

# **People's Panel for Wellbeing 2022 and Beyond: Process and Learning Evaluation – Final Report**

**November 2023**

People's Panel for Wellbeing 2022 and Beyond: Process and Learning  
Evaluation – Final Report

Dr Clementine Hill O'Connor, University of Glasgow

November 2023

## Contents

Contents .....	2
<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Methods .....</b>	<b>6</b>
a. Documentary analysis .....	6
b. In-depth interviews .....	6
c. Focus group.....	7
d. Analysis .....	7
<b>3. People’s Panel – Summary of approach .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4. Findings.....</b>	<b>13</b>
a. Understanding the role and aims of the People’s Panel .....	13
b. Impacts of the People’s Panel .....	16
i. Panel members .....	16
ii. Policy community .....	18
c. Assessment against existing best practice.....	19
i. Accountability and Communication .....	19
ii. Accessibility, Inclusion and Support.....	20
iii. Equitable Representation .....	20
iv. Integrity and Balance.....	21
v. Innovation and Learning.....	21
vi. Diversity of opinions .....	21
vii. Using and developing best practice principles in future .....	23
d. Opportunities and challenges for the next steps .....	23
<b>5. Conclusion and Recommendations.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Appendices .....</b>	<b>30</b>
Appendix 1: List of documents included in documentary analysis .....	30
Appendix 2: List of principles developed by Institutionalising Participatory and Deliberative Democracy Working Group (IPDD) .....	31
Appendix 3: List of National Standards for Community Engagement .....	32
Appendix 4: Extract from Facilitator Guide .....	33

# Executive Summary

This report presents findings from research on the ‘People’s Panel for Wellbeing’ that ran between June 2022 and March 2023. This research was commissioned by the Scottish Government in February 2023 to deliver some preliminary insights into the People’s Panel process to address the following research aims (RAs):

RA1. To provide a descriptive account of how the panel worked, its aims and design, the resources, roles, and people who were involved

RA2. To assess the quality of the impact of the panel on policy process, panel members, and the impact of the panel as a step towards more participatory approaches

RA3. To provide suggestions on how a People’s Panel with a wider remit could improve on this model in the future

## Methods

A combination of documentary analysis, in-depth interviews and a focus group were used to address the research aims. Documents provided by the Scottish Government research team included the project proposal for the panel, project plans for each of the 6 events and interim reports. A total of 12 interviews were carried out, 6 with panel members and 6 with members of the policy community within the Scottish Government. Following the analysis of the interviews and key documents a focus group with the research team was organised to discuss some of the key findings and reflect on the People’s Panel process. The data was analysed in NVivo (qualitative analysis software) and the approach allowed for analysis of the data based on previous theory and for the analysis to surface new ideas and themes that came directly from the data.

## Key Findings

- Panel members said that their involvement in the panel had an impact on them personally. Interviewees reported that they had benefited from hearing different views and perspectives. They felt this gave them a better awareness and understanding of society as it offered new and different insights into the issues that were discussed.
- Two panel members described feeling empowered by the process, and another said that they were more engaged in their local community as a result of their involvement in the panel.
- The use of a pre-event questionnaire, to understand the support needs of the panel members and the plain English and accessible language used in communication helped create a space in which panel members felt listened to and valued.
- Despite efforts by the research team, panel members who were interviewed were not always clear about the impact of the panel on policy making processes.
- Policy community interviewees gave some examples of how the input from the panel had impacted on their work including the development of a

marketing campaign, and ensuring the accessibility of some of the guidance they were writing.

- The panel was described as offering a 'rich evidence base' from which policy makers could draw from more generally, rather than it having a specific and tangible impact on a single decision or policy.
- The key opportunity from which this work can develop is that there was a lot of positivity from the policy community and the panel members and clear enthusiasm for this approach within the research team. Interviews with the policy community and panel members indicate a desire for the People's Panel approach to be a core part of policy making processes.

## Recommendations

- Time should be taken to develop a clear set of outcomes for the People's Panel approach so that these can be communicated consistently to panel members and wider policy stakeholders. These should be accompanied by a clear evaluation framework, informed by a Theory of Change. This would address some of the challenges highlighted in the research (for example, setting expectations about what impact can be achieved and providing evidence of such) and offer a way to build on the enthusiasm and opportunities also outlined in the findings.
- The need to offer ongoing feedback to the current People's Panel members on the ways that their participation has had an impact on the work of the Scottish Government and some wider recognition of the role that the panel members have made. This might include the provision of references of a certification related to their role. This would require some resourcing which may be a challenge but would be important to consider in order to be in alignment with the best practice guidance that was written by the Poverty Alliance for the Poverty and Inequality Commission<sup>1</sup>.
- To overcome some of the challenges and take advantage of the opportunities there needs to be ongoing and sustained conversations about the People's Panel approach and the value it offers for evidence generation. This should include presentations on the People's Panel approach, ensuring wide circulation of the publications related to this work and the development of training modules for inclusion on the staff intranet and as part of induction processes. A mentorship programme could also be started with those who worked on the first panel supporting those who want to learn more and perhaps develop the approach in other areas of the Scottish Government.
- Work with parts of Scottish Government pursuing Scotland's Open Government commitments, to ensure that there is clarity and consistency in the terminology being used across the organisation. This would also support the development of an understanding of the ways that the People's Panel approach to generating evidence might link to ideas about participatory and deliberative approaches.

---

<sup>1</sup> Guidance document on involving experts by experience: [Guidance-on-involving-experts-by-experience-PIC-Guidance.pdf \(povertyinequality.scot\)](https://www.povertyinequality.scot/guidance-on-involving-experts-by-experience-PIC-Guidance.pdf)

# 1. Introduction

In January 2022, Deputy First Minister and Cabinet Secretary for COVID-19 Recovery signed off on the creation of a COVID-19 People's Panel to *'to collect and deliver in-depth information on lived experiences of behaviour and attitudes toward the pandemic and the Scottish Government's response'*. The impetus came from the need to supplement existing quantitative data with more in-depth evidence that comes from qualitative data. The idea was that the Panel would serve as a starting point for learning how to work in this way, and offer some examples of the value of this approach. Utilising the existing skills of the social researchers in the Central Analytical Division (CAD) the team were able to get something up and running relatively quickly. There were 24 people who were subsequently recruited to take part in six online meetings between June 2022 and March 2023 to discuss and offer their insights on a series of themes around COVID-19 recovery, prevention and protective measures. The panel was later renamed 'The People's Panel for Wellbeing' to reflect a focus on wider issues, including the Cost of Living Crisis, NHS pressures, community resilience and planning for emergencies.

