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Background

The British Columbia Council for International Cooperation (BCCIC) is a coalition body of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and individuals working in international development. BCCIC’s mission is to support a coalition of members, operating locally and globally, to reduce global poverty and achieve sustainable human development. The vision of BCCIC is that all members are supported in their international development work and that all British Columbians are active and engaged global citizens. BCCIC is the only member-based body of international development NGOs in BC and currently has 38 organizational and 22 individual members.

Many BCCIC members have developed strong public engagement (PE) resources and evaluation tools to measure changes in people’s behavior and attitudes in international cooperation. One of BCCIC’s roles is to bring together PE practitioners to share best practices, case studies and evaluation tools of successful PE initiatives. In June 2008, BCCIC organized a member’s lunch and learn meeting, entitled ‘Best Practices in Public Engagement’. Four organizations presented their best practices and tools in public engagement. BCCIC documented two case studies including Global Citizens Kelowna and RESULTS Canada, titled “Reflections: Examining Best Practices in Public Engagement” see Appendix 01. The response from participants was a desire to ‘go deeper’ on the sharing of good practice.

On March 26, 2009 BCCIC organized a one-day workshop, entitled ‘Public Engagement: Resources and Evaluation Tools’. BCCIC invited those with experience or responsibility in public engagement either as staff members or volunteers to attend. The intended outcomes of the workshop were to deepen learning and understanding of PE approaches, and evaluate tools while building stronger working relationships. The anticipated outputs are that challenging and successful techniques are documented and shared through mechanisms identified by members. BCCIC hopes in the long-term that this and other workshops lead to improved member capacity to engage Canadians in their international cooperation work.

This document will highlight the findings, discussions and key learning from the one day-workshop. This report will first be shared amongst workshop participants before being made available for BCCIC members and public engagement practitioners.

BCCIC Survey Highlights on Public Engagement in British Columbia

One of BCCIC’s priorities is to increase the effectiveness of public engagement activities in BC by facilitating the sharing of tools and best practices amongst its members. Using Survey Monkey, BCCIC designed two surveys:

1. BCCIC Membership Survey, October 2008 (Appendix 02)
2. Public Engagement Pre-Workshop Survey, March 2009 (Appendix 03)

Both surveys specifically focused on researching and investigating public engagement definitions, examples of best practices and evaluation tools and organizational capacity in terms of years of experience and willingness to share resources. The outcomes from the surveys helped identified key issues that BCCIC members are interest to address in order to actively educate, inform and mobilize British Columbians to reflect and act on local and global issues. The overall impression from both surveys is that BCCIC member organizations have solid experience and expertise in public engagement programming and are interested in sharing resources and tools via workshops, newsletters and online forums.
In October 2008, BCCIC carried out its own membership survey with objectives to collect quantitative and qualitative findings to help develop resources, tools, workshops and services for BCCIC to better serve its members. BCCIC asked its members questions on public engagement definitions, activities, best practices and sharing information with other members. The response rate was high, with 76% member organizations and 72% individual members filling out the survey. The key findings are summarized below:

- BCCIC organizational members defined public engagement as:
  - “Working with the Canadian public to educate them and mobilize them to contribute personally to international development (in various forms)”
  - “Challenging”
  - “Different from public education. It’s about engaging the public in a vision and mission that we share. Public engagement means action.”

- BCCIC individual members defined public engagement as:
  - “Touching the hearts and minds of individuals so that they become personally involved in some aspect of our work.”
  - “Raising awareness of global issues.”
  - “Making connections with the Canadian public, either constituency or general, in order to provide information, stimulate transformative thinking, and facilitate participation.”

- 61% responded that fundraising was a public engagement activity they were involved in.
- 74% responded that they were willing to share their public engagement activities and information with other BCCIC members.
- BCCIC organizational members shared examples of best practices in public engagement;
  - “Our PE is done by bringing representatives from overseas partner NGOs and touring BC communities.”
  - “Multimedia show presentations and selling products that have an educational component.”
  - “Presentations at schools, churches, stories and articles in the local newspaper.”
  - “Our overseas interns must do public engagement work once back in Canada.”

In March 2009, in support of the Public Engagement workshop on Resources and Evaluation Tools, BCCIC wanted to collect information, seek feedback and gain insight from members on how organizations use public engagement as part of their overall programming. Prior to the workshop an online survey was developed to collect anonymous feedback that could only be presented as collective results. From the twenty participants that attended the workshop, fourteen filled out the survey. The key findings are summarized below:

- 61.5% responded that their organization has been doing public engagement programming for over ten years.
- 42.2% responded that a quarter of their time and responsibility is dedicated to public engagement activities while 38.5% said half of their time is dedicated to PE activities.
- 46.2% characterized the level of competency and capacity within their organization to undertake public engagement as ‘adequate’
- 63.6% use interviews as a tool to evaluate their public engagement work.
- When asked to define public engagement in their work, responses included:
  - “As the ability to move community members from an increased place of awareness into active participation in international development initiatives.”
  - “A means to engage audiences in meaningful conversations that build awareness and inspire collaborative action.”
  - “Outreach to Canadians, sharing about issues in development and working to get involved in solutions.”
Workshop Design

In planning the Public Engagement workshop, BCCIC staff reviewed Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC) ‘Signs of Change: Assessing out Public Engagement Impacts Report 2003 (Appendix 04) which explores frameworks for assessing public engagement activities. BCCIC found this a useful document and disseminated it to member organizations as preliminary reading for the workshop. BCCIC’s own workshop design process involved consulting with six of its member organizations to determine and prioritize the workshops purpose, outcomes and outputs. The contributions, feedback and insight provided by member organizations helped shape and form the workshop agenda and case study presentations. A workshop plan was drafted to act as a guide and template to set deadlines, address challenges and establish next steps once the workshop was complete. Writing a ‘Workshop Report’ was written into the plan. The workshop purpose and anticipated results are highlighted below.

A. Workshop Purpose
   • To bring together BCCIC members, who employ public engagement as part of their program, to:
     a) Establish a common definition and understanding of PE concepts and principles and how these can support member programming;
     b) Share best practice, tools and resources that can be documented and shared;
     c) Share evaluation tools that measure quantitative and qualitative (immediate and intermediate) results of public engagement.
   • To highlight successful long term public engagement case studies that link awareness-raising to taking action.

B. Workshop Outcomes
   1. Deeper learning and understanding of public engagement approaches and evaluation tools.
   2. Improved capacity to successfully engage the public (in their programming and events) and to evaluate these.
   3. BCCIC members’ network, build stronger working relationships and collaborative approaches.
   4. Concrete links are shared and demonstrated between public engagement and active global citizenship.
   5. BCCIC members’ network, build stronger working relationships and collaborative approaches.
   6. A sharing of medium to long-term outcomes of public engagement initiatives including changes in people’s behavior.
   7. BCCIC members identify strategies to continue dialogue of public engagement practices and evaluation resources. This may be via on-line communication tools, working groups, documents etc.
   8. Members develop a common vocabulary around PE as it applies to international development.
   9. Relationships are strengthened and a network of PE specialists is established within BC.

C. Workshop Outputs
   1. Successful’ public engagement techniques are documented and shared amongst BCCIC members.
   2. Challenges and successes of specific public engagement initiatives are identified
   3. BCCIC members’ network, build stronger working relationships and collaborative approaches.
   4. Members develop a preliminary framework to measure and evaluate public engagement initiatives.
   5. Quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods are documented and shared
WORKSHOP HIGHLIGHTS

I. Why are you here?
Participants were asked to introduce themselves and express, in a few words what would make the day a success for them.

- To learn and exchange ideas.
- To gain gems of wisdom.
- To learn of ways to engage the public on sensitive issues.
- To find ways to measure success.
- Interested in getting people out.
- To perceive and evaluate process and outcomes.
- To expand and improve our own program.
- To find ways to learn from others.
- To develop a definition/concept and determine how it relates to projects.
- To learn of other concepts/purpose of public engagement.
- To provide information on what CIDA is doing.
- To hear what other people are doing in this area.
- To determine the role of not for profit in hard-hitting Public Engagement techniques.
- To find ways to learn from others.
- To develop a definition/concept and determine how it relates to projects.
- To provide information on what CIDA is doing.
- To hear what other people are doing in this area.
- To determine the role of not for profit in hard-hitting Public Engagement techniques.
- To learn about evaluation methods

II. Approaches to Public Engagement
Joe Knockaert, Director, Pacific Regional Office, CIDA and Richard Delayne, Delayne and Associates presented approaches to public engagement and public participation.

A. Joe Knockaert
With 30 years of experience in international programs both locally and abroad, Joe talked about his experience with CIDA and public engagement.

Public Engagement Programs in CIDA include:
- PE Fund
- Some funding under the Voluntary Sector Fund Program
- Development Information Program (Mass Media Initiative, Global Classrooms Initiative and Journalism and Development Initiative)
- International Development Week

As of April 1, 2009 Canadian Partnership Branch will be responsible for all of these programs with the exception of IDW which remains with the Communications Branch.
An overview of CIDA’s interest in Public Engagement:

**Rationale:** PE means that Canadians are better informed and more involved, and will thus push the government of the day to deliver more effective international development.

**Goal:** To build a deeper understanding of development amongst Canadians and increase support for programs.

**Summary:** We need to understand what we are trying to accomplish together and how we are going to define success.

**B. Richard Delaney – Delaney and Associates**

Richard Delaney supported the design and development of the workshop agenda; he also facilitated the event. Richard has a background in public and stakeholder consultations, training, programming, and organizational development and is also licensed to deliver the International Association of Public Participation certificate program.

**Handout:** IAP2’s Public Participation Spectrum and examples of planning and evaluation frameworks (Appendix 05)

Public Participation:

The purpose of domestic public consultation in support of international development efforts is to move people along a continuum, towards an action of some kind (contribution, volunteering, writing to MPs, etc.) that supports the goals of the organization. The processes used to engage stakeholders (audiences) will vary depending upon the objectives of the consultation and where stakeholders are situated on the continuum. Stakeholders may be situated at different positions on the continuum, which calls for a variety of approaches.

**Questions Discussed:**

- Is public information and public education a goal, or a means to an end?
- How do we define evaluation criteria that demonstrate a measure of success in a way that supports on-going measurements?
- How can your evaluation efforts demonstrate a return on investment for your public engagement programming?
A Model for Public Consultation Programming:
- The goal of domestic public consultation is to motivate action and involvement.
- Integrate this goal with our desire to move people towards action, as well as, planning, design and evaluation processes.
- Different approaches to consultation (public information, communications, relations, etc.) help to move stakeholders along the spectrum, from awareness to action.
- Initial efforts help to identify potential involvers and to orient them towards where they are going (i.e. a program of engagement).
- Must create and provide access to opportunities or the tools to take action.
- There is tension between letting the program get too far ahead of stakeholders, i.e. we need to create opportunities for action along all stations of the spectrum in order to stay in touch with stakeholders.
- If you want to make decisions on how to best engage stakeholders (your audiences) you need to know where organizations are and what people ‘need’ to work together, i.e. consultation needs to include two-way communications.
- Different levels on spectrum point towards different techniques, which in turn provide different results. For example: Appreciative Enquiry is a technique that helps to ask where participants want to go in a way that creates positive energy towards the goals that you set.
- Framing the issues is an important activity, as it frames the discussion moving forward and ultimately makes a difference in results and clarifies process (i.e. Houston v. San Diego’s traffic problem). People in a process define the problem as they go.

Public Engagement v. Publics Engagement
- Various publics have different goals, i.e. advocacy, contribution, volunteerism, responsible consumption, etc.
- Programming needs to support people to take action.

When should organizations or individuals implement evaluation for Public Engagement?
- Think about what you will ultimately evaluate to determine if you have been successful while you are in the planning stage. This helps to identify “critical success factors” and will inform planning going forward.
• The “results” that you identify need to be observable and measurable, so that you can calculate if and how successful you have been. For example if your PE is supposed to generate new volunteers then you can calculate the number of new volunteers, or number of volunteer hours over a certain period.
• As you continue your PE you can measure the increases or decreases in average volunteer hours, to give you an idea of the effectiveness of your on-going program.
• If you don’t identify ‘what success looks like’ at the beginning then you will be picking results that emerge as measures of success and not getting a true reading.

Guidelines for results based evaluation
• Commit to a structured / formal evaluation effort
• Develop the evaluation framework soon after you have confirmed the public consultation goals and objectives.
• Identify what success looks like in a way that can be observed and measured.
• Collect evaluation information/data as part of your overall project/initiative, this supports on-going evaluation/improvement.
• Keep it simple.

(Break out into Buzz Group session)

III. Buzz Groups

Based upon the information presented in the previous session, participants divided into buzz groups to react to the material presented as it might apply (or not) in their own organizations and public engagement activities. Buzz groups were asked to document their thoughts and perspectives to three questions. Groups responded to the structured approach of public engagement, how to build public trust by gaining and keeping accountability.

1. What are your strengths or challenges?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The diversity of our ideas</td>
<td>- PE approaches take time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Our ability to look at outcomes</td>
<td>- Certain approaches might not be supported by CIDA, Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The ability to set goals and strategies</td>
<td>- Our work might not reflect the policies of the funder or government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Focusing on a target audience</td>
<td>- Ability to show relevance in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Establishing indicators</td>
<td>- To gain and keep accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing clear goals that reflect the intentions of the people and creates political leverage</td>
<td>- The need to be more independent in our funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Experience and collaboration: We are a strong core of engaged individuals</td>
<td>- Measurement is a continuum; It is difficult to measure the changes in values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The variety of ways in which we work</td>
<td>- Other international organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Evaluation tools; establishing a baseline and engaging the public to measure our public engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Canada is intercultural and we need more participation from this perspective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. What could be adopted or adapted?
- The learning from overseas needs to be brought back to our organizations.
- Need to connect with private sector industries for ideas and explore non-traditional partners.
- Ways to gain financial and political support.
- Know when to plan and when to work intuitively.
- Find a structure that will work for you or your NGO.

3. What are we already doing?
- Committed to RBM planning.
  - Engage partners and stakeholders at the beginning.
  - Evaluate our methods from the start to the end.
  - Evaluation that is consistent.
- We ask the public and respond to the public’s wants and needs.
- We are representing Canadian values.
- We use focus groups, surveys, educational workshops, polling, discussion forums etc.
- We collaborate, to some degree.
- Canadian government funding may be positive because the Government is engaged, and also negative because we become less independent

IV. Public Engagement Tools and Techniques
Richard Delayne facilitated a discussion to examine public engagement techniques and tools that bring people together

**Handout:** Techniques to bring people together (Appendix 06)

Discussion Question: What do you do in Public Engagement to increase public awareness and outreach?
- Give presentations to different audiences.
- Act as a guest speaker at events coordinated by others.
- Host informative dinners.
- Use participatory media such as photos, videos and DVDs to engage the public.
- Use “guerilla marketing” techniques such as approaching people on the street with information or entering into new neighborhoods.
- Send mail outs and magazines.
- Use asset mapping to find interested groups.
- Allow people to be involved throughout the project enabling grass-root level participation.
- Mass media for people not directly involved in project including public meetings and workshops.
- Online communication such as blogs, webinars and podcasts.
- Host an information booth at events that are already happening in the community.
- Host “connect days” or information days for public to become more informed.
- Take advantage of the sphere of influence of corporations i.e. host information sessions at company events, have employees sign up for ‘volunteer days’.

V. Case Study Presentations
A PowerPoint framework was distributed to three presenters in order to document a long-term or one-off public engagement project or program in their organization.

Power Point Presentations are shared below:
1. Don Wright, Amnesty International

**Slide 1**  
Amnesty International

AI's vision is for every person to enjoy all of the human rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. AI's mission is to conduct research and take action to prevent and end grave abuses of all human rights – civil, political, social, cultural, and economic.

**Slide 2**  
Public Engagement

- Media work
- Resource development
- Public awareness / campaigns
- Grassroots organizing / youth program
- Group events and activities

**Slide 3**  
PE Objectives

- To increase public awareness and knowledge of human rights
- To change public attitudes around human rights – each of us has a responsibility to act
- To change behaviours – to support an active and engaged public that takes action to improve human rights through campaigns and international solidarity

**Slide 4**  
PE projects and programs

- National: Write for Rights, 10,000 Voices, No Exceptions, Small Places, Day for Darfur
- Local: panel discussions and forums, film events

**Slide 5**  
Accomplishments

- Increased awareness and knowledge
- Affirmation for current supporters
- More letters written / MPs visited
- People outraged by human rights abuses but inspired by hope for a better world

**Slide 6**  
Strengths and Challenges

- Strengths
  - Brand recognition / reputation
  - Networks of local groups and action circles, fieldworkers and coordinators
  - Active at 450 high schools and post-secondary institutions
- Challenges
  - Breaking through the clutter
  - Role of privilege / empathy gap

**Slide 7**  
Evaluation and Planning

- Feedback from members and groups: annual general meetings, think tanks, consultations, questionnaires
- Public response, focus groups and polls
- Media coverage
- Financial support
- Film ratings / e-mail surveys

**Slide 8**  
Lessons Learned

- People are busy
- People are interested
- People need to be invited
- People need to be supported

**Slide 9**  
Impact Analysis: AI Film Festival

**Inputs:** Staff, volunteers, films, media support, venue...

**Outputs:** 4-day film festival / 1800+

**Outcome:** people are outraged, inspired, motivated, and equipped to act

**Impact:** increased awareness and knowledge / changes in attitude and behaviour

**Slide 10**
3. Lynn Thornton, Victoria International Development Education Association (VIDEA)
* To be provided at a later date
VI. Table group exercise

In groups participants shared and reviewed their own PE evaluation tools (qualitative and quantitative) and how/when they are used during PE activities.

