

## Recap Meet-Up #3 – 2 May 2018



### Meet Up Agenda

1. Welcome and purpose
2. Facilitated discussion
  - a. Individual perspectives on the citizen Jury
  - b. What was learnt through the process
  - c. Where could this go next as a deliberative practice
3. Next meeting topic and call for facilitators

This was the third meeting of Deliberate ACT. Our focus was exploring the experience the recent Citizen Jury on Compulsory Third Party Insurance undertaken by the ACT Government.

The meeting was facilitated by Mark Spain and structured as a deliberative dialogue session that encouraged listening and reflection in a circle structure.

People who chose to contribute an experience or observation would do so when they held the 'talking rock'. Significant comments or reflections were noted by the sound of symbols. There were three rounds of the circle and each time the 'talking rock' returned to the facilitator, a new question would be posed. These rounds included, (1) identify a perspective, (2) sharing learnings, (3) discussing what could be next for deliberative processes. The following is a summary, statements, some of which are verbatim and non-attributable that were made through these three dialogue rounds.

### Perspectives:

28 people formed a circle bringing a range of perspectives to the group including:

- Those directly involved in the citizens jury – facilitator, government supporter, jurors, participants from the Stakeholder Reference Group and people who came along to the sessions as observers of the jury in action
- Other participants in the meet-up included – interested members of the public, other engagement practitioners, academics, other government representatives looking to undertake deliberative practices.

### Learnings

- Trust the process and let it play out - lot of people trying to stir up things; but trust in the process
- Community is an incredible resource and we shouldn't operate within the blackbox, an incredible amount of time that goes into the process, realistic about where and when we can put these in this place
- All the different perspectives create a great policy outcome
- No recipe to this and juries don't work for everything - the team around the process was open to learning and willing to have their objectives challenged - understand the underlying objectives (start less with the tactic and more about the deliberative nature and what the best approach) – you can come under criticism for involving stakeholder deeply in the process but it is nuanced - creativity and ability to design a process that brings integrity
- This was one way to address the sweeping statements, there wasn't a peak body that covered it - it was a mix of provider groups - this was a way to hear from voices that we couldn't normally hear from - we were able to bring people together and help them have a conversation - it is properly a result we wouldn't have got from any other process
- As an observer - a really diverse people turned up on a Saturday and Sunday - impressive when we struggle to engage in other ways - that people will step up even on a dry topic
- Learnt a bit about the politics and the vested interested in play around these engagement processes
- If a decision is difficult of course it is going to have winners and losers and complex. If we are going to engage on these things we can't be naive about them - we need to be ready for them. I observed the respect that people had for each other in the group, and for other people's perspectives juxtaposing that with the media treatment or the other agendas in the community. A small number of people in the broader community didn't really participate or interested - civic pride.



- When you give people information and tools to do the job - they can do it. The critical thinking tools were powerful. Even if that is the only outcome - that we start using critical thinking tools. What kind of role can CAPAD take to assist in these processes - this is the first juicy activity.
- Can you live with it question? At the end. This question recognised that we don't live with a blank slate and that there was an opportunity still for everyone to have their opinion.
- Interested in public interest and the complexity of public interest in these kinds of areas - like all the citizens - that we need to think a lot about how we bring the different perspectives together (like not having current claimants as part of the process). How these processes sit within the messy and unpleasantness within the communities and how they connect with wider community and stakeholder groups. Can be a view that stakeholder always have a vested interest but some of the outcomes can be that stakeholders are shaped by the process itself.
- Skeptical about engagements given previous experience - but what I did learn that ordinary people can have very complex information presented to them and they can make a decision about this - it was robust, transparent what we talked about - people were never afraid to say their piece, we questioned each other deeply and the jury questioned the stakeholder reference group - if we could teach kids in schools the critical thinking skills
- Sense that people had that they were doing something important - maybe these processes that take a bit of time and effort - much less than some of the other options that can create havoc
- Juror - after the first day I didn't want to be seen in the media but I changed my mind - it was really important for the community to see me and show my voice - I brought a perspective that was also able to educate people about practical realities of accidents and how. I had an interaction with the community - which included someone who had an accident and when she learnt about the process she thanked me for participating. It was hard and it was rewarding. Such a diverse group - we all came with limited knowledge - I did media in the end - from that I had people stopping me to thank me for participating and I would say that I would do a jury again.
- I was an observer watching the last day when all the participants were sharing - the process, respected each other and trusted their peers - they were all taking about the outcome being equitable and fair - really heartwarming - I would like to be a part from the start to see how the community moves through a citizens jury.

### What could be next?

In the third round through the circle, a number of suggestions and interesting points were made about what could be next for deliberative practices within the ACT. Key suggestions included:

- Developing an ROI model - quantifying the time investment by citizens in the jury process and comparing this to a policy development process within government
- Creating advocates for these processes and how participants can play an active role in the next processes – supporting, observing or volunteering
- How the community itself could crowdsource a deliberative process on a wicked challenge – taking the policy development completely out of government and government timeframes/drivers