This research was commissioned by the Scottish Government in February 2023 to deliver some preliminary insights into the People's Panel process to address the following research aims (RAs):

RA1. To provide a descriptive account of how the panel worked, its aims and design, the resources, roles, and people who were involved

RA2. To assess the quality of the impact of the panel on policy process, panel members, and the impact of the panel as a step towards more participatory approaches

RA3. To provide suggestions on how a People's Panel with a wider remit could improve on this model in the future

The following section of this report (section 2) will cover the methods used to generate and analyse the data. Section 3 will offer a descriptive account of the People's Panel in terms of the overall rationale, approach and summary of the timeline of key events. Section 4 will set out the key findings of the research related to the impacts of the panel on the members and on policy processes, the different perspectives on the role of the panel and the challenges and opportunities for the future of the people's panel. The final section of the report will offer some recommendations for the ways that this model of research could be used, and improved, in the future.

## **2. Methods**

A combination of documentary analysis, in-depth interviews and a focus group were used to answer the research questions. These methods are outlined in subsequent sections, followed by a description of the analytical approach taken. This research was granted ethical approval by University of Glasgow College of Social Sciences Ethics Board.

### **a. Documentary analysis**

The Scottish Government research team provided a series of key documents that offered insight into some of the practical processes and resources required to set up the People's Panel (for example, consent forms, information sheets, feedback surveys, needs assessments), the ways that the findings from the panel were reported to other parts of the government (for example, reports) and the format and content of the meetings (for example, presentations, facilitator guides, planning documents). A full list of the documents included for analysis are in Appendix one. A detailed reading and analysis of the documents addressed RA1 and some initial insights into the RA2. The analysis also offered an overview of the process that supported the development of the topic guides used in the in-depth interviews.

### **b. In-depth interviews**

To supplement the documentary analysis and to offer up-to-date evidence of emerging ideas and impact, interviews were conducted with members of the People's Panel and with members of the policy community from across the Scottish Government.

The Scottish Government research team sent an email to each of the panel members with information about the research and sought permission to send on their contact details to the researcher. At the time of the research there were 23 panel members, all of whom were emailed by the Scottish Government research team with information about this research, seeking permission to send on their contact details to the researcher. Out of 23 panel members, 11 responded positively and these names were sent to the researcher. From this list, interviewees from the People's Panel were sampled to reflect which breakout group they were a member of, within the People's Panel meetings. These breakout groups were organised by the research team based on the members views and behaviours around COVID-19 (for example, the extent to which COVID-19 guidance was followed and vaccine status), level of accessibility needs and a group for newer members who joined the panel from meeting 4 onwards (November 2022). There were five small groups in total, one interviewee was randomly selected from each of the groups plus an additional interviewee from group 4 as that was a larger group.

The policy community interviewees were sampled for variation across levels of seniority, types of roles, ensuring that members of different teams were included. Working with the research team the sample also included those who were involved in different parts of the Panel process. For example, delivery of information,

requesting a particular policy theme or question, using the People's Panels discussion to inform their work. A total of 12 interviews were carried out, 6 with panel members and 6 with members of the policy community within the Scottish Government.

The topic guides for the interviews were developed using the steps laid out by Mason (2002), beginning with the consideration of the 'big research questions (2002: 69) as per the research aims above. These were broken down into smaller, more specific sub-categories that were used to inform the set of questions in the topic guide. The topics covered included motivation and rationale for involvement in the process, description and understanding of the process, perspectives on what went well and what could be improved. A final open question was included to give all interviewees the chance to add anything that they felt may have been missed in the interview.

### **c. Focus group**

Following the analysis of the interviews and key documents a focus group with the research team was organised to discuss some of the key findings and reflect on the People's Panel process. As the team responsible for organising and facilitating this work in the future, it was an opportunity to reflect on the successes of the process, what could have been done differently and the potential future directions for the work. The final People's Panel event had not taken place at the time of the focus group, therefore there was not a chance to discuss the entire process. However, in offering comments on the initial draft of this report the team were able to offer additional views having had chance to consider the entirety of the process. Comments that were made in interactions that followed the focus group are indicated clearly in the following sections.

### **d. Analysis**

The interviews and focus group were recorded and transcribed verbatim. The qualitative analysis software Nvivo was used to analyse all the data. The approach was a combination of data-driven and theory-driven coding. This allowed for analysis of the data based on previous theory and for the analysis to surface new ideas and themes that came directly from the data. The coding framework drew on previous work on modes of participation and policy stakeholders' ideas about the role of public participation and qualitative data in policy making (Hill O'Connor et al, 2023) and used existing good practice principles to understand the extent to which the People's Panel process aligned with them. Combined with data driven coding, this was a flexible approach designed to capture new themes not covered by previous theory. For example, there was a key theme from the data that highlighted the different approaches required to support groups where there are very diverse perspectives.



### 3. People's Panel – Summary of approach

This section will provide a descriptive account of how the panel worked, the aims and design, resources, roles and people involved (RA1).

The People's Panel members were drawn from a pool of those who had responded to an online free text survey about the impact of the pandemic<sup>2</sup> and those who had taken part in a telephone survey on the impact of COVID-19 on wellbeing<sup>3</sup> who also agreed to be contacted about future research conducted by the Scottish Government. They were recruited to be a diverse set of participants with a range of experience of, and attitudes to, COVID-19. A selection of equality organisations were also approached in order to recruit panel members who had not completed an online survey<sup>4</sup>. The initial rationale for the panel was to bring together a group of people, in order to gather and analyse their attitudes, beliefs, and experiences in relation to COVID-19 recovery plans. These in-depth, qualitative insights were not being captured from existing data sources, such as surveys and online polling data. This was described in the initial proposal as an opportunity to:

‘deliver high quality, regular research findings that will add to the depth and breadth of our knowledge [...] It will provide a rich and nuanced source of intelligence on lived experience of the pandemic and our response to it’

Further, the approach was framed as part of the Scottish Government commitment to participatory democracy, co-production and deliberative research<sup>5</sup>.

The People's Panel was led by a social research team within the Central Analysis Division (CAD), within Scottish Government. Note-takers and facilitators were drawn from research teams across the Scottish Government following a request for volunteers. This approach was taken so that there were enough people to support the running of the events but, as stated in the proposal had the ‘added bonus of exposing multiple officials to the research methods to increase capacity in-house’. Prior to each panel event there was a preparation session to run through the practicalities, key themes and research questions to cover in each of the discussion sessions. Following the events there was a debriefing for facilitators and note-takers to discuss any emerging issues and reflect on the processes and outcomes.