Group 1:
Process of Engagement and Outcome:
- The feedback process is built into the engagement so it can be responsive.
- The activity is the process of engagement.
- Develop a training session questionnaire before and after the activity to see if the organization is using what was learned.
- Use photos to document the process.
- Use community maps (e.g. number of gardens, funding and number of people) as a process.

Questions and Observations:
- Why would we want to take credit for an outcome, rather then see it as an outcome of collaboration?
- Who really should be measuring the outcomes? The individual, the organization or the government?
- Indicators may miss the main outcome.
- How does an organization deal with concerns around the timing needed to go back and measure outcomes?
- How do organizations ensure the community wellbeing and long term sustainability of the process?
- The measurement of PE is different depending on where it is being done.
- The outputs are easy to develop.

Group 2:
Process of Engagement and Outcome:
- Promotions/public awareness/best practice
  - Evaluation is done by the virtue of donations and choice of programs.
  - Whether an organization was invited back or not after presentation can be used as an evaluation tool.
  - Intern returnees are encouraged to present to funders, schools and service groups, as a way to engage the public.
- A questionnaire is standard for the evaluation process
  - Aids in accountability.
  - For smaller organizations questionnaires make it easier to monitor outcomes.
- The use of online web 2.0 for participatory engagement
  - Use blogs and other media to engage Canadians in discussions.
  - Brings International Development into the home via the internet.
  - Allows for information sharing through links from other websites and discussions.
- Using photography and anecdotes for evaluation.
  - People look for qualitative data such as pictures and stories as information.
  - Testimonials/anecdotes are more concrete than “numbers”, including photos
- Provide direction and support to those who will do evaluations: keep them short and select a limited number of useful indicators that are measurable.
- Use deliberative polling: give out a survey, create a dialogue and then repeat the survey

Questions and Observations:
• For a successful evaluation of public engagement an organization needs both statistics and testimonials. This creates a baseline by having an evaluation at the start to measure change at the end of project.
• An organization needs to be responsible for carrying out their evaluations; this can not be left to the partner organization.
• Evaluation is a challenge when there is a lack of funding and time. Better funding would enhance presentations for public.

**Group 3:**
Process of Engagement and Outcome:
• The number of times an organization is called upon by the government as an “expert” is used as a measure of success.
• A personal book is used to collect the contact information of interested parties and is carried to events to be continuously updated.
• Send an email out a week after the event, the number of people who respond to the email is used as a measure of success.
• Track the built in rating system on podcasts and other websites. This is also beneficial as it allows for anonymity when posting web comments.
• Use photography to evaluate an event (look at how many people came).

Questions and Observations:
• It is challenging to determine ways to measure engagement of different cultures and communities in Canada.

**VII. Evaluation Tools and Methods**
A wrap-up of the discussions surrounding PE planning, evaluation approaches and long-term best practices was led by Richard Delaney.

Participants returned to the summary of the objectives of the workshop to discuss any final questions and thoughts surrounding them:
  i. Establish a common definition and understanding of PE concepts and principles and how these can support member programming;
  ii. Share best practice, tools and resources that can be documented and shared;
  iii. Share evaluation tools that measure quantitative and qualitative (immediate and intermediate) results of public engagement.
  iv. Highlight successful long term public engagement case studies that link awareness-raising to taking action.

**VIII. Final Evaluation**
BCCIC handed out an evaluation form at the end of the workshop in order to measure the immediate impact of the workshop. The public engagement evaluation workshop report (Appendix 08) key findings are summarized below:
• 50% strongly agreed that the objectives of the workshop were clear at the start and 66.67% agreed the objectives were accomplished in the workshop.
• 58% felt that the handouts were helpful (see workshop report appendices)
• 58.3% strongly agreed and 25% agreed that they had enough opportunity to discuss questions or concerns.
• 66.6% described their overall impression of the workshop at ‘Good’, 8.3% said ‘Excellent’ and 16.6% said ‘Adequate.’
• The workshop was of value in the following ways:
  - Useful models of engagement to follow
  - New ways of looking at PE
  - Networking
• Ways that participants might apply the learning from the workshop in their organizations or community included:
  - Develop more evaluation mechanisms from planning & relate PE activities to project goals
  - Bring more “impact” questions into some evaluations.
  - We will continue to look at taking a strategic approach to our public engagement efforts
• Participants outlined their organizations public engagement activities in priority;
  - Events/workshops
  - Network/partnership sharing and collaboration
  - Speaking engagements, community colleges, service clubs, schools, public promotional events.
• Additional comments included:
  - It would have been nice to have a bit more time for exploring specific evaluation techniques.
  - Keep the workshops coming!
  - A good day, but a little too much emphasis on public participation which feels like the way government tries to facilitate public involvement in decisions that directly affect them (i.e. Community resources, economic development, infrastructure, etc.) rather than for engaging people in ID issues.

IX. Summary and Next Steps
In the next six - twelve months, BCCIC plans to review and evaluate the results arising from the workshop and report. BCCIC is interested to continue working with its members, inter-council networks and CIDA in order to continue the learning, dialogue and sharing of resources and tools via workshops, newsletters and online forums. BCCIC will continue to monitor its work to support its members in the following:
• BCCIC members are better networked and work more collaboratively when planning and coordinating public engagement activities, events and programs.
• BCCIC members are in communication with each other in order to continue the dialogue on how to best put into effect public engagement.
• BCCIC members refer to the public engagement case studies, best practices, evaluation tools and other documentation disseminated by BCCIC
• BCCIC members are better positioned to apply and strategize for current or future public engagement projects

Next Steps
BCCIC will disseminate the workshop report to workshop participants in April 2009. Feedback and contributions will be requested in order to improve the quality and authenticity of this report. Once a sufficient number of workshop participants have approved this report it will be shared with the public. In June 2009, BCCIC will follow up with both individual and organizational members to determine how to continue the learning and move forward on sharing public engagement initiatives and resources. Dates and timelines will be established during this phase.
Appendix 01 - Reflections: Examining best practices in public engagement
Reflections: Examining best practices in public engagement  
BCCIC Membership Meeting, June 17th 2008

“How can there be Peace without people understanding each other and how can this be if they don’t know each other?” Lester B Pearson.

Joyce Brinkerhoff from Global Citizens Kelowna referred to this quote to highlight her organizations best practices of public engagement at the BC Council for International Cooperation’s membership meeting on Tuesday 17th, June 2008. Twenty three individual and organizational members attended to network, share ideas and discuss best practices together. The afternoon event started with a lunch and tour of the ‘Bridges That Unite’ exhibition, hosted by the Aga Khan Foundation at the Roundhouse Community Centre.

Four panelists, Barb Kruger from Partners for Prosperity, Anita Mark from Results Canada, Lynn Thornton from VIDEA and Joyce Brinkerhoff from Kelowna Global Citizens presented their organizations best practices and tools in public engagement. A dynamic and interesting discussion followed raising numerous thought provoking questions; what is public engagement and who is it for? How do we celebrate and track our work and successes? Others noted that “public engagement is a role to play, it is not enough just to turn up at events, but people somehow need to become physically involved”. The event ended with Gregory Spira’s presentation on ‘Chaiuriri through the lens: envisioning community development through photovoice’. His work demonstrates a growing need to use different mediums, working with cameras, to help a community document their lives and issues. As a follow-up to the meeting, we contacted our wonderful panelists and asked them to expand their thoughts on the four questions of the day. We look forward to organizing more membership meetings both in Vancouver and around the province! Stay tuned!

Best Practices in Public Engagement - Global Citizen Kelowna, Joyce Binkerhoff

1. Highlight of our organization’s work in public engagement.
Global Citizen Kelowna is all about public engagement! It is an annual festival to raise community awareness of the diversity of humanitarian organizations located in the Central Okanagan. We, like Lester Pearson, believe that we can accomplish far more by understanding and knowing one another – utilizing each other’s strengths to the greatest degree and supporting each others weaknesses. Furthermore, we gain the ability to then tell others about who we know and what they do that we don’t! The focus is on promotion of the cause of humanity and not duplication of services or competition for support. The Global Citizen Kelowna committee is made up of members from several local NGO’s who, for the past 4 years, have coordinated a number of independent events all taking place during the same week and/or leading up to that week. The events work together for efficiency, momentum, promotion and cost sharing – in effect ‘creating a bigger bang for the buck’. The intention is not to raise one organization’s profile over another but to draw attention to the variety and scope of the various organizations and especially to promote the great need for truly ‘global citizens’. Individuals are inspired to action and are then able to ‘get into action’ where they feel a natural fit. The importance is not who gets the ‘credit’, but more importantly, that people get involved and that the MDG’s are reached!

2. One example of best practice.
Working together removes ‘prejudice’ or people avoiding getting involved because there are ‘so many groups’ and they all are ‘after my money’ enables broad-based business and government sponsorship as it is not ‘favoritism’ to a particular group media can create ‘a buzz’ leading up to and following each event with feature articles leverage of each group’s contacts and resources to enable greater impact (i.e. bringing in a big-name speaker).

3. Describe a couple of key tools you use to track qualitative impact from your public engagement.
Tracking the number of volunteers involved in Global Citizen activities and events, media coverage, willingness for sponsors to re-commit their sponsorship and the interest and excitement among Global Citizen committee members.

4. What are the trends you see in public engagement?
There is a growing trend in people wanting to be more personally involved in humanitarian activities – especially in groups. i.e. family members wanting to help out in an orphanage, a school class wanting to go build houses, People want ‘on-ramps’ to get involved. Once they see the need – they want an easy and effective way of getting involved and one that fits with their degree of comfort, passion and time available. People are weary of the barrage of needs and many are skeptical of the authenticity of some of the promotions. Accountability is a value embraced by all groups promoted during Global Citizen Kelowna activities. The public assumes that you are just promoting your ‘cause’ and it is exactly the same as the one they heard about last week. They are afraid of duplication of services and therefore need to be shown the differences between various projects. (not ‘better’ but ‘different focus’ and therefore a better fit for an individual’s particular passion. i.e some are drawn to health issues, others to education.

Best Practices in Public Engagement –RESULTS Canada, Anita Mark

1. Highlight of our organization’s work in public engagement.
MP visits to Africa: In 2006 CIDA’s TB spending was in jeopardy. After getting wind of the pending cuts, RESULTS Canada led a successful, 4-person multiparty MP delegation to Kenya where we worked with our ACTION colleagues on the ground there to coordinate site visits to clinics and home visits to meet TB patients in Nairobi’s slums. Included were Alexi McDonough (NDP), John McKay (Liberal) who as a result of his work is presenting at the RESULTS International Conference in Washington DC speaking on Canada’s Better Aid Bill (he was largely responsible for it passing). And he joined RESULTS! This past November, RESULTS Canada took two Canadian MPs, Dr. Ruby Dhalla (Liberal) and Lee Richardson (Conservative), to Cape Town, South Africa to learn about the devastating effects TB and TB-HIV co-infection are having on people and health care systems in South Africa and around the world. The trip also coincided with the Union World Conference on Lung Health which both Mr. Richardson and Dr. Dhalla attended. Lee Richardson is now a monthly financial supporter of RESULTS.

2. One example of best practice.
RESULTS organizes monthly ‘Education & Action’ meetings where we learn about global poverty issues from researched Action Sheets lead to learning and “results”. At these meetings we have discussions, write to MPs and the media. These meetings and subsequent actions are a very effective form of engaging the public.
3. Describe a couple of key tools you use to track qualitative impact from your public engagement.

We track our media publications (Letters to the Editor, Op Eds, Editorials) - we had over 400 pieces published in 2007. We know the media pieces that get published influence government foreign policy. Also our volunteers meet in person with MPs in Ottawa and at home, presenting issues of importance that generate tangible outcomes.

4. What are the trends you see in public engagement?

- Online trends – e.g. Make Poverty History, Engineers Without Borders (EWB), Fair Trade AVAAZ (The World in Action), etc
- Philanthropy trends – Bill Gates, Warren Buffet etc
- Celebrities endorsing social causes
- Business marketing strategies supporting and endorsing causes e.g. The Gap’s Red Campaign Programs in schools
1. How would you define Public Engagement? (34 responses)

Organizational member responses

- Ongoing process of involvement of citizen groups (including women, youth, disabled, indigenous groups) to voice their opinions and suggestions in a public forum, such that they are able to influence and drive change in their community.
- Working with the Canadian public to educate them and mobilize them to contribute personally to international development (in various forms)
- Educating and motivating public understanding and interest in international development activities
- Moving individuals from wherever they are to a more active participation in a specific arena of activity, such as donating time or money or services, going to work on a project, etc.
- Different from public education. It's about engaging the public in a vision and mission that we share. Public engagement means action.
- "To genuinely engage Canadians as global citizens is the basis for a range of activities that can move individuals from basic awareness, through understanding, to personal involvement and informed action. Public engagement is the key!" - CIDA (this best reflects our philosophy)
- Educating our partners and the Canadian public about issues of development and human rights, particularly as they relate to our Latin American partners.
- developing an international "learning" community
- Are you referring to advocacy and public awareness campaigns?
- Educating Canadians about development in developing countries
- Involving the Canadian public in international development work - in terms of the need, objectives and strategies.
- Bringing awareness to Canadians of community development initiatives and opportunities the organization is engaged in and to enlist their involvement and support
- creating opportunities for Canadians to think about, learn about, link to, global issues of social justice, globalization, trade, international development, poverty
- Dissemination of information into the public arena, including educating the public, lobbying politicians
- Raising awareness, facilitating education, providing option for action, advocating on specific issues either to government and the public (our church constituency primarily) and occasionally a call to action asking the public to advocate to the government on an issue.
- Presenting our work in Africa in such a way that the general public is made more aware of the realities (good and bad) and challenges faced by rural African villagers and be moved to participate in responding to those needs in some way (through us or some other avenue).
- Challenging
- Interaction with Canadian public on organizational activities and projects
- Informed discussion, learning opportunities, whole of community approach using a variety of fora, methodologies and media to deepen understanding of issues of International cooperation, Canada's role in the world and efforts to end global poverty in a just and sustainable manner.
- Creating an awareness of Global issues around poverty and provide opportunities for Canadians can engage in what is being done to alleviate poverty. This problem (poverty) is too big for NGOs and Government to tackle in their own. We need all Canadians to be informed and involved.
- Engaging the public in the debates surrounding international development specifically and the work we do individually.
- Advocacy through public speaking
Individual member responses

- Drawing attention to NGO work, and hopefully leading this attention to understanding, and maybe some passive, or even active participation in NGO work.
- Activity that helps the public understand the importance of our work, and be motivated to support our work and get involved.
- Getting the public to care about, and get involved with, the issue I’m advocating for. I think the most important way to get people to care is to tell your org’s story, how what you’re doing is effectively and efficiently making a difference in the world, and ultimately to show the public why/how this is relevant to them -- from a marketing point of view, it’s important to remember that to consumers “it’s all about me”, so it’s important to help the public connect the dots as to how what you’re doing matters to them. Means to getting public engagement include ‘earned media’ (PR-related) and ‘paid media’ (advertising), fund-raising efforts, marches, online networking (e.g. Facebook), etc...
- Methodologies that build awareness and create constructive action within the general community.
- An opportunity to share knowledge with the public
- Education, events, training, newsletters, awareness building. I’m very happy with everything that comes our way from BCCIC
- I would define public engagement as educating and involving the community at large. This could include holding information seminars, hosting a booth at a fair, or running workshops. It would include providing volunteer opportunities to engage the community.
- Making connections with the Canadian public, either constituency or general, in order to provide information, stimulate transformative thinking, and facilitate participation.
- The definition would vary depending on the organization’s mandate, its stakeholders, the objectives of the public engagement activities and the intended audience for the activities. There is no one definitive definition of public engagement.
- Active involvement to address issues of public concern for the betterment of all
- Raising awareness of global issues. I am unclear on how this term is defined by CIDA.
- Touching the hearts and minds of individuals so that they become personally involved in some aspect of our work.

2. In which of the following public engagement activities are you, as a member, involved? (30 responses)

- Writing letters to MPs: 30.5%
- Fundraising: 61%
- Media Campaign: 36%
- Tabling at events: 50%
- Participating in MPH events: 36%

Please list additional P.E. activities and give examples of best practices in your organization or work.

