

Facilitating a Deliberative Session: Transcript

Ms. Dierdre Gilmore: Okay, let's get started. We want to thank you all for joining us, welcome. Today we will be talking about facilitating deliberative sessions. Before we get started, I do want to acknowledge there is a severe weather warning on the east coast. Due to this there may be a chance that we have disruptions on our phone or internet line. We're going to do our best to mitigate this. But if we do lose power – hopefully we will not do that – but if we do we will be emailing you later with the link to where you can access this webinar and the notes.

Great, so first, I'd like to go over the purpose of today's session. As you know, deliberation is a method of public consultation that is designed to obtain informed input on a complicated question. The techniques for facilitating a deliberative session differ in important ways from facilitating a focus group. Our goal today is to share with you some of the practical guidance on facilitating a deliberation, and provide you with facilitation techniques, exercises, and tools that can use in your own work. At the end of this session, you should be able to identify facilitation skills unique to deliberation, develop exercises for guiding group discussion, as well as understand how to use facilitation tools to prepare for your groups. We do have a number of people joining and I think we actually are hearing those beeps. I apologize, I'm not sure I don't know how to turn those off but I think most folks have joined.

I am Dierdre Gilmore, Senior Researcher at the American Institutes for Research. Thank you all for joining. We're very excited to have you participating in this webinar. We have a number of people on the line, coming from various places such as government agencies, universities, foundations, as well as community organizations, among others.

To start us off, I want to introduce our co-presenters. We have Marge Ginsburg, Director of the Center for Healthcare Decisions and Ela Pathak-Sen, Director of Commotion. I also want to recognize Jess Fernandez, who is our research associate at AIR. She has helped us tremendously in our preparing for our webinar, so thank you. Also, we have Joanna Siegel on the line, who is our Project Officer at AHRQ. She has contributed a great deal to this presentation as well. Next Slide please. This webinar is a part of a three-year project. It's called Community Forum. It's funded by AHRQ and led by the American Institutes for Research. It was initiated in August of 2010. It includes two key parts. One is to expand stakeholder engagement in AHRQ's Effective Health Care Program, as well as to advance understanding about the use of public deliberation as a method for public input. Across this project we conducted a large demonstration using deliberative methods to examine public views on the use of evidence in healthcare decisionmaking, a central topic to the Agency's work. The demonstration included 76 public deliberations using four different deliberative methods. These were conducted across the country last year from August to November. And so we're really excited to be sharing some of our learning with you all.

Today's agenda will focus on what is a deliberative process and what is a deliberative question. We're going to be talking about some facilitation techniques and managing the discussion. We'll be talking and actually be having some of you join us in some group exercises. We'll be talking about managing participant behavior, as well as facilitation tools and strategies around training. We also want to leave at least a half hour at the end of the presentation for Q&A. So we are going to try to make this webinar a bit interactive. We'll be using the chat box feature on the right side of the WebEx screen as you can see and we encourage you to send your questions in throughout the session. During the Q&A after the presentation we do hope to address a number of the questions that you raised. We will be opening the line for a couple of our deliberative exercises as well. We will be muting and unmuting the lines for the exercises so you'll hear us working through this in real-time. Most importantly, we would love to have a volunteer for one of our exercises, so if you are interested and are brave enough please write in the chat box letting our host know that you would like to volunteer.

I'm going to now turn it over to Marge who will begin our discussion on the deliberative process.

Ms. Marge Ginsburg: Thanks Dierdre. Before describing the role of the facilitator for public deliberation, it's important to fully grasp what a deliberative process is, and what makes it different from other types of public input. Once it is clear what deliberation is intended to do, then the strategies the facilitator uses makes much more sense. First and foremost deliberation asks people to be problem solvers. And the problem itself is complex and multifaceted, it requires accurate, unbiased facts, it has multiple solutions or approaches, each with trade-offs, requires interactive discussion and debate, and the decisions are grounded in personal and societal values. Deliberation is often confused with focus groups, because they can appear the same, sometimes a group of 10-12 people are sitting around the table with a facilitator. But what they are doing around the table is what distinguishes them. Let me give an example of the same topic that's asked in a focus group, and is asked in a deliberative session. Since we're trying at this from the healthcare or health policy that's the context we will use here.

Next slide. In conducting a focus group the background information might be something like this: Antibiotics are overused in this country, leading to bacteria that cannot be controlled. Research shows that patients often insist on getting a prescription, even if their doctor doesn't think they need one. But it's very difficult saying no to patients who are convinced that they need an antibiotic. How do you feel about this? How can doctors better communicate with patients? Well what researchers will learn from these kind of questions is how the public views their own authority in making these treatment decisions, what the doctor needs to say and do to reassure patients that they're not being short-changed, and the educational approach, or information, that will gain patients' cooperation in not overusing antibiotics. All of this is an opinion giving, and all of it is valuable.

Next slide. However, in conducting a deliberative session the scenario would be different, something like this: Regardless of considerable publicity about the dangers of overuse of

antibiotics, they are still being prescribed excessively, and unnecessarily, and increasingly superbugs are killing patients. Should there be more specific limits on how doctors use antibiotics? Well rather than getting peoples' reactions to messages, as in the focus group, this same scenario is now asking people to solve a problem. Whether and how to restrict the authority of doctors and patients as a means of reducing the incidents of superbugs. Addressing the problem requires trade-offs, and those trade-offs speak to social value judgments, such as, concerns about the loss of patient and doctor authority, how people balance the importance of personal choice, and concerns about societal protection, and if there are acceptable strategies for maintaining clinical antinomy while reducing harm to others. As in this example, deliberate topics take on societal issues, where the benefit to the group may differ from that of benefits to the individual. What is clear now is that the common good may be a threat to individual freedom, or vice versa. These are the types of social values that are being discussed in this particular deliberative project.