---

<sup>2</sup> Survey: [Introduction - Coronavirus \(COVID-19\) and society: what matters to people in Scotland? - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](https://www.gov.scot/publications/introduction-coronavirus-covid-19-and-society-what-matters-to-people-in-scotland-2020/pages/introduction-coronavirus-covid-19-and-society-what-matters-to-people-in-scotland-2020.aspx)

<sup>3</sup> Survey: [Coronavirus \(COVID-19\): impact on wellbeing - survey findings - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](https://www.gov.scot/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-impact-on-wellbeing-survey-findings/pages/coronavirus-covid-19-impact-on-wellbeing-survey-findings.aspx)

<sup>4</sup> For a full description of the recruitment methods see the 3 published panel reports. Which are: 'People's Panel: Covid', 'People's Panel: Community Resilience' and 'People's Panel: Cost of Living'

<sup>5</sup> Scottish Government Participation Framework: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/participation-framework/documents/>

The design of each event was led by the research team, with topics guided by the needs of various policy teams. Such needs were gathered via regular requests from the research team that went out via email. Using a standard form, teams were asked about the area of interest they wanted to talk to the People's Panel about and the strategic links to other parts of the Scottish Government. The form had a section to describe the 'lived knowledge' that could be used in the area of work in the short term (in effect in the next 6 weeks) and another section related to longer term needs (in effect over the next year). Responses to the form were followed up by the research team to clarify the requests from policy teams and ensure that the policy team understood the remit of the People's Panel. This process was described by one of those who delivered information at a People's Panel event and used the findings from the Panel in their work:

'I've worked with [the research team] quite closely in terms of looking at things we want to know and then how we actually translate that into a social research question, and the difference between being like a focus group to review something versus a group which looks at the experiences and feeling and perceptions and ideas, the kind of differentiation between that. So yeah, I've been working with [research team] to develop sessions for the group.'  
(Policy 5)

The above excerpt highlights the work done by the research team between events and the way that this acted as a form of capacity building for policy teams to understand the way the panels work in more detail and to find the most effective way of working with them.

The events themselves ran for five hours, including breaks, and were held on Fridays. This was agreed with the Panel members who were asked for feedback about the way the events were run following each event (including the length of breaks, and the timing of the events). In total there were six events between June 2022 and March 2023. Each event was a combination of information sessions, led by a member of the relevant policy team, and discussions facilitated in smaller groups. After two events feedback sessions were added for policy teams to inform the People's Panel about the ways in which their views had been used. At this point there was also a shift in how the events were designed as research questions were made explicit in the planning documents and these were used to design the facilitation guides for the discussion sessions. This is indicative of the fact that the team were reflecting on and learning from the events as the process progressed. The text below summarises the content of each of the events.

### **Timeline and summary of six People's Panel events**

#### Event 1: June 10<sup>th</sup> 2022

Introduction to the values, principles and ways of working. Discussion sessions to talk about experiences of COVID-19 over the last two years. Information session on the Scottish Government approach to addressing COVID-19 harms. Discussion session about motivations for joining the panel and their views on further topics for discussion at subsequent meetings.

## Event 2: June 24<sup>th</sup> 2022

Information session on current Scottish Government protective behaviour guidelines.

Discussion session about feelings of being safe/unsafe and the behaviour that prompts these feelings. Information session on Scottish Government ventilation plans.

Discussion session on the thoughts and feelings the panel had about the importance of ventilation and the related guidance. Discussion session about the meaning and impact of the Cost of Living Crisis.

## Event 3: September 23<sup>rd</sup> 2022

Session on impact of findings to date. Three discussion sessions based on the following research questions:

- 1) what impact is (or will) the cost of living crisis having on member's behaviour?
- 2) what impact is (or will) the cost of living crisis having on members health and wellbeing?
- 3) What are members attitudes towards COVID and protective measures this autumn and winter?
- 4) What do members think about the new ventilation guidance?

## Event 4: November 18<sup>th</sup> 2022

Session on impact of findings to date. Information sessions on the use of CO<sub>2</sub> monitors and Resilience.

Three discussion sessions based on the following research questions:

- 1) To what extent, if at all, could the use of CO<sub>2</sub> monitors in spaces with public access and signage to that effect provide reassurances to panel members and make them feel safe?
- 2) What do this group understand by the terms communities and resilience?
- 3) What are this group willing to do ease the pressure on the health service and how do they feel about taking action?
- 4) To what extent are this group aware of risks to their health, safety and wellbeing and how does this translate into planning for emergencies?
- 5) How are this groups of people going about looking for help and support (financially or otherwise) to address difficulties?

## Event 5: January 27<sup>th</sup> 2023

Information session on coping with emergencies. Two discussion groups based on the following research questions:

- 1) What aspects of household resilience are practical for this group of people?
- 2) What do this group believe they can do to help them cope with the impact of an emergency?
- 3) How can the Scottish Government and partners help households to help themselves cope with emergencies?

4) How do People's Panel member think it best to communicate and inform community resilience ideas to the public in a helpful way?

#### Event 6: March 24<sup>th</sup> 2023

The final event served in part as a reflection on the People's Panel process with members discussing the highlights, lowlights, and memorable moments.

In addition, the discussions were organised to address the following research questions:

- 1) What are the views, opinions, feelings and ideas of the People's Panel about COVID-19 now?
- 2) To what extent, if at all, have their feeling changed over the last year?
- 3) To what extent, if at all, do you expect their feeling to change over the next year?
- 4) Are we still the broken society riddled with anxieties as found in event 3 in Sept 2022?
- 5) What did People's Panel members want to talk about after a year of events, covering COVID 19 recovery, Cost of Living crisis and community resilience?

The research team were responsible for compiling notes from the notetakers and they carried out thematic analysis to identify key themes for reports that were circulated internally, 10 days after each event. The headline findings were shared at the beginning of the subsequent People's Panel event.

The resources that were requested in the initial proposal for the People's Panel included £125 per panel member per meeting plus funds to enable participation for example. IT equipment, software, and caring responsibility payments. Resource was also requested for key members of staff to support the development and running of the panels and volunteers were to be used for note taking and facilitating. In reality, the staff time required changed over the course of the process. Initially, there was a significant time commitment which reduced once the team were familiar with the process and the preparation that was required for each event.

Beyond financial resources it is also important to consider the resource of time, energy and emotional impact of this type of work – both for the panel members and those facilitating the events. Over the course of the process additional resource has been required to emotionally support both the panel members and the other members of the research team. From the documentary analysis it is clear that time and thought was given on how best to do this. Facilitator notes have a series of support services identified by the research team for panel members to be signposted to if necessary. The research team also remained available on the online platform for at least 30 minutes after each event to allow panel members to discuss any issues they may want to raise. The facilitator notes also state that the team felt that some of the content shared was difficult to hear and offers debriefing as a team or as an individual. Between events one and two the team sought to identify a mental health first aider within Scottish Government who could observe the meetings and be on call if needed. When this was not possible, one of the

research team trained as a mental health first aider to offer that option to panel members.

## 4. Findings

### a. Understanding the role and aims of the People’s Panel

The following table shows the different ways in which the role and aims of the People’s Panel were represented in a) documentary analysis b) interviews with the policy community c) interviews with panel members. The variation stems, in part, from the different perspectives of the interviewees, and the different intended audiences for the documents. That there are differences in how the policy community and panel members understood the aims of the People’s Panel also indicates the need to have a consistent approach in the language used to describe the People’s Panel (see point 3 below).