Organizational member responses

- Public events: co-hosted the Nature Child Reunion event in February, 2007 and are planning a major international conference in March 2009.
- School resources (ministry approved)
- We have a strength in youth engagement. We also, for example, work with journalism students to help them better understand some issues and how it can affect their reporting (specifically international humanitarian law)
- Maintain a local and international network of “like minded” individuals and groups
- Our PE is done by bringing representatives from overseas partner NGOs and touring BC communities.
• Multimedia show presentations  Selling products that have an educational component
• Bringing southern partners to Canada to engage with the Canadian public
• We publish a newsletter (sent to our members) three times annually; hold three or four public events a year, including a Nepali Film Festival; and maintain a website.
• Our overseas interns must do public engagement work once back in Canada.  This includes conducting presentations, networking with non-governmental organizations working the same field as those org. that the interns were placed with.
• What is tabling at public events?  We have done a variety of events but I don't have time to answer this question in the detail you are asking for at this time. We can discuss it in more detail of that is of value.
• Presentations at schools, churches, stories and articles in the local newspaper
• Presentations to a variety of groups, films, music and art events, public forums, always seeking to provide a space for Indigenous people north and south to have their voices heard and their perspectives validated, media...
• We also take people on trips to visit programs and expose them to some of the difficulties and injustices that exist in much of the world today. This has been an effective tool in getting more people involved.
• Guerilla marketing for organizations
• I have given Powerpoint talks on the subject of reducing global poverty

Individual member responses

• Hosting overseas visitors from Nepal and Honduras - meeting supporters in Canada.
• Organizing events
• Worked on the media campaign for the MPH march we did, but that was over a year ago.
• N/A
• I have been involved in various types of PE activities over the years including photo exhibits, workshops and panel discussions.
• In Canada: events regarding the current situation in Uganda (east Africa) and how to get involved.  In Uganda: Community meetings in Uganda with locals, village chair etc.
• With my primary client, I support the work of the public engagement coordinator
• Placing articles in print publications, online community building, giving presentations on activities (public speaking) and facilitating discussion groups on issues.
• Training and education through workshop that we deliver or contracts we have done around Global Issues.
• Even fundraising is limited - time constraints, but articles written about Afretech in newspapers and magazines have garnered positive responses.  We also give presentations of service groups such as Rotary.

3. Are you willing to share your public engagement activities and information with other members? (35 responses)
   ▪ Yes: 74%
   ▪ No: 16%
   ▪ No response: 10%

If yes, how could this be shared with other members?

Organizational member responses

• Experience from around the world - how local government can engage public
• On our website; through BCCIC
• We have a staff dedicated in part to public engagement, who ensures communications with BCCIC where activities and information are concerned.
• We advertise through your newsletter
• Have to give it some thought
• In the future, when we have some.
• Throughout website or email distribution list.
• Although the PE 'products' couldn't be shared we could share knowledge/lessons learned.
• We don't really have any activities or information at this point. However, we do plan to bring some people to Canada from Bolivia to visit and meet various groups, at least twice in the next four years.
• Not sure, we're all pretty busy!
• Communicating with other organizations of our activities and including them in certain specifically targeted programs.
• In many ways, what do you have in mind? Perhaps a workshop together where we share reflections on best practices
• Don't really know. It's not rocket science, and very organization specific.
• Poverty should be well defined. Well defined problem is more likely to be minimized/solved. Poverty is more complex and diverse. We can share our field experience.
• *(Organization name)* publishes a yearly magazine and quarterly updates to inform donors, and the public of our current activities and projects We also regularly updates Canadian project partners by presentations and dinners
• Children's book on the impact of climate change on Indigenous communities north and south, website, one-on-one conversations.
• Through meetings and the Justice High website
• Invite me to give a talk on: Reducing Global Poverty

*Individual member responses*

• You need to contact *(Organization name)* directly.
• Case studies, workshop co-facilitation
• Again, at the moment I'm fully engaged, but I'd be willing to develop marketing/communication plans in the future.
• Advertising in the newsletter/emails
• Since my primary client is not a member of BCCIC but is a member of CCIC, my sharing could only be on a personal basis and not related to this client's work
• I have already shared some of this at a previous event. I am happy to speak to my insights on media relations (one of the specialties of my consulting practice) for groups. I am also happy to write short pieces for inclusion in the BCCIC newsletter or other venues online.
• I am not sure what I have or know that would be useful. I have not engaged in active lobbying or advocacy except on behalf of projects.
• Sorry, but time is so very limited, but perhaps someday.
1. How many years has your organization been doing public engagement programming?
   - 1 – 5 years: 23.1%
   - 5 – 10 years: 15.4%
   - 10 plus years: 61.5%

2. How much of your time and responsibility is dedicated to public engagement activities?
   - 0%: 7.7%
   - 25%: 46.2%
   - 50%: 38.5%
   - 100%: 7.7%

3. How do you define public engagement in your work?
   - Multi-stakeholder processes, broad citizen engagement in visioning processes
   - As the ability to move community members from an increased place of awareness into active participation in international development initiatives
   - Public speaking engagements (approx. 12/year); newsletters (3/year)
   - The wide variety of ways that our organization helps move individuals along the continuum from basic awareness of international cooperation issues through understanding to personal involvement and informed action.
   - A means to engage audiences in meaningful conversations that build awareness and inspire collaborative action.
   - Keeping Canadians engaged in international development. Focus on returned volunteers
   - Informing those in your community about the work you undertake.
   - Helping the public learn about and understand our work so they will get involved in our campaign work and our organization.
   - Forums to bring together citizens and elected municipal representatives; education on civic politics. A second organization I'm involved in focuses on restorative justice for youth offenders, setting up conferencing from RCMP and Crown Council referrals.
   - All public exposure, whether presentations, speaking engagements, small events and media
   - Sharing our collective resources (locally and internationally) and involving the diverse communities we live and work in service based learning opportunities.
   - Outreach to Canadians, sharing about issues in development and working to help them get involved in solutions

4. Why is public engagement important to your organization?
   - Public engagement ensures that projects are responsive to the needs of a community and the community will own the process. It builds capacity amongst participants to be able to articulate their needs, to participate in governance and brings voices to the table that may not always be included.
   - It is the key outcome for public education work
   - It makes the public aware of our organization and its role in international development; it inspires volunteerism and financial contributions to our programming and that of other NGOs.
Complex issues require the resources, knowledge and impetus of many different individuals and organizations in order to create sustainable change in our lifetime. Collaborating with and engaging others are a key direction in our organizational plan, essential to achieving our mission.

- It helps us keep volunteers involved in all aspects of our work
- It informs constituents about the work we do and the manner in which it is done. It also updates donors and attracts new ones.
- Public engagement is how our program spreads information about critical humanitarian issues. Using public engagement also allows us to reach a wide audience which may never have heard of the issues that are affecting our world today.
- Public engagement is at the core of our work - without the public, we would not be able to think of ourselves as a grassroots organization.
- For both community organizations I work with, it is the raison d’être. Community building and service through engaging citizens is the mandate of both.
- Informing the public about the needs of our constituents and our successes in addressing them; for volunteer recruitment as well as fund raising and gaining third part credibility to attract partners and collaborators in similar and/or complimentary work.
- It is the glue ... the relationship piece between the people, places and issues/ It is indeed how we create and international "learning community". In the old UNICEF language for Grade 5's It is the "care and share" part of our building and international community
- Without an active and responsive Canadian community/constituency, we cannot work overseas.

5. What are the top three challenges in your public engagement work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1: 100.0%</th>
<th>#2: 92.3%</th>
<th>#3: 84.6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation / Measuring change (short and long term) among PE / Tracking experiences and &quot;learning&quot; from the organizational end</td>
<td>Funding x 4</td>
<td>&quot;Competing&quot; with the other facets of people's lives / gauging audience / Properly supporting the ways the public may wish to engage with us / maintaining and involving volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget / Availability of matching funding for CIDA projects</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Cross-cultural applicability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity. Access to the media in order to reach the public (x3)</td>
<td>Unwillingness of CIDA to see fund raising as a legitimate PE outcome</td>
<td>CRA guidelines that restrict the ability of those associated with charities to undertake campaign work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available time (x2)</td>
<td>access to public - occasions</td>
<td>funding to produce excellent audio visual materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants</td>
<td>A public which feels it is powerless</td>
<td>preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What ideologies should or should not be addressed in our public engagement efforts</td>
<td>maintaining focus in diverse activities</td>
<td>More PE opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Lists- keeping up to date</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing action, not just awareness</td>
<td>The public is faced with many choices and confusing information about those choices</td>
<td>Measuring meaningful results rather than just quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing the stories while creating them</td>
<td>creating a place to house and share &quot;lessons learned&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Which of the following tools do you use to evaluate your public engagement work?

**Interviews: 63.6**
- Surveys 27.3
- Focus Groups: 45.5
- Questionnaires: 27.3
- Longitudinal Studies: 9.1

**Other:**
- We evaluate primarily on the concrete outcomes of the PE work, I'm less interested in how many people came to a workshop, or whether they left better informed and intending to take action, than I am on evaluating the actions that they actually do take.
- donor and volunteer response to our ongoing programming needs
- Activity levels in Web 2.0 communities; Media Monitoring
- Conversations
- Not evaluated in a formal way
- Media resources, CD's DVD's and photo journals

7. In your public engagement activities or projects at which stages do you implement evaluation methods? (Please indicate all that apply)

- Project Design: 33.3%
- Project Start: 50.0%
- Mid-Way through the project: 50.0%
- **End of Project: 58.3%**
- Post project: 58.3%
- Not at all: 25%

8. How would you characterize the level of competency and capacity within your organization to undertake public engagement?

- None: 0%
- Quite limited: 15.4%
- Some: 7.7%
- **Adequate: 46.2%**
- Sophisticated: 30.8%

9. One of the purposes of public engagement is to develop ‘global citizens’. In point form and order of priority, please list the characteristics of global citizenship.

- 1) Acting on personal rights and responsibilities 2) Understanding international responsibilities as they relate to individuals, corporations, states and taking action to hold players accountable to their responsibilities
- Critical thinking
- 1) Awareness of self and one's society in a global context. 2) demonstrated commitment to solutions to global problems through various forms of action (volunteering time and effort, donating funds, engaging others in dialogue or events
- 1) Recognition that each individual has the power and responsibility to create change. 2) Recognition that social and economic change is interlinked on a local-global scale. 3) Personally active in creating this change. This level of activity will fluctuate as time goes on, depending on schedules, priorities and opportunities in the individual's life, but will always be present.
Engaged in the world creating solutions
Wikipedia asserts, "It is a moral and ethical disposition which might guide the understanding of individual or groups of local and global contexts and their relative responsibilities within different communities. It is distinct from the concept of world citizenship."
1) Empathetic 2) Aware 3) Passionate 4) Action Oriented
Aware well-informed empathetic inclusive engaged empowered multiplier
1) Engagement with key issues 2) An orientation toward 'thinking globally and acting locally'
3) Education in models of dialogue and participatory government; ie. civic co-creativity
approaches to community problem solving
1) Aware of and holds strong informed ideas & opinions about global issues. 2) Engagement
in dialogue about global issues and responsibility 3) Participation in addressing issues, being
part of the solution
1) This would take more space then given. It is a curriculum in length. Individuals and
groups committed to both the idea and the practice of building a new world order and the
recognition of its global citizens as one diverse human family as part of an ever advancing
civilization. Both the vision and the daily practice of constantly increasing our understanding
world issues/challenges and applying the solutions in ones own family and communities
globally and internationally
Active in both local community and support to international efforts in development

10. Complete this sentence – For me to consider this workshop a success, at the end of the
day I will:
- Have more tools for public engagement and evaluation of the effectiveness of that
  engagement.
- Other ways to move communities to action and not just raised awareness of international
  issues. Better ‘know how’ to use my limited resources to engage in more effective PE
  activities and to access previously unknown-to-me resources to enhance our
  organization's PE efforts.
- Have new ideas to incorporate into future PE planning, including evaluation techniques
  and partners for potential collaboration.
- Learn from the experiences of my colleagues in evaluating the effectiveness of PE
  efforts. Work with other NGOS in a creative way
- Know what is meant by "public engagement"
- Have discovered new ways to engage the public that are low-no cost.
- Inspired and motivated.
- Come away with some network contacts and with some ideas for overcoming the
  obstacles that prevent community based civic organizations from having a greater
  impact.
- Have an enlarged knowledge base on how to engage in quality, measurable results based
  PE.
- Learn one new thing, meet one new friend and share a thought/feeling/idea with someone
  there.
- Have learned something new, meaningful, and relevant to the way we engage the
  Canadian public
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INTRODUCTION

For CCIC members and others concerned with public involvement in development cooperation, the question of how we measure our progress in engaging Canadians is an essential one. Assessment in this area is particularly challenging, given the diverse understandings, aims and objectives of “public engagement”. Among CCIC’s member organizations, public engagement embraces a wide range of activities--including involving Canadians as volunteers or cooperants, stimulating public dialogue and policy discussion, creating educational resources, and mobilizing public input on issue-based action campaigns.

In April 2003, CCIC hosted “Signs of Change”, a workshop which brought members together to jointly explore the assessment of public engagement. Given the disparate outcomes that organizations aim for, the workshop focused in particular on the planning stages of assessment, letting participants clarify goal definitions so that measures of progress could be named and monitored in ways that were meaningful and achievable for each specific project. A preliminary part of the workshop involved examining how the signs organizations monitor in gauging success have to be finely tuned to their underlying goals. Participants analyzed their own public engagement goals in relation to three broad areas or aims extrapolated from planning examples offered by CCIC members in advance of the workshop: systemic changes; social values/ behavioral changes; and changes in the organizational support base.

Lynette Shultz of the University of University of Alberta and co-chair of the Alberta Council for Global Co-operation presented a seven-step process for participatory evaluation, consistent with the principles of stakeholder involvement shared across our sector. In addition to covering the fundamentals of assessment planning, the workshop gave participants an opportunity to share and apply their experience in evaluating public engagement projects, through hands-on exercises based on actual case studies volunteered by participants. They also defined stakeholder groups relating to public engagement examples, and considered the benefits and implications of involving stakeholders in the planning and assessing public engagement initiatives.

This report captures presentation and discussion highlights of the workshop, along with the outcomes of participants’ work in groups. While the “signs of change”, or indicators, generated in the case-study exercises were inherently “raw” given the brief time available, they provide a basis of comparison and source of additional ideas for others planning assessment of their public engagement programs. (See pp. 18-25.) Bear in mind that each initiative is unique and must be assessed in terms tailored to its own specific aims and objectives.

Appendices accompanying this report also include activity material, case studies, planning templates, and handouts. Lynette Shultz’s presentation materials have been incorporated into section 3 of this report.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Naming signs of change in personal and social values

Of the many areas of “change” examined in this workshop, the difficulties of defining, capturing and monitoring value change in particular were underlined by participants. Because the evolution of personal and social values is non-linear and subject to many influences, participants noted the difficulty in naming and capturing such changes and attributing any observed changes to a given project or program. Evaluation in this area is complicated by the fact that value change is long-term, and it is difficult to predict how individuals will manifest their values. Some participants offered the term “rung on a ladder” to describe the contribution they attribute to their activities in working towards cumulative, long-term social change. Several participants also pointed to a rich body of anecdotal feedback that they have access to, but felt unsure how to validate “anecdotes” as a credible measure of success in changing values or behaviours.

The pressure of reporting requirements

Another overriding concern that surfaced was that assessment is often muddied by external pressures. While accountability was noted as an important part of why organizations need to assess their activities, many participating organizations felt driven by external pressure to evaluate primarily to report on results to donors and funders, rather than to learn from and build upon their experience. As most organizations participating in the workshop receive a substantial portion of external funding for their work from CIDA, much of the discussion of evaluation and reporting requirements related to CIDA funding conditions. A primary concern shared by those receiving short-term “project” based funding from CIDA was a perception that too much is demanded in terms of identifying long-term outcomes and impacts within an unrealistically short time frame. Those carrying out public engagement projects within this funding framework did not feel they had either adequate resources (financial and other) or a reasonable time frame for assessing results beyond the most immediate outputs. Some therefore feel external pressure to demonstrate broad “impacts” beyond the scope, timeframe and means of their individual projects.

Defining impacts

A key component of the workshop was collaborative group work in which participants jointly planned an assessment framework for case studies drawn from real life. After this exercise, observations were offered in plenary on the challenges and breakthroughs realized. Many of the observations focused on the elusive nature of impact-level changes that could be attributed to planned activities. Some concrete suggestions emerged from this discussion:

- that, in the area of values/social change, impact-level results (project goals) be defined as ideals that are worked towards, recognizing that ultimate success may be difficult to claim;
- that broad outcomes and impacts should be seen as the product of complementary efforts by many different initiatives, rather than seen as attributable to any one set of planned activities;
- that defining incremental markers of change may be a more realistic goal for project planners—signposts that indicate that project fundamentals are on track, even if ultimate aims are elusive;
- that CIDA and other funders be realistic in the level of assessment they demand from partner organizations, and should specifically clarify reporting requirements so that project evaluations do not “overreach” measurable and attributable outcomes; and
- that CIDA consider dropping or adapting its RBM planning requirements for public engagement programming, in recognition of the essentially qualitative, and non-linear nature of engagement.
The need to build capacity
In the concluding session which focused on outcomes and follow-up, participants also made a number of concrete suggestions for building sectoral capacity in assessing public engagement. Specifically, participants look to CIDA and the national and regional councils for international cooperation to provide ongoing opportunities and resources for increasing knowledge on evaluation.

From the councils, participants would like to see more workshops and learning events; sector-wide sharing of evaluation knowledge; research on and compilation of long-term indicators; and the documenting of evaluation resources. From CIDA, groups look for longer term public engagement funding to make possible realistic assessment; consistency between the Agency’s own assessment guidelines and the expectations spelled out for public engagement projects; a “help-line” on assessment, and refinements of the RBM planning requirements to better fit the nature of public engagement.
SESSION HIGHLIGHTS

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND REVIEW OF WORKSHOP GOALS AND EXPECTATIONS

CCIC program officer Mary O’Neill welcomed participants, overviewed the workshop approach, and gave participants an opportunity to share their expectations.

