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Introduction

Each year the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) seeks nominations for the Core Values Award to recognize excellence and innovation in the field of public participation. Winning projects demonstrate the use of innovative techniques, provide solutions to problems that face the field of public participation, involve the public in new areas and show how public participation has affected decisions. While “winners” are selected each year, all of the entries present a wealth of information about the state of public participation worldwide and showcase excellence in practice.

The IAP2 Research Committee determined that it was important to share these stories with our membership in the form of a State of the Practice Report. This is the sixth edition of the report. Previous editions of the State of the Practice Report are available at www.IAP2.org. The descriptions submitted for these awards are a valuable tool for learning about others’ experiences. We can learn from their stories to inform our own practice. The projects presented here are exemplars of good practice. They support IAP2’s core values, and exhibit creative ways to engage the public. The public is engaged in a variety of methods and media; from town focus groups, consensus conferences, world cafes, and participatory laboratories to digital social networking sites. They range from local to national levels and from 40 to over 28,000 participants. They cross topical areas such as health care, transportation, education, community visioning, sustainable development, policy making, and re-visioning democracy. They all result in benefits for the agencies, stakeholders, communities and citizens.

The studies provide useful examples of creative techniques, management or governance structures for participatory processes, methods to engage diverse groups or agencies, and reflections on lessons learned. The Core Value submissions also can be used for promoting or “making the case” for participatory approaches. Initially, the projects were judged against the IAP2 core values award criteria. Each submission is peer-reviewed by members of the Core Values Award Committee for inclusion.

The report is organized for easy access:

- The first section is a summary of the Core Values applications in table form to help identify which projects may be of interest to you. These summaries have been prepared by the State of the Practice report authors.
- The second section contains the full submissions as written by the person or agency applying for the Core Values Award.

The International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) uses the Core Values Awards to recognize excellence and innovation in public participation practice around the world. These awards are made annually. Winning entries and finalists are selected by a panel of judges who are experienced public participation practitioners in their own right. The seven Core Values are used as the basis for the evaluation of the entries.
President’s Message

This year it was my pleasure once again to announce the IAP2 Core Values Awards.

This year's International Core Values Awards received 19 entries in two award categories: Project of the Year and Organization of the Year. Entries came from Canada, Italy, South Africa, and the USA.

Having been a Core Values Award winner myself it is such a credit to practitioners the world over that time is taken to showcase your work around the world and to support your peers through sharing your projects and learning in your organizations.

The absence of entries in the Research Award category in 2012, points the challenge of undertaking research in this field. Together with our partner the Deliberative Democracy Consortium we publish the Journal of Public Deliberation and throughout the year you can follow research from the field.

This year the Core Values awards was very well represented from Health and Local Government in particular and with Canada hosting the inaugural North American IAP2 Conference, it is worth noting the high percentage of entries from Canada!

Thank you to our international judging panel and to Carla Leversedge, IAP2 Australasia president who convened this year's panel and was ably joined by

- Tamsin Jones, South Africa, consultant at Graduate School of Business, University of Cape Town in South Africa
- Romain Lacuisse, France, Judge 2011, 2012, consultant for public participation
- Emma Lawson, Australia, Core Values Awards Winner 2011, works for government in South Australia, New South Wales
- Tim Steffensmeier, USA, co-editor Journal of Public Deliberation, assistant professor of Communication Studies at Kansas State University

Thank you to the all applicants. We make ourselves just a little bit better every time we rise to the challenge of competition. For this year it is important to note that the judges were impressed with variety and quality of the award entries, so each entrant can take pride in knowing that their work was highly regarded. A special mention of sincere thanks to the team behind the scenes as well in particular the stalwart publication volunteer Pat Crawford from USA and team at IAP2 HQ especially, Ellen Ernst.

Geoff Wilson
Presiding Member IAP2 Federation
International Judging Panel Members

Carla Leversedge
Each year an international judging panel is formed to assess the applications and this year the Judging Panel was led by Carla Leversedge, IAP2 Australasia president and International Federation board member. She was joined by a panel from academia, media and practitioners in the field.

Tamsin Jones
has extensive experience in the international arena having worked on three continents. She is a dynamic, passionate professional who has delivered social innovation on three continents and in the public, private and community sectors. Her resume includes over a decade of senior work in social policy and programmes with a focus on cross disciplinary collaboration. She has a background in policy, entrepreneurial and innovative business design that interfaces with community engagement in science, public policy and urban development. She is a graduate of Oxford’s MBA program at the Skoll Centre for Social Entrepreneurship and is currently a Consultant at Graduate School of Business, University of Cape Town in South Africa.

Romain Lacuisse,
is a consultant for public participation in France. After having worked as a local press correspondent in sensitive districts of Marseilles, he became a civil servant in charge of participatory democracy for the municipalities of Vendôme and Clamart. He works now freelance, either with local authorities or with commissions of public debate about great infrastructure projects. In 2010-2011, he’s been following the public debate about the “Grand Paris” project, on behalf of the French railways owner, Réseau Ferré de France.
**Emma Lawson**  
has more than 13 years of experience working for government in South Australia, New South Wales and the United Kingdom, and worked across government in the parliamentary, political, policy, and community engagement fields. She has worked as a political advisor to the current Labor government, led parliamentary inquiries and developed policy in a diverse range of areas including health, workers compensation, economic development, education, skills and housing. Most recently she headed up the community engagement process for the update of South Australia’s Strategic Plan. This process been recognised by IAP2 International with their prestigious award for a best practice community engagement project and has also received a commendation from the Future Gov 2.0 awards for leading use of social media by government in Asia Pacific.

---

**Tim Steffensmeier**  
is an assistant professor of Communication Studies at Kansas State University. Dr. Steffensmeier currently works with Public Square Communities, LLC and the Kansas Leadership Center (KLC) on civic leadership and community building projects. Tim teaches classes in Communication and Democracy, Leadership Communication, Classical Rhetoric, and Argumentation Theory. Dr. Steffensmeier focuses much of his facilitation and research on deliberation and community development.
Core Values Awards Program Criteria

Project of the Year Award

The Project of the Year award recognizes excellence in the tools, techniques and efforts in public participation within a finite framework.

The Problem and Challenge
Describe the problem and challenge faced.

The Role of Public Participation
Briefly describe the role of public participation in addressing the problem or challenge.

Public Participation Methods
Describe the methods used to implement public participation.

Uniqueness of the Project
Describe what makes this project special. Some questions to consider in this section include:
- In what way(s) did public participation improve the decision?
- How did public participation contribute to the resolution of the problem?
- Describe the innovative participation techniques that were used.
- Was the project able to solve a problem that faces the field of public participation?
- How did the project spread the practice of public participation into a new area?

Project Results
Describe the project’s effectiveness in achieving results. Provide a brief summary of the project evaluation.

Alignment with Core Values
Describe how the IAP2 core values are reflected in the project outcomes. Specifically:
- How did the project ensure that those most affected by the decision or problem were involved?
- How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public’s contributions?
- How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated?
- How did the project seek out and facilitate the involvement of those most affected?
- How did the project seek input from participants on how they wished to participate?
- How did the information provided to participants support or contribute to meaningful participation?
- How did the communication of the project results ensure that participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem?
Organization of the Year Award

The *Organization of the Year* award recognizes the application of the core values in all aspects of an organization and how they are embedded into decision-making that features public participation.

Public Participation Challenges and Opportunities
Describe the mission of the organization and its challenges with regard to internal and external stakeholders or public entities.

Rationale for Public Participation
Discuss the rationale or impetus that led the organization to embrace the principles and values of public participation.

Impact of Core Values on the Organization
Discuss how the Core Values are influencing both operations and organizational culture. Provide examples of specific ways that public participation has impacted decisions, leveraged or created opportunities for your organization.

Provide evidence of how the Core Values are helping to shape organizational culture. Evidence of a culture of public participation within an organization may include (but are not limited to):
- evidence that public participation is an organizational strategy, a component of organizational mission/mandate, or a key business element or deliverable for the organization
- the existence of a public participation policy, and the breadth of scope of the policy’s influence on the operations or work of the organization
- evidence of public participation knowledge and/or practice competency of employees, and the existence of internal training programs for staff, volunteers, etc.
- existence of internal frameworks for carrying out public participation work that reflect or are based in IAP2’s Core Values
- evidence that the public participation activities of the organization are evaluated as part of overall business strategy

Evaluation against Core Values
Provide evidence to demonstrate how the Core Values influence the organization and its public participation approach and practice.
1. Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.

2. Public participation includes the promise that the public's contribution will influence the decision.

3. Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.

4. Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.

5. Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.

6. Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.

7. Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.
2012 Core Values Winners Circle

Project of the Year Winner
Blood Donation Lifetime Deferral Policy
Canada

Organization of the Year Winner
Promoting Citizen Participation in Tuscany
Italy

Organization Special Mention
Creating a Culture of Engagement at Capital Health
Canada
# Nomination Summaries

## Project of the Year

**Blood Donation Lifetime Deferral Policy**  
**Canada**

| Title | **Blood donation lifetime deferral policy for men who have sex with men**  
*Project of the Year 2012* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Canadian Blood Services (CBS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Head Office, Ottawa, ON, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>CBS’ policy that excludes men who have had sex with men (MSM) from donating blood is a source of outrage and high emotion that polarizes stakeholders. Patient groups are critically concerned with ensuring the safety of the blood supply. Community groups, who have fought for and made significant progress in the area of human rights, feel it reinforces discrimination against gay and bisexual men and their partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>The Board of Directors introduced a motion to reduce the deferral period from a lifetime to a defined term of five to ten years, to be determined through extensive stakeholder consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Comprehensive engagement of multiple stakeholders to influence submission to our regulator, Health Canada requesting a change to the policy. New relationships were forged between patient and community groups. Consultations resulted in identification of common ground, consensus on the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Blood donation lifetime deferral policy for men who have sex with men

*Project of the Year 2012*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>way forward and a commitment to continue to work together. This demonstrates an enormous compromise from both sides of the policy issue.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>2010 - 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Over 9,300 people including patients, community, medical and scientific experts, general public, Canadian Blood Services staff and volunteers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.blood.ca">www.blood.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organization of the Year

Promoting Citizen Participation in Tuscany, Italy

#### Title

**Promoting Citizen Participation in Tuscany (Italy); Law no. 69/07 and the Regional Participation Authority**

*Organization of the Year 2012*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizing Group</th>
<th>Legislative Assembly of the Tuscany Region – Regional Participation Authority (RPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Tuscany Region (Italy) with a population of 3,749,813 (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>How can a 'meso'/regional government promote citizen engagement in policy making as an ordinary practice, in the face of declining political participation and social capital?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Town meetings, Citizen juries, Consensus Conferences, World Cafés, Participatory budgeting, Open Space Technology, participatory laboratories, workshops, stakeholder interviews, Consensus building, SWOT ….</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>103 participatory processes have been funded in four and a half years of implementation of the Law by the RPA throughout the region on a wide array of topics, empowering citizens in local policy and decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Innovation of forms of participation, from traditional 'open doors' assemblies and interest group consultations towards structured processes enhancing dialogue and deliberation according to IAP2 core Values, also involving stratified random samples of citizens, and generating:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- participant and promoter satisfaction for the processes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- organizational and social learning;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>Promoting Citizen Participation in Tuscany (Italy); Law no. 69/07 and the Regional Participation Authority <em>Organization of the Year 2012</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>2008-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>An estimated 10,000 persons have taken part in the 'core' participatory meetings of funded participatory processes, taking place in 103 local communities and schools; some 7-80,000 have been involved - albeit less deeply - in the 'side-events' of such processes (Table no. 1 shows the total population residing in the affected communities - students in the case of schools; obviously not all the population of these communities was actively involved, the processes affected their communities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.consiglio.regione.toscana.it/partecipazione">www.consiglio.regione.toscana.it/partecipazione</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organization Special Mention**

Creating a Culture of Engagement at Capital Health

Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Creating a culture of engagement at Capital Health <em>Organization Special Mention 2012</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Capital Health Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>How to embed patient and public participation into the day-to-day practices of the organization in order to fulfill the Citizen and Stakeholder Engagement and Accountability strategic direction. Improve health outcomes for patients and the community and involve them in decision-making in the Capital Health district through greater engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Citizen panels; social media; crowdsourcing; deliberative dialogue; experience based design; patient/public involvement in committees and work groups; surveys; focus groups; community dialogue events; World Cafes; policy; framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Title | *Creating a culture of engagement at Capital Health*  
*Organization Special Mention 2012* |
|---|---|
| Results | and toolkit; progress measurement framework  
Citizen Engagement is a strategic direction of the organization. To make this strategy come alive, public participation values and principles are included in organizational policy and reflected in decision-making processes throughout the organization. Capital Health has developed an engagement framework, tools and in-house training for staff and leaders. It regularly uses public participation to:  
- inform district level directions and decisions, such as business planning and community health planning;  
- inform program and service quality improvement;  
- engage patients, families and staff in collaborative relationships and care planning;  
- support the introduction of healthy public policy (such as healthy food choices)  
An important demonstration of commitment to public participation as an organizational practice is signaled by the commitment of dedicated staff and budget resources to support engagement activities. |
| Impact Level | Capital Health district (population: 400,000) |
| Time Frame | 2007-08 to present |
| People Engaged | Tens of thousands (public, patients and staff) |
| Web Link | www.cdha.nshealth.ca |
## 2012 Nominees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th><strong>Canadian Blood Services</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Canadian Blood Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Across Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>Canadian Blood Services was created out of the ashes of Canada’s tainted blood scandal of the late 1980s. The organization was founded on a commitment to openness, transparency and collaborative decision-making. Despite geographic challenges and incredible vigilance by a disparate group of stakeholders, this organizational commitment to public engagement has helped the organization rebuild trust in the blood system, and assume additional roles in the health care system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Standing committees of external stakeholders; open board meetings; consultations; round tables; advisory committees; consensus conferences; public polling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Trust in the blood system has grown from a rate of 56 percent in 1998 to a rate of 82 percent in 2010. The organization was asked to take on a high profile role in organ and tissue donation in 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>Nationally (outside Quebec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>1998 to current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>Stakeholders, patients, donors, recipients, health care practitioners, governments, partners,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.blood.ca">www.blood.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Chapel Hill 2020</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapel Hill 2020

**Title**: Chapel Hill 2020

**Sample Methods**: Our methods covered the entire gamut of IAP2’s Spectrum of Public Participation. We inspired participation from the public through flyers, radio interviews, newspaper columns, advertising, a bus wrap, and in-depth issue presentations. We consulted, involved, collaborated and empowered the public through community meetings, work sessions, keypad polling, social media, children’s artistic visioning, a community open house, a blog, surveys, an unconference, word clouds, charrettes and Tavern Talks.

**Results**: Those who live, work, play, study, invest or pray in Chapel Hill participated in record numbers in developing Chapel Hill 2020. Their contributions helped to develop a plan with values and goals that will guide Town decision making for years to come.

**Impact Level**: Town-wide including those who live, work, play, study, invest and pray in Chapel Hill.

**Time Frame**

- **People Engaged**: 28,869 community contacts

### Common Roots: Halifax Urban Farm Project

**Title**: Common Roots: Halifax Urban Farm Project

**Organizing Group**

- Cities & Environment Unit and Partners for Care

**Location**

- Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada (population 350,000)

**Key Question/Problem**: How can members of the public help transform a derelict site into an urban farm, then operate and sustain it on an ongoing basis mainly through volunteer work and donations?

**Sample Methods**: Six public-engagement sessions in which urban farm leaders and citizens shared information; collaborative site design among participants; the creation of three “hub” subcommittees; an information-kiosk design contest; regular volunteer “work parties.”