**Table 1: Summary of the ways that the People’s Panel intended aims were represented in each source of data**

Source	Documentary analysis	Policy community interviews	Panel member interviews
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Capacity building</li> <li>- Gathering views</li> <li>- Testing policy ideas</li> <li>- Feed into developing policy options</li> <li>- Quickly inform government on public attitudes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gather insights related to COVID-19</li> <li>- Feedback and sounding board</li> <li>- Evidence base</li> <li>- Approach to using lived experience research</li> <li>- Fostering sense of community</li> <li>- Building trust in Scottish Government</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gather insights related to COVID-19</li> <li>- Feedback on various policy topics</li> <li>- Panel insights as evidence</li> <li>- Make sure public voice is heard</li> <li>- Informing strategies and decision making</li> </ul>

There are key points from this that have implications for the extent to which the People’s Panel approach meets best practice guidance and principles and the ways in which this work could be carried out in the future.

1. The focus group (with the research team) felt that the emphasis was on outputs rather than outcomes. They would want to think more clearly about how to articulate outcomes in the future.

‘[A]nd I think there are some outcomes, but I think we are quite bad at articulating them and I think policy are quite bad at articulating them.’

Whilst there were some clear outcomes stated in the preparatory documents put together by the research team to support the facilitators (for example, ‘Members understanding of and comfort with Teams, confidentiality, trust, respect for all opinions and People’s Panel processes are maintained and improved’ and ‘We

understand the reality for vulnerable households coping with emergencies'). There were other, less tangible, outcomes about shifts in perspectives and the value placed on qualitative work by policy stakeholders that were not so clearly stated in written documents. However, in developing the materials for the final event the team gave a lot of consideration to this issue and worked on a way to better articulate such outcomes. The presentation given to the panel included an explanation of the ways that the Panel had made an impact on the knowledge and understanding of decision makers which in turn would influence what they think about particular issues and will ultimately have an influence on the decisions that are made. It was emphasised that this could not be achieved instantly but would build up over time. The presentation served twin purposes 1) to further develop the way that the team articulate the outcomes they hope to see, and how this might happen and 2) to further manage the expectations of the panel members so that they understand the extent to which they can expect to see changes based on their input to the panel.

In future work, having reflected on the work of the current panel, as described above it may prove useful for time to be taken to develop a clear set of outcomes to be front and centre of the communications used throughout the panel process. This should be accompanied by a clear evaluation framework in order to be able to evidence the outcomes of the process. Theory of Change logic models have been successfully used in previous policy evaluation work (Myers et al, 2017; Steiner et al, 2022) and can be used to achieve a common understanding of what policy or process was intended to achieve and support the development of an approach to evaluation (Craig and Campbell, 2015).

2. The panel started off focus on COVID-19 recovery plans, but this changed overtime.

The focus on COVID-19 recovery was a key part of many of the panel members motivations to join the process and the recruitment and sampling approach was based on this premise. However, this then shifted to reflect emerging priorities in the wider socio-economic and policy landscape. There was some confusion about this shift in focus, with one panel member reporting that they felt like they were being '*dissuaded*' from conversations about COVID:

'I was confused about the diversion into the economic impact for the end, it seemed like we were being dissuaded from talking about COVID and encouraged instead to discuss our financial situation and barriers, which I agree is an incredibly important conversation to have, especially as so many people have been financially compromised, as a result of COVID. But to then remove the discussion of the overarching issue by focusing the conversation on things like fuel prices, felt a bit weird, like our panel was being used to cover another topic, as an afterthought.' (Panel 1)

Another panel member also stated that they were unclear as to why the focus had shifted, but had assumed that this was a reflection of the realities of government priorities which have to move with current events:

'[I]t felt we were moving on [...] And I suppose it's...it is quite interesting because that's what governments are having to deal with all the time, is that something that is an issue can get just pushed to the side by something bigger.' (Panel 6)

Reflections during the focus group with the research team was that that there could have been a better approach to communicating why the shift was necessary. In future, it might be necessary to consider having a more open theme when initially recruiting participants. However, as stated by the panel member in the excerpt above it is always possible that there will be shifts in priorities and processes will always need some level of flexibility. As such, even with planning there will be changes to content and format which will require open and transparent communication about why this is happening.

### 3. Differences in understanding of the role of the panel members' voice and input

There was a range of different words used to describe the way that the Panel Members' would feed into the policy making process. The proposal for the People's Panel framed the process as the next step for the Scottish Government's 'commitment to participatory democracy' using deliberative approaches and participatory principles which in turn links to the work of the Open Government team within Scottish Government. As such, some of the language in the above table suggests active and ongoing input of the People's Panel. For example, capacity building and feeding into developing policies. However, other ways that the aims were articulated suggest a one off or more passive involvement of the People's Panel members as providing an 'evidence base' or people from whom views are 'gathered'. This highlights the need to have some consistent language and understanding of the role and aim of the People's Panel so that there are not unrealistic expectations (from either Panel members, or the policy community) about what the Panel can and cannot achieve. For example, using the language of deliberation implies processes that result in 'collective public judgement' and the identification of 'common ground on solutions' (OECD, 2021: 5) as opposed to processes that generate opinions, discussions and sharing of experiences. The reality of what the People's Panel can and has done, is in creating a qualitative research practice which can feed into existing policy making processes. The research team described that there had been a change in language from deliberation, to dialogue which better suited the approach that was taken.

It is unclear at this stage the extent to which this work is connected to the Scottish Government's commitment to Open Government and participatory and deliberative democracy. In the future it will be important to establish the relationship between these different pieces of work more explicitly. The two approaches have the potential to complement each other but there needs to be more clarity around the various terms used across the Scottish Government. This reduces any risk of diluting the understanding and impact of either pieces of work.



## **b. Impacts of the People's Panel**

The following sections outline the impacts of the People's Panel from the perspective of the Panel members and of the wider policy community within the Scottish Government. The panel members identified some individual impacts as well as reflecting on the extent to which they thought the processes had an impact on policy. Similarly, the policy interviewees were asked about the extent to which the panel had an impact on their work. It is important to note here that at the time of the interviews and analysis there was one more panel event still to take place. This means that the impacts of the panel are those that have been reported in the very short term and there may still be more to be reported in the medium and long term.

### **i. Panel members**

The Panel members were asked about their understanding of the impact of the panel on them as individuals as well as on policy processes. Although there was a commitment from the research team and wider policy community for routes of accountability through feedback sessions at the panel meetings, the panel members were not always clear about the ways in which their input was being used.

Whilst one of the panel noted that they had seen a clear impact on the phrasing and tone of some of the public facing campaigns, other members had anticipated seeing more of the campaign they had contributed to:

'I thought this was going to be suddenly a new poster campaign that was going to be plastered up all over town, and yeah, and I didn't [see it]' (Panel 6)

This panel member assumed that the campaign had changed angle and been put on hold, but had not had any specific feedback to let them know. As a poster campaign had never been an aim of the policy team working with the panel on this issue, this comment suggests the need for further expectation management and some alternative ways of articulating impact. As described previously, this had started to be addressed at the final panel event.

