

Glossary of Terms for Evaluating Methods Used in Co-Creation

To evaluate the effectiveness of methods used in co-creation, and especially to compare the effectiveness of co-creation methods, researchers must establish a definition for effectiveness, and criterion or criteria by which the effectiveness can be assessed (1). It is unlikely that one criterion will reflect the overall effectiveness of the co-creation method (1), the criteria are related and can be seen as a complementary set, to which each criterion brings a different and unique perspective to the understanding of a method (2).

Definitions:

1. **Co-Creation:** Co-creation refers to the collaborative approach of creative problem-solving between diverse stakeholders at all project stages. It emphasizes diverse stakeholders at all parts of an initiative process, beginning with determining and defining the problem through to the final stages of a project (3).
2. **Co-Creation Method:** Co-creation methods encompass a diverse range of tools, activities, approaches, and techniques employed across the entirety of the co-creation process. These methods serve various purposes, including but not limited to recruitment, facilitation, data collection, reflection, data analysis, and dissemination. Notably, these methods can be quantitative, qualitative, participatory, or a blend of these, allowing for flexibility in achieving diverse objectives (4).
3. **Effectiveness:** Effectiveness evaluates how well the intended goals are reflected in the outcomes delivered by the method. Assessing the effectiveness of a specific method (or methods) and concluding is crucial for identifying potential areas for improvement and verifying the realization of intended outcomes. Furthermore, the effectiveness of a method relies on its appropriateness and alignment with a specific context (5,6).
4. **Criterion:** A criterion serves as a standard or principle in evaluation, forming the basis for the evaluative judgements to assess effectiveness. The purpose of evaluation criteria is to provide a consistent, high-quality framework and offer prompts for posing pertinent questions during evaluation. Criteria can be considered as lenses through which one can understand and analyze a co-creation method (2,7).

- a. **Process Criterion:** Process criteria encompass a set of standards and rules against which the co-creation method can be evaluated. They are related to the potential acceptance of a procedure and examine how components of the method contribute to the effective involvement of co-creators (6,8,9).
- b. **Outcome Criterion:** Outcome criteria represent expected results based on standards of practice for a specific co-creation method. The assessment of outcomes directly aligns with the objective of the method (6).

Evaluation Criteria:

Criterion Name	Type	Definition	Observation Prompt
1. Useful Outputs	outcome criterion	This criterion evaluates the co-creation method's capacity to employ techniques that produce outputs that offer significant value to co-creators, and to the overall co-creation process. It considers the variety of formats in which data and information are presented, recognizing that different contexts or projects may benefit from different formats and techniques.	Co-creators described what holds significant value to them. It used a variety of formats in which data and information was presented, aiming to fit this co-creators and the setting, in a way that allows co-creators to engage.
2. Reliability	outcome criterion	This criterion assesses the co-creation method's ability to ensure the trustworthiness and consistency of the generated data and information, providing a reliable basis for decision-making and facilitating further analyses within collaborative processes.	Co-creators were working with data that is provided iteratively throughout the methods of the workshop, and there is repeated validation of the data accuracy.
3. Clarity	process criterion	This criterion evaluates that the co-creation method is effective in articulating and ensuring a clear understanding of all its components among the co-creators, including the nature and scope of the task.	Co-creators asked clarifying questions for clear communication, swiftly addressing any confusion. They showed understanding through affirmative gestures like nodding and taking notes. Responses to prompts were relevant, indicating comprehension. Body language aligned with instructions, and facilitators adapted approaches for clarity.