**Results**: Guiding principles were drafted to develop the land. Broad awareness, understanding and support for the urban-farm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Common Roots: Halifax Urban Farm Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>November 2010–ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Hundreds of local citizens, including: residents; non-profit organizations; municipal, provincial and federal government officials; police force members; youth; school staff; urban-agricultural specialists, gardeners and landscapers; health care workers; university students, members of the aboriginal community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Community Engagement to build the City Centre Redevelopment Master Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Edmonton, Alberta, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Develop a Master Plan to develop a world-class, sustainable community on a long debated section of land that has been an airport, just north of the City’s core. The community engagement strategy was used to ensure that the citizens of Edmonton were consulted, listened to, and to the greatest extent possible, see their ideas reflected in the final Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Stakeholder Advisory Committee, location-based community workshops, stakeholder meetings, digital engagement (including blogs, social media, online surveys, videos), newsletters, media coverage, displays at community events and at City Hall, and making all information available online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>The community engagement has led to the development of a Master Plan for the City Centre Redevelopment that the public can ‘recognize themselves’ in. By meeting people and discussing things in-depth, relationships were built that have led to the residents we consulted with becoming champions for the project’s success. The engagement also helped heal a community that was divided over the decision to close the airport and use that land for an urban development, helping the community move on together with a shared vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>City-wide (geographic impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>15 months (ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Community Engagement to build the City Centre Redevelopment Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>1,500+ Edmonton residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.edmonton.ca/ccr">www.edmonton.ca/ccr</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Edmonton Downtown Light Rail Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group Location</td>
<td>City of Edmonton &amp; Steer Davies Gleave Edmonton, Canada. Metro Population ~ 1,160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>The proposals for the routing of the Downtown Light Rail Transit (LRT) line would see a section of the line run along Harbin Road through Edmonton’s China Gate continuing through the surrounding Chinese and local communities and adjacent to the local community facilities on the corridor. Following the initial design development and associated public engagement, the local Chinese and surrounding community groups along a two block section of the route felt that they hadn’t being sufficiently involved and consulted in the development of the proposals for the LRT line, raising concerns about the proposal for the route and the associated impacts to community facilities and the surrounding community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Conducted three location-based community workshops focused on the Chinese and surrounding communities. Transparent workshops encouraged community members to work in groups to identify the issues and important facilities within the community, and they helped to understand the constraints in developing an LRT through the area and design potential options within the proposed and adjacent corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>The results of the community workshops gave the local community groups a voice in the design of the LRT options. They emphasized the identity of the area, the importance of the community facilities, access to the existing buildings for residents, visitors and emergency services, the importance of the Chinese community facilities and walking accessibility. The workshops also provided participants with information on the objectives and challenges faced during the design of the LRT alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Local, Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>5 Months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Edmonton Downtown Light Rail Transit

**People Engaged**
40 Community leaders and residents

**Web Link**
http://www.edmonton.ca/transportation/ets/future-lrtprojects.aspx

---

### I-69 Driven by Texans

**Organizing Group**
Texas Department of Transportation

**Location**
The Texas portion of Interstate Highway 69 (I-69) is a 700+ mile interstate starting in Northeast Texas, running south along the Texas gulf coast, terminating at the Texas – Mexico border. I-69 Texas is part of a national interstate system that runs through eight states.

**Key Question/Problem**
In 1991, the U.S. Congress passed legislation creating Interstate I-69. Since this time, some citizens and communities have been working towards the development of I-69 in Texas. Others have been hesitant to support the project because transportation planners haven't always fully understood the needs and concerns of citizens and communities. The key challenge for this project was developing I-69 Texas with the input and support of citizens and communities in the project area.

**Sample Methods**
Citizen advisory committees, open houses, community presentations, multilingual print material, website, video, social media, Quick Response codes, citizen comment cards, online commenting, community brochure distributions.

**Results**
A citizen-authored plan for I-69 development was created and the first section of I-69 Texas was posted in South Texas with the support of citizens and local communities. These citizen plans will help continue I-69 development while considering the needs and concerns of affected communities.

**Impact Level**
Because of the proposed 700+ mile interstate route, this project has a massive impact area that includes northeast/East Texas, Texas gulf coast communities with the project area continuing into South Texas to the Mexican border.

**Time Frame**
2009-potent

**People Engaged**
Nearly 150 citizens served as members on planning committees, over 5,000 citizens were reached through citizen-led community meetings, open houses and other public participation activities.

**Web Link**
http://www.txdot.gov/driverbytexans/
### Let’s Re-imagine the City Together

**Organizing Group**
Development Action Group (DAG)

**Location**
Cape Town, South Africa, population ~3.3 million

**Key Question/Problem**
Cape Town is one of the most unequal cities in the world. DAG wants to demonstrate how working in partnership with citizens who share a pro-poor agenda can lead to sustainable solutions that redress social, economic and spatial inequalities.

**Sample Methods**
Conducted at a city wide level, horizontal learning platforms, community leadership programmes, pro-poor development proposals, local community events and multi stakeholder forums.

Methods: community visioning exercises; participatory planning, facilitated multi stakeholder forums, video documentary, citizen’s charter, action learning and reflection.

**Results**
Active participation of 25 citizen’s groups in mobilizing Cape Town citizens to become actively involved in re-imaging their city. The support of key urban development experts, both local and international, in supporting the production of pro-poor development proposals. Promotion of active citizenry based on the slogan – the space between passivity and violent action. The adoption of a citizen’s charter. Public meetings bringing together more than 1000 ordinary citizens to discuss re-imaging our city. The co-operation and involvement of city officials. The documentation of the process as it unfolds through written reports and video recordings.

**Impact Level**
The inclusion of both rich and poor citizens in the process of re-imaging our city.

Demonstration of successful pro-poor development projects.

**Time Frame**
24 months

**People Engaged**
5000 people through workshops, seminars, sms communication, public events.

**Web Link**
www.dag.org.za

### Old Bronte Road/Khalsa Gate Streetscape Plan

**Organizing Group**
Town of Oakville, Ontario Canada

**Location**
Town of Oakville, Ontario Canada

**Key Question/Problem**
Palermo Village was the first community in the Town of Oakville and a popular destination for visitors travelling between Toronto and western Ontario. The village began to deteriorate after the 1950s and worsened in 2007 with the creation of a regional road by-pass. This new road displaced stores and homes, depreciating the character of the community and leaving only traces of the historic village.

Today the original main street – Old Bronte Road (which...
### Old Bronte Road/Khalsa Gate Streetscape Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Methods</th>
<th>The project incorporated a policy review, site mapping, virtual tour, study webpage, stakeholder meetings, open houses, public meetings with Town Council, an interactive public workshop and a street tour.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Through significant public participation, the streetscape plan was supported by the community and endorsed by Town Council. The plan offers a set of guidelines the town and developers can use for redesigning the street. The concepts and standards in this plan take into consideration the entirety of Palermo Village, and are rooted in community recommendations. Further collaboration has been provided by various town and regional departments. The final result is a visioning document that revitalizes Old Bronte Road/Khalsa Gate into a welcoming place for the community in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>The local residents of Palermo Village, businesses in the area, as well as visitors to the town.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Roughly 100 residents, stakeholders, land owners and merchants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Voice Shapes HIV Service Planning at Vancouver Coastal Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizing Group</th>
<th>Vancouver Coastal Health Authority (VCH) Community Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Vancouver, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Involving diverse, highly marginalized populations in the shaping of strategies to improve testing, treatment and support services for HIV/AIDS. P2 processes were used to: encourage and support opportunities for dialogue between VCH and the public it serves; collect the experiences and recommendations of people living with and at risk for HIV so</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IAP2 State of the Practice Report

19
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Public Voice Shapes HIV Service Planning at Vancouver Coastal Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>that their perspectives would influence service planning and decision-making; build partnerships between VCH leadership and community organizations; identify and develop ongoing engagement mechanisms for people living with HIV. P2 strategies, methods and questions (in English and Spanish) developed and implemented in collaboration with HIV + Community Representative, community agencies and HIV activists. Population specific discussion groups and interviews conducted in settings familiar to target groups (e.g. at regularly scheduled clinics or groups, in shelter housing, drop-ins, etc.). All discussion groups co-facilitated by a member of the specific population (e.g. Latin American youth) and included HIV education as requested by the participants. Anonymous online surveys about HIV testing and treatment services. Flexible and adaptive with questions and methods in order to approach diverse populations with sensitivity and respect, including gay and other men who have sex with men; transgendered, homeless and Aboriginal people; men and women in street-based sex trade; youth living with HIV; women escaping domestic violence; people living with addictions and/or serious and persistent mental illness; refugees and illegal immigrants from the Latin American community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>This multi-phase and broad consultation strategy has involved individuals and organizations from many diverse communities that are affected by HIV and face significant stigma, and also face multiple barriers to accessing services and influencing service planning. Public involvement increased community acceptance of the STOP HIV strategy and its services, and increased trust between community partners and the health authority. Recommendations from participants had direct and ongoing influence on service planning and decision making. Through continuous attention to scope of public influence in this project, and our commitments to the public on behalf of project leadership, we ensured the integrity and honest of this P2 process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>May 2010 to April 2012 (24 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>510 participants; 19 community organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.vch.ca/get_involved/community-engagement/reports/">www.vch.ca/get_involved/community-engagement/reports/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Resident and Family Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Community Engagement Team of Vancouver Coastal Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Vancouver Coastal Health Region, British Columbia, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>How can VCH support sustainable and effective mechanisms for resident and family involvement that could enhance quality of life for residents at all Vancouver Coastal Health and Providence Health Care owned and contracted complex care facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Workshops, focused discussions, interviews, advisory committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>The development and launch of a toolkit to support facility administrators to more effectively gather and use the voice of residents and family members to improve the quality of life for residents. The toolkit was distributed, in the form of a memory stick, to every owned and operated and contracted residential facility in VCH. It is also available on the VCH website. In addition indicators for measuring resident and family involvement were developed through consultation and those indicators were implemented in April 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Region of Vancouver Coastal Health (22 municipalities and regional districts, and 16 first nations communities, covering approximately 25% of BC’s population). Spreading throughout the province of BC through access on website to toolkit, and collaboration and sharing provincially in Home and Community Care networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Workshops, discussions, interviews held November through December 2010 Report and recommendations delivered February 2011 Planning and development for toolkit completed September 2011 Launched and distributed September 2011 Posted to public website November 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>In initial consultation 58 In toolkit development phase 15 In implementation and launch all staff and residents in VCH owned and operated and contracted facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Southeast Fort Worth Passenger Rail Feasibility Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>The T-Fort Worth Transportation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Fort Worth, Texas, population: 741,206; approximately 111,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>The City of Fort Worth is one of the fastest growing cities in the nation’s fourth largest metropolitan area; and with that growth comes the issue of expanding public transportation options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>The southeast area of Fort Worth represents the highest ridership for the Fort Worth Transportation Authority’s (The T) public transportation system. Recognizing this, the agency engaged rail consultant R. L. Banks and Associates (RLBA) to perform a feasibility study of the area that incorporated public input and technical evaluation towards the determination of the physical, operational and financial feasibility of passenger rail service in Southeast Fort Worth. This information will also be used to set future transportation priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>During the study period both traditional and non-traditional methods were used to engage the public and get their input. Tools included: QR codes, a partnership with a local neighborhood association for billboard space, community meetings, “person on the street” interviews, and online survey tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>Input was gathered not just from the immediate community, but from business owners and their employees, students and others in Tarrant County. This line is seen as a catalyst for future economic development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>This study provided recommendations for the implementation of passenger rail in Southeast Fort Worth. These recommendations were based on stakeholder preference and technical evaluation, which included alignment, technology, service and phasing priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>City and county-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td>December 2010-October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.the-t.com/SERailStudy/tabid/265/Default.aspx">http://www.the-t.com/SERailStudy/tabid/265/Default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Shape Your Future Victoria – The City of Victoria’s Official Community Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>The City of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Victoria, BC, Canada, population ~ 80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>The problem was to develop a 30-year plan for Victoria with a broad base of community support. Unlike a lot of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Shape Your Future Victoria – The City of Victoria’s Official Community Plan

**Title**: Shape Your Future Victoria – The City of Victoria’s Official Community Plan  

**communities, Victoria has groups of citizens who are highly engaged and vocal about land use decisions and very attached to their neighbourhoods. The unique challenge for the City of Victoria was to shift the role of citizen participation from its focus on neighbourhood planning issues, which are often site-specific, to a future-oriented and citywide conversation about a sustainable city.**

**Sample Methods**

Citizenship Advisory Committee Project website; social media (Facebook, Twitter); discussion papers; topic sheets; e-newsletter distribution list.

Mobile kiosks survey; information booths at community events; community forums; visioning workshops with stakeholders incl. hard to reach groups such as youth; Citizen Insight Councils; citizen-led community circles; community cafe; coffee talks; staff presentations; formal submissions.

**Results**

Through public participation, the project was able to develop an OCP that reflects the interests, perspectives, values and ideas of citizens through public policy on land use and related issues which have broad public support. Along the way, a new relationship was fostered between the City of Victoria and neighbourhoods.

**Impact Level**

Municipal boundaries  

**Time Frame**

January 2010 – April 2012  

**People Engaged**

7500 participants  

**Web Link**

[www.shapeyourfuturevictoria.ca](http://www.shapeyourfuturevictoria.ca)

---

### St Elizabeths East Transportation Network Environmental Assessment

**Title**: St Elizabeths East Transportation Network Environmental Assessment  

**Organizing Group**

District of Columbia Department of Transportation and PRR  

**Location**

Ward 8, District of Columbia, population 70,712  

**Key Question/Problem**

Engage Ward 8 citizens to provide public input as part of the St Elizabeth’s East Campus transportation environmental assessment (EA) and Master Plan recommending a solution that reflects the community’s needs and wants.

**Sample Methods**

Public meeting series, one-on-one briefings, walking tours, online comment forms, student art competition

**Results**

1. Formed a Community Action Team of Ward 8 residents who were employed to engage their fellow citizens on a grassroots level.

2. Engaged Ward 8 leaders through one-on-one community briefings to ensure meetings were designed to suit their constituents’ preferences.

3. Achieved widespread participation in the EA from Ward 8 residents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>St Elizabeths East Transportation Network Environmental Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Thousands of Ward 8 residents and leaders, and DC area leaders, media, and citizens were reached as part of the public outreach process, and hundreds attended public meetings facilitated by the project team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>March 2011 – February 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Ward 8 residents and leaders were the key target of public outreach by the project team; the team also engaged citizens from the DC area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.stelizabethseast.com">www.stelizabethseast.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Strong Schools, Strong Communities – Districtwide Action Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Saint Paul Public Schools (SPPS), the largest urban school district in the State of Minnesota, supported by the Greater Twin Cities United Way and the Saint Paul Public Schools Foundation, both independent non-profit organizations serving our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Saint Paul, Minnesota, United States; population: 285,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Paramount for our school district is supporting our student-focused mission: Premier education for all. With achievement gaps too predictably tied to race and home language, in 2004 SPPS began aggressively rethinking how we deliver public education, which much more intentionally involved our students, families, and community stakeholders. Going deeper in 2008 with broad-based community involvement to examine large-scale system change, we accelerated our efforts in 2010 to develop our new strategic plan. With IAP2 training and public support by the Superintendent and elected Board of Education for the IAP2 Core Values, we comprehensively engaged stakeholders to frame the effort to deliver a premier education for all, which meant closing achievement gaps. In 2011, it was time to translate that community-based plan into specific implementation activities, which required a new engagement design with unique objectives and tools that drove the work much deeper. Again reaching out to our stakeholders, nine Districtwide Action Teams (DATs) were formed and met regularly for seven months to develop specific recommendations to the Superintendent around topics critical to student success: Achievement gap, transition to middle grades, specialized academic programming (immersion, Montessori, etc.), aligned instruction, racial integration and school choice, external partnerships, shared community accountability, site...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strong Schools, Strong Communities – Districtwide Action Teams

**Sample Methods**
Advisory groups brought together diverse and dynamic groups of stakeholders in facilitated, focused discussion leading to specific actions in a key area on questions critical to ensuring high-quality public education for all students in our community. Advisory group conversations and the background information they gathered and developed was documented and supported by web sites and e-mail communications. Staff provided briefings to DATs to ensure they had the information they needed to accomplish their tasks together. Public forum format brought all the teams together with district leadership and other interested community members for the presentation of recommendations. This event was also recorded and rebroadcast on cable television.