Next slide. Our next presenter will be discussing many of the characteristics of participants as they progress through the deliberation and techniques the facilitator can use to help participants address the problem at hand. Before I turn this over to Ela, I want to alert you to the fact that there are features of the deliberative design that will have great influence on what the facilitator does. The first is complexity of the topic. This may determine how much time needs to be devoted to educating participants, use of outside experts, and how many different techniques may need to be used to give participants sufficient exposure to the nuisances of the issue. The more complex the topic, the more the facilitator may need to verify participants' understanding, and be especially alert to statements that might be complex, because some people are confused by the facts. The second is the time allocated for deliberations. Deliberative methods span from a two hour session to a three day session.

Alright. The second item, so I just finished talking about the complexity of the topic, the second is the time allocated for deliberation. Deliberative methods span from a two hour session to a three day session. The facilitator's work may look very different, depending on how much time is available to achieve the goal. And the last is the number of participants, which also will influence which strategies are used to give participants the opportunity for deliberation. Regardless of these attributes of the session, there are certain principles that the facilitator maintains, no matter how large, or how long, the process is. These principles are maintaining strict neutrality, and participants should not know how the facilitator personally feels about the issue being discussed. Maximizing the opportunity for participants to talk; remember the facilitator should not be a dominant voice in the discussion, and encouraging dialogue among participants. The fact is they learn from each other, they don't learn from the facilitator. I'm now going to turn it over to Ela, who will go into detail on participant characteristics and facilitator strategies.

Ms. Ela Pathek-Sen: Great. Thank you very much. Hello everybody, this is Ela. Jess could we have the next slide please? So I'm going to talk about how you facilitate for deliberation. And in

order to help you think about this I'm using the model, which we call the continuum of engagement. It builds on the involvement model participation from Sherry Ornstein. But we've adopted this model, in terms of how we actually use involvement, the involvement model to facilitate for deliberations. So the model is a series of steps, and the lower down on the step the less deliberation you're getting. And as participants move to the top of the staircase there, what we are trying to do as facilitators is to encourage them to be at the top of the staircase so they are deliberating. The beauty of using a steps model is that you can climb up and down, you can jump two steps at a time, or down as your fancy takes you. But what really determines how we engage with this model is what Marge was talking about, and that's the context. So the things that we need to think about are what's the question that we're asking the public to participate in?

Who is participating? So do we have a group that know each other, have participated in something like this before, or have a diverse group of people? How much time have we got? And Marge made the point that sometimes we can be facilitating for deliberation in a two hour session, and as we did with the Community Forum it could be for as long as two and a half days. And lastly, what are we really seeking to do? What are we doing with the outcome? How are we going to use what we get from the public? So the essence is that form follows function, and it's important to think through the who, the what, the when, and the where. That tells us the how we're going to do it. In the next slides I'm going to talk about some pointers, and tips, and what to look for, and to look at key behaviors at each of these stages. But really the concept that I want to leave you with is the lower down the ladder you are, the less deliberation is likely to be happening. The higher up the staircase you are, if you're at the interactive or mobilization end, the more deliberation is happening. And what is the key thing that causes that deliberation to take place? It's this notion of power. And it's the power between the facilitator and the group.

Jessica could you click the next button please? So at the lower end of the scale power rests largely with the facilitator. As we move up the scale power passes from the facilitator to the group itself, to the participants.

Next slide please. So one of the things that I want to talk through with you is key behaviors that teaches these levels. So how do you recognize passive participation, as opposed to functional participation, as opposed to interactive participation? When we're thinking about passive participation we're really thinking about information giving, so that the participants understand the process. Typically this happens at the beginning of a participatory event, the participants don't know each other, they may not be clear on the task that's before them, and so really in order for them to operate effectively they need to know these things. As Marge used an example that's based in healthcare, I want to use a similar example, and I want to use the notion of obesity, one of the big challenges in healthcare at the moment. This was one of the case studies we actually used in the Community Forum. And I really want us to think about this particular problem in relation to the growing rate of obesity, the challenges this causes

individuals, and the healthcare system, and thoughts on tackling the problem. So if we're at the passive participation end then what we really need to do, or what participants really need to know at this end are two things. One is they need to understand what the problem is, as described by the sponsor, or the person asking them the questions. And secondly, they need to know about the facilitation process to tackle this problem. So what are they being asked? How are they going to answer this question? Typically comments and questions at this point from participants are asking what's going to happen with this particular answer, how is going to be used? When we get to the consultation phase of the model typically what's happening is we're asking participants to provide us with views and opinions, and we're telling participants how their views will be heard. So if we use the obesity example again, participants need to express their opinions at this point, not just opinions but their prejudices, their likes, and their dislikes. And they need to do this safely. So that's when I talk about how we encourage safe participation to the use of ground rules. But typical comments at this stage might be I don't think that's the case, so back either to the facilitator, or other participants, beginning to disagree, talking about their prejudices. So in terms of obesity, they may talk about it's their own fault. They might be critical of the kinds of things that the sponsor's getting them to infer. They might be talking about it's not about cost it's about personal choice, it's about freedom, they might be thinking that costs are too high. So here we are getting participants express some of these prejudices, these notions, these opinions, and their likes and dislikes. But again, for them to feel safe, they need to know how this information is going to be used. So again at this point we're being really clear with participants by telling them how this information is going to be used by the sponsoring agency.