She indicated that the focus of the workshop would be on the planning side of assessment, particularly emphasizing the need to start at project/program inception with a review of goals, and building a participatory process of assessment, involving key stakeholders.

Key workshop objectives were to build organizational capacity in evaluating public engagement programming; and to expand the potential pool of indicators used in identifying changes resulting from public engagement efforts.

While efforts were made to avoid technical jargon in preparing this workshop, some of the language related to results-based management (RBM) was unavoidable, given the reality that many CCIC members plan their programs within an RBM framework. Participants were encouraged to step back from the “jargon” and continue to look at basic goals and signs of success, without getting hung up on the language.

2. STRENGTHS, CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES IN ASSESSING PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

Materials:
- Worksheet 2: Taking Stock
- Handout: Challenges to Assessing Public Engagement

CCIC Program Officer Sue Cass led participants through an activity designed to help them identify their existing strengths in assessing public engagement, the challenges to doing this well, and areas of potential that might provide a base for improving their assessment practice. The chart on the following page summarizes the findings of this activity.
Summary Chart: Strengths, challenges and opportunities identified by participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>CHALLENGES</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• direct contact with the public and good short-term feedback from them</td>
<td>• short term funding – project-to-project basis</td>
<td>• collaboration with other organizations for longer term relationships with participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• long-term relationship with “constituency”</td>
<td>• difficulty of measuring impact because of length of project</td>
<td>• partnerships – academics, students, colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• grassroots connections</td>
<td>• how to measure qualitative response</td>
<td>• new, creative ways to communicate/share/strength en North-South links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• enthusiasm of volunteers to share ideas and stories</td>
<td>• disentangling our impacts from those of other activities</td>
<td>• times we’re in – current social climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• program highly targeted to some organizations – more likely to get feedback</td>
<td>• developing a baseline from which to measure</td>
<td>• openness in formal education sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• regional/multisector representation</td>
<td>• measuring/defining qualitative change</td>
<td>• emergence of external organizations that will do evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• constant update of information through evaluation sheets; website surveys</td>
<td>• lack of experienced staff (in evaluation), time, money and tools</td>
<td>• collective interest in evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• adapted RBM tools to the organization</td>
<td>• lack of capacity to deal with people who are engaged/interested as a result of our activities</td>
<td>• funder education on value of evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• creative, interactive methods of evaluating that are themselves educational/transformational</td>
<td>• participant mobility makes follow up difficult</td>
<td>• systematic planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• long-term commitment to PE long-term knowledgeable staff</td>
<td>• staff changes and loss of knowledge</td>
<td>• building the evaluation framework into the action plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• experience: basic training; long term diversification</td>
<td>• meeting curriculum requirements (schools) with our concerns</td>
<td>• collecting and crediting anecdotal information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• overall organizational support to do assessment of PE activities</td>
<td>• response mediated through teachers in schools; challenge of hearing directly from youth participants in education system</td>
<td>• technology; often more centralized/easier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• find new, creative ways to assess (evaluation boredom)</td>
<td>• clickable software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• organization structure – ensuring consistent assessment across the country on the same project</td>
<td>• refining our tracking tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• institutional buy-in</td>
<td>• learning more about polls, surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• organizational development – prioritizing training staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. A PROCESS FOR PARTICIPATORY EVALUATION AND IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Materials:
- Overhead handouts, “A Process for Participatory Evaluation and Impact Assessment”

This cornerstone presentation and discussion session was led by Lynette Shultz, President of the Alberta Council for Global Co-operation, Instructor and PhD candidate, Education Policy Studies, University of Alberta. The overhead version of Shultz’s presentation can be found in Annex C.

Shultz’s presentation began with a review of the “Impact Chain” and highlighted the importance of organizations looking beyond their activities and outputs to focus on assessing the real effects or “impacts” they achieve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Impact Chain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inputs → Outputs → Outcomes → Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inputs:** Resources for activities and programs

**Outputs:** Activities completed by the organization. (In RBM, outputs are the results of the activities)

**Outcomes:** Short term changes resulting from project or program activities

**Impact:** Lasting change, positive or negative, intended or not, in the lives of people as a result of a given action or series of actions

Shultz observed that it is easy to mistakenly evaluate outputs without ever really looking at outcomes or impacts. Very often organizations only get as far as evaluating outputs. She cited a number of examples to illustrate the point that focusing on actual impacts may result in quite radical changes in programming.

Shultz provided some history on the logical framework planning tool, which came out of systems theory and impact assessment. She related how in the neo-liberal environment of the 1980s and 90s, results-based management (RBM) was increasingly adopted within public organizations. The impact chain was made results-based. Shultz noted that this poses real problems for NGOs and their public engagement activities. She commented that a lot of the tension expressed by the workshop participants stems from where RBM has taken the impact chain and molded it in ways that are hard for the NGO community to work with. Shultz pointed out that a neo-liberal bias is to never see enough results from public institutions. If NGOs rely on public funding, they must deal with RBM and an insatiable demand for “results”.
Results Trap

- In neo-liberal perspective, there are NEVER enough results achieved by the public sector.
- Short term focus
- Efficiency over effectiveness

Shultz went on to clarify some of the distinctions between “evaluation” and “impact assessment” which many use as synonymous terms. She defined impact assessment as a process undertaken at the end of a long-term undertaking, to identify real and lasting changes in the lives of those affected.

In addressing the time frame and other differences between assessment and evaluation, Shultz presented the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Periodic</td>
<td>Analysis of process</td>
<td>Specific look at processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Frequent</td>
<td>Descriptive recording of inputs, outputs and activities</td>
<td>Very specific look at a project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Assessment</td>
<td>Infrequent:</td>
<td>Analysis of longer term change (how and why)</td>
<td>Also considers external context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At end of project/intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shultz stressed the importance of using a participatory process: she stated that if organizations are really going to find out if they are making a difference, they have to involve people outside the organization. She then presented an eight-step process for participatory evaluation and impact assessment:

**A Process for Participatory Evaluation and Impact Assessment**

1. **Decide who the assessment is for and for what purpose it will be carried out.**
   - To what degree is it to prove results and to what degree to improve practice?
   - Which decisions will be informed by the data and who will make these decisions?
   - Involving stakeholders, particularly beneficiaries, will help to ensure applicability and sensitivity. How will this be achieved?
   - How will information identifying problem areas be dealt with? (Is there an expectation that only positive information is to be collected?)

Shultz commented that this first step is when project planners must decide who the assessment is for and for what purposes it will be carried out. She related this step to a need to increase accountability in the NGO community, noting that we need to improve not only our assessment practice but our ability to tell our stories. Shultz felt that in this sector there is an expectation that one should never make mistakes, or never talk about them. Shultz urged participants to discuss what they are going to do when they find out they have made mistakes – to talk about it beforehand.
2. Identify Stakeholders.

- Who should be involved? Key stakeholders might be participants, staff, board members, volunteers, community members, researchers, and government representatives.
- Are they interested in being involved?
- Can they commit to the time and the process?
- Once you have identified stakeholders, ask: How diverse is the voice of this group? Whose voice will not be heard? Is there a cross section of ages, race or ethnicity, and economic groups? Is participation gender balanced?

In addressing this point, Shultz underlined the need to be clear about the composition of stakeholders targeted, and the benefits of including a diverse range. Shultz commented that by pooling a diverse group, the information collected would be much more valuable.

3. Clarify participants’ expectations of the process, and in what way each person or group wants to contribute.

- Will they be part of a focus group or a planning committee?
- Do you need to build the capacity of the evaluation group before beginning the process?

Shultz underlined the need at this step to start a process of communication—to hear what participants have to say. Some people may just want a weekend or an evening focus group. Evaluators must determine who in their organization is going to do what, and make sure that the people involved have the information they need.

4. Identify indicators that will provide the information needed.

- This needs to be connected to organizational strategic planning already completed.
- What indicators will be used for unexpected outcomes?

Shultz remarked that this step is where people usually gasp, because they are intimidated by naming indicators. She pointed out that this need not be seen as so difficult, and that much of the next days’ work would focus on indicators. She presented the following anagram to guide planners in their selection of indicators:

Indicators should be: SMART and SPICED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMART</th>
<th>SPICED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Specific</td>
<td>• Subjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Measurable</td>
<td>• Participatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attainable</td>
<td>• Interpreted and communicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relevant and easy to collect</td>
<td>• Cross-checked and compared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timebound</td>
<td>• Empowering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Diverse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shultz highlighted that it is important for project planners to think about how they are going to deal with unexpected outcomes. Evaluators sometimes box things in so that they only get the expected results.
asked workshop participants to consider how they could build in an element of surprise, by considering how to ask their questions and frame their discussions in order to get more complete information.

5. **Agree on the methods, responsibilities and timing of information collection.**

- What combination of tools will be used? (eg. Focus groups, surveys, interviews)
- Who will be the key manager of data collection?

Shultz noted that nobody in an organization wants the job of managing evaluation. But organizations need to identify someone who will play a central role; otherwise the evaluation probably won’t happen.

6. **Collect the information.**

- Valuing the wisdom and judgment of ordinary people is a critical part of evaluation and impact assessment.

Evaluators sometimes get stuck in the numbers. Shultz reminded participants that often the true understanding of the work that they do comes from personal and anecdotal feedback, and that it is important to use that information both when an organization “tells its story” and when it is planning. It is the wisdom and judgment of ordinary people that needs to be captured. She suggested that evaluators should not be afraid to just listen, because often they will find important information about impact in this kind of feedback.

In addressing this point, Shultz presented a brief summary of tools for participatory evaluation, all of which are widely available, and can be further researched on the Internet. She encouraged evaluators to use a variety of approaches and to go beyond the traditional, “check this form” evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tools for Participatory Evaluation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ranking (Done before and after. If no baseline information available, participants can reconstruct the past.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spider diagrams that identify changes in relationships and pressure points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impact flow charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. **Analyze the information.**

- How will information be presented? If stakeholder capacity building is important, would a format other than a standard report be more helpful?
- How will success and under performance be reported?

Shultz encouraged participants to think beyond the usual report format for conveying the results of their assessments. Depending on the public that organizations see themselves as accountable to, more accessible formats such as videos or flyers may be entirely suitable. Evaluators need to keep in mind that not everyone speaks the language of NGOs.

8. **What action or changes will take place as a result of the new information?**

- What has the organization learned?
- How will this information be used in the organization? By stakeholders?

Often evaluators don’t get to this important step. Evaluators must think about what they are going to do with the information they get. Shultz stressed that, in her experience, when organizations seriously undertake an impact assessment, it is certain that the organization will change. She asked participants to consider how change happens in their organizations; they will need to know how they will adapt.

Finally, Shultz reviewed a series of overall “good practice tips” for impact assessment and evaluation more generally.

### Good Practice Tips for Evaluation and Impact Assessment

- Impact assessment must be seen to be of importance to your organization. Who is impact assessment for? Who will be involved?
- Know how your organization deals with CHANGE. What do you have in place to facilitate change? ALL impact assessments lead to organizational change (unless we choose to ignore the information).
- Be realistic about what IA will do for your organization. Better evaluation doesn’t always mean more money or participants. It does give you good information for planning and program choices.
- Keep IA simple and user-friendly (ie flexible and focused on a few key indicators). Keep your focus on the end of the impact chain.
- Embed evaluation, monitoring and impact assessment into all parts of the project cycle. IA is easier to do if you have good baseline information gathered in the planning stages of the project. (But don’t let a lack of baseline info stop you from getting started!)
- Recognize that effective evaluations and impact assessments are evolving: the process doesn’t stay the same. It is also good to have one person or department responsible for facilitating this evolving process.

In closing, Shultz reminded participants that what they do this year will be very different from what they do three or four years down the road, because change is a constant. In her experience, when organizations start to look at impact assessment, internal changes are inevitable. Having an internal unit that focuses on evaluation can be invaluable.
Plenary Discussion

Q. Do you feel the tendency in our sector is for organizations to “prove” themselves to others (public and private donors, etc.) or “improve” themselves and their work?

A. Shultz responded that in this sector people spend a great deal of time “proving” themselves, partly because funds are scarce, and there is a lot more competition than people like to admit. Sometimes public engagement and fundraising get mixed up, where organizations don’t have dedicated staff for each area. Organizations get stuck in proving themselves, and looking for funds. But she said that she sees change coming. Shultz cited the “Signs of Change” workshop itself as a first opportunity for members of the NGO community to come together to talk about improving evaluation practice. She remarked that once organizations are confident in assessing to improve practice, they will find they have better information to prove their results.

Q. What do you think of organizations using external evaluators?

A. Shultz stated that external evaluators can be great. They can be very skilled at what they do and may sometimes lend credibility to a project. Sometimes funders even suggest that organizations get external evaluators. However, Shultz thinks that in terms of organizational learning, the more one can do internally, the better. Internal and external evaluations are not mutually exclusive. Shultz advised that if an organization has money to hire somebody, they should go for it, but not at the expense of building an evaluative capacity in the organization itself.

There was also a discussion of the value of using participatory evaluation methods to help engage people and effect further change. Shultz discussed the fact that the more you involve people, the more you create strong networks that can further strengthen other areas of your work.

Comments were made about the frustration NGOs experience when funding is short-term and they are asked to evaluate projects before they have been completed. Shultz felt that it would be very positive for constructive feedback to come out of the workshop to make donors like CIDA aware of what is not working in the demands made of NGOs and other partners.

4. RELATING OUR GOALS TO SIGNS OF CHANGE

Materials:

- Diagram: Naming our goals for public engagement
- Worksheet 3: Relating our goals to signs of change

CCIC Program Officer Mary O’Neill opened the session by asking participants to focus initially on the goals their public engagement projects and programs aim for. She presented a cluster diagram that overviewed the principle aims that CCIC member organizations work towards in engaging the public. The planning of project assessment has to start with broad goal statements and then with the definition of specific objectives (target results). How success is measured depends in large part on the initial definition of the kinds of success one is looking for. O’Neill presented the cluster diagram not as a definitive mapping of public engagement goals, but as a starting point for reflecting on the types of goals one’s own organization is working toward. (See the diagram “Naming our Goals for Public Engagement” in Annex B.)
The cluster diagram presented 3 sets of public engagement goal areas, nested within a broader set of mission-level goals, specific to each organization:

1. **Organizational support goals** were noted as the familiar terrain—name brand recognition, numbers of volunteers, supporters or even donors—that many planners fall back on as the “safest” and most measurable goals around which to plan assessment. They are goals relating to building the public support and recognition of a given organization, or more broadly, its aims.

2. **Values and behavioral change goals** are goals related to what people believe and value, and often, how they act on these values and beliefs. Many CCIC members express their overarching public engagement goals in terms of building a value base consistent with global citizenship, for example. Measuring progress toward these goals is extremely difficult as the process of value shift is long-term and manifests itself differently in each individual.

3. **Systemic goals** are those related to changing systems, policies or structures. Examples here include public engagement initiatives that aim to influence corporate or government policies or—as with some global education initiatives—to transform school curricula. Outcomes for these Systemic Goals are quite concrete. When systemic change happens it is very visible/demonstrable (e.g. change in legislation or corporate practice).

O’Neill underlined that all of these goal areas (organizational support, values/behavioral change and systemic change) fit within a broader context of mission-level goals. CCIC member organizations engage the public as organizations that exist to achieve poverty eradication through their work in human rights, sustainable development, education for all, etc. She noted that we sometimes lose sight of the differing goal areas in our work. Some organizations have one really long-term focus for their PE work— not all the goal areas are relevant to all organizations. But sometimes real goals drop off the radar screen in planning assessment because they are either overlooked, or seen as too difficult to monitor.

O’Neill then introduced the activity “Relating our Goals to Signs of Change”, designed to give participants an opportunity to define their work in terms of its goals, and to begin the process of relating these goals to observable “signs of change”.

**Plenary Discussion**

In plenary O’Neill asked workshop participants whether they felt there was a need for any new “bubble” in the cluster diagram. Participants cited North-South connections and the example of global citizenship as goals that did not fit neatly into any one bubble but perhaps fit into all three.

Lynette Shultz commented on the subject of fair trade choices and indicators. What measures can be used to show that things are changing? Would people describe their behavior as changed or should organizations monitor the sale of fair trade coffee? How are people going to indicate that they are aware? There are some behaviors that organizations need to identify. If these indicators are identified before a project is undertaken, it helps as the program goes on. Project planners also need to know what incremental changes they should be looking for, in order to assure themselves that the little steps are actually important. This is particularly important in the area of systemic or policy change, where achieving concrete changes may be long term, but where results may appear “suddenly”. Organizations need to pre-identify markers of gradual progress.

O’Neill asked participants about unexpected outcomes in terms of value/ behavioural change and organizational support goals. Given the unpredictability of how people will manifest their “engagement”, how do we measure success or failure when people go elsewhere with their values and beliefs than where we want to take them? In terms of organizational support goals, is it a failure if volunteers or donors are turned onto something but choose to support other organizations? Can people buy into the values you
promote but choose a different solution than the one your organization supports? The response from the floor to this question was that this should be counted as a success, at least from the point of view of involving people. In terms of organizational support, we enjoy collective success when people join or support civil society groups, even if they choose to act through one other than the organization sponsoring the “engagement” activity.

