

van Mierlo, B., Regeer, B., Beekman, V., Bunders, J., Buning, T. D. C., Elzen, B., ... Leeuwis, C. (2010). Reflexive Monitoring in Action.

18.16. Facilitation skills for co-production

Project Name: CONNECTING Nature (Grant Agreement no. 730222)

Author/s and affiliations: Katharina Hölscher¹

¹ Dutch Research Institute for Transitions (DRIFT), Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, the Netherlands

Facilitation skills for co-production	Participatory Planning and Governance
<p>Description and justification</p>	<p>Workshops and interactive meetings with multiple actors are at the core of co-production processes. A workshop can be generally viewed as a structured meeting that is led by a facilitator and that emphasises participatory involvement (Weyers and Rankin 2007). One of the salient characteristics of such events is that the facilitator plays a pivotal role in their ultimate success or failure. Thus, facilitation skills are a key precondition for co-production (Reed and Abernethy 2018; Djenontin and Meadow 2018; Chatterton et al. 2018).</p> <p>Facilitation is about making meetings participative and more effective: “Facilitation is the art of leading people through processes towards agreed-upon objectives in a manner that encourages participation, ownership and creativity by all those involved” (Cserti 2019). Bens (2009) defines a facilitator as someone “who contributes structure and process to interactions so groups are able to function effectively and make high-quality decisions. A helper and enabler whose goal is to support others as they achieve exceptional performance.”</p> <p>A facilitator has a wide range of tasks to perform in co-production processes. Cserti (2019) summarise three key roles of facilitators: A ‘catalyst’ that makes possible the transformation of input (ideas, opinions) to desired outcome without being an active part of the conversation itself. A ‘conductor’ of an orchestra who synchronises all participants, optimally guiding the use of their instruments toward the desired result – a harmonic musical expression of the musicians’ complex interactions, creativity, and expertise. A ‘coach’ who helps the group form a constructive way of working together, identify its needs and wishes, and reach the outcome they would jointly like to achieve.</p>

In line with these roles, facilitation skills are complex (ibid.; Bens 2009). They involve skills for designing, planning and preparing a workshop or meeting (e.g. asking the right questions, process design, agenda planning, communication with stakeholders), running the process and facilitating a workshop or meeting (e.g. creating an inclusive environment, communicating clear guidelines and instructions, empathy, active listening, consensus-building, managing time, flexibility), and recording results (e.g. recording and keeping visible agreements made, points of consensus, decisions and action item).

For co-production processes, facilitation skills need to be ensured by those initiating and guiding the process; they can emerge from the initiating team (e.g. city government) or participants composition, they can be mobilised elsewhere (e.g. by hiring a professional facilitator), and fostered by institutional support (e.g. professional development training) (Hölscher et al. 2018; Djenontin and Meadow 2018). 'Skill' in this context can be defined as "personal qualities" (Green 2013 p. 5). Skills are acquired through both experience and training and represent the power of an individual to make that knowledge investment productive in the job or in real life (OECD 2017).

Bens (2009) developed a Facilitator Self-Assessment checklist that can be applied for different levels of skills and allows people identify both current competences and skills they need to acquire most. Level I consists of core skills required to lead routine discussions and manage meetings effectively. Level II consists of the ability to design complex decision processes and manage difficult situation. Level III involves designing and leading activities that are part of a planned change efforts. The questions for each level cover different levels of facilitation skills related to the ability to manage a group discussion, effective meeting design, fostering participation and making clear and accurate summaries and notes.

Weyers and Rankin (2007) developed a Facilitation Assessment Scale (FAS) to measure and analyse the impact of the facilitator and facilitation process on the outcomes of workshops. The assessment questionnaire consists of four compulsory categories of effective workshop facilitation: Firstly, the facilitator's aptitude focuses on the extent to which they can be viewed as both content experts and as skilled interpreters and promoters of the data and ideas. Secondly, his/her presentation skills refer to the presentation of data and the facilitator's ability to involve participants. Thirdly, the learning process assesses the quality of the communication and appropriateness of the material and data that was communicated. Fourthly, the workshop context focuses on the contextual elements that might have a positive or

	negative impact on goal attainment, including quality of the venue, the learning material and educational aids and tools.
Definition	<p>Facilitation skills for co-production refer to the availability of personal qualities of an individual to lead groups through key meetings and gatherings towards intended outcomes.</p> <p>The Indicator will be equal to the sum of the average number of each question (sum of responses per question divided by respondents), divided by number of questions. The facilitator skills can be evaluated using a five-point Likert scale (Weyers and Rankin 2007):</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Poor — 1 — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5 — Very good / excellent</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Poor (1 – 1.79) 2. Fair (1.8 – 2.59) 3. Average (2.6 – 3.39) 4. Good (3.4 – 4.19) 5. Very good / excellent (4.2 – 5)
Strengths and weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Provides detailed overview of available facilitation skills and whether additional skills need to be sourced + Can give explanation into impact of co-production processes + Easy to implement ex ante and ex post (e.g. selection of questions integrated in questionnaire after a workshop) - Risk of stakeholder fatigue when there are multiple questionnaires after a workshop
Measurement procedure and tool	<p><i>Quantitative P:</i> Scale inventory/Questionnaire (survey procedure, paper-and-pencil administration, computer-based administration)</p> <p>T: 8 items at measuring respondents' perception of their/the facilitator's facilitation skills for co-production.</p> <p><i>Qualitative P:</i></p> <p>T: participatory data collection methods, such as focus groups, semi-structured interviews, case study analysis, participant and non-participant observation</p> <p>T: When looking for a candidate who could facilitate a co-production process, s/he could use the questionnaire as a self-assessment. In addition, the employees could look at their past experiences, who they have worked with and for specific facilitation training.</p>
Scale of measurement	<p>Items aimed at assessing facilitator's skills (Weyers and Rankin 2007; Bens 2009):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The facilitator is knowledgeable about the subjects/issues to be/that were covered <i>Strongly disagree – Disagree - Not sure – Agree - Strongly agree</i> 2. The facilitator can/could link the material to the participants' level of knowledge <i>Strongly disagree – Disagree - Not sure – Agree - Strongly agree</i> 3. The facilitator is/was skilled at active listening, paraphrasing, questioning and summarising key points.

