

Consult your community

A guide to running a youth jury

Series Editor Lyn Carson



Authors

Lyn Carson
Christopher Sargent
Jesse Blackadder

Contributors

Lorien Vecellio	James Cullen
Maria Zuza	Joseph Sorby
Marc Tutaan	Sue Fick

Acknowledgements

Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs

Parra Youth Matters was proudly supported by the Commonwealth Government *Living in Harmony* initiative. Administered by the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, the *Living in Harmony* initiative aims to promote community harmony. It recognises that, whatever our backgrounds and beliefs, we are united as Australians and want to live in a country that is free of racial intolerance and demonstrates the Commonwealth Government's serious commitment to promoting community harmony. For more information on the *Living in Harmony* initiative, visit www.immi.gov.au/harmony.

Institute of Public Administration Australia/University of Canberra Public Administration Research Trust Fund

The research on which this publication is based was assisted by a grant from the Institute of Public Administration Australia/University of Canberra Public Administration Research Trust Fund.

The University of Sydney and Southern Cross University

The Parra Youth Matters youth jury project referred to in this handbook was run by the [School of Economics and Political Science](#) at the University of Sydney and was the recipient of an international award in 2004 from the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2). The project was also supported by [Southern Cross University](#), Lismore, which has experimented with citizens' juries as a teaching strategy and as a method for decision making in the University itself.

© Crown Copyright 2004

NSW Premier's Department
Level 39 Governor Macquarie Tower
1 Farrer Place Sydney
NSW Australia 2000

<<http://www.premiers.nsw.gov.au>>

Published July 2004

ISBN 0 7313 32474

Disclaimer:

While every reasonable effort has been made to ensure that this document is correct at the time of printing, the State of New South Wales, its agents and employees, disclaim any and all liability to any person in respect of anything or the consequences of anything done or omitted to be done in reliance upon the whole or any part of this document.





Table of contents

Foreword	2
Introduction	4
The Parra Youth Matters Team	5
Part One – About youth juries	7
1.1 Citizens’ juries – the model for youth juries	7
1.2 What is a youth jury?	7
1.3 History of youth juries	7
1.4 Why use a youth jury?	9
Part Two – Setting up a youth jury	11
2.1 The organisational steps	12
2.2 Initiating a youth jury	13
2.3 The roles within a youth jury	14
2.4 Managing a youth jury	17
2.5 Inviting stakeholders to participate	18
2.6 Recruiting and selecting the jury	18
2.7 Developing background information	19
2.8 Organising event logistics	20
2.9 Running the youth jury	21
2.10 Communicating outcomes and next steps	22
Part Three – Youth juries in practice	
A case study of Parra Youth Matters	23
3.1 Initiating the project	23
3.2 Setting up the project	24
3.3 Running the introductory events	28
3.4 Running the youth jury	31
3.5 Outcomes	32
3.6 Lessons and reflections	35
Part Four – Conclusion	37
Part Five – Resources for youth juries and citizens’ juries	39
Part Six – Appendices	45
1. Parra Youth Matters: Invitation to participate	45
2. Parra Youth Matters: Terms of reference for project steering committee	47
3. Parra Youth Matters: Random selection methods	48
4. Parra Youth Matters: Responsibilities of youth jurors	52
5. Parra Youth Matters: Youth jury agenda	54
6. Parra Youth Matters: Expert witnesses	55
7. Parra Youth Matters: Youth jury recommendations	58
8. Parra Youth Matters: Evaluation report	66
9. Parra Youth Matters: Media strategy	76
10. Parra Youth Matters: Media release	78
11. Parra Youth Matters: Budget	79



Foreword

This manual is about how to run a youth jury, which is a citizens' jury for young people. A youth jury (like a citizens' jury) is a process designed to overcome the problems of traditional forms of consultation, which often attract only 'the incensed and articulate'.

A lack of trust exists between politicians and their constituents, which is mutual and quite rational. That's because politicians consider that the people who are most often consulted are just the 'squeaky wheels'. Citizens consider that if they are not involved in a lobby group (like an environmental group or a chamber of commerce), they will not be heard - they're literally the silent majority. The reality is that important voices are being left out of consultation methods like public meetings or committees or written submissions.

Deliberative consultation methods, including youth juries, can offer a way forward if they use random selection and if the participants engage in in-depth discussion. If these conditions are fulfilled, you end up with very diverse and very informed groups. Effective consultation methods capture missing voices and are likely to avoid vested interests. By the end of the process you can trust the views expressed by such a group because they're not merely opinions, they are well-considered judgments.

In 2003 I taught an undergraduate course at the University of Sydney called Consultation in Community, Business and Government. The students conducted their own in-class citizens' jury as part of their course and did a fabulous job of it. At the end of semester I noticed an invitation to apply for funding from the Department of Immigration, Multiculturalism and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA), under DIMIA's 'Living in Harmony' grants, and I shared this idea with the class. One postgraduate and ten undergraduate students stepped forward. We applied for funding and were successful.

The result was the Parra Youth Matters' youth jury. The group of young students who ran the youth jury enlisted other students and designed, organised, ran and evaluated the youth jury (which is examined as the case study in this manual) basically on their own. The extent of their achievement was recently recognised by the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2, based in Denver, Colorado), which presented them with a Special Recognition Award in IAP2's 2004 Project of the Year category.

This youth jury was a first for two reasons. It was the first youth jury to be conducted in Australia (though a number have been conducted by adults with young participants in the UK).



But more significantly, we think that this is the first youth jury in the world that has been designed and conducted by young people themselves—that's appropriate and that's pretty innovative! We hope that the Parramatta Youth Jury will encourage others to follow its example.

But more significantly, we think that this is the first youth jury in the world that has been designed and conducted by young people themselves – that's appropriate and pretty innovative! We hope that the Parramatta youth jury will encourage others to follow its example.

I want to conclude by making a controversial statement: typical young people and typical adult citizens don't know much, and that's because so much information and knowledge is irrelevant to them. However, we should never underestimate their capacity for judgement; given adequate information and an opportunity to discuss it, they'll shine every time.

This should leave us feeling very optimistic because youth juries provide an opportunity to demonstrate this incredible capacity for judgement—not by gathering together and sharing opinions, based only on passion or prejudice or misinformation—but by gathering together and challenging beliefs and opinions, exposing them to questioning and reflection, asking questions of those who regard themselves as experts, and then deliberating in a highly informed manner. This process leads to sound judgement.

I commend Parra Youth Matters for running Australia's first youth jury. There is a wealth of material in this manual which comes directly from their rich experience and beyond. I encourage you, reader, to use it.

Dr Lyn Carson
PYM Project Manager
University of Sydney
May 2004



Introduction

Our main aim with the youth jury was to empower the young people involved and you could see that from day one. It was their youth jury. Everything was up to them.

– Chris Sargant, PYM Coordinator

The Parra Youth Matters' youth jury project had its roots back at the beginning of 2002, when our class of second and third year university students enrolled in a subject at the University of Sydney on consultation and deliberative democracy, run by Dr Lyn Carson. As part of the class we formed our own citizens' jury. This experience had such an effect on us that when Dr Carson suggested that we could run a jury of our own with young people, we jumped at the idea. We formed a project team, and the project 'Parra Youth Matters' (PYM) began.

While we had very different interests, backgrounds, cultures and ambitions, we were united by our sincere belief in the importance of democracy and the positive impacts that deliberation can have on people and their communities.

This was a 'youth for youth' project. While most of us on the project team were undergraduate students, we were not studying or formally training in this area while running the youth jury. We were supported by academic experts and an extensive network of professional contacts in the community consultation sector in Australia and overseas, and we had informal training as part of the youth jury process. However, it really was an action learning project, with our own development and learning being an important outcome.

Our aim in producing this manual is to let others know a little of the history of citizens' juries, explain what's involved in running a youth jury, and share the particular outcomes and experiences we had running a youth jury ourselves. We want this to be a practical manual that will encourage other youth-focused organisations to try innovative consultation methods like youth juries.



Parra Youth Matters: The Team (2003)



Dr Lyn Carson

Dr Carson's research interest is in public participation in government decision making. Her book (with Brian Martin) *Random Selection in Politics*, explores innovative consultative mechanisms, some of which she has trialled in Australia. As a former elected representative in local government, she has written widely on community consultation and has been involved with the design, management or implementation of consensus conferences, citizens' juries, televotes and deliberative polls.



Samantha Allen

Samantha is completing her Honours year in Government and International Relations, as part of her Bachelor of Economics (Social Sciences) degree. Samantha tutors primary and high school students. Through her role in the University of Sydney Union, she developed and presented career seminars for year ten students. She was actively involved in developing an 'International Youth Parliament', as established by Oxfam Community Aid Abroad from 1999 - 2000.



James Cullen

James is completing his Honours year in Government and International Relations, in a Bachelor of Economics (Social Science) Degree. James has worked with the Public Relations Office of Parramatta Council and been involved in youth activities in the Parramatta area, such as the Parramatta Youth Council (1999). James is co-founder and treasurer of Polisoc (Government Students Society), devising a more inclusive consultative mechanism for student involvement in social and public events.



Rebecca Hicks

Rebecca is completing her Economics/Law degree. She is interested in policy development and public education and is completing her major in Government and International Relations and Economics. Rebecca teaches dancing to children up to ten years old. She also volunteers at the National Children's and Youth Legal Centre.



Frances Phillips

Frances is completing her Honours year, as part of a Bachelor of Economics (Social Sciences), where she majored in Government and International Relations and Political Economy.



Christopher Sargant

Christopher is studying a Bachelor of Arts at the University of Sydney, majoring in Government and International Affairs and Asian Studies. In his fourth year he will complete his Honours which will focus on deliberative processes in Australia as well as throughout the world. He has worked with young people in a diverse range of fields including youth care and teaching drama.



Marc Tutaan

Marc studied psychology at the University of Sydney. His experience with young people includes tutoring, volunteering at the International Youth Parliament and being a delegate to the 2001 Youth Summit associated with the United Nations World Conference against Racism.



Lorien Vecellio

Lorien has completed his Bachelor of Arts degree, studying Government and International Relations, Philosophy and Psychology. He worked as a facilitator in the citizens' jury run by the class in 2002. Lorien has also worked as a tutor with young people.



Maria Zuza

Maria is an education student at the University of Sydney. She has established a voluntary tutoring program at an inner city school and is active in making sure that youth affairs are dealt with fairly and in accordance with basic human rights.





Part one. About youth juries.

1.1 Citizens' juries – the model for youth juries

A citizens' jury is a way of making democracy real for ordinary people. It's a process involving a small group of typical citizens, which is designed to show the wider community's attitude towards a certain issue if people are fully informed about that issue.

In a citizens' jury, a group of between 12 and 20 'jurors' are randomly chosen from the general public in a way that represents the demographic make-up of their community. The aim is to gather together a very diverse group. Over several days of the 'hearing', expert witnesses (informed representatives from a range of relevant organisations) give evidence to the jury about all aspects of the issue under question. The jury can ask questions and request more information. When the presentations are complete, the jurors meet to deliberate, and finally, to make recommendations on the issue.

The term 'jury' can be misleading. A citizens' jury is different from a legal jury because the jury members aren't asked to reach a guilty or innocent verdict - rather, they are encouraged (but not forced) to work towards a consensus on their recommendations. Also, jury members are able to directly question the expert presenters (or witnesses), which can't happen in a legal trial.

The issue (or 'charge') that the jury considers is usually something of public importance - for example, there have been citizens' juries in Australia which have looked at introducing container deposit legislation, the location of a road through a sensitive forest area, developing a social plan for a rural shire and developing the central business district of a coastal city.

1.2 What is a youth jury?

A youth jury runs along the same lines as a citizens' jury, but the jury is made up only of young people, typically aged between 12-25. We believe that youth juries provide young people with a unique and stimulating way of talking about and being involved with issues that concern them and have an impact on their lives, their community and their country. A youth jury is a way for the wider community to listen to the voices of young people, and for the jury members to be exposed to a variety of different views.

1.3 History of youth juries

Prior to this project, youth juries had only been held in the United Kingdom. The Parra Youth Matters' project was the first attempt at involving 16-17 year olds in a youth jury in Australia.

As far as we know, Parra Youth Matters was also the first youth jury worldwide that had young people as designers and co-ordinators of the process, not just the participants.



Cambridge City Council youth jury 1999

Cambridge City Council organised a youth jury in 1999, which consisted of 15 young people nominated by schools and community youth workers. The selection of jurors was based on their willingness to contribute and their spread of age and gender. The jury was run with the aim of actively and meaningfully involving young people in Council decision-making. The Council let go of power by enabling the young people to design the consultation and decide the best way of doing things.

Response from the jurors who took part showed appreciation for the process. One juror stated 'We can make a big difference: the Council should listen to us and I think they will'. Another said, 'I have done things in this project that I never thought I would have the confidence to do'.

Belfast youth jury 2000

A youth jury was held in Belfast 2000, comprised of 18 randomly chosen year-12 students from nine high schools (called 'post primary schools') in Northern Ireland. The students identified the strengths and weaknesses of the current Northern Ireland system of high school selection, a controversial and quite unpopular system based on an examination at the end of primary school which can affect a young person's life options. The citizens' jury concept and the issues around high school selection were explained to students before the jury took place. During the jury, jurors questioned a range of expert witnesses to help them clarify the issues. They then formed recommendations for what they believed were the best future options.

Leicestershire youth jury 2002

This youth jury was held on behalf of the Leicestershire Rural Partnership. The objective was to hear the views of young people in the county about what was important to them. The jury was made up of 14 young people aged between 14 and 18 who were representative of the Leicestershire community as a whole in terms of gender, age, mobility, ability and geographical location. The jurors made recommendations on how to ensure that young people in Leicestershire are engaged in decision-making, how young people want to be able to access services, and their priorities. The jury highlighted barriers to young people becoming independent. Jurors noted the lack of choice in relation to political parties and the feeling that they were not considered to be part of the electorate. Jurors considered that having a say in areas such as the future of society and college would make young people feel more independent.



1.4 Why use a youth jury?

Often decision makers have trouble finding out the values and attitudes of the communities they represent. They may be influenced by vocal lobby groups and ideological debates and miss out on hearing from a large part of the community. A youth jury aims to be deeply deliberative – which means that it focuses on gathering as much information as possible through different means (including being able to put questions directly to experts within the field), using creative methods to process and understand information (like brainstorming and argument mapping) and building consensus around an issue rather than different sides that either win or lose. In addition, a youth jury has the special function of giving a voice to young people, who have few ways of speaking out or being heard in their communities.

Youth juries bring together groups that don't normally meet. In this process ordinary young people work with experts, service providers, interest groups and the decision makers. A youth jury also emphasises deliberation and interaction. These attributes encourage learning both amongst participants and between participants and officials.

Youth juries share some of the limitations of citizens' juries – they can be expensive (though don't have to be), it can be hard to evaluate their impact on decision making, and there's the risk that even with rigorous random selection, the small number of jurors may not fully represent the views of the whole community.

This is a way of strengthening our system of government and building stronger communities—imagine this youth jury method being used routinely within and between schools—what prejudices might be dissolved, what learning could occur, how might schools be democratised through the experience?

- Dr Lyn Carson, University of Sydney





Part two. Setting up a youth jury.

The steps to organising and running a youth jury are outlined in this section, illustrated with the Parra Youth Matters' case study in section three and then expanded in more detail in the appendices . . . The process is not necessarily linear and many of these steps will need to be carried out simultaneously.

In running Australia's first youth jury we followed many of the processes and roles developed by Lyn Carson for running citizens' juries. Many of the steps and roles outlined here are reproduced from her work¹.

However, there are also some key differences between an adult citizens' jury and a youth jury and these are mainly in relation to working with young people and accommodating their different needs. The differences include:

- The need for flexibility to accommodate physical needs and attention spans of young people – for example days may be shorter than would be normal for adults, and physical movement and a variety of activities and processes may be introduced.
- The need for introductory sessions prior to the youth jury to introduce young people to the process, facilitate bonding between jurors and, importantly, between jurors and facilitators.
- The need to build jurors' skills in listening, questioning and integrating information.
- The need for a clear structure to provide boundaries and a firm chairperson to manage the participants.
- Holding an awareness of young people's vulnerability to being seen as 'uncool' by their peers.
- The importance of non-oral forms of communication/deliberation (time alone, journal writing, drawing etc.).
- The need for mentors and professional support if the leaders of the youth jury are also young people.
- Regular incentives, encouragement and praise.
- Awareness of the dynamics of young people in group settings and how to manage problems such as competition or 'ganging up'.

