

2097: WE MADE OURSELVES OVER  
HULL COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

POTENTIAL WORKSHOP  
TOOLS & PARTICIPANT  
ENGAGEMENT PLAN

BY RICH SHARP WILSON



## OVERVIEW OF WORKSHOP POTENTIAL METHODOLOGY

As discussed at the meeting I suggested that the basic structure of the workshops could follow an adapted Open Spaces Technology/Participatory Appraisal methodology. The reason for this is the flexibility of the approach, as regards the client groups, and the level of participation/engagement that such an approach can elicit from an often hard-to-reach client demographic. In addition such an approach allows for a creative thought flow space, that the client groups should feel ownership of, while being guided through the process by the facilitators.

In addition this open and flexible approach, allows for it to be adapted to fit the client groups, while having a core underlying methodology across all the workshops. This document lays out a brief of the suggested use of Open Spaces Technology methodology, the Participatory Appraisal (PA) tools, and how those tools link to develop the final consultation data set required.

### Open Space Technology Methodology

**What is an ‘Open Spaces’ gathering:** There is no agenda, only a question is to be considered and to start generating ideas. People put forward their ideas/issues. Connected ‘ideas’ are put together, and discussion groups evolve. Whoever is involved in a group is the right person at that time, and however the discussion evolves is the right way for NOW! The creative flow will start when it is meant to, and when it’s over it’s over. Don’t force it!

**How the process starts:** It all begins simply with paper and pens, and ideas. People write their ideas/issues down, one per piece of paper. These are posted on the “wall”, where facilitators group related ideas and concepts, in order to develop initial groups.

**Once the groups are formed:** People naturally gravitated to their own ideas, sharing/expanding/discussing them with others in the group. Under the “Rule of Two Feet” people are free to move to other groups if they feel they are no longer contributing to a group conversation, to spread the seeds of fresh ideas to other groups. Eventually the groups are asked to bring 3 key ideas back to the larger gathering. The 3 ideas from each group are put forward, and in the last stage prioritised by all the participants, in a free vote.

**The Rule of ‘Two Feet’:** “If, during the course of the gathering, any person finds themselves in a situation where they are neither learning nor contributing, they must use their feet and go to some more productive place.” This allows for cross-fertilisation of ideas, between groups, which the facilitators can/should encourage.

## **Participatory Appraisal Tools**

The idea of using PA tools is that one informs the next, in order to develop ideas and create focus.

### **First Stage Process: Idea generation (all ideas are good ideas!)**

Initial idea generating tools (using Post-It Notes and/or pieces of paper) help to get all ideas out, however abstract they may initially seem, as often the more abstract ideas are the ones that develop into the most interesting concepts later in the process. Therefore variations of “spider diagrams” or “graffiti wall” tools are suggested. In particular the graffiti wall tool groups themes, as mentioned in the previous Open Spaces Technology methodology.

For children and young people, either or a combination of these is suggested. For the older client group it is suggested that we start with either a “mapping” tool or a “timeline” tool to help them conceptualise a continuation from the past experiences, to the present and then project into the future.

### **Second Stage Process: Discussion groups (cross pollinating ideas.)**

Once ideas have been generated, the discussion stage develops those ideas, and through the “rule of two feet” hopefully cross pollinates ideas between themes. Spider diagrams can be used to help focus attention. But often giving and encouraging the use of lots of large sheets of paper, pens, Post-Its and sticky dots, is sufficient to create evidence of the process to move forward to the final stage. The key to this stage is the facilitators to encourage participants to use the “rule of two feet” when they feel they can no longer contribute to the group they are in.

### **Third Stage Process: Ranking & Prioritising Ideas.**

The groups are given fair warning that they must rank their most popular, or agreed best ideas, that they wish to bring back to the larger group. This can be done through a simple vote, or through a “Bean Counting” ranked vote, using 3, 2, and 1 sticking dots, as a voting system. All ranked ideas are brought back to the “Graffiti Wall”, and presented to the larger group.

Depending on the final results requirements, the final ranking/voting on ideas can take a simple 3-2-1 sticky dot voting system, or for a more complex understanding, a High, Medium, Low, ranking matrix can be brought into play. Through this, rather than just a ranked list of ideas, the conceptualized understanding of idea implementation difficulties can be defined.

## **Equipment requirements**

A1 flipchart paper  
Post-It Notes (various colours)  
Flipchart pens (various colours)  
Sheets of sticky dots.

Plenty of space to spread out, and blank wall space to create graffiti wall, for all to see.

## **Additional potential tool idea**

If a particular idea/concept appears problematic, and participants want to explore solutions, a “Causal Impact” tool can be used. Which simply looks at the causes of a situation, and helps participants to consider solutions to those causal effects, rather than looking at the problem as a single insurmountable concern.