

PARTICIPATORY METHODS TOOLKIT
A practitioner's manual

Citizens Jury

Colophon

Participatory Methods Toolkit. A practitioner's manual
Method: Citizens Jury

This is an extract of the publication 'Participatory Methods Toolkit. A practitioner's manual', a joint publication of the King Baudouin Foundation and the Flemish Institute for Science and Technology Assessment (viWTA).

The full version of the manual includes:

- Introduction about participatory methods
- General guidelines and tips for participatory methods
- Complete description of 13 participatory methods: 21st Century Town Meeting® ; Charrette ; Citizens Jury ; Consensus Conference ; Deliberative Polling® ; Delphi ; Expert Panel ; Focus Group ; Participatory Assessment, Monitoring and Evaluation ; Planning Cell ; Scenario Building Exercise ; Technology Festival ; The World Café
- Brief descriptions of 50 methods and techniques

All publications are available free of charge, online via www.kbs-frb.be or www.viWTA.be.

Editors

Stef Steyaert (viWTA) and Hervé Lisoir (King Baudouin Foundation)

Author

Nikki Slocum (United Nations University – Comparative Regional Integration Studies)

Layout and printing

Belgian Advertising (B.AD)

Legal depot

D/2005/2893/19

ISBN

90-5130-506-0

With the support of the Belgian National Lottery

September 2005

CITIZENS JURY

I. DEFINITION

The Citizens Jury method is a means for obtaining informed citizen input into policy decisions. The jury is composed of 12-24 randomly selected citizens, who are informed by several perspectives, often by experts referred to as 'witnesses'. The jurors then go through a process of deliberation and subgroups are often formed to focus on different aspects of the issue. Finally, the jurors produce a decision or provide recommendations in the form of a citizens' report. The sponsoring body (e.g. government department, local authority) is required to respond to the report either by acting on it or by explaining why it disagrees with it. Usually a 4-5 day process, the Citizens Jury is intended to provide a means for more democratic decision-making.

II. WHEN TO USE

The Citizens' Jury is particularly useful for building a bridge between the jury and the broader public. The process is also an excellent opportunity for participants to explore values, as jurors frequently engage in thoughtful value-based discussions in developing policy recommendations.

The Citizens Jury method has been applied to a wide range of topics, including economic, environmental, social and political issues. It is most applicable when one or more alternatives to a problem need to be selected and the various competing interests arbitrated. It was invented in the U.S.¹, but its widest use has been in the U.K. The method is also being used in Australia and has been tried in India and Brazil.

Sponsors are usually government agencies, but can also be NGOs or anyone interested in providing a context in which competing alternatives can be expressed and arbitrated. However, the sponsor(s) should be seen as unbiased toward a particular outcome. The method is most likely to lead to concrete action when it is directly linked to legislation or other decision-making process.

III. PROCEDURE ²

TIP: The present description of the process is based on the way it has been conducted in the United States. Projects in other countries have often been less elaborate.

A. Overview

Preparation: The preparation of a Citizens Jury is extensive. First, it entails recruiting a project director, staff, an advisory committee and a working group. Second, criteria for selecting the jurors must be developed, a questionnaire created for this purpose and the jurors recruited. Third, the charge of the jury must be established and an agenda developed. Next, criteria for expert witnesses must be engendered and the experts recruited; moderators must also be recruited. Finally, binders of information must be compiled, logistical matters arranged and media contacted.

¹ The U.S. inventor of the process, Ned Crosby, is now attempting to use the process in conjunction with voting (not covered in this fiche).

² The procedure, timing and budget information presented here are a condensed version of the Citizens Jury Handbook, updated and revised edition 2002, by Keiko Veasey, provided by the Jefferson Center (www.jefferson-center.org). Please refer to this source for more detailed information, guidelines and example documents.



The Citizens Jury Event: An introductory day is followed by several hearing days, in which the expert witnesses give presentations and are questioned by the jury and the jury deliberates to come to a consensus on the charge, if possible. Two moderators facilitate the entire process. A draft report of the decisions, reasons and description of the process is produced.

Follow-up: A final news conference is held to announce the result of the jury's deliberations; evaluations are conducted with participants and sponsors and a final report is produced and disseminated.

B. Preparation

1. PERSONNEL AND TASKS

(a) Project Director

A project director needs to be appointed. The project director is responsible for the execution of the Citizens Jury project. (S)he participates in the advisory committee and is the liaison between the project staff, the advisory committee, the sponsor and any other involved entities. It is the director's responsibility to delegate tasks. Depending on the director's skills and the complexity of the issue and project, the role of the director can range from half-time to full-time for 3 – 6 months.

