept-Oct</i></p>	<p>Broad scale engagement period.</p> <p>Chance for local citizens to see what other councils do (i.e. through election period) as they weigh options.</p>
<p>Phase 3 <i>November – wk1 Dec</i></p>	<p>3 day jury process (scheduled on Saturdays; essential 2 wk gap between mtg 1 & 2). Five week delivery period achievable.</p>
<p>Phase 4 <i>March 2017</i></p>	<p>Minister’s response to Geelong community</p>

Selection

We will operate a jury of approximately 100 citizens spanning all parts of Greater Geelong, with those people selected at random.

In addition, we recommend integrating the voice of those who have held elected local government positions in Geelong in the last 10 years by offering them the chance to participate in the stakeholder briefing and a ‘set the scene’ discussion. This ensures the knowledge and insight from these active voices are part of the recommendation while ensuring the balance of power is in favour of everyday people.

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.

*****Amendment inserted August 15th following post-announcement community comment and stakeholder meeting feedback:*** Geographic stratification will be used to ensure a mix of people from across the Greater City of Geelong. Operationally we will aggregate the range of ABS State Suburb categories into four clusters: Rural North and Corio, CBD North, CBD South, and Rural South and Bellarine.

As with all NDF projects, the invitation will note that those who hold or have held paid political employment are ineligible for selection.

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 15,000 physical addresses (not billing addresses) drawn from land titles information or Australia Post databases. This ensures that tenants and those not on electoral rolls are reached – in short, the widest possible catchment of “all people”, not just ratepayers. Where concerns exist about under-representation we are able to use complementary databases to flood the initial sample without affecting the second round draw (eg: TAFE databases help to address notoriously poor response rates among 18-24 males).

Recipients of the invitation will be invited to register electronically with nDF to indicate that they are available for the final selection (a phone number is provided for those without online access). 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 oversampling exercise is conducted simply to ensure sufficient diversity exists in the pool from which this second (final) draw is delivered.

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 government (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. LGV and Council (role to be agreed) 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 \$300 per participant in total paid at the conclusion of the process by NDF.

Invitations will clearly note that this is from the Minister 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. NDF 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 government, 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 series of sessions for stakeholders (active local community groups, local MPs, former councillors, business groups) 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.

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 **both** a number of the panel of experts the jurors should be exposed to in the first two sessions and a representative mix of participants. 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 a research report following the process conducted with the City of Sydney and NSW Premiers' Office).

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 Local Government Victoria. This is a plain English exercise in **candidly describing** – and where possible **mapping** – the 'problem' as the State Government sees it and the starting point for action.

This cannot be a brochure. Shallow insubstantive 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.

The Department 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.

Uniquely, this kit should include the opportunity for the presentation of a range of alternative models from a variety of sources (university, political, concerned citizen etc). LGV can also note pro's and cons.

2. After the wider consultation, submissions from active stakeholders and interest groups (as sought through the briefing process) 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?*”. A key output of the first meeting is to bring jury requested viewpoints into the room for the second meeting.

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:

Our council was dismissed. How do we want to be democratically represented by a future council?

Please note:

- ✓ *The question is deliberately non-technical, easily accessible and understandable for any citizen to engage with.*

In terms of authority, it is proposed that:

The Minister is seeking a form of representation which complies with the Victorian local government legislative framework.

The Jury is free to also recommend representation structures not currently compliant with Victoria’s local government legislative framework.

The Minister commits to:

1. ***Table the unedited jury report in Parliament.***
2. ***Submit to Cabinet the outcomes of the jury’s deliberations***
3. ***Consider aspirational recommendations in future reviews of local government legislation***
4. ***Respond to the jury, including providing the government’s response.***

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 on a recommendation 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.

Critically, the entire report will be written by participating jurors. No editing from any other party (government, contractors, facilitators or NDF) will occur.

Facilitators are advised to note the value of the jury 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 and should ideally be recognised by the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2). While they can be procured by government, as the single most critical component of the operation of the process NDF requires a right of veto if we have low confidence of their skills in executing these highly challenging facilitation tasks.

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 (final operational decision) and also manages speaker recruitment. A dedicated project management liaison within LGV is essential.

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 Minister for Local Government visibly endorses the process *at the outset before any results are known*. While our experience is with elected representatives rather than a Board, 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.

An early strong statement to the effect that the government is integrating a deliberated community view at the outset (in stark contrast to the traditional approach of having a draft for comment and then seeing nothing change) should be accompanied by dates for information sessions open to all sizes and types of stakeholders.

Costing Outline

Key costs within the direct NDF scope of responsibilities are provided 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 the Department wherever possible.

The costing outline is predicated on a single jury of 100 people. It excludes the additional broad scale engagements which are suggested as being a cost for the Department.

