

Public Dialogue BBSRC's Food, Health and Nutrition Challenges



Evaluation Report

Executive Summary

This report evaluates a public dialogue on the topic of 'Food, Health and Nutrition Challenges', commissioned by BBSRC in 2014. For ease of access, key findings are listed below from the participants' perspective and the evaluator's.

Participant feedback

All participants said they were **satisfied with the workshops**, with 81% saying they were very satisfied.

All, bar one, participants said that the **information shared was fair and balanced**. The odd one neither agreed or disagreed that it was fair and balanced.

All, bar one, participants said that they could **ask questions and get answers** and felt that they were **able to contribute their views and have their say**.

All participants agreed that **the facilitation was independent, professional and effective**, and that they felt **comfortable with the experts** (BBSRC) and that they helped to answer questions. 89% strongly agreed to both statements.

Just under half the group said that there needed to be **more time to discuss issues**.

A third of the group either disagreed or were neutral on whether the workshops would **make a difference to how food strategy develops in the future**.

Evaluator's key points

The facilitation was fair, unbiased and enabling. Participants were encouraged to talk, reflect and think through issues both individually and collectively.

The workshop design allowed participants to raise issues and begin thinking before they were influenced by presentations from BBSRC. Issues of social influence, genetics, lack of information, health, impacts of food on the body, additives and chemicals, the Government's role and media influence were all discussed in groups before the initial BBSRC presentation.

The facilitators used a range of techniques to ensure that people had the opportunity to speak and think; including reflecting and clarifying participants' views and task instructions; allowing space for clarity among participants to emerge without the facilitators themselves interpreting; and generally by being calm, efficient and empathetic.

The available time was a constraint (strongly mentioned by participants in the feedback). Despite this, the workshops could have been enhanced by more interaction between participants and the BBSRC; and more explicit reference to stakeholder views that challenged choices over research areas.

1 - Introduction

This report evaluates a public dialogue on the topic of 'Food, Health and Nutrition Challenges', commissioned by BBSRC in 2014.

The evaluation contains -

- a. Descriptions of the process used by the facilitators.
- b. The evaluator's reflections on key *participant* responses from their evaluation of the process (via questionnaires and informal conversations with participants), on the facilitators and whether the participants own purpose in being present was met.
- c. The evaluator's comments on the facilitators' process, facilitation and whether the purpose of the workshops was met.
- d. The evaluator's comments on broad concepts like, was the proposed output possible with the time, process or resources used.

2 - Background

BBSRC commissioned Hopkins Van Mil to design, facilitate and report on a public dialogue, with a sample of the public, to consider challenges (or areas of research funding) that will inform the development of the BBSRC Food Strategy.

The phrase 'public dialogue' is used in this report to mean "A process during which members of the public interact with scientists, stakeholders and policy makers to deliberate on issues relevant to future policy decisions".

BBSRC have a multi-disciplinary Working Group which has already considered a range of challenges; and as per BBSRC emerging practice, they wanted to contrast these with public priorities and consider the similarities and differences between what they have considered and public perceptions of the challenges.

3KQ was appointed as external evaluator of the public dialogue.

3 – The Public Dialogue

The aim of the public dialogue was broadly to understand what a selection of the public consider to be the research areas (or challenges) that the public would like to see the BBSRC focus on; and to compare these with BBSRC's own emerging challenges.

Specific objectives of the public dialogue were to:

- Engage in meaningful conversations on the challenges in the food, nutrition and health space on which BBSRC should focus
- Engage in meaningful conversations about the role of different actors in the food, nutrition and health research system (for instance industry, policy makers, research funders and consumers).
- Engage a range of views & values
- Provide advice which is relevant to BBSRC and to which it can respond

- Demonstrate BBBSRC's commitment to open and transparent strategic planning

The process design for the public dialogues comprised the following key elements:

- Selection of a sample of 20 participants
- Materials for pre-reading by participants
- Materials for use during the workshops
- Two 3 hour evening workshops to hold meaningful conversations

These elements are illustrated in the timeline below, together with the dates and details of attendees.

Element	Date	Attendees
Event 1 – Russell Hotel, London	10/03/14	19
Event 2 – Russell Hotel, London	12/03/14	19

Recruitment for the public sample was conducted by Acumen Fieldwork using a combination of on-street face-to-face recruitment, topped up via a market research database and informal contacts. Whilst the recruitment process did not claim to be representative of the wider population, the screening questionnaire and quotas for age, gender, socio-economic class and ethnicity did ensure a cross section of the population attended. An additional proviso was that 25% of participants would have not attended an event like this in the past; and that some participants had an interest in healthy lifestyles. 19 participants attended in total, with 19 participants completing the whole dialogue process. Participants were given a 'thank you payment' at the end of the second event of £120.