(b) Project Staff

Project staff needs to be hired. The staff is responsible for the execution of the following elements of the Citizens Jury project:

- Advisory committee
- Jury selection, including survey
- Establishing the charge
- Developing the agenda
- Identifying, selecting, recruiting & preparing witnesses
- Logistical issues
- Moderator training
- Managing the hearings
- Wrap-up, follow-up and evaluation
- Media and publicity (coordinate with sponsor).

These steps are not necessarily chronological, many elements require attention simultaneously.

Traditionally the project staff, including the director, is separate from the sponsor (or final policy decision-maker) of the Citizens Jury project. This helps to ensure that no one entity can exert undue influence on the project. The duty of the staff is to protect and preserve the integrity of the process, not to influence the content of the outcomes.



(c) Advisory Committee

Before assembling the advisory committee, the general timeline and scope of the project should be agreed upon by the sponsor and staff (although revisions may occur). Furthermore, funding should also be secured.

Although the make-up and function of the advisory committee will vary between projects, it is composed of approximately 6 – 15 individuals who are knowledgeable about the issues at hand. The committee's role is to ensure that the project staff is aware of the different perspectives and relevant issues so that an appropriate charge, agenda and witness list can be developed.

Two possible types of advisory committees are those that are constituted of 'wise and thoughtful' individuals who understand the issues but are not the stakeholders or advocates in the issue at hand. Alternatively, the stakeholders and advocates can be members of the second type of advisory committee. The 'wise' committee may be less conflict ridden and more manageable, but the project may receive less support from the stakeholders and hence have less impact, if they are not directly involved. In either case, it is important to ensure that all significant perspectives are represented so that the charge, agenda and witness list are not biased.

At the first advisory committee meeting, the Citizens Jury process should be explained and the role of the advisory committee clearly defined. It is essential that members understand that their role is to assist and advise the project staff so as to reflect the relevant issues and varying perspectives in a balanced and objective manner. Advisory committee meetings are facilitated by project staff and should be viewed as an opportunity:

- To gather input and ideas about the charge, agenda and witness list. They may also provide input on the telephone survey, jury demographics, media outreach, etc.
- To build and maintain support for the project from a range of perspectives. Whether or not they agree with the outcomes, all stakeholders should feel that the process is balanced and fair.

(d) Working Group

It can be helpful (albeit not necessary) to appoint a working group, the members of which are more closely associated with the sponsor and may or may not also be members of the advisory committee. The function of the working group is to ensure that the project is being planned in such a way as to fulfil the needs of the sponsor(s). It provides the project staff with a channel to solicit input from and check-in with those closely associated with the sponsor. A working group also allows for candid discussions of input from advisory committee meetings. The working group should consist of fewer than five persons and should include the main contact person from the sponsor to ensure that the sponsor remains 'in the loop' throughout the entire planning process. It will probably meet several times throughout the planning process and can be consulted via email and telephone as questions and problems arise.

(e) Moderators

A Citizens Jury project cannot be successful without qualified and skilled moderators. Because of the strenuousness of the Citizens' Jury process, it is usually advisable to have two moderators.



The role of the moderators.

The purpose of the moderators is to lead the jurors through what is usually a long and complicated agenda in a way that enables them to understand what they are doing and why and to facilitate the discussion sessions so that the jury arrives at conclusions and clear recommendations.

In deliberations and discussions the moderators aim to ensure fairness, to maintain decorum and to see that the designated topic is adhered to within broad limits. The goal of these sessions is to seek consensus and common ground whenever possible. However, consensus is not always possible, so a vote may be necessary. Several different types of voting, including weighted voting and silent ballots, may be employed in situations, as appropriate. The hearings are not conducted using rules of procedure from the legal system. In contrast, considerable latitude is given to the witnesses to make their statements.

At the conclusion of each day, there is a meeting with all project staff. Since the moderators are most closely connected to the jurors and will have the best sense of how the jury is feeling, it is imperative that the moderators participate fully in the staff meetings. It is the moderators' responsibility to represent the jurors' best interests, while other project staff may be responsible for representing the best interests of the sponsor and the process. If agreed to by all concerned, changes to the agenda may be made to accommodate the needs of the jury. For example, additional discussion time can be added in or a witness may be called back in for clarification.

Another key responsibility of the moderators is to ensure that the charge questions are answered. The moderators must direct the discussion and deliberations in such a way as to focus the jurors on the charge in the given timeframe. The jury may choose to go beyond the charge, but the charge questions are the first priority. In addition, the jury may choose not to answer a charge question or to answer it in a different way, but they must provide detailed reasoning for altering the charge.

Due to the nature of the Citizens Jury project, a team of two moderators is necessary. While the 'primary' moderator leads the jurors through discussion, the 'secondary' moderator observes. Each moderator serves in each capacity throughout the hearings. It is important that the secondary moderator listens carefully to the discussion, observes jurors and witnesses, is on alert for negative jury dynamics, assists with group activities and helps with any necessary recording on flipcharts. Having two moderators also helps in the process of summarising results after each session.