	<p><i>Strongly disagree – Disagree - Not sure – Agree - Strongly agree</i></p> <p>4. The facilitator is/was able to manage time and maintain a good pace. <i>Strongly disagree – Disagree - Not sure – Agree - Strongly agree</i></p> <p>5. The facilitator knows/knew techniques for encouraging active participation and generating ideas. <i>Strongly disagree – Disagree - Not sure – Agree - Strongly agree</i></p> <p>6. The facilitator encourages/encouraged participant involvement. <i>Strongly disagree – Disagree - Not sure – Agree - Strongly agree</i></p> <p>7. The facilitator is/was able to organise workshops <i>Strongly disagree – Disagree - Not sure – Agree - Strongly agree</i></p> <p>8. The facilitator is/was able to help a group achieve consensus and gain closure even in polarized situations. <i>Strongly disagree – Disagree - Not sure – Agree - Strongly agree</i></p>
Data source	
Required data	<p>Essential: Questionnaire of facilitation (self-)assessment</p> <p>Desirable: Qualitative data on how the facilitation was perceived, what could be done better and how it affected the co-production process/outcomes</p>
Data input type	Quantitative (quantitative and qualitative, if participatory data collection methods, and/or participatory action research are opted for)
Data collection frequency	<p>Aligned with NBS implementation, especially the implementation of workshops.</p> <p>Assessment can be done before or after workshops. Before: (self-)assessment of facilitator and/or initiating/organising team. After: Let each participant complete the facilitation assessment questionnaire at the end of a workshop.</p>
Level of expertise required	<p>Quantitative data collection requires no expertise</p> <p>Qualitative data collection (case study and participatory methodology, for example) requires medium level expertise in social science research</p>
Synergies with other indicators	
Connection with SDGs	<p>Goal 9. Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation</p> <p>Goal 10. Reduce inequality within and among countries</p> <p>Goal 11. Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable</p> <p>Goal 16. Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels</p>

Opportunities for participatory data collection	Participatory methods (e.g., focus groups, participatory data collection methods, and/or participatory action research) may be applied to collect community-relevant information on facilitator’s skills and how it affected their perception of the co-production process.
Additional information	
References	<p>Bens, I. (2009) <i>Advanced Facilitation Strategies. Tools & Techniques to master difficult situations.</i> Wiley Imprint: San Francisco.</p> <p>Chatterton, P., Owen, A., Cutter, J., Dymski, G., Unsworth, R. (2018) Recasting urban governance through Leeds city lab: developing alternatives to neoliberal urban austerity in co-production laboratories. <i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>: 226-243. DOI:10.1111/1468-2427.12607</p> <p>Cserti, R. (2019) Essential facilitation skills for an effective facilitator. https://www.sessionlab.com/blog/facilitation-skills/</p> <p>Djenontin, I.N.S., Meadow, A.M. (2018) The art of co-production of knowledge in environmental sciences and management: lessons from international practice. <i>Environmental Management</i>, 61: 885-903. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-018-1028-3</p> <p>Green, F. (2013) <i>Skills and skilled work. An economic and social analysis.</i> Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.</p> <p>Hölscher, K., Wittmayer, J. M., Avelino, F., Giezen, M. (2019). Opening up the transition arena: An analysis of (dis) empowerment of civil society actors in transition management in cities. <i>Technological Forecasting and Social Change</i>.</p> <p>OECD (2017), <i>Getting Skills Right: Skills for Jobs Indicators</i>, OECD Publishing, Paris. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264277878-en</p> <p>Reed, M.G., Abernethy, P. (2018) Facilitating Co-Production of Transdisciplinary Knowledge for Sustainability: Working with Canadian Biosphere Reserve Practitioners, <i>Society & Natural Resources</i>, 31:1, 39-56, DOI: 10.1080/08941920.2017.1383545</p> <p>Weyers, M., Rankin P. (2007) The Facilitation Assessment Scale (FAS): Measuring the effect of facilitation on the outcomes of workshops. <i>The Social Work Practitioner-Researcher</i>, 19(1).</p>

18.17. Procedural fairness

Project Name: CONNECTING Nature (Grant Agreement no. 730222)

Author/s and affiliations: Kato Allaert¹, Katharina Hölscher¹

¹ *Dutch Research Institute for Transitions (DRIFT), Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, the Netherlands*

Procedural fairness	Participatory Planning and Governance
Description and justification	Procedural fairness refers to “the fairness of the processes used to produce [...] decisions” (Lauber et al, 2010). It is important in relation to participatory planning and