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This observation guide facilitates the evaluation of a co-creation workshop. The observer is instructed to fill in this guide to evaluate each method based on the associated evaluation criteria. This task should be carried out by an impartial observer present solely to document all interactions and complete this structured guide. Throughout the workshop, the observer's focus should be on reporting observed behaviors rather than interpreting them. Following each observation, the observer can formulate their conclusions and briefly summarize the events in the comments section.

Employing a 'checklist' approach, this guide outlines specific elements for the observer to monitor during their observation. It enables the systematic recording of information concerning the facilitators’ and co-creators’ performance relative to the processes and outcomes of each method. The checklist format also includes space for concise comments, offering supplementary insights beyond the checklist items. Upon completion, the observer should total the checks per column to derive a performance score per method. Please refer to Appendix 1 for instructions on calculating the overall performance score for the workshop.
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# Workshop Summary

**Date:**

**Location:**

**Language of the workshop:**

**Your Name:**

**Number of Co-Creators**:

**Number of Facilitators**:

**Number of Note-takers:**

**Number of Observers**:

# Method evaluation

## Method 1:

**Description:**

**Objective:**

**Time:**

### Criteria:

**1. Useful Outputs**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DESCRIPTION** | **ACHIEVED** | **NOT ACHIEVED** | **NOT RELEVANT** |
| Co-creators described what holds significant value to them |  |  |  |
| The method used a variety of formats in which data and information were presented, aiming to fit these co-creators and the setting, in a way that allows co-creators to engage |  |  |  |
| **Total:** |  |  |  |
| **Percentage:** | ((achieved) / (achieved + not achieved))\*100 = X% | | |

Comments on Useful Outputs:

**2. Reliability**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DESCRIPTION** | **ACHIEVED** | **NOT ACHIEVED** | **NOT RELEVANT** |
| Co-creators were working with data that was provided iteratively throughout the methods of the workshop, or from a prior workshop |  |  |  |
| There is repeated validation of the data accuracy |  |  |  |
| **Total:** |  |  |  |
| **Percentage:** |  | | |

Comments on Reliability:

**3. Clarity**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DESCRIPTION** | **ACHIEVED** | **NOT ACHIEVED** | **NOT RELEVANT** |
| Co-creators asked clarifying questions for clear communication |  |  |  |
| The facilitator swiftly addressed any confusion |  |  |  |
| The co-creators showed understanding through affirmative gestures like nodding and taking notes |  |  |  |
| Responses to prompts were relevant, indicating comprehension |  |  |  |
| Body language aligned with instructions |  |  |  |
| The facilitator adapted approaches for clarity |  |  |  |
| **Total:** |  |  |  |
| **Percentage:** |  | | |

Comments on Clarity:

**4. Transparency**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DESCRIPTION** | **ACHIEVED** | **NOT ACHIEVED** | **NOT RELEVANT** |
| The inputs, outputs, and procedural steps were made visible |  |  |  |
| The facilitator described how the inputs were gathered during the activity |  |  |  |
| The facilitator described how inputs led to the outcome (if there was an intended outcome) |  |  |  |
| **Total:** |  |  |  |
| **Percentage:** |  | | |

Comments on Transparency:

**5. Impactful Decision-making**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DESCRIPTION** | **ACHIEVED** | **NOT ACHIEVED** | **NOT RELEVANT** |
| 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 |  |  |  |
| **Total:** |  |  |  |
| **Percentage:** |  | | |

Comments on Impactful Decision-making:

**6. Conflict Management**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DESCRIPTION** | **ACHIEVED** | **NOT ACHIEVED** | **NOT RELEVANT** |
| Conflicts were handled constructively |  |  |  |
| All co-creators and facilitators worked towards a solution |  |  |  |
| The co-creators were leveraged to stimulate constructive debate and foster development |  |  |  |
| Promoted resolution of the conflict in a harmonious environment and encouraged group cohesion |  |  |  |
| Decisions were reached through consensus |  |  |  |
| **Total:** |  |  |  |
| **Percentage:** |  | | |

Comments on Conflict Management:

**7. Perspective Integration**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DESCRIPTION** | **ACHIEVED** | **NOT ACHIEVED** | **NOT RELEVANT** |
| The method encouraged open dialogue and the exchange of diverse viewpoints among co-creators |  |  |  |
| The facilitator treated all co-creators equally |  |  |  |
| The facilitator valued the co-creators contributions and perspectives |  |  |  |
| The facilitator ensured genuine representation of all inputs |  |  |  |
| **Total:** |  |  |  |
| **Percentage:** |  | | |

Comments Perspective Integration:

**8. Impartial Collaboration**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DESCRIPTION** | **ACHIEVED** | **NOT ACHIEVED** | **NOT RELEVANT** |
| 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) |  |  |  |
| **Total:** |  |  |  |
| **Percentage:** |  | | |

Comments on Impartial Collaboration:

**9. Method Efficiency**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DESCRIPTION** | **ACHIEVED** | **NOT ACHIEVED** | **NOT RELEVANT** |
| The method efficiently utilized time and resources, with co-creators effectively using materials |  |  |  |
| The transitions between instructions, implementation, and closure were seamless |  |  |  |
| The method was flexible and avoided redundancy, adapting to changes |  |  |  |
| The downtime was minimal, ensuring continuous engagement and productivity |  |  |  |
| **Total:** |  |  |  |
| **Percentage:** |  | | |

Comments Method Efficiency:

**10. User-Friendly Execution**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DESCRIPTION** | **ACHIEVED** | **NOT ACHIEVED** | **NOT RELEVANT** |
| 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 |  |  |  |
| Co-creators showed confident body language, and there were smooth transitions between steps |  |  |  |
| Co-creators required minimal assistance or guidance |  |  |  |
| **Total:** |  |  |  |
| **Percentage:** |  | | |

Comments on User-friendly Execution:

**11. Resource Accessibility**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DESCRIPTION** | **ACHIEVED** | **NOT ACHIEVED** | **NOT RELEVANT** |
| There was accessible and fair allocation of resources across all the co-creators |  |  |  |
| Co-creators could easily obtain essential resources (e.g. materials, information, digital resources, time, or access to experts) |  |  |  |
| All co-creators had access to vital resources, promoting overall inclusivity and effectiveness |  |  |  |
| **Total:** |  |  |  |
| **Percentage:** |  | | |

Comments on Resource Accessibility:

**12. Group Dynamics**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DESCRIPTION** | **ACHIEVED** | **NOT ACHIEVED** | **NOT RELEVANT** |
| Co-creators were highly engaged in numerous interactions |  |  |  |
| Co-creators were 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 |  |  |  |
| **Total:** |  |  |  |
| **Percentage:** |  | | |

Comments on Group Dynamics:

**13. Objective Alignment**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DESCRIPTION** | **ACHIEVED** | **NOT ACHIEVED** | **NOT RELEVANT** |
| The objectives were achieved as intended |  |  |  |
| The design ensured that the method and its outcome aligned harmoniously with the initially intended objectives, contributing to a meaningful alignment between the method and the objectives |  |  |  |
| The task was completed as outlined in the framing of the method |  |  |  |
| **Total:** |  |  |  |
| **Percentage:** |  | | |

Comments on Objective Alignment:

**14. Impact Assessment**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DESCRIPTION** | **ACHIEVED** | **NOT ACHIEVED** | **NOT RELEVANT** |
| The method was effective in assessing and measuring the impact of the co-creators' participation |  |  |  |
| The method delivered concrete outcomes that reflected the influence of co-creators |  |  |  |
| The method facilitated the acquisition of knowledge during the co-creation process |  |  |  |
| **Total:** |  |  |  |
| **Percentage:** |  | | |

Comments on Impact Assessment:

**15. Experience and Satisfaction**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DESCRIPTION** | **ACHIEVED** | **NOT ACHIEVED** | **NOT RELEVANT** |
| The co-creators appeared comfortable, and 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 for instance clapping or thanking the facilitator or other co-creators |  |  |  |
| **Total:** |  |  |  |
| **Percentage:** |  | | |

Comments on Experience and Satisfaction:

Overall Method 1 comments:

## Method 2

## Description:

## Objective:

**Time:**

copy and paste all relevant criteria here, and repeat the sections based on the number of methods you’ll have in your workshop

# Overall Observations:

Insert any overall reflections or comments that you did not capture in the guide so far

# Final Performance Scores

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Average performance (%)** | **Performance** |
| 1. Useful Outputs |  |  |
| 2. Reliability |  |  |
| 3. Clarity |  |  |
| 4. Transparency |  |  |
| 5. Impactful Decision-Making |  |  |
| 6. Conflict Management |  |  |
| 7. Perspective Integration |  |  |
| 8. Impartial Collaboration |  |  |
| 9. Method Efficiency |  |  |
| 10. User-Friendly Execution |  |  |
| 11. Resource Accessibility |  |  |
| 12. Group Dynamics |  |  |
| 13. Objective Alignment |  |  |
| 14. Impact Assessment |  |  |
| 15. Experience and Satisfaction |  |  |

**Key**

For the performance column, you can see the following parameters:

* If the average percentage score falls between 1-33%, the performance is deemed "Need improvement".
* If it falls between 34-66%, the performance is considered "Acceptable".
* If it falls between 67-100%, the performance is classified as "Outstanding".

# Appendix 1. Calculating your performance score

1. **Tally up the checked boxes per criterion:**
   * For each criterion, count the number of checks in the 'achieve', 'not achieve', and 'not relevant' columns.
   * Add these tallies together to get the total number of observations for that criterion.
2. **Calculate the total number of relevant observations:**
   * Add the tally for 'achieve' with the tally for 'not achieve'.
   * This total represents the number of relevant observations for that criterion.
3. **Calculate the percentage performance score per criterion:**
   * Divide the number of 'achieve' checks by the total number of relevant observations.
   * Multiply the result by 100 to obtain the percentage performance score for that criterion.
4. **Average the percentage scores across methods per criterion:**
   * Repeat steps 1-3 for each method and criterion.
   * Once you have the percentage scores for each method, calculate the average percentage score across all methods for each criterion.
5. **Evaluate overall performance of each criterion:**
   * If the average percentage score falls between 1-33%, the performance is deemed "Needs improvement".
   * If it falls between 34-66%, the performance is considered "Acceptable".
   * If it falls between 67-100%, the performance is classified as "Outstanding".

**Here's a simplified example to illustrate:**

Method 1: Criterion A: 80%, Criterion B: 50%

Method 2: Criterion A: 70%, Criterion B: 60%

Method 3: Criterion A: 90%, Criterion B: 40%

For Criterion A:

* Method 1: (80%)
* Method 2: (70%)
* Method 3: (90%)

Average score for Criterion A: (80% + 70% + 90%) / 3 = 80%

The overall performance for Criterion A was considered “Outstanding”

Similarly, calculate the average score for Criterion B and classify overall performance based on the ranges provided.