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## Facilitation guide for the organization of EW in HEI

The facilitation guide reports a list of points studied to guide an effective organization of EW. The facilitation guide is based on six fundamental questions reported on fig. 4.7. The guide is based on a literature review and the experience from the EW realised in Map4Accessibility (section 4.5). The facilitation guide has a general character and can be used to build EW for different urban contexts and issues with a Service-Learning (SL) approach.

**Facilitation Process**

1. The teacher presents the general objectives of EW to students following the Service-Learning pedagogical approach (WHY),
2. The teacher organises the discussion on the other Question Words (WHAT, WHERE, WHO and WHEN): make the choice of EW really born from the student,
3. The teacher provides participants with materials or (preferably) leaves students producing and organising their materials (HOW),
4. At least one walk leader is defined for each EW. If necessary, the teacher can be the walk leader or a co-walk leader,
5. The walk leaders lead the walk with selected stops determined in advance and listed. At each stop the participants consider how safe, connected, accessible, walkable, and attractive the node is for specific groups of students and citizens (e.g., disabled, children or the elderly),
6. If the weather is bad, the number of stops and the amount of information to be recorded can be reduced and the discussion periods moved in a sheltered area. Alternatively, the EW can be shifted or anticipated in other day or time,
7. A conversation at each node is realised to discuss the principles of good design – e.g., observed physical or digital barriers. Participants can rate the node on a scale of 1-5 (5 being the most adequate) on different criteria (e.g., accessibility by walking, wheelchairs, or biking). The walk leader controls the registration of participants observations at each node on the survey,
8. Once the EW is completed, participants’ experiences are discussed. The walk leader asks a few open-ended questions to encourage discussion around additional community improvements (e.g., which node the participants felt the least/ most accessible and why),
9. Do not focus only on negative aspects (what can be improved) during the EW but also on what people like in the area,
10. Do not limit the participants in their recommendations (let them be creative),
11. Do not let people monopolize the discussion,
12. Use social media (e.g., Facebook) or local media to promote the experience and the active role of walkers,

13. Make the walk fun but make sure the walkers take it seriously,

14. Ensure a follow up for a long-lasting engagement in case of a successive urban walk,

15. The walk leader collects all the participants’ surveys and writes a final report with the collaboration of all students.

16. The teacher and the walk leaders disseminate the outcomes of the EW in the proper channels, as identified by students, and an evaluation of impacts on communities and territory is done (see section 3.4.2 and 3.4.3).

SIX QUESTIONS FOR EXPLORATORY WALKS

1. **WHY**

Determining the symptoms of crisis phenomena in the area of revitalization

Identifying the potentials of stakeholders in the revitalization process

Determining the areas and directions of revitalization activities

Making students the actors of change following the Service-Learning approach

1. **WHAT**

Issues related to attractiveness, security, accessibility, walkability, and connectivity of the urban landscape (see section 4.2).

The investigated issue can be part of an argument related to a specific HEI course or project.

1. **WHO**

Around 10 HEI students and at least 1 walk leader (preferably student) for each EW. The teacher can check the activities and guide students when required.

The number of participants can vary based on the purpose of the EW and urban area characteristics. Groups of 2-4 people can properly explore an area, but a larger group can allow for a more fruitful and lively interaction. A larger group requires additional efforts for walk leaders, preliminary training, and final reporting.

Specific experts for the scheduled EW (e.g., technicians from the urban planning department of the city hall)

Be aware that the presence of elected officials can shift the focus on politics.

People with different disabilities or belonging to disadvantaged classes are very welcomed to experience and report real barriers and issues.

1. **WHERE**

Central, popular locations

Areas or routes where the issue(s) are keenly felt by citizens and/or the students

Important urban services are present

Students can complete an EW within a maximum of 90/120 minutes (Make EW with achievable objectives)

1. **WHEN**

The majority of participants are available

The investigated process happens (e.g., during serious traffic congestion time)

During lesson time as an activity linked to an exam

The weather is good (or it represents a typical condition for the area)

1. **HOW - Materials needed for walkers**

Clipboards/smartphone/tablet

Maps with nodes displayed (printed and/or digital)

Pens or pencils

Smartphones/digital camera to take pictures and make videos

Participants can use wheelchairs, noise-isolating headphones, masks or similar tools to experience tangible difficulties and actual barriers for disabled people.

A survey template (see section 4.4)