Workshop OIDP 2018

Workshop title	Combining digital and face-to-face tools for an inclusive citizen participation ecosystem at city level: what do we want to achieve and how do we do it?
Organizer	Décider ensemble
Moderators	Tatiana de Feraudy, Décider ensemble Virgile Devile & Lucas Hamani, Open Source Politics Rosa Borge Bravo, Universitat Oberta de Catalunya
Participants	About 40 participants.
Summary and methodology	Many municipalities have launched digital participation platforms to allow citizens to contribute to local policies and public services. Some tools focus on citizen reporting and mapping, others propose spaces for expression and debate, others still offer combined means of participation, in the case of participatory budgeting for instance. These platforms serve different objectives, from the collection of urban data to the inclusion of marginalized publics. As municipalities start to assess the results of these experiments, we would like to focus on the criteria used to evaluate their success to rethink how these platforms are designed in combination to face-to-face tools. The workshop started with two short presentations. Virgile Devile presented what can be and what is evaluated when the Decidim platform is used. Rosa Borge Bravo then presented a first framework of indicators to evaluate participatory processes at local level. Participants were then invited to identify the indicators used to measure success and evaluate participation processes involving digital tools. They then worked in groups of 10 to link these indicators to specific objectives for participation processes, and presented their results to the participants of the workshop.
Conclusions	A list of indicators and categories was produced. These allowed to identify objectives associated with digital tools, and how they should be combined to face-to-face mechanisms to deliver on these objectives. In addition, questions regarding the evaluation process itself were raised.
Other/comments	Detailed workshop results below.

Combining digital and face-to-face tools for an inclusive citizen participation ecosystem at city level: what do we want to achieve and how do we do it?

Workshop 121-E organized by Décider ensemble at the 2018 OIDP conference in Barcelona.

Moderated by: Tatiana de Feraudy, Décider ensemble; Virgile Devile & Lucas Hamani, Open Source Politics; and Rosa Borge Bravo, Universitat Oberta de Catalunya.

Workshop results :

Regarding indicators used to evaluate success, participants identified three main areas of evaluation. The first was the diversity of individuals taking part in the participation process (e.g. in terms of geographical areas or social and professional characteristics). The second was the plurality represented in the participation process (e.g. the plurality of opinions represented, the degree of conflictuality and the depth of discussion). The third was the quality of engagement, ranging from an evaluation of the participation "experience" for individuals to the actual impact of the process on public action. Some indicators pertained to different categories. For instance the diversity of policy areas covered by the participatory process related both to the diversity and the plurality aspects.

Participants also discuss the specific indicators used to evaluate digital engagement. Many metrics exists through automatic collection (number of visitors and of registrations, number and types of contributions, churn rate, return-rate…). These should however be combined with more qualitative indicators. For instance, sentiment analysis software can provide some information on the plurality of points of view represented and on the structure of discussion, while an analysis of interactions can inform an evaluation of the deliberative quality of the process. Participants also stressed that when designing the process, a combination of digital and face-to-face actions should be planned to improve the inclusiveness of the process (e.g. design for inclusion and for deliberation, acquisition strategy targeting specific groups through on-the-ground action).

Finally, many questions emerged regarding the evaluation process itself. Several participants reported that evaluations are most often not planned for, many instruments are not even assigned specific objectives before-hand. Participants stressed the importance of external evaluation (by participants, independent experts, or researchers) and of adapting indicators to the ambitions and objectives of the process. Many of the questions related to digital tools and new means to provide and manage a large amount of information, and how to evaluate their contribution to an increased transparency in participation processes.

Evaluating success: indicators	Objectives	Combining face-to-face and in-person	Additional questions on how to evaluate
Diversity - Of individuals (geography; income; education; gender; age; languages spoken) - Of participation profiles: first-comers, regular participants - Of stakeholders/ ideas/ opinions/interests represented (degree of "conflict"): are opposing opinions present or is it very consensual. - Of topics/ policy areas/ proposals (*see also plurality)* - Diverse from in-person mechanisms' results (for all indicators: individuals, profiles, stakeholders and ideas represented…) How the platform supports diversity: - Number of languages available for contribution; - Accessibility and inclusiveness of platform design and content: i.e. are images inclusive (representing different populations), is the platform accessible (e.g. can you contribute without writing…) Plurality - Different ideological positions reflected in content (i.e. sentiment analysis) - Types of issues raised (and by whom- which user groups) - Types of issues/ policy areas concerned: project topics (education, green spaces…), number of occurrences of the same proposal (diversity or not), same proposal in different processes/ different people proposing it. - Depth and structure of discussion - Values represented – measuring empathy?	- Reach more people, get a more diverse group of participants - Get them to work together - Bring people to exchange in real life - Achieve more efficiency for local governments - Different objectives for the government, participants, others - Guarantee adequate information before, during, after the process - Target specific groups - Transparency - Information - Overcome geographical barriers - Enrich means of participation (diversify, make it more regular) - Increase the transparency of information on the process	- Acquisition: effort to reach out to different groups in person - Provide the possibility to choose between online and offline - Mobilize resources in the local government (throughout the process) - Online: provide different ways to participate - Online: design for consensus - Online: use the automatic indicators provided by the website. - Offline: analysis with more qualitative approach can't be done automatically - Online: input= feedback (amount) – link to offline sphere in the feedback phase.	Who evaluates? Independent party and/or by participants? Role of researchers? How do you measure values ? Define indicators according to process (e.g. how representative it is, different in participatory budgeting with binding decision that can concern the entire population, or in a voluntary consultation, a citizen jury…) Measure/evaluate information provided: - map information flows during the process - allow different actors to provide information - assess quality of information provided to participants.

Quality of engagement			
- Impact on policy (binding or not)/ government response - Feelings of trust in the platform, the process - Trust in the government - Do people feel represented? Do people feel their values are represented? - Social capital quality (community- building), level of interaction, quality and capacity for deliberation, depth of discussion, structure of conversation (see also plurality) - Deliberation quality (results) – link to depth of discussion/ structure of discussion. - Link to in-person mechanisms - Types and levels of engagement (visits, comments, votes, how many and how qualitative…) - How people are interacting with the platform: how many visitors, where do they click, number of registrations, regularity/ return-rate, churn rate (abandon before contributing) - Quality of information provided (open data, how transparent is the manner in which contributions are taken into account, how transparent is the process and public policy itself)			

Many thanks to all the participants for their contributions! To continue the discussion, reach out to us: t.deferaudy@deciderensemble.com