Specific Responsibilities of Moderators.

The specific responsibilities of moderating a Citizens Jury include:

Planning

- Participate in the design of the agenda and charge when possible, bringing to the process the perspective of the person who will lead the jurors through it.

Facilitating

- Keep foremost in consideration the Citizens Jury principle that meeting the needs of the jurors is their primary task, so long as this is consistent with fairness to witnesses and sponsors.
- Be able to monitor the jurors' level of satisfaction with what is happening.
- Help the jurors clarify and refine their statements without putting words in their mouths or leading them in one direction or another.
- Ensure that all the jurors are given an opportunity to express their opinions and ask questions, to make sure all their concerns are aired.
- Be responsible for ensuring that the jurors are treated in a respectful manner and that their needs are met during the intense time they spend at the hearings.
- Create a climate within which the jurors feel good about their tasks, melt as a group and operate with mutual respect.
- Suggest some kind of framework for the jurors to finish putting their ideas together in a timely and organised fashion.
- Work with the jurors to pull out their ideas instead of leading the jurors in order to bring them to a good set of recommendations.
- Keep close track of the timing of the hearings so that neither witnesses nor jurors are shorted in the time they deserve, both for discussion and for breaks.
- Ensure that the rules of procedure are explained to the jurors and are followed throughout the proceedings.
- Be aware of the format and goal of each session, so as to direct the flow of conversation appropriately.
- Facilitate the interaction between the jurors and the persons brought in as expert witnesses or advocates. Depending on the format, the persons appearing before the jury may give a formal presentation first or simply be available to answer the jurors' questions. If a formal presentation is given, the moderator will need to listen carefully and be ready to involve the jurors in the discussion.
- Ensure that there is no inappropriate lobbying going on amongst the jurors or between stakeholders and jurors.
- Question the experts directly, if the jurors seem reluctant or unable to do so and a clear majority of the jurors wishes this to be done. The goal is to let the jurors ask the questions, but at the beginning of the process the jurors may be shy about this. Also, if the topic is complicated, they may just not know how to begin. The moderator can help with questions or prompting of the jurors.
- Facilitate the interaction among the jurors themselves in the sessions in which they frame questions, reach conclusions or develop recommendations. This work will usually involve restraining the very vocal jurors and bringing out the ideas of the quiet jurors. Sometimes the goal is a consensus conclusion and at others a vote is taken. In either case, jurors will be asked to explain their conclusions and the moderator needs to help them not only reach their decisions but be able to articulate their reasons to the public.

Meeting with Staff

- Be advocates of the jurors when uncertainties arise within the project staff. Always represent the jurors' best interests.
- Work cooperatively with other project staff, before and throughout the hearings.

Evaluating

- At the conclusion of the process suggest any improvements for future projects.

The Jefferson Center (www.jefferson-center.org) has developed a [Moderator Training Guide for Citizens Jury Projects](#), which can be referred to for more detailed information on moderating Citizens Juries.

It is essential for the project staff to meet with the moderators and discuss the process and the project with them and make sure that they understand the unique elements of moderating a Citizens Jury project. It is also very important for the two moderators to get to know each other and each other's working style prior to the hearings. The moderators should play a role in establishing the charge and developing the agenda.

2. JURY SELECTION

A Citizens Jury is designed to be a microcosm of the population covered by the project (in all important and relevant ways), so jurors need to be chosen in a way that ensures this.

- The first step is to clearly define the relevant population, which is determined by the scope and purpose of the project. The population may be as narrow as a subsection of a community or as wide as an entire transnational community.
- The second step is to decide on which specific demographic variables to base the jury selection. What characteristics of the population need to be reflected accurately in the jury in order to make it a microcosm of the public? Some common demographic variables include age, educational attainment, gender, geographic location within the community and race. Often a sixth variable is added. This can be a demographic characteristic, such as tax paying status for a given year or health insurance status, etc. Alternatively, it can be an attitudinal question, such as one's opinion regarding European monetary union. Other variables can be incorporated as well, but the sponsors, project staff and advisory committee should carefully weigh the usefulness of each variable. The final constitution of the jury will reflect (or nearly reflect) the actual percentage of the population that falls into the sub-categories.

3. JUROR RECRUITMENT

(1) Survey

Use of a random survey to form the jury pool is an essential part of a Citizens Jury. Identifying potential jurors on a random basis establishes credibility for the project. The survey can be conducted by telephone (if legally permitted), in which case telephone numbers can be purchased or a random selection from the public telephone book can be used (such as calling every fourth listing with two even numbers in the last four digits of the phone number or any such random procedure). Alternatively, recruitment can be done in person or by mail.