¹ Carson L (ed.) (2003)

Consult your community—Handbook. A guide to using citizens' juries, prepared for PlanningNSW, Department of Infrastructure, Planning, and Natural Resources, Sydney. It can be downloaded from: <http://www.iplan.nsw.gov.au/engagement/stories/docs/cj_handbook.pdf> or <<http://www.hydra.org.au/activedemocracy/>>.



2.1 The organisational steps

The following steps should be followed when organising a youth jury. The process is not necessarily linear and many of these steps will need to be carried out simultaneously. They are explained in more detail in the following sections.

Initiate the project

- Identify if a youth jury is the most appropriate method to use.
- Secure funding and set the budget.
- Appoint a project manager.

Establish the basics

- Define roles and terms of reference for everyone involved (including staff, jury members, advisory committee members and so on).
- Appoint an advisory committee of seven to ten people from different organisations relevant to the youth jury.
- Appoint an independent evaluator.
- Appoint the chair and facilitator.
- Prepare terms of reference and the charge/question for the panel or establish a theme and allow the charge to emerge during the introductory session.

Involve stakeholders

- Identify and invite stakeholders to give input to the youth jury theme and charge.
- Hold public meetings about the youth jury process.
- Identify and invite expert presenters.

Create the jury

- Identify parts of the community from which you will draw the jurors (such as schools).
- Choose the jury selection method (e.g. matching demographic profiles or pure random selection).
- Select the jury.

Develop background information

- Provide objective and balanced background information about the topic to jurors.
- Provide logistical information to everyone who is involved.

Organise event logistics

- Organise event logistics (such as booking the venue, arranging catering, managing transport etc.).
 - Carry out publicity according to a promotional plan.
-



Hold the event

- Manage the practicalities of running the event.

Communicate outcomes and take the next steps

- Make recommendations.
- Evaluate the process.
- Communicate outcomes and next steps.



2.2 Initiating a youth jury

Decide if a youth jury is appropriate

A youth jury could be initiated by a council, government department or other organisation that makes decisions affecting young people or wants to understand their views.

A youth jury is useful when the questions to be explored are relatively clear in advance. It's well suited to situations that involve complex issues, where expert involvement is required for participants to fully understand the process. Other indications are when there are competing vested interests, where there is uncertainty (i.e. not a single generally accepted opinion), and where decisions made will have an impact on the broader youth community. For youth juries to be effective tools of participation, there should be strong links back to the decision-making bodies.

As well as reading this handbook, you could refer to the publication *Ideas for Community Consultation*² which explains a range of participation methods and how to select the one most suitable for your situation.

Secure funding and set the budget

You will need enough money and resources to run a youth jury. Think about items such as recruitment costs; payment for jurors (covering their out of pocket expenses, and possibly also a small fee for their time), chair, facilitator and evaluator; event organisation costs such as venue, catering and travel; publicity; staff costs for the project managers; and printing and distribution costs. For Parra Youth Matters, organising a youth jury was a full time job for at least four months, with some preparation a few months prior to that. The Parra Youth Matters' budget is included as Appendix 11.

² Dr Lyn Carson & Dr Katherine Gelber, *Ideas for Community Consultation*, NSW Department of Urban Affairs and Planning (2001). May be downloaded from: <http://iplan.nsw.gov.au/engagement/stories/docs/ideasforconsult.pdf> or <http://www.hydra.org.au/activedemocracy/>.



Appoint a project manager

Running a youth jury is a major project management exercise and the project manager is ultimately responsible. As well as having (or being able to develop) skills in logistics and public participation processes, the manager needs to be neutral in relation to the charge.

2.3 The roles within a youth jury

Project manager – where the buck stops

The project manager is responsible for the entire organisation of the process, although she or he is supported by the advisory committee when it comes to making important decisions. The manager needs to be appointed early in the process and some of the tasks that fall to her or him include encouraging stakeholders to participate, correctly selecting the jury, identifying the expert presenters, providing background information and support to all participants, determining the 'charge' facing the jury, managing the actual event itself, dealing with issues arising during the process and providing reports and evaluations. Most importantly, the manager must treat all participants fairly and impartially and avoid influencing the jury's decisions and recommendations.

Advisory committee – providing credibility

The project manager is responsible for the event, but the advisory committee exists to support the manager and team, and ensure that the project has independence and credibility. Ideally made up of ten people or less, the committee gives advice on the terms of reference, choosing expert presenters, and helping project staff stay neutral throughout the process. The project manager decides if the committee is only made up of experts in public participation, or includes stakeholders in the issue being examined. If the jurors are selecting the issue themselves, then it may be difficult to include stakeholders that are involved in the issue due to lack of time after the charge has been devised.

Mentors – the brains trust

If the youth jury is being managed and run by young people (as well as having youth participants), then it is essential to have mentors for young people in the key roles to provide professional development, support and feedback. Mentors can be appointed to support the people holding each role, including chair, facilitator, researcher, evaluator and so on. Parra Youth Matters labelled their mentors 'The Brains Trust'.

Chairperson – keeping the process under control

The chair keeps control of the nuts and bolts of the jury process, including the expert presentations and discussion sessions. This includes timekeeping and making sure presenters stay focused on key issues. In a youth jury, the chair is likely to become involved in developing the agenda of the jury, assisting with how the jury members hold group discussions and how they question expert witnesses (for example, the chair determines the 'rules of engagement' such as: length of speakers' time, order of questions, permitting follow up questions and so on). The chair needs to ensure that all jurors are confident in the process, and resolve problems or concerns. This need not be an adult, as Parra Youth Matters demonstrated. Sometimes the roles of chair and facilitator are combined.



Facilitators – keeping the jury on track

Facilitators are responsible for helping youth jurors perform effectively and efficiently. They manage group dynamics and must have the ability to stay neutral at all times. While citizens' juries generally operate with one facilitator, youth juries function better with a team of two or three facilitators who can work with small groups. Along with the chair, the facilitators need to assist the jury members to understand and feel comfortable with their role. This can be done by helping them find ways of assessing and challenging expert knowledge, focusing on key questions and making sure they achieve their tasks, including producing the final report. In a youth jury it is important that there is a high level of trust between the jurors and the facilitators and for this reason, trained young people are an excellent choice. It also helps if facilitators can relax and have fun during the process.

I was one of three facilitators. Our role was to help the jurors achieve the outcomes that were necessary for the process. So if the process was to think logically through ideas and come up with recommendations, the facilitator's role was to help them come up with that result.

– Maria Zuza, Facilitator, PYM youth jury

Jurors – the heart of the process

The jurors are at the heart of the youth jury process. Their task is to respond to the charge by listening to the presentations, debating the issues, deliberating on the findings and making a series of recommendations based on their conclusions. Their role is to present the views and recommendations of fully informed members of the public on the issue at hand. They must be committed to attending and participating fully in all parts of the process.

Researchers – providing high quality information

The researchers must provide high quality background information about the issue being discussed that is relevant, unbiased and diverse. The researchers for Parra Youth Matters aimed to balance biased or opinion-based information with information reflecting alternative biases or opinions. This balancing act was an important exercise for the jurors to become aware of the existence of bias in all opinions, as well as the difference between facts and diverse viewpoints. In a youth jury, the researchers must also present information in a way that's accessible to 16-17 year olds, which may require creative approaches and an understanding of youth culture.

Rapporteurs

Rapporteurs collect data and record proceedings and outcomes of the various meetings and deliberations throughout the youth jury process (including the introductory sessions). They are responsible for printing, distributing and correcting these documents to the satisfaction of participants.



Evaluator – observing and assessing the process

The role of the evaluator is to observe all the proceedings of the jury without participating, and assess the effectiveness of the process against pre-agreed criteria. For example, in a youth jury the evaluator may assess the effectiveness of lead up activities and the impact they had upon the jury's level of skill. The evaluator should not be involved in organising or running the youth jury, since he or she must provide considered and unbiased insight into the factors that affected the youth jury's success (or otherwise) in achieving outcomes. The evaluation normally forms part of the final report.

External observers – keeping the process open

A youth jury should be as open and transparent as possible, with interested parties being allowed (and possibly invited) to observe, though without participating in any way. The jury must decide about the presence of observers and during some panel sessions the panel may ask observers to leave. Observers must be informed of rules and protocols in relation to interacting with the jury, such as privacy issues.

Support roles – helping the process happens smoothly

Running a youth jury is a large logistical exercise and organisers may find it helpful to delegate tasks or areas of responsibility. Other organisational and logistical roles could include:

- Administration coordinator – overseeing budget expenditure, budget reporting, taking care of administrative tasks.
 - Guest speaker liaison – ensuring guest speakers are fully equipped to deal with the process.
 - Media liaison – managing event publicity and liaising with media representatives.
 - Publication/web page coordinator – coordinating material for project web site, printed reports etc.
 - Catering coordinator – arranging food and refreshments.
 - Entertainment coordinator – organising activities to keep youth jurors attentive, motivated and interested.
 - Venue coordinator – selecting and organising a suitable venue.
 - Transport coordinator – particularly important in a youth jury, the task is to make sure all jurors are safely transported to and from the venue, plus assisting with transport for other participants if necessary.
 - Technical coordinator – managing audiovisual requirements, setting up and testing equipment, troubleshooting.
-



2.4 Managing a youth jury

Defining the terms of reference

Everyone involved in a youth jury needs to be clear about their role and responsibilities. It's useful to provide written documents explaining various roles. A more formal document called 'terms of reference' is important for the advisory committee and the jurors. It gives information on what they are (and aren't) responsible for and what tasks they must complete. For example, the organisation initiating the youth jury process could make a commitment that it will take account of the jury's findings, or publicly explain why it cannot take them into account. See Appendix 2 for a sample terms of reference document.

Appointing an advisory committee

The project manager should choose an advisory or steering committee with a mix of skills and expertise best suited to the specific youth jury project. Project managers should build an advisory committee from people who are experts in public participation and/or the organisation that wants to run the jury and organisations involved with the subject area. This group then helps to make sure that people cooperate and participate, and that the results of the jury are credible.

Appointing an independent evaluator

Evaluation is important so that the general public and decision-makers can trust and respect the recommendations of the jury. It is a way of identifying any issues that may affect the panel's recommendations. Appointing the evaluator early is important in ensuring the process is transparent and unbiased from the beginning. The results of any independent evaluation are included in the final report of the panel.

Appointing the chair and facilitator

Project managers should list the skills and qualities they want in these two roles. The advisory committee can help the manager find the right people and give them guidelines for working with the jury.

Setting the 'charge'

The 'charge' is the task or question on which the jury must deliberate. The charge is usually a question or series of questions that the jury and expert presenters address and discuss. The question is developed with help and advice from the advisory committee and it's important that it is unbiased and acceptable to all stakeholders. Care should be taken to avoid a charge that 'answers' the questions in advance. Also, a fine balance exists between a charge that is general enough to give the jury latitude and specific enough to keep the jury focused.

The Parra Youth Matters' organising team chose to let the jury set its own charge within the framework of a broader theme of cultural diversity.



2.5 Inviting stakeholders to participate

Involving stakeholders

It's important that people and organisations who are 'stakeholders' (with a particular interest or investment in the issue) participate in the youth jury process and are given the chance to present their points of view. Their input is very important when producing good quality background material for the jurors. Their involvement is essential when it comes to implementing the youth jury's recommendations after the event. They can also act as a useful network for the youth jurors who may want to participate in other activities after completing the youth jury.

Selecting presenters

The advisory committee and the project manager choose high quality experts who know a lot about the issue and who are excellent communicators. These presenters provide in-depth information about the issue being considered. They are chosen to represent a variety of opinions. The focus isn't only on their presentations – the way they interact with the jury and participate in questioning is also important.

The Parra Youth Matters' organising team allowed the jury to choose the presenters, based on the suggested list created by the team and advisory committee.

2.6 Recruiting and selecting the jury

Choosing the jury selection method

There are several ways to approach random selection. The first choice is between random selection that matches demographic profiles and random selection that doesn't. The benefit of random selection that matches a demographic profile is that you are more likely to obtain a diverse jury. This contributes to the richness of the deliberations and may increase the credibility of the jury's conclusions in the wider community. On the other hand, using pure random selection is much simpler and involves less risk of being accused of bias. But unless you receive many applications, the composition of the jury can reflect the types of people who mainly applied (such as females or Caucasians).

Once the method is decided, the project manager must choose suitable techniques of selection. In a citizens' jury this could involve advertising for participants in newspapers with wide coverage to create a pool from which people are chosen, or mail outs using the electoral roll, or telephone listings, or randomised phone dialling. However it is more difficult to randomly select a youth jury, as young people are not on the electoral roll and often don't have phone listings. Invitations to schools and youth organisations may be used instead. The decision about which method to use will depend on how best to find the relevant mix of young people.



Recruiting the jury

If you are using random selection to match a demographic profile:

- invite youth to become involved using the selection methods you have identified;
- gather demographic information from youth who respond;
- enter the details of each application into a spreadsheet or database;
- group respondents on primary demographic statistics such as age, sex, location, type of schooling (public or private) and ancestry;
- decide on the order of priority of these demographic categories. For example, decide if it is most important to match the demographic profile in terms of ancestry, and least important to match the demographic profile in terms of type of schooling;
- randomly select an applicant and include the person in the youth jury unless a sufficient number of jurors belonging to the same demographic category as that applicant have already been selected;
- repeat this process for each demographic category in order of priority; and
- if one category remains very unbalanced after random selection, you may decide to go through the applications again and find other applicants to improve the balance in that category without disrupting the balance in other categories.

If you are using random selection without aiming to match a demographic profile, the process is much easier. Simply allocate a number to each prospective participant, then pull the numbers out of a hat! Once you have a short list of randomly selected youth from these groups:

- take steps to ensure that all groupings are included;
- draw up a final list of participants, with a shadow list in case of last minute withdrawals; and
- notify and confirm participants.

Because panellists are randomly selected from people who have responded to a survey or advertisement, there is an element of self-selection present – however this relates to participating in the youth jury process, not the topic of the jury, which is not revealed at this stage.

Random selection is explained in greater detail in Appendix 3.

2.7 Developing background information

Providing background information on the issue

The project manager must provide comprehensive and balanced background information for jury members on the issue being considered. The background information should define the issue, outline the charge and terms of reference, and provide information (such as the criteria for assessing some of the options that will be presented to the jury and details on where to seek further information should jury members wish to do more in-depth research). This is an important step and often involves a great deal of discussion and negotiation between stakeholders before the material is agreed upon.



Providing logistical information

The project manager must provide jury members and other participants with accurate information about the process of a youth jury, the logistics and what will be required from them during the event.

As a school counsellor I hear a lot of young people around me say that they don't get a say. They want to be involved in decision-making processes. They want to be involved. The process of youth jury really facilitates that.

- Matilda Mandic, School Counsellor

2.8 Organising event logistics

Event logistics

Ideally preparation should start four to six months before the youth jury. The project manager needs to arrange or delegate logistics including venue, accommodation, transport, refreshments, presentation tools (white boards, computer screens, video players etc.), ensure that all participants know when and where they should arrive, provide separate rooms for the hearings and for jury discussion and so on. It is extremely important to care for jury members and ensure their wellbeing during the process. In a youth jury it's important to keep jurors attentive and enthusiastic by using appropriate activities and entertainment. It's also the responsibility of the project manager to make sure the jury provides its final report.

Publicity

One of the aims of running a youth jury is to stimulate wider public interest in the topic being explored (and sometimes, the youth jury method as well). However, publicising a youth jury needs to be done sensitively. It's good to keep the community informed about a youth jury, but too much publicity close to the event could result in lobbying by different interest groups. Ideally the community should be notified that the event is happening (for example, during the random selection process) and publicity can be carried out immediately after the jury.





2.9 Running the youth jury

Most citizens' juries will run over two or three days. With the involvement of young people as participants and as organisers, a youth jury may need at least one extra preparatory day. A typical program for a youth jury event is below.

Preparatory day (or days)

- Introduction to the concept and history of youth juries.
- Explaining why the youth jury is taking place.
- Introducing people involved with the youth jury.
- Explaining random selection methods.
- Running group bonding and trust building activities for jurors.
- Developing jurors' skills in deliberation methods.
- Developing jurors' skills in listening, speaking, and strategic questioning.
- Brainstorming interests, prioritising and formulating the charge (if required).
- Selecting presenters (if required).
- Ensuring jurors complete pre-jury questionnaire for evaluation purposes.

