

*COST Action TU 1002 - "Accessibility instruments for planning practice in Europe"
Munich, Germany, the 8th and 9th of December, 2011*

Amsterdam, 22nd December 2011

Start up meeting for Workgroup 3 MINUTES

8 December 2011 (12:00 – 16:30)

9 December 2011 (09:00 – 12:00)

Venue:

Department for Urban Structure and Transport Planning of Technical University Munich

Local host:

Gebhard Wulfhorst

Benjamin Bütnner

Marco te Brömmelstroet

Index

0. List of participants.....	3
1. Welcome to the participants.....	4
2. Adoption of agenda	4
3. Matters arising	4
4. Introduction of the workshop protocol	4
5. Discussion on the workshop protocol.....	4
6. Concluding remarks of day 1	5
7. Introduction of the performance framework.....	5
8. Discussion on the performance framework	5
9. Actions	6



0. List of participants

<i>Name</i>	<i>Country</i>
BOUZOUINA LOUAFI	FR
BÜTTNER BENJAMIN	DE
CALDERON ENRIQUE	ES
CONDEÇO-MELHORADO ANA MARGARIDA	ES
COPPOLA PIERLUIGI	IT
CURTIS CAREY (skype)	AU
HÖMKE MAIK	SW
KANNINEN VESA	FI
LANGELAND ANDERS	NO
LAZARIDOU ATHINA	GR
MÄNTYSALO RAINE	FI
LAZARIDOU ATHINA	EL

MELLOR ROGER (skype)	AU
MILAKIS DIMITRIS	EL
PINTO NUNO NORTE (skype)	PT
SITAR METKA	SL
PERGAR PETRA	SI
TABASSO MATTEO	IT
TE BRÖMMELSTROET MARCO	NL
THOMAS ISABELLE	BE
VERHETSEL ANN	BE
WULFHORST GEBHARD	DE
ZAIDEL DAVID	IL
ZAKOWSKA LIDIA	PL



8th December

12:00 – 12:45: Opening Session

1. Welcome to the participants

Gebhard Wulfhorst and Marco te Brömmelstroet (representing the Local Organizing Committee) welcomed all participants and presented a couple issues on the venue and the host Department.

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda and purpose of the meeting was explained by Marco te Brömmelstroet and the proposed agenda was adopted.

3. Matters arising

No matters arising.

12:45 – 16:45: Presentation and discussion on workshop protocol

4. Introduction of the workshop protocol

Raine Mäntysalo prepared a presentation on a first concept of a workshop protocol. He linked this to the wider debate on what an accessibility instrument can contribute to planning practice and used the Kuopio Three Urban Fabrics Model as an example. His proposal was based on an earlier presentation (in Edinburgh) by Luca Bertolini on Designing Accessibility Together. Each workshop then consists of 4 steps:

- A. Conceptualizing accessibility in the light of wider economic, social and spatial goals
- B. Collectively mapping, interpreting and analyzing the conception of accessibility
- C. Understanding changes in accessibility
- D. Designing integrated solutions/strategies

5. Discussion on the workshop protocol

Several question were raised after the presentation. In a plenary setting and in smaller groups. This lead to a revision of these 4 steps. The important changes were:

- Awareness is asked for differences in scales of the planning problem, the size of the area covered, the complexity of the instrument, the different planning styles, the accessibility awareness of planning participants etcetera. After a discussion on this, it was decided that the workshops should not be limited in all these aspects (to improve generalization) but rather use this variety to improve our understanding of what works when and why. It is important that each local workshop maps themselves on these dimensions.
- In order to efficiently deal with time during a half-day workshop, a division has to be made between actions before and during.
 - The **before** actions are locally different. These should aim at gaining insight in the level of knowledge of the participants, the general planning goal(s), the accessibility parameters of this and potential interventions. Through this, WUs should reflect on participants interests by adopting their instruments and presentation to specific local planning issues. In this way, the accessibility instruments can be prepared for the workshop
- **During** the workshop the results of the first accessibility calculations are presented. Together, the accessibility instrument is discussed, the current situation is shown and sensitivity to interventions (as defined in before workshop part) is presented. Then, the planning participants are asked to come up with interventions that can maximize the chosen accessibility indicator.