**Results**
Major policy and implementation decisions have been and continue to be guided by the DAT recommendations. In a follow-up evaluation, almost all respondents (93% agree or strongly agree) said that they felt their voice was heard and that it was a good experience overall (86% agree or strongly agree).

**Impact Level**
District-wide (~39,000 students) / City-wide (285,068 residents)

**Time Frame**
May 2011 – February 2012 (SSSC public participation work is still ongoing)

**People Engaged**
191 total (Board of Education, staff, family and community) members on the nine District wide Action Teams, standing advisory groups that in turn connected with hundreds of others.

**Web Link**
http://accountability.spps.org/actionteams
http://accountability.spps.org/strongschools

---

### Sustainable Development, City of Edmonton

**Organizing Group**
City of Edmonton

**Location**
Edmonton, Alberta; Population (2011): 812,201

**Key Question/Problem**
The City of Edmonton’s is developing a comprehensive **City-Wide Food and Agriculture Strategy** (CWFAS) to address issues in the food system. Many citizens have voiced a wide array of concerns about food, urban development, and sustainability with many divergent perspectives on the relationship between urban development and food. Within a short timeframe of little over a year, the City intends to engage a broad, diverse, and representative group of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sustainable Development, City of Edmonton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>The City of Edmonton worked with HB Lanarc Golder and the University of Alberta’s Centre for Public Involvement to implement a Public Involvement Plan (PIP) for the CWFAS. This plan includes questionnaires, public and landowner surveys, information events, stakeholder workshops, Citizen Panels (details to follow), and internal and external advisory committees. For the Citizen Panels, the City collaborated with randomly selected citizens who met six times weekly in a series of sessions to discuss about the developing food policy. At the end, the groups met together to summarize and finalize their recommendations that contributed to the development of the CWFAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Input and recommendations from a wide and broad range of representatives provided guidance to the development of the CWFAS and the model for the Food Policy Council. Over 110 unique individuals representing groups and organizations came to a series of stakeholder focus groups discussions. The Public Opinion Survey was completed by 2378 people. The Citizen Panels engaged over 2000 people, with 66 directly involved as panelists and approximately 1000 completing surveys. There was a high retention rate in the Citizen Panels with 98% of participants attending all six weekly sessions. Citizens felt their opinions were respected and they had an important role in the discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>City-Wide. Involvement levels ranged from informative to collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>12+ months, ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>8000+ Edmontonians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://edmonton.ca/city_government/urban_planning_and_design/food-and-agriculture-project.aspx">http://edmonton.ca/city_government/urban_planning_and_design/food-and-agriculture-project.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Winter City Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Edmonton, population 812,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>By far and large, Edmontonians have fallen out of love with winter and our perpetual summer state of mind has impacted our quality of life during a significant portion of every year. The opportunity is to develop a strategy to become a great winter city: to engage Edmontonians, to build on good things already happening, to identify challenges and opportunities to becoming a great winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Winter City Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Held an exploration forum with key stakeholders to gauge support for the initiative and determine initial direction. Created a WinterCity Think Tank (citizen panel) to lead the development of the goals of the strategy. Held a publicized kick-off event followed by a half-day symposium. After kick-off, launched a contest with Global TV, a postcard campaign, twitter and facebook posts, and the City’s first online crowdsourcing tool, Ideascale. Held a lunch-time forum/presentation, a dozen presentations to various stakeholder groups, and almost twenty in-depth dialogue sessions and workshops with key targeted groups. Methods were all along the IAP2 continuum, with an emphasis on Collaborate and Empower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>This multi-faceted engagement strategy enabled us to understand where Edmontonians would like the strategy to take us. The Think Tank ensured that ownership of the strategy rested with the community. The groundwork has been laid for the successful implementation of a strategy that is built from the ground up, reflecting our local assets and issues, and telling our uniquely Edmonton story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>City but also Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>June 2010, mainly December 2011 – October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>700 individuals in Edmonton and region, plus undetermined number of people through radio, TV and newspaper media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.edmonton.ca/wintercitystrategy">www.edmonton.ca/wintercitystrategy</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nomination Descriptive Reports
## Case Study Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Blood donation lifetime deferral policy for men who have sex with men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Canadian Blood Services (CBS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location(s)</td>
<td>Head Office, Ottawa, ON, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question / Problem</td>
<td>CBS’ policy that excludes men who have had sex with men (MSM) from donating blood is a source of outrage and high emotion that polarizes stakeholders. Patient groups are critically concerned with ensuring the safety of the blood supply. Community groups, who have fought for and made significant progress in the area of human rights, feel it reinforces discrimination against gay and bisexual men and their partners. The Board of Directors introduced a motion to reduce the deferral period from a lifetime to a defined term of five to ten years, to be determined through extensive stakeholder consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Break-out groups, plenary sessions, electronic polling, expert panels, open space, deliberative dialogue, socratic circle, focused conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Comprehensive engagement of multiple stakeholders to influence submission to our regulator, Health Canada requesting a change to the policy. New relationships were forged between patient and community groups. Consultations resulted in identification of common ground, consensus on the way forward and a commitment to continue to work together. This demonstrates an enormous compromise from both sides of the policy issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact level</td>
<td>Patients, community groups, gay men’s health, current and potential donors, general public, youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>2010 - 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People engaged</td>
<td>Over 9,300 people including patients, community, medical and scientific experts, general public, Canadian Blood Services staff and volunteers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.blood.ca">www.blood.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Problem and Challenge

This issue originated with the extremely tragic health crisis in Canada in the 1980s, when thousands of Canadians received tainted blood. Many people who trusted in the blood they had received died. Almost overnight, the Canadian public lost all trust in the blood system and many donors stopped giving blood. In 1998, under the leadership of Justice Horace Krever, a new blood agency – Canadian Blood Services – was established. Since then, we have worked tirelessly to regain public trust not only so that people will GIVE blood, but so they also trust us when receiving it.

Canadian Blood Services currently has a policy that excludes men who have had sex with men (MSM) even once since 1977 from donating blood. This policy has been a source of outrage that has polarized stakeholders for decades. Patient groups, the hardest hit by Canada's tainted blood tragedy, feel it is critical to ensure the safety of the blood supply. On the other side of the issue, community groups, who have fought for and made significant progress in the area of human rights, feel it reinforces discrimination against gay and bisexual men and their partners. In addition, this has the potential to negatively impact the organization's ability to maintain an adequate supply by virtue of the ripple effect on willingness to donate, especially with youth who are attuned to social justice issues. Over the next three years, the blood system needs to recruit 500,000 new donors to ensure patients receive the products they need. In direct opposition to this need, gay rights activists have initiatives in place to disrupt/ban blood donor clinics and boycott donation across the country.

This policy was initially based on scientific evidence that some MSM are in the highest risk group for HIV/AIDS infection. Other high-risk groups are also permanently deferred for other reasons (e.g. injection drug users, persons born or who have lived in an HIV-endemic country, and those who have lived with a person at risk for HIV). Given the current environment where many international blood operators have reduced their deferral periods, and there have been substantive improvements to testing technology, surveillance, and responsiveness to emerging threats, it was time to contemplate a change to this policy. It’s now about doing the right thing so as to be as minimally restrictive as is necessary to manage risk.

Health Canada, as the regulator, has final decision-making authority over any change to policy. There are strict regulations that govern every aspect of the blood system — collection, testing, manufacturing and distribution of blood and blood products. Any change has to be supported by scientific evidence that demonstrates an equivalent or improved level of safety will result.

The motion put forward by the CBS Board of Directors to reduce the deferral period from a lifetime to a period of no less than five years but no more than ten years was clearly underscored by a commitment to extensive stakeholder consultation to inform decision making. The greatest challenge in this project was bringing patient and community groups together to openly discuss each other’s views, achieve mutual understanding, reach consensus on the way forward, and commit to working together over the long term. The question that was posed was, “Given the parameters the Board has set out (five to 10 years), what is the time frame for the MSM deferral policy that you can support?”
The Role of Public Participation

As stated above, any change to blood system policy must be approved by Health Canada. There is no international scientific consensus on a safe deferral period to protect against risk of HIV. Therefore, the two critical elements for influencing policy change are the scientific evidence and the support of stakeholders from both sides of the issue. Given the history and level of emotion involved, and the high level of compromise that would be required to reach consensus, the role of public participation was absolutely critical.

Public Participation Methods

Inform:
- Prepared a scientific discussion paper (Report on Donor Selection Criteria Relating to Men Who Have Sex with Men) which was reviewed externally by a panel of experts from various disciplines (public health, gay men’s health, epidemiology, risk assessment, ethics, international blood operators, Héma-Quebec counterparts) that formed the basis for detailed information on the issue
- Developed Q&A and key messages for response to public inquiries (consistency)
- Sent briefing notes to members of standing committees of the Board both at the regional and national levels
- Undertook presentations/discussions with Regional Liaison Committees (external standing committees of the board)
- Exchanged letters and emails with interested individuals and organizations (responsiveness)
- Developed a university campus strategy for delivery at local and national level
Note: Scientific discussion paper and reports from each session were provided to all consultation participants for their review

Consult:
- Gathered the views of over 9000 stakeholders on their awareness and opinions towards the MSM policy, including support/opposition for this change, and the impact of changing this policy on perceptions of safety, intentions to donate and trust in CBS. The stakeholder audiences included in this Ipsos Reid research poll were:
  - the general public;
  - active donors;
  - members of the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) – the national organization that represents the interests of university and college students throughout Canada; and,
  - members of the Community Based Research Centre (CBRC) – a non-profit charitable organization dedicated to using research to guide community action on health and social issues, with a special focus on Gay Men’s Health with initiatives on HIV, sexual health promotion, and policy development.

Survey Methodology
- The methodology for this research involved an online survey. Apart from the general public research, which was conducted using the Ipsos Reid Online Omnibus, the survey was administered using the Zoomerang online survey tool.
- The sample for the Ipsos Reid Online Omnibus is sourced from the Ipsos Reid Household Panel (approximately 200,000 members nationwide), and pulled to be representative of adult Canadians, 18 or older (in this case excluding Quebec). Quotas
and slight weighting was used to ensure a representative sample of the Canadian population by region, gender, and age.

- A cross-section of active donors were emailed an invitation to complete the survey, while members of the Canadian Federation of Students and the Community-Based Research Centre were sent an open link by representatives of each respective organization, introducing the survey and asking for their participation. The surveys were completed from February 27-March 2, 2012.
- The following table shows the number of completed survey by audience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>No. of Completes</th>
<th>Margin of Error*</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>± 3.1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>± 2.6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS</td>
<td>6,111</td>
<td>± 1.3%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBRC</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>± 3.6%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* While not probability samples, the table indicates the theoretical margin of error associated with each sample at the 95% confidence interval; in other words what the results would have been had the entire adult population of each audience in Canada been polled (19 times out of 20).

** It is not possible to calculate the response rate for the CFS and CBRC audiences given that it is unknown how many people were made aware of the survey given that an open survey link was used.

**Involve:**
- Face to face deliberative poll with National Liaison Committee (external standing committee of the board which has broad stakeholder representation) seeking their support for the policy review and consultative approach

**Collaborate:**
- Three-Phase approach to consultations which were all facilitated by an external organization with an objective view and approach to gather diverse public voices. (Dialogue Partners Inc.)
  - Phase 1 involved a face-to-face consultation with representatives from national patient group organizations
  - Phase 2 involved a face-to-face consultation with representatives from the Lesbian, Gay, Bi, Trans, Two-Spirit, Queer (LGBTTQ) community groups
  - Phase 3 involved a face-to-face joint session with representatives from both patient groups and LGBTTQ community groups

Note: To ensure an impartial and non-directive consultation, independent facilitators were used for the consultations (Dialogue Partners Inc.)
Uniqueness of the Project

This has been one of the most critical and moving consultations Canadian Blood Services has undertaken in its 14 year history. Given our role in the healthcare system, the impact we have on Canadians, and the dramatic history of tragedy, it is no surprise that public participation is a cornerstone of the organization. This project necessitated that patient groups and LGBTTQ groups understand and trust each other, and for both of them to trust us in moving forward carefully, and with their support. Two key milestones had to be achieved to ensure consideration of a change on the part of Health Canada: 1. Science - A change to policy could not be considered by Health Canada without adequate scientific evidence to demonstrate it does not decrease safety, and consequently would increase risk for Canadians receiving blood and blood products; 2. Stakeholder Support - The request had to include broad stakeholder support for the change. Without stakeholder support, trust in the system would decline and so would donations causing another safety risk – that of an inadequate supply. For LGBTTQ groups, the change contemplated does not serve to open up blood donation for MSM as there will still be a deferral period in place. In effect we were asking them to get behind a change that would do nothing to further their cause immediately, but would shift a paradigm as a first step of several needed. For patient groups, many of whom are chronic users and receive transfusions on a regular basis, it meant putting aside their fears of the past and trusting in the system.

Project Results

Relationship perspective: Throughout the process we watched in awe as the barriers between the two sides of the issue slowly disintegrated. Stories were shared that came from the hearts of the participants; the honesty of them was respected and honoured by all in the room. Fear emerged as one of the key common themes; fear of infection for the patients, fear of discrimination for LGBTTQ. A deep and sincere mutual understanding took over, and first steps were taken in the forging of important relationships. But it didn’t stop here - a commitment to ongoing advice and collaboration; and willingness to trust each other and us were the final results. One participant said it well by stating, “It is no longer us and them. It’s now ‘we.’” Quite simply, we could not have hoped for more.

Scientific perspective: While the science supports a move to a five-year deferral at this time, we know that this incremental change will eventually lead to an even shorter deferral period. The public participation process clearly identified a stakeholder interest in achieving the ultimate goal of a gender-neutral screening process, supported by scientific evidence to ensure safety. The success of this project has provided us with strong evidence to present to Health Canada that will ensure the future of the blood supply; both its safety and its adequacy.

Alignment with Core Values

How did the project ensure that those most affected by the decision or problem were involved? Stakeholders were identified in the following categories: National Patient Group organizations, LGBTTQ groups (national, provincial, regional, local), general public outreach, external standing committees and individuals who self-identified. All participants were given the opportunity to identify other stakeholders that should participate. Polling was undertaken to reach an even broader audience.

How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public’s contributions? Their comments, feedback and suggestions directly shaped the content of the submission document to Health Canada. Their letters of support were part of the submission document for consideration.
How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated? Throughout the consultations, notes were taken by the facilitators that were continually verified by the participants. Reports were produced from each session, shared with the participants for comment, finalized and then shared with the decision-makers for consideration. A teleconference is planned for the fall to review the final submission and plan for next steps. Extensive key message/question and answer documents were produced to capture information gathered. In addition, participants determined the components for moving forward together and the level of involvement they would like to have; areas include educating the public, communication, research and surveillance and continued collaboration between groups.

How did the project seek out and facilitate the involvement of those most affected? We purposely take a very open view of stakeholders to ensure we consider the broadest range of views and perspectives on any given issue; this meant both organizations and individuals were invited. The participant selection process was focused on inclusive representation of those interested in and/or affected by the issue, geographic consideration and the following: 1. national organizations, 2. regional organizations, 3. local organizations, 4. past membership in the LGBTTQ working group, and 5. individuals. When there was a perspective that was not otherwise represented in the room, and/or an individual expressed an interest in the consultation process, an invitation was extended. In addition, participants nominated/suggested others who were also invited to participate.