All the events were facilitated and recorded by the delivery contractor, Hopkins Van Mil.

Participants had opportunity to read a variety of information and materials in different formats.

At event 1:

- a handout entitled Points to Help the Discussion covering the background to the dialogues, how they would work, roles of people in the room and some information on the types of research conducted and how it is applied.
- copies of the BBSRC presentation on what the BBSRC is, how it is funded, its remit

and the purpose (from their perspective) of the dialogue.

- Laminated cards illustrating some of the products of previous research
- a handout entitled What is Healthy?, that is a product of a previous dialogue

At event 2:

- a handout on the organisations involved in food research and how it is funded
- copies of the BBSRC presentation on emerging research challenges

Between the two events, participants were asked to do a homework task to prompt further deliberation: talking to a family member or friend about their views what they had talked about so far; and what their own personal reflections of the first event were.

4 - Evaluation Aims and Methodology

The **aim** of this evaluation is to provide an independent assessment of the public dialogue's design and facilitation and participant responses to the process and facilitation of the workshop.

The key questions covered in the evaluation are:

- **Objectives:** has the dialogue met its short term objectives of having meaningful conversations about the public's view of the research challenges; which can inform the development of BBSRC's Food Strategy?
- **Good practice:** was the design and facilitation of the event good practice?
- **Satisfaction:** have those involved been satisfied with the dialogue?
- **Lessons:** what are the lessons for the future (what worked well and less well, in terms of design and facilitation)?

And to a lesser extent -

- **Short term impact:** what difference or impact has the dialogue made?

This evaluation report is based on the following data collection and assessment methods, conducted between 10th March 2014 (the first workshop) and 12th March 2014 (the second workshop):

- **Observation.** The evaluator directly observed both events on March 10th and 12th 2014.
- **Informal discussion.** Conversations with participants about their understanding of their role and their experience of the facilitators; and with BBSRC attendees about their observations of the workshops.
- **Questionnaires.** Written self-assessment questionnaire data was gathered from participants at the end of both workshops. The data gathered from these events is published separately in Appendix A.

- **Document review.** The evaluator reviewed the process plans, materials shared in the workshops and the materials used in the workshop (flipcharts, post-its and thought cards).

5 - Objectives

“Has the dialogue met its objectives?”

There were five objectives for the public dialogue. Each is taken in turn with an assessment from the evaluator as to how well they have been met. Evidence underpinning the assessment is taken from direct observations, participant questionnaires and informal interviews.

Note that the public dialogue was not intended to be fully representative of public views, but broadly reflective in a qualitative sense.

Objective 1: Engage in meaningful conversations on the challenges in the food, nutrition and health space on which BBSRC should focus

This objective was **well met**. Note that a definition of ‘well met’ is included in Appendix B.

The workshop was designed to enable participants to engage in a range of different conversational activities. These ranged from plenary discussions; work in groups of ten; work in groups of five; work in pairs or threes; and the opportunity to ask BBSRC experts questions.

In the first workshop, the activities built from an initial reflection on What my favourite food is and why?; through explorations of what is important about food; where information is gathered from; how people are influenced; questions to BBSRC about their role, independence and research; and a final conversation in groups about people’s research ideas and how they might get the data needed.

In the second workshop, the activities started with a reflection on the last workshop and any conversations people had had with family or friends; then a roving idea storm to look at additions and commentary to the emerging ideas for research; a presentation on the BBSRCs emerging research areas; a review of the research areas proposed by both BBSRC and participants; and a final session to think through the implications of prioritised ideas and some feedback from BBSRC.

The workshops were explicitly designed to give people many opportunities to think through and discuss ideas, reflect on these and hear from BBSRC about their motives and work.

The objective is marked well met, as opposed to very well met, because time to have dialogue between BBSRC and participants was not designed in. This is because the workshop was about participant ideas and their reactions to BBSRCs role and work; not a dialogue between BBSRC and participants to co-create or have face to face conversations

about research and the role of the BBSRC. Having said that the sessions allowing BBSRC to present and field questions were well run and allowed participants to learn a lot.