Youth jury day one

- Formal opening with guests and media.
- Reminder of youth jury aims for all participants.
- Jurors formulate questions for expert witnesses.
- Expert witnesses give presentations for and against the charge, and respond to strategic questioning by the jurors.
- Jurors work in facilitated sub-groups to deliberate on the information, and compare it to their prior experiences and understanding.
- Jurors share learning in whole group.
- Jurors evaluate the day's activities through a brief questionnaire.
- If time permits, some time for individual reflection (such as drawing, writing, thinking).

Youth jury day two

- Jurors reflect on the outcomes of the first day, and how their understanding of the topic has changed.
- Jurors continue to deliberate and formulate further questions for expert witnesses.
- Jurors hear additional expert witness presentations.
- Sub-groups join together to share current understandings and opinions on the charge.
- Jurors explore conflict between points of view, to prepare for consensus building.
- Jurors discuss and evaluate the second day's experiences.

Youth jury day three

- Jurors join in final deliberation on all issues raised.
 - Jurors work towards consensus in their response to the charge.
 - The recommendations are drafted and refined until the jury reaches consensus.
 - Jurors relax and evaluate the jury experience.
 - Jurors complete post-jury questionnaire for evaluation.
-



2.10 Communicating outcomes and next steps

Apart from providing some real solutions to addressing the concerns of young people with media portrayals of cultural diversity, the Parramatta Youth Jury project has created a little piece of history in Parramatta while putting a 'blue and gold' stamp on the benefits of getting young people involved in community decision-making. I know that it has changed the way I think about interacting with young people in my electorate and I look forward to experimenting with similar forms of consultation.

- Tanya Gadiel, State MP for Parramatta

Recommendations

After final deliberations, the jury releases its findings and recommendations in a public forum. The recommendations should accurately reflect the jurors' own language. The recommendations are presented in the form of a report.

Evaluating the process

Evaluation approaches will vary depending on what is being evaluated and this should be decided early in the planning process. Generally evaluation will be on a 'micro' level, looking at the event itself and whether it was fair and unbiased. The evaluation is typically included in the final report.

Outcomes and next steps

It's vital that project managers clearly and transparently carry out any actions they've agreed to – such as publicly promoting the results of the jury, accurately representing the jury findings to governments and providing the jury report to appropriate people. A public explanation about what will happen after the jury is an important part of promoting a youth jury. The project managers must carry out any follow up actions and keep the jurors informed.

At the conclusion of a youth jury, it is likely that the jurors' motivation for being active in their community is high. Organisers should build on this by providing opportunities or ideas for jurors to channel their enthusiasm in appropriate ways.



Part three. Youth juries in practice.

A case study of Parra Youth Matters

3.1 Initiating the project

Background

So, back to our group of University of Sydney students. We had support and encouragement from our lecturer, we had funding provided by the Australian Government and we had the experience of running our own citizens' jury in our classroom. Our task now was to set up and run a youth jury ourselves, in the western Sydney suburb of Parramatta.

We formed a group called 'Parra Youth Matters' which ran a youth jury project called "Talkin' Culture, Thinkin' Youth". Our aim was to encourage deliberation and greater understanding and cultural tolerance between people in their communities. We wanted to help young people in Parramatta feel that they not only had something important to contribute, but that their voices could indeed be heard.

Our team came up with a draft plan for how to proceed, which involved following the steps outlined in the previous section. However we differed from other youth juries in one vital way. We wanted our jury members to have the experience of actually coming up with the charge themselves, within the context of our project theme 'the impacts of diversity'. We believed this would be the most powerful way of enabling them feel a sense of accomplishment.

I think consultation is about participation and those young people will have a ripple effect within their communities.

- Grace Leotta, Consultant/ Facilitator

Our plan for a youth jury

We started with an initial plan for proceeding with our youth jury.

- We would invite community stakeholders to express their ideas about the project theme 'the impacts of cultural diversity'. This would include completing surveys and interviews with young people and community organisations in the Parramatta area.
 - We would advertise the youth jury widely within the area (through local media, schools, Parramatta Youth Week 2003 activities, youth organisations and a community stall) and all young people would be welcome to apply.
 - The applicants would be randomly selected until we had a group of 17 participants aged between 16 and 17 that would broadly represent the cultural and socio-economic diversity of Parramatta society.
-



- Once selected, the jurors would discuss the theme and nominate key issues they wanted to focus on. Based on these issues, the jurors themselves would define the charge, with support and help from us.
- We would prepare a background briefing document focusing on issues related to the charge, with input from stakeholders, experts, and relevant research materials gathered by the project team. The jurors would use this document to help them devise questions, formulate new ideas, and ultimately assess the charge.
- A group of guest speakers and expert witnesses would be invited to address the youth jury.
- In the first introductory session, the jurors would form sub-groups to identify and prioritise their values and reach agreement on ground rules. This would help focus the proceedings of the entire youth jury process.
- Throughout all three introductory sessions, the jurors would participate in role playing exercises to develop important skills such as argument mapping, consensus building and strategic questioning, which would enhance their skills for deliberating.

It was clear from the outset that we were all personally affected by the charge and ready to do something about it. Our eagerness and enthusiasm surprised even myself. This youth jury struck me as an opportunity to be involved in the community and feel as though I was making a difference.

- Marsha El-Khoury, Juror

3.2 Setting up the project

Involving stakeholders

At the start of the project we approached as many people and organisations as possible that were located in the Parramatta area and involved with youth in some way. These included community groups, youth sport groups, Parramatta police, the Parramatta Council Youth Community Development Officer, Parramatta Chamber of Commerce, schoolteachers, local businesses, professionals, local media, Parramatta Federal and State government departments and members of Parliament.

I was impressed with the approach of the young people. They brought a depth of skill and engagement that you don't often see in adults.

- Steven Healy, Lecturer at University of New South Wales



Appointing a steering committee (or advisory committee)

From the wide group of stakeholders we appointed a steering committee of nine members, including three from the project team. We had already developed the terms of reference for our funding application, so committee members were clear from the start about their responsibilities. Members made a commitment to provide guidance to the project team on any matters related to running the jury, the preparation of final reports, acquitting the grant and assisting with promotion and publicity. The terms of reference are included in Appendix 2.

Recruiting and selecting the jury

We created the jury through random selection to achieve demographic representation. In reality, it is rarely possible for such a small sample of people to fully represent their community, so our aim was to create as diverse a jury as possible, with representation from specific ancestries and different schools. Given our limited time frame, we chose to target schools and youth organisations to recruit jury members, because they were easy to contact and provided access to a diverse range of young people.

We created a randomised list of all 73 applicants. We started selecting jurors from the top of the list, i.e. the first 17 applicants. Each applicant was selected, unless there were already sufficient jurors from that ancestry. For example, we needed four jurors from Oceania (that's a category used in census data which describes the Australasian region), but once we'd found these four, we ignored any more applicants who had Oceanic ancestry.

Eventually we had 17 youth selected with the right proportion of different ancestries, but we had the wrong mix of schools — our list did not reflect all the schools in the Parramatta area. This meant we had to go further down the randomised list, this time looking for educational backgrounds. If one category of educational background was over-represented, then the last juror to be selected from that educational background was discarded and we found the next person on the list with the relevant educational background. This process was repeated until no educational background was over-represented. We went through the same process to maximise the number of schools represented on the jury.

Parramatta Advertiser 12.2.03

Cultural diversity to take the stand



Parramatta's youth citizen Adam Kuziow with Councillor Chiang Lim, Lyn Carson, Councillor Julia Finn, Chris Sargent and Frances Phillips at the launch of youth jury

UNIVERSITY students will analyse the effects of cultural diversity on the lives of young Parramatta residents as part of Australia's first youth jury launched this week.

The Federal Department of Immigration, Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs has awarded a \$40,900 grant to a group of students from the University of Sydney and Southern Cross University.

The team will be led by University of Sydney senior lecturer Dr Lyn Carson and will work with the aim of promoting cultural, racial and religious harmony.

The youth jury will consist of up to 20 randomly selected young people between the ages of 16 and 17. They will come up with recommendations for consideration by local decision-making bodies.

"One of the key strengths of the project is that the youth involvement in the organisation guarantees a sensitivity towards young people that might not have been possible with an adult-run youth jury," Dr Carson said.

Anyone interested in finding out more about the youth jury can email parrayouthmatters@student.usyd.edu.au or call 9351 3089.



Eventually 17 jurors were selected, four males and 13 females, which was indicative of the much higher number of females who applied. We selected 17 jurors, several more than we needed because we assumed two or three would drop out. As it happened, our final jury had 14 jurors (including all the males that had applied) though all 17 attended at least one of the introductory sessions. The random selection process is described in more detail in Appendix 3.

It was such a great mix – not just a racial mix, but also an educational mix...and the mix helped me challenge my own assumptions.

- Armina Soemino, Juror

Recruiting expert witnesses

We chose our expert witnesses with the guidance of the steering committee and with input from our youth jurors, who had strong views on who they wished to include. This was empowering for the jurors, but made the process of inviting the presenters more complex, since a large number of preliminary invitations were made (to cover all the possibilities), but only a small proportion were ultimately invited to the event.

We chose to group the witnesses into three panels – one comprising people from cultural and ethnic organisations, one comprising media organisations and one comprising academic institutions. The list of presenters and background information about them is included in Appendix 6.

The youth jurors all had a spark that was worth fostering. It gave them an opportunity to learn about public life and democracy which will be good for us later when they're adults...The Public Forum also worked well because it brought forward from both sides activities and actions and suggestions that could be put in place. This underlined that the youth had hit upon things that really matter.

- Warren Duncan, Expert Witness, Media Officer
at Community Relations Commission for a Multicultural NSW

Developing background material

We developed a package of background material which included:

- articles and radio transcripts related to the charge;
 - information on the Australian Broadcasting Authority and Australian Press Council;
 - responses from community interviews and surveys;
 - an explanation of reader response theory;
 - information about the panel questioning style; and
 - a list of the expert presenters, their backgrounds and their potential arguments.
-



Event logistics

The youth jury introductory days and the jury event both required a high level of organisation and event management. There were three facilitators on duty at all times. The chairperson did not attend the introductory days, but was present throughout the youth jury and this helped differentiate the informal preparation from the formal event. There were three rapporteurs, one for each of the small groups in both the introductory sessions and the youth jury.

We also kept two support people available throughout the sessions – a youth worker in case any juror needed personal support and an organiser who prepared food, cleaned and mustered the jurors back from breaks. It was important for the evaluator to attend all the sessions, even if not the complete session. There was always a mentor watching over the facilitators.

Publicity and promotion

The PYM team devised a media strategy for the youth jury that involved setting media objectives, identifying actions, setting a timeframe and allocating responsibilities. Our aim was to maximise public exposure of the project and also engage adult stakeholders in the youth jury. We took a targeted approach and developed relationships with nationally focused print, radio and television media. We were successful in gaining publicity for the introductory sessions, the youth jury event and for the follow-up public forum. Our media strategy is included as Appendix 9, one of our media releases as Appendix 10 and media clippings appear throughout this booklet.

Other forms of promotion included the development of the Parra Youth Matters website for the duration of the project (www.parrayouthmatters.org.au) which tracked progress and included a discussion area for the jurors, and the final project report which was printed and released in the public forum at the conclusion of the project. The site is still updated with new developments and can now be found at <http://www.hydra.org.au/parrayouth/>.



This project is about giving young people a say about decisions that affect them - and to encourage more to get involved. I will be encouraging my Youth Advisory Council to examine this project and to see where it can be rolled out across the state. It's a great way for decision makers to keep in touch with young people.

– The Hon. Bob Carr, Premier of New South Wales, quoted in the Parra Youth Matters' media release



3.3 Running the introductory events

Introductory events and developing the charge

The youth jurors went through three introductory sessions which aimed to create respect and support between the jurors and the PYM team, build understanding of the youth jury process, develop skills in deliberation, and decide upon the charge.

During the first and second introductory sessions, the jurors discussed issues, ideas and feelings about cultural diversity in Parramatta and analysed information provided by the community surveys and interviews. We ran team-building exercises and role-plays. In the third introductory session, the jurors practised strategic questioning techniques and refined the topic area that they wanted to focus on, based on its degree of interest and potential for generating realistic recommendations. After deliberation the group selected the topic: 'media as related to cultural diversity' and formed a charge, which was '*the media adversely influences people's views about different cultures, affecting perceptions of Australia as a nation*'.

Introductory day one: 8th June 2003

Fourteen young people from different cultural backgrounds and schools came together for the first half day introductory session (three jurors were unable to attend).

After playing a quick ice-breaker activity the jurors wrote down their initial thoughts and feelings about the youth jury process. They separated into three small groups to get to know each other and build trust. After sharing experiences, the jurors individually wrote down some key issues about cultural diversity in Parramatta.

The small groups came back together and shared their experiences, with everyone having the opportunity to comment. After each juror spoke, they placed their issues on the wall. By the end of the discussion there were several groups of issues.

After a break the jurors went back into small groups to discuss the jury's role. Each group came up with principles and guidelines that would help create an atmosphere of respect and support and presented them back to the larger group. Time ran out, so the group wasn't able to reach final agreement or evaluate the day. They were given evaluation forms to take home, told about the online discussion forum set up for them to use and thanked for participating.

Many projects involving young people can come across as tokenistic but this process got the balance right. It was well organised and clearly all were engaged and involved.

- Liz Skelton, Expert Witness, General Manager at Streetwize Communications



Introductory day two – 22nd June 2003

All 17 jurors met for the second introductory session to learn more about the youth jury process and work towards devising the charge. It was apparent that there were still some misunderstandings about the youth jury. Some jurors believed it to be a metaphor for a standard around-the-circle forum and others believed that there was a party being prosecuted, like a mock trial.

The PYM team explained how the youth jury would be structured. We described in detail an example of a citizens’ jury run by Lewisham Council in the United Kingdom on the topic of drugs and community safety. We were impressed that the jurors were keen to know what sort of specific changes resulted and believed that this was a reflection of their desire to make improvements in their own community.

We returned to the ‘wall of issues’ from day one, and after further discussion grouped them into categories and produced a list of pros and cons for each. At this time the jurors realised how complex some of the issues were. Eventually they settled on the broad topic of ‘media as related to cultural diversity’ and we discussed who they wanted as presenters for this topic.

It was a gruelling half day and we congratulated the jurors on their efforts and concentration. It was very encouraging for the team to see the excitement about the web discussion site. These young people were not afraid to voice their opinions. However there was still a lot of work to do before the youth jury could begin.

Parramatta Sun 16/7/03

AUSTRALIANS first ever Youth Jury started on Monday at Parramatta Town Hall, stressing the importance of the cultural and socioeconomic diversity in Parramatta.

The Jury discussed how the most serious media focused on youth issues and how to change its attitude towards youth.

Dr Lynn Curran, Parramatta Youth Matters Youth Jury project manager, said the role of the jury is Parramatta and Australia was its port of call as it was up to them to make a difference.

"Citizens not only have a right to be involved in the running decisions that affect them, they have a responsibility to do so," Dr Curran said.

"The issue of students contacting the youth jury will, arguably, make a difference – to their world and to this community."

Tara Anglim student Emma Chisley is one of the jurors. She said she went into the jury not knowing what to expect, but now realised the impact young people can have on the community.

"We need to push for more diversity in Australia rather than segregation," she said.

"We want there to be more positive influences [from the media]. The most adverse influences people's views about different cultures."

Emma said the Youth Jury had increased her interest in public and community affairs.

Over the past three days the Youth Jury has debated its ideas and has developed recommendations to address the issues raised. It concludes today.

For more information on the Parramatta Youth Matters Youth Jury go to www.parramattamatters.org.au.

PIONEERS... Parramatta MP Ross Cameron speaks with members of the Youth Jury. Photo: LUKE PUGH

- AMANDA WRIGHT

Introductory day three – 6th July 2003

When the project team arrived at the Parramatta Police Station (this was the venue, not as a result of a bust up!) we were concerned because the agenda for the half day was ambitious. The jurors had to finalise the charge and still acquire skills such as strategic questioning. Unfortunately three jurors had other commitments; however the remaining 14 were present.

We started by introducing the chair of the youth jury. She explained her role in the youth jury process and her expectations of the jurors.



The jurors were then faced with their most difficult task to date: agreeing upon the final charge. It was essential that they all understood and were satisfied with the final charge. We have covered this process in some detail below to illustrate its complexity.