When we get up to the next step on the staircase, functioning participants, typically at this point what participants begin to realize is that they don't have a blank sheet of paper, we're not starting from scratch, typically the sponsor or the public body who are engaging with them have already made some big decisions in the area, but really what they're seeking to do is to ask the participants for their views, their values, to have them hone some of their decision making to help the sponsor hone its own decision making in that area. So for example, if we think about the obesity example again, participants might here about the new soda tax, or the program to eradicate food deserts, or whether resources should be spent on surgery, or public health programs in the case of obesity. They're asked about how best to take these ideas forward. They're asked about what values they place on each of these ideas. When we get to the interactive participation stage something shifts at this point, participants begin to see that they have a stake in decision making, and they also begin to see they have a right to a voice in this sort of decision making. They begin to provide multiple perspectives, and they are in learning mode. And when we talk about being in learning mode, they're not just learning from the information that we're giving them, they're not just learning from experts who may be presenting to them, but very importantly they're beginning to learn from each other. So in this stage, using obesity again, participants begin to see how the problem of obesity affects them, and society at large, so they're beginning to take the individual and societal perspective, they're

beginning to challenge each other's views, and can provide reasons for the statements they make.

So it goes back to Marge's notion that deliberation is about solving a problem, it's about reason giving. At this point, they also begin not just to challenge each other, but they begin to challenge the experts' views and opinions, and very often begin to challenge the sponsoring agency too. And after, like at the top of the staircase, we have the self-mobilization stage, and this is where control and power passes from the facilitator to the participants, and they decide what it is that they're going to talk about, and they might even decide the resources that they're going to put into this part of their deliberations. This could mean who they want to hear from, this could also mean the time they want to allocate to this particular task. And it could be that there are things that they begin to talk about but may not even be on the agenda. They begin to talk the language of values, moving from an individual to societal perspective. So an example here could be they could be saying things like actually it's not about one intervention over another, it's not about who deserves a particular package of care, or who doesn't, it's about a problem that needs fixing, and if we don't do this together we're actually stuck. So they begin to see the problem is bigger than just themselves as individuals, their smaller communities, and thinking about society as a whole. I'll say a little bit more about the self-mobilization stage later on.

Could we have the next slide please? OK so we are at the start of, at the bottom of the staircase, people are in facet participation mode, and there are two things that we really need to do at this point. We need to build trust within the group, and we need to give information. I said earlier some things about giving information, at this point I just want to focus on building trusts. So there are two ways we do this. One is we can use ice breaker, energizers, to get people feeling comfortable with each other, and the other thing that we do, is we begin to get the group to set the ground rules. So they begin to set the rules of the deliberative process they're going through, how they're going to engage, how they're going to deliberate, how they're going to share air time, when it comes to speaking. And these are their rules, they're not the sponsors' rules, they're the facilitator's rules, they're owned by the participants. And so Marge will talk a little later on about how these ground rules can be brought into play when participants are causing problems. But before we do that, I want to try an exercise. So here we are we're going to try an ice breaker. We're going to play a game called Simon Says, and so the rules of the game are really simple. As the facilitator I'm going to make some statements, when I preface my statements with Simon Says I would be asking you to carry out an action that Simon's asking you to carry out. If I don't say Simon Says that means that what I'm saying you completely ignore. So we're going to have some fun here, it's going to be a bit chaotic, but I'm going to ask you to take a risk, take a chance with us. Jess could you unmute everybody please? OK here we go.

Ms. Ela Pathek-Sen: OK. Well as I said we were trying to, we were taking a risk. Basically, there were two points to the exercise, and Dierdre's going to talk about this in greater detail later on,

but it's about having fun, and when people are having fun they're relaxed, and when they're relaxed they're more likely to trust each other, they're more likely to share information with each other, and they're more likely to listen and to learn as well. Some of the energizers that we also use could be ice breakers, but some of the others that we could be using, for example in the middle of the day, when things are beginning to get boring, which just after lunch, we call that the graveyard slot, we could get people to do some deep breathing. And doing deep breathing as a group, in order to stimulate the brain cells, so to get oxygen flowing to the brain so that people can start thinking and participating again. But as I said, Dierdre's going to talk more about that later on.

Could we have the next slide please Jess? OK. So what are we actually trying to do at the consultation phase? Very often at this point what the facilitator is trying to do is trying to organize the flow of the discussion. And in order to do that, the facilitator needs to listen actively. So you're not just listening for verbal signs and signals, but for non-verbal signs and signals as well. And it's at this point that participants are beginning to open up to each other, wanting to have their views and their opinions heard. Two ways to do this is to use the concept of stacking, and the concept of sign posting. So stacking really means trying to collect questions that go under one heading together. So very often when you're working with a large group of people you might say to them I'm now going to take questions about whether or not we think a soda tax on sugary drinks is a good idea. Or, you could say actually at this point if you've got questions about how bariatric surgery might be a good idea could you just hold those questions for a moment.

Sign posting, again one of the things that we're trying to do is to build up this notion that we're not just talking about one perspective; we're talking about multiple perspectives. And again, when we do use sign posting we can use things like post-it notes, or flip chart paper, and get people to write up their ideas based on a theme or a topic that they're talking about, and we can begin to cluster them around the room so that people can actually see where their ideas, and how their ideas are being thought through. Another way to use sign posting is to sign post participants to each other, now this is a good way to get a discussion going. So you might say to a group of participants that's an interesting point you've made, Dierdre made a similar point a little while ago, perhaps both of you could have a discussion and come up with your view as a twosome. Again, you're getting people to interact with each other, while others are just interacting with the facilitator.