(2) Survey Questionnaire

Regardless of whether the initial survey is conducted via telephone, mail or in person, a questionnaire will be required to grab the interest of the potential participants, provide a brief description of the project, to establish its credibility (by mentioning key sponsors) and to inform about the kind of time commitment required and any payment being offered. If the respondent says (s)he would be interested in participating, additional questions should be asked to establish his/her demographic details. Then the potential participant should be told that more information will be sent out immediately.

TIP: In order to keep track of the survey calls and potential jurors as well as to generate letters, a computer with a database and print merge capability will be needed. After completed questionnaires have been entered into the database, a letter should be produced for each potential juror from that day. A control number should be assigned to each survey respondent. The number will be used as the identification of the potential juror until the final selection is established. This helps to prevent bias in the selection process.

(3) Sending initial materials to those considering participation

The day after the initial contact a packet of materials should be sent to the respondents who said they would or 'might' be interested in participating. The packet for potential jurors should include:

- a covering letter explaining the project
- a form to fill out and return
- a small stamped envelope for returning the form
- a fact sheet on the project.

When forms are returned, this should be indicated in the database and the corresponding control number should be clearly indicated on the form, which should be saved.

(4) Selection of jurors and alternates

There will be a pool of people in each category who are willing to participate. The staff must then choose the jurors and alternates needed for the right balance in each category and notify them that they have been chosen as jurors or alternates. It is advisable to first call to confirm the selected jurors and then arrange for the alternates (in case a juror does not show up). Alternates should be asked to come the first morning.

TIP: If all the jurors arrive on time, the alternates will be dismissed. If a juror needs to be replaced, the alternate that is demographically the most similar will be seated as a juror. Alternates are typically paid an agreed upon sum if they are dismissed. If they are seated, they receive the same stipend as an original juror. It is advisable to select three alternates for 18 – 24 person projects and two for 12 person projects.

(5) Notification of jurors and alternates

4 – 8 weeks before the jury hearings, a phone call should be made to the selected jurors and alternates, confirming their participation. In addition, a formal letter acknowledging their selection and providing detailed information should be sent. A sample information packet to a selected and confirmed juror includes:

- letter
- juror expectations sheet
- maps, if necessary
- lodging/parking/special needs information
- stamped return envelope, if necessary.

TIP: It is highly advisable to make one or more follow-up calls, including one on the week before the jury event.

A letter of thanks should be sent to those potential jurors who were not selected for the jury. It should include a note about how to find information about the process.

4. ESTABLISHING THE CHARGE

The charge is one of the most important elements of the entire project. The charge will guide the agenda, the witness selection, the deliberations and the form of the recommendations. It must be clearly written and focused but without directing the jurors towards any bias. The charge defines the scope of the project, so it must present a manageable task to the jury.

The project staff can draft a preliminary charge after consultation with the sponsors. This draft can then be revised and refined after further consultation with sponsors, partners, moderators and advisory committee members. It is the responsibility of the project director to ensure that the charge is worded in such a way as to meet the needs of the sponsors, to be unbiased, focused and allow for useful recommendations to be developed in response to the charge.

The charge questions can be separate questions or it can be a series of linked questions that build on one another. Ideally, there should not be more than three charge questions, including sub-questions, but it can be difficult to appease all of the involved parties.

5. DEVELOPING THE AGENDA

Since key components of a Citizens Jury are the education of the jurors and the opportunity for thoughtful deliberation, careful attention needs to be paid to the structure of the agenda for the introductory, hearing and deliberation days. The agenda is based upon some preliminary decisions that are made by the advisory committee and/or working group,



including:

- goals and objectives of the project
- scope of the project
- charge to the jury
- issues to be addressed
- timing of the hearing and number of days scheduled
- form of the final conclusions.

In addition, the following matters should be considered in setting the agenda.

In the education process of the jurors, there must be enough information presented to enable them to have a good grasp of the issue at hand, but not an overdose of information. The information must come from several points of view, balancing the perspectives of all relevant stakeholders. Enough time should be provided for jurors to discuss what they are learning, for them to have their questions answered and for them to deliberate and reach conclusions on the final day.

The hearings are organised to utilise expert witnesses or presenters. One must decide when to make use of 'factual' information and when to utilise advocates to present specific views or arguments. Staff need to consult with advisors to recruit competent 'witnesses' who can answer jurors' questions about the issues.

Staff will have to decide how much information – if any – should be sent out to the jurors in advance and then do so.

TIP: Some jurors say they would prefer to receive all materials in advance for their perusal before arriving at the jury. However, there are risks involved. Jurors who are not good at reading may find the information intimidating and may not show up on the first day. Furthermore, since not everyone will read it, jurors will arrive with different levels of preparation for the project.