It was clear from the previous session that the jurors wanted to talk about the media, so in the large group we revisited some of the ideas from previous discussions. Jurors then worked in small groups to explore concepts including media, power, effects, influences, identity, results, Australia and people's views. Eventually the group settled on the following question: *Does the power of the media influence people's views about ethnicity affecting Australian identity?*

The jurors analysed the charge to make sure they all had the same understanding of the key words. For example, one juror was concerned that the term *ethnicity* might exclude those of an Anglo-Saxon background. There was considerable debate about the term *identity*, with some believing that it meant collective characteristics and others believing that it was individual. Eventually they agreed on the meaning of those characteristics that defined Australia as a nation.

After this process the jurors believed they had finalised the charge and had a break. However at the end of the break there was more discussion and the charge was rewritten as a statement: *The media adversely influences people's views about different cultures affecting perceptions of Australia as a nation.*

There were a few reasons for this change:

- the term *power* in the first charge was very loaded;
- *ethnicity* was still misunderstood by some of the jurors;
- rather than using *identity*, which could be defined differently later on, the words *Australia as a nation* were used, following the group's discussion about what identity means; and
- the initial charge had lost a lot of the passion that arose from the discussions; the second charge allowed this passion to come through again.

There was some debate amongst the jurors about the word 'adversely'. Some thought a simpler word like 'negatively' should be used. Others thought 'adversely' made the charge sound more impressive. In the end the jurors voted 13 to 1 to keep 'adversely'. Thus the charge was set.

The final part of the day consisted of a strategic questioning exercise, training jurors to use open-ended questions designed to attract the most thoughtful and informative answers from presenters. The jurors worked in small groups to criticise and improve their own questions. They learned to differentiate between yes/no questions such as 'do journalists undergo continual

By no means was this process easy. It proved to be a tough and trying couple of days... [At] one point we all just wanted to go home, but thanks to the efforts of our beautiful mentors we got back on track... This jury for me has been a learning experience not only in terms of knowledge received from panelists, but also in terms of teamwork, cooperation, compromise and deliberation – all aspects of life that are invaluable and necessary.

- Lauren Estabillo, Juror



learning to keep them aware of changes in cultural patterns?’ and strategic, open-ended questions like: ‘how are journalists kept up to date with changes in society’s cultural patterns during their careers?’

The day finished with thumbs up for the catering. The jurors were ready to participate in Australia’s first youth jury.

3.4 Running the youth jury

The youth jury 14th–16th July 2003

This was the project team’s first attempt at a youth jury. We held what seemed like endless meetings to finalise the agenda, allocate times correctly, design fair and straightforward processes, allow for flexibility and also reflect on our own learning.

The youth jury was held from Monday 14th to Wednesday 16th July 2003 during the school holidays. The first day was held at the Parramatta Town Hall and the second and third days were held in a seminar room at the Crown Plaza Hotel in Parramatta.

Throughout the three days we aimed to give the jurors the opportunity to understand and incorporate new ideas about the media in Australia, and therefore encourage them to challenge and deeply explore the charge.

A highlight was when we interviewed someone from the media. There was an editor from one of the newspapers that we got into a heated debate with...and I think we managed to impress upon him how much we feel about these things. Also one of the speakers was from a cultural group – and because she was young and also doing something for her community – that was an inspiration – she spoke so well about discrimination and how she handled herself.

– Aramina Soemino, Juror

The expert witnesses were grouped into three panels (each with two or three experts), based on their area of expertise in the field of media and their differing views. The jurors’ task was to identify new concepts and reach consensus on key ideas and perspectives. At the end of the expert witness panels, the jurors were encouraged by the facilitators to ‘brain-dump’ ideas by expressing their thoughts and feelings rather than letting each new idea and opinion circulate in their minds.

After the informed presenters came in we had a lot more information and we could understand both sides rather than just attacking the media. We could analyse the situation a bit better and come up with more realistic recommendations.

– Marsha El-Khoury, Juror



I experience a lot in a different way now, I can choose my opinions. I can relate to people better. It taught me how to behave – at school we talk over each other, we don't care – now I listen to people. I think I'm more willing and open outside of school.

- Michelle El-Hage, Juror

The last day involved intensive exercises run by the facilitators to help the jurors absorb the new information, formulate ideas and ultimately draft the final recommendations.

The agenda for the youth jury is included as Appendix 5.

3.5 Outcomes

The recommendations

The youth jury came up with the following recommendations in answer to the charge: *The media adversely influences people's views about different cultures affecting perceptions of Australia as a nation.*

1. The introduction of 'life-long' learning programs to educate journalists and media professionals in reporting on multicultural issues.
2. Circulation throughout the general public of fact sheets describing how individuals can contact the media.
3. That workshops be made available for members of the general public to attend in order to learn more about media strategy and goals.
4. That government at the Federal and State levels provide/s a commitment to ensure that the wider public are aware of differences in culture and their effect on lifestyles.
5. Promoting the 'social responsibility' of the media through more balanced and accurate media coverage of stories involving different cultural groups.
6. The need for greater enforcement and incentives for journalists to adhere to guidelines regarding reporting of issues with reference to cultural backgrounds.
7. More incentives for media organisations to adhere to guidelines designed to monitor the use of negative material regarding different cultural groups.
8. The need for media to make clear, formal apologies in the case of erroneous reporting.
9. The formation of a body of youth within each suburb or region specifically established to address issues of importance to cultural harmony within the community.

Underpinning the recommendations developed by the youth jury was a belief that there should be open channels of communication between the media and the wider community, so as to increase the capacity for better communication in both directions.

The detailed recommendations, which include background and suggestions for implementation, are included in Appendix 7.



Evaluation

The independent evaluation was carried out by a student from Dr Carson's class. He was assisted by a mentor who helped him develop an evaluation plan and the research tools necessary to carry out the evaluation, including questionnaires used at the end of each introductory session and each day of the youth jury. The evaluator attended all sessions of the youth jury except for one of the introductory days, and made his own observations about the process. He did not participate in the project team or interact closely with participants, except during breaks, which was important in dispelling the image of a mystery man at the back of the room always watching and writing!

After the youth jury, the evaluator interviewed key members of the project team to find out their impressions of the process and what they would do differently next time. He also interviewed some of the jurors after the youth jury. His evaluation report is included in Appendix 8.

Communicating the recommendations

Parra Youth Matters launched its recommendations at a public forum on 23rd September 2003. The forum was attended by representatives from local community organisations, Parramatta City Council, Federal and State government bodies and media organisations. The jurors attended, along with their families, friends and school teachers. Two of the informed presenters were also able to attend.

The youth jury project manager opened the forum. The Hon. Ross Cameron, Federal Member for Parramatta, spoke about the youth jury's role in the community and presented the jurors with certificates for participating in Australia's first youth jury.

Three jurors spoke about their expectations of the youth jury, their experiences, and their hopes at the end. One of the informed presenters, Thao Nguyen, Youth Chair of the Ethnic Communities Council of NSW, also spoke highly of her involvement in the process. All attendees received a preliminary copy of the youth jury report, which contains the youth jury's recommendations.

The second part of the forum was highly interactive, with the aim of obtaining the views of people who were attending. We used a deliberative process called Speed Dialogue³, in which the attendees divided into six groups. Each group engaged in a brief discussion with a pair of jurors about one recommendation and the practical actions that could be taken to support it. After ten minutes, all six groups of attendees moved to another pair of jurors to discuss a different recommendation and this rotation continued until all attendees had listened to all jurors.

The Speed Dialogue process demonstrated the jurors' capacity to think on their feet, explain their ideas and engage with other people's ideas. In addition, it gave attendees an appreciation of deliberative democracy and the youth jury. Some of these attendees subsequently offered to support the youth jury recommendations. The information we gathered in this process was posted on the Parra Youth Matters' website and mailed to all those who attended the public forum.

³ Based on the World Café method. For further information visit the website <http://www.theworldcafe.com/about.html>



The public forum worked well because it brought forward from both sides activities and actions and suggestions that could be put in place. This underlined that the youth had hit upon things that really matter.

- Warren Duncan, Expert Witness, Media Officer at Community Relations Commission for a Multicultural NSW

Ordinarily it is not the role of a youth or citizens' jury project team (or of the jurors themselves) to do anything other than make recommendations. In the Parra Youth Matters youth jury, the process itself was successful and empowering for the young people involved.

However being an Australian-first heightens the importance of this pilot project. We believed that the jurors should play a direct role in communicating the recommendations to relevant stakeholders. Therefore the project team made a commitment to play a mentoring role for the jurors (and other community members) to support and encourage them to promote the recommendations.

An important learning experience for us was that implementing recommendations is an entirely new project with high demands on time and resources. Ideally, we planned to capitalise on interest in the project by running interviews and meetings with those people and organisations that supported us, with a view to gaining their support on specific activities. However in reality, we were faced with limited resources and time to embark on a major follow-up program.

For follow-up actions to be truly effective, a youth jury planning team needs to factor the time and resources into the project planning right from the beginning. In the end, we decided not to continue with the mentoring project because of these limitations and the fact that the jurors wished to move on to other activities.

The process is good and just and well thought out. From the initial goals to the final outcome it was brilliant. It would be good to develop a working party to implement the recommendations so it doesn't get tied up on a politician's desk.

- Darren Reader, Young Person Worker at Nicholii College

The jurors, along with those young people that applied for the youth jury but were not randomly selected, were given examples of other local projects and opportunities that they could participate in. Parramatta City Council's Youth Development Worker, Matt Roberts has informed the jurors and other young people about the Parramatta Youth Advisory Committee and some of the work it does with Council.



In February 2003 members of the project team and some of the jurors met with the Premier of New South Wales, the Hon. Bob Carr and Tanya Gadiel, the State MP for Parramatta, to discuss their project. Both politicians were impressed and the Premier agreed to encourage his Youth Advisory Council to examine the project and to see how it could be applied in other parts of NSW.

In March 2004 the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2, based in Denver, Colorado), presented the PYM youth jury project with a Special Recognition Award in IAP2's Project of the Year category. The project team was invited to give a presentation about the youth jury project in the association's annual conference *Wisdom of Voices*. Two of the team travelled to Madison, Wisconsin, to receive the award, having received financial assistance from the NSW Premier's Department.

Members of the project team have been asked to make numerous presentations about the youth jury to local and state government organisations, university groups and private organisations that focus on youth relations and also community building.



Australia's "first ever" youth jurors

3.6 Lessons and reflections

We learned some key lessons in the process of running Australia's first youth jury.

Jurors must attend the whole program

A golden rule is that jury members must be able to attend every introductory session and each day of the youth jury. During our youth jury a couple of jurors missed an introductory session and a day of the youth jury. When they returned, the jury had advanced in terms of its thinking, feelings and ideas. The jurors who had been absent held up the process and the group became frustrated as a result.

Break up the jury process

Our jurors were tired by the third day. Due to the intensive deliberations involved in a youth jury, we suggest a day's break between youth jury day two and day three. This will give the jurors time to absorb all the information they have heard, relax their minds, and form better arguments in regards to the charge. All this will help improve formation of the recommendations on the final day.



Distinguish introductory events from the formal jury

It's important to make a distinction between the informal introductory sessions and the formal youth jury. This helps keep the jury focused during the intense deliberations that take place during the youth jury, and also adds variety. Having a formal opening of the youth jury, where dignitaries, media, stakeholders, friends, family, and the public are invited helps the jurors feel that their activities are worthwhile.

Model good team work and democratic principles

The quality of work and relationships within the project team is crucial to the success of the youth jury. Our team always listened to each another and gave constructive criticism. We looked for help if we got stuck but always took initiative when we could. We had fun together. We practised the principles of deliberative democracy. This was important not only in our enjoyment of the project, but in our ability to model behaviour and ideals to the youth jurors.

Make the jurors feel comfortable

Helping jurors feel comfortable requires good attention to detail and organisational skill. On the second day of the youth jury we were late setting up the room and ended up arguing in front of the jurors about the practical details. This made us look unprofessional and created some tension at the start of the day. Having details taken care of, playing music and playing games at the start of each day all help to establish a professional, comfortable atmosphere.

Recognise and value the contributions of the jurors

It is important that the jurors are always congratulated and rewarded for the work they do. We regularly handed (or threw) lollies to jurors who had achieved something. This simple action helped more self-conscious jurors to open up and feel like they were important to the group. We also handed out certificates of appreciation to all jurors for taking part in the youth jury.

Plan for what comes after the jury

In hindsight we wish we'd developed an exit strategy for the jurors to help nurture their great enthusiasm for getting involved in the community. After becoming friends during the youth jury and feeling privileged to help their community, they wanted opportunities to continue working on community projects. However due to our other commitments (like university study and paid employment) we were unable to spend the time creating such an exit strategy. Such a strategy could be organised before the youth jury takes place and could include sourcing information from community organisations about what help they need from youth or what youth projects are up and coming, so that interested jurors can take up other opportunities.



Part four. Conclusion.

We all went in with the aim of bettering the community by influencing policy making. However over the course of the project there is so much more that a youth jury has to offer. Most importantly I think that the youth jury provides opportunities and challenges that young people rarely experience.

- Chris Sargant, PYM Coordinator

Youth juries are an innovative development of the citizens' jury concept and we sincerely hope that this handbook helps this method of community consultation to grow and flourish.

A youth jury has many advantages over traditional youth consultation processes. The random selection process encourages young people to participate who may never have thought about taking part in a political or community activity before.

The process incorporates the interests and opinions of businesses, community organisations, and other stakeholders with a group of young people. This is extremely important for seeing the recommendations put in place, as decision-makers can understand the process and, therefore, also appreciate how deeply considered the recommendations are.

The jurors themselves have the opportunity to make leaps in their personal development. They learn new things and express new feelings and ideas in new ways. Confidence, trust and friendships develop. The youth jury processes and the behaviour modelled by the facilitators have a big impact on the jurors. The process also motivates jurors so much that many of them want to continue assisting their community by taking part in other projects.

We ran the youth jury with little direct experience in this process. Although it was fun it was also extremely tiring! The advice of our mentors was invaluable and they often reminded us to 'let go and enjoy'. They meant that it's important to have a process planned, but to acknowledge that things will always happen which change the plan; we needed to be relaxed enough and confident enough to change direction. We had to learn to trust the process. We had to be prepared, but also keep our hearts and minds open.

We could sit there and think about it freely, no constraints at all, and say what we thought. Everyone was working together on the same goal. When we finished the recommendations – everyone cheered – it felt like we'd achieved something and made a difference and that we were a part of the first ever youth jury in Australia's history – and we've set the foundation for future youth juries.

- Michael Yuen, Juror





Part five.

Resources for youth juries and citizens' juries.

Authors of this book

You are welcome to contact the authors of this handbook via Lyn Carson:
<l.carson@econ.usyd.edu.au>.

Youth juries and youth participation

Books and reports

Cambridge City Council 2000, 'Submission to the IPPR/The Guardian Involvement Awards Panel', Cambridge City Council.

Edwards, L 2001, *Politics not parties: Young people and political engagement – Findings from a series of discussion groups with young people*, Institute for Public Policy Research, London.

Foster, J 2001, 'Framing youth participation in the twenty-first century or 'Missing the wood for the trees'', in J Foster & K Naidoo (eds), *Young people at the centre: participation and social change*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London.

Institute for Public Policy Research 2001, *Involving young people in decision-making: a survey of local authorities*, Local Government Association, London.

Kennedy, K & Mellor, S 2000, *Reviving civics education for a new agenda in Australia: the contribution of the IEA study*, web-site accessed 4 November 2002:
<http://www.canberra.edu.au/civics/papers/reviving_civics.html>.

NSW Commission for Children & Young People 2002, *Participation: Sharing the stage*, NSW Government, Sydney.

Save the Children 2000, *Local and vocal: Promoting young people's involvement in local decision-making, an overview and planning guide*, Save the Children, London.

Save the Children 2000, *Young people as researchers: A learning resource pack*, Save the Children, London.

Schemm, AV 2000, 'Enhancing adolescent engagement in learning and decision-making', briefing paper, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Nebraska.



Journal articles

Bessant, J 2003, 'Youth participation: A new mode of government', *Policy Studies*, vol. 24, no. 2/3, pp.87-100.

Brown, C 1991, 'Marginalised young people and the power of decision making', *Youth Studies Australia*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 41-46.

Burfoot, D 2003, 'Arguing for a better future: Children and young people's participation', *Youth Studies Australia*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 44-51.

Web sites

Democratic Dialogue 2000, *The future of selection: the verdict of a young citizen's jury on 11+*, Conflict Archive on the Internet, Londonderry, <<http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/dd/papers/citizens.htm>>.

- This page provides access to the findings of Democratic Dialogue, a Belfast-based think tank, of a 'young citizens' jury' they conducted in 2000 with randomly selected year-12 students in Northern Ireland.