In terms of systemic changes, there was further discussion around the collective impact NGOs have had on CIDA and the level of international aid. Participants felt the improving aid levels should be attributed at least in part to collective pressure from international cooperation NGOs.

5. CASE STUDY 1: SCHOOLS FOR ALL INTERNATIONAL

Materials:
• Case Study 1: Schools for All International

Before undertaking a group exercise in framing an assessment, participants first analysed a prepared assessment framework, in terms of the challenges it revealed for monitoring progress. The hypothetical case study focused on the efforts of a fictional organization working to increase youth participation in support of international goals for basic education. Participants read a brief overview of the how the organization was defining its assessment goals, and reviewed a framework of target results and indicators of progress. Guiding questions focused participants on key issues such as the relationship between defined indicators and the program’s broader goals, assessing the quality of indicators used, weighing qualitative evidence, and the implications of involving stakeholders in the assessment process. See Case Study 1: Schools for All International in Annex B.

Plenary Discussion

In plenary, participants addressed some of the goal areas that may have been missing from the S4A assessment planning framework. Suggestions included connecting the public engagement activity to the organization’s overall mission goal: progress toward the UN millennial goals for education, although it was not clear how such progress could be correlated to S4A activities.

In terms of values/behavioral change, it was suggested that a measure of students’ level of participation would be students’ ability to develop their own projects after the program, and in effect build a leadership base. Discussion of this tangible sign of progress led to the realization that such a possibility would be best integrated at the planning stage of the activities, building in a component that fit with program objectives, and could be demonstrably assessed. It was suggested that one such concrete measure would be the creation of student organizations as a planned result of the program.

O’Neill remarked that in planning assessment as an integral part of program planning, we may come to the realization that a program component is missing. In this example, where the creation of student organizations struck many as a meaningful and measurable indicator, there was nothing in the original program plan to explicitly enable that outcome, even though it was obviously compatible with the planners’ aims.

In discussing the pros and cons of involving stakeholders in assessment, participants felt that evaluation findings would be qualitatively improved through a participatory planning process. Participants identified parent’s and teacher’s associations, school staff and administration, other local and international partner organizations and, most importantly, students as stakeholders who should be involved in assessment planning. One participant suggested it might be interesting to ensure a cross-section of participating
students (e.g. refugee students, First Nations students) to energize the discussion and ensure diverse participation. Participants raised funding and logistical challenges as impediments to involving many stakeholders in assessment planning and execution.

There was further discussion of using qualitative indicators to measure progress toward public engagement goals. It was felt that qualitative information is very important, but perhaps not taken seriously enough. Some participants identified tools for effectively capturing qualitative feedback (e.g. pre- and post-questionnaires; participant rating scales; journals with directed questions). Testimonial experiences of “life change” as a result of public engagement programs and volunteer cooperation was discussed as a valuable, and to some extent measurable, qualitative indicator.

6. PEER LEARNING – POOLING OUR INSIGHTS TO FRAME AN EVALUATION

Materials:
• Case Study 2: Speaking Out – Aboriginal Media Talk Development
• Case Study 3: Generating Momentum for our World
• Worksheet 4: Building a framework for evaluation
• Framework template

This session provided a structured opportunity for groups of participants to apply their knowledge to building an assessment framework for actual projects submitted by CCIC member organizations. Participants had a choice between two examples: Case Study #2, “Speaking Out: Aboriginal Media Talk Development”, contributed by Pacific Peoples’ Partnership, focused on building aboriginal media capacity to cover development issues and increasing public awareness of North-South dimensions of aboriginal issues. Case Study #3, “Generating Momentum for Our World” was based on an initiative by the Manitoba Council for International Cooperation to develop youth skills and leadership on international issues and to increase networks and partnerships within the formal education system.

Each case study description outlined the project rationale, aims, planned activities and components and intended audience/ beneficiaries. Using a guiding worksheet, participants were asked to: a) complete an assessment planning framework identifying results and indicators; b) discuss and analyze challenge areas; c) identify potential sources of evidence; d) assess the potential for stakeholder involvement; and e) summarize key questions and reflections that come from their group planning process.

Once the initial analysis was completed, each working group then joined with another group that had analyzed the same case study to compare notes. Each pair of groups then presented their findings to the workshop plenary.

Copies of the case studies provided can be found in Annex B. The charts in Annex C: Participants Evaluation Frameworks summarize the results and indicators that groups generated for the activities outlined in each of the two case studies. In the time available, most groups defined results and indicators relating to only one of several defined project activities. Please note that these charts have been edited for clarity only, with numbering added to allow for correlation of results and indicators. Partial or incomplete work has been omitted from these summary charts (e.g. where results were defined but no corresponding indicators provided, or vice versa.).
Plenary Discussion

After groups completed their assessment frameworks, groups working on the same case study were paired to compare and discuss their findings. One reporter from each “pairing” was asked to present their overall reflections on the exercise to plenary. Below are the key reflections on each case study:
CASE STUDY #2

In analysing this case study, participants noted the challenges of assessing outputs and outcomes that are essentially of qualitative value. In this case, judging the depth and quality of media articles/broadcasts resulting from capacity building among journalists was deemed an unavoidably subjective process. Reporters for both pairs of groups noted that many of the indicators focused mainly on levels of participation (numbers), and then on the depth and quality of coverage on the different issues.

There was also discussion around distinguishing between outcomes (medium term results) and impacts (long-term results). Participants felt that the shorter-term results could be assessed with more confidence, but that things get more vague and difficult to relate to individual initiatives at the “impact” level. One participant characterized this as the “impossibility of measuring ultimate goals” and suggested organizations have to focus on what they can identify as their piece of the long-term process.

CASE STUDY #3

In sharing what they observed from attempting to build an assessment framework for the youth skills development workshop, participants focused on the limited timeframe and the challenges of naming outcomes and impacts that could be attributed to a short term project. As with Case Study 2, groups reported that they had found it easier to find indicators that could measure short-term results. There was discussion of whether impact assessment is appropriate or valuable for short-term, one-off projects.

It was suggested that a project plan could identify an impact level goal and some related indicators that would serve to mark incremental progress. This would allow project evaluators to say, “we’re not there yet but we’re on the way”.

Participants returned to an earlier discussion of how identifying measures of longer-term impacts was a useful front end exercise to help project planners better harmonize planned activities with desired impacts. One example offered was of planning for a measurable after effect, such as student networks. It was also noted that in looking ahead to signs of long-term impact, one should also consider possible negative effects, to plan in terms of what to avoid as outcomes.

7. OUTCOMES AND FOLLOW UP

This final section of the workshop provided an opportunity for participants to reflect on what they had learned and shared, and identify priorities for follow-up. Before taking part in a plenary discussion, participants were asked to reflect on areas that had been clarified or strengthened, remaining challenges and what could be done to improve assessment of public engagement activities. (See Worksheet 5: Outcomes and Follow up in Annex B.)

Below is a summary of outcomes and recommendations for follow up from participants:

Areas strengthened/clarified:
- What an indicator is and how to define it meaningfully. The need to be realistic.
- Importance of thorough planning.
- Importance of stakeholder involvement.
- Interconnectedness of activity planning and evaluation planning. If we can’t assess change, we may need to change our activity.
- More care in thinking about real changes.
• Using a planning framework to think about various aspects of change we want to see rather than as part of the funding chase.

**Follow-up for participants’ organizations**
- Better integrate assessment planning within our whole organization
- Clarify evaluation/reporting expectations with CIDA officer.
- Pursue being adequately resourced to evaluate effectively.

**Suggested next steps for CCIC/ regional councils**
- Create more learning opportunities on measurement tools – including technical expertise (ie, how to measure success of Web sites).
- Host regional workshops on this topic.
- Increase sharing of knowledge and resources within our sector. Eg. Distribute participant list from this workshop; map what people are doing in this area; CCIC could host an online “chat room” to help us identify partners.
- Create/distribute a database of indicators.
- Engage experts in researching long-term indicators.
- Push for longer term funding.
- Document evaluation resources.

**Recommendations for CIDA**
- Work on gap between assessment guidelines and practice/expectations.
- Provide an assessment “help line” for our community.
- Need to find a way to better integrate process into RBM.
- Longer-term funding for public engagement and more resources for assessing.
Annex A: Workshop Evaluation

Participants completed both an oral and written evaluation of the workshop.

Oral feedback:
- Received a lot of good background.
- Very hands-on. Appreciated the case studies.
- Would definitely welcome a follow up opportunity to look at networking and tools.
- A chat room on evaluation could be very enriching.
- CCIC should have more presence with the NGO community in Quebec.
- More visuals next time.
- A lot of NGOs have common points. There is a role for CCIC in emphasizing a common voice to remind CIDA that we are working hard on PE and on tools to evaluate our work.

Evaluation questionnaire summary:

34 completed questionnaires were submitted.

1. How satisfied were you with…?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization (registration process)</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content of workshop</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What did you find most useful about the workshop?

- Case studies, applying the concepts (9)
- Networking/ sharing ideas and experiences (9)
- Overview presentation by Lynette Shultz (6)
- Peer learning/ participatory group work (6)
- Exercise in “naming our goals” (4)
- Working through some of the RBM terminology and process (3)
- Techniques for evaluation and assessment of Public Engagement (2)
- The presence of a few people who could really help us in small groups. It would be great if every small group could have a “mentor”.
- Concrete resources
- Learned to develop indicators
- Assessment guidelines (SMART & SPICED)
- Looking at a small area and focusing to learn more, rather than going too wide
- Getting my head into the planning

3. What did you find least useful?

- Introductory exercises (expectations; strengths, challenges and opportunities) (5)
- Case studies (2)
- Amount of time spent on the “systemic”, “behavioral” and “organization” goal areas (2)
- Sometimes activities were a bit rushed (2)
• Starting on Sunday evening (2)
• Too much to digest at times (2)
• Everything was useful. (2)
• Changing working groups
• Difficult to hear at the table (small group discussions)
• Discussing follow-up
• Sometimes translation may have suffered
• Overview presentation was a little basic.
• Not enough Southern voices
• Too many worksheets

4. **Did the workshop provide an opportunity for you to share concerns and experiences?**

- Yes/ definitely, etc. (22)
- Somewhat (5)
- Indirectly
- Small (and varied) groups were helpful.
- Good to talk about our concerns. Sometimes we don’t want to admit that we’re weak in evaluating.
- Time was ALWAYS too short, but that wasn’t a concern, rather an indication of the sharing that was happening.
- Great to network with others from this sector!
- A lot of excellent high level debate.
- I learned what my concerns should be!
- Suggest a display area for each organization
- Tended to take place outside of formal plenaries etc.
- The Sunday night music was a nice idea, but the volume did not allow for easy communication.

5. **What, if any, new understandings, skills or insights did you leave with today?**

- Importance of including assessment at project planning stage (4)
- Measuring long term impact. Recognition that it’s a collective, incremental process, (4), that we’re all a rung in the ladder.
- Better understanding generally of assessment processes and language (4)
- Importance of participatory evaluation, involving stakeholders (2)
- Greater sense of where other NGOs face challenges (2)
- Importance of assessing in order to improve our activities and focus on the end result
- Greater understanding on how to design evaluation, impact assessment for different uses and a clearer idea of my organization’s (or program’s) goals
- New ways of FRAMING what we do: It will help communicate our objectives/impact … We’ve been too vague.
- Some good ideas for “big picture” PE, but knowing that the big picture is made up of lots of individual projects/activities
- How to implement this in my organization
- Public engagement is more than a head count; the importance of qualitative indicators
- Moving from awareness to action
- Inspiration for our upcoming planning process
- More interest/energy around the whole process
- “spiced” indicators
- Having an opportunity to share and learn from one another really strengthens our work
- Need time to digest the many ideas that were shared
- Choosing meaningful indicators + the need to really put a log of thought into planning (link between planning + evaluation: importance of assessment for program/organization growth
- Log Frame Analysis/ RBM can not measure all results or should not be used as the only measure of RESULTS.
- Prove results vs improve practice. Planning for unexpected results.
- Using evaluation as a tool to involve good people, with clear and simple ideas.
- Weighing the relevance of our activities—are they really necessary?
- Need dedicated staff to effectively evaluate.
- Be realistic.
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ANNEX A: WORKSHOP EVALUATION
What, if any, follow up actions would you suggest by CCIC or others?

- More tools for participatory evaluation (Lynette’s presentation)
- Keep facilitating the network.
- A brief report “summary” for all participants will be useful. (5)
- Participant contact list (9)
- Interested in other training opportunities related to public engagement, RBM, sharing of methods, tools processes etc.
- Some kind of web-based means to share information (4).
- Liked idea of database of indicators. (2)
- More case studies would be great.
- Hold more workshops (5).
- Long term funding by govt./CIDA(2). Increase timeline to 3 years.
- Would have liked to chat more about linking planning to program to evaluation to planning again.
- CCIC could pass info along on reading lists, resources etc.
- Workshop on how to integrate impact evaluation into agency planning and proposal writing (2).
- Follow-up on Case Studies and what the outcomes were.
- Provide a forum for exchange of indicators/common experiences/problems.
- To do a workshop specifically on evaluation (methods)
- Offer ongoing workshops at local level (OCIC) that focus on a specific aspect of public rather than general.
- A follow-up workshop to discuss progress (e.g. in six months time).
- Further discuss other challenges.
- Lose RBM or at least make it less of a hoop and more of a process that is useful for those using it. Value anecdotal more.
- Follow-up CIDA support for public engagement; common voice to express value of PE.
- Influence CIDA to offer special funding for work on Impact Assessment.
- Workshop on skills – innovative techniques for measuring success. Support network for completing RBM sheets. Use challenges to provide input into the PE working group. Policy development with CIDA to increase funding for the evaluation stages. Next time, I would have a 2-day workshop and include a presentation or 3 on tools/techniques.
- Ateliers sur l’implication combinée médias – éducation; plaidoyer et outils.
- Communicate NGO concerns on evaluation to CIDA.

7. Other Comments:

- Thank for organizing this workshop, I found it very valuable! But next time it has to take place in Brandon, or Swift Current or Moncton.
- I wonder about the importance of doing baseline stuff before evaluation.
- Would really appreciate regional versions of this – in Western Canada!
- How do you ensure that you hear at the plenary from everyone and not usually the same people? Some people might be intimidated by the microphone – not sure I have an answer. The workshop needs to be TWO FULL days at least.
- Exceeded my expectations! Well done!
- Bring more depth by giving small groups more distinct tasks.
- We need more of this type of networking.
- Tools for evaluation.
WORKSHOP REPORT: SIGNS OF CHANGE—ASSESSING OUR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT IMPACTS

ANNEX B: WORKSHOP MATERIALS

WORKSHEET 1: PACK YOUR SUITCASE

Before completing this activity, take a few minutes in your group to briefly introduce yourselves (name, organization and your interest in attending the workshop).

Agree on who will record the information requested below from your group, and who will report to the other groups in the discussion that follows.

1. Take a minute individually to think about what you hope to get out of this workshop today: areas of knowledge, confidence, insight, etc.

2. Share your hopes and expectations with your partners.

3. Together, choose five things your group would like to leave the workshop with today. Pack them in the suitcase below.

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 
WORKSHOP REPORT: SIGNS OF CHANGE--ASSESSING OUR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT IMPACTS

WORKSHEET 2: TAKING STOCK

In this activity, we will do an inventory of our strengths, challenges and opportunities in assessing public engagement.

Following the facilitator’s directions, you will be asked to share and record with others a few key examples of your:

**Strengths**
What are some of the assets you and your organization have to help you assess your public engagement projects and programs?

**Challenges**
What factors make it difficult for you to assess your public engagement projects and programs?

**Opportunities**
What are some areas of potential that could improve your practice in assessing public engagement?

*Notes on plenary discussion:*

**Strengths:**

**Challenges:**

**Opportunities:**
OVERHEAD: CHALLENGES TO ASSESSING PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

- **The varied terrain.**
  Public engagement takes many forms and aims for a variety of different results. There is no one-size-fits-all solution to assessing all forms of PE.

- **Key results may be long-term, and difficult to measure.**
  Changes in values, attitudes and behaviour take place over a lifetime, and are difficult to quantify.

- **The challenge of “attribution”.**
  Can we establish a causal link between our PE efforts and the changes we see? What other factors may have contributed to the observed outcomes?

- **Assessing to prove results rather than improve practice.**
  Funding imperatives can make reporting results our first priority, rather than learning from success or weaknesses.

- **Social development goals are an awkward fit in any logical framework of analysis.**
  This is not unique to public engagement, but social change doesn’t follow a linear and predictable chain of cause and effect.