The staff and advisors need to design an agenda framework that divides the information sessions into logical steps in acquiring the education needed. The information should flow easily from an orientation to the Citizens Jury process to a general introduction to the material and finally into the details of the issue. Enough time should be allowed along the way for the jurors to understand how their own backgrounds or values may be influencing their interpretations. Allowing time for the jurors to tell their own stories relating to the topic is important for giving them ownership of the subject and process.

6. SELECTING AND RECRUITING EXPERT WITNESSES

Expert witnesses include all persons who aid the jurors in understanding the issues central to the charge to the jury. This goes from the neutral resource persons, who introduce the vocabulary and history of the topic, to the experts, who either discuss all the options or advocate one point of view.

(a) Definition of the role of expert witness

The role of the expert witnesses is to help jurors understand all aspects of the topics included in the charge to the jury. Because the topics may be ones that the jurors have not thought about before, witnesses need to be able to explain the complexities in a language that average citizens can understand. In most projects, the witnesses will give brief presentations that sketch out their perspective, but at least half of the scheduled time will be devoted to jurors' questions.

(b) Neutral resource persons/presenters

The role of neutral resource persons is to familiarise the jurors with the vocabulary of a complex topic, to explain the history behind a current problem and sometimes to lay out – in a non-partisan or unbiased manner – possible options for solutions to the problem. These persons may only participate at the beginning of a project, to set the stage for advocates who will argue different points of view. Alternatively, they might be hired as experts who will accompany the jurors through the entire project in order to assist them with questions they may have as the other advocate witnesses present their opinions. However, this latter approach risks introducing biases into the project and must be done with great care.

(c) Options for advocate witness selection

The advocate witnesses can be chosen in various ways:

Advocates can be selected to present each competing point of view in an adversarial context. In this case, the advocates choose their own witnesses for the panels that consider different aspects of the problem. In this scenario, a neutral resource person is usually chosen to orient and advise the jurors.

In another method, project staff can choose a balanced group of experts, making sure to find witnesses to represent both (or all) sides of the issue or to choose individuals who can discuss all sides. There are two models within this method:

- Separate experts present specific positions that they favour or
- Panels of experts, both academics and practitioners, discuss all sides of the issues.

(d) Review of witness criteria

In the planning stages, the advisory committee may adopt criteria for selecting the panels of experts. The staff, advisory committee and sponsoring organisation should brainstorm to define the full range of existing points of view on the topic at issue. An attempt should be made to include all points of view within the scope of the jury's charge.

When selecting witnesses, the staff needs to know whether witnesses are supporting a particular position. It may also be necessary to consider criteria such as employment for a particular organisation that stands to gain financially from a



particular solution.

In the case of an advocacy method, it is important to choose advocates of equal status and capability for all sides, so that the jurors are not swayed more by the advocate's talent or personality than by the facts presented. This is generally a challenge, because some people present better than others.

The advisory committee should decide whether to make an explicit attempt to include diversity as a criterion for witness panels. A diverse panel can improve credibility for the jury panel (which is itself diverse), for the public and policy makers who follow the proceedings and for the media who reports the results.

Once key decisions are made about the method of witness presentation and the agenda, the staff needs to create lists of possible witnesses for each witness 'slot', including neutral resource persons, advocates and experts.

TIP: Advice on possible witnesses can be sought from many sources, in addition to the sponsors and advisory committee members, such as: academics from a variety of universities, professionals or policy makers in the field, legislators, private and governmental agencies, think tanks or institutes, business leaders or chambers of commerce, interest groups or lobbyists, reporters, special advocacy organisations.

(e) Recruitment of specific individuals

It is recommended to make initial contact with a possible witness by telephone. However, one can also first send a letter or fax. Provide a concise description of the project and the role of the witnesses. The witness selection criteria should also be mentioned. Determine whether the person is interested and available on the hearing dates. If the person is interested, a covering letter with follow-up materials should be sent immediately.

TIP: Sometimes it is necessary to contact more witnesses than will actually be needed in order to have enough from which to draw a balanced panel and ensure that they can all come on the day chosen.

(f) Materials to send to witnesses

The information packet for the selected witnesses can include some or all of the following:

- a covering letter
- information about the Citizens Jury and the role of the witnesses
- witness guidelines
- details about the current project, including the charge to the jury
- information about the topics the witness is being asked to cover in his/her presentation
- specific date(s) and time(s) for the witness's presentation(s), as well as the time limit
- inquiry about the audio/visual equipment required by the witness

- request for background information and/or a brief position statement
- request for witness to prepare copies of any presentation handouts
- request for a one-page summary of the witness's position or a questionnaire
- information about the specific location of the hearings
- travel vouchers or reservation information
- information on any hotel accommodation that will be provided.

This information can be sent in two stages, if preferred.

Once a final selection has been made, any experts who are not needed or who are not available on the appropriate day should be contacted.