Raine Mäntysalo and Marco te Brömmelstroet will use these new suggestions to come up with a new workshop protocol that will be presented and discussed at the Annual Meeting in Turin.

6. Concluding remarks of day 1

The participants are thanked for their attendance and participation. The venue for the evening dinner is presented and everybody is asked to hand in their reimbursement form.

9th December

9:00 – 11:45 – Presentation and discussion on performance framework

7. Introduction of the performance framework

Roger Mellor prepared a presentation on how to measure the performance of the accessibility instruments in each local workshop. He presented this via Skype from Australia together with Carey Curtis. The presentation mostly focussed on a number of instruments that are needed to gather relevant data on the usability of the accessibility instruments in their local workshops. This included:

- A. Pre-workshop survey (attitudes and perceptions to accessibility instruments)
- B. Participant observation (impact of accessibility instrument on individuals and group)
- C. Post workshop survey (impact of accessibility instrument on individual/understanding barriers to use)
- D. Semi-structured focus group (uncover complexities, unexpected insights)
- E. Expert panel (overview of all Local Workshops)

Roger presented detailed ideas about each of these five performance products.

8. Discussion on the performance framework

The discussion first focussed on if the performance outcomes of the Local Workshops can be compared with each other. It was said that the range of the relevant context variables is too large to come to any reasonable comparison/generalization. It was concluded that generalization should not be our target. However, standardized measuring of the performance/usability of the accessibility instruments was still considered to be worthwhile, since it enables the COST Action to gain insights in the relations between the context variables and the outcomes.

A second point was the language of the surveys (and the workshop itself). How are we going to deal with the differences in local languages and the comparability of the outcomes. One of the options is to do everything in English, but that would significantly limit the degrees of freedom for the participants. And more generally, this would still mean that many terms can be ambiguous in their interpretation. Since there is no real alternative for this within the limitations of the COST Action, this is again something to be aware off in the final analyses.

There were some doubts about the size of all the surveys (apart and together) and the risk of participant fatigue. On the one hand, the surveys need to capture a wide range of potential outcomes, but they also need to be workable for the participants. The group adopted as a general rule that each of the sub products should be smaller than an A4 paper.

During the discussion, three groups were formed to work on specific parts of the performance framework. Group A (Post Workshop Survey & Evaluation), Group B (Pre workshop evaluation survey)



and Group C (Focus group and debriefing evaluation). These groups did a first round of thinking on what should be in the respective sub products of the performance framework:

Group A: The proposed statement based measuring device can do the job. Thinking needs to be done if this should be filled in anonymously or not. Also, the question remains if parts of the survey can be synthesized or removed (if not that relevant) to prevent participant fatigue.

Group B: The categories of the proposed framework can be used, but should be used to guide the observer in a qualitative way. It provides categories to be covered during observation. Maybe more categories are relevant?

Group C: In the focus group a selection of participants is asked to respond to a number of questions related to the usability of the used accessibility instrument. Every participant of this focus group is asked to respond. Some categories need to be established, but there should also be room for surprises/context related parts. This focus group should not take more than one hour.

The three groups are going to work on the sub parts of the performance framework to be presented at the Annual Meeting in Turin. Each group is assigned a sub group at the website to support their interactions. The group leaders (A: Dimitris Milakis; B: Lidia Zakowska; C: David Zaidel) will structure the process towards a short presentation in Turin.

9. Actions

Workgroup 3 is going to present the workshop protocol and the performance framework in Turin. The preparation work until then is divided into subgroups:

BEFORE 16TH OF FEBRUARY (TURIN):

- ❖ **Group 1 (Raine Mäntysalo & Marco te Brömmelstroet) will adapt the workshop protocol to meet the issues raised.**
- ❖ **Group A (lead by Dimitris Milakis) will adapt the Post Workshop Survey and Evaluation in English (to be translated into local language by Work Units)**
- ❖ **Group B (lead by Lidia Zakowska) will adapt the participant observation structure in English**
- ❖ **Group C (lead by David Zaidel) will construct a structure for the focus group in Egnlish**