How did the project seek input from participants on how they wished to participate? Prior to the face-to-face consultations, participants were given an opportunity to suggest any specific topics they would like to discuss. An online pre-session survey allowed participants to identify their objectives in coming together, topics for discussion, information gaps they wished addressed, ground rules, concerns, as well as fears or worries. At the start of each meeting, rules of engagement were discussed to ensure a safe and respectful environment. Evaluations were done at the conclusion of each interaction to inform change and ensure a high level of satisfaction. Staff remained responsive to any concerns/ideas that emerged throughout the process.

How did the information provided to participants support or contribute to meaningful participation? An expert document was prepared and provided to all participants prior to the meetings so they could review, consider, and prepare for the discussion. A presentation was done at the start of each session to provide an overview of information, and offer opportunities to seek clarification and comment. Participants were asked what they needed more information on and it was acted on. A panel of resources was present at each session that could be drawn on as questions/issues arose during the meetings. Detailed reports were produced after each session for review and comment.

How did the communication of the project results ensure that participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem? Participants were advised of the process from the start. Reports were produced, approved and shared throughout the process. Once the submission to Health Canada is prepared a teleconference will be held to share the content with participants. During this teleconference we will discuss their vision of ongoing involvement; we have also agreed to launch a working group that will help us operationalize any potential change.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Promoting citizen participation in Tuscany (Italy): Law no. 69/07 and the Regional Participation Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Legislative Assembly of the Tuscany Region – Regional Participation Authority (RPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Tuscany Region (Italy) with a population of 3.749.813 (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key question</td>
<td>How can a 'meso'/regional government promote citizen engagement in policy making as an ordinary practice, in the face of declining political participation and social capital?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample methods</td>
<td>Town meetings, Citizen juries, Consensus Conferences, World Cafés, Participatory budgeting, Open Space Technology, participatory laboratories, workshops, stakeholder interviews, Consensus building, SWOT ….</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>103 participatory processes have been funded in four and a half years of implementation of the Law by the RPA throughout the region on a wide array of topics, empowering citizens in local policy and decision making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Impact level | Innovation of forms of participation, from traditional 'open doors' assemblies and interest group consultations towards structured processes enhancing dialogue and deliberation according to IAP2 core Values, also involving stratified random samples of citizens, and generating:  
  - participant and promoter satisfaction for the processes;  
  - organizational and social learning;  
  - emergence of regional and local communities of practice formed by local administrators, civil servants, academics, citizens, professional consultants;  
  - influence on decisions and policies. |
| Time frame | 2008-2012 |
| People engaged | An estimated 10,000 persons have taken part in the the 'core' participatory meetings of funded participatory processes, taking place in 103 local communities and schools; some 7-80,000 have been involved -albeit less deeply- in the 'side-events' of such processes (Table no. 1 shows the total population residing in the affected communities -students in the case of schools-; obviously not all the population of these communities was actively involved, the processes affected their communities). |
| Web link | [www.consiglio.regione.toscana.it/partecipazione](http://www.consiglio.regione.toscana.it/partecipazione) |
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Background
At the end of 2007 the Region of Tuscany passed Law no. 69 defining ‘Rules on the Promotion of Participation in the Formulation of Regional and Local Policies’ (henceforth the Law or Law no. 69/07), an innovative legal provision explicitly aimed at pro-actively fostering citizen engagement in decision making ‘as an ordinary form of administration and government … in all sectors and at all levels’. In this respect, the Law represents an example of how authorities might go about actively promoting and institutionalizing citizen participation as a routine practice.

Law no. 69/07 is remarkable for a number of reasons:
1. It is perhaps the first law in the world passed at the regional level of government aimed at fostering citizen engagement in general (rather than only in a specific area).
2. It is one of the first attempts to translate the normative principles of deliberative theory into institutional practice.
3. It was formulated through a (meta-)participatory process that, alongside the formal procedures typical of regional legislation, also involved a large number of administrators, stakeholders and ordinary citizens across the region who contributed significantly to defining the goals, contents and features of the Law itself; the topics and questions that emerged during the consultations were introduced to a large-scale ‘21st Century Town Meeting’ with more than 400 participants that took place in Carrara in November 2006. Thus, citizens were deciding how citizens should participate. In fact, some one thousand individuals are estimated to have, in various forms and on different occasions, contributed to the legislative text as it was being drafted.

The Law introduces two distinct types of participatory processes. In the first type, the Region aims at dealing with the siting of concerning large infrastructure projects having a significant environmental or social impact on a regional scale; these projects typically give rise to considerable conflict, spawning angry ad-hoc citizen committees; articles 7-10 of the Law introduce a process somewhat along the lines of the French débat public. The second type aims at enhancing citizen engagement in relation to policies and decisions at the local level; since until now no request to carry out a ‘public debate’ has been forwarded to the RPA, the implementation of the Law has focussed entirely on the local participatory processes (artt.14-18).

The implementation of the Law has been entrusted to an ad hoc monocratic’ (i.e both an individual and a juridical entity ) independent Authority, connected to Regional Assembly (artt.3-6). The RPA is a very small organization: the Authority himself and one administrative staff, plus occasional assistance from the staff of the Assembly (having approx. 400 employees). The ‘independence’ of the Authority guarantees its neutrality and avoids suspicions that one political party or the other might influence participation to its advantage.To this end the RPA is appointed by the Assembly according to a procedure based on a bi-partisan agreement. Furthermore, candidates for the position must be experts in political science or public law, or have established experience in the field, thus ensuring professional competence -rather than political affiliation- as the prevailing nomination criterion.

The case is perhaps somewhat a-typical since the PRA is not an organization responsible for substantive policies; instead, it offers support to other subjects wishing to undertake participatory processes in a broad variety of areas and topics.

1 The complete text of Law no. 69/07 in English can be found at www.consiglio.regione.toscana.it/partecipazione/documenti/l_r69_2007_English.pdf;
2 www.regione.toscana.it/regione/export/RT/sito-RT/Contenuti/sezioni/diritti/partecipazione/rubriche/piani_progetti/visualizza_asset.html_1746852500.html contains the documents and recordings regarding the process undertaken for the formulation of the Law.
3 In fact the Authority was voted by the Assembly almost unanimously; he took office on October 1, 2008.
The Authority is entrusted with a number of tasks (art.3), the main being assessing requests and deciding on funding of local participatory processes\(^4\), and offering methodological advice to promoters of such processes (art.14.6b). The RPA also presents an annual Report on activities to the Regional Assembly, and disseminates documentation via website about the processes and their results.

As far as financial support is concerned, the Law is more than just symbolic, as it allocates approximately 650,000 euro per year to local processes. During the four and a half years since its approval, 191 projects have been evaluated and discussed with proponents, and 103 have been funded by the RPA, receiving an average contribution of 32,000 euro. Figures concerning the number of requests presented to (and examined by) the RPA, the number of projects funded and the total funding per year are shown in Table no.1 on page 8.

Considering only the period 2008-2011 (2012 is still under way, as explained in the footnote of Table no.1), out of 166 requests, 86 (51%) have actually received funding\(^5\). 69 of these (i.e. almost 80%) projects were proposed by local administrations; the remaining processes were proposed by citizens and schools (approx. 10% each). Funded projects concern a broad spread of topics: urban renewal projects (27.6% of total), land planning (13.8%), participatory budgeting (13.8%), health and social services policies (9.2%), education, (10.3%, obviously concerning processes carried out by schools), economic policies (4.6%), environmental policies (10.3%), and siting decisions (5.7%), typically a contentious issue.

After the conclusion of the processes, proponents are required to present a final Report, that is evaluated against the initially approved proposal; these Reports are then made available on the website, also as a resource for other actors interested in presenting proposals, thus hopefully stimulating a learning process as well as the gradual formation of a community of practice.

The RPA also promoted the culture of participation by organizing international seminars on a number of topics and methodological approaches, with the aim of fostering the creation of a regional community of practice:
- **Participatory budgeting** with G. Allegretti -CES – University of Coimbra, Portugal- and V. Canafoglia -Municipality of Modena-; the seminar started with a ‘World Café’ (July 7, 2009).
- **Quality Participation in Tuscany** with T. Mannarini -University of Lecce- and T. Peixoto -European University Institute, Florence- (May 26, 2010).
- **Mediation of Local and International Conflicts** held by Mediators Beyond Borders (USA) (October 5, 2010).
- **Participation and Democracy: Europe-Italy-Tuscany**, with P. Isernia -University of Siena- and J. Fishkin -University of Stanford, USA- (December 13, 2010).
- **Educating to Democracy**, with Nancy Thomas,-The Democracy Imperative, New Hampshire University, USA (May 9, 2011).
- **Is the consensus building approach possible in the world of politics and administration?** with M. Sclavi -Milan Polytechnic- and L. Susskind -MIT, USA- (October 4, 2011).

**Public Participation Challenges and Opportunities. Rationale for Public Participation** (the two points are discussed jointly)

Tuscany has historically been one of the best invested regions of Italy in terms of social capital and civicism\(^6\); it was considered very cohesive in social terms, with a distinctive political culture inspired by

\(^4\) The Law also introduces participatory processes on a regional scale, but these are managed directly by the Regional Government, with no role of the RPA. The Government also manages 150,000 euro per year support training activities targeting civil servants, local authorities and civil society to spread relevant skills and know-how.

\(^5\) In 6 cases funds were repealed because the processes had not started within the time indicated by the Law; in 2 cases the processes aborted before being completed.

\(^6\) According to Cartocci, R., 2007, Tuscany has the second highest social capital among Italian regions.
the values of democracy and solidarity, and featuring very high levels of political participation and a rich grass-roots network of associations. The rationale behind the Law is the recognition that social capital is being eroded and that there is an overall legitimation crisis of political representation. In proposing the Law, policy makers were well aware of these changes under way, and aimed at ‘strengthening democracy’ (as explicitly stated by art.1.3a of the Law) by renewing its institutions, integrating them with practices, processes and instruments of participatory democracy, and ‘tapping into the knowledge, skills and forms of civic engagement already present and active in Tuscan society’.

Law no. 69/07 offers a unique opportunity for the participative and civic potential of Tuscan society to re-emerge; the mission of the RPA is to promote citizen engagement in any policy area of interest to societal and institutional actors.

Impact of Core Values on Organization
The RPA was specifically created with the purpose of implementing Law no. 69/07, in turn inspired by principles of citizen engagement and deliberative democracy; thus, its activities are entirely devoted to promoting citizen participation; participatory processes funded by the RPA on the basis of Law no.69 present a number of features that fit quite well with IAP2 Core Values, as discussed below.

Evaluation against Core Values
The Law spells out a set of principles and quality features (quoted throughout this application) for allocating regional support to local processes. The Authority is entrusted with the task of verifying the existence of such criteria and priorities in the proposed projects. However the Law also leaves considerable leeway, based on his professional judgement, to the RPA who thus has a pivotal role in defining process design and features.

In fact, the RPA has used his ‘bargaining leverage’ (art.17) in deciding which projects are funded in order to promote robust participation featuring neutrality, information, influence, implementation of outcomes; also, the RPA has promoted the use of methods structuring and fostering dialogue and deliberation, that significantly differ from ‘traditional’ (in this region) forms of engagement (open assemblies, consultations). Funded processes have used a variety of methods (such as Town Meetings, World Cafés, Citizen Juries and many more). At the same time the RPA has tried to avoid that proponents (and consultants) use such methods ‘mechanically’, instead favoring an adaptive approach, tailored according to the specific aims and context of each process (also on the basis art.15.1d).

1. Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.
This is precisely the foundation of the Law (art.1) that aims at empowering citizens in public policy formation; it states that participating in local and regional policy making constitutes a right of Tuscan citizens; the entitlement of citizens to request financial support to participatory processes (even in conflict with administrations) represents a concrete recognition of that right. Also, as mentioned above, participation is institutionalized as a routine practice.

2. Public participation includes the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision.
As mentioned, Law no. 69 aims at promoting citizen participation in the ‘formulation of local and regional policies’ (art.1.1) Thus, it is not merely a symbolic exercise: participation is a part of the overall
decision-making processes defining public policies and collective choices. To this end, the Law specifies that participatory processes must deal with matters that are well-defined, and that projects must specify how participation fits into the broader decision making processes. The Law aims at participant empowerment by moving up towards the top rungs of the IAP2 ‘Public Participation Spectrum’ (the RPA regularly uses the Spectrum exactly to illustrate the idea of empowerment).

In the case of local authorities, in order to have access to regional support they are requested to sign an entente agreement (artt.15.4a and 18) in which they voluntarily accept the principles of the Law and its procedures not just in the process at hand, but regularly in their decision-making processes. Local authorities are required to declare officially that they will take into serious account the results of the participation process. Should they deem the outcomes less than acceptable (for example, evidence of opposing community interests or their electoral mandate), they can override the outcomes only on the condition that they publicly provide the reasons for their deferral. All in all, this ‘device’ appears to be an original, balanced and workable solution to the relationship between participatory and representative democracy, enabling at a minimum some influence exerted by participation. Also, the Law offers citizens and social movements too the possibility to be recognized and influence decisions and policies both by proposing processes themselves (collecting citizen signatures) or by taking part in processes proposed by local authorities. Either way, influence appears to be substantial.

Also, citizens can turn to the RPA signaling lack of implementation or delays; in such cases the RPA formally requests clarifications on the situation to the local administration that received regional support, in the name of the entente agreement (this has actually occurred in several cases).

Finally, beyond what is requested by Law no. 69/07 and the discussed entente, to further guarantee actual participant empowerment the RPA requests local administrations applying for funds to commit all processes to include feedback ('restituzione') of the outcomes to participants, as well as to the community at large and to nominate ad hoc Committees (usually formed by representatives of the participants themselves) to monitor the subsequent implementation of decisions and policies.

3. Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.

Local decision makers represent 80% of the proponents of funded processes; thus they have the possibility to ensure that their needs are adequately represented; the use of interviews and other ways to 'explore the field' in many processes offers the possibility to recognize needs and interests of societal actors; often the methods themselves that used -such as Citizen Juries- are structured in ways that allow stakeholders perspectives to be adequately presented and taken into consideration.

4. Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.

Firstly, requests of support to participatory processes can come from a variety of subjects: a) local authorities (municipalities, provinces, local health authorities, etc.); b) residents above the age of 16 (including foreigners); c) schools; d) firms, in the case of new projects having relevant social, economic or environmental impacts. Though local administrations, as mentioned, represent approximately 80% of processes funded, schools and citizens have also had access to the benefits of the Law.

Furthermore, Law no. 69/07 contains explicit reference to such aspects by stating that ‘special attention should be given to those conditions capable of ensuring equal possibilities of expressing all points of view’ (art.15.1f). The Law gives priority to processes that give voice to powerless interests and pursue social equity: processes thus should be organized in ways that favor active participation with equal opportunities for diverse cultural and social groups (art.15.1g), and physically disabled individuals (art.16.1a), and inclusion of weaker members of society; also, equal gender participation is foreseen by the law (art.15.1f) and pro-actively pursued by the PRA (e.g. by offering baby-sitting services).
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To give voice to the community as a whole, as well as to its different social and demographic components, the RPA has chosen to 'broker' recruitment of participants by means of stratified random sampling. Though this approach met initial resistance as it counters traditional forms of participation (stakeholder consultation, open door assemblies), increasingly both participants and local administrations have come to appreciate the merits of random recruitment. Depending on specific themes, topics and contexts, this approach is combined with the presence of self-selected citizens and/or organized stakeholders. Actors such as organized stakeholder groups can also be involved in other roles, such as members of the 'Guarantee committees' so as to verify the process quality, and hopefully develop a sense of 'ownership' of it.

5. Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.
The Law indicates that ‘methods and instruments must be appropriate for the goals and context of the process’ (art.15.1d) and explicitly (art.16.1f) favors the use of innovative process design. Furthermore, the ‘management of the process should be entrusted to a neutral and impartial actor’ (i.e. a facilitator) (art.15.1e).

Processes are designed by proponents, with the methodological advice of the RPA, as discussed above, and their consultants. Thus, participants are usually not involved in the designing of processes, also because this would require additional resources and time, hardly available. To compensate for this, the RPA requests that an ad hoc ‘comitato di garanzia’-Guarantee committee- be set up; its size and composition can vary according to local situations and considerations, but it should be balanced and formed by individuals (for example majority and opposition politicians in the town council, well known and respected individuals, representatives of local associations).that in some way represent the community and shed confidence in the process in the eyes of the -often initially skeptical and mistrustful- citizens. The task of such boards is to validate the main activities and decisions during the process, such as: the adequacy and neutrality of information provided to participants; participant selection; timing and location of meetings, and other aspects in which bias might occur.

Also, flexibility towards requests from participants in the course of the process is requested and a specific question in the Final Reports to be presented by proponents specifically addresses the issue.

6. Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.
The community at large receives information about the process, its goals and its outcomes; the Law repeatedly emphasizes this point in articles 15 and 16, and part of the funding is explicitly labelled for this purpose within the budget of each process. Specific action should be undertaken to ensure maximum dissemination among all citizens of information, even technical, before, during and after the process (art.15.1h) and local authorities must ensure access (also using information technologies) to all relevant information (also in non-technical language) on the topic as well as on the process itself (art.15.4c; art.16.2f and d). Practically all projects initiated under the Law have set up websites or dedicated pages within the sites of local administrations, allowing citizens to access documents concerning ongoing processes, and in some cases to provide feedback comments.

Though the Law does not deal with information to be provided specifically to participants, the RPA has has implemented as much as possible the principles of the IAP2 'Communications for effective Participation' manual, and strongly emphasized this aspect in discussing methods to be used so that processes generate participant opinions incorporating available relevant information and knowledge (proponents must describe this aspect in their Final Reports).

7. Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.

9 Instructions and forms for presenting funding support and Final Reports can be found at:
http://www.consiglio.regione.toscana.it/partecipazione/default.aspx?nome=domanda
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See considerations developed under Core Value no. 2 (in particular the Committee monitoring the subsequent implementation, as mentioned above). Also, generally websites remain active after the end of processes and continue to provide information on the implementation of process recommendations.

Table no. 1 – Number of requests of support and of projects funded; total funding granted and population residing within funded communities and schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>No. requests</th>
<th>No. projects funded</th>
<th>Total funding granted</th>
<th>Population residing in communities with funded projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>€ 684,700</td>
<td>1,666,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>€ 707,275</td>
<td>2,036,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>€ 746,800</td>
<td>1,107,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>€ 641,240</td>
<td>1,301,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>€ 516,675</td>
<td>568,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>€ 3,296,690</td>
<td>6,680,284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There are 3 rounds of proposals each year established by the Law, with submissions accepted to the end of March, July and November; thus the year 2012 is not yet finished since proposals can be submitted by July 31.

Note:
Lists of all requests and funded projects, résumés of finished and under way projects, as well as further data, are available in the RPA's annual Reports at: www.consiglio.regione.toscana.it/partecipazione/default.aspx?nome=rapporti
Résumés (in Italian) of many processes are available in the page 'Repertorio' at www.consiglio.regione.toscana.it/partecipazione; a limited number of résumés in English, representative of the variety of processes funded by RPA under Law no. 69/07, are available in the page 'Repertory of cases'.
Several videos produced by funded processes are available in the page 'Videos' (some of these pages are presently under construction and will be available shortly).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Creating a culture of engagement at Capital Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Capital Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>How to embed patient and public participation into the day-to-day practices of the organization in order to fulfill the Citizen and Stakeholder Engagement and Accountability strategic direction. Improve health outcomes for patients and the community and involve them in decision-making in the Capital Health district through greater engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Citizen panels; social media; crowdsourcing; deliberative dialogue; experience based design; patient/public involvement in committees and work groups; surveys; focus groups; community dialogue events; World Cafes; policy; framework and toolkit; progress measurement framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Results | Citizen Engagement is a strategic direction of the organization. To make this strategy come alive, public participation values and principles are included in organizational policy and reflected in decision-making processes throughout the organization. Capital Health has developed an engagement framework, tools and in-house training for staff and leaders. It regularly uses public participation to:  
- inform district level directions and decisions, such as business planning and community health planning;  
- inform program and service quality improvement;  
- engage patients, families and staff in collaborative relationships and care planning;  
- support the introduction of healthy public policy (such as healthy food choices)  
An important demonstration of commitment to public participation as an organizational practice is signaled by the commitment of dedicated staff and budget resources to support engagement activities. |
| Impact Level | Capital Health district (population: 400,000) |
| Time Frame | 2007-08 to present |
| People Engaged | Tens of thousands (public, patients and staff) |
| Web Link | www.cdha.nshealth.ca |
Creating a culture of engagement at Capital Health

Public Participation Challenges and Opportunities
Capital Health established a new mission in 2007 to become a world-leading haven for health, healing and learning. Thousands of stakeholders (staff, patients, physicians and the public) contributed to this mission through the Strategic Quest process (see IAP2 State of the Practice Report, 2008). Our Promise, the strategic plan that resulted from Strategic Quest, challenges us to be more than simply a provider of health care information and services but to create an environment of shared accountability for health and health care in our community.

By adopting an expansive definition of health (which embraces physical, emotional, mental and spiritual well-being) the mission enables a focus on health and care partnerships with people. The mission’s explicit focus on learning embraces people in the communities we serve, and includes them as integral members of a learning network that will help us to achieve better personal and community health.

As we engage people and communities more actively in their health and care – both in communities and at the bedside – we create opportunities for patient and public voices to shape health care quality, patient experience, and system priorities and decisions, thereby making them more effective, more reflective of the population’s needs. This ultimately leads to a more sustainable health system in our community.

The challenges Capital Health faces with regard to internal and external stakeholders are many, not the least of which are history and culture. Command and control decision-making models of health care administration and bedside care have been the predominant paradigm. Health care has traditionally been the domain of science, clinical experts, and health policy experts, leaving little room for the experience of the public and patients to truly influence decisions. When combined with traditional levels of unquestioning trust and deference to authority and expertise in Canadian society, these conditions have led to a situation where patients and the public hold little power or ability to influence decisions about their own care, or decisions affecting the broader taxpayer-funded system.

This is challenging territory for meaningful consultation and engagement of patients and the public. While there is sincere belief and good intent to place people at the centre of health and care decisions, this has proved very challenging given the predominant expert-culture and the power structures.

Since 2007-08 Capital Health has been on a journey to develop its Citizen and Stakeholder Engagement and Accountability strategic direction, and to embed it in the practices of the organization. The transformation opportunities created by involving patients and the public more actively and directly in health and health care decision-making are many. Engaged patients and families make care safer and more effective because patients have a better understanding of their role and responsibilities in their own care through improved communication and relationships with providers. Informed and engaged people create realistic expectations of providers and the system, and lead to a greater balancing of power in these relationships and a shared responsibility for the outcomes.

Rationale for Public Participation
In creating Our Promise our stakeholders told us that we did not do a very good job of engaging patients and citizens, and this led to the citizen engagement strategic direction. To achieve the transformation Capital Health was seeking the public and other key stakeholders needed to be
involved. Changing health and health care is enormously complex. Add to this declining public trust in large institutions, and a growing global movement towards increasing public demand for a say in public policy matters, it became clear that Capital Health alone would not be able to address the monumental health and sustainability challenges it faced. Well-informed, highly engaged public and patients were needed as partners to affect the kind of transformation necessary to realize Capital Health’s mission.

Impact of Core Values on the Organization

The public should have a say in decisions about actions that could affect their lives. This core value is fully integrated into the strategy of Capital Health. Our Promise and the Declaration of Health place patients and the public at the center of decision making and seek to involve them. Our Promise refers to citizens as the “drivers of the system,” and the Declaration speaks of collective decision-making with community, partners and stakeholders. In 2011 Capital Health adopted an Engagement Policy, which states, “Capital Health will ensure its decisions and priorities reflect the needs of the people it serves by engaging patients and citizens.” This core value is further reflected in the Guiding Principles and Values, which are fully detailed in section 1.5 of the Engagement Framework and Toolkit.

Evidence that this core value lives within the practices of the organization can also be found in Capital Health’s Multiyear Business Plan (2010-13). Capital Health’s Citizen Panel on Business Planning pilot (2011/12) involved 10 members of the public in shaping the business plan priorities for the 2012-13 fiscal year, and provided advice for ongoing citizen involvement in our business planning practice.

Public participation includes the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision.

This core value is reflected in both Our Promise and the Declaration of Health. Its fullest expression is in the policy’s Guiding Principles and Values, which states, “Participation in decision-making sets the expectation of action and outcome. Capital Health will be publicly accountable for reporting to citizens the rationale for participatory decisions…” and “The rationale for decisions will be shared openly.” This value is also used by the senior leadership team which has incorporated “inclusive decision making” into its process to ensure that patient and public views are part of decision-making evidence.

In 2009 Capital Health struck a citizen-stakeholder panel to provide policy direction on food sold in our retail restaurants, convenience shops and vending machines. The report, Healthy Food Choices at Capital Health, details how the panel’s deliberations and recommendations directly influenced retail food policy in the district. The panel’s work led to the removal of deep fat fryers from all restaurants, and has been the impetus for changes in menus and food offerings in all retail food outlets to healthy food options.

Public participation supports sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.

This core value appears in our key strategic documents (Our Promise, the Multiyear Business Plan, policy and framework) which reinforce the involvement broad interests, including those of decision makers on the Capital Health Board and the NS Department of Health and Wellness. Furthermore, Capital Health’s 7 Community Health Boards prepare a Community Health Plan (CHP) on a multiyear basis which influences directions and decisions in Capital Health. This planning tool reflects the broadest possible range of community interests. The 2010-13 CHP gathered data from 4,000 residents through telephone surveys and a series of community
dialogue events. Capital Health responds directly to the CHP by providing a report on how the data influences operations.

The Baby Stories project through Public Health Services started in 2009-10 with an impact assessment of 200+ prenatal education clients. The issues raised in the impact evaluation led to the broader outreach to stakeholders, program staff, the provincial Public Health system leaders, and the public. An issue brief to help frame a broader public discussion about how the program needed to evolve to meet the community’s needs was created with stakeholder input. The complex and interdependent decision-making layers within the public health system led to the creation of a “system team” structure to ensure that key decision makers across the system had information about and the ability to influence the design and direction of the project to ensure alignment and preserve relationships.

Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in the decision.

This core value is central to Capital Health’s philosophy of patient and public engagement, and is directly reflected in the policy, section 1, which states, “Capital Health will ensure its decisions and priorities reflect the needs of the people it serves by engaging patients and citizens.” It is visible in the substantial internet presence that Capital Health maintains and with a dedicated email address (participate@cdha.nshealth.ca), as well as the active use of social media tools (such as Facebook and Twitter @CapitalHealth, @Engage4Health). The website is a public communications tool and provides background reports on our public participation projects. Capital Health offers an online form that allows the public to register their interest to participate in patient and public engagement initiatives, and along with social media, is also used to recruit people to get involved in public participation activities.

There are both internal and external examples of this core value in action within the organization. The entire rationale that led to the creation of the Citizen Panel on Business Planning was the direct involvement of the public in key decisions about health care resources. Part of the mandate of the panel was to advise on how to expand the scale and scope of citizen involvement in business planning in the future, and the panel offered recommendations in its final report.

With 12,000 staff and doctors, Capital Health has also dedicated resources to engage this important stakeholder group. The Baby Stories project involved staff on the project team that to ensure that staff issues, concerns, and communication was a key component of the work.

Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.

Examples of this core value can be found in some of the previously noted work; however, the Citizen Panel on Business Planning specifically had an advisory mandate around future citizen participation. As well, the 2011 Business Planning Team, an internal group of leaders whose task was to develop and guide the business plan process for the organization, established guidelines that ensured staff, stakeholders, and the public were consulted on how they could best contribute to the planning process.

In 2011 Capital Health hosted a Patient-Leader Forum and brought together current and former patients and family members with physician leaders, directors, and senior executives to explore how to engage patients and families more effectively. Patients and families participated in the steering group that designed and hosted this event, and a key outcome from this event was the creation of a Service Standards Working Group involving senior staff, patients and the public.
Capital Health’s Co-Leadership practice brings clinical administrators work and physician leaders together to co-manage programs and services. This ensures that the full range of perspectives is brought into frontline decision-making. In Capital Health’s 2010 Accreditation Report, Accreditation Canada acknowledged this collaborative practice: “Good working relationships exist between the board and senior leadership and the directors. There is significant evidence of including physicians and directors in the new co leadership program.” (2010 Accreditation Report, pg 8)

**Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.**

The policy and framework emphasize the importance of providing information to patients, staff and the public to enable and encourage participation in decision making. Both documents are freely available on the website. As well, Capital Health’s website and social media tools play a crucial role in providing information to patients and the public to enable them to engage effectively and actively in decision-making opportunities.

The Guiding Principles and Values in the policy and framework reinforce the importance of this core value: “Ensuring equity means open and transparent exchanges and sharing of information and opinion.”

Some project-specific examples of this core value include:

- The Baby Stories project used input from 140 stakeholders and used a national evidence scan of pre- and post-natal programs to develop an issue brief that was used to inform the public participation component of this project.
- The “My Health, Our Community” (MHOC) sessions address this core value by providing a presentation and background information to participants on data that relates to health care sustainability. The “kitchen table” conversation kit enables people to self-host conversations with family and friends, and it includes a highlights document about the health care system to inform the discussion.
- The Citizen Panel on Business Planning was provided with a resource binder, three 3-hour orientation sessions, access experts, and staff support for ethical decision-making and deliberative dialogue. Panel members took part in two business planning workshops with frontline leaders that were designed to provide information and gather input on key business planning issues.

**Public participation communicates to participants how their input influenced the decision.**

The Engagement framework requires that the decision and rationale be reported back to participants as part of the engagement process. This core value is also evident in the Guiding Principles and Values: “Participation in decision-making sets the expectation of action and outcome. Capital Health will be publicly accountable for reporting to citizens the rationale for participatory decisions.” Other examples of this core value include:

- The Healthy Minds Initiative engaged over 500 people (individuals, consumer groups, government, community members and other organizations) in 2004 to play a role in improving mental health supports for people in our community. Today, this initiative continues to engage mental health consumers, advocates and family members in some 22 committees, working groups and networks that inform patient care, provide peer support, and influence decisions and priorities within the Mental Health Program.
- Through the Understanding Communities Unit (Public Health Services), Capital Health provided a detailed response document to the 2010-13 Community Health Plan, Our
Healthy Future. Our Healthy Future was a community health plan developed by the seven Community Health Boards in Capital Health, who engaged over 4,000 citizens in the preparation of the plan and recommendations.