Next slide please Jess. At this point in participation what we're seeking to do is to broaden participation, so the last one point I left you with was about getting people to talk to each other. Again, here we are trying to get this happening across this group. We used two things, there a show of two examples of how you can do this. One is the EMUC example, and basically EMUC in the manifest stands for Encourage, Moderation, Use the Clock, and to encourage participants to participate, rather than just calling on them. Again, we can use the sign posting example, somebody says something about a topic, do you want to respond to that particular

question. The other way in which we can encourage, and that goes back to our active listening example, is we're looking out for those participants who are finding it difficult to participate, and we use the notion of the facilitator's friend at this point. So very often when you're facilitating you have a co-facilitator, the co-facilitator's job is to look for those non-verbal, to look to see who wants to participate but quite can't get there. And so the facilitator's friend might work with the participants to frame the question, to think through what it is that they're trying to express. And again, the role of the facilitator is to moderate in the same way as you would moderate any large meeting. It's about making sure people have equal air time, that people are challenging each other appropriately, and are being respectful of each other's views and opinions. But of course the constraint in all of this is time, and therefore, using the clock to moderate is a good way of actually drawing the session to a close. So you might say something like we have ten minutes to go does somebody want to summarize the discussion that we've just had? Or you might say we have ten minutes to go what is the key point that you actually want to make? Or what is the key thing we have not talked about but somebody feels we absolutely need to say at this particular point. Another exercise that we use is the hat exercise. And the hat exercise is really about taking people out of their comfort zones. At this point and time people are talking very often from the comfort zone of either being individual, being a mother, being a patient, being a clinician, being a policy maker, and really what we're trying to get them to do is to shift from that perspective and take on a different perspective. And so we metaphorically say OK we understand where you're coming from, now do you want to take that hat off and put on the hat of a policy maker, a government decision maker, a clinician. And basically what we're trying to do is to get people to stand in somebody else's shoes and think about somebody else's perspective.

Next slide please Jess. So here we are at interactive participation. Really at this point we're listening actively again, we're trying to draw folks out; we'll be using the facilitator's friend to help with some of this. But by and large, we're giving permission to disagree. And really in order for us to have deliberations there has to be disagreement. If everybody is just on one side of an argument we really could use the hat exercise, and some other exercises, to begin to start taking different perspectives. So giving permission to disagree at this point is very important, but actively listening, and actively listening now on the part of the facilitator, is not just about listening for non-verbal, but also beginning to listen to where the debate is actually going. So one of the things that we begin to do at this point is we begin to mind map. And we begin to draw folks out so that their views are beginning to take shape.

And we can use mind mapping either on a white board, or on flip chart paper, but it's very important that when we're mind mapping at this point the participants can see what the mind map is beginning to look like. And the reason for this is, their beginning to see how their arguments are taking shape, they're beginning to see what course, and what views, and what values are clustering together, and they're also beginning to see which values or views that they've expressed before, if they haven't had a chance to fully discuss them they're up on the

mind map and they know that they will get to them at some point in that discussion, we will begin to talk about some of those views and values.

Next slide please Jess. So how are we going to manage these divergent perspectives? Yes of course we want people to disagree, but it has to be, it needs managing. And it needs managing not just by the facilitator, but if we're talking about power shifting to the participants, the participants need to be managing this too. So we talked about sequencing earlier, stacking and sequencing, putting things in buckets, or having issues list for people to look at, mind mapping, as I've just talked about it, but also using the mind map to be focused. So the mind map really should be a map of where the discussion's going, how it's going, and it's for the facilitator and the participants to begin to look at the mind map and say does it help on the overarching question? And if it's not doing that there's an opportunity to begin to refocus, and typically we would refocus by actually being very upfront and saying what you said is very interesting, it perhaps expresses part of what the question is asking you but we really need to focus on answering the question so what else are we going to begin to talk about. And it may not be that it's the facilitator who does that, it could actually be participants beginning to recognize that.

Next slide please. And as we get to the top of the staircase, this is where we talked power moving to the participants, and one way we make sure that happens is the facilitator encourages this to happen is to use a technique called open space. And I'm going to say a little bit more about open space in a little while, but open space typically is about getting participants to reflect the issues that are very, very important to them. So in a sense, it is not a session that is controlled by the facilitator. Typically, the facilitator would say we have two hours, or however much time they've got at this particular point, what are the issues that the participants feel that they now need to discuss, and they feel are absolutely important and pertinent to the overarching question? And the rules of the game are that really the open space is a market place of inquiry. Participants begin to express topics, or views, or notions, or issues that they want to talk about. The participant that raises an issue becomes a host for an issue, so they put it down on a piece of flip chart paper and stand around the room, and the room becomes a market place. Because those participants who don't express a view have the opportunity now to move from flip chart to flip chart, from issue to issue, to engage in a debate and a discussion there. The role of the host participant is to make a note of who attends their session, and to make a note of the views that are being expressed.

The other rule that governs this particular technique is the rule of two feet. So participants go to the issues that they feel are important and they want to discuss. If they don't go to a particular issue it doesn't mean that the issue is not important, it means that the issue is not important for the group, it may be an issue for an individual participant. And the other part of the rule is that participants once they've had a discussion in a particular they can choose to spend the entire time in one group, because the notion, or the issue, or the views being expressed are so important to them, or they can choose to go to another group. So participants

can visit as many groups as they like. It's interesting to note that all the facilitator might have to do to remind people of the time, and we notice that people naturally begin to stop participating, and once they stop participating we know that the discussion is over. And then what we would typically do is to get the host participants to feedback weekly all of the things that they've actually heard. But it is at this point that we hear what's important to participants, not what's important to the facilitator.

Next slide please Jess. So here's one of the techniques that I want to talk about, and it's a technique that helps us get to our core values. So I'm using the notion of onions, because really asking why to get to the center, to the core of the onion. And sometimes that can be quite uncomfortable, and so we all know that when we're chopping onions it can be quite tearful, sometimes it can be quite challenging and quite difficult to get to the core. We call this the five wives techniques.

Next slide please Jess. So typically this has been used in the car industry when they've been developing new methodology, because it's about saying recognizing what a problem is but truly understanding what's at the root of the problem. One of the things that happens when we ask why, and it's quite interesting that as children we have no problems asking why, and in fact as children we're encouraged to ask why. Somehow it seems to have shifted from our psyche as we get to adulthood. And sometimes asking why as adults can come across as quite rude. And so there are ways in which we're going to do this. We talked about onion tearing before, but now I want to have the option to try this out. Can we have the next slide please Jess? Jess we said we needed one participant to volunteer at the beginning of the session, I'm going to ask that participant to be a responder, and I, as a facilitator, am going to be the questioner. Do we have a willing volunteer?