- **Lack of research, documentation and learning on assessing PE.**
  There is limited funding for experimentation and learning; little published literature specific to assessing public engagement; and few opportunities for us to learn and pass on our knowledge within our organizations.
DIAGRAM: NAMING OUR GOALS FOR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

Mapping the Interplay

**Mission level goals:** Eg) Poverty eradication; strengthen human rights; education for all; etc.

**Systemic goals:** Eg. Change government policy, corporate codes of conduct or provincial school curricula

**Values and behaviour goals:** Eg. Change public knowledge, values and attitudes; Foster global citizenship

Organizational support: Volunteers, funding, public support for mission
Mission level outcomes:
- very long-term
- qualitative and quantitative
- *progress toward* these goals may be demonstrable over time, but difficult to correlate to public engagement inputs

Systemic outcomes:
- may be short-term or long term
- tangible and demonstrable
- *progress toward* these goals may be difficult to gauge

Values and behavioral outcomes:
- mainly long-term
- qualitative and quantitative
- difficult to document

Organizational support outcomes:
- ongoing (short- and long-term)
- tangible and quantifiable
- perhaps the easiest to document
WORKSHOP REPORT: SIGNS OF CHANGE—ASSessING OUR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT IMPACTS

WORKSHEET 3: RELATING OUR GOALS TO SIGNS OF CHANGE

Before beginning to complete this worksheet, take 10 to 15 minutes to share examples with your group of:
a) the main goals you have for one of your public engagement projects or programs
b) signs or indicators you use to measure progress against these goals

Agree also on who will record the information requested below from your group, and who will report to the other groups in the discussion that follows.

Next, work with your group partners to complete the worksheet below:

1. Identify one example of a public engagement goal from your work for each of the basic goal clusters included in the overhead.
2. For each of the goals identified, name 2-3 key signs of change that are used to measure progress.
3. When you have completed your group worksheet, record your goal statements and signs of change on the large sheets the facilitator has posted for each goal “cluster”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systemic Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal statements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational Support Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal statements</th>
<th>Signs of change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value and Behavioural Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal statements</th>
<th>Signs of change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- *Identify any public engagement goals from your group that don’t fit with the diagram clusters.*
CASE STUDY 1: SCHOOLS FOR ALL INTERNATIONAL

Schools for All International (S4A) raises awareness and funds to promote the UN commitments to Education for All, and supports programs for children’s’ primary education in several countries in Africa and South Asia. In Canada, its public engagement efforts are largely focused on the formal school sector. Working with experienced teachers, S4A produces classroom-ready resources that highlight global disparities and underscore international commitments to achieve the millennial goals for basic education. It has developed a working relationship with several school boards across the country and its resources are used to supplement senior social studies modules in many schools.

In past years, S4A viewed its public engagement outcomes largely in terms of building its base of support, and raising funds. The planning and evaluation process has met both internal and external reporting requirements, but its public education director, Fatima Somji, wonders whether the programs are really creating positive changes in those involved. She decides in this program cycle to focus on the skills, values, behaviors and attitudes of both the teachers using the resources and the children learning from them to see if involvement with S4A has any impact.

Analysing the case study

Refer to the planning chart on the following page showing target results and indicators.

Discuss:
1. What basic “clusters” of goals from the diagram explored earlier today do you recognise in the stated results?

2. What other results statements might Fatima include to cover the impacts on students and teachers that she wants to assess?

3. Compare the listed indicators with the target results defined. How relevant do they seem? Do they meet the SMART and SPICED criteria outlined earlier?

4. What other indicators would you add to address the areas of change that Fatima feels are important?

5. Identify some of the qualitative indicators Fatima has included. How might she go about collecting evidence relevant to some of these indicators? How conclusive do you feel such evidence must be?
## Chart of existing S4A program outcomes and indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1.** Production and distribution of classroom resources on global disparities in education. | **outputs** (short term developmental results) | • number and type of materials produced  
• volume of requests by educators for S4A resources  
• quality of feedback on S4A resources and events |
|                     | • Quality S4A classroom ready resources—magazines, videos and teacher support material—available and used by students and teachers. |          |
|                     | • Teachers benefit from pre and in-service training workshops held in six provinces | • number and location of workshops held  
• level of participation by educators in S4A training workshops  
• quality of feedback on S4A training workshops. |
| **2.** Pre and in-service training workshops for teachers linked to the global ed resources. | **outcomes** (purpose level statements; medium term) |          |
|                     | • Teachers integrate global education issues and approaches in the classroom. | • volume of requests for S4A classroom resources  
• Reasons cited for requests |
|                     | • Teachers and youth support S4A program responses to inequities in education. | • level of student and teacher participation in S4A sponsored events  
• reasons cited by participants for taking part in S4A events |
|                     | **impacts** (goal level objectives; longer term) |          |
|                     | • youth and educators support S4A initiatives to address global inequities in education. | • volume of donations to S4A  
• number of requests to volunteer with S4A |
|                     | • Increased institutionalization of studies on global education needs in school curricula | • integration of S4A contents on educational disparities into board wide curricula |
|                     | • Active network of school boards working closely with S4A in development and delivery of resources | • Board affiliation of teachers involved in writing and delivery of resources  
• Requests from boards for materials and presentations |
Considering stakeholder perspectives

In the past, S4A has included only staff members in the planning and assessment of its public engagement program. In deciding to focus more on the impacts programming has on students and teachers, Fatima considers widening participation in planning the assessment process.

Consider:
1. What stakeholder groups might she include in the process?

2. How might their perspectives differ? What signs of change did these stakeholders put on the “radar”?

3. What might be some of the pros and cons for S4A of involving stakeholders in defining the evaluation process?
CASE STUDY 2: SPEAKING OUT - ABORIGINAL MEDIA TALK DEVELOPMENT

A Public Engagement initiative of Pacific Peoples’ Partnership

Organization
Pacific Peoples’ Partnership was founded in 1975 and is Canada’s principal community development, social justice and development education organisation working with indigenous peoples of the North and South Pacific to create lasting solutions to poverty, injustice and environmental degradation. Since our inception, PPP’s mission and priorities have been derived from the work and needs of our Pacific counterparts. While research, education and advocacy remain PPP’s top priority, we also support the work of community-based groups in the Pacific, as well as projects that facilitate links between indigenous peoples in the Pacific and First Nations peoples in Canada.

Project Description
Rationale
For most Canadians, the South Pacific evokes images of white sands and swaying palms. Most have never heard of Vanuatu, West Papua, Palau or the Marshall Islands. The poverty, militarization and human rights abuses, systemic discrimination against women, and environmental degradation in many Pacific island nations are unknown to most of us. Few Canadians know that the majority in the Pacific are indigenous peoples engaged in struggles identical to those confronting Aboriginal peoples in Canada—the loss of local resources, sustainable livelihoods, cultural survival and land. Even fewer can cite examples of indigenous peoples in the Pacific acting as creative social agents, bringing perseverance and innovation to their struggles for justice.

This project will challenge Canadians to move beyond these stereotypes. It will invite Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples alike to recognize the commonality of issues and struggles, to examine how international cooperation can and has furthered these struggles for change, and to explore how they themselves can begin to engage in and support these efforts.

Objectives
Speaking Out: Aboriginal Media Talk Development covers all points on the public engagement continuum. It is aimed at:

- generating awareness among Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Canadians about:
  - commonalities of issues confronting indigenous peoples globally,
  - the realities of global interdependence, and the opportunities of global citizenship
  - the reality and roots of poverty, conflict, and underdevelopment confronting indigenous peoples in the South Pacific
  - Canadian involvement in the Pacific, particularly as it relates to ODA and its effectiveness in the region
  - examples of innovative community action in the Pacific in the areas of domestic violence, local resource conservation, constitutional change, indigenous rights, etc.

1 This case study is an abridged project description prepared by CCIC staff, based on an original project proposal and other materials supplied by PPP. Many thanks to Pacific Peoples’ Partnership for their willingness to share details of their project planning with CCIC members to enrich our learning.
- **enhancing the long-term capacity of the Aboriginal media** to address and report on sustainability issues from a global perspective including traditional knowledge and intellectual property rights; climate change; cultural survival; governance, democratic development and conflict, etc.

- **heightening inclusion in the mainstream media** of more analytical pieces on global indigenous development issues

- **furthering individual and collective action** to address these issues both in Canada and the Pacific, and deepening Canadian commitment to act on our responsibilities as global citizens, including through involvement with Pan-Pacific development activities in collaboration with PPP.

**Project Strategy:**

This project has two phases:

**Phase One**

- Using the support and networks of five principal Aboriginal media organizations in Canada, **PPP will choose three individuals** with an interest in the range of social justice and sustainable development issues around which this project revolves. Two will be established journalists. A third participant will be a young student drawn from the First Nations Technical Institute with substantial experience in youth-oriented Aboriginal media.

- **The three participants will be brought to Victoria for a two-day orientation.** Together with a PPP staff person, **the participants will then embark on a two-week educational tour to the Pacific** where they will interview and engage in discussion with a variety of PPP’s key counterparts, significant actors and thinkers, as well as indigenous media organizations.

- Upon their return, all participants will be required to **write or broadcast a minimum of four pieces on their experiences, interviews and discussions.** These will be produced in the national Aboriginal media, mainstream print and broadcast media, the local media and media aimed in particular at Aboriginal youth. The five multi-media organizations, and the journalists we choose, offer PPP an extensive national reach into the homes, minds and hearts of both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Canadians. Stories are likely to appear, for example, in *Windspeaker*, as well as several of the Aboriginal Multi-Media Society’s monthly regional papers, in *Aboriginaltimes*, on various programmes produced by the Aboriginal Peoples’ Television Network, in *The Globe and Mail*, in local mainstream papers, on the CBC, and possibly on Vision TV. It is anticipated that these stories will collectively reach a minimum of 750,000 people with each broadcast or publication.

- **PPP will also produce a special edition of Tok Blong Pasifik magazine featuring two stories each from the three journalists.** *Tok Blong Pasifik*’s readership includes government officials, academics, development practitioners, Pacific islanders living in Canada and the Pacific, activists, Aboriginal Canadians and other PPP supporters. It is distributed to close to 1,500 individuals, libraries and institutions in more than 40 countries, and is the only journal to focus on Pan-Pacific indigenous development issues.
Phase Two

- **Public Forums**: Upon their return, the journalists will also participate in a public forum in five strategically chosen cities in Canada: Victoria, Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto and Ottawa. In each of these cities, PPP has a strong relationship with Aboriginal organizations, environmental groups, Pacific island community associations, and NGOs. These forums will draw in: the general public, decision-makers in government, development practitioners, students, other Aboriginal and mainstream journalists, members of the Aboriginal and Pacific island communities in Canada, and PPP supporters. For the forums, PPP will produce a Pan-Pacific Action Sheet intended to further stimulate thought and action around Pan-Pacific development issues.

- *The Pan-Pacific Action Sheet* will include:
  - A list of key Pan-Pacific or Pacific-based networks working on relevant issues
  - A list of significant resources on a range of sustainability issues in the Pacific
  - A quick how-to for community organizing (to generate locally based awareness and action on Pan-Pacific indigenous issues)
  - Possibilities for engaging in Pacific development opportunities including involvement in ongoing and future programming activities of Pacific Peoples’ Partnership

**Target Groups**

- Aboriginal Canadians from coast to coast to coast.
- Aboriginal youth
- Non-Aboriginal Canadians, in particular those supportive of Canadian official development assistance
- Pacific islanders
- Canadian non-governmental organizations

**Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries**

The direct beneficiaries are the journalists, the media they represent, and their respective Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal audiences. The indirect beneficiaries are the organizations, communities and indigenous peoples whose struggles are impacted through the knowledge gained as a result of the heightened, in-depth and global-oriented coverage. They will also benefit as the possibilities for future linkage and Pan-Pacific collaboration become clear through phase two of the project. Pacific Peoples’ Partnership, our counterparts overseas and our collaborative programmes are also the indirect beneficiaries of this initiative as our respective organizations, analysis and work will most certainly gain from the awareness raised among the Canadian public.

**Evaluation**

The programme director and executive director will evaluate the programme, with active engagement of the journalists and their representative media institutions. Evaluation will be carried out immediately after each phase of the project and will involve interviews and surveys, among other methodologies. An analysis of the longer-term impacts will be performed in March 2004 through a survey of the journalists and their media institutions of coverage over that period, and through an assessment of the spill-over effect of the project with respect to other PPP activities.
CASE STUDY 3: GENERATING MOMENTUM FOR OUR WORLD

A Public Engagement Initiative of the Manitoba Council for International Cooperation

Organization
The Manitoba Council for International Cooperation, founded in 1974, is a coalition of 35 organizations involved in international development. These organizations are committed to:

- respect, empowerment and self-determination for all peoples;
- development that protects the world’s environment; and
- global understanding, cooperation and social justice.

MCIC’s mission as a coordinating structure is to promote public awareness, member interaction and advocacy on international issues; and to administer funds for international development.

Overview
Project Goal: To actively engage Manitoba high school students and teachers in international development issues.

Objectives:
1. To provide leadership and skills development to high school students so that they are better able to engage fellow students on international issues.
2. To link awareness to action through a conference that is creatively engaging.
3. To create a network of new and experienced teachers interested in global issues and better able to support their students.
4. To build partnerships with and among:
   - skilled people in Manitoba to facilitate the creative workshops.
   - international development NGOs and other community organizations.

Project Description:
Generating Momentum for Our World is an interactive provincial youth conference which brings together students who are involved in international development and other social activist groups in their schools for a day of leadership and skills training. Through a range of creative skill building workshops, the conference will:

- create awareness, urgency and excitement about what Canadians can do as global citizens
- provide a chance for students and teachers to network with others interested in international development issues and
- build transferable skills for engaging their fellow students back in their own schools.

The conference will conclude with a Showcase of the students’ work for the day. The showcase will be recorded on a digital video camera, so that excerpts can be uploaded to websites.

The main conference, to be held in Winnipeg, is expected to attract over 100 students. Another 50 students are expected to attend a satellite conference in Thompson to provide an opportunity for northern Manitoba students to participate. These 150 students will have an impact on many more

2 This case study is an abridged project description prepared by CCIC staff, based on an original project proposal and other materials supplied by MCIC. Many thanks to MCIC for their willingness to share details of their project planning with CCIC members to enrich our learning.
students and people in the communities in which they live. The conference will be held in late fall, likely November, so that students have time to organize activities in their schools during the rest of the year.

The methodology of Generating Momentum for Our World builds on the success of a similar youth conference coordinated recently by MCIC and partners on Children and War. The methods used in that conference will in this case be applied to the themes of Child Labour, Consumerism and Fair Trade.

**Student component:**
From high schools across the province, up to six students per school, ideally those with leadership potential and some interest in international development issues or other social causes, will be selected to attend the conference.

**Media used:**
These workshops use innovative and creative mediums to get at the content/topic of the conference. The conference is set up so that students will choose a primary stream for the day. Each stream will focus on the topics of the conference, while participants learn specific skills and techniques of one of the following creative media:

- Radio
- Mural Art
- Creating Video PSAs
- Short theatre presentations
- Expression through Music
- Performance Poetry/Spoken Word
- Creating a Magazine
- Contemporary Dance

**Teachers Stream:**
Teachers that accompany the students will be able to participate in and review resources that are available from international development NGOs that they may be able to use with their students. The teachers will later tour some of the student workshops.

**Collaboration, cooperation and linkages:**
Collaborating is fundamental to reaching the goals of Generating Momentum for Our World. MCIC is working with the following key groups in planning and implementing the conference:

The Manitoba Public Engagement Group (PEG) includes a number of MCIC’s member agencies, as well as other community groups that share an interest in public engagement. Other groups involved are: Menno Simons College that offers an International Development Studies Degree, Winnipeg Harvest, the local food bank, Kairos, and the Needs Centre for War Affected Families. **Teachers Steering Committee** to not only provide input on the current education system but to ensure effective and timely dissemination strategies and schedules; **High School Students Steering Committee** - a grassroots committee made up of representatives from several high schools and social justice organizations. **Facilitators** come from a number of different community organizations e.g. Contemporary Dancers, Manitoba Theatre for Young People, Graffiti Gallery, and the private sector such as recording studios etc. **Faculties of Education** at the University of Manitoba and Winnipeg, to encourage “teachers in training” to be group leaders for each of the workshops.
Target group(s):

Geography
Rural Manitoba
City of Winnipeg, Brandon, and Thompson
Northern Manitoba - Thompson and surrounding area

Formal Education Sector
Grade 9-12 students in Manitoba High Schools S1-S4 (activist orientation, and diverse backgrounds)
High School Teachers
Faculty of Education students (teachers-in-training) to assist in conference

Community
NGOs
Facilitators

Media
Mainstream: TV, radio, print
Alternative: University radio, print, community newspapers
Websites

Direct and indirect beneficiaries:

Direct beneficiaries:
• students participating
• teachers participating
• facilitators and group leaders

Indirect beneficiaries:
people that the students are engaging at school;
• public-at-large attending the Showcase presentation; and
• public-at-large exposed via media about the conference as well as the results after the conference.
• other teachers in the participating schools
• family and friends of the students and teachers that participate

Evaluations:
• survey forms at conference
• participant impact statements at the conference
• debriefing meeting with facilitators
• follow-up interviews with teachers
• follow-up meeting with steering committee
WORKSHOP REPORT: SIGNS OF CHANGE--ASSESSING OUR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT IMPACTS

WORKSHEET 4: BUILDING A FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATION

1. Read the case study.

2. Discuss with your group and identify:
   a) the overall goals
   b) the target groups
   c) key stakeholders

3. From the project activities defined, pick one or two that your group members would like to explore.
   1.
   2.

4. Complete a framework relating the overall goals for the project activities to specific expectations (target results), and signs of progress (indicators) in meeting these expectations. A template for this framework is attached on page 3.
5. Discuss and identify:

a) **Areas of greatest challenge.** i.e., Which of the expected results do you find hardest to match with indicators that meet the SMART and SPICED criteria outlined in the overview presentation? Why? What is your sense of how precise and measurable an *impact* indicator must be?

b) **Sources of evidence and approaches to gathering evidence.** What are some evaluation tools you would use to “read” the signs of change? How “conclusive” do you feel evidence of longer term progress or change must be?

c) **The potential for stakeholder inclusion in the evaluation process.** Who would you include in planning and executing the assessment? What would be the implications of involving these stakeholders?