Evaluation against Core Values
Capital Health has developed a Progress Measurement Framework for its engagement activity. The IAP2 Core Values are reflected in both the outcomes and the measures in the framework. Specifically, Scope of Participation measures link to Core Values 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6; Effectiveness of Participation relate to Core Values 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7; and, Creating a Culture of Engagement connects to Core Values 1, 2, 4 and 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Evidence/Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patients/families, citizens participate in decision-making/priority-setting</td>
<td>Scope of participation</td>
<td>Year-over-year increase in the number of people participating (base year is 2010-11); inclusion; representative of population; capacity to participate;</td>
<td>Bi-annual Inventory, Standard survey, 2013 Milestone data, Process audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients/families, citizens, stakeholders influence decisions/priorities</td>
<td>Effectiveness of participation</td>
<td>High level of satisfaction with participant influence over decisions/priorities; level of involvement (input into decision-making); public understanding of shared accountability; transparency and openness;</td>
<td>Standard survey, Process audits, Decision analysis, Annual public survey, Key influencer study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Health demonstrates a culture of engagement</td>
<td>Creating a culture of engagement</td>
<td>Attitude towards/understanding of engagement; increased levels of trust and involvement in decisions of staff; engagement leadership competencies demonstrated; integration of engagement data as decision-making evidence; decision-makers perception of changes in decision-making as a result of engagement; numbers trained; engagement activity reports</td>
<td>Employee survey, My Leadership capabilities (# achieving Transformation Leader level in key areas), Policy compliance Milestone, Training, Process audits, Bi-annual Inventory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence of the influence of the IAP2 Core Values on Capital Health and its public participation approach are reflected in the standard evaluation questions included in the framework and toolkit. Capital Health also provides a standard evaluation template for engagement projects, and we have begun compiling the data for annual reporting on progress. Data on key Citizen Engagement milestones is reported in the Strategic Indicators reports and patient satisfaction surveys. We have recently launched a Patient Experience Reporting System that provides qualitative feedback reports directly to unit managers about patient experiences with Capital Health’s services, and the first semi-annual report is set to be released during the summer of 2012.

As further evidence of the evolution of a culture of participation, Capital Health went from a single engagement advisor position in 2008 to a full-fledged Citizen Engagement program in 2011 with 14 staff and a budget of over $1 million annually. The service includes Patient and Public Engagement, a Community Health Board Secretariat and the Patient Experience service.
Involving Patients and Citizens via Capital Health’s website (left)

Strategic Plan Renewal (right) - Getting staff, patient and public feedback on our strategic directions.

(Left and below) Pictures from the field — Engaging with the public helps us to build new programs and identify important priorities for action.

(Above and right) Over 4,000 citizens participated in the development of the 2010-13 Community Health Plan.

(Right) Ad for the Baby Stories public engagement sessions. There were 4 open sessions and 22 targeted focus groups with moms.

(Above and right) Images from our training video on Capital Health’s Engagement Policy. All staff are required to view the video and complete a brief online quiz.

(Above) Graphic recording at the Baby Stories public sessions.
# Case Study Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th><strong>Canadian Blood Services</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Canadian Blood Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location(s)</td>
<td>Across Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question / Problem</strong></td>
<td>Canadian Blood Services was created out of the ashes of Canada's tainted blood scandal of the late 1980s. The organization was founded on a commitment to openness, transparency and collaborative decision-making. Despite geographic challenges and incredible vigilance by a disparate group of stakeholders, this organizational commitment to public engagement has helped the organization rebuild trust in the blood system, and assume additional roles in the health care system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Standing committees of external stakeholders; open board meetings; consultations; round tables; advisory committees; consensus conferences; public polling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Trust in the blood system has grown from a rate of 56 percent in 1998 to a rate of 82 percent in 2010. The organization was asked to take on a high profile role in organ and tissue donation in 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact level</strong></td>
<td>Nationally (outside Quebec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>1998 to current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People engaged</strong></td>
<td>Stakeholders, patients, donors, recipients, health care practitioners, governments, partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.blood.ca">www.blood.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Participation Challenges and Opportunities

Canadian Blood Services is the operator of Canada’s blood system. Founded out of the ashes of the tainted blood tragedy in the late 1980’s, in which more than 1,200 Canadians were infected with HIV and thousands more with Hepatitis C, Canadian Blood Services created a new blood system from the ground up; one that is built with transparency, consultative decision-making, and public participation at its very core. It’s built into our mission, “…….Canadian Blood Services has established and works to maintain effective relationships with all of our stakeholders…..” In addition many key components of effective public participation are encapsulated in our core values, “Safety, Integrity, Quality, Respect, Excellence, Accountability, and Openness.”

With mistrust and a broken system as our challenge and ‘never repeating the same mistakes’ as our opportunity, we worked with our stakeholders to overcome the challenges of the past and position ourselves to better serve Canadians for the future. Together, we have stabilized the blood supply, transformed the system, established trust, delivered on transparency and accountability and informed the way forward through genuine collaborative decision-making. All of this has been accomplished in an environment of broad geography, increasing diversity and a tightening fiscal reality.

Rationale for Public Participation

In his inquiry into the tainted blood scandal, Justice Horace Krever made several recommendations which went on to provide the basis for the core values of Canadian Blood Services. Those recommendations included the following:

- That there be a national blood system under a single operator
- That safety is paramount
- That there be clear accountability
- That there be sufficient funding and contingencies
- That the system be voluntary
- That it focus on consultative decision-making

Perhaps most significantly (as it pertains to public participation), Justice Krever noted that “The public must have access to information about the policy, management and operations of the blood supply system and be represented in the decision making.”

Impact of Core Values on the Organization

Public Participation as an Organizational Strategy

This commitment to engagement and public participation infuses all the work we do at Canadian Blood Services. It has become a recognized strength of the organization, and there is an entire team within the Public Affairs division dedicated to ensuring stakeholders and the public participate in decision-making and policy development.
A critical piece in the organization’s approach to engagement comes in the form of Standing Committees of external stakeholders. We have a National Liaison Committee (NLC) that is made up of approximately 21 members – seven drawn from health care organizations, seven representing national patient groups, and seven representing regional interests – which reports directly to the Canadian Blood Services Board of Directors.

Additionally, there are seven Regional Liaison Committees (RLCs) which report to their relevant regional director and to the national public affairs office at Canadian Blood Services. Each RLC is comprised of roughly 15 members who represent the region’s blood donors, its volunteers, patients, community partners and health care institutions. The structure of the committees is shown here:

Each committee meets face-to-face twice per year, and once via teleconference.

The broad make-up of the committees, and the access they have to the key decision-makers in the organization, helps ensure that these stakeholders have input into all facets of the organization. It also provides a way to strengthen and build new relationships and establishes a broad network that can be tapped into for insight on particular issues. Over the past 11 years, these committees have shaped policy on a range of issues including ways to deal with the threat of West Nile Virus, the development of a strategy to deal with emergency blood shortages, and increasing the diversity of the donor base.

Beyond the standing committees, the organization holds two open board meetings throughout the year in different locations across the country and any member of the
public is invited to come and address the board at those open meetings. On matters that require broader input, consultations will be designed and executed to solicit feedback.

In addition, the organization conducts consultations on key policy issues on a regular basis. Over our 14 year history, we have conducted in excess of 30 consultations that have helped shape health-care policy in this country. One gauge of public trust is captured via an annual survey, that indicates public trust has risen from a low of 56 per cent in 1998 to 82 per cent in 2010.

**Professional Development**

Every member of the stakeholder relations team is certified by IAP2, and is guided by four key principles:

- Stakeholders should be engaged proactively, and expectations must be clear and realistic
- Supportive and constructive relationships must be built with stakeholders
- Inform good decision-making with evidence from multiple sources
- Be transparent in decision-making while respecting privacy and partnerships

These principles, and the reasoning behind them, are shared throughout the organization via lunch and learn sessions, internal communications vehicles and an interactive and detailed Intranet portal.

**Breadth and Scope of Core Values in Organization**

Corporate: Canadian Blood Services’ stakeholder relations team leads the development and delivery of an overall corporate stakeholder strategy that positions the organization within a broad healthcare environment as a contributor to and leader in the field. This ensures the highest level of integration at both the Board of Directors level and the suite of Senior Executives.

Operational: The organization’s operations are defined by business lines, each of which is governed by a business performance council. Stakeholder engagement strategies are designed and delivered within each line of business, supported by an advisor from the stakeholder relations team to identify opportunities or challenges, to provide strategic engagement advice, and to direct the planning and execution of consultations or other engagement initiatives.

Policy: The best way to illustrate the work at the policy level is by sharing a recent and extensive example. In 2008, Canadian Blood Services was tasked by governments with a new and critical mandate – to make recommendations on how to improve organ and tissue donation and transplantation (OTDT) in Canada.

Canada is one of the only countries in the western world without an integrated system for organ and tissue donation and transplantation. Our deceased donation rates are less than half that of the best performing countries and the donation rate has not improved over the last decade. The system as it stands today is at capacity, and is struggling to cope with current needs and projected future demand. There are currently more than 4,300 Canadians on an organ waiting list; and every day and a half, someone in this country dies while waiting for a transplant to save their life.
In collaboration with domestic and international experts, with health policy specialists, and with members of the public, Canadian Blood Services explored ways to improve Canada’s OTDT performance. Strong partnerships were built with ten key national patient organizations (representing more than 15 million Canadians) to ensure the voice of the patient was captured and reflected in the work.

A series of nine independently facilitated public dialogues were held across Canada. These sessions provided the opportunity for people to offer their views, suggestions and input on the potential options and recommendations towards the design of an integrated OTDT system.

A “Kitchen Table Conversation” kit was developed to help those unable to attend an in-person session convene their own discussion on the issue and provide their input to Canadian Blood Services.

Additionally, a website was created that allowed the public to:
- provide additional feedback
- share their personal stories
- read progress updates
- share information with friends, colleagues and family members

Each public dialogue resulted in a comprehensive report that contained the input gathered during that session, with a final report that consolidated all the information gathered across the country at the end of the process. These documents were provided to the decision-makers, made available to the public and posted online.

Throughout the process, Canadian Blood Services sought opportunities to further engage partners, and hosted a number of partner roundtable sessions to discuss particular aspects of the work and solicit input on specific pieces of the current and future system.

All told, the stakeholder relations team made outreach to more than 4,200 points of contact across Canada during this process. Each of those points of contact represents a different network of individuals and included Organ & Tissue awareness organizations, Universities and Colleges, donor families, recipient families, wait list patients, patient caregivers, community centres, Organ Procurement Offices, National Patient Organizations (CNIB, Kidney Foundation etc), OTDT champions, physiotherapy clinics, libraries, volunteers, laboratory technicians, service groups (Lions clubs, Kiwanis), local sports clubs, researchers, policy analysts, stem cell technologists and concerned citizens.

Almost three years of work culminated in April 2011, when Canadian Blood Services delivered Call to Action, a strategic plan to improve organ and tissue donation and transplantation performance in Canada to the Provincial and Territorial Ministries of Health.

On May 24, 2012, Canadian Blood Services met with the Conference of Deputy Ministers of Health, at which time Deputies agreed to move forward on a national OTDT strategy with Canadian Blood Services in a leadership role. This was a milestone in healthcare history that will ultimately save thousands of lives. Canadian Blood Services will
continue to consult with governments, stakeholders and the public as detailed implementation plans are developed.

Since receiving the response from governments, we have been in the process of circling back to all participants, to ensure they have a copy of Call to Action, and to highlight ways in which their contributions impacted the final recommendations.

Those discussions have come with an invitation to continue collaboration as we move into the next phases of the project.

Governments have universally recognized the depth of consultation that took place on this initiative, and the sheer amount of input and passion stakeholders have brought to the proceedings. Without that open approach, it is highly unlikely the report would have achieved the endorsement of governments.

**Evaluation against Core Values**

At an individual level, adherence to stakeholder principles and organizational values are central components of employee’s annual performance reviews.

At an organizational level, the Stakeholder Engagement Index is reported on as part of our Balanced Scorecard and is an important measure of how the organization has performed in any given year. This index is populated through an annual survey of stakeholders and ongoing dialogues with them.

While public participation and engagement is at the forefront of what the organization does, we are always looking for ways to get better and improve processes and approaches.

Stakeholders and partners are surveyed annually, as are the NLC and RLCs. That feedback is used to measure how the organization is performing and if there are any areas that need particular attention. It also ensures that we continue to be held to account and that Krever’s recommendations continue to be top of mind.

At the conclusion of every consultation, we survey participants to measure their experiences, as well as internal stakeholders to ensure the activities are meeting their needs.

Driving an organization-wide commitment to public engagement is not always easy, but it’s been critical in re-establishing trust in the blood system and in positioning Canadian Blood Services as a key player in Canadian health care.
# Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Chapel Hill 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Town of Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Chapel Hill, NC population ~ 57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>Chapel Hill is not what it used to be. The once rather small town has steadily grown over the years into a vibrant university center of more than 57,000 residents. This growth has had mixed reviews from the community. There are those who are excited about the multi-level condominium projects they see on Franklin Street and “new urbanism” development at Southern Village. And there are those who would prefer to see less traffic, fewer student rentals and a return to simpler times.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous comprehensive plan (adopted in 2001 and the guiding document for land use management decisions) was a product of small committee decision-making with very little public input. The Town Council wanted to create a new plan. The People’s Plan, or Chapel Hill 2020, was based on extensive public participation so that it would be reflective of and responsive to the needs and interests of the community on many issues – not just growth. The aspiration of including people who live, work, play, study, invest, or pray in Chapel Hill spoke to the desire to make the Chapel Hill 2020 process one of many voices resulting in one vision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sample Methods</strong></th>
<th>Our methods covered the entire gamut of IAP2’s Spectrum of Public Participation. We inspired participation from the public through flyers, radio interviews, newspaper columns, advertising, a bus wrap, and in-depth issue presentations. We consulted, involved, collaborated and empowered the public through community meetings, work sessions, keypad polling, social media, children’s artistic visioning, a community open house, a blog, surveys, an unconference, word clouds, charrettes and Tavern Talks.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Those who live, work, play, study, invest or pray in Chapel Hill participated in record numbers in developing Chapel Hill 2020. Their contributions helped to develop a plan with values and goals that will guide Town decision making for years to come.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On June 25, 2012, the Chapel Hill Town Council voted unanimously to adopt the Chapel Hill 2020 plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>Town-wide including those who live, work, play, study, invest and pray in Chapel Hill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>28,869 community contacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Problem and Challenge
Chapel Hill is not what it used to be. The once rather small town has steadily grown over the years into a vibrant university center of more than 57,000 residents. This growth has had mixed reviews from the community. There are those who are excited about the multi-level condominium projects they see on Franklin Street and “new urbanism” development at Southern Village. And there are those who would prefer to see less traffic, fewer student rentals and a return to simpler times.

The previous comprehensive plan (adopted in 2001 and the guiding document for land use management decisions) was a product of small committee decision making with very little public input. The Town Council wanted to create a new “People’s Plan” named Chapel Hill 2020 that would be based on extensive public participation. The plan should be reflective of and responsive to the needs and interests of the community on many issues – not just growth. The aspiration of including people who live, work, play, study, invest, or pray in Chapel Hill spoke to the desire to make the Chapel Hill 2020 process one of many voices resulting in one vision.

The Role of Public Participation
The Chapel Hill 2020 process, the community visioning process to create a new comprehensive plan, rolled out to the public in September 2011 and continued until it was adopted in June 2012. We had a number of initial goals, but foremost among these was for the Chapel Hill 2020 comprehensive plan to be a “people’s plan,” based on extensive public participation. At the beginning of the process, the Initiating Committee set the goal of touching 10,000 people during the Chapel Hill 2020 process. The aspiration of including people who live, work, play, study, invest, or pray in Chapel Hill spoke to the desire to make the Chapel Hill 2020 process one of many voices resulting in one vision.

The Chapel Hill 2020 public participation surpassed any outreach activity in the history of Chapel Hill. The outreach and engagement effort strove to be creative, engaging, and open to innovation and exploration, and through the many working session meetings, outreach efforts, face-to-face discussions, Tavern Talks, and more, the Chapel Hill 2020 outreach efforts successfully met the goal of touching 10,000 people and easily surpassed this.