Objective 2: Engage in meaningful conversations about the role of different actors in the food, nutrition and health research system (for instance industry, policy makers, research funders and consumers)

This objective was **well met**.

There were sessions in both workshops where participants were engaged in conversations about the different actors involved in and affected by research. These produced a plethora of issues including social influence (media, advertising), ethics (who funds the researchers and is it independent?), funding mechanisms, the difference between primary and translational research and the Government's role.

Again, the objective is well met, as whilst there was lots of meaningful conversation between participants, there was little conversation between BBSRC and participants, aside for the Q&A sessions after each presentation.

Objective 3: Engage a range of views & values

This objective was **well met**.

Participants were given a range of materials to characterise the purpose of the workshop; including information on the products of research, findings on What is Healthy? from other workshops, and copies of the BBSRC presentations. BBSRC were also candid about areas of controversy, like GM, and issues of ethics, like industry funding for research.

Among the groups of participants there was a wide range of views and knowledge about food, nutrition and health and the facilitators ensured that people had the space to share these and reflect on others people's views, and knowledge.

Again, this is not marked very well met, because the workshop design did not explicitly share views and values from other stakeholders which would have been critical of the BBSRC, the food industry, marketing, food production, and other systemic issues. And while the workshops were not a dialogue between the public and a range of stakeholders, presenting other views would have, potentially, influenced the conclusions that participants came to.

Objective 4: Provide advice which is relevant to BBSRC and to which it can respond

This objective was **very well met**.

The products of the participant discussions on both the research areas they thought important and their reflections on the BBSRC's emerging areas of research were said to be useful by the BBSRC at the end of the workshop. The research areas proposed by the participants aligned well with emerging BBSRC ideas; and they also suggested that research into GM and cloning should be considered, which is not one of the BBSRC's current research areas..

It's worth noting that participants scored lower on confidence that the events would make a difference to food strategy than for any other question, suggesting some remaining uncertainty about how the product of the workshop will be used. (See question 8, Appendix A) BBSRC committed to sharing the report on Strategy and the final Strategy document with participants; this should address these concerns. It is, perhaps, not unusual for trust not to be given unreservedly after such a short interaction.

Objective 5: Demonstrate BBSRC's commitment to open and transparent strategic planning

This objective is **well met**.

The BBSRC shared its planning process, its collaboration with other Research Councils, its consideration of ethics and its review process. They also reiterated the purpose of the workshop at various points and committed to sharing the Food Strategy once it was complete.

In conversation with various BBSRC representatives they described the value of using public engagement to their work, especially on specific issues, and how they desired to use similar methodology internally to aid the strategy development process.

In summary, **all five objectives were either very well met, or well met**. Overall, a key contributing factor for this was the clarity and practically demonstrable nature of the objectives, in particular the fact that the dialogue did not try to be over-ambitious in its scope and remit.

6 – Good Practice

“Has the dialogue met the principles of good practice?”

Focussing on these aspects – the context, process design, facilitation and interaction in the workshops and the outputs or potential impact – the evaluation takes four principles of good practice from the Sciencewise Good Practice Principles as a benchmark.

- **Context:** The conditions leading to the dialogue process are conducive to the best outcomes.
- **Scope:** The range of issues and policy options covered in the dialogue reflects the participants' interests.
- **Delivery:** The dialogue process itself represents best practice in design and execution.
- **Impact:** The dialogue can deliver the desired outcomes.

Each principle is taken in turn below. I provide an assessment of how well the principle has been met, what evidence this assessment relies on, and what contributed to the principle being met or otherwise.

Context Principle: The conditions leading to the dialogue process are conducive to the best outcomes.

This principle was **very well met**.

Purpose. The purpose and objectives of the workshops were clear from a number of perspectives, including the initial recruitment, joining instructions, conversations with participants and BBSRC attendees.

Policy. There is a clear route for the workshop outputs to feed into BBSRC's Food Strategy, and this was clear from the first presentation made by BBSRC; reinforced by subsequent questions from participants and re-iterated in closing words from BBSRC.

Timing. The workshops timing fits well with BBSRC's strategy development.

Resources. Resources allocated met the need of the project. Whilst more resources could have been applied to have more discussion time, or more highly produced and varied materials; I do not think that this would have significantly changed the outputs of the workshops. It's primary purpose was not to engage in dialogue with BBSRC scientists, staff or management; it was to provide ideas for BBSRC's Food Strategy and make a comparison with BBSRC's current and emerging research challenges.