6. **Discuss this framing process.** Summarize key questions and reflections that have come out of your work together.
## FRAMEWORK TEMPLATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>TARGET RESULTS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outputs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(short term developmental results)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(purpose level statements; medium term)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(goal level objectives; longer term)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WORKSHEET 5: OUTCOMES AND FOLLOW UP

Before we discuss “what next?” please take a few minutes to record your thoughts on the following:

1. What if any areas of public engagement assessment do you feel have been clarified or strengthened for you today?

2. How has your thinking about signs of public engagement success altered, if at all?

3. What areas of assessment remain problematic or challenging?

4. What kinds of follow up do you personally need to do to address these areas?

5. What kinds of follow up needs to be taken collectively, or by CCIC or regional/provincial councils on behalf of members?

6. What changes could CIDA or other funders make to strengthen or facilitate assessment of public engagement?

7. Are there any concrete things (additional resources? changes in funding or reporting requirements? etc.) that could make assessment easier for you?
### Annex C: Participants’ Evaluation Frameworks

#### Case Study 2: Speaking Out – Aboriginal Media Talk Development

**GROUP #1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>TARGET RESULTS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Plan and carry out two-week educational tour for media participants.</td>
<td>outputs (short term developmental results)</td>
<td>1.1.1: Number of participants, 1.1.2: Level of participant satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Tour completed with participation of key counterparts (as identified by Southern partners) and social actors, including community organizations and Aboriginal groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outcomes (purpose level statements; medium term)</td>
<td>1.1.1: Number and quality of articles, range of outlets – (evaluation grid used to grade quality of articles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1: Greater interest in and analysis of Aboriginal issues in a variety of media outlets.</td>
<td>1.2.1: Number of people who call in to express opinion/respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2: Increased public awareness of commonalities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impacts (goal level objectives; longer term)</td>
<td>1.1.1: Participation level as assessed in 1 year follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1: Ongoing dialogue among participants in support of Canadian-Pacific cooperation.</td>
<td>1.2.1: More profound analysis of commonalities and stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2: Improved coverage of Aboriginal issues in mainstream media.</td>
<td>1.2.3: Level of coverage of issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions arising from framing process:**

- How do we define and measure progress toward incremental goals?
- How ambitious can indicators be?
## Case Study 2 continued

### GROUP #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>TARGET RESULTS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Prepare aboriginal media participants to write/broadcast stories about experiences. | **outputs** (short term developmental results)  
   1.1: At least 4 pieces produced by each (Canadian) participant  
   1.2: Pacific Island journalists produce media about experiences  
   1.3: Items published/broadcast by Canadian and Pacific Island media | 1.1.1 and 1.1.2: where published/when broadcast  
   1.3.1: 750,000 people reached by broadcast/publication (BBM ratings) |
|  | **outcomes** (purpose level statements; medium term)  
   1.1: Broad and diverse audience reached  
   1.2: Increased interest in aboriginal issues | 1.1.1 and 1.2.1: Concrete feedback from audience (focus group)  
   1.1.2: BBM ratings  
   1.2.2: Requests for information increase (website, phone, etc.) |
|  | **impacts** (goal level objectives; longer term)  
   1.1: Commitment by partners (aboriginal and mainstream media) to further explore the issues | 1.1.1: Longer term reporting of issues |

### Questions/comments arising from framing process

- How to measure if stereotyping has been decreased?
- Measuring impact – so long term!
### Case Study 2 continued

**GROUP #3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>TARGET RESULTS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Public forums:</td>
<td><strong>outputs</strong> (short term developmental results)</td>
<td>1.1.1 Number of people attending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1: Forums held in 5 cities</td>
<td>1.1.2 and 1.2.1: Level of public discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2: Public exposure to Pacific peoples’ challenges and issues in common, North-South</td>
<td>1.2.2: Evaluation comments – quotable points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>outcomes</strong> (purpose level statements; medium term)</td>
<td>1.2.3: Change in knowledge/ awareness (coming out of a pre- and post-questionnaire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1: Relationships/ network built between PPP and southern counterparts, and between people North/South</td>
<td>1.2.4: Memberships received via a sign-up sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2: Heightened media awareness from forum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>impacts</strong> (goal level objectives; longer term)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1: Individual and collective action to address North-South Pacific issues</td>
<td>1.1.1: Continued public discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2: Canadian responsibility to act on responsibility in Pacific</td>
<td>1.2.1: Questions in House of Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3: Increased awareness among Canadian media</td>
<td>1.3.1: Newspaper coverage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ANNEX B: WORKSHOP MATERIALS
Case Study 2 continued

GROUP #4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>TARGET RESULTS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Educational journalists tour outputs (short term developmental results)</td>
<td>1.1.1 and 1.2.1: Number of stories that are published</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Public Forums</td>
<td>2.1.1: Number of people who attend forums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1: 3 journalists' oriented/ exposed to Pacific issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2: Journalists produce stories on Pacific issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1: Public forum held in 5 cities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outcomes (purpose level statements; medium term)</td>
<td>1.1.1: Baseline interview results that show attitudinal change in journalists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1: Attitude change in target journalists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impacts (goal level objectives; longer term)</td>
<td>1.1.1: More coverage of the South Pacific in aboriginal papers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1: Capacity of the aboriginal media to cover Pacific issues enhanced</td>
<td>1.2.1: more/ better (number? quality?) mainstream coverage of aboriginal issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2: Improved aboriginal coverage in mainstream media</td>
<td>1.2.3: PPP inquiries go up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3: Increased general awareness of Pacific issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Study 3: Generating Momentum for our World

GROUP #5 (Note that this group focused on identifying “process” outcomes and indicators)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>TARGET RESULTS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Youth skill-building workshops: Promotion, preparation and participation</td>
<td>outputs (short term developmental results)</td>
<td>1.1.1: Number of different school representatives involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 students and teachers involved in planning phase (from previous conference too)</td>
<td>1.1.2: Results of satisfaction survey on process (felt/heard/effective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.3: Number of referrals and applications for participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outcomes (purpose level statements; medium term)</td>
<td>1.1.1 and 1.2.1: Follow-up action plan identified at each high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1: Development of a network of youth and teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2: networking/sharing between high schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impacts (goal level objectives; longer term)</td>
<td>(Not defined)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Not defined)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question arising from framing process:

- What “triggers” a person towards an interest/openness in international awareness/experiences?
- What’s the personal path that leads to a life committed to change?
## Case Study 3 continued

**GROUP #6 (This group also focused on process outcomes and indicators.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>TARGET RESULTS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Planning phase of youth skill building workshop</td>
<td>outputs (short term developmental results)</td>
<td>1.1.1: How participants evaluate process (survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1: All groups participated equitably</td>
<td>1.1.1 and 1.1.2: Number and diversity of attendance/ participation as revealed in committee lists, minutes of meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2: Established stakeholder groups</td>
<td>1.1.3 Meetings planned vs attended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3: Group creates a plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outcomes (purpose level statements; medium term)</td>
<td>1.1.1: Minutes compared to conference plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1: Stakeholder issues identified and addressed</td>
<td>1.2.1: Able to plan and work together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2: Common ground established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impacts (goal level objectives; longer term)</td>
<td>1.1.1, 1.2.1, and 1.3.1: Results of conference evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1: Identified goals common to all groups</td>
<td>1.2.1: Number of attendees – who they are (ratio/diversity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2: Active networks established with and among stakeholder groups</td>
<td>1.3.1: 50% of those surveyed – engaged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3: Actively engaged students and teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question arising from framing process:**

- Where do we separate the activities?
- How do the numbers/results inform what happens next year? Do you aim for bigger, better?
Case Study 3 continued

GROUP #7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>TARGET RESULTS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth skill workshop (Media)</td>
<td>outputs (short term developmental results)</td>
<td>1.1.1: Quality of product – reflecting the message for both participants and the audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1: Artistic products (dance, media itself)</td>
<td>1.1.2: All groups create product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2: Students have fun</td>
<td>1.1.3: Showcase of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.1: Positive feedback from youth--Would they do it again/recommend it to others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outcomes (purpose level statements; medium term)</td>
<td>1.1.1 and 1.2.1: Individual feedback (oral or written)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1: Better understanding of international development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. Better understanding of media techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impacts (goal level objectives; longer term)</td>
<td>1.1.1: Increased peer education programs (clubs, assembly, plays) – school to school or within one school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1: Student engagement/ increased interest in international development issues</td>
<td>1.1.2: Increased contact/requests for information from partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.3: Anecdotes from students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.4: Feedback from teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions/ comments arising from Framing Process:

- How to make the data/feedback useful? What conclusions are legitimate to draw from feedback?
- Challenges in differentiating between indicators and outcomes/impacts.
- Challenges in differentiating between outcomes and impacts.
- How realistic can our measurements of impact be?
Case Study 3 continued

GROUP #8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>TARGET RESULTS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students media skills workshops</td>
<td>outputs (short term developmental results)</td>
<td>(?) Number of students who participated in the workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1: Workshop materials are prepared</td>
<td>1.3.1: Showcase in evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2: Facilitators are sensitized to the themes of the conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3: Artistic products (students’ outputs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes (purpose level statements; medium term)</td>
<td>1.1.1 and 1.2.1: Percent or proportion of participants who indicated they had increased skills and knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1: Increased technical skills in a particular medium</td>
<td>(?) Number of participants who expressed an interest in follow-up workshops and/or additional materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2: Increased knowledge about themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts (goal level objectives; longer term)</td>
<td>1.1.1: Number of youth engaged in designing and implementing development-related activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1: Manitoba students are actively and innovatively engaged in international development issues</td>
<td>1.1.2: Number of networks developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.3: Number of students who continue being informed by or using a given medium to elicit social change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.4: Number of students who join other international development organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.5: Number of facilitators invited to the schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions Arising from Framing Process:

- How to incorporate feedback and assessment into project/program planning?
ANNEX D: REFERENCE SHEETS

CIDA RBM DEFINITIONS

Source: Results-Based Management in CIDA - Policy Statement, Annex A
Prepared by Results-Based Management Division
Performance Review Branch, March 1996

Results
- **Result.** A result is a describable or measurable change in state that is derived from a cause and effect relationship.
- **Developmental result.** The output, outcome and impact of a CIDA investment in a developing country.
  (2) Given its international assistance mandate, the FSU/CEE Branch will adopt modified definitions of terms such as developmental results suited to its purpose.)
- **Operational result.** The administrative and management product achieved within the Agency.
- **Input.** The resources required, including money, time or effort, to produce a result.
- **Results chain.** Generally seen to correspond to the output, purpose and goal levels of a logical framework analysis (LFA)(3).
  (3) **Purpose.** A level of objective within the control of program/project activities and which explains what service is being provided, who is the direct beneficiary of the service and why or to what higher goal the project is contributing.
  **Goal.** A level of objective immediately above that of program/project purpose which links the program/project to a wider set of strategies being undertaken to address a specific problem.

The Results Chain
- **Output.** The immediate, visible, concrete and tangible consequences of program/project inputs.
- **Outcome.** Result at the LFA purpose level, constituting the short-term effect of the program/project. This is generally the level where the beneficiaries or end-users take ownership of the program/project and CIDA funding comes to an end.
- **Impact.** Broader, higher level, long-term effect or consequence linked to the goal or vision.

Performance measurement
- **Baseline data.** The set of conditions existing at the outset of a program/project. Results will be measured or assessed against such baseline data.
- **Performance indicators.** Specific performance measures chosen because they provide valid, useful, practical and comparable measures of progress towards achieving expected results.
- **Quantitative indicators.** Measures of quantity, including statistical statements.
- **Qualitative indicators.** Judgments and perceptions derived from subjective analysis.
- **Performance assessment.** Self-assessment by program branches/units, comprising program, project or institutional monitoring, operational reviews, end-of-year reporting, end-of-project reporting, institutional assessments and special studies.
- **Performance review.** A comprehensive corporate review of a given program theme and ODA priority across all Agency program branches.
CIDA GUIDANCE ON SELECTING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Source: “Results-based Management in CIDA: An Introductory Guide to the Concepts and Principles”
RBM-division, Performance Review Branch, January 1999, pp. 20-22
Extracts highlighted by CCIC.

“Performance indicators are qualitative or quantitative measures of resource use, extent of reach and developmental results achieved used to monitor program/project performance. Quantitative indicators are statistical measures such as number, frequency, percentile, ratios, variance, etc. Qualitative indicators are judgement and perception measures of congruence with established standards, the presence or absence of specific conditions, the extent and quality of participation, or the level of beneficiary satisfaction, etc. It is a popular myth that information collected on quantitative indicators is inherently more objective than that collected on qualitative indicators. Both can be either more or less objective or subjective depending on whether or not the principles of social science research have been rigorously applied in the data collection and analysis process.”

Six criteria for selecting performance indicators

1. **Validity**—Does it measure the result?
2. **Reliability**—Is it a consistent measure over time?
3. **Sensitivity**—When the result changes, will it be sensitive to those changes?
4. **Simplicity**—Will it be easy to collect and analyse the information?
5. **Utility**—Will the information be useful for decision-making and learning?
6. **Affordability**—Can the program/project afford to collect the information?

“It is suggested that at least three indicators per expected result at the outcomes level should be used: at least one quantitative, one qualitative and one of your choice. In many cases, a total of two indicators at the output level would be sufficient. For each quantitative indicator, it is important to specify the unit of analysis or comparison. Benchmarks should also be specified for each qualitative indicator, as well as expected perceptions or judgement of process by stakeholders and a detailed description of expected conditions or situation to be observed.”

“Developing a performance measurement system is a trial and error experience that can only be improved after several cycles of data collection, analysis and appraisal. Some performance indicators may, after some use, prove not to meet the above criteria and must then be replaced from the reserve pool. The RBM principle of learning by doing applies best to performance measurement.”
CIDA ON ASSESSING OUTPUTS, OUTCOMES AND IMPACTS

Source: “Results-based Management in CIDA: An Introductory Guide to the Concepts and Principles”
RBM-division, Performance Review Branch, January 1999, p. 23
Extracts highlighted by CCIC

“Since outputs are the short-term logical consequences of activities, data collection on output achievement should begin shortly after the completion of an activity. Information collected on output achievement will support management learning, decision making and continuous performance improvement.

Since outcomes are the logical consequences of a combination of outputs, they will not begin to materialize or manifest themselves until a sufficient number and type of outputs have been achieved….”

“Since impact level results are a logical consequence of a combination of outcomes, and outcomes are generally achieved around program/project termination, then it would be unlikely that measuring impacts during the implementation phase would reveal much in the way of attributable performance information. Consequently, the responsibility for impact evaluation should rest with the Country Program Directors (CPD) or responsible Program Director. Because impact level results are long-term socio-economic changes expected at a country level, it would be virtually impossible to attribute them to discrete program/project initiatives.”
Appendix 05 - IAP2’s Public Participation Spectrum and examples of planning and evaluation frameworks
IAP2 Spectrum
of Public Participation

**Inform**
To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.

**Consult**
To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.

**Involve**
To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.

**Collaborate**
To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.

**Empower**
To place final decision-making in the hands of the public.

---

**Promise to the public**
- We will keep you informed.
- We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.
- We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.
- We will look to you for advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.
- We will implement what you decide.

---

**Example techniques**
- Fact sheets
- Web sites
- Open houses
- Public comment
- Focus groups
- Surveys
- Public meetings
- Workshops
- Deliberative polling
- Citizen advisory committees
- Consensus-building
- Participatory decision-making
- Citizen juries
- Ballots
- Delegated decision
Appendix C: Health Canada’s Public Involvement Continuum

This public involvement continuum has been provided by the Office for Public and Consumer Involvement, Health Products and Food Branch, Health Canada. It has five levels:

- **Level 1: Inform or Educate** Level 1 provides members of the public with balanced and objective information to help them understand the issues, the options, the process and the solutions. Examples include posting public advisories or other information documents on web sites, conducting public awareness campaigns, etc.

- **Level 2: Gather Information** Level 2 collects public concerns and information about the affect of the developing policy. Examples include surveys, focus groups, mailing or web posting discussion documents for feedback, etc.

- **Level 3: Discuss** Level 3 allows the public to discuss the policy. At this stage the policy is not set, so the public has an opportunity to influence its final form. The exchange of information is usually between one individual or group and the decision maker. Examples include bilateral meetings, public or town hall meetings, etc.

- **Level 4: Engage** Level 4 offers a more thorough and in-depth deliberation about the issues.
A proposed public participation framework

1. Determine the level of participation required

Each level of the Public Participation Continuum shown below describes a "type" or "depth" of participation that may be appropriate to support the pending decision. For example, if the decision is not controversial and will not create winners and losers, then informing the public and stakeholder groups of the proposed decision and its rationale through a press release or advertising campaign may be all that is required. If, however, the decision will likely create controversy or affect a large segment of the province or a number of stakeholder groups, then the decision-making organization should consider using a more sophisticated approach to participation. As a general principle, the more significant the impact, the greater the need for public participation.