Other panel members expressed a lack of clarity more broadly in relation to the impact the process had. Two members expressed a 'hope' that their views would be taken into account, but were also realistic about the extent to which that could happen in the context of limited resources and a dynamic social and economic landscape which leads to necessary shifts in policy priority. However, this did not seem to have an effect on how they felt about their participation in the panel with one member stating that if they had the opportunity to be involved in a process like this again, they *would 'jump at it'* (Panel 5) because of how important they felt it was that different experiences and perspectives were part of discussions. Another panel member acknowledged that the impact of the panel would be difficult to fully understand given that it is just *'one of many things'* (Panel 4) that feed into decisions.

Finally, there was some significant cynicism about the role and impact the panel could have:

'What I think is actually happening, is the government using the panel as a way to evidence their claim they are listening to people and that whenever they make whatever decision, frankly that they were always going to make, they can say, well after consulting and after being in consultation with this cross-section of the population [...] this is the conclusion that we have reached.' (Panel 1)

Nevertheless, this same panel member was incredibly positive about the way that the research team had conducted the work, indeed in their answers they frequently differentiated between the research team and the Scottish Government as if they were in fact two separate entities.

Involvement in the panel had individual and personal impacts on the members. Primarily, panel members reported that they had benefited from hearing different views and perspectives. They felt this gave them a better awareness and understanding of society as it offered new and different insights into the issues that were discussed.

'Certainly [the personal impact has been] in terms of meeting people that I'd never normally meet. I think that's been really interesting, a couple of those were a real eye-opener. I'm very fortunate to lead a comfortable life and I don't know anyone in as difficult a situation as a couple of the panel members were in. And it was a great thing for us to be able to talk to them because we just...the sympathy was just pouring out of us. And the horror, you know. And I think that any experience like that makes you a better person.' (Panel 4)

'I think it's made me more aware of other peoples' situations. And, I mean, you know, I like to think that I do know what's going on in the world and that I've got quite broad views on inclusivity, et cetera. But I think having that experience of absolutely getting very fine information about other peoples' situations has been incredibly eye-opening [...] it's been good for me actually, it's been good for me.' (Panel 6)

In addition, two of the panel members that were interviewed said they felt a sense of community had been built in their small groups. Keeping consistency in the groups meant that panel members got to know one another well and, having shared what were often difficult experiences, they felt they had been through '*quite the journey*' (Panel 5) as a group and expressed a desire to keep in contact in the future.

Two panel members in the sample described feeling empowered and more engaged as a result of their involvement in the panel. One described that the way in which the Panel had been organised and facilitated had made them feel empowered to raise the concerns and issues they had. Despite acknowledging that there are limitations to the extent to which the Panel may have an impact on decision making, they were positive about the process and their role in it:

‘The People’s Panel made me feel empowered in a way to kind of raise these issues and concerns and everything, but I was being a realist, and an optimist but realising that we can’t do everything. We’ve got an NHS that badly needs the funding. We’ve got nurses who haven’t had pay rises in years and years. So we can’t do everything.’ (Panel 5)

Another member of the People's Panel said that they were more engaged in their local community as a result of their involvement and was more likely to get involved in participatory processes in the future.

‘I went this week to a meeting at our local community centre which I was invited to because I use the facilities [...] And I think I went to that meeting with a very different kind of sense of – not authority, but, ooh, I can contribute something here. And I think having taken part in the People’s Panel has made me feel that I can sit comfortably along with other people and make my voice heard’ (Panel 6).

Finally, one of the participants described the way in which they had been using some of the approaches to accessibility that they had seen and heard as part of the People's Panel.

‘I have tried to adopt, when I’m communicating, I’ve been trying to...when I’m communicating broadly, I try to adopt some of the same accessibility of...it doesn’t come up very much because I’m not leading classes or anything. But if I know I’m trying to communicate something to a larger group of people, I’ll try to remember to keep it simple, just because it works so well in the panel.’ (Panel 1)

The findings indicate a lack of clarity about whether the People’ Panel has had an impact on policy processes from the perspective of panel members. There was some scepticism about the extent to which this was a genuine and meaningful commitment from the Scottish Government. However, there was also a sense of realism and pragmatism about whether it would be possible for policy makers to act on the input from the People’s Panel, due to competing priorities, limited resources and the fact that there are other sources of information that feed into decision making processes. Whilst the research team made efforts to manage expectations about what the panel could and could not do, and the impacts that the panel did make, this was not always reflected in the interviews with panel members. Nevertheless, there has been a clear impact on panel members personally who reported feeling more confident, empowered and having learnt from others’ experiences.

## **ii. Policy community**

The research team gave clear guidance to those from the policy community who sought input from the People’s Panel that they had to consider the ways that the input would be used and be prepared to feed this back to the panel. This was described by three of the policy community interviewees and features in the plans

and presentations used in the Panel meeting. This indicates a commitment by the team to ensure that there is accountability and communication as per best practice guidelines and principles (see next section).

One of the policy community interviewees was able to give specific examples of government activity that has been influenced or affected by the input from the People's Panel. They stated that *'conversations with the People's Panel and insights [...] directly helped to inform the development of our marketing campaign'* (Policy 5) and had an impact on the way that the ventilation guidance was framed *'it really helped us in terms of shaping that guidance and making it more accessible in terms of language'* (Policy 5). Others talked about the input that the Panel had made to a report about the Cost of Living crisis (Policy 2 and Policy 3). A summary report put together by the research team in preparation for the final event outlines additional impacts language use in communication about the COVID-19 booster vaccines, in ventilation guidance, and informed the design of survey questions for opinion polling about the NHS.

In the interviews, more frequent than specific examples of impact were reflections that the work had a broader impact in offering a *'legacy'* (Policy 5) and a set of findings from which to draw on in future. Another interviewee described the panel as providing a *'rich evidence base'* (Policy 1). This same interviewee said that due to the timing of the Panel it was not necessarily possible for the inputs to impact specific policies. This raises questions for future panels about the stage at which the panels run within any policy process and how they are used within policy processes. However, what is clear from the work of the Panels so far is that there are parts of the policy community that value having this type of evidence base to draw on.

### **c. Assessment against existing best practice**

One of the questions in the tender for this research was 'How far does the People's Panel follow best practice in relation to the main sources of evidence on best practice?' with reference to Institutionalising Participatory and Deliberative Democracy (IPDD) work which sets out a series of principles for participation, democratic innovations and citizens assemblies (see appendix 2). The subsequent sections outline the ways in which the People's Panel approach aligns with these principles and additional best practice guidance from the National Standards for Community Engagement (NSCE) (see appendix 3). It is not the intention to offer a full assessment against each, merely to offer some evidence of where there is clear alignment and highlight the areas of success which should be taken forward in future work.