The public phase of the Chapel Hill 2020 process began with a community-wide visioning session held on September 27, 2011, in which 475 people participated. Throughout the Chapel Hill 2020 process, the community worked tirelessly, attending community meetings and thinking creatively about goals for the town. The Chapel Hill 2020 comprehensive plan is a product of these values, aspirations, and ideas of the community.
Public Participation Methods

The Public Participation Methods used were many and varied:

**Initiating Committee:** Town Council appointed an Initiating Committee made up of a diverse group of Chapel Hill residents who met four times to design the process for creating the Chapel Hill 2020 plan. This group was able to recommend to Council the process design for Chapel Hill 2020 which was adopted by Council as the framework for the project.

**Community Mapping:** Town staff conducted a community mapping project which was successful in achieving its three goals:

1. To identify community leaders in nonprofit and faith organizations
2. To interview a sample of leaders of hard to reach and underrepresented communities in order to identify barriers to participation in Chapel Hill 2020 and suggestions for overcoming these challenges
3. To create a network of community leaders who would share information with their communities about Chapel Hill 2020 and encourage them to participate in the process.

**Media Relations:** We began by inviting the media to a Media Briefing in September 2011 to announce the process. Throughout the year, we worked closely with local media, providing regular columns, blog posts, or radio interviews from special topic presenters to promote their talks.

**Advertisements:** We scheduled our limited funds for advertising with the Chapel Hill News, WCHL AM Radio, and WUNC-FM for key event milestones including the Kickoff, the Community Open House, special Design Workshops, Tavern Talks, and a big Thank You at the end.

**Website:** We created a new design for the CH 2020 website within the Town of Chapel Hill web. Working with Vision Internet, we acquired a component to showcase videos to feature our residents talking about their ideas and vision for the future. [www.chapelhill2020.org](http://www.chapelhill2020.org)

**Social Media:** We created the blog [www.2020buzz.com](http://www.2020buzz.com) (please visit, link to “Buzz” and view interesting posts, perhaps link to “posts by month”). We kept it current and lively, utilizing UNC-Chapel Hill students to attend meetings and write postings about what they saw and heard. We also established a Facebook page and used Twitter for the project.
Public & Community Meetings: During this process, 11 theme group meetings and more than 20 special topic presentations were held for the community. The theme group meetings were a combination of work and reporting out sessions and averaged 150 participants per meeting. Attendance at the special topic presentations ranged from 11 to 48 participants.

In order to increase participation from hard to reach groups, outreach was also done to community groups with members of the Outreach Committee and Staff sharing information about Chapel Hill 2020 and gathering feedback at meetings of the NAACP, Ministerial Alliance, Tech Support Coalition, Latina Mommas (Stay at Home Latina Moms), Chapel Hill-Carrboro Chamber of Commerce Young Professionals Club, Laurel Hill Homeowners’ Association, UNC Employee Forum, Chapel Hill Optimist Club, Habitat for Humanity – Burmese, Sharon, Black homeowners and many more!

Budgetopolis Game: Forty-two people including community members, Council members and Town staff took part in Budgetopolis, a game designed by the UNC School of Government to lead groups through the process of learning about priority based budgeting in a fun and interesting way.

Glue and Glitter: We encouraged the community to assist in building the plan through artistic visioning. At our Community Open House children as young as three were able to draw their vision of Chapel Hill’s future. The children’s art was then sewn together to create a Children’s Art Quilt which was displayed at the next Chapel Hill 2020 public meeting. Other youth artistic opportunities included pictures drawn by children from Estes Hills Elementary School which were shown as participants entered the Stakeholder’s meeting on October 6, 2011 and students throughout the Chapel Hill-Carrboro Public Schools were invited to enter a Chapel Hill 2020 Art Competition which had three winners, one of which had their artwork displayed as the cover of the Chapel Hill 2020 plan.

Adults also had the opportunity to get out the scissors and glue. 30 adults created their visions of Chapel Hill at the Community Open House. Another group of 19 from a local retirement community was also able to do this.

Surveys: Feedback was sought from the community through many different channels. Keypad polling was used by 220 people at the October 6th 2011 Stakeholders meeting to gather information about the community’s vision for the future. Those results determined the six themes of the final plan. Surveys were also used online, face to face, and on camera at a video booth at the Community Open House to garner additional feedback. We are currently conducting a final survey to learn from the community which parts of the process were most effective so we can continue to use these experiences.
Word Clouds: Notes from the Kickoff meeting were analyzed to create word clouds which were shared at following community meetings and events to illustrate the words most frequently used by community members to describe Chapel Hill and their hopes for its future.


Advisory Groups: The Town of Chapel Hill has 19 advisory boards all of which were invited to participate in Chapel Hill 2020. However, two advisory boards, the Planning Board and the Sustainability Committee, played a special role as required by their charge and the Land Use Management Ordinance (LUMO). The Planning Board was specifically required by the LUMO to present their recommendations regarding the plan to Council which they did.

2020 Innovation Unconference: This less traditional meeting was aimed at encouraging participation from Gen X and Gen Y. The Keynote speaker was Holden Thorp, Chancellor of UNC Chapel Hill. Over 50 people attended the unconference and discussed topics such as innovation, entrepreneurship and technology.

Information Booths: Town staff and volunteers organized information booths at a number of locations including the UNC Volunteer Fair, University Mall, Farmer's Market, Rainbow Soccer, and Earth Action Day. Flyers were passed out in English and Spanish, public comments were collected to be added to the blog, and temporary Chapel Hill tattoos were given out to all.

Individual/Group Volunteer Activities: Chapel Hill 2020 volunteers gave hundreds of hours of service. We are so grateful to our Project Co-Chairs, eighteen Theme Group Leaders, PTAs and School groups that organized meeting refreshments, Information Booth staffers and survey administrators who helped to make this project possible.

Uniqueness of the Project
This project has been transformative because it represents a new way of thinking for the Town of Chapel Hill. Chapel Hill 2020 had greater public participation than any previous Town project. The final product is reflective of the will of the entire community rather than that of a vocal minority.

Significant efforts were made to reach people in
their daily lives rather than expecting that they would come to a meeting. One way this was done was by staff riding buses to hand out information about Chapel Hill 2020. We also created a bus wrap which can be seen regularly around town reminding people about the project.

Our evaluation and monitoring of public participation during the process was informal. We counted the number who attended each meeting and event as well as tracked the number of comments on our blog. Now that the project has been completed we are working with the UNC School of Government to conduct a participant survey so that we can learn more about how they viewed their experience.

https://unc.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_cSmPxkRPQLCn9q

Project Results
The Chapel Hill 2020 public participation surpassed any other process of its kind undertaken by the Chapel Hill community. Through the working session meetings, outreach efforts, face to-face discussions, tavern talks, and more, the Chapel Hill 2020 outreach efforts successfully met the goal of reaching 10,000 people and easily surpassed this contacts.

The Town Council unanimously approved the plan at their business meeting on Monday, June 25, 2012.

We reached record-setting numbers in attendance at public meetings. The quality of public participation was tremendous, as evidenced at the May 21, 2012, public hearing in which the draft plan was presented to the Council. Please check http://bit.ly/L3kCjz - advance directly to Item No. 3: Public Hearing: CH 2020 Comprehensive Plan. Following the showing of the video, residents speak to their experience with the process at about 1:59. An example:

“*I’ve lived here over 20 years, and I’ve never seen anything like this before. I felt so involved and so a part of the Town in a way I never had before … I used to think I’m just a member of the Town, but now I think I can be a driving force for what the Town does in the future,*” one resident said during the public hearing.

Town Manager Roger Stancil has aptly described the process as “transformative.” As we move forward, we want to find ways to bring this high citizen engagement to other pressing issues. We believe that key to our success was personal interaction that put a face to Town Hall. This is the sort of project that reminds us why we love our work in local government. The Chapel Hill 2020 comprehensive plan is not an end point, but a beginning. Implementing the plan will include the Town, the community, other local governments, non-profits, and many others to work collaboratively on achieving the goals set forth in this plan. Building partnerships, thinking creatively, and being willing to try something different will be necessary for the success of the Chapel Hill 2020 comprehensive plan.
Organizing Group Alignment with IAP2 Core Values

The outcomes of Chapel Hill 2020 are reflective of IAP2 core values in a number of ways. Specifically:

- From the beginning Council was interested in seeking out and involving those most affected by the development of a new comprehensive plan; those who live, work, play, study, invest and pray in Chapel Hill. To achieve this goal, Council appointed an Initiating Committee of town residents to design the process. An Outreach Committee proactively targeted those who are traditionally underrepresented by going out to meet them at the mall, on the bus and at club meetings all over town.

- The outcome of the project would have been entirely different without the public’s contribution. Because of their work as meeting facilitators, outreach committee members, editors and participants we were able to draft a plan that represents the community’s interests and goals.

- The project promoted sustainable decisions by including sustainable decision-making as a key component of implementing the plan as well as involving the Town’s Sustainability Committee as a key partner in developing the Chapel Hill 2020 plan.

- The project offered the community a menu of participation options with the goal of offering something for everyone’s level of interest and ability. Throughout the project, we were responsive to feedback we received from the community and altered participation opportunities as needed. For example, we had requests for additional special topic sessions on a number of important community issues. Within six weeks, those sessions were organized and on the calendar. Another example is that we had feedback from the public that they wanted more time for discussion in their theme groups so we changed the meeting format to accommodate that request.

- The information provided to participants was central to meaningful participation. From the advertisements about event logistics in English and Spanish to The Peoples Bus, the communication materials drew people to the meetings and events and inspired them to discuss the issues relevant to the plan.

- Participants were kept informed of the projects progress and the effect of their input on the plan’s evolution through regular email contact as well as blogposts and Council agenda items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Common Roots Urban Farm Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing group</td>
<td>Cities &amp; Environment Unit and Partners for Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada (population 350,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key question/problem</td>
<td>How can members of the public help transform a derelict site into an urban farm, then operate and sustain it on an ongoing basis mainly through volunteer work and donations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample methods</td>
<td>Six public-engagement sessions in which urban farm leaders and citizens shared information; collaborative site design among participants; the creation of three “hub” subcommittees; an information-kiosk design contest; regular volunteer “work parties.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Guiding principles were drafted to develop the land. Broad awareness, understanding and support for the urban-farm project were garnered. Site-programming ideas were detailed and site-operations recommendations were drafted. The urban farm’s design was finalized. A broad, inclusive network of community partners and volunteers was formed that will build, operate and sustain the urban farm into the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact level</td>
<td>City wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time frame</td>
<td>November 2010–ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People engaged</td>
<td>Hundreds of local citizens, including: residents; non-profit organizations; municipal, provincial and federal government officials; police force members; youth; school staff; urban-agricultural specialists, gardeners and landscapers; health care workers; university students, members of the aboriginal community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cdha.nshealth.ca/involving-patients-citizens/community-projects-initiatives/common-roots-urban-farm">www.cdha.nshealth.ca/involving-patients-citizens/community-projects-initiatives/common-roots-urban-farm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Problem and Challenge
How can members of the public help transform a derelict site into an urban farm, then operate and sustain it on an ongoing basis mainly through volunteer work and donations? In 2010, a 3.5-acre site at the corner of Bell Road and Robie Street in Halifax was given to Capital Health to accommodate the possible future expansion of the adjacent hospital. Through Partners for Care, Capital Health wanted to find an interim community use for the site with a strong connection to health. Because the land was part of the original Halifax Common and formerly home to Queen Elizabeth High School, Capital Health recognized how much the community valued it. Thanks to the burgeoning local-food movement, many citizens expressed interest in developing an urban farm on the site. Partners for Care seized the chance to promote health education, nutritious food and active recreation.

In November of 2010, Partners for Care hired a co-ordinator to guide the project and lead fundraising. Soon after, Cities & Environment Unit (CEU), a community-planning and research unit at Dalhousie University, initiated broad community engagement to plan, design and build the Common Roots Urban Farm. Six public forums were held where community members shared their ideas, knowledge and designs for the farm.

The challenge was to develop an urban farm that united myriad voices. The process aimed to mindfully listen to all participants’ suggestions, then act on the best ones.

The Role of Public Participation
Community input was essential in deciding how to transform the site into an urban farm and what activities and spaces would be most educational in promoting health, specifically food security and sovereignty. Six public-engagement sessions attracted a broad range of ages and occupations, many of whom had knowledge about traditional and urban agriculture, plants, livestock and design. The sessions helped develop a clear vision and long-term strategy for the urban farm.

In the past year, three subcommittee “hubs” were formed to guide the design (they are now one advisory committee): Therapeutic Hub (Health); Urban Agriculture Hub (Agriculture); and Arts, Culture and Community Hub (Education). Part of the Common Roots Urban Farm is designed for the nearby hospital’s patients, staff and visitors. This includes a plaza near the hospital entrance, universal-access gardens and horticulture-therapy programming (the Therapeutic Hub oversees these). Most of the site is dedicated to healthy food production. There are market gardens with cold frames and hoop houses, composting and seeding/propogation areas, washing stations and cool storage (the Urban Agriculture Hub oversees these). Finally, the most important part of the farm is that all visitors, volunteers and participants will be positively impacted by this “grow our own health” project. As such, the Community Hub will greet visitors, engage the community and co-ordinate volunteers, among other duties.

An email sent from a recent “work party” participant to the Common Roots Urban Farm project co-ordinator sums up the passion for this project: “Two of my sons, their girlfriends, several neighbours and I were all at the site on Friday to help build garden beds. Everyone had glowing reports of camaraderie and possibility. Thanks for creating the conditions that support all members of our community to dream and engage!”
Public Participation Methods
The public participation process involved the following steps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session type</th>
<th>Purpose of session</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Session outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. General community session | Ideas for the site | Nov. 20, 2010 | • Gained consensus to create an urban farm  
• Established guiding principles for the project |
| 2. Issue-driven community session | Site programming | Jan. 26, 2011 | • Main components/ideas for the farm  
• Recognition that it is a limited site and not appropriate for livestock  
• Site amenities  
• Multi-purpose programming |
| 2. Issue-driven community session | Farm organization | Feb. 2, 2011  | • Volunteer staff will be needed for ongoing operations  
• Collective farming efforts  
• Build on community partnerships |
| 2. Issue-driven community session | Food distribution | Feb. 9, 2011  | • Food-distribution priorities based on need  
• Space designed for maximum yield of food |
| 2. Issue-driven community session | Design concept | March 2, 2010 | • Key elements needed on-site: support buildings, entry/gateways, gardens, public gathering spaces  
• Draft design of site will feature all valued ideas from public forums |
| 2. Issue-driven community session | Design review | March 9, 2010 | • Established design concept  
• Designed moveable shelters to provide working structures for the urban farm and potential future farm projects |
| 3. Open work sessions | Between all of the public sessions, open work sessions were held, where members of the public representing different interests helped develop the design of the urban farm. | | |
| 4. Individual meetings | Throughout the process, multiple individual meetings were organized to gain additional input. | | |
| 5. Two concentrated design sessions | Final design development | January–February 2012 | • Finalized the site design with CEU and hub committees  
• Drafted a plan that met the desired programming expressed by the public |
| 6. Conclusion | Public-engagement findings were summarized and presented. | March–June 2012 | |

During the past year, the public has participated in the following ways:

1) Art fence. Working with the theory that the best defence is involvement, rather than build a physical fence to reduce vandalism, project leaders decided to
involves the community—particularly youth and priority demographics—to create something unique on the site; by doing so, the hope is that community ownership increases and vandalism decreases. The broad design is crowd-sourced, and the build will be through work parties, which everyone is welcome to attend.

2) **Information-kiosk design contest.** This crowd-sourcing project encourages the public to come up with unique designs for the urban farm’s volunteer-staffed information kiosk. A Facebook page was created for the contest, which is being sponsored by Capital Health. A $250 prize will be awarded to the winning entry.

3) **Seasonal “work parties.”** From April to October, regular work parties will be held at the site, during which volunteers and visitors will handle whatever farm duties are needed, from planting seedlings to pruning to harvesting. At one work party held in early June of 2012, more than 200 enthusiastic volunteers showed up to move soil in wheelbarrows to the garden beds.