Scope Principle: The range of issues and policy options covered in the dialogue reflects the participants' interests.

This principle was **very well met**. Factors for this are explained below.

Framing. Participants were clear about the purpose and structure of the workshops and the boundaries of discussion. At several times, some space was allowed for other issues, but the group were always willing to return to the matter in hand; and this was handled effectively and gracefully by the facilitators.

Participants. The participants, in terms of visible diversity, represented a range of ages, gender and ethnicity. From contributions observed and one to one conversations, it was also clear that a range of class, attitude to food, and knowledge about food and science was also represented.

Focus. A key challenge in these workshops was allowing enough time for the participants to discuss the range of issues that emerged from their conversations. This was commented on by many participants in the evaluation of both workshops. Nevertheless, 14 out of 19 participants still agreed (in the evaluation) with the statement, "I had enough time to discuss the issues".

Facilitators approach. Both facilitators allowed participants to shape the conversations, but keep them within in the boundaries of the workshops, and prompted or clarified issues with participants to ensure that the objectives were met during both workshops.

Delivery Principle: The dialogue process itself represents best practice in design and execution.

This principle was **well met**. Factors for this are described below.

Organisation. This was apparently without issue - participants received advance information, workshop materials were available on tables, handouts were delivered promptly, flip charts paper and post-it notes were ready to use, thought cards and an issue wall were provided, timekeeping was good and the facilitators improvised with timings to allow the group to complete conversations (for example after the presentation in the second workshop), and still finished on time.

Clear objectives communicated. I spoke to ten participants in breaks, all of whom felt that they “understood the objectives of the day” and that they were clear why they were there. Their responses can be summarised by saying that they all understood that they were there to talk about what research should be done with regard to food and science.

Non-biased. The design and facilitation of the events seemed balanced and non-biased to the evaluator. At no point did I observe the facilitators suggest content or behave differently in response to different people’s contributions. I consistently observed them reflecting on what people had said, clarifying participants meaning, allowing the group to arrive at a conclusion with the facilitator directing them to, summarising various people’s contributions and affirming all contributions as useful to the discussion.

18 out of 19 participants perceived the information provided as being fair and balanced, (see Appendix A). And 100% of participants agreed that the facilitation was independent, professional and effective.

Range of perspectives. Much of the workshop was devoted to the discussion of participant responses to certain questions and prompts. There were two presentations from BBSRC; and some time after them to discuss questions and get answers. But what was missing from the workshop were perspectives that may have dissented from BBSRC’s priorities; challenged the research system; engaged participants in more in depth discussion of the pros and cons of certain suggestions; and so on. Strictly speaking the workshops were supposed to design for this, but the inclusion of other voices and perspectives, may have produced different outputs.

Specialist input. Each of the workshops had BBSRC staff or Board/Working Group members present. Both presenters made clear and succinct presentations and demonstrated their passion and commitment to the issue of food, health and nutrition. The presentations were shared with participants; and in the second workshop, experts answered questions or clarified BBSRC directions. Appropriately they did not try to sway the public in one direction or another, and were content to observe the range of conversations and ideas that emerged in the discussions.

Be deliberative. The purpose of the workshop was not to co-produce outputs, but the evaluator did observe the group moving from generalised statements about food, to several considerations of their views and ideas, to a final selection of some proposed priority areas. This was a little rushed, as the end of the workshop was looming, but still provided a good representation of participants’ priorities.

Appropriate scale and diversity. The public dialogue was not intended to be fully representative of public views, but broadly reflective in a qualitative sense. The workshops engaged 19 people through to the end of the process. However, it is hard to say *a priori* that this gives a strong indication of what the public at large feels: it is quite a limited number of participants.

In the absence of a clear number of participants above which a sample becomes quantifiably credible, numbers are by default driven by practical factors. The budget available can only go so far, and facilitators can only manage a certain number of people at once. In these terms, the numbers engaged were indeed appropriate, to give an indication of what people - given the chance to talk about food and research into food - think should be the priorities for research.

Impact Principle: The dialogue can deliver the desired outcomes.

“What difference or impact have the workshops made?”

It is not possible to say at this point what the impact will be beyond the workshops, but the BBSRC made a commitment to consider the workshop outputs and communicate their reports to participants.

68% of participants reported that they agree that the events will make a difference to how food strategy develops in the future. 94% of participants said that they had learned something new; 88% said that taking part had affected their views on food, and 81% said that they would change something they did as a result of taking part.