Institute for Youth, Education, and Families 2002, *Promoting youth participation: Issue 3*, National League of Cities, Washington, D.C., <www.nlc.org/nlc_org/site/files/reports/promoting.pdf>.

- This is an action kit designed to assist municipal leaders in facilitating youth participation in areas including education, youth development, early childhood development, the safety of children and youth and family economic security.

Oxfam Community Aid Abroad 2004, *Oxfam International Youth Parliament*, Oxfam Community Aid Abroad, Melbourne, <<http://www.iyp.oxfam.org/index.html>>.

- The Oxfam International Youth Parliament brings together young leaders from over 150 countries around the world and assists those young people in developing and implementing viable action plans to further social justice.

Parramatta City Council 2002, *ParraKidsMatta FAQs*, Parramatta City Council, Sydney, <http://www.parracity.nsw.gov.au/faq/kids_index.html>.

- This portal is designed for children and young adults as a source of resources that may be useful to young people, including recommended reading lists and tips for researching school projects.

Parra Youth Matters

- The website maintained by the authors of this handbook can be accessed via <<http://www.hydra.org.au/parrayouth/pym.html>>.

Youth and Community Education Service 2002, *Young People's Citizens' Juries*, Leicestershire County Council, Leicester, <http://www.leics.gov.uk/education/youth_community/youthwork/citjury.htm>.

Youth News 2003, *Youth Democracy Online!*, Infoxchange Australia, Melbourne, <http://www.youth.infoxchange.net.au/featured_news/items/2003/12/00002.shtml>.

- This page provides information about the development of a student virtual parliament, an initiative of the peak European student body OBESSU and Student Virtual Parliament. A feature of the parliament is an online opinion market where students post and vote on opinions – creating a live youth opinion poll.
-



Citizens' juries and citizen participation

Books and reports

Atlee, T 2003, *The Tao of Democracy: Using co-intelligence to create a world that works for all*, The Writer's Collective, Cranston.

Carson, L & Martin, B 1999, *Random selection in politics*, Praeger, Westport.

Carson, L (ed.) 2003, Consult your community—Handbook. A guide to using citizens' juries, prepared for PlanningNSW, Department of Infrastructure, Planning, and Natural Resources, Sydney, <http://www.iplan.nsw.gov.au/engagement/stories/docs/cj_handbook.pdf>.

Carson, L (ed.) 2003, Consult your community—Handbook. A guide to using the residents' feedback register, prepared for PlanningNSW, Department of Infrastructure, Planning, and Natural Resources, Sydney, <http://www.iplan.nsw.gov.au/engagement/stories/docs/carson_handbook.pdf>.

Carson, L & Gelber, K 2001, Ideas for community consultation: A discussion on principles and procedures for making consultation work, NSW Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, Sydney, <<http://www.iplan.nsw.gov.au/engagement/stories/docs/ideasforconsult.pdf>>.

Coote, A & Lenaghan, J 1997, *Citizens' juries: Theory into practice*, Institute for Public Policy Research, London.

Crosby, N 2003, *Healthy Democracy: Empowering a clear and informed voice of the people*, Beaver's Pond Press, Edina.

Crosby, N 1999, 'Using the citizens jury process for environmental decision making', in K Sexton, AA Marcus, KW Easter & TD Burkhardt (eds.), *Better environmental decisions. Strategies for governments, business and communities*, Island Press, Washington D.C.

Delap, C 1998, *Making better decisions*, Report on an IPPR Symposium on citizens' juries and other methods of public involvement, Institute for Public Policy Research, London.

Font, J (ed.) 2003, *Public participation and local governance*, Institut de Ciències Polítiques i Socials, Barcelona.

Gastil, J 2000, *By popular demand: Revitalizing representative democracy through deliberative elections*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Inglis, G 2000, *A guide to citizen market research in local government*, vols 1, 2 & 3, Local Government and Shires Associations of NSW, Sydney.



Manning, B, Matisone, S, & Romslo, J 1997, Jefferson Center's citizens' jury handbook, Jefferson Center, Minneapolis.

Moyer, B 2001, *Doing Democracy: The MAP model for organizing social movements*, New Society Publishers, Gabriola Island.

Rebick, J 2000, *Imagine Democracy*, Stoddart, Toronto.

Renn, O, Webler, T & Wiedemann, P 1995, *Fairness and competence in citizen participation. Evaluating models for environmental discourse*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.

Journal articles

Aldred, J & Jacobs, M 2000, 'Citizens and wetlands: evaluating the Ely citizens' jury', *Ecological Economics*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 217-232.

Bostwick, M 1999, 'Twelve angry citizens: Can citizens' juries improve local democracy in New Zealand?', *Political Science*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 236-246.

Brown, C 1997, 'Greater democracy, better decisions', *Consumer Policy Review*, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 170-173.

Brown, TC, Peterson, GL & Tonn, BE 1995, 'The values jury to aid natural resource decisions', *Land Economics*, vol. 71, pp. 250-260.

Carson, L, White, S, Hendriks, C & Palmer, J 2002, 'Community Consultation in Environmental Policy Making', *The Drawing Board: An Australian Review of Public Affairs*, vol. 3, no. 1, July, <<http://www.econ.usyd.edu.au/drawingboard/journal/0207/carson.html>>.

Carson, L 1994, 'The jury is IN: Parent juries as an empowerment tool in education', *Community Quarterly*, vol. 33, pp. 18-20.

Carson, L 1998, 'Random selection in consultation and participation', *Community Quarterly*, vol. 47, pp. 68-76.

Crosby, N 1990, 'The peace movement and new democratic processes', *Social Alternatives*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 33-37.

Crosby, N, Kelly, JM & Schaefer, P 1986, 'Citizens panels: A new approach to citizen participation', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 170-178.

Lenaghan, J 1999, 'Involving the public in rationing decisions. The experience of citizens juries', *Health Policy*, vol. 49, no. 1-2, pp. 45-61.



Monbiot, G & Carson, L 2003, 'Global governance and deliberative designs', *The Drawing Board: An Australian Review of Public Affairs*, 22 December, <<http://www.econ.usyd.edu.au/drawingboard/digest/0312/monbiot.html>>.

Pickard, S 1998, 'Citizenship and consumerism in health care: A critique of citizens' juries', *Social Policy & Administration*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 226-244.

Price, D 2000, 'Choices without reasons: citizens' juries and policy evaluation', *Journal of Medical Ethics*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 272-276.

Smith, G & Wales, C 1999, 'The theory and practice of citizens' juries', *Policy and Politics*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 295-308.

Smith, G & Wales, C 2000, 'Citizens' Juries and Deliberative Democracy', *Political Studies*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 51-65.

Williams, D 1998, 'Rekindling democracy in local government', *Local Government Management*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 22-25.

Web sites

Active Democracy

<<http://www.hydra.org.au/activedemocracy/>>

- Website providing access to information on citizen participation in decision-making. Maintained by Lyn Carson, University of Sydney.

Citizen Science Toolbox

<<http://www.coastal.crc.org.au/toolbox/index.asp>>

- A portal linking to tools to assist in the development and enhancement of stakeholder participation in decision-making.

Community Builders NSW

<<http://www.communitybuilders.nsw.gov.au/>>

- A clearinghouse of resources relating to community level social, economic and environmental renewal including on the issues of regional NSW, crime prevention and drugs.

Deliberative Democracy Consortium

<<http://www.deliberative-democracy.net/>>

- The webpage of a network of organisations which are working to renew democracy through citizen participation and deliberation and through their research initiatives in the area of deliberative democracy.
-



The Jefferson Center

<http://www.jefferson-center.org/citizens_jury.htm#what>

- The US organisation that developed the citizens' jury process. Includes descriptions and explanations of the citizens' jury process.

Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR)

<<http://www.ippr.org.uk>>

- Independent think-tank in the UK that seeks to contribute to public understanding of important public issues through research, discussion and various publications.

International Association for Public Participation (IAP2)

<<http://www.iap2.org/>>

- An association of members that seeks to promote and improve the practice of public participation in relation to individuals, governments, institutions, and other entities that affect the public interest in nations throughout the world. Very little on citizens' juries but an interesting association for those interested in citizen participation.

National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation

<<http://www.thataway.org/>>

- A coalition of organisations and individuals who are concerned with strengthening deliberative democracy. The site fosters dialogue between the organisation's members and provides some information on deliberative democratic initiatives.

NSW Commission for Children and Young People

<<http://www.kids.nsw.gov.au/ourwork/participation.html>>

- The participation page of the NSW Commission for Children and Young People's site provides information on participatory opportunities, examples of participation in practice, and links to resources to facilitate research into participation.
-



Appendix 1

Parra Youth Matters: Invitation to participate (A)

Youth Jury Participation Form

Talkin' Culture, Thinkin' Youth



Parra Youth Matters

"IT'S A NEW WAY FOR YOUNG PEOPLE TO SAY WHAT THEY THINK ABOUT CULTURAL DIVERSITY, AND WHAT THEY WANT DONE TO MAKE IT WORK BETTER."

Do you live, study or work in the Parramatta City Council area? Will you be 16 or 17 years of age in July 2003? If so, you can be one of Australia's first Youth Jurors. To enter your name, fill in the participation form on the back of this page.

A world first event, only for the youth of Parramatta.

- The Parra Youth Matters Youth Jury is a new project organised and run by young people. It will run from the 14th-16th of July from 10am-3pm, with 3 short Introductory Youth Jury Events will be in May and June.
- It's not a criminal jury, as there are no lawyers or judges. The findings of the Youth Jury are completely decided by the young people who are in it.
- Basically the Youth Jurors look at information, ask questions to expert witnesses, and talk to each other about what they've heard.
- By sharing their views and resolving differences, the Youth Jury will create a Report that all Jurors are willing to support.
- The Youth Jury's Report has been requested by government organisations, the media, and Parramatta community organisations.

"WE DON'T CARE ABOUT YOUR GRADES, SKILLS, LOOKS - YOU ARE IMPORTANT!!!"

What do YOU get as a JUROR!!!

Media Coverage, meals/transport costs covered, free entertainment events, keep all the materials you use, learn about Australia's political processes and
Get a Certificate of Participation in Australia's first Youth Jury.

ALL WE'RE LOOKING FOR IS A YOUTH JURY THAT HAS A SIMILAR MIX OF YOUNG PEOPLE AS THE PARRAMATTA COMMUNITY. WE WILL RANDOMLY SELECT 16 YOUTH JURORS IN ORDER TO OBTAIN THIS MIX.

GIVE IT A GO!
www.parrayouthmatters.org.au



Parra Youth Matters: Invitation to participate (B)

Youth Jury Participation Form

Name: _____	Home address: _____
Phone number: _____	_____
Email: _____	_____

1. What age will you be in July 2003? _____

2. Sex: Male Female

3. (a) What country were you born in?

(b) What countries were your parents born in?

4. What is your family's religious background?
(Please tick one)

- Buddhism Christianity Hinduism Islam Judaism
 No religion
 Other religion: _____

5. Are you studying in the Parramatta area? Yes No

If Yes, what is the name of your educational institution?

6. Do you have a full-time job in the Parramatta area? Yes No

7. The Youth Jurors will come from a range of cultural and religious backgrounds.

Are you willing to work co-operatively with a diverse group of people?

Yes No

8. Your opinions will be fundamental to the Youth Jury.

Are you happy for some of your ideas to be used (anonymously) in the Youth Jury Report that will be presented to the Government?... → Yes No

Please note: If you are selected to participate in the Youth Jury, you'll need to get permission from your parent or guardian to attend the Youth Jury and the pre-Jury training events. Specific dates will be announced soon. Closing dates for forms is 16th May.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

"The Youth Jury project is backed by the University of Sydney and Southern Cross University, and proudly funded by the Commonwealth Government's Living in Harmony initiative. For more information, visit www.immi.gov.au/harmony. The project is also supported by Parramatta City Council, the NSW Department of Education, and many Parramatta community organizations"



The University of Sydney



council for
multicultural
australia



Appendix 2

Parra Youth Matters: Terms of reference for project steering committee

As specified in the funding contract agreed between the University of Sydney and the Commonwealth Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA), a Steering Committee of key stakeholders from the Parramatta region is to be formed to oversight the conduct of the Parra Youth Matters' youth jury project.

Members of the Parra Youth Matters' project steering committee agree to undertake the following activities in support of the project, in a manner consistent with the DIMIA 'Living in Harmony' program objectives:

With respect to the conduct of the youth jury and associated pre-event training activities, the steering committee will provide guidance to the project team on:

- the selection of expert witnesses to appear before the jury panellists;
- the format, content and style of presentations to be provided by the expert witnesses;
- the format, content and style of briefing material prepared for the jury panellists; and
- any technical issue associated with the conduct of the youth jury that has not been satisfactorily resolved by the project team's internal management processes with a view to ensuring an appropriate balance of the potentially divergent views that are presented to the panellists, and maintaining the credibility of the project team as an independent facilitator of the youth jury project.

With respect to the contractual arrangements between the University of Sydney and DIMIA, the steering committee will provide guidance on the project team's preparation and clearance of:

- the Interim Report to DIMIA on the progress of the project team in conducting the youth jury and its associated events;
- the Final Evaluation Report to DIMIA focusing on the project's achievement of agreed performance indicators specified in the contract;
- all audited financial reports requested by DIMIA, and prepared by the University of Sydney on behalf of the project team;

with a view to ensuring that the project is conducted in accordance with the terms specified in the DIMIA contract, and reflecting sound project management practices.

With respect to the project team's publicity and media events, the steering committee members – while not being spokespersons for the project team – also agree to:

- attend (or facilitate representation from their organisations) project related publicity activities, where this is deemed appropriate by their respective organisations;
- assist the project team in the promotion of the project amongst local stakeholders, where this is deemed appropriate by their respective organisations;

with a view to ensuring that the project receives the highest possible profile within the Parramatta community.



Appendix 3

Parra Youth Matters: Random selection methods

This paper explains the principles and procedures used to select the youth jurors for the Parra Youth Matters' (PYM) youth jury; i.e. selecting 17 youth jurors from 73 applicants.

The selection process outlined below is known as stratified random selection. We chose this method because we wanted a selection method that was fair, objective and unbiased. Randomness meant that every applicant had an equal opportunity to be selected. This process was complemented by the use of a demographic profile for the youth jury to ensure that it reflected the diversity of the Parramatta community. For example, if the census data showed that 12.5% of the population in the Parramatta region was of Middle Eastern origin, we wanted to reflect this 12.5% in the make up of the jury.

1. Demographic representativeness

The legitimacy of the youth jury process and the validity of its recommendations were critically contingent upon the extent that youth jurors were representative of the broader community. As the purpose of the youth jury was to discuss issues of cultural diversity from the perspective of young people, the salient demographic features were the applicants' ancestry, their educational background and gender. These demographic features will be discussed in turn.

1.1 Ancestry

The term ancestry was used to capture broader concepts of ethnicity, nationality and/or cultural diversity. The ancestry of each applicant was derived from an examination of their place of birth and their parents' place of birth. Place of birth as an indicator of ancestry anchors the concept in geographical terms. It has the benefits of being easily reported in an application form and readily compared with statistical population data. The various ancestral groups were derived from the geographical regions used in the 2001 ABS Census. The proportion of jurors belonging to each ancestral group was also derived from census data for the Parramatta LGA (see Table 1 below).

Table 1: Ancestral groups and the corresponding number of jurors required from each group.

Ancestral group	Number of jurors required
Oceania	4
North East Asia	2
North Africa/Middle East	2
South/Central Asia	1
North West Europe	5
South East Asia	1
South/East Europe	2
Not stated	1



1.2 Educational background

The next significant demographic feature was educational background. A representative distribution of youth jurors reflecting a mix of such backgrounds was necessary to gain a range of perspectives from young people in the Parramatta region. Educational background referred to the type of school each 16 or 17-year-old applicant attended, if enrolled in full-time education. Educational background was based on the following census based categories: government school; non-government school and Catholic school. If the applicant was not engaged in study in the Parramatta area, but lived in the area, they were allocated to the “Other” category, which was also accounted for in the census. This category represented a miscellany of situations: for example, the other category could refer to young people who were working or unemployed, or those studying outside of Parramatta.

Table 2: Educational backgrounds and the corresponding number of jurors required from each educational background.

Educational background	Number of jurors required
Government school	10
Catholic school	5
Other non-government school	1
Other	2

1.3 Gender

Gender was the third critical demographic feature. The aspiration was for the number of youth jurors to be equal by sex. Ideally, nine female and nine male youth jurors would be selected once the representative proportions based on ancestry and educational/work background were satisfied.