(g) Confirmation

About a week prior to the hearings, the project director should call all witnesses to confirm their participation, remind them about the details, answer any questions, nudge them to return information and forms if they have not done so and to check on audio-visual equipment requirements.

7. LOGISTICAL ISSUES

(a) Site choice

The staff is responsible for finding and reserving a meeting location, handing all the site details during the event and making hotel reservations for all persons who require accommodation.

The meeting room should be large enough to accommodate a U-shaped table set up to seat the jurors comfortably. It should be large enough to allow jurors to split up into four or five groups or – even better – the site should have smaller rooms available for this purpose. The moderator and witnesses will sit or stand at the open end of the U-shape, so allow space for a podium, table and projector. The room must also have sufficient electrical power to accommodate the electronic media.

The following items will (or might) be necessary:

- at least two flip charts on easels
- space to hang the flipchart sheets
- tape or tacks to hang sheets
- projector (for power point presentations)
- a projector screen
- a podium (for individual speakers)
- a table (for panels)



- a microphone
- bathroom facilities
- a photocopier machine
- telephone
- laptop computer
- printer
- video camera
- extra chairs
- pens, pencils, paper.

If an audience is expected, additional chairs should be set up in an unobtrusive location behind the jurors.

(b) Food and Accommodation

Arrangements will need to be made to provide the following:

- meals during the hearing days
- hotel accommodation, as required
- parking
- travel arrangements
- travel reimbursements
- stipends.

(c) Information

Prepare the following materials:

- Juror Binders
Include background information, project overview, description of the Citizens Jury process, list of participants, charge, current agenda, witness list, rules of procedure, blank paper, copies of witness presentations, a set of dividers and space to insert handouts and additional notes, etc.
- Staff Binders
These should include the same information as the jurors' binders, as well as a telephone list for all relevant persons (staff, jurors, witnesses, advisory committee members, caterers, etc.), a detailed list of logistical details, such as break times.
- Public Information Materials
A table should be set in a convenient yet unobtrusive location to set out public information materials. This may include additional press packets and information for the general public. Include: Project overview, description of sponsoring organisation(s), charge, agenda, witness list, juror list, extra copies of witness handouts, sign-up sheet for final report (including name and address).
- Media Briefing Packet
Some possible contents include: agenda, project contact person and phone numbers, philosophy of the Citizens'



Jury, project overview, revised schedule, jury selection explanation, juror list, reporting information, expert witness panel lists, advisory committee list, sponsoring organisation information, list of sponsors, additional information on the issues to be discussed, commentary.

C. The Citizens Jury Event

1. INTRODUCTORY DAY

Various housekeeping details need to be addressed on the first day. The morning of the first day is usually devoted primarily to orientation of the jurors to the process and to each other. It is important to focus on the importance of the jurors and the central players in the project and to build this notion in their minds. Time should be allowed for the following:

- Jurors introduce themselves to each other.
- Staff reviews the background of the Citizens Jury concept.
- Staff explains the details of the current project.
- Distribute guidelines and rules of the procedure.

TIP: After the jurors state their name, where they live and what they do for a living, the moderators can pose a question for each juror to answer. The question should not be too personal or controversial but something that will provide a bit of unique information about each individual. It is also important to encourage the jurors to learn about each other through discussion of their own experiences concerning the issues they will investigate further with the expert witnesses. This helps to get biases on the table as well as to create a group feeling.

If the process will involve many decisions made by voting, jury members should be introduced to the voting process early on so that they are comfortable with it.

2. HEARING DAYS

The next days are dedicated to the education of the jurors through the presentations and questioning of expert witnesses. The amount of time dedicated to this can vary.

In most juries, advocates are used to present opposing cases for particular points of view. The advantage of this is that jurors hear consistent cases, pro and con, from start to finish. The disadvantages are the adversarial nature that this approach builds into the process and the reliance that the jurors must place on the advocate for the choice of witnesses and presentations. If the jury concerns a highly contentious issue, the advocate system may be necessary. If this approach is chosen, the hearings should begin with some factual background information to provide the context of the different views that will be presented.





In cases where the issue is not highly contentious, it may be more productive to let the jurors sort out the issue without being directed by advocates and rather have them assisted by experts carefully chosen by the staff. This system allows the witnesses to express their opinions freely because they are not limited to advocating only one point of view.

It can be useful to utilise panels when a number of different perspectives on the same issue are presented. For example, each perspective can be given a set amount of time for a presentation, followed by clarifying questions. After all perspectives have been presented, construct a panel with each presenter as a member of the panel. The jury can then ask questions to several members of the panel at the same time. The panel structure helps to illustrate the areas of agreement and disagreement between the various perspectives.

Allow plenty of time for the jurors to discuss and deliberate throughout the week. Some of the discussion in the early parts of the hearings will be to assist the jurors in processing the information they hear. At other times, the discussion will take the form of deliberations. If the agenda is divided into stages, the jurors may deliberate and reach certain conclusions after each of these stages.