Ms. Jessica Fernandez: We do, and I'm going to ask the volunteer, Mark can you please unmute your line now? Great. Mark you're on the line.

Ms. Ela Pathek-Sen: Hi Mark, it's Ela here. Thank you for volunteering.

Mr. Mark Rosenberg: No problem.

Ms. Ela Pathek-Sen: Jess can we have the next slide please? OK Mark you've got four statements here, I want you to choose the statement that's most important to you, or if there's a statement here that you, that you can't sort of quite get your head around, give me a statement of your own?

Mr. Mark Rosenberg: OK. How about our school system has failed young people.

Ms. Ela Pathek-Sen: OK why do you say that Mark?

Mr. Mark Rosenberg: Well as somebody's who has recently graduated from college, I think there are many people who have participated in schooling for quite some time that are unable to be as successful as they'd like.

Ms. Ela Pathek-Sen: And why do you think that you're, that success is linked to the school system?

Mr. Mark Rosenberg: I guess I've always assumed that much of childhood and young adulthood is preparing for future steps, and that future success.

Ms. Ela Pathek-Sen: So what I'm hearing you say is that you're linking, because there's an assumption there which is about childhood events in school, and therefore, school has some role to play in determining a child's future success, --- are you describing a success?

Mr. Mark Rosenberg: I think primarily I was referring to the professional success that I know that I would actually consider professional personal happiness in other areas, it could be success that I don't think many young people are achieving as much as they'd like to.

Ms. Ela Pathek-Sen: So tell me a little bit more about what about the school system has blocked that?

Mr. Mark Rosenberg: Well I think there, this is tough, I think there are quite a few ---. I think that you don't have as many skills that are relevant for the current economy. I also think that school is very focused on making certain achievements and doing well enough on certain things, as opposed to being well rounded and happy as an individual.

Ms. Ela Pathek-Sen: OK so it's interesting that you link that to success, in terms of employment, but you're also talking about personal happiness. So again, when you talk about school, why do you talk about school as just one thing?

Mr. Mark Rosenberg: I think the school system is there to prepare you for X, Y and Z, and if it doesn't prepare you for those things, or fails to prepare you for other things that are important, I think that's a failure of the school system that collectively has aim. So I do think that there are elements within the system that are more or less successful at achieving those aims.

Ms. Ela Pathek-Sen: OK so what I'm hearing you're saying is it's not just one school system, you've got to unpack some of that school system, that concept of what is the school system, in order to understand what exactly in there is causing the problem? Am I right?

Mr. Mark Rosenberg: Yeah, I think that would be very helpful.

Ms. Ela Pathek-Sen: OK thank you Mark for participating.

Mr. Mark Rosenberg: No problem. Thank you.

Ms. Ela Pathek-Sen: OK. So what happened there? Mark chose something that he felt a personal bond and a link with. And what I was trying to do was to try and understand what he meant by failure, and I think what he told us was failure was about the inability to have skills to get you into the employment market. But there was a second notion around failure, and that was around personal happiness. And it seems as though he said that he ranked them equally, and that society ranked them differently. He made the point that he saw both of those as what he called failure. And then when he began to talk about the school system, what we were trying to do was to unpack what exactly about the school system was causing that failure. I'm afraid I don't think I was very successful in doing that, because I was hoping to be able to tease out some of the concepts behind the school system is largely, was he talking about the public school system, was he talking particularly about teaching, was he talking about funding, what exactly was it that was causing the problem. But I hope that gave you an overall flavor, in terms of the way in which you could use the five wives. And the last point that I want to leave you with is yes it's about asking why, it's about drilling down, but sometimes it's also about summarizing, reflecting back to the participant so that you're beginning to unlock the next thing that's in their mind. So it's about using reflection as a way to get them to start thinking. And at that point, I'd like to hand over to my colleague Marge.

Ms. Marge Ginsburg: Thanks Ela. In any group where individuals are dealing with sensitive issues that may challenge their thinking about what the right thing to do is, participants can sometimes respond in ways that are not conducive to deliberation, they dominate the discussion, they get off topic with long stories, they get antagonistic or sarcastic with those they don't agree with. Setting some ground rules at the beginning is helpful, if only because the facilitator can then remind people when needed, without looking as if she's dreaming these things up to fit the circumstances. The most common problem in deliberations that have limited time are those participants who monopolize the conversation, talking too often, too long, or not germane to a topic. There are a number of ways a facilitator can redirect the discussions. For example, saying to someone Mary I know this issue is important to you, since we have limited time today could you tell us how this incident affected the way you see this problem? Or George it's really important that we hear from everyone, so I'm going to ask you to hold that thought and let's hear now from those who haven't had a chance to talk. The third way of dealing with one of the problems is Frank please remember that one of the ground rules we mentioned earlier is respect for other's opinions, let's keep that in mind.

So obviously the key here is addressing the behavior issue without completely shutting them down, and making sure that the facilitator always show respect for the participants as well. Though a goal of deliberative process is for the participants to be discussing and debating with each other, and not with the facilitator, the facilitator should never lose sight of the fact that she has control of the meeting. I'm going to now turn this back over to Dierdre who will talk about the process for training facilitators.