1.4 Exclusion criteria

Some applicants were excluded from the selection process for one or both of the following two reasons:

1. Did not fall within the age bracket 16-17 years old as at 14 July 2003.
2. Did not study in the Parramatta area and also did not live in the Parramatta area.

2. Selection process

A randomised list of all applicants was created using an Excel spreadsheet. Youth jurors were selected by moving down the randomised list of applicants from the top. Each successive applicant was selected to be a youth juror, unless there were already sufficient youth jurors from that ancestry (as defined in Table 1 above). This was to ensure that no ancestry was over-represented on the youth jury.

Once all types of ancestries were adequately represented in the youth jury, replacements on the basis of educational background were made. If one category of educational background was over-represented, then the last juror to be selected from that educational background was



replaced. The replacement was carried out by moving down from the top of the original randomised list, and selecting the first available applicant who had the same ancestry but a different educational background to the individual being replaced. This process of replacements was repeated until no educational background was over-represented on the youth jury. The nature of the process ensured that the distribution of ancestries on the youth jury was unaffected.

Next, replacements on the basis of gender were made. If one gender was over-represented, then the last juror of that gender to be selected was replaced. The replacement was carried out by moving down from the top of the original randomised list, and selecting the first available applicant who had the same ancestry and educational background to the individual being replaced, but was of the opposite gender. Ideally this process of replacements is repeated until both genders were equally represented on the youth jury. However, with PYM there were many more female applicants than males. Achieving a diversity of schools was considered to be a more important characteristic than gender.

Finally, an attempt was made to maximise the number of schools represented on the youth jury. This was intended to reduce the chances of any school missing out altogether from the youth jury process, and increase the set of school stakeholders directly affected by the youth jury. It was also intended to avoid the scenario of several youth jurors from the same school conglomerating and thus hindering deliberations amongst all youth jurors. If more than two jurors attended the same school, then we attempted to replace one of them with an applicant from a different school who had the same ancestry, educational background and gender.

3. Backup jurors

When the 18 selected jurors were contacted to confirm their participation, a small number could not be contacted or were unable to participate. The same replacement process outlined above was used to select backup jurors. The replacement was carried out by moving down from the top of the original randomised list, and selecting the first available applicant who had the same ancestry, educational background and gender as the individual being replaced. Due to the relatively small number of applicants it was often not possible to find backup jurors with matching ancestry, educational background and gender.

4. Outcome of the selection process

The selection process, including the selection of backup jurors, resulted in a final sample of 17 jurors. The various ancestries were adequately represented, with the exception of North Western European (see discussion below). The various education backgrounds were adequately represented. Females were over-represented in the final sample, because female applicants outnumbered male applicants by two to one, and also because gender was the lowest priority criterion when carrying out replacements.



5. Shortcomings of the selection process

The major shortcoming of the selection process was the ascription of ancestry on the basis of place of birth and parents' place of birth. These statistics were only able to give a very crude indication of ancestry. This was most apparent in the case of North Western European ancestry. None of the applicants were deemed to have North Western European ancestry⁵. Judging from their surnames, several applicants were Anglo-Saxon Australians but were classified as Oceanian ancestry rather than North Western European. It would be a matter for further investigation to determine which ancestry each individual identified themselves with. This would be complicated by the age bracket of the applicants, characterised as a period of identity formation.

6. Conclusion

The selection method is fundamental to a youth jury and should be as random as possible, whilst maximising diversity. The democratic role of the youth jury hinges upon gathering together a sample of jurors who are demographically representative of the broader community. Thus demographic representativeness by reference to salient demographic features of ancestry, educational background and gender was the over-arching principle. This principle was implemented using a process of random selection to ensure objectively fair and unbiased selection of the jurors.

⁵In order to be classified as North Western European, an applicant needed to either:

(i) have both parents born in a North Western European country; or (ii) be born in a North Western European country and have one parent born in a North Western European country.



Appendix 4

Parra Youth Matters: Responsibilities of youth jurors

Responsibilities prior to the youth jury

The tasks of youth jurors before the event are to:

- complete a participation form and a youth opinion survey;
- complete a questionnaire about personal expectations about the event;
- participate in three introductory sessions leading up to the youth jury;
- be involved in activities to improve the skills that will make youth jurors more effective;
- discuss the roles of youth jurors in this list, and suggest what could be added or changed;
- make a group decision about the set of ground rules that all youth jurors must follow;
- make a group decision about what the charge for the youth jury will be, based upon personal preferences and the results of youth and community surveys;
- give suggestions to the project team about how to improve the draft plan for the youth jury process;
- read background briefs on the charge, and ask questions if something doesn't make sense; make a note of anything that doesn't match your own experiences; and
- notify the project team if any further background information is required.

Responsibilities during the youth jury

During the event, youth jurors have the following tasks:

- attend youth jury sessions over three days;
 - participate in small group deliberations;
 - express own views and opinions, based upon personal experience and reading of background briefs;
 - think about the views and opinions of other youth jurors;
 - respect differences in opinion, and make suggestions for compromise;
 - decide upon critical questions to ask the expert witnesses;
 - take turns asking questions to expert witnesses;
 - listen to presentations by expert witnesses in response to questions;
 - participate in small group deliberations based on what the expert witnesses said;
 - make suggestions about possible solutions to the charge, and listen to suggestions by other youth jurors;
-



- come together as a large group to:
 - share the findings of each small group (presented by one or more members of each small group)
 - move towards a set of views and opinions about the charge that all youth jurors are willing to endorse; and
- contribute to the creation of recommendations about what the youth jury believes are the issues and the solutions. These recommendations form the basis of the youth jury report.

Responsibilities after the youth jury

After the event is completed, youth jurors have the following tasks:

- participate in the final press conference where the recommendations of the youth jury will be presented;
 - be photographed as a group;
 - be interviewed and be individually photographed for the media;
 - complete a questionnaire about personal satisfaction with the youth jury event;
 - complete a youth opinion survey about cultural diversity in the Parramatta area; and
 - (optional) be involved in promoting the youth jury's recommendations, to help turn them into reality.
-



Appendix 5

Parra Youth Matters: Youth jury agenda

Day 1

10:00 - 10:40	Formal opening.
10:40 - 11:30	Morning tea.
11:30 - 11:40	Welcome by chairperson.
11:40 - 12:00	Refresher of the youth jury process.
12:00 - 12:55	Deliberations and formation of questions for the first speaker panel – experiences of media (small groups).
12:55 - 1:05	Agreement of questions and back-up questions (large group).
1:05 - 1:45	Lunch.
1:45 - 2:15	First presenter panel.
2:15 - 2:50	Discussion of new thoughts /perspectives (small groups).
2:50 - 3:05	Afternoon tea.
3:05 - 3:50	Identifying key ideas as a group (large group).
3:50 - 4:00	Debrief.

Day 2

10:00 - 10:15	Welcome and agenda handout.
10:15 - 10:55	Deliberations and formation of questions for the second speaker panel – experiences of media (small groups).
10:55 - 11:10	Agreement on questions and back-up questions (large group).
11:10 - 11:30	Morning tea (jurors assemble for the plenary session at 11:25).
11:30 - 12:00	Second presenter panel.
12:00 - 12:35	Discussion of new thoughts and perspectives arising from the plenary session.
12:35 - 1:05	Lunch.
1:05 - 1:55	Deliberations and formation of questions for the third speaker panel of academics (large group).
1:55 - 2:05	Review of questions and deliberations (large group).
2:05 - 2:35	Third presenter panel.
2:35 - 2:50	Afternoon tea.
2:50 - 3:05	Personal reflection.
3:05 - 3:40	Braindump.
3:40 - 4:00	Debrief.

Day 3

10:00 - 10:10	Welcome and agenda handout.
10:10 - 10:25	Walk through of the youth jury report and the recommendations process.
10:25 - 10:55	Recommendations process 1: challenging the 'charge' (small groups).
10:55 - 11:10	Morning tea.
11:10 - 12:20	Recommendations process 2: confirming problems with the 'charge' (large group).
12:20 - 12:50	Lunch.
12:50 - 2:10	Recommendations process 3: creating and confirming solutions for problems raised (large group).
2:10 - 2:25	Afternoon tea.
2:25 - 3:10	Recommendation process 3 continued.
3:10 - 3:40	Evaluation.
3:40 - 4:00	Debrief and close.



Appendix 6

Parra Youth Matters: Expert witnesses

Panel session 1 – cultural and ethnic organisations

Warren Duncan

Community Relations Commission for a Multicultural NSW

A career journalist who worked for ABC in radio and television for 15 years. This included six years as a political correspondent in Canberra and three and half years as a foreign correspondent in China. He also worked for another ten years as a freelance correspondent in South America, England and Spain for the ABC, BBC, CBC, the American Networks, the Sydney Morning Herald and Canberra Times. For the last 15 years he has worked as a media officer with the Community Relations Commission which is responsible for the promotion and maintenance of community harmony in NSW.

Thao Nguyen

Youth Representative, Ethnic Communities Council of NSW

Thao has been involved as a volunteer with the Ethnic Communities Council (ECC) of NSW and finishing a law degree at the University of Sydney. The ECC is a non-government peak body representing thousands of people from ethnic communities throughout the state. It operates on a voluntary basis and its primary roles are advocacy, education and community development. It actively promotes the principles of multiculturalism, and is involved in developing strategies regarding the most important issues to touch ethnic communities. Thao has also been involved with youth and community forums in the Blacktown area. The media is an issue that has been raised several times in her discussion with young people.

Panel session 2 – media organisations

Liz Skelton

General Manager, Streetwize Communications

Liz has 10 years experience working within the youth and community sector at a management level, most notably as founder and manager of a national young people's peer education drug information service in Scotland and manager of a youth social marketing organisation in the UK. Liz has been general manager of Streetwize Communications since April 2000. Liz has managed national youth projects on a range of issues as diverse as Hepatitis C, reconciliation, youth depression, car theft and refugees.



Streetwize Communications is a not for profit national organisation which undertakes research and develops resources targeting young people who are disadvantaged and 'hard to reach'. The aim of Streetwize is to provide young people with credible information on social, health and legal issues so they can make informed choices about issues which affect their lives.

Miranda Wood

Education Writer, *The Sun Herald*

Miranda writes about education issues affecting young people for the *Sun Herald*. The *Sun Herald* is a Sunday paper published by John Fairfax Holdings, which is Australia's leading publishing group and also publishes *The Sydney Morning Herald*, *The Age*, *The Australian Financial Review*, and internet publishing (amongst other things). Miranda has also written about lifestyle issues, entertainment and popular culture.

Roger Coombs

Managing Editor, *The Daily Telegraph*

Roger Coombs is the managing editor of *The Daily Telegraph*, a newspaper owned by News Corporation, which also owns many other media outlets in Australia, including *The Australian* newspaper, Foxtel, and the *Parramatta Advertiser*. Overseas it owns media outlets such as *The Times*, *The New York Post*, and *The Sun*. According to *The Daily Telegraph* website: 'Every day more than 411,000 people buy a copy of *The Daily Telegraph*. And it's read by more than 1.1 million people! What makes *The Daily Telegraph* so popular with all types of people right across the State? Our emphasis is on news, delivered with accuracy and relevance. We focus on Sydney with a studied balance of national and international news. Our coverage is always relevant, favouring substance over sensationalism as we cover life in all its colour'.

Panel session 3 – academic institutions

Dr Wendy Bacon

Associate Professor in Journalism, Australian Centre for Independent Journalism, University of Technology, Sydney (UTS)

Wendy Bacon is a journalist, non-practising lawyer and an academic. She has been involved in teaching journalism at UTS for more than a decade and is currently the editor of the on line magazine *Reportage*. As part of her work for the Centre, she has been involved in projects about racism and the media and the coverage of ethnic communities by the Australian media. She is also a freelance reporter for the *Sydney Morning Herald*. She began her career as a journalist as a student editor of the University of New South Wales newspaper *Tharunka* and has been involved as an activist in many anti-censorship, resident action, women rights and prison reform movements. She won a national journalism award for an investigative feature on political corruption in NSW. She has worked as a reporter for Fairfax newspapers, *The National Times* and the *Sun Herald*, the SBS program 'Dateline' and Channel Nine's 'Sunday' program.



Dr Melissa Butcher

Researcher, Research Institute for Asia and the Pacific, University of Sydney

Melissa Butcher's research interests include globalisation, cultural change and the media, youth and popular culture. Melissa managed the GENERATE project (University of Western Sydney, 2000-2002) which looked at youth culture in Western Sydney, and worked with young people and the media to try to create more balanced media coverage. Before this she lived in India for several years researching the impact of transnational television such as MTV and Channel [V] on young people there. She began her working life as a radio producer with the Australian Broadcasting Commission (ABC) and then as a producer/presenter on community radio, both here and in Ireland. Melissa is also an intercultural trainer and travel writer.

Dr Susan Thompson

Senior Lecturer, Faculty of the Built Environment, University of New South Wales (UNSW)

Susan joined UNSW in 1991 after many years of experience in public sector planning. She worked in both state and local government in strategic and statutory planning. She teaches in the areas of local planning, social and cultural planning, qualitative methods and general urban planning issues. One of her most significant areas of research is cultural diversity. Her research has uncovered many of the ways in which local government has embraced cultural diversity. She recently started researching transnationalism and the creation of belonging as part of the settlement process. Her interest in multiculturalism extends to teaching practices in the classroom and the development of a culturally sensitive planning curriculum.



Appendix 7

Parra Youth Matters: Youth jury recommendations

Extract from the booklet *Media, culture and youth*
Recommendations from the youth jury
Coordinated by Parra Youth Matters
September 2003

Underpinning the recommendations developed by the youth jury was a belief that there should be open channels of communication between the media and the wider community, so as to increase the capacity for better communication in both directions.

Media education

Recommendation one:

That 'life-long' learning programs be introduced to educate journalists and media professionals in reporting on multicultural issues.

The problem: The youth jury found that media professionals may be limited in their capacity to accurately and sensitively report on people from different cultural groups, and sometimes this is due to a lack of knowledge about different cultural groups or skills associated with reporting on multicultural issues.

The youth jury also found that some people in the media are not aware of existing guidelines about reporting on people from different cultural backgrounds.

In response to this problem, jurors recommended that journalists be required to maintain skill levels by partaking in life-long learning courses.

Outcome: This recommendation aims to increase the number and quality of appropriate opportunities throughout the university training of media professionals, in which they are exposed to the latest theory and best practice approaches to cultural diversity reporting. Further educational opportunities should be provided for journalists throughout their career, to refresh and update their university training.



The youth jury found that existing curricula address codes of conduct for journalists; however there should be more opportunities to develop skills in cross-cultural communication. Enhancements to the educational curriculum in undergraduate communications degrees should be developed by universities in collaboration with media industry associations.

Furthermore, the establishment of a professional association and the sponsoring of formal training by media organisations, would serve to update the skills of those media professionals already immersed in the industry. In particular, their awareness of existing guidelines about reporting on people from different cultural backgrounds should be increased.

The youth jury believes that this would improve the quality of journalism now and, importantly, into the future.

Potential responsibility: To be implemented by the Australian government in collaboration with media organisations and their peak bodies.

Community education

Recommendation two:

Circulation throughout the general public of fact sheets describing how individuals can contact the media.

The problem: The youth jury discussed how there is a need for people to communicate their views to the media, in particular, how people from different cultural groups should communicate stories about the true nature of their culture.

The youth jury found that problems to do with insensitive reporting may be due to a lack of awareness amongst some media professionals about the impacts that insensitive reporting can have on communities and individuals.

The youth jury also concluded that there is a responsibility for citizens to tell media outlets when they are not satisfied with their reporting practices. However the youth jury recognised that it is often difficult for many people to contact the media and communicate their concerns. This is largely because they are not aware of the avenues that are available, and also because they may lack the skills to utilise these avenues effectively. In addition, the youth jury found that sometimes when people communicate to the media, their input is not sufficiently recognised. For example, usually only a proportion of letters to the editor are published.

Outcome: This recommendation aims to inform the general public about what avenues are available for communicating their views to the media, and how to best make use of them (see also Recommendation 9).



Potential responsibility: To be implemented by media industry associations in collaboration with the Australian government. Separate fact sheets should be produced for young people and adults, and could be translated into different languages.

Recommendation three:

That workshops be made available for members of the general public to attend in order to learn more about media strategy and goals.

The problem: The youth jury recognised that media is powerful in influencing Australians through various strategies (for example, one of the expert presenters confirmed that headlines are designed to attract the reader, thus they often include controversial material). The youth jury also understand that the goal of media is not simply to provide information, but to operate along commercial lines like all private businesses.