#### **i. Accountability and Communication**

Both the IPDD principles and the NSCE make clear that an important aspect of best practice when working with processes such as the People's Panel is for there to be clear and open lines of communication (NSCE) and accountability (IPDD). In practice this means that participants should be kept informed of the results and outcomes of the processes they are involved in. The IPDD principle of accountability makes reference to the need for a formal process in which relevant

decision makers should respond to recommendations made by participatory processes. The People's Panel process did not require the panel members to offer specific recommendations, as such it is not necessarily appropriate for this specific form of accountability to be taken into consideration when assessing the process. Nevertheless, it is clear that throughout the People's Panel process considerable effort was made to ensure that the panel were kept informed of how their views were being used. This was described by one of the members of the policy community as a '*feedback loop*' (Policy 5) when they were invited to come back to a meeting to talk to the panel about the impact the panel's views had made. NSCE also states that not only should there be communication about impacts and results of processes but that it is '*clear and easy to access and understand*'. Adherence to this standard was evidenced in the use of Plain English, options for easy read documents throughout the People's Panel process and positive feedback from panel members.

## **ii. Accessibility, Inclusion and Support**

All panel members completed a support needs questionnaire to understand the additional resources that may need to be drawn on to ensure that participants could take part. This included questions about whether people would need help to access a computer, connection to the internet and/or Microsoft Teams. There was also an open question for people to write in any additional support they would need to attend the panel events. The examples given included the use of an interpreter (for a different spoken language, or sign language), easy read documents and money to pay someone to care for a person you usually care for. In addition, it was clear from the comments from the panel members that alongside practical considerations for accessibility the facilitators had also paid attention to the ways that they ran the sessions and created a space where people could talk freely and feel safe to do so.

'I got the feeling I that I had no worries that I can say and I feel safe saying what I want to say. I get that feeling that my thoughts are [taken] care of, it's listened to or something.' (Panel 1)

Creating such inclusive spaces and building that into the design of the process is part of best practice principles as set out in terms of accessibility (IPDD), inclusion and support (NSCE).

## **iii. Equitable Representation**

The proposal for the People's Panel clearly stated that '*The Panel will not be a representative sample of the population rather a range of people with highly diverse experiences of life and circumstances will be recruited.*' It is important and valuable that this was stated up front and continues to be relevant as the work of the panel progresses and the findings are discussed and made public. There is alignment with the IPDD principle of 'equitable representation' in that the recruitment process sought to prioritise those with lived experience of the issues being discussed, and the potential to be the most effected by the decisions taken. However, there is still work to be done so that this principle is better understood by those who may use the outputs and evidence generated by the panel and that findings are not dismissed or

undermined by the fact that the panel is not representative of the general population (see opportunities and challenges section for further discussion).

#### **iv. Integrity and Balance**

In the context of the IPDD principles, integrity and balance are associated with the use of evidence in deliberative processes and as such is not relevant to the People's Panel in this way. Nevertheless, there were attempts throughout the process to ensure panel members were clear about what was 'official' information and guidance, and what were personal views and opinions of other panel members. This was particularly important in the context of discussions about the COVID-19 pandemic and there were a diverse range of perspectives, including those who were sceptical, or even in denial about the existence of COVID-19. From event 2 onwards the facilitator briefing included the following:

'If a member suggests any documents or websites to other members or tries to share a link please make sure people know that whatever it is it's not endorsed by us. This is true of services as well. Although services are not in the same category as other 'evidence' or documents we still need to make sure people know we don't endorse them just in-case they have a bad experience of them.'

In addition, integrity and balance were considered as part of the facilitator role. When discussing this with one of the facilitators they talked about the importance of maintaining '*professional distance*' and not taking any political stances even when these were discussed within the groups.

#### **v. Innovation and Learning**

The IPDD principles set out the importance of innovation and learning throughout any participatory processes, and this is reflected throughout the NSCE which emphasise the need for feedback at various stages within a process. The use of feedback surveys between each meeting have allowed participants to reflect on the process and given them the opportunity to suggest changes. All panel members were also offered a one to one meeting with someone from the research team following event two (June 2022). The IPDD focus on innovation is framed in terms of opportunities for deliberation and the utilisation of a variety of tools and techniques to facilitate this. Whilst this is not directly relevant to the People's Panel process (given that deliberation was not a feature) there may be opportunities in future processes for there to be a wider variety of communication techniques, beyond online discussion groups. Drawing on some of the creative and participatory methods used in community-led research could be one way of engaging with panel members in a different way. Some examples include the use of storytelling (Labonte and Feather, 1997) and photos (Wang and Burris, 1997) as creative ways to prompt discussion and generate data.

#### **vi. Diversity of opinions**

The principle of inclusion within the Scottish National Standards for Community Engagement states that in order to meet the standard of inclusion 'A wide range of opinions, including minority and opposing views, are valued within the engagement

process' (page 10). It is clear that participants held a wide range of opinions, however this risked alienating others, with three of the six participants stating that it made them question their own involvement in the process. The team quickly resolved this issue and reorganised the small groups to create more cohesive groups. Nevertheless, this raises questions over how best to include different perspectives and the implications of doing so. Some of the ideas behind deliberative and participatory approaches are built on the notion that bringing differing views together can support the development of a consensus and build knowledge and understanding of a range of viewpoints. Indeed, a number of panel members really valued hearing other people's views and experiences (as illustrated in the previous section). However, there is a limit to this as was made clear in some of the interviews with Panel members that when views are entirely opposed they can undermine the experiences of others and leave them wanting to withdraw from the process entirely.

'I'm so tired of hearing people deny that COVID exists and I just thought 'I don't need to hear their opinions anymore'. They're not based on fact and they're not based on compassion or empathy or any appreciation for anybody other than themselves really.' (Panel 1)

Later on in the interview, the same interviewee referred back to this issue, stating that they were relieved when the groups changed:

'Because I was not sure how long I was going to continue with the panel if that kept up the way it was, just because, I just didn't want to hear their opinions anymore'. (Panel 1)

Given that the intention of the People's Panel was to elicit views and experiences, rather than make any clear decisions, or come to a consensus view on an issue it is not necessarily of concern that the small groups were divided by opinion. Indeed, taking this approach allowed for the successful continuation of the panel and built trust between the facilitators and the members who felt listened to when their concerns and request were acted upon.

Reflecting on this issue within the focus group with the research team resulted in an interesting discussion about the extent to which such controversial views, as some of those held by panel members, could meaningfully and usefully be brought into policy making processes. While it was viewed as important '*to know why people are thinking these things, because otherwise you can't change anything*' there were some reflections at the focus group that it was difficult to have wider discussion as members brought everything back to their core beliefs about the negative impacts of lockdown. There was an idea that mixing the groups up could have countered this, but that it could not have been done without causing real harm to some of the panel members:

'I can see the argument, that if you can mix up groups and perspectives, you might end up with different views and different conversations, but that would

have been...With this panel, that would have been harmful to mix those together'

On further reflection following the final People's Panel event the research team reported that this appeared to have changed:

'Those with entrenched views actually started to show an understanding that their views were extreme and while they stood by them they were sympathetic to other points of view. They also gave a valuable contribution to a discussion about 'other subjects' we had, bringing a perspective that no other group brought. As such I would include people with non mainstream views in any future plans.'