- a. Printing and postage (15,000 pieces).
- b. Database access costs (may be zero with council GIS assistance)
- c. Participant per diems of \$300 pp.
- d. Facilitator (3 people for each meeting plus planning and preparation days - recommendation that this person also has involvement in broad engagement).
- e. Catering (100 x 3 days)
- f. Licensing of online discussion tools and moderation (assuming access to council tools).
- g. Provision should be made within the budget for a reasonable level of expenses for nDF representatives and expert speakers.
- h. Costs for stakeholder briefings are embedded in items (d) and (g)
- i. Venues (with AV capability) are assumed to be available in government/council buildings or at negligible cost (linked to a minimum catering order in Item e).

Costs associated with recruiting and running a 100 person citizens' jury over three days are estimated to be **\$146,750**. 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 Local Government Victoria contributes to a research fund which will capture what is learned through the innovation process up to the value of **\$20,000**. 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 **\$55,000** 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 **\$75,000**. The total estimated project cost is thus **\$221,750**.

DRAFT TIMELINE FOR 2016 DELIBERATIVE PROCESS:

LOCAL GOVERNMENT VICTORIA
PROJECT: DEMOCRACY IN GEELONG

HOW DO WE WANT TO GOVERN OURSELVES IN GEELONG?

Our council was dismissed. How do we want to be democratically represented by a future council?

The Minister is seeking a form of representation which complies with the Victorian local government legislative framework.

The Jury is free to also recommend representation structures not currently compliant with Victoria's local government legislative framework.

The Minister commits to:

1. **Table** the unedited jury report in Parliament.
2. **Submit to Cabinet** the outcomes of the jury's deliberations
3. **Consider** aspirational recommendations in future reviews of local government legislation
4. **Respond** to the jury, including providing the government's response.

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

July	Selection of online platform services <i>Outreach to Australian and international academics involved in democratic design and reform. Request is for 2 page synopsis of models against an agreed template.</i>
August	Media briefing Stakeholder briefing, and call for submissions. Printed jury invitations designed, approved and posted
September	RSVP's close First round selection to secure jury representatives <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Seeking 100 citizens➤ Email explanation of commitment required: attendance at all elements of process, active (and measured) reading and discussion online. Follow up in-depth phone call to all jurors by NDF.➤ 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 government as part of neutrality promise. Cynics will suggest these people are handpicked favorites of government: the best counter argument is to encourage</i>

	<p><i>an FOI request which returns zero contact with this jury.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Online environment/ forum tested and loaded with submissions. ➤ Information Baseline kit (online and hard copy) distributed
Week 2 October	Finalisation of Jury. Provision of welcome kit of materials (distribution by hard copy in post).
<p>Online Step 1</p> <p>Week 3 October</p> <p><i>15-30 minutes</i></p>	<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 (<i>must contact others</i>)
<p>Online Step 2</p> <p>Week 4 October</p> <p><i>2-4 hours reading</i></p> <p><i>30 min posting time.</i></p> <p><i>30 min read posts.</i></p>	<p>Read, Share and Question</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Open up new forum/ discussion topic. ➤ Focus question: <i>What two things did you find most surprising or interesting when you read the 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>Saturday October 29th (TBC)</p> <p><i>(Full day required)</i></p>	<p>Opening day: The First Deliberation– The Learning Phase ~ Immersion</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. ➤ Key content: Panel sessions with up to 8 expert speakers agreed by stakeholders and the Steering Group. ➤ Key deliverable: Jury to identify speakers sought for future assemblies. <p>Welcome from Minister <i>strongly</i> recommended if possible. (9-10am)</p>
<p>Day 2</p> <p>Saturday November 12th (TBC)</p>	<p>The Second 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</p>

<i>(Full day required)</i>	<p>produced by Government.</p> <p>Shortlisting of major ideas/ theming will be advanced.</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>Do we have enough of an understanding to make a recommendation to our community?</i>
<p>Day 3</p> <p>Saturday November 26th (TBC)</p>	<p>The Third Deliberation – Shared Decision</p> <p>Consensus session which may incorporate clarifying new information to reinforce or support the recommendations. Time must be allowed for a read-through session to finalise the recommendation(s) to the Minister.</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 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 will be effectively final today. (Juries may occasionally ask for a few days to ‘sleep on it’ which may stretch finalisation date by up to one week.)</p> <p><u>Key test:</u> Can we live with it? <i>Will we stand shoulder to shoulder in the media to explain our decision?</i></p>
<p>March 2017</p>	<p>Minister’s response to the jury</p> <p>The Minister will respond to the jury, including providing the Government’s response to the jury.</p>
	<p>Process debrief and agreement on Action Items.</p>