Staff should be ready to provide material to help the jurors organise the information they hear, such as colour-coded sheets to take notes on different sections of the charge. The staff can develop scoring sheets and voting forms and provide other materials, if requested by the jurors.

During the hearing days, the staff needs to monitor the comfort level of the jurors with the agenda. It may be necessary to adjust it somewhat. Jurors tend to become more talkative as the process progresses, so a question period that is long enough on the first day may be too short on the third day. Ideally, however, the agenda should be defined in advance and remain unchanged.

It can be very useful to hold a staff meeting at the end of every day of the hearings. This can include the project staff, moderators and sometimes representatives of the sponsoring body or partner organisations. These meetings should be run by the project director and can be used to discuss the day, the next day and any issues that may have been raised during the hearings.

3. DELIBERATIONS

The final stage, which may last a day or longer, is for deliberations aimed at reaching conclusions on the charge to the jurors. At this point, a clear charge to the jury will be a great advantage because it frames the deliberation discussions and will lead to clear decisions, either by vote or consensus.

TIP: The moderators should have a clear understanding of the kind of decisions the jurors must reach and a strategy on how they can best get there. Moderators need to take a very active role in moving the discussion along to cover all the necessary points.

Different kinds of deliberation strategies are needed for different juries. If the jury charge is a fairly straightforward vote or decision, the deliberations should probably be done with the whole group. If the goal is more complex, like designing a reform plan, it may be better to divide the job into pieces and have the jurors split into small groups to work on different sections. The groups can then report back to the whole and discuss the results in order to find an agreement. Ideally, the work of the small groups should be typed up and brought back to the whole group so that everyone has the proposed language in front of them as they discuss it. Once the jurors agree on their conclusions, these are typed up and brought back to them again so that they can review their final product and give their endorsement or request changes. This final review is an essential part of the process. The report, entirely written or approved by the jury members, will be issued at a press conference on the final day.

TIP: It is useful to have a staff member and a laptop computer present at deliberations so that the recommendations can be typed, printed and copied and then presented to the group as a whole.

In answering a charge question, it is necessary to provide background information on how the jury arrived at a specific recommendation, especially if the charge question is framed as a 'yes' or 'no' type question. This background information may consist of rankings of the various options, votes on the various proposals presented, pro/con evaluations of the options, etc. This information is often the most useful piece to the sponsors and stakeholders because it provides the justification for the recommendation.

D. Follow-Up

1. FINAL NEWS CONFERENCE

The jurors should be prepared for the final news conference and they should elect two spokespersons (usually one male and one female) to present their work to the media and public. They should be briefed on the questions the reporters may ask, and copies of the initial project report should be provided to the press before the conference.

2. EVALUATIONS

After the jurors have concluded their work (and before the news conference), they should be given an evaluation form and time to complete it. Evaluation forms can also be given to each of the witnesses – as well as to the staff and other project participants. Include at least one standardised question, asking their opinions about the fairness of the process.

3. DE-BRIEFING WITH SPONSORS AND PROJECT STAFF

Another part of evaluating the project involves meeting with the sponsors and staff to share opinions about the success of the project and suggestions for improvement. This should take place soon after the completion of the project. A celebratory atmosphere can facilitate the ease of the conversation.



4. MEDIA

All newspaper articles about the project should be collected and selected ones will form part of the final report. In addition, people can be recruited to record radio and television news broadcasts. If the jury proceedings have been aired on the radio, staff should ask the station to keep track of the comments on listener hotlines.

5. DISSEMINATION OF THE FINAL REPORT

Once the final version of the Citizens' Jury report has been prepared, it should be distributed (with letters of appreciation) to the sponsors, staff and all participants in the Citizens Jury as well as made available to the public.

IV. RESOURCE CONSIDERATIONS (TIME, BUDGET)

A. Timelines

The complexity and contentiousness of the issue will have the greatest impact on the project's timeline. However, a Citizens Jury project should not take more than 4-5 months to plan, once funding is secured. (Shorter times are possible with the simpler processes, such as those sometimes used in the U.K. or Australia.) Two possible ways of structuring the Citizens Jury are presented here. Both timelines begin AFTER a contract or agreement has been signed and funding has been secured.

The first timeline divides the planning into two separate phases, with most of the planning occurring in Phase One and implementation occurring in Phase Two. The primary advantage of this structure is that the sponsor is given an opportunity to evaluate the progress of the project prior to the initiation of the survey (which is a significant cost). The sponsor can suggest changes regarding the charge, agenda, witness list, etc. and allow more time for revision of the plans or (s)he may choose to terminate the project. However, Phase One is very intensive, requiring considerable work from the staff and presenting potential scheduling difficulties for the advisory committee members.