#### **vii. Using and developing best practice principles in future**

As the People's Panel approach develops further it will of course be important to have clear guidance and principles to inform best practice. However, careful consideration should be given so that the aims and ambitions of the approach are clear and aligned with the framing of the guidance. The use of IPDD and NSCE are helpful to understand the ways in which the People's Panel has successfully addressed the need for accessibility, accountability and inclusion. However, these principles and standards are set for quite different purposes (in effect deliberative approaches and community engagement) and do not speak to the research elements of the work of the People's Panel.

Throughout the preparation documents used to plan the events and brief the facilitators and notetakers it is evident that core principles and skills of qualitative research have been applied. For example, the use of research questions to guide the content of the session and design the facilitator guides (Rubin and Rubin, 2005; Mason, 2002). Notes to facilitators to keep questions open and only prompt when necessary (see appendix 4) is also an important part of generating good quality data from semi-structured interviews and focus groups.

Ethical research practices have also been built into the People's Panel process in the use of consent forms and ongoing reminders about anonymity and confidentiality at the start of each People's Panel event (Centre for Social Justice and Community Action & National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement, 2022).

If the People's Panel approach is to develop further and become embedded in the way that evidence is generated, then it is important that alongside strong principles and guidance around inclusion and participation, the above illustrated values and requirements of rigorous, robust qualitative research are also represented.

#### **d. Opportunities and challenges for the next steps**

The key opportunity from which this work can develop is that there was a lot of positivity from the policy community and the panel members, and clear enthusiasm for this approach within the research team. Interviews with the policy community and panel members indicate a desire for the People's Panel approach to be a core



part of policy making processes. One interviewee saw the People's Panel as a '*baseline for future development*' (Policy 1) so that strategic work across the government was accompanied by input from a People's Panel. Another suggested that this type of panel could be utilised as a cross-government resource for different teams to tap into. Specifically, they saw potential value in a panel being used in early considerations around policy impact assessment, so that input from panel members would form part of the evidence used within the process. The notion of the People's Panel feeding into policy by providing a type of evidence in a more systematic and consistent way was also part of how one of the panel members saw the future of the process. They said they would like to see this approach '*written into the heartbeat of government, [this should be] something that happens all the time*' (Panel 4). This was clearly also a priority for the research team who, as previously described, hoped that this approach would serve as a kind of pilot and starting point for further work. Reflecting on the work during the focus group members of the research team were clear of the potential of this approach, and identified the potential routes to embedding this work across government:

'[T]he opportunities of this way of working are immense. We've got a working group looking at it and there are so many people wanting to do it, saying they're doing it, thinking about doing it across Government in lots of projects. So the opportunities are that we, as a profession, and [name and job title of senior colleague], is very much on this, if we can upskill across the office, capacity build so that we can do this in a robust and systematic way.'

The focus here was on upskilling so that the researchers have the capabilities and skills to prepare, facilitate and deliver this type of work. This had started to happen because of this initial People's Panel. The research team described that in the earlier stages of the process, the organisation and preparation for events was incredibly time-consuming and led by one senior member of the team. This had changed over the course of the six events and the team were clear that significant capacity had been built. It was also felt that this went beyond the small, core research team and into the work of those from other parts of government who volunteered to be facilitators and note-takers. However, for this type of work to really become embedded in the everyday of government activity then the capacity building needs to go beyond the social researchers so that the parts of the government that use evidence understand and value the qualitative data that the People's Panel generates.

The importance of people across the Scottish Government understanding and using qualitative data as a form of evidence speaks to the challenge of the People's Panel not offering a representative sample. This was highlighted in four of six interviews with members of the policy community and was part of the discussions with the research team in the focus group. One interviewee clearly stated that although they knew the People's Panel membership was not designed to be representative, they would '*always favour*' a representative sample. Nevertheless, they did see value in the approach taken and had found the evidence from the panel useful in their work. Another interviewee described some people they had worked with not seeing the value of the research '*given that it's not a representative*

*sample*'. This suggests that there is a real need for a more in-depth and nuanced understanding of what qualitative data is and what it can offer. This was underlined during the focus group when one of the members of the research team who said that a key challenge they had experienced in the process of working on the People's Panel was that *'People who should know better still imply it is a collection of anecdotes and inferior to quant[itative data]*.

There is also a resourcing challenge to be considered. As highlighted in section 3, there are significant inputs that are required for this work to be carried out successfully. Some interviewees from the policy community identified some options for how this might work in practice, for example different parts of Scottish Government would contribute resources as with other research that is used by numerous teams:

'[W]hat I would like to see is different areas, I guess, contributing funding towards it. Because that's always kind of an important...kind of buy-in for people, isn't it? So, people can say, yes, they think it's important and we're supportive of it, but [...] It's whether or not people are prepared to put funding towards it. And we've done that in the past with things like, I don't know, the Scottish Social Attitudes Study, or kind of other, other kind of work that's been tied to a number of areas. But I think, yeah, it needs to be a kind of cross government resource.' (Policy 2)

This would be contingent on teams across the Scottish Government seeing value in this approach. Nevertheless, there are clearly some teams that have engaged with the process thus far that see value and as such present an opportunity for further work.

## 5. Conclusion and Recommendations

Overall, the panel members were positive about their experiences and there is enthusiasm for this approach in the wider policy community across the Scottish Government. The idea for developing the People's Panel came, in part, from a desire of the research team to show proof of concept, demonstrate the value of the approach and to start to think about how to embed the approach within the day-to-day ways in which evidence for policy making is generated. This research has shown that there have been some successes and examples of good practice that should be taken forward in any subsequent work:

- In the design of the People's Panel there was a clear commitment to inclusion and meaningful steps were taken to facilitate participation. The team used a pre-event questionnaire to understand the support needs of the panel members and all the communications used plain English and accessible language. This helped create a space in which panel members felt listened to and valued. These steps should be replicated in future work.
- The online events included a floating member of staff to provide technical support where needed. However, panel members still felt less comfortable with the platform (Teams) as opposed to others. As it may not be an option to switch to other online platforms, ongoing support for any technical difficulties is important.
- The approach taken clearly illustrated examples of good research practice in the use of ongoing informed consent practice, research questions to guide the design of the process and a well-structured facilitator guidance. This should be continued and represented in any future guidance that is developed to support other teams in the Scottish Government to engage with or utilise this approach in their work.
- Teams across the Scottish Government should use the strategic mapping work that has been carried out which outlines range of panels that are running at any one time, with information about the key questions and issues they are seeking to address. The research team who carried out this work should circulate and publicise this more widely and consistently. The interviewees were not aware of this work but stated that this type of approach would be useful to make sure that resources are being used effectively, and that people are not being over-researched.