4. Transparency	process & outcome criterion	This criterion emphasizes openness regarding the inputs, outputs, and procedural steps of a method. It evaluates how well the method ensures clear visibility of its workings and how clearly it connects input to outcomes.	The inputs, outputs, and procedural steps were made visible. The facilitator described how the inputs were gathered during the activity, and how they led to the outcome (if there was an intended outcome).
5. Impactful Decision-Making	process & outcome criterion	This criterion assesses the co-creation method's effectiveness in structuring the decision-making process, resulting in impactful and effective decision-making. Overall, the criterion evaluates how well the co-creation method facilitates a comprehensive and productive decision-making process.	Co-creators were invited to take part in making a decision. The decision-making process was structured and facilitated a productive decision-making process. The co-creators could discuss their choices and preferences, which were then incorporated into decisions made.
6. Conflict Management	process criterion	This criterion evaluates the co-creation method's ability to address, manage, and resolve conflicts among competing interests within the group. It assesses how well the method not only handles conflicts but also leverages them to stimulate constructive debate and foster further development. The emphasis is on promoting resolution in a manner that cultivates a harmonious environment, sustains group cohesion, and utilizes conflicts as opportunities for growth. It aims to ensure that conflicts are handled constructively, and decisions are reached through consensus, thus promoting a cooperative and positive development process.	Conflicts were handled constructively, with all co-creators and facilitators working towards solutions. They were leveraged to stimulate constructive debate and foster development, promoting resolution for a harmonious environment and group cohesion. Decisions were reached through consensus.
7. Perspective Integration	process criterion (<i>and outcome criterion?</i> – TBC)	This criterion evaluates the co-creation method's effectiveness in constructing and applying techniques that foster open dialogue, and the exchange of relevant information and alternative viewpoints among the co-creators. It assesses the method's commitment to treating all co-creators equitably, valuing their contributions, opinions, and diverse perspectives. It strives to minimize variance in opinions and enhance	The method encouraged open dialogue and the exchange of diverse viewpoints among co-creators. The facilitator treated all co-creators equally, valuing their contributions and perspectives, ensuring genuine representation of all inputs. Additionally, it fostered mutual understanding, bridging differences in language, approach, and viewpoint.

		representativeness by obtaining input that genuinely represents all co-creators. Moreover, this criterion evaluates the method's capacity to promote deeper mutual understanding among co-creators, bridging language, approach, and viewpoint differences.	
8. Impartial Collaboration	process & outcome criterion	This criterion places a strong emphasis on conducting the co-creation process independently and impartially, ensuring that the results remain free from external pressures. It evaluates the method's commitment to maintaining a fair and unbiased environment where collaboration occurs without undue influence or bias from internal or external factors. It aims to ensure that the co-creation process remains focused on the co-creators and their perspectives rather than being swayed by outside interests or pressures, or internal pressures such as power imbalances.	Collaboration thrived in a fair, unbiased environment, prioritizing co-creators' perspectives over external pressures. Co-creators contributed equally, refraining from interruptions, with everyone having opportunities to speak. Co-creators and the facilitators displayed open and inclusive body language (e.g. facing each other, relaxed posture, smiling and making eye contact, nodding, actively listening, and respecting each other's personal space).
9. Method Efficiency	process criterion	This criterion evaluates the efficiency of method execution, assessing its overall performance in reducing time and resources required for output development while ensuring that the method remains impactful and effective in achieving its intended goals, thereby streamlining the co-creation process to achieve optimal efficiency without compromising effectiveness.	The method efficiently utilized time and resources, with co-creators effectively using materials. Transitions between instructions, implementation, and closure were seamless. Group interactions were well-coordinated, with clear transitions in and out of groups. The method was flexible and avoided redundancy, adapting to changes. Downtime was minimal, ensuring continuous engagement and productivity.
10. User-Friendly Execution	process criterion	This criterion assesses the co-creation method's user-friendliness and ease of execution for both the co-creators and the facilitator. It encompasses various considerations, such as the method's utilization of graphical visualization techniques to enhance co-creators understanding. Additionally, it emphasizes inclusivity by ensuring a user-friendly execution that aligns with the diverse needs of all co-creators.	The facilitator used graphic visuals to enhance understanding, and emphasized inclusivity by adapting the delivery in a way that aligned with the needs of all co-creators. The facilitator was able to deliver the method with ease. Co-creators engaged in the activity without hesitation, and demonstrated that they could complete the task without challenges or obstacles. They showed confident body language, and there were

			smooth transitions between steps. Co-creators required minimal assistance or guidance.
11. Resource Accessibility	process criterion	This criterion thoroughly evaluates the accessibility and fair allocation of resources within the co-creation method. It examines the ease with which co-creators can obtain essential resources, including materials, information, digital resources, time, and access to experts. The primary focus is on guaranteeing that all co-creators have impartial and balanced access to vital resources, promoting overall inclusivity and effectiveness in the co-creation method. The goal is to enhance both the ease of resource accessibility and the fairness in their distribution, enabling co-creators and facilitators to readily obtain and utilize required resources, thus fostering an equitable and accessible co-creation method.	There was accessible and fair allocation of resources, and co-creators could easily obtain essential resources (e.g. materials, information, digital resources, time, or access to experts). All co-creators had equitable access to vital resources, promoting overall inclusivity and effectiveness.
12. Group Dynamics	process criterion	This criterion evaluates the co-creation method's approach to group dynamics and its impact on the co-creation process. It assesses the method's ability to foster active interaction, high involvement, and the strategic use of personalized and interactive aspects to create a harmonious and productive co-creation environment. The focus is on how the method manages the dynamics of the group and encourages positive interactions and cooperation among co-creators.	Co-creators were highly engaged in numerous interactions, facilitated by personalized and interactive elements strategically incorporated to foster a harmonious and productive environment. The facilitator ensured that interactions among co-creators were effectively managed to encourage positive engagement and collaboration. Tools such as templates, worksheets, or canvases were utilized to facilitate joint task completion, promoting active participation among co-creators. During collaborative tasks, co-creators exhibited welcoming body language, including smiles, laughter, and gestures of support, further enhancing the collaborative atmosphere.
13. Objective Alignment	process & outcome criterion	This criterion evaluates the co-creation method's effectiveness in aligning with the objectives intended to be achieved through its application. It also assesses	The objectives were achieved as intended. It ensured that the methods and its outcome aligned harmoniously with the initially intended objectives, contributing to a