Outcome: The youth jury believed that by coming to an understanding of what motivates media organisations, it was better equipped to distinguish between fact and editorial opinion.

This recommendation aims to educate members of society about media strategies, goals and motivations.

The youth jury supports this because it would provide members of the general public with the skills to analyse the information presented by media.

The youth jury recommended that these workshops be trialed at the high school level because young people are the decision-makers of the future.

Potential responsibility: In the first instance, these workshops would be initiated by high schools on a trial basis, before being sponsored by the Australian government and local media outlets to be run in a community forum format.

There is also a role here for the citizen (and student) in engaging with the material provided by the workshop, and improving his or her understanding of how the media works.



Recommendation four:

That government at the Federal and State levels provide/s a commitment to ensure that the wider public are aware of differences in culture and their effect on lifestyles.

The problem: This recommendation focuses on trying to rectify the problems in society rather than the internal workings of media itself.

One of the problems identified by the youth jury was that the media's reporting of issues involving different cultural groups, influences people's views about different cultures to varying extents, depending on the depth of knowledge about other cultures.

Outcome: The youth jury recommends then, that more 'proactive' educational strategies be undertaken by all spheres of government to encourage greater understanding and acceptance of different cultural groups in Australia. Strategies could also take the form of more practical education. The Federal and State governments are in the best position to promote a greater infusion of information into the community relating to multiculturalism and can organise events aimed at improving interaction of cultural groups on a larger-scale.

Some suggested educational strategies might include:

- undertaking community-based educational programs about difference between cultures in the Australian community; and
- the initiation of more community events celebrating cultural differences and encouraging interaction between different groups. More multicultural type 'national days' like 'Harmony Day' are also a possibility here.

It would be expected that through the implementation of some of the above strategies, individuals would gain a deeper understanding of cultural diversity and hence facilitate the ability of individuals to distinguish between accurate and inaccurate media accounts of different cultures.

Potential responsibility: The educational programs to be implemented by state governments with the Australian government examining the feasibility of introducing more national multicultural celebrations.

There is also a role here for community organisations in lobbying government for improved educational strategies on behalf of their members/clients.



Media responsibility and the community

Recommendation five:

Promoting the ‘social responsibility’ of the media through more balanced and accurate media coverage of stories involving different cultural groups.

The problem: A recurring point of discussion throughout the youth jury was the tendency of the media to focus on negative stories regarding particular cultural groups. The youth jury found that despite the diversity of media outlets, sometimes there is a lack of diversity of opinion. Currently, balanced reporting is the exception rather than the norm.

Issues of crime and unrest involving individuals from certain cultural backgrounds were seen by jurors as making up a disproportionate amount of current commentary on various cultural groups and their lifestyles. This tendency within the media restricts the amount of positive media attention received by different cultural groups, and is not conducive to positively influencing peoples’ views about different cultures or promoting harmony in the Australian multicultural community.

The youth jury agreed that it is important that all viewpoints surrounding a particular issue are presented.

Outcome: The youth jury’s recommendation is to increase the incidence of balanced reporting of cultural differences in the media through a commitment by both governments and the media to promote the ‘social responsibility’ of the media regarding community perceptions of cultural differences. The idea being that a desire within the media to enhance community harmony combined with their internal agenda-setting capacity, will produce stories with a positive focus on different cultural groups.

Some mechanisms included in this recommendation to achieve such a development include:

- an incentive-based strategy developed in collaboration between the media and government to encourage the ‘social responsibility’ of the media. Such a system would emphasise the intangible benefits for the media of reporting examples of positive interactions among diverse cultural groups;
- increased media coverage of cultural festivals of individual cultures;
- a commitment by editors/or media decision-makers to increase the number of articles and feature stories about the positive aspects of different cultures; and
- greater commitment by media organisations to use evidence accurately, for example footage must be dated so images cannot be misrepresented or manipulated (on purpose or by mistake).

Potential responsibility: Strong commitments here are required from the Australian government in partnership with the editorial management of media organisations.



Recommendation six:

There needs to be a greater enforcement and incentives for journalists to adhere to guidelines regarding reporting of issues with reference to cultural backgrounds.

The problem: The youth jury here recognised that the ideals of ‘free speech’ and a ‘free media’ do not always correlate with those laws imposed by the Anti-Discrimination Act.

The youth jury acknowledged that there might need to be regulations introduced so those journalists adhere to guidelines related to the reporting of cultural background.

Outcome: This recommendation aims to ensure journalists are made aware of their responsibilities to the community, particularly the need to balance a commitment to reporting the facts while being sensitive to the cultural groups involved.

The youth jury supports the following:

- internal initiatives within media organisations could foresee journalists changing their reporting methods so as to avoid the stereotyping of certain cultural groups (see Recommendation one); and
- local community or cultural-based action groups who forward concerns about negative reports so the relevant media bodies could drive these initiatives.

Potential responsibility: Community and cultural-based organisations in support of individual members of the general public have a responsibility to advocate and work with the media organisations in question.

See Recommendation one regarding the education of journalists.

Recommendation seven:

More incentives for media organisations to adhere to guidelines designed to monitor the use of negative material regarding different cultural groups.

The problem: The youth jury noted that the media does have the potential to adversely affect peoples’ perceptions of different cultural groups, in this case, their concern being that the existing guidelines and codes of practice for the media’s reporting of culture, ethnicity and race, are currently only suggested and not enforced.

This recommendation addresses the problem of ineffective guidelines. It was observed that this was partly due to these guidelines being developed and endorsed by media industry associations themselves, potentially presenting a conflict of interest. Other than the Australian Broadcasting Authority and their regulation of television, radio and internet, there is no independent regulation of media codes of practice relating to race, culture or ethnicity.



Outcome: Thus the youth jury recommends the establishment of some form of ‘third-party’ body, made up of non-members of the media sector (possibly government), to adjudicate on identified instances where the guidelines have been blatantly breached and which is potentially destructive of community harmony. Complaints may be made by members of the general public.

The intended outcome of the implementation of the above recommendation would be to limit the opportunity for media organisations to emphasise aspects of culture or race in stories, where arguably commercial news values are placed above the public interest.

Potential responsibility: The Federal and State governments would be required to negotiate the appropriate funding and logistical commitments to establish such an independent body. The introduction of state-focused bodies would better reflect local differences and concerns with media reporting.

Recommendation eight:

There is a need for media to make clear, formal apologies in the case of erroneous reporting.

The problem: The youth jury found that apologies by the media to affected communities are not frequent or visible enough. This recommendation seeks to change the current practice of apologies being ‘hidden’ in the corners of a newspaper page or radio report.

The youth jury understands how easy it is for media to erroneously present information due to time constraints. For example, a journalist who works on a daily newspaper is limited to one day to research an article to be published the next day. Sometimes sources are not sufficiently validated due to time limits or inefficiency, leading to inaccurate representations of different cultural groups. However, stereotyping that is unintentional can be still be damaging to other members of the cultural group concerned.

Outcome: The youth jury supports action taken by community or cultural-based organisations on behalf of the cultural communities concerned, to make representations to the media organisation responsible for any erroneous reporting.

The youth jury believes that, if media outlets accept responsibility for incorrect or unfair accounts of information, it would be less likely for instances of erroneous reporting to occur in the future.

Potential responsibility: Community and cultural-based organisations in partnership with the media organisations would work to rectify erroneous reporting.



Local networks

Recommendation nine:

The formation of a body of youth within each suburb or region specifically established to address issues of importance to cultural harmony within the community.

The problem: In their summation of the charge, the youth jury considered that at present the media were at times unaware of the negative influence on peoples' perception of different cultures that their coverage sometimes incited.

The youth jury held strongly that the media *does* have the capacity to change, and that this could be accelerated through a greater organised response from media consumers.

Outcome: To address this problem, the youth jury supports the establishment of a body of youth in each suburb or region that could address issues such as this, as well as others, as they pertain to cultural harmony. Since youth, aged between 15-18, are considered primary users of media and also through their school experiences may be considerably enlightened on issues regarding cultural differences, they are in a good position to actively provide feedback to media and government regarding evidence of problems that affect perceptions of Australia as a nation.

This body of youth could be formed on a voluntary basis, or merged with existing youth organisations, thus taking advantage of networks and structures already in place. Furthermore, it is envisaged that application for government funding through grant programs would be a factor in gaining financial support.

Potential responsibility: The implementation and acceptance of such a recommendation requires local government, existing youth organisations, and local media organisations to establish a feedback mechanism whereby any concerns are brought to the attention of media professionals and worked through accordingly.



Appendix 8

Parra Youth Matters: Evaluation report

Prepared by Joseph Sorby
7 September 2003

Executive summary

The youth jury has brought about some outstanding results, having far reaching effects on all the participants. There has clearly been a change in the way of thinking on behalf of the jurors in relation to the subject area. Whilst the jurors may have already been conscious of cultural diversity and multiculturalism, this has been heightened with participation in the youth jury.

The central youth jury roles, including chair and facilitators, were successful in upholding their responsibilities. Furthermore, the initial expectations of the jurors were mixed, ranging from being nervous to excited, and heighten the importance of the facilitators in helping the jurors. The jurors were asked what factors were important to them in conducting a successful youth jury. Many of the factors were achieved at the conclusion of the jury. However there were a small number that were not, including attendance and respect for others and their ideas. The quality of the briefing kit and selection process may also need to be revisited as they slightly diminished the otherwise high standard of the youth jury.

Introduction

The evaluation component of the youth jury focused upon two aspects. The first being the process, that essentially involved scrutinising how the youth jury was conducted. Secondly, the subject matter was evaluated in order to determine how the participants or jurors' understanding of multiculturalism and democracy has changed as a direct result of the youth jury. The evaluation and project teams at the beginning of the youth jury process earmarked these two aspects as the key success factors. Primarily these two aspects were measured through observations of the jurors and project team, a number of questionnaires (both before, during and after the jury process), face-to-face discussions with participants and a look at the theory behind a citizens' jury and more specifically a youth jury. It was hoped that the variety of techniques in measuring the youth jury would provide sufficient opportunities for all participants to be heard in compiling the evaluation report.

Ultimately this report intends to help people embarking on similar projects in the future to conduct a successful project. Consequently the primary aim throughout this report is to offer lessons learnt that could have enhanced the project. Whilst the project was extremely successful this report will focus on both the positive and negative areas so others may design stronger projects in the future.



The process

From the onset it is important to situate the term citizens' jury into a theoretical framework. Looking at the theory behind a youth jury will be important in ultimately measuring the success of the youth jury. This definition can be applied to the Parra Youth Matters youth jury because the general ideals for both a citizens' and youth jury are similar.

Citizens' Juries – theoretical perspective

Coote and Lenaghan (1997, 8) specifically define a citizens' jury as a process where a number of individuals 'are recruited to be broadly representative of their community. Their task is to answer questions on a matter of national or local importance'. Furthermore Coote and Lenaghan prescribe that the citizens' jury process 'aims to combine information, time, scrutiny, deliberation, independence and authority'. These six factors will be drawn on throughout this evaluation to establish whether they have been met during the youth jury. As such these factors will become the key success indicators in both the first and second categories. Consequently it is important to clearly identify what the six terms actually propose.

Drawing on the definitions presented by Coote and Lenaghan (1997, 11) this report has classified the six categories accordingly –

- **Information:** Have the jurors been informed about any background information?
- **Time:** Have the jurors been given time to consider the charge before making recommendations?
- **Scrutiny:** Have the jurors been given the opportunity to ask their own questions about the charge and receive answers before coming to recommendations?
- **Deliberation:** Have jurors been given an opportunity to reflect on the information given to them and then discuss the matter with each other?
- **Independence:** Do the jurors have any control over how their final recommendations are interpreted and communicated to others?
- **Authority:** Do the recommendations carry any authority or influence in the wider community?

It was important that the project team devised a number of reports and background papers that highlighted the focus of the jury. Documents produced before the youth jury clearly specified background information, project objectives, the youth jury process, proposed stakeholders and information about the project team. These documents are essential in the plenary phase of the youth jury as they clearly specify what is to be achieved from the onset. It may also be beneficial to have a timeline devised from the beginning to ensure individuals know what needs to be done and by when.



Youth jury roles

Many of the roles specified under the 'youth jury roles' document were obtained from the 2003 publication: *Consult your community—Handbook. A guide to using citizens' juries*. Consequently the functions of all the youth jury participants, ranging from the chair to the web page coordinator, were narrowly defined in the youth jury *Roles* document. The youth jury *Roles* paper is fundamental in clearly stating what is required from each individual. This report has drawn upon the youth jury *Roles* paper in determining the success of the key individuals in the youth jury, including the chair, facilitators and project team.

The chair essentially manages the expert presentations and discussions sessions and is also responsible for timekeeping and helping the presenters stay focussed on the key issues. This is a vital position that can either result in the success or failure of the entire jury process. The position requires a strong willed person that is able to command a degree of respect from the jurors yet is also approachable. The Parramatta youth jury worked well with a single chair however having two may also be effective. The chair for this youth jury was successful in time management and was meticulous in ensuring that the youth jury remained on time according to the program over the three days. Additionally there was a degree of discipline that was exercised by the chairperson that ensured the jurors remained focused on the task. The same level of discipline would not have been possible through the facilitators due to their close relationship because facilitators were considered a part of the jury, not a higher authority, like the chair.

Possibly more efforts could have been made by the chair during the question and answer sessions to ensure the presenters answered the questions directly. Whilst this is an extremely hard task, as you don't want to overstep the mark in being rude, it may have ensured many of the jurors didn't come away from the particular session stating: 'The individual [expert witness] did not answer my question'.

However it needs to be acknowledged that the jurors were given ample opportunity to ask questions to three groups of expert witnesses. As a result the category of *scrutiny* was accomplished. More effort needs to be directed at the formulation of the questions from the jurors. The focus of the questioning needs to be in acquiring information from the experts.

The facilitators had the combined task of supporting the jurors throughout the youth jury and managing the group dynamics. Each facilitator was directly responsible in enabling the jurors to perform effectively and efficiently. Observations during the jury process indicate that the facilitators upheld these requirements. In fact I was taken back by the professionalism of the facilitators considering it was their first attempt at conducting a youth jury. The fact that most jurors felt comfortable with themselves by the second introductory session is a testament to the methods employed by the facilitators. It was these introductory sessions that were fundamental in establishing the group dynamics and the smooth functioning of the youth jury on the first day.



Additionally, the group discussions amongst the jurors, particularly the smaller group discussions, were extremely productive with no individuals dominating. It was also important that the facilitators never conveyed their own opinions in relation to the issues and ensured the ideas being expressed came solely from the jurors. The facilitators ensured that the category of *deliberation*, from the theoretical framework developed, was achieved.

Finally the project team had the broad role in overseeing the entire youth jury process particularly at the early plenary phase. The efficient running of the entire youth jury, from the introductory sessions to the final day of the youth jury, can be credited to the thorough planning and foresight of the project team. However there were a number of minor glitches that the project team experienced that needed a degree of flexibility to counter these problems. The central problem for the project team in the plenary phase was the degree of communication. Too often other pressures meant the project team could not sit down together to exchange ideas and delegate tasks. Perhaps for future projects it may be worthwhile to structure the project team so that one individual is responsible for delegating tasks.

Initial expectations and selection process

For the purpose of conducting similar youth jury programs it is important to briefly mention the initial thoughts and expectations of the jurors going into the process. By giving an insight into the jurors' expectations it may make the organisation of future youth juries easier if the project team understands how the jurors feel at the beginning.

Many jurors talked about how eager and enthusiastic they were in being given the opportunity to share and discuss their own experiences and issues in relation to the topic. Numerous survey responses indicated that the jurors felt scared initially but once they were informed about what the youth jury was and their own role during the process, their feelings changed. Therefore it is important that the jurors are not left in the dark and informed at the very beginning to ensure each juror doesn't feel lost and on the outer because they are confused.

Another respondent mentioned that he/she felt a great deal of 'anxiety' yet also 'anticipation'. Clearly there is a wide mix of thoughts, both positive and negative, coming from the jurors at the commencement of the jury process. However the most common response was that 'I didn't really expect anything because I didn't have any idea what we were doing'. A degree of vulnerability is illustrated by this response that underlines the importance of the facilitators on the first day to educate and ensure that the jurors are comfortable with each other and the process.

The initial selection process of the jurors was based upon the citizens' jury model. Selection is based upon the random selection of the local population. Jurors would not be chosen because they had a special interest or expertise relating to the topic before the jury (Coote & Lenaghan 1997, 9). The jurors selected for the youth jury represented a good cross section of the sample population. However the proportion of female jurors out-numbered the amount of male jurors by almost three to one.