Public Participation Continuum

Source: Adapted from Health Canada and International Association of Public Participation

2. Document the desired results.

The decision-maker needs to be clear from the outset how much they expect to factor in public involvement in support of the pending decision. The objectives listed below outline the general expectation for each level on the continuum. The decision-maker needs to determine the specific results that participation is seeking to achieve. For planning purposes these results should be expressed in terms of outputs (for example, information reports, statistics, agreements) and, where possible, outcomes (for example, increased awareness of the issues or acceptance and respect by the various parties for others views).
IAP2’s Five Steps for Public Participation Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.   | Gain Internal Commitment | Activity 1: Identify the decision maker(s)  
Activity 2: Profile sponsoring organization’s approach to P2  
Activity 3: Clarify the scope of the decision  
Activity 4: Identify preliminary stakeholders and issues  
Activity 5: Assess sponsor’s view of the IAP2 Spectrum level |
| 2.   | Learn from the Public | Activity 1: Identify the decision maker(s)  
Activity 2: Profile sponsoring organization’s approach to P2  
Activity 3: Clarify the scope of the decision  
Activity 4: Identify preliminary stakeholders and issues  
Activity 5: Assess sponsor’s view of the IAP2 Spectrum level |
| 3.   | Select the Level of Participation | Activity 1: Understand how people perceive the decision  
Activity 2: Develop a comprehensive list of stakeholders  
Activity 3: Correlate stakeholders and issues  
Activity 4: Review/refine the scope of the decision  
Activity 5: Assess “readiness” of sponsoring organization |
| 4.   | Define the Decision Process and Participation Objectives | Activity 1: Determine plan format  
Activity 2: Integrate baseline data into plan format  
Activity 3: Identify the public participation techniques  
Activity 4: Identify support elements for implementation  
Activity 5: Plan for evaluation |
| 5.   | Design the Public Participation Plan | Activity 1: Determine level of participation  
Activity 2: Select level on the IAP2 Spectrum  
Activity 3: Assess “readiness” of sponsoring organization  
Activity 4: Review/refine the scope of the decision  
Activity 5: Assess sponsor’s view of the IAP2 Spectrum level |

© 2006, International Association for Public Participation
1. Workshop Goal
To engage stakeholders in discussions about the long-term vision of CGDI and to use this common ground to plan and to set in motion the action to realize the newly shared vision.

2. Workshop Objectives
a. To discuss and agree upon the specific roles and responsibilities of the various stakeholder groups in the long-term operation of the CGDI.
b. To identify CGDI gaps that limit distribution and sharing of geospatial information and any new and emerging technology that could fill these potential gaps.
c. To discuss and identify institutional and social barriers to the continued growth and ultimate sustainability of the CGDI.
d. To identify opportunities to greater leverage existing investment for increased value to the user communities.
e. To collaboratively develop a plan and to set in motion stakeholder-owned initiatives that will crystallize that common future.

Outputs of Workshop
✓ A wide range of issues of concern are expressed and discussed by the community and documented for future analysis and decision-making.
✓ Various strategic directions are discussed and documented, including the level of support for each and by whom.
✓ A workshop report is developed that contains:
  o a listing of the highest priority issues facing each group within the community.
  o a listing of opportunities that are not currently being exploited.

Outcomes of Workshop
✓ Stakeholders better understand the perspectives of other stakeholders including their needs, contributions to date and roles within CGDI.
✓ Stakeholders who have been participating on the margins of CGDI development and operation are brought into mainstream discussion and operation.
✓ Stakeholders identify innovative products, services or enhancements for the CGDI through communication and collaboration.
✓ Stakeholders are better informed on the state of technology within the field of web-based geospatial data management.
✓ Stakeholders demonstrate strong support to CGDI continuance.
✓ Stakeholders understand (the difference between) mass market geospatial products and the CGDI and how both will develop and interact in the future.
✓ GeoConnections staff gain direction on how best to position the CGDI for the completion of phase II funding.
✓ The CGDI community understands that the role of the Federal Government in this area will be changing.

1 Federal departments, provincial and territorial ministries, municipal, public safety, public health, aboriginal, environmental, academia, GIS support industry (data & software services), GIS consumer products industry and other users.
2 In terms of data accuracy and currency, standards development for interoperability, system maintenance, expansion, availability and robustness.
3 Economic, technological and within the GeoConnections theme areas of public safety, public health, aboriginal and environmental.
4 The Canadian geospatial information community.
3. Evaluation Criteria

Process Success (post workshop evaluation)

Participants:
1. are informed of workshop purpose and background.
2. felt that activities leading up to the workshop helped them to better understand the issues.
3. felt that the workshop was well designed and paced to facilitate overall objectives.
4. felt that they have been heard.
5. were able to exchange perspectives.

Impact Success (6-12 month review and evaluation)
1. The governance structure is reviewed and confirmed or amended collaboratively amongst partners and stakeholders.
2. New partners join and become involved in a meaningful way.
3. A vision and action plan is published.
4. Partners participate in the governance activities at their own expense.

4. Communications

Key Messages
1. Purpose of the event is to secure CDGI sustainability
   a. Looking to secure and enhance the infrastructure as a public asset.
   b. Meaningful participation of past, current and future partners and stakeholders is required for success.
   c. Redefining the governance structure (who's going to run it?) & probably also the operational context.
2. The future of GeoConnections is unknown after March 31, 2010:
   a. GeoConnections funding for stakeholder participation is not infinite and is slated to end after March 31, 2010.
   b. Secure the investment of all partners and leverage investments to date for future performance improvements.
   c. In its last two years, scope for GeoConnections to influence policy in order to help secure the sustainability of the CGDI.
3. Positioning CGDI to meet future needs.
   a. Need to be sure that it is serving its purpose - honest broker.
   b. Needs to stay in sync with the operating environment (including the user community).
Appendix 06 – IAP2’s Techniques to bring people together
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique to bring people together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Community Fairs

- **(10) can view 2 once**
- Set up a station or other special people
- Exhibit opportunities
- Opportunity for attendance
- Opportunity for attendance

### Open Houses

- **(2)** can view 2 once
- Opportunity for attendance
- Opportunity for attendance
- Opportunity for attendance
- Opportunity for attendance

### Tours

- **(1)** can be explored
- Opportunity for attendance
- Opportunity for attendance
- Opportunity for attendance
- Opportunity for attendance

### Simulation Games

- Always think it through
- What can go wrong
- What can go right
- Never think it through
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNIQUE</th>
<th>ALWAYS THINK IT THROUGH</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO RIGHT</th>
<th>WHAT CAN GO WRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEETINGS WITH EXISTING GROUPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small meetings with existing groups or in conjunction with another event</td>
<td>• Understand who the likely audience is to be&lt;br&gt;• Make opportunities for one-on-one meetings</td>
<td>• Opportunity to get on the agenda&lt;br&gt;• Provide opportunity for in-depth information exchange in non-threatening forum</td>
<td>• May be too selective and can leave out important groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEB-BASED MEETINGS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings that occur via the Internet</td>
<td>• Tailor agenda to your participants&lt;br&gt;• Combine telephone and face-to-face meetings with Web-based meetings.&lt;br&gt;• Plan for graphics and other supporting materials</td>
<td>• Cost and time efficient&lt;br&gt;• Can include a broader audience&lt;br&gt;• People can participate at different times or at the same time</td>
<td>• Consider timing if international time zones are represented&lt;br&gt;• Difficult to manage or resolve conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPUTER-FACILITATED WORKSHOP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any sized meeting when participants use interactive computer technology to register opinions</td>
<td>• Understand your audience, particularly the demographic categories&lt;br&gt;• Design the inquiries to provide useful results&lt;br&gt;• Use facilitator trained in the technique</td>
<td>• Immediate graphic results prompt focused discussion&lt;br&gt;• Areas of agreement/disagreement easily portrayed&lt;br&gt;• Minority views are honored&lt;br&gt;• Responses are private&lt;br&gt;• Levels the playing field</td>
<td>• Software limits design&lt;br&gt;• Potential for placing too much emphasis on numbers&lt;br&gt;• Technology failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC HEARINGS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal meetings with scheduled presentations offered</td>
<td>• Avoid if possible&lt;br&gt;• Provides opportunity for public to speak without rebuttal</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not foster constructive dialogue&lt;br&gt;• Can perpetuate an us vs. them feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESIGN CHARRETTES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive session where participants re-design project features</td>
<td>• Best used to foster creative ideas&lt;br&gt;• Be clear about how results will be used</td>
<td>• Promotes joint problem solving and creative thinking</td>
<td>• Participants may not be seen as representative by larger public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSSENSUS BUILDING TECHNIQUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techniques for building consensus on project decisions such as criteria and alternative selection. Often used with advisory committees. Techniques include Delphi, nominal group technique, public value assessment and many others.</td>
<td>• Use simplified methodology&lt;br&gt;• Allow adequate time to reach consensus&lt;br&gt;• Consider one of the computerized systems that are available&lt;br&gt;• Define levels of consensus, i.e. a group does not have to agree entirely upon a decision but rather agree enough so the discussion can move forward</td>
<td>• Encourages compromise among different interests&lt;br&gt;• Provides structured and trackable decision making</td>
<td>• Not appropriate for groups with no interest in compromise&lt;br&gt;• Clever parties can skew results&lt;br&gt;• Does not produce a statistically valid solution&lt;br&gt;• Consensus may not be reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNIQUE</td>
<td>ALWAYS THINK IT THROUGH</td>
<td>WHAT CAN GO RIGHT</td>
<td>WHAT CAN GO WRONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN-SPACE TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>Important to have a powerful theme or vision statement to generate topics</td>
<td>Provides structure for giving people opportunity and responsibility to create valuable product or experience</td>
<td>Most important issues could get lost in the shuffle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need flexible facilities to accommodate numerous groups of different sizes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Can be difficult to get accurate reporting of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groundrules and procedures must be carefully explained for success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKSHOPS</td>
<td>Know how you plan to use public input before the workshop</td>
<td>Excellent for discussions on criteria or analysis of alternatives</td>
<td>Hostile participants may resist what they perceive to be the &quot;divide and conquer&quot; strategy of breaking into small groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct training in advance with small group facilitators. Each should receive a list of instructions, especially where procedures involve weighting/ ranking of factors or criteria</td>
<td>Fosters small group or one-to-one communication</td>
<td>Several small-group facilitators are necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE SEARCH CONFERENCE</td>
<td>Hire a facilitator experienced in this technique</td>
<td>Can involve hundreds of people simultaneously in major organizational change decisions</td>
<td>Logistically challenging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individuals are experts</td>
<td>May be difficult to gain complete commitment from all stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can lead to substantial changes across entire organization</td>
<td>2 — 3 day meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Part 1: Description of the event**

| Name of the event |  |
| City, Location where the event takes place |  |
| Date of the event |  |
| CCI Program officer |  |
| Person or group responsible for this event |  |
| Resource person or person invited for this event |  |
| Is this event part of a partnership project? If so, which one? |  |

1. Brief description of the public engagement event, including objectives, public target, approach taken, etc.

2. What was key strategy used to achieve objective(s) above?

3. In what sense did the planned objective of the activity / the event contribute to CCI objectives, which are:
   - To build an active and engaged community of supporters prepared to take action in support of our mission
   - To influence policy and effect change
   - To raise CCI profile and credibility
   - To increase and leverage resources

**Part II: Participation at the event**

1. How many people actively participated in the event? Number of women? Number of men? Where possible, please indicate the number of Crossroaders (returned overseas volunteers) and partners.

2. How many people were reached by the event? Number of women? Number of men? (if possible, indicate the number, otherwise an estimation)

3. List any media outlets in attendance and the date and time of the coverage received (include a copy if possible).

4. Did the event suggest an action (postcard signature, registration to an electronic bulletin, etc.) If so, which action?
5. If possible, indicate how many signatures, postcards or email addresses were collected. How many people signed up to the CCI e-bulletin? Or took a concrete action? If possible, indicate number of women and men.

6. From your point of view, in what sense people may change their attitudes, their beliefs as a result of the event?

7. From your point of view, how may people have undertaken effective action or behaviour changes because of the event or modified their behaviour?

Part III: Learning

Is there anything that you learned from this event that you would like to share with the rest of the Crossroads community? This might be around the way the event was organized, or the nature of the event, or the audience to whom the event was directed. This question is completely open-ended – please feel free to write about any aspect of the event that you think is important for others to learn.

Part IV: Most significant moment

Is there a significant moment regarding the event? It could be a participant’s testimony, participant taking action, media coverage, or impact in the community.
Action Ideas

Want to take action but unsure where to start?

*Learn more about poverty issues locally and globally*

*Vote! And be an informed voter.*

*Write letters to local or national newspapers, magazines, and websites.*

*Be an informed consumer and investor; look into Fair Trade and Ethical Investing.*

*Support an organization with your time, your ideas, your networks, your voice, your dollars. For example, volunteer to support immigrant professionals integrating into the job market (intercultural associations), volunteer to support housing projects for marginalized populations…*

*Be Visible – organize an event, a potluck, a picnic and share news, ideas, actions*

*Engage your MP - write a letter or arrange a meeting (see back)*

*Visit these networks and organizations for information and opportunities to get involved:*

Subscribe to your province’s Community Economic Development bulletin or to your province's Council for International Cooperation newsletter. You can find them through their National Network links: [www.ccednet-rcdec.ca](http://www.ccednet-rcdec.ca) and [www.ccic.ca](http://www.ccic.ca).

Make Poverty History [www.makepovertyhistory.ca](http://www.makepovertyhistory.ca).

Subscribe to the CCI e-bulletin to stay informed: Register in the News and Announcements section of [www.cciorg.ca](http://www.cciorg.ca).

Global Citizens for Change [www.globalcitizensforchange.com](http://www.globalcitizensforchange.com)


---

Tips for Letter writing

- MPs are busy, so keep your letter short and to the point. Just a few paragraphs will be enough.
- Be polite and courteous. Getting annoyed or rude will achieve nothing, and may even be counterproductive.
- Remember to include your full name and address.
- Use bullet points to highlight your main concerns.
- Include supporting evidence, but 1 or 2 key points clearly explained is better than 5 points poorly explained.
- Make it clear what you are asking the MP to do.
- Only write to your own MP.

Things to include:

- A description of the problem
- What you want them to do
- Your personal testimony; why you want them to do something and your personal opinion on the matter
- Further evidence: key points regarding the issue
- Ask for a personal reply and say you are interested in your MPs own opinions.

For Information about poverty and statistics visit:

Evaluation Results

1. The objectives of the workshop were clear to me at the start.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The objectives were accomplished in the workshop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The print material (handouts) was helpful to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I had enough opportunities to discuss my questions or concerns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58.33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The location (Burnaby) was appropriate for me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41.67%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. In what way(s) was the workshop of value to you?
   - Networking
   - Learning/Sharing Experiences
   - New ways of looking at PE
   - Great Speakers
   - Useful models of engagement to follow
   - Time dedicated to PE (usually not well considered compared to program)
   - Concepts of PE were clarified and systemized
   - Great to hear what others in Vancouver/BC are doing in International Development
   - Shared insights and experiences of others in the sector
   - Saw cross-connect of PE with project goals
   - Great to meet others and hear their approaches and experiences
   - To learn about PE across a variety of small and large organizations/to be part of discussion on PE
   - I enjoyed hearing about different PE options
   - Time to share with others and hear from others
   - Respect shown to each other. Non-partisan.
   - Gave me course ideas offered by iap2
   - Gained insight and ideas on how to carry out public awareness
   - Best and worst practices from other NGOs

7. How might you apply your learning from this workshop to your organization community?
   - Bring more “impact” questions into some evaluations.
   - New ways to engage our public
   - Reassessment of program goals
   - Try new PE techniques, plan
   - Develop more evaluation mechanisms from planning & relate PE activities to project goals.
8. In which areas would you like to build organizational capacity?
- Evaluation and networks
- Resource materials for effective PE
- Evaluation techniques
- Data collection
- Ability to support wide range and the ways people might want to engage in our work
- Ongoing evaluation
- Evaluate public engagement throughout the project process
- Evaluation
- Building from ideas and small operation with large awareness to larger participation and larger impact

9. Circle the word below which best describes your overall impression of this workshop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Needs Work</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
<td>16.66%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. I would also like to say:
- Good questions from group tables – lots of group work is great
- Keep the workshops coming!
- RD has synthesizing, consensus-building skills, but I found the presenter difficult to listen to for most of a day. (He must finish his point before interrupting himself to respond to hand-raisers) I appreciated all four other speakers, Small groups good.
- I loved receiving the survey results before the workshop. Good coverage of concepts. Would like some more detail on techniques.
- It would have been nice to have a bit more time for exploring specific evaluation techniques.
- A good day, but a little too much emphasis on public participation which feels like the way government tries to facilitate public involvement in decisions that directly affect them (ie. Community resources, economic development, infrastructure, etc.) rather than for engaging people in ID issues.
- It would have been good to create a PE strategy for a project. Everyone learns differently – some need to do!

11. In order of priority, please outline your public engagement at your organization.
- Events/workshops
- Network/partnership sharing and collaboration
- Community responses
- Speaking engagement, community colleges, service clubs, schools, public promotional events.
- On two levels: a) None done – only focused on goal of poverty reduction and b) All that’s done – networking and getting people together, but to do what?