Ms. Dierdre Gilmore: Thanks Marge. On the next few slides I want to talk about some practical tools that you can use to achieve many of the things that Ela and Marge have just talked about. One of these tools is a facilitator's guide, which can range from a brief outline, to a full script. Your approach will depend on the deliberative method, the experience of the facilitator, as well as the goals of the session. We found in Community Forum the structured guide was a really invaluable tool for us, as we had a number of new facilitators to deliberations that were included in this process. So as you can see on the slide, we have example content that we actually use – taken right out of one of our guides. Some of the essential components include an outline of step by step activities, the timing and staff responsibilities. This helps the facilitation team become very clear on the objective of each activity, as well as who will be presenting, and how much time each person has to present their piece. It also allows the facilitator and the co-facilitator to work together, and really think about the flow of the day, and the conversation that's going to be happening. You'll see here as well we have some example script, this is a really important component. The script lays out the purpose and the goals of the session, how to list those out, how to introduce the discussion materials, as well as a list of potential questions to help participants think more deeply about an issue. The script is able to be modified by facilitators, so it comes from his or her own voice, and so the facilitator can feel very comfortable with what they're saying. There were pieces in the script though that should not be altered, or were not altered, and that is things such as describing the purpose of the session, or asking the overall question. And when there were certain things that we didn't want to alter in the group, so remember we had 76 groups so we certainly didn't want to alter some of this information, we actually put it on PowerPoint, or posted it around the room, so that was a really helpful way not to alter important language.

Next slide Jess. This structured approach really helps facilitators prior to the group anticipate how the session would look and feel, as well as what might happen, in terms of how the conversation might go. It is also a great training manual to practice from prior to the group starting. Once you begin to actually utilize the guide, it becomes a much more dynamic and organic tool. You never know which discussion path a group is going to take, you can't really anticipate that. So the facilitator needs to be extremely flexible and change the guide as needed. Let me just give you some examples of some of the changes that we made throughout Community Forum. One is we added in a lot more real world examples to ground an issue. Ela talked about a bit ago about obesity. Obesity was one of the case studies, and we thought how do we really ground this, and because we held the groups in so many different locations, we looked up newspaper articles, looked at Mayor initiatives, anything that showcased obesity in the actual place in which we were doing the deliberation. So we brought a lot more into that, into the actual deliberation. We also extended the time of an activity for when really good discussion was happening. Ela mentioned open space, or open market, and so participants actually will stop discussing when there isn't anything more to talk about. Or they'll continue if it's a really fruitful conversation. So the facilitator needs to be very flexible in those times, allowing for good conversation to occur. We also refined questions to get to the controversy of an issue, and refining questions happen throughout the process. So again, this is all to say that

the facilitation tool, while it is very important that it's structured, especially for new facilitators, it's really important for it to be flexible and organic in its nature.

Next slide. Thanks. So another tool a facilitator should have is an array of ice breakers. And Ela mentioned some of these earlier on. There are three stages of ice breakers that can be utilized in a deliberation, getting to know you, understanding the process and creating a community. Next slide. Thanks. So during stage one, at the beginning of a session, a great way to build a sense of comfort quickly for participants is a getting to know you exercise. A good example of this is handing out half of a four panel comic strip to each person in the room, different comic strips. You're then going to ask people to stand up and find the other half of the comic strip that someone else is holding. Once participants have found their other half, and are paired with a partner, then in turn they can ask each other's names, why they came, and one fun fact. Then each person should introduce that person to the full group. So this activity is allowing for movement at the beginning of the day, it's also pairing people up who may not necessarily talk to one another. And it also builds a sense of comfort in the room. You actually have to go around to at least three to four people until you find that person holding your other half of the comic strip. So you're actually talking to more people than you would if you had just turned and talked to your neighbor. So it's a really nice way to just create that comfort in the room.

Next slide. So during stage two, early on in the session you'll want to familiarize participants with the deliberative process. Most likely some people will be familiar with the process, while others it will be entirely new for them. A nice way to illustrate deliberation, and to make people feel comfortable, having a stance, as well as discussing it, is through an ice breaker. I want to play a clip for you now from one of our groups that shows how this can be accomplished. Jess? Ms. Jessica Fernandez: Great. Thank you Dierdre. I just want to let everybody know that this video will be played through your computer speakers, so I'm going to go ahead and start it, but please make sure that your computer speakers are turned on, or if you're unable to hear it there will be subtitles.

(Pause for clip to play)

Ms. Dierdre Gilmore: Great. Thanks Jess. So as you can see from the clip, this was a disagree/agree exercise, and it was fun and educational, and people were starting to feel comfortable sharing their opinions, and hearing from others in the group. Ela did a nice way of just starting out with the question of is the world flat. And so it can start out fun, and then she got into antibiotic use, so making the questions a bit more difficult, and then really having people share their stance, and have a stance on that issue. And so that was a nice way to do that in an ice breaker that made people feel comfortable.

Our next slide. Now in stage three, around midpoint of your session, a sense of community is beginning to be formed. People are starting to feel comfortable with one another, and are almost ready to tackle the hard questions ahead. A creative activity at this time is to hold the

musical orchestra. So you can ask everyone to group themselves into an orchestra by choosing percussion, string, wind or keyboard instruments, and then using their voices as the instruments to play a tune that's familiar to everyone, such as Old McDonald. This type of exercise helps to break down any remaining barriers. As Ela mentioned before, and has been shown in these three examples, the key to any ice breaker is that it has to be fun. When participants are starting to have fun, their defenses do come down, and that's when deliberation can truly begin.

I just want to make another point, around facilitation tools, for one of our methods was over three days, so, you know, you want to have a number of ice breakers ready at your disposal. Ela mentioned the breathing technique, as well as Simon Says. And so having three to five, possible ice breakers that you can bring out at different times, depending on your participants' energy level, or comfort, or understanding of where you're going in the next phase of the discussion is really helpful. You may not know exactly which one you're going to use at that time, but having them in your back pocket is a really important element.