PHASE ONE	
Week 1	Establish working group
Weeks 1-2	Select advisory committee
Weeks 1-8	Consult with working group
Week 4	1st advisory committee meeting: develop preliminary charge, agenda, witness list
Week 6	2nd advisory committee meeting: charge, agenda, witness list development
Weeks 6-9	Design phone survey
Week 7	3rd advisory committee meeting: further develop preliminary charge, agenda, witness list
Week 9	4th advisory committee meeting: finalise preliminary charge, agenda, witness list
Week 9	Sponsor reviews progress

PHASE TWO	
Week 1	Purchase random phone numbers
Weeks 2-3	Conduct phone survey; Mailing to survey respondents
Week 2-4	Set jury targets; Meet with moderators
Week 5	Select jurors
Weeks 1-10	Finalise charge, agenda, witness list; Recruit and prepare witnesses; Finalise logistics;
	Consult with working group
	Additional advisory committee meetings, if necessary
Weeks 7-9	Prepare juror and staff handbooks
Week 9	Confirm all jurors, witnesses and logistics
Week 10	Jury Hearings; Friday: issue initial report
Week 13	Issue final report

The jury is composed of 12 – 24 persons who are either randomly selected or otherwise representative of a given public or set of stakeholders.. The advantage is that the total time is reduced. However, there is less flexibility to address any problems or disagreements that arise, since jurors will already have been contacted with the dates. In addition, staff will have to juggle more tasks simultaneously.

Week 0	Receive project approval
Weeks 1-18	Consult with sponsor on design elements
Week 1	Select advisory committee
Week 2	Design telephone survey
	Develop jury selection targets
	Develop preliminary charge ideas
Week 3	Purchase random telephone numbers
	Select site
Weeks 4-14	Consult with advisory committee
Week 5	Conduct telephone survey
	Mail information packet to survey respondents
Week 6	Develop preliminary charge, agenda, witness list
	Finalise site
Week 7	Charge, agenda development
Week 8	Select jury
	Discuss: charge, agenda development
	Meet with moderators
Weeks 9-11	Discuss: charge, agenda development
Week 12	Finalise charge, agenda, witness list
	Recruit witnesses
Week 13	Confirm and prepare witnesses



Week 14	Confirm jurors
	Confirm logistical details
	Prepare juror & staff handbooks
Week 15	Jury hearings
	Friday: issue initial report
Week 18	Issue final report

B. Budget

The following items listed are the main budgetary items in a Citizens Jury:

- Personnel
 - project staff (possibly including project director, manager, assistant(s), clerical staff)
 - stipends for members of the jury
 - moderators
 - honoraria for expert witnesses
- Travel
 - jury members
 - experts
 - moderators
- Accommodation
 - jury members
 - experts
 - moderators
- Food
 - meals for jurors, experts and project staff during the event
- Recruitment and Promotion
 - recruitment of jurors
 - recruitment of experts
 - Citizens Jury promotion and advertising
- Communications
 - printing of draft and final report and dissemination
- Facilities
 - location for Citizens Jury event
- Materials and Supplies
(See detailed list provided.)

TIP: Staff time is the most significant cost of a Citizens jury project. The amount of staff time needed depends on many factors, including experience, competence, contentiousness of the issue, length of the project, etc.



V. ADDITIONAL BEST PRACTICES AND POTENTIAL PITFALLS

In order to guarantee that the jury is representative of the population in question, a reliable and open procedure should be established for obtaining consensus on the demographic or attitudinal characteristics to be taken into account when setting up the jury (at the beginning of the process), as well as for ratifying the recommendations of the jury with those they are supposed to represent (at the end of the process).

Requiring policy makers to be active participants in the Citizens Jury process, to ask and be asked questions and to put forward their points of view, would make the method more powerful. It would enable citizens to dialogue directly with those who govern them, involving them more directly in the policy arena.

References and Resources

- Armour, A. (1995). The Citizens' Jury Model of Public Participation: A Critical Evaluation. In O. Renn, T. Webler and P. Wiedemann (Eds), *Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation*, pp. 175-187. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Crosby, N. (1995). Citizens Juries: One Solution for Difficult Environmental Questions. In O. Renn, T. Webler and P. Wiedemann (Eds), *Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation*, pp. 157-174. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Crosby, N. [2003]. *Healthy Democracy: empowering a clear and informed voice of the people*. Edina, Minnesota: Beavers Pond Press. (May be ordered through www.BookHouseFulfillment.com)
- Glenn, J. (Ed.) *Futures Research Methodology*. Version 1.0. AC/UNU The Millennium Project.
- ICIS Building Blocks for Participation in Integrated Assessment: A review of participatory methods.
- Veasey, K. (2002). *Citizens Jury Handbook*, updated and revised version. Provided by the Jefferson Center.