It must be recognised that the number of applications made by females was far greater than males. Consequently the pool of potential male jurors to choose from was minimal. This is an important consideration for future youth juries in the selection of jurors, particularly through written applications.

The briefing kit

The briefing kit is integral to ensuring the jurors are provided with enough background information on the topic to engage in deliberation. It needs to be thorough enough to cover all the issues under the broad topic but not too long so the jurors will not bother reading the document. Therefore a fine balance needs to be struck.

A questionnaire given to the jurors at the conclusion of the youth jury asked –
‘Has the Information Pack been helpful in undertaking your role as a youth jury member?’

All the responses returned indicated that the information pack was helpful. However considering the juror members have never participated in a youth jury they may not know what to expect from an information pack or briefing kit. The briefing kit was a good attempt in providing the jurors with a reasonable amount of background information on the topic. As a result the category of *information*, under the theoretical framework, was satisfied. However the kit could have been refined in some areas. In retrospect members of the project team conceded that more time needed to be accorded to compiling research for the briefing kit. As a result the jurors may have been better equipped to question the presenters and formulate their recommendations.

The facilitation process

In the questionnaire handed to the jurors on the first day of the youth jury they were asked to –
‘List the factors that you feel are important in conducting a successful youth jury over the next three days. (It could be things carried out by anyone; including you, the project team, facilitators, and/or the expert witnesses)’.

Consequently their responses were summarised for the final questionnaire given to the jurors at the conclusion of the youth jury. The jurors were asked to mark off which particular factors they felt were achieved over the three days. The basis of this question was ownership on behalf of the jurors. These particular factors were important to the jurors, not the project or evaluation teams.

Out of the 17 factors listed there were five that all the jurors believed had been achieved, these included:

- time management;
 - teamwork;
 - communication between facilitators, project team and jurors;
 - smooth transition between presenters; and
 - participation.
-



Furthermore there were another four factors that only one juror felt was not achieved, these were:

- free to ask questions;
- formation of charge;
- trust; and
- openness.

There were another five factors that two or three jurors felt had not been achieved, including:

- enjoyment;
- coordination;
- courage;
- speak truthfully and honestly; and
- an understanding of what is being said and happening.

Clearly there is a high proportion of jurors who believe these factors had been fulfilled over the three days. However there is still a small proportion of jurors who believe that these factors were not achieved. Subsequently it may be important for future youth jury projects to pursue these factors and ensure all participants believe these have been achieved. This is attainable since only a few jurors felt that the factors did not occur.

There were two other factors that just over a majority of jurors believed were achieved, including:

- cooperation; and
- respect for others and their ideas.

After speaking to a number of jurors it was apparent that often arguments and questioning were perceived to be negative and not respectful.

'There was a bit of disagreement between people and I found this quite intimidating. It was hard to speak up'

Whilst debate is productive there is a point where debate can become personal, and unfortunately this occurred on a few occasions. Here the role of the facilitator is crucial in redirecting the debate so as not to focus on the person but instead on what is being said and the subject matter. This was achieved in some situations, but not all, during the youth jury. Consequently the amount of jurors who felt there was respect during the three days was low, comparative to the other factors.

Finally there was one factor that only four jurors believed took place. Having everyone turn up or attendance was the weakest factor out of the 17. There were a few jurors who had to pull out of the jury and others that missed particular days. It is hard to ensure attendance every day and there are always unforeseen events. However it was apparent that those jurors who missed time were left behind and withdrew from participation, at times. The time at the youth jury, including the introductory sessions, is very concentrated and jurors really can't miss any of it. If a juror misses a day it is not only to the detriment of themselves but also others.



As a result there may need to be a requirement for future youth juries that jurors attend every session and day, otherwise they cannot continue.

The subject

The second category of 'the subject' was established to determine whether there has been a change in the juror's outlook of multiculturalism generally. It is also useful to gauge whether there has been a change in the juror's knowledge of government and democracy, loosely related to the theory of a citizens' jury. Ultimately this category will help to determine what influence the youth jury has had in developing the juror's intellect. This will help establish whether the entire process has been worthwhile and beneficial in developing their young minds. Primarily the means of collaborating data for this category was through the first and final questionnaires. The same general questions were asked in both questionnaires with the intention to determine if there had been any change in the juror's ideas. The questions covered a broad scope of themes, ranging from definitions to what strategies the juror proposes to make cultural diversity work in their local area.

The first part of the questionnaire asked for the jurors to define three terms – cultural diversity, deliberation, and democracy. It was hoped that the jurors would encounter these words or activities throughout the youth jury and by the end would have a clearer understanding of the concepts. To some extent this did happen. Several responses from the first questionnaire left no response or wrote 'No idea'. In the final questionnaire there were no blank responses. This could be attributed to the fact that jurors were given more time to compile their responses. It might also indicate that the jurors felt confident in at least attempting the question. This confidence may have directly grown from participation in the youth jury.

The jurors were also asked to:

'Please read the following statement and circle the response that most suits your answer.

"I believe that one of the strengths of my local area lies in its cultural diversity"

Strongly Agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

In the first questionnaire there were five respondents who strongly agreed, six who agreed, four who were unsure, and none disagreed or strongly disagreed. By the final questionnaire there were eight who strongly agreed, three who agreed, one juror who disagreed, one who was still unsure and no one strongly disagreed. There were two jurors who did not compile final questionnaires unfortunately.

These results indicate that the youth jury has helped the jurors to refine their response and formulate an answer. As a result the youth jury has succeeded in making the jurors think critically about local issues in relation to cultural diversity. The following extract from a survey response typifies this argument: *'We're all different, but we accept and embrace that difference'*.



Whilst in the first survey, before the introductory session, the same juror was unsure for the same question. Clearly there had been a change during the jury process in the jurors' understanding of the issue. There are a number of other similar examples where the respondent has shifted from being initially unsure or merely agreeing with the statement to strongly agreeing with the statement at the conclusion.

Interestingly, as a side note, the only juror to disagree with the statement in the final survey shifted from initially strongly agreeing. The following extracts from the juror's survey help to underline why and how the shift in opinion has occurred:

Before – *'Because it's true and it is visible'*

After – *'The area I live in is not very diverse in terms of culture. Therefore I don't think it is particularly true'.*

Participation in the youth jury may have directly brought about change in the jurors' perception. However it is likely that participation in the youth jury has made the jurors conscious of issues such as multiculturalism and cultural diversity in their everyday life. This point emphasises the positive and far reaching influence the youth jury had on participants.

The final two extended response questions asked the jurors to suggest any actions the government and young people can pursue to make cultural diversity work in Australia and their local area.

The first question asked: 'What do you want governments (local, State, and Federal) to do, so cultural diversity can work better in Australia and in your local area?'

Some responses became more in depth in the final questionnaire with specific programs to be adopted, such as cultural festivals and multicultural committees. Responses also had the theme of the jurors' recommendations in mind, for example: *'Hopefully will do with the release of our recommendations'*, and *'Put our recommendations into action'*.

Evidently the jurors are in fact thinking generally but also thinking about what they have learnt during the youth jury. Through these comments the jurors are conveying a degree of ownership. Subsequently the theoretical category of independence has been upheld to some extent.

The next extended response question asked the juror – *'What can you imagine young people doing to make cultural diversity work better in Parramatta?'*

This was an important question that brought about a range of responses from the jurors. Most importantly there were six responses that said they were not sure in the first questionnaire. By the final questionnaire all the jurors had suggestions to make. This shift can be partly, if not solely, attributed to the jurors' participation in the youth jury.



Finally the category of authority extends beyond the youth jury process and seeks to understand what influence the recommendations have in the wider community. A public forum held in September will be used as one of the primary avenues to have the recommendations promoted within the community. The project team are eager to ensure the youth jury and recommendations get as much exposure as possible. Whether this will happen can only be determined in future months.

Recommendations

The youth jury, generally speaking, was a successful project. The youth jury was an outstanding example of a project developed by young people for young people. The fact that young university students organised and ran the event was one of the key success factors. It was clear that the jurors' felt comfortable around the project team whilst also upholding notions of respect.

1. The question and answer sessions were extremely important in the jurors developing the final recommendations. It may have been beneficial to devise the questions in an earlier introductory session and send the questions to the experts. Therefore the experts would be given more time to come up with considered answers that provide a rich amount of information. Often it is hard for a speaker to provide an appropriate answer on the spot, a task the experts had. Additionally if the jurors felt their question had not been answered then they should have been given the opportunity to further probe the experts and ask follow up questions.
 2. An extra introductory session may have been useful to help refine any procedures before the youth jury process. A fourth introductory session may have given the project team more time to finalise which expert witnesses would be involved. Additionally it would allow the jurors to formulate their questions for the experts earlier. It may have been appropriate to conduct the introductory sessions closer together, possibly within the same week. By having the introductory sessions closer together it means the jurors have the work fresh in their minds. Therefore the jurors can spend less time refreshing where they are up to at the start of each day.
 3. Whilst the recommendations from the jurors were finalised, there needed to be a little more time to ensure all the jurors felt comfortable with each one. The tabling of the recommendations occurred at the end of the day and it seemed that the jurors were not completely focused on the task. If there was more time accorded to this component then it may have polished the process and the final outcome.
 4. As discussed earlier, the issues of attendance and the briefing kit need to be considered and refined. Full attendance by all the jurors is important in minimising disruption and ensuring that all the jurors have the opportunity to contribute equally. Whilst the briefing kit is crucial in providing the jurors with enough information to make well thought-out questions and ultimately recommendations.
 5. As a brief note it may be worthwhile to have all participants, from the mentors to the jurors, wearing name tags at the beginning. These name tags would also state what their role is.
-



By having all the participants wear name tags it would make the environment comfortable from the beginning and help build relationships.

Revisiting the theoretical framework developed at the beginning of this report indicates that all six categories were satisfied. Some were categories very strong, including *scrutiny*, *deliberation* and *information*. The categories of *independence* and *time* were a little weaker. The final category of *authority* has been good to date, but needs to be utilised further.

Acknowledgements

This report would like to express thanks to the entire project team of the Parra Youth Matters youth jury. Their efforts in providing as much information and support in assembling this report has been important. Finally, the advice and support from Martin Stewart-Weeks, the evaluation mentor from The Albany Consulting Group, has been decisive in the evaluation process.

Bibliography

- Coote, A. & Lenaghan, J. 1997. *Citizens' Juries: Theory into Practice*. London: Institute for Public Policy Research.
 - Carson L (ed.) (2003) *Consult your community—Handbook. A guide to using citizens' juries*, Prepared for PlanningNSW, Department of Infrastructure, Planning, and Natural Resources, Sydney.
-



Appendix 9

Parra Youth Matters: Media strategy

Objectives

- **Meet project commitments relating to media milestones:** give maximum effect to the project's contractual requirements for widespread publicity as specified in the project milestones;
- **Develop relations with high-profile print, radio and television media outlets:** take the current relationships developed with local print media during the project's research phase to a wider audience, and utilising all media formats;
- **Maximise public exposure of the project:** in combination with the above, explore all options to maximise the public exposure of the project, with a focus on the youth jury and the subsequent public consultation forum. This includes identifying additional publicity focused events to those specified in the contract milestones; and
- **Enhance opportunities for engaging 'adult' stakeholders in the project:** increasing the project's exposure in the media is likely to assist in encouraging a greater level of 'adult' participation in the project's activities.

Actions

- **Identify key media contacts in target outlets:** this was largely completed in the research phase of the project. Additional work required in identifying contacts, and developing relationships with the nationally focused print, radio and television media organisations;
 - **Write to major media stakeholders:** take a targeted approach to advising media outlets of the potential benefits of covering the project and its activities during its 'publicity' phase, including an emphasis on:
 - ▶ print media (local): The project's unique youth-4-youth focus, the first policy consultation project of its type (youth jury) focused on local policy issues and empowering local youth and the community;
 - ▶ print media (metros): Australia's first youth jury, linked to broader public cynicism of current democratic institutions, focus on cultural diversity is nationally significant and potentially controversial;
 - ▶ radio (national): the project's youth dimension, opportunities for vox pops with attitude and energy (especially around pre-jury events). Local radio networks will also have a similar focus to that of local print media; and
 - ▶ television: presence of high-profile national/state celebrities/politicians, cultural diversity as potentially controversial, fits in with network regulator's obligations on local news content, create competition by creating the impressions of favourable discussions with other networks.
-



- **Follow-up phone calls/e-mail messages to arrange meetings with media outlets:** seeking initial comments on the relevance of the project to the organisation's media focus, and where necessary encouraging a new focus that accommodates coverage of the project.
- **Coordinate meetings with 'responsive' media outlets:** based on initial feedback, organise face-to-face meetings with key media stakeholders as a relationship building exercise, and an as opportunity to find out how best to work with the media organisations in the future.
- **Act on advice provided by 'responsive' media outlets:** act on advice provided by responsive media outlets, and in cooperation with their nominated representatives. This could require a third phase media strategy.

Note: DIMIA is to be advised of key developments arising from these actions to allow for coordination of their Ministers' media related activities.

Timeframe

- **Identify contacts – early to late May:** key weaknesses identified were the national print, radio and television outlets.
- **Mailing of letters:** before the end of May 2003. Draft letters were prepared based on the details outlined above.
- **Phone calls/e-mails:** no more than five days after sending letters (with phone calls being accompanied by e-mails to nominated representatives of the specific media outlet).
- **Coordination of meetings:** mid June – noting there may be variable interest in the project, and television networks are likely to require more time than radio networks.
- **Actions:** depending on outcomes of meetings – implement throughout June, to allow appropriate coverage of the youth jury (July) and public consultation forum (September).

Allocation of responsibilities

- Elisha and Dennis (metro print and TV): identify contacts, drafting and finalising letters, phone/e mail follow up, coordinating and attending meetings.
- James and Chris (local print and radio): identifying contacts, phone/e mail follow up, coordinating and attending meetings. (James - media releases and alerts).
- Sam (electronic media): identifying contacts, coordinating and attending meetings. This is, in reality, an extension of Sam's existing activities.

Other project team members are likely to be called upon to undertake specific tasks associated with all three above task groupings - particularly with respect to meeting media stakeholders.



Appendix 10

Parra Youth Matters: Media release

Premier Gives Big Tick to Youth Jury Media Release 27th February 2004

Members of the 'Parra Youth Matters' project team and some youth jurors met with Tanya Gadiel, the State MP for Parramatta, and the Premier, the Hon. Bob Carr last week to discuss their project.

'This project is about giving young people a say about decisions that affect them - and to encourage more to get involved', Mr Carr said.

'This project has really benefited the young people involved - and the Parramatta community. I'm sure we have future Premiers and Prime Ministers involved in the Youth Jury.

'I will be encouraging my Youth Advisory Council to examine this project and to see where it can be rolled out across the state.

'It's a great way for decision makers to keep in touch with young people.'

The meeting with the Premier was a special opportunity for two of the youth jurors, Lauren Estabillo from Our Lady of Mercy College, and Michael Yuen from Parramatta Marist High School, to speak about their experiences on the jury.

The State MP, Tanya Gadiel attended the opening of the Youth Jury in July last year, and immediately saw the appeal of the jury for government consultation practices.

'It has inspired me to consult locally with more young people and to give them a voice in State Parliament,' Ms Gadiel said.

'I congratulate Dr. Lyn Carson and university students who make up the 'Parra Youth Matters' project team, they have made a tremendous contribution to the community in Parramatta.'

Photos are available on request.

Media Contact: James Cullen 0409 719 879 or parrayouthmatters@student.usyd.edu.au



Appendix 11

Parra Youth Matters: Budget

INCOME	BUDGET \$	ACTUAL \$
LIH Grant	40,900.00	36,810.00
TOTAL	40,900.00	36,810.00

EXPENDITURE	BUDGET \$	ACTUAL \$
Salaries (including on-costs)	11,000.00	10,984.96
Travel (visits to Parramatta and Canberra stakeholders)	310.00	59.00
Harmony Day Event (including promotional t-shirts, backdrops, entertainment)	2,400.00	1,513.05
Administration (including stationery, telephone, postage, paper supply and miscellaneous charges)	2,210.00	717.72
Publicity (including project launch, public forum, advertising and web-site development)	2,400.00	3,268.66
Printing (including letters, information packs and photocopying)	1,500.00	1,226.50
Youth Jury Costs (including youth participation fees, team fees, venue hire, experts' allowances)	21,080.00	13,814.13
TOTAL	40,900.00	31,584.02
<i>Unexpended funds</i>		<i>5,225.98</i>