So I'd like to focus now on an organized approach to practicing your facilitation skills. While we incorporated each of these activities listed here in a two day training, with homework assignments on the front on the back end, you can also think of these stand-alone activities, depending on the experience of the facilitator, as well as the facilitator's comfort with the materials. As a first step, becoming familiar with the material is essential, this would include the facilitation guide, discussion materials, and any background information that participants receive. At this time you can also start mapping out your session and visualizing what it's going to be like. And if you are working in a facilitator team, this is the time that you'll want to start talking with your co-facilitator, and thinking about who will lead which activity.

As a next step, facilitators can hold an informal deliberative group, and this is usually with family and friends. This will allow the facilitator to become much more familiar with a deliberative process, and the materials, as well as identify any of those key facilitation challenges that we all have. So once you've identified your challenges, by bringing it back to a larger facilitation team, or to your colleagues, you can help find solutions, and to role play.

A great way to do this is actually conducting a mock session. So this can be a shortened version of your session that you're actually going to be facilitating, and it allows you to practice those key challenges that you identified earlier. Skilled facilitators should be included in the mock session to observe and provide feedback on presentation skills, strategy for probing, and ways to encourage participant engagement. And one of the last stages, you'll want to start visualizing the space, the room that you'll actually be in. Will participants be sitting at one table, will they be sitting in round, around in a large room, you know, will you have breakouts, will you be sitting with them at a table or will you be walking around? Finding out how you'll use the space for each activity will help promote participant interaction as they begin to process together.

And last but not least, continue practicing and getting feedback throughout the process is an important element. To do this you can ask observers to join you on your first session, you can meet with team members right after your session and talk through potential enhancements, or you can hold standing facilitation calls with other facilitators. These are all effective strategies that we use in preparing for our sessions. Thank you. And this is actually the end of our presentation part of the webinar. So I want to turn it over to Ela now to start our Q&A session.

Ms. Ela Pathek-sen: Great. Thank you very much Dierdre, and Marge. And we're now open for questions. We've got one question here that's come through, and it's about the open space technology. I guess the person's asking about when to use open technology. So which contexts are most appropriate for open space, and which are not? I think the challenge that you faced is that sometimes you felt that the group, instead of answering the specific questions, had sort of probably wondered off onto things that are important to them. As the person who used open space in our Community Forum, but Dierdre was part of that as well. So Dierdre from your perspective when would you not have used open space? Is that something you want to answer?

Ms. Dierdre Gilmore: When would I have not used open space? You know I think the best way to use open space is when participants are feeling extremely comfortable already in having shared their input, and having had time in small groups or in a group of 12, to just discuss among themselves. I think open space happens after that, after people are starting to feel really comfortable. And so I would say it's more closer to the end of a session.

Ms. Ela Pathek-sen: Yeah. The other thing that I would add to that is if the sponsor has a particular solution in mind already, and is hoping to guide a group to provide a particular kind of solution, then open space doesn't really work. I think open space works when whoever is asking the question is truly willing to be surprised by the answer. So I think one of the things about deliberation is that, you know, you can, as Dierdre said, you can prepare it for as much as you want but you also have to be prepared to be surprised by what you actually hear. And I think open space gives you the opportunity to do that. I think it's important also to use it when the participants have answered all the questions of the challenges that the sponsor has put to them. And it's really, I would attempt to use it at the end of the deliberation, giving them the opportunity to synthesize and to pull together all the things that they want to talk about, and what they see as key, as germane and crucial to them. I hope that helps answer your question. Have we any further questions Jess?

Ms. Jessica Fernandez: Yes Ela we have a question to see if it was possible maybe you could talk us through an example of mind mapping?

Ms. Ela Pathek-sen: OK. So I use mind mapping, some of you may be familiar with the concept and notion of mind mapping, and mind mapping is really trying to draw pictorially the responses that people are giving you to a particular question. So let's use the example of obesity, we could be talking about, and I'm drawing now on the experience that we had with

one of our community forums where they were beginning to talk amongst themselves the things that they've heard from the Experts. And they'd heard about bariatric surgery and how bariatric surgery was important, and they'd also heard about how public health interventions were important, and they were beginning to think, you know, if they had to channel their resource into a particular direction would they go for bariatric surgery, or would they rather spend more of their resource on public health interventions. So typically on a mind map what you would begin to do is you would begin to ask a question, and it wouldn't be a very open question. So it would be what do people was important about what you heard, and people would then begin to call out perhaps topics and ideas, and on a white board you would begin to, the only way I can describe it is put up the notion in clouds, those clouds specifically closely together, you put in one corner of the white board, that stand out specifically you use the space on the white board to do that. As people then begin to define some of their thinking further, so they might begin to talk about, as we heard, it's great to talk about public health interventions, it's great to talk about, you know, having parks, and in Chicago I think one of the participants talked about how yes it's great to talk about that but I couldn't possibly send my children to the park because I'm so afraid about being, you know, dealing with gunshots sitting on my front porch what chance have I got to send my child to a green space down the road where it's unsafe. And so you might talk about, on the mind map you might begin to link issues of safety, people might then begin to start talking about well actually is it just about safety, what else stops us from in a sense making healthy choices. So you might begin then to develop thoughts around making healthy choices, what stops you from making healthy choices, and what helps you to make healthy choices. You might then get into the notion of actually personal responsibility, is it about spending money to help people make better choices, or is it about personal responsibility. Should we putting our resource towards helping just a few, as in the case of bariatric surgery, or should we be thinking about the many. Should we be thinking about the harms of bariatric surgery, the after affects? And so actually on a white board what you've begun to do is to draw a picture of what people are thinking. You can use words, you can also use symbols, and the symbols that you use could be things that are important to people, so people talk about parks and open spaces, and you could draw a tree. People are talking about issues related to healthy food and you can draw an apple.

Ms. Jessica Fernandez: Did you find that there was an optimal size for the group that took place in deliberative processes in general, is there some numbers that work better than others?