This research has also highlighted some areas where the approach requires some further development. The following recommendations include those that could be addressed in the short term in the early stages of planning any future panels:

- Varying the time and day of meeting so that more people are able to attend. While this group were able to attend on a weekday having the meetings during the day on a weekday may have limited those in work, (or in less flexible work) from participating.

- Offering more flexibility in the format of the events so that there is more time to spend on the subjects where panel members felt they had more to say.
- The timeline of future panels should take into consideration a longer-term view, as well as the ongoing and shorter term request form that was used to understand policy needs. Although it was not possible to do so in the development of this first panel, it would be useful to undertake some preliminary work to scope out the significant pieces of work that may be on the horizon (for example, implementation plans or strategic documents). This would sit alongside the existing practice of gathering shorter term requests that may come up and require a quicker turnaround.
- Recruit future panels based on a broader theme and be clear in participation information that a key part of the panel approach is flexibility, in order to respond to policy needs as they arise.

The following recommendations are more strategic in focus and in some cases may require some resourcing to take forward:

- Time should be taken to develop a clear set of outcomes for the People's Panel approach so that these can be communicated consistently to panel members and wider policy stakeholders. These should be accompanied by a clear evaluation framework, informed by a Theory of Change. This would address some of the challenges highlighted in the research (for example, setting expectations about what impact can be achieved and providing evidence of such) and offer a way to build on the enthusiasm and opportunities also outlined in the findings.
- The need to offer ongoing feedback to the current People's Panel members on the ways that their participation has had an impact on the work of the Scottish Government and some wider recognition of the role that the panel members have made. This might include the provision of references of a certification related to their role. This would require some resourcing, which may be a challenge, but it would align with the best practice guidance that was written by the Poverty Alliance for the Poverty and Inequality Commission<sup>6</sup>.
- To overcome some of the challenges and take advantage of the opportunities there needs to be ongoing and sustained conversations about the People's Panel approach and the value it offers for evidence generation. This should include presentations on the People's Panel approach, ensuring wide circulation of the publications related to this work and the development of training modules for inclusion on the staff intranet and as part of induction processes. A mentorship programme could also be started with those who worked on the first panel supporting those who want to learn more and perhaps develop the approach in other areas of the Scottish Government.
- Work with parts of Scottish Government pursuing Scotland's Open Government commitments, to ensure that there is clarity and consistency in

---

<sup>6</sup> Best practice Guidance: [Guidance-on-involving-experts-by-experience-PIC-Guidance.pdf](https://www.povertyinequality.scot/guidance-on-involving-experts-by-experience-pic-guidance.pdf) ([povertyinequality.scot](https://www.povertyinequality.scot))

the terminology being used across the organisation. This would also support the development of an understanding of the ways that the People's Panel approach to generating evidence might link to ideas about participatory and deliberative approaches.

## References

Centre for Social Justice and Community Action & National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement (2022) *Community-based participatory research: A guide to ethical principles and practice* (2nd edition), CSJCA & NCCPE, Durham and Bristol.

Craig, P. and Campbell, M. (2015) *Evaluability Assessment: A Systematic Approach to Deciding Whether and How to Evaluate Programmes and Policies*. Working Paper. What Works Scotland. [Available at: <http://whatworksscotland.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/WWS-Evaluability-Assessment-Working-paper-final-June-2015.pdf>]

Hill O'Connor, C., Smith, K., and Stewart, E. (2023). Integrating evidence and public engagement in policy work: an empirical examination of three UK policy organisations, *Policy & Politics*. doi: 10.1332/030557321X16698031794569

Labonte, R. and Feather, J. (1996) *Handbook on Using Stories in Health Promotion Practice*. Ottawa, Health Canada.

Mason, J. (2002) *Qualitative Researching*. London: Sage

Myers, F., Geyer, J., and Craig, P. (2017) *Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015. Evaluability assessment of Parts 3 and 5: participation requests and asset transfer request*, Edinburgh: NHS Health Scotland. [Available at: <http://www.healthscotland.scot/media/1696/evaluability-assessment-of-parts-3-and-5-of-the-community-empowerment-act-dec17-english.pdf>]

OECD (2021), "Eight ways to institutionalise deliberative democracy", *OECD Public Governance Policy Papers*, No. 12, OECD Publishing, Paris [Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1787/4fcf1da5-en>]

Rubin, H. and Rubin, I. (2005) *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. London: Sage

Steiner, A., McMillan, C. and Hill O'Connor, C. (2022) Investigating the contribution of community empowerment policies to successful co-production- evidence from Scotland. *Public Management Review*, doi: [10.1080/14719037.2022.2033053](https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2022.2033053)

Wang, C. and Burris, M.A. (1997) Photovoice: Concept, Methodology and Use for Participatory Needs Assessment. *Health Education and Behaviours*. doi: [10.1177/10901981970240030](https://doi.org/10.1177/10901981970240030)

# Appendices

## **Appendix 1: List of documents included in documentary analysis**

Proposal for a COVID-19 'People's Panel'

Recruitment information sheet

Easy read recruitment information sheet

Availability and Support Questionnaire

Feedback survey

Project plans for events 1-6

Slide decks for events 1-6

Facilitator and notetaker briefings for events 1-5

Summary of 1 to 1 meetings with Panel members

Interim findings reports from events 1-4

## **Appendix 2: List of principles developed by Institutionalising Participatory and Deliberative Democracy Working Group (IPDD)**

Purpose

Accountability

Accessibility

Transparency

Public Engagement

Equitable Representation

Integrity and Balance

Innovation and learning

Empowerment

Flexibility

See [here](#) for full descriptions of the principles



## **Appendix 3: List of National Standards for Community Engagement**

Inclusion

Support

Planning

Working together

Methods

Communication

Impact

See [here](#) for full descriptions of the standards

## **Appendix 4: Extract from Facilitator Guide**

Firstly can we talk about what might have changed in terms of what you (or others you know) buy and what you do because of the cost of living crisis?

(Prompts: less food/clothes/shoes, poorer quality food/clothes/shoes, different shops, heating turned down or off, fewer journeys, less socialising, cut down or stopped entertainment going out, stopped having people round to your home)

Follow-ups:

Do you have different priorities from before? Are you making any trade-offs or sacrifices? What decisions are you having to make? Do you have choices or has the crisis taken them away?



© Crown copyright 2023

**OGL**

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit [nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3](https://nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3) or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at [www.gov.scot](http://www.gov.scot)

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at

The Scottish Government  
St Andrew's House  
Edinburgh  
EH1 3DG

ISBN: 978-1-83521-661-3 (web only)

Published by The Scottish Government, November 2023

Produced for The Scottish Government by APS Group Scotland, 21 Tennant Street, Edinburgh EH6 5NA  
PPDAS1388194 (11/23)

**W W W . g o v . s c o t**