		how well the method supports and aligns with the goals and intentions of those involved. The emphasis is on ensuring that the co-creation process and the outcome align harmoniously with the initially intended objectives, contributing to a meaningful alignment between the method and the overarching goals.	meaningful alignment between the method and the objectives. The task was completed as outlined in the framing of the method.
14. Impact Assessment	process & outcome criterion	This criterion considers the co-creation method's effectiveness in assessing and measuring the impact of participation. It evaluates the method's ability to deliver concrete outcomes that reflect the influence of co-creators on the structure and specific areas of the co-creation process. Additionally, it assesses how well the method facilitates the acquisition of knowledge during the co-creation process.	The method was effective in assessing and measuring the impact of participation. It delivered concrete outcomes that reflected the influence of co-creators. It also facilitated the acquisition of knowledge during the co-creation process.
15. Experience and Satisfaction	process criterion	This criterion assesses the co-creators holistic experience within the method. It includes their comfort level, their perception of success, their enjoyment of the process, and their willingness to engage in similar future sessions. The criterion emphasizes co-creator perceptions to gauge the overall effectiveness and satisfaction levels achieved by the co-creation method, to provide valuable insights into the participant experience.	The co-creators appeared comfortable, relaxed, and showed signs of enjoyment. The co-creators were willing to engage in the method. Co-creators expressed satisfaction with the method or were showing visible signs of satisfaction (e.g. smiling or positive facial expressions, open body language such as facing the facilitator or the person that is speaking, keeping arms uncrossed and maintained good posture). The co-creators were attentive and maintained eye contact with the facilitator and the other co-creators, or were taking notes. The co-creators expressed appreciation by clapping, thanking the facilitator or other co-creators.

References:

1. Hartson HR, Andre TS, Williges RC. Criteria For Evaluating Usability Evaluation Methods. *Int J Human–Computer Interact*. 2003 Feb 1;15(1):145–81.
2. OECD. DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation [Internet]. OECD Publishing; 2010 [cited 2023 Nov 22]. (DAC Guidelines and Reference Series). Available from: https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/dac-quality-standards-for-development-evaluation_9789264083905-en
3. Vargas C, Whelan J, Brimblecombe J, Allender S. Co-creation, co-design, co-production for public health – a perspective on definition and distinctions. *Public Health Res Pract* [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 May 30];32(2). Available from: <https://www.phrp.com.au/?p=41678>
4. Agnello DM, Balaskas G, Steiner A, Chastin S. Methods Used in Co-Creation Within the Health CASCADE Co-Creation Database and Gray Literature: Systematic Methods Overview. *Interact J Med Res*. 2024 Nov 11;13(1):e59772.
5. Sillak S, Borch K, Sperling K. Assessing co-creation in strategic planning for urban energy transitions. *Energy Res Soc Sci*. 2021 Apr 1;74:101952.
6. Rowe G, Frewer LJ. Evaluating Public-Participation Exercises: A Research Agenda. *Sci Technol Hum Values*. 2004 Oct;29(4):512–56.
7. Blackstock KL, Kelly GJ, Horsey BL. Developing and applying a framework to evaluate participatory research for sustainability. *Ecol Econ*. 2007 Feb 1;60(4):726–42.
8. Maskrey S, Priest S, Mount NJ. Towards evaluation criteria in participatory flood risk management.
9. Public Participation Methods: A Framework for Evaluation - Gene Rowe, Lynn J. Frewer, 2000 [Internet]. [cited 2023 Nov 22]. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/016224390002500101>