Ms. Ela Pathek-sen: Does Marge want to talk about that?

Ms. Marge Ginsburg: I think the size depends on a whole lot of different elements. The larger, the groups the more input you can get, the more different opinions you can get, there's some real advantages. But with size also becomes the additional burden of both a budget issue, and an issue of how you're going to be utilizing them in the most effective way possible. You get groups, if you're really intent on, my experience on really intensive group discussion I find that's hard to do with more than about a dozen people. So if you get a really large group then

you're going to want to use a lot of these techniques that Ela talked about, in terms of small group breakouts, and open space, where people can gather together in smaller groups and talk. But trying to get real interaction going among 25 people can be a tremendous challenge, so optimum depends on, you know, what impact you're trying to get. The more people that is part of a process altogether the greater the impact you're going to be making, in terms of the strength of your findings, but the more effort that has to go into recruiting, compensating, and organizing the group. So it has a lot of different factors that have to be taken into account in determining size.

Ms. Ela Pathek-sen: Thanks Marge. Would you say that there was a number below which you wouldn't go?

Ms. Marge Ginsburg: I find groups any smaller than eight are probably not as productive; usually I say a minimum of nine to get a good discussion going.

Ms. Ela Pathek-sen: I tend to use the 8-10 as a minimum and I draw that from group and team building theory, where it talks about for a group to be effective you need about eight people in it because people play different team roles in the group. We have another question here. Somebody's asked the question prior to today I'd not heard of deliberative methods but I feel like motivation interviewing skills may be very relevant when practicing engaging individuals, do you believe motivation interviewing is an important component of this type of work? Who wants to take that?

Ms. Marge Ginsburg: Not me.

Ms. Ela Pathek-sen: So perhaps, can I ask is this motivation interviewing in terms of the kind of interviewing that psychologists like Miller developed, and is it possible for behavioral, I guess you're talking about the behavioral effective therapy kind of interviewing, which is around being non-judgmental, being positive, and to draw out, trying, realizing what their root skills are and how they reach their goals. I think anything that helps participants engage, and if you can draw on motivation interviewing skills that's great because I think it helps you to express some form of empathy, but remember in deliberations were also meant to be neutral. The only thing that I would say about motivation interviewing is sometimes motivation interviewing avoids arguments, and avoids conflict, in deliberation we are actually looking for an element of conflict, because we are looking for differences of opinion, and when we're looking for differences of opinion we can be confronted with conflict, it's about how we manage that conflict that's important. I hope that helps? Any other questions?

Ms. Jessica Fernandez: We have the list still open so please feel free to send in any questions. Ela is there anything that you didn't touch on today that you would want to address now while we wait a minute to see if there's any other questions?

Ms. Ela Pathek-sen: Well I think, I mean maybe all of us who presented could just take a moment to think about other things we really wanted to talk about, that we, you know, that suddenly come to us that we should've said. And perhaps we can all take it turns. Marge was there anything you wanted to say?

Ms. Marge Ginsburg: Yes. And I'm not sure we touched on it much in this, and that's the role of the facilitator as devil's advocate. As we were talking about the optimum number of people, and oftentimes that number is important because if it really is a random group of folks you never quite know whether you're going to get folks there who really come with diverged opinions. And nothing is more wonderful than having people who immediately are arguing with each other. But every now and then you will get a group where they really are all of the same mind, and getting them to stretch their view to other ways of seeing things then really falls to the facilitator. And that's what, that's tricky stuff, but it's also very satisfying and actually a great deal of fun, which is to take a group who have pretty much decided on the best course of action and, you know, basically try to throw a monkey wrench into their thinking by presenting a what if statement, or asking them to look at it from a somewhat different angle. And part of what's tricky about that, as we said earlier, it's really important the facilitator stays neutral. So somehow this will have to be done without it appearing that the facilitator is actually embracing this perspective, which he or she is not, what she's doing is trying to, you know, present a new way of seeing things, and really urging them to consider how they would address that from that new perspective. But in terms of a facilitator skill that one I find really helpful to know about, and to use with comfort.

Ms. Ela Pathek-sen: Thanks Marge. Dierdre is there anything that you had?

Ms. Dierdre Gilmore: I just want to reiterate what Marge is saying is really important, and just mention the need of the facilitator to remaining flexible throughout, because you don't know where the conversation's going to go. You want to go to from A-Z and the actual participants may take it from A-G, you know, to the Z - they might go in different places and then get to where you need, you know, where you would like the conversation to head. And so sometimes you just have to let that conversation take its course, and be flexible with that. I think that was a lesson learned for me during this time.

Ms. Ela Pathek-sen: OK. And I'd perhaps like to finish by saying I think when I'm facilitating for public deliberations I'm always inspired and amazed, because I think when you put a bunch of, what I could call ordinary folk into a room, and the wisdom that they demonstrate and they come up, on many, many occasions, it's part of that element of surprise. I've never ceased to be surprised, and never ceased to be amazed by some of the things that I learn, and that the folks learn. And I think one of the satisfying end stages of deliberation is when folks have finished a deliberative process and then they think gosh we actually did that, we talked about that, it's not something we might talk about or think about in our ordinary lives but we've done it, and we've done it as a group. And we hope, and those that have written about deliberation talk about this

notion that once you've set that fire going people tend to go off and do other things in their communities as well. So I live in hope that that continues to happen. I hope you've enjoyed our webinar today. I hope we've been able to share with you some of our tips, I mean obviously we haven't been able to talk about everything, but I'm going to hand it over to Jess now for the final word.

Ms. Jessica Fernandez: Thanks Ela. And thank you everybody for joining us today. We will be putting this presentation on the ARC website, and for everybody that's joined today we'll be sending you an email and the link when the presentation is posted. So thanks all, and have a great and safe day.

[END]