Whose voice is missing?

AI-assisted analysis of public consultation responses

Up to 10 staff · 2 × 90 min · In person or live online

The decision brief

A municipality is considering new opening hours for a community centre. Thirty fictional responses arrive. Prepare a brief that conveys recurring views and a reservation raised by one person. For planning, participation, policy and resident-service staff who write or check consultation summaries.

Learning outcomes

Assign one response to several themes, distinguishing support, opposition and conditional support. Detect an omitted position in an AI draft, separate quotations from paraphrases and trace each claim to its source. Explain whose views the file represents, what remains unanswered and who should follow up.

Preparation

Participants need basic spreadsheet skills. Provide one computer per pair and an AI tool approved for internal use. The instructor can supply prepared outputs for all activities. Use only fictional responses. All required work takes place during the sessions.

What the authority takes away

A one-page decision brief, a 30-row response matrix and an audit log. Each participant explains how a coding decision changed the brief. The templates can be reused after adaptation to local procedures.

Online group pilot · 90 min

Pilot / full programme, per group, before VAT where applicable.

Israel: 490 / 990 ILS • Finland: 149 / 349 EUR • Sweden: 1,650 / 3,900 SEK

The pilot fee is credited when the group continues within 30 days. Other countries and on-site delivery are quoted separately.

Teaching languages: English, Swedish, Danish and Hebrew. Norwegian by prior arrangement.

Session plan

Whose voice is missing?

1 · Read and code the responses · 90 min

0–10 min: define the question facing the decision maker. 10–30: independently code six common responses for theme, position and supporting words before viewing the AI draft. 30–50: compare interpretations and agree definitions, examples, duplication and conditionality rules.

50–80: split the remaining responses and compare each suggested code with the original text. Complete one matrix for all 30 records. 80–90: each pair records one correction and its rationale. Keep disputed cases for the next session. Materials include a blank sheet, numbered responses and an AI draft containing test cases.

2 · Write and audit the brief · 90 min

0–10 min: decide which duplicates count and how to report them. 10–35: draft a shared summary with a repeated view, a reservation, a limitation of representation and an open question. 35–65: check every quotation and a random sample of five distinct response-to-theme assignments. Record and correct similar errors where needed.

65–80: compare versions, identify the approver and tell residents when and from whom to expect an update. 80–90: each participant codes a new response and explains whether the brief should change. Partners rotate writer and reviewer roles.

Practice and assessment

Whose voice is missing?

A worked example · Response 17

“I support evening opening. If that means closing on Friday mornings, I object. Friday is the only day I can come.” Code support for evening opening and opposition to Friday closure separately. Both statements have the same respondent and source ID. An editor may paraphrase that the resident supported evening hours and wanted Friday mornings retained. Use quotation marks only for verified original wording.

Assessment and evidence

Submit the brief, matrix and audit log. Explain the duplicate count, preserve the minority view and both positions from response 17, identify a source for each claim and verify every quotation. For five sampled assignments record the reviewer and corrections. Invented quotes, omitted rare views or unsupported claims require revision. Each participant justifies one new coding decision with the text.

Reading and source materials

OECD (2022) · Guidelines for Citizen Participation Processes

Gale et al. (2013) · The framework method for qualitative data

DfT AI and Data Science Team (2025) · Consultation Analysis Tool evaluation