COST Action TU 1002 - "Accessibility instruments for planning practice in Europe"
Turin, Italy, the 16th and 17th of February 2012

Torino, 21/02/2012

Workgroup 3 Meeting

MINUTES

17th February 2012 (09:00 – 13:00)

VENUE:

SiTI - Higher Institute on Territorial Systems for Innovation

LOCAL HOST

Matteo Tabasso

Stefano Pensa

Index

1. **Workshop protocol (3a)**

2. **Post Workshop Survey and Evaluation**

3. **Participant Observation Structure**

4. **Focus Group**

5. **Close methodology for Pilot in Amsterdam**

6. **Divide work for next steps**

17th February

This session was chaired by Marco te Brömmelstroet.

1.   Workshop protocol

A shared protocol for the practical proposal of Accessibility Instruments was discussed. Raine Mäntysalo and Marco te Brömmelstroet introduced the issue of workshop protocol. The discussion focused on the usability of the instruments for users: understandability of language and accessibility maps. Roger's work seems to be an excellent platform to start.

The proposal of 3 steps with physical meetings (pre-workshop; workshop; post workshop) was considered to be too heavy for users and organization in many of the participating working units. Therefore simplification is needed. Dimitris Milakis suggested reducing the process to 2 steps: The scheme with e-mail pre session+workshop 4-6 weeks later seemed to be the best one.

2.   Pre-Workshop Survey

Carey Curtis introduced the survey and noted that provision has been made for comment prior to this meeting. It was noted that the Australian team had already started piloting the instrument in Australia as a requirement of their national project. It was agreed that everyone should be given the opportunity to make any final comments on the instrument (to Roger Mellor) before the instrument is finalised for COST. It was also agreed that following this step, each WU translate the instrument into their respective national language for application, but will report back the results using the English language in readiness for the final report.

3.   Post Workshop Survey and Evaluation

Dimitris Milakis introduced the post workshop survey. It was agreed that there respondents were reporting their personal opinion rather than that of their organization. It was agreed to add in a question on professions and on gender. It was agreed to check that certain items could be used from this survey and from the pre-workshop survey to follow a 'before and after' comparison on changing attitudes towards accessibility instruments.

4.   Participant Observation Structure

Lidia Zakowska presented some ideas for structuring the workshop observation in order to evaluate the process. The group rejected the proposal of video recording the workshops (too complicated technically and constrictive of the discussion spontaneity). Participants discussed the opportunity of anonymity/categorization of users according to profession or position, especially related to the need of *in itinere* evaluation of the process. It was agreed that instead of a continuous observation, three key points during the workshop session should be carefully observed: 1) at the discussion of the **goals** of the workshop and identification of the planning problem to be addressed; 2) during the discussion of **assumptions** being applied in the accessibility instrument and about the planning

problem; 3) during the discussion about the outputs from the accessibility instrument. It was agreed that the reporting of the observation should be based on qualitative methodologies, be discursive and focussed on the issues of use and usability and in particular provide a report on three key aspects: 1) Areas of **tension** and debate; 2) Areas of **consensus**; 3) Areas of **enlightenment**. Where a Likert scale is used for recording reactions it should be fairly simple – such as 1=yes; 2= indifferent; 3= no. Ron Bos suggested avoiding open questions.

5. Focus Group

David Zaidel illustrated step by step how the focus groups work. It was agreed that rather than follow the research design to the letter (a two hour focus group) that we would rename this intervention as a **debriefing session.** Its purpose to be gaining a sense of participants reactions to the workshop and to each other's points of view. In this way we could limit the exercise to 15 minutes duration, to follow the completion of the post-workshop survey (as this will prompt their thinking on issues of relevance to us).

6. Close methodology for Pilot in Amsterdam

In the first week of July a pilot workshop in Amsterdam will take place. Dimitris Milakis, Lidia Zakowska, Carey Curtis, Roger Mellor and David Zaidel will meet 3 days before the rest of the MC to work on the Pilot.

7. Divide work for next steps

Nuno Porte Pinto proposed to create a group of 15 young researchers to work on the standardization of Working Units (consolidate glossary, etc ...) with a training week to take place in Torre Orsaia next June (Enrica Papa and Enrique Calderon with Nuno Porte Pinto as proposer team).

Marco te Brömmelstroet asked for someone to work in WG4: Dimitris Milakis volunteered.

Participants were invited to upload on the COST Website papers and activity concerting COST issues, even if produced outside from COST framework.