Whilst impacting the thinking and actions of participants was not an objective of these workshops, it is useful to understand that this kind of workshop process does indeed alter participants' thinking and potentially their behaviour.

7 - Satisfaction Levels

“Satisfaction: have those involved been satisfied with the dialogue?”

Satisfaction levels are **very high**.

The public participants were certainly satisfied with the dialogue, with 100% of participants saying that they were “overall satisfied with the events I attended”. The vast majority, 81%, of these agreed strongly, which indicates very high satisfaction levels.

Some of the BBSRC participants also expressed satisfaction with the way the workshops were run and the emerging ideas with the evaluator at different times.

8 - Lessons

“What are the lessons for the future (what worked well and less well, and more widely)?”

These workshops were very well organised and facilitated. The materials shared and used were concise and appropriate. The only, slight, criticism of the workshops is that there could have been more time for discussions and different voices could have been shared with participants to help them understand the scope of perspectives on food and food research.

Carl Reynolds, 3KQ

Appendix A - Evaluation Results

Note - participants' comments are separated by a semi-colon

1	The invitation process and advance details for today were well-handled (Note – asked on day one only)	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither	Tend to Agree 4	Strongly Agree 15	D o ' n ' t K n o w
	What did you think of them?	<p>Very organised; well organised; well organised and presented; thorough grounding, much appreciated</p> <p>Well done; calm and reassuring; fine; clear, welcoming</p> <p>Intriguing; it made me think a great deal and I went to the BBSRC website; leaflet was very helpful</p> <p>Could have had more notice</p>					
2	The information presented today seemed fair and balanced. Eg the What is Healthy? document and the presentation (Note – 1/x = responses on day one, 2/x = responses on day two.)	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither 1/1 2/1	Tend to Agree 1/6 2/3	Strongly Agree 1/12 2/15	D o ' n ' t K n o w
	What was useful about the information?	<p>Day one all; appropriate</p> <p>very interesting; I learnt some new stuff; you can use it for everyday life; very fair, encouraged debate; all of it...my mind is exploding with new facts and info; one is always learning; told me things I did not know</p> <p>I didn't know of BBSRC's existence; commitment of BBSRC</p> <p>Day two realistically informative; informative; very fair information; informed me about new areas; factual, informative</p> <p>broken down and easy to understand;</p> <p>very helpful for personal; that it will and has made a difference in my life; it was pertinent to me; incredibly useful;</p>					
3	I could ask questions easily and get appropriate answers	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree 1/0 2/1	Neither	Tend to Agree 1/7 2/5	Strongly Agree 1/12 2/13	D o ' n ' t K n o w

	Comments:	<p>Day one very open; easy, approachable people; very polite to talk to</p> <p>quality experts;</p> <p>felt all my questions answered fully; every one was given a chance</p> <p>Day two excellent; very fair; I found the second session a lot more easy to answer; I was encouraged to ask questions and got clear answers; most certainly; good</p> <p>some of the words were very technical, didn't understand</p> <p>great leader</p>					
4	I had enough time to discuss the issues	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree 1/4 2/4	Neither 1/0 2/3	Tend to Agree 1/9 2/8	Strongly Agree 1/6 2/6	D o ' n ' t K n o w
	Comments:	<p>Day one so much to pack in; time was slightly pushed; not enough time for all comments; could do with more time; a little pushed for time; there was so much to talk about you'd probably never have enough time</p> <p>Day two lots concisely; unfortunately could do with more time; sometimes certain topics were rushed; there was a lot crammed in; so much to get through; absolutely; sometimes limited; there were so many issues and they were complicated so time was short</p>					
5	I was able to contribute my views and have my say	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree 1/1 2/1	Neither	Tend to Agree 1/4 2/1	Strongly Agree 1/14 2/17	D o ' n ' t K n o w
	Comments:	<p>Day one nicely led; group discussion; nobody took over and there was lots of space to talk</p> <p>I felt uneducated and not much positive input</p> <p>BBSRC seemed genuinely interested in listening to us</p> <p>Day two encouraged and respected; I felt a lot more comfortable to answer and give my opinion; I was listened to; caring group; definitely; yes;</p> <p>again time constraints;</p>					

