**Results of Community Deliberation About Social Impacts of Ecological Restoration**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Study ID** | **indicators** | **methods** | **scale** | **practices** |
| ID76 | 1. community's social make-up (People), 2. its jobs and wealth (Economy), 3. its character (Place), 4. And its organizational and leadership capacity (Vision and Vitality). | Interactive community forums complemented with a set of small-group, interactive participation techniques, facilitated discussion  groups.  1st step: numeric ratings  2nd step: presentations and questions and answers dialogue  3rd step numeric ratings (a different scale)  4th step: group discussions  5th step: numeric ratings and qualitative justifications | -numeric ratings  of their community's current (baseline) situation across  each of the four dimensions, based on a scale ranging in  values from 1 (the most negative situation for the community,  one that was "as bad as it could be") to 10 (the  most positive situation that was "as good as it could be"); -5 ("the most negative, adverse impact in 2020 possible") to 5 ("the most positive, beneficial  impact in 2020 possible"); the midpoint was designated as  reflecting the maintenance of current, or baseline, conditions  into the future.  for each community dimension. | Two categories of subjects participated in the research: „self-selected” and „actively engaged participants.  The research blended numeric ratings with dialogic techniques in a multi-method, sequential approach  1st step: numeric ratings  2nd step: presentations and questions and answers dialogue  3rd step numeric ratings (a different scale)  4th step: group discussions  5th step: numeric ratings and qualitative justifications  Good practice: the design (multi-method, sequential) and the collection of direct or empirical data |