6	The facilitation today was independent, professional and effective	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither 1/1 2/0	Tend to Agree 1/3 2/2	Strongly Agree 1/15 2/17	D o , t K n o w
	What did you like about the facilitation?	<p>Day one friendly, welcoming, informal; very welcoming and friendly; very professional</p> <p>could not fault it; excellent and fair; hearing everyone's views; efficient and concise; a good air, atmosphere; it had good reason behind it</p> <p>Day two very helpful without being intrusive or influential; encouraged and respected; it was very polite and understanding; that it was very professional; good atmosphere to work in and learn; fair, informative and balanced; friendly, informal</p> <p>a lively discussion; always stuck to great time keeping; very well organised sessions; everything was made clear – one only had to ask</p>					
7	I felt comfortable with the expert person/people who helped to answer questions today	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither	Tend to Agree 1/5 2/2	Strongly Agree 1/14 2/17	D o , t K n o w
	What did they do to help you understand the issues?	<p>Day one available, clear and concise; good clear explanations; explained in layman's terms; so keen to talk about subject</p> <p>Day two I found listening to David and Richard very interesting; very interesting people;</p> <p>they were giving examples and situations; they answered the questions in broken down terms; everything answered fully; very informative; revelations about gut I loved; listened and answered; very informative, helpful; clear and concise</p>					

Day one - Any other comments?

Well done; very well presented and organised; I found it very interesting and Im looking forward to the next session; good food/healthy; enjoyable group

Note - The following questions were only asked on day two

8	I am confident that these events will make a difference to how food strategy develops in future	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree 1	Neither 5	Tend to Agree 5	Strongly Agree 8	Don't Know
	What makes you think this?	<p>Strongly agree: we are looking forward; it very good to be able to give our personal opinions; because I feel they are big enough to make a difference; BBSRC told us they have learnt a lot; I hope so; we are all human beings</p> <p>Tend to agree: I hope they will make a difference. I look forward to reading the report; hope the points raised are discussed; I think the views will be taken into account</p> <p>Neither: I don't know if what we found out about was ground breaking enough; unsure over trust;</p> <p>Tend to disagree: no comment made</p>					
9	I found the time/energy to do the follow-up work between the two events	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree 2	Neither 3	Tend to Agree 6	Strongly Agree 8	Don't Know
	Comments:	Too busy; researched on internet; I googled the BBSRC;					
10	Overall I am satisfied with the events I attended Note – 16 responses in total	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither	Tend to Agree 3	Strongly Agree 13	Don't Know
	What was the best thing about the events?	The topics that were being discussed; it was informative; team work and good info; very well organised; finding out more about BBSRC; company and information; the learning curve; very interesting and important issues;					
11	I learned something new as a result of taking part Note – 16 responses in total	Strongly Disagree 1	Tend to Disagree	Neither	Tend to Agree 2	Strongly Agree 13	Don't Know
	What was the main thing you learned?	Bacteria in the gut; about the gut; BBSRC work hard on our behalf and are underfunded; I learnt a lot about nutrition; the fact that scientists know very little about the gut, but the idea that it is central to our health; genes can be influenced; that GM and cloning is the way to go forward; lots – both to do with the physical process and research					

12	Taking part in these events has affected my views on the topic Note – 16 responses in total	Strongly Disagree 1	Tend to Disagree	Neither 1	Tend to Agree 6	Strongly Agree 8	Don't Know
	In what way have your views changed?	I am no longer negative about GM and cloning; that I can influence my health through my diet; faith in Government has increased; I will look more closely at what I eat; increased confidence in the work bioscientists are doing; I need to know more; feel more reassured that the UK are researching into our food health					
13	I am likely to change something that I do as a result of taking part Note – 16 responses in total	Strongly Disagree 1	Tend to Disagree	Neither 2	Tend to Agree 7	Strongly Agree 6	Don't Know
	What are you likely to change?	My opinion and hopefully others opinions; eat less fat; it will help with my motivations to eat healthily; may change eating habits; research more into some of the foods I eat, effects that some foods have on me; with more info forthcoming – yes; eat more broccoli; be more relaxed about my attitude to chemicals, pesticides, GM food					

Appendix B - Calibration and Definitions of Assessments

Very well met	Met to the greatest degree that could be expected. No improvements are identified that could realistically have been implemented.
Well met	Met, with only one or a few relatively small improvements identified, but without any substantive impact on the output of the dialogue.
Fairly well met	Met, but with a series of improvements identified that could have substantively improved the process and/or impact of the dialogue.
Not very well met	Falls short of expectations in a substantive and significant way.
Not met	Effectively not met at all.