4) **Garden-plot donations.** The goal is for community members and groups to donate annually whatever amount they wish for the use of a Common Roots Urban Garden plot. Such groups as the Halifax Regional Police, Byrony House, Citadel High School, Immigrant Settlement and Integration Services and Phoenix House have already done so.

**Uniqueness of the Project**

1) **What was the decision statement and how was the public involved in framing the statement?**

The program arose out of the laundry list of desired elements put forward by the public. Our project is unique in Canada because of the combination of elements in this garden: it’s therapeutic, a community garden, a market garden and a public open space. The public expressed a desire for all of these elements, something that would never have happened if the concept had been left up to a single designer.

2) **In what ways did public participation improve the decision?**

The public-participation process combined the knowledge of many residents, stakeholders and agriculture experts. It improved decision-making because it tapped into the community’s expertise and interest. The process allowed community members to take ownership of the project; as a result, public interest continues to build. The community is excited about the Common Roots Urban Farm, and hundreds of people are willing to volunteer to bring it to life.

3) **How did public participation contribute to the resolution of the problem?**

The knowledge provided by participants was crucial in resolving detailed design problems. For example, many people who attended the public-information sessions didn’t think it was a good idea to have livestock at the urban farm. A public discussion on the topic examined the logistics and quality-of-life concerns of having livestock. Based on this meeting, participants were united in the decision not to include livestock. Many other concerns were resolved in the same manner.

4) **Describe the innovative participation techniques that were used.**

Each public-information session focused on certain objectives that helped guide the process; this meant that participants could focus on specific topics and build on their ideas each week. They were asked to give feedback by attending the sessions, phoning, emailing or arranging a personal meeting. This was an exhaustive process but one that resulted in richer outcomes. At each session, large-format posters displaying the ideas
that had been generated in the previous session was displayed.

5) **How did the project advance the practice of public participation?**

The participation process helped cross many boundaries and affect what we can accomplish as a city. The number of people who participated was incredible because participants were given many opportunities to share in different ways. As a result, a larger number of people with different backgrounds were able to engage. This process, which is ongoing through the implementation of the site plan, allowed for true consensus building across a broad spectrum.

6) **What evaluative and monitoring techniques were used throughout the project to provide evidence of publication participation?**

At the CEU sessions, attendees were asked, "Who is not here who should be?" Feedback was requested verbally, then written down to monitor the effectiveness of the process. Also, a “parking lot”—a piece of paper posted on the wall where additional questions were written that were answered later—was effective. Current farm staff members are using this same strategy to help gather questions and feedback from the volunteers they’re training. The information kiosk will have a comments box and a chalkboard where visitors can leave feedback. There is interest in working with CEU to do an annual design review with the public so more input can be gathered about what’s working and what could work better.

**Project Results**

There is overwhelming community consensus that this site should be an urban farm connected to the hospital. The more than 200 volunteers who showed up to take part in the first work party in early June are testament to the community’s passion for the Common Roots Urban Farm. The project is uniting a broad range of social, cultural, agricultural and educational networks. The organizational distribution and physical design have been developed; the next step is to resolve specific technical issues and proceed with building and operation. The citizens of Halifax want this project to come to fruition and are willing to put in the extra effort required to make it happen.

**Alignment with IAP2 Core Values**

1) **How did the project ensure that those most affected by the decision or problem were involved?**

The Common Roots Urban Farm project affects a broad range of people and organizations, including patients at the adjacent hospital; Capital Health employees; local residents; students and staff at the nearby high school; local food producers and food activists; non-profit organizations that deal with food distribution; and individuals who rely on these organizations to meet their dietary needs. Common Roots Urban Farm organizers recognized that involving the public would make this project better and stronger. Public engagement would make the project more likely to happen and build community and project networks. As a result, CEU and Partners for Care held public-engagement sessions that were open to all interested parties. They also ran smaller work sessions, while Partners for Care engaged with local governments and organizations that could be impacted by the decisions made in the public sessions.

2) **How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public’s contributions?**

The Common Roots Urban Farm project sought a level of public engagement that ran deeper than mere consultation. Participants in the public sessions actually drove the content of the final plan. Rather than creating the plan, then seeking public input, the
planning process asked the public to begin designing the farm they envisioned from the ground up. Public contributions at the engagement sessions informed the development of the farm’s guiding principles and program. Public input helped CEU and Partners for Care understand what kind of farm would work best on the site, to what extent the community would support it and where community resources existed to help make the project an ongoing success.

3) How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated?
Interestingly, it was members of the public who laid out key guiding values that insist upon sustainability, such as allowing community groups, rather than just individuals, to have garden plots and choosing organic farming practices over the use of chemicals. The project ensured that these interests were communicated during the six public-engagement sessions that covered all aspects of design and operation.

4) How did the project seek out and facilitate the involvement of those most affected?
Participants in the consultation process were sought through these channels: social media and email networks; regular media; posters; speaking one-on-one with citizens at the local farmers’ market; making announcements at the nearby high school; and contacting community organizations. An emphasis was placed on involving youth in the community. Those who couldn’t attend the sessions were invited to providing feedback to CEU by email or in person. The number of sessions held ensured that a broad range of people could attend at least some of the sessions, if not all of them.

5) How did the project seek input from participants on how they wished to participate?
Participants were welcome to give feedback in whatever way they felt comfortable doing so. Surveys were distributed to those attending the public-engagement sessions. People were asked to voluntarily join design committees so they could offer input on the farm’s design. We continue to seek public input, offering an “engagement menu” in an attempt to make this project accessible to everyone who is interested in it.

6) How did the information provided to participants support or contribute to meaningful participation?
The public sessions strove to achieve transparency. Each began with an overview of the situation, including the history of the site, what had occurred in previous sessions and what the project team hoped to learn from participants. Maps of the site and surrounding area were provided, and CEU and Partners for Care staff were on hand to answer questions. Participants were urged to voice their ideas, often in smaller groups focused on specific topics. For example, at the site-programming session, participants could choose to join groups discussing different needs such as buildings, animals and plants. This let them provide input in their area of expertise or visit multiple groups to offer ideas on each topic.

7) How did the communication of the project results ensure that participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem?
Right from the start, participants were made aware that their input would directly influence the design of the Common Roots Urban Farm guiding principles, as well as the site’s programming and design. Attendees at multiple public sessions saw each phase of the urban farm plan. The plan was shaped and altered as public input was received, then presented back to participants.
Common Roots
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Public design session, March 2011, photo CEU.

First work party, June 2012.

First work party, June 2012.

Second work party, June 2012.

Land allocation recommendation public design session, February 2011. Graphic by CEU.

Final Design for Common Roots Urban Farm, April 2012.
## The Problem and Challenge

In the history of the City of Edmonton, there are few issues contested as long and as passionately as the City Centre Airport lands. For decades, debate has swirled over the need for and role of the airport, and whether or not an airport, or another development, would be the highest, best use of the 217-hectare land located just north of the City’s core.

In 2008, Edmonton’s City Council started to re-examine the issue, and conducted a detailed review that addressed the historical importance, economic impact, market feasibility, and medevac services associated with the airport site. At that time, the City also held an in-depth public consultation to hear what citizens felt was the best use for the land. After a passionate public debate, in June 2009 Council voted for a phased closure of the airport so it could be redeveloped into a world-class, sustainable community for 30,000 residents.

Residents who saw the land as an opportunity to combat urban sprawl and develop an eco-friendly community were pleased and anxious to see the City move ahead. However, supporters of the airport continued the debate, and looked for ways to reverse the decision.

It was in this climate that the City embarked on developing the Master Plan for the City Centre Redevelopment.

Council’s vision is to develop a world-class community that offers unprecedented opportunities to live in an eco-friendly, sustainable, transit-oriented community that offers a range of healthy, connected lifestyle options. This transformative project stands to create a
community like no other. The scale of the development, and the vision for sustainability, make this community a leading case study for cities around the world. It is a vision that immediately drew, and continues to draw, public attention locally and internationally.

The process of selecting the best planning team and ultimately devising the plan needed to build on this public interest, while maintaining a strong approach to public engagement. Therefore, the goal of the community engagement was to ensure that the citizens of Edmonton were consulted, listened to, and to the greatest extent possible, see their ideas reflected in the final Master Plan.

**The Role of Public Participation**
Given the high level of interest in the land, it was critical that participants felt listened to, heard and respected. Therefore, the public engagement was designed to deliver a process that:

1. Enabled people to ‘recognize themselves’ in the final Master Plan.
2. Allowed multiple opportunities to participate in in-depth engagement opportunities.
3. Was dialogue based, disciplined on project scope, and gathered the information City Council needed to make a decision.
4. Was based in integrity, inclusive, and demonstrated both breadth and depth in its execution and report back.

There were two phases of community engagement for the Master Plan:

1. The City held an international competition for an urban design that would meet vigorous guidelines. Out of the 33 submissions, 5 international teams were short-listed and their conceptual plans along with a five minute video explaining their concepts were presented to the public in February 2011 so that citizens could provide comment on the different plans. Those comments were given to the City’s Selection Committee and to City Council as information to consider when making a final selection.
2. The second phase, after Perkins + Will was selected to develop the Master Plan, was to provide input on the Master Plan.

Though the focus of the public engagement plan was on the development of the Master Plan, people we talked with would often bring up “out-of-scope” issues, for example, neighbouring communities would bring up issues in their area they wanted addressed, or local businesses would want to revisit keeping the lands as an airport rather than an urban development. We listened to all comments, but we were also very clear on what the Master Plan could, and couldn’t accomplish. This helped people understand the process, and not set up false expectations that couldn’t be met through this process.

The community engagement also had a role in healing the community after the closure of the airport was announced. Those most ‘wounded’ by the decision to close the airport were engaged to fully participate in its transformation, in an effort to help the public move past the decision and move ahead together.

**Public Participation Methods**
Throughout the community engagement, the City of Edmonton ensured that all levels of engagement were met. Citizens were informed through newsletters, newspaper articles, videos, blog posts, social media and online information; consulted through open houses, online feedback forums, and presentations; collaborated with through the Stakeholder Advisory Committee, and in-depth meetings with specific topic groups. Specific engagement activities were tailored to best suit the type of information being shared and sought:

1. For the 2011 Master Plan team selection:
   a. An online survey
   b. Displays at City Hall, that were staffed during peak hours
   c. Four public meetings held throughout the city
   d. A blog post to spark discussion
2. After Perkins+Will was selected to develop the Master Plan, a Stakeholder Advisory Committee was struck for those most affected by the City Centre Redevelopment. Led by a City Councillor, it plays an active and ongoing role in the development of the Master Plan, and is made up of community leagues adjacent to the development, NAIT (an adjacent post secondary institution), three area business associations, an Aviation museum, and nearby shopping centre.

3. For the 2010-11 Master Plan development:
   a. A series of three public workshops, held October 2011, February 2012 and May 2012 (each series had three workshops in different geographic areas of the city)
   b. Stakeholder group meetings (met with over 90 groups in addition to the above noted Stakeholder Committee).
   c. All presentations were available online, along with a form for providing comments.
   d. Displays at prominent events, such as the City’s Connections 2012, where citizens were invited to a day-long event to learn about civic projects and services, and at City Hall.
   e. Videos to inform people on the project and encourage them to participate.

**Uniqueness of the Project**

Given the emotion around the issue, interactions with the community were based on proven theories for healing communities and building relationships. However, what made this project unique is how much attention and effort was put into making this a valuable experience for the community, and how much the project has benefited from strong public involvement.

Public consultations can appear superficial. In this case, residents truly had the opportunity to participate in a variety of ways and under different topics. The entire design was meant to reflect the theme of the administration: Not business as usual. For example, having the community comment on who the City hired to lead the Master Plan development sent a strong signal that this was a different level of consultation than Edmontonians had seen before.

Meaningful and valuable participation was achieved by organizing our efforts into clusters of interest, such as affordable housing, urban agriculture, public art, etc. This led to in-depth conversations on specific topics, such as placement of schools, creating intentional communities, and development guidelines. By meeting with groups several times, the project team could dig deeper and ensure the public’s concerns and solutions were understood. This community engagement also ensured that the public could see the impact the consultation had on the final results. Again, multiple engagements proved effective, as they could see the evolution in the Master Plan as it was being developed, instead of waiting to see the final product months after they were consulted. This gave the public a real look at how their input was being incorporated during the process.

This also allowed residents to grow with the project. In many instances, the ideas and technologies being looked at for this Master Plan are new to Edmonton. This meant there was a significant learning curve for Edmontonians, particularly as it related to a sophisticated environmental sustainability agenda and cutting-edge urban design practices. Over time, residents came to learn these new ideas, and were able to have conversations at a higher level than could ever have been achieved with only one point of contact.

**Project Results**

Though the Master Plan is still under development, the public have seen the process and can ‘recognize themselves’ in what has been done so far. There are tangible, significant changes to the Master Plan that are a direct result of the community engagement, and have made the project stronger and more innovative as a result.
The community engagement also developed a highly engaged group that now shares the City’s vision for this development, and has clearly stated the City must ‘stay the course’ on this project as they see it heading in the right direction.

By allowing multiple opportunities to participate in in-depth engagement opportunities, the City and the community have built long-term relationships. This level of buy-in is making the people we engaged with more than just interested parties who want their concerns heard. They are now becoming community champions for the project, who want to be involved with the project on an ongoing basis. They now want to play an active role in helping it succeed after the Master Plan is done and development starts.

There has also been significant healing in the community as a result of the community engagement. The focus has shifted from an airport debate to developing a great, sustainable community that Edmontonians can be proud of. This was evident as the project team worked through the workshop series, as participants focused less on the airport issue, and engaged more in discussions on what they wanted to see the development’s Master Plan.

As part of evaluating the engagement’s success, the City distributed a survey after each of the public workshops to seek feedback on their experience. The results showed strong satisfaction with the process. Over the three workshop series, 93% (October 2011), 94% (February 2012) and 93% (May 2012) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statements: The workshop was helpful, valuable; I understood the purpose of the workshop; and; the facilitators were helpful.

Alignment with Core Values

Core Value 1: How did the project ensure that those most affected by the decision or problem were involved?

Stakeholders for this project came from many areas. There were those in the area: neighbouring communities, businesses and business associations, a post secondary school, museums, etc. directly affected. Then, there were stakeholders interested in specific areas of development, such as environmentally sustainable innovations, arts and culture, social innovations, transit expansion, housing and housing support services, and school boards. Finally, there was a great deal of interest all around the city in the community and the public amenities such as the new city park.

Targeted groups in the area were invited to join the Stakeholder Advisory Committee. This included: Kingsway Mall, NAIT, three are business associations (Kingsway, Alberta Avenue and Inglewood), the Aviation Museum, five area neighborhoods (Prince Charles, Prince Rupert, Inglewood, Spruce Avenue and Westwood), Workers Compensation Board and Canadian National Railway.

As a group, they could discuss common, and competing, interests in the project, which helped the project team understand their issues. It also gave committee members an opportunity to hear from others affected by the project, gain perspective on the larger picture, and help all involved see how they can contribute to the project’s vision.

The City had ongoing relationships with many of the stakeholders with interest in specific areas, such as affordable housing and social agencies. The project team made it standard practice to ask at every session, “Do you have any suggestions on who else we should be talking with?” This strategy worked extremely well. At the outset, the plan was to engage with 30 stakeholder groups, and in the end the team ended up meeting with over 90 groups, most of which were referrals from the public.

Finally, to capture the ideas and comments from the broader community, the project team hosted workshops throughout the city and by offering input options online (which is done often in Edmonton, and has come to be an expected and valued way Edmontonians engage).
Core Value 2: How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public’s contributions?

The Selection Committee expressed that comments gathered in the first phase of the community engagement – the gathering of the public’s comment on the five shortlisted teams – were very helpful to them.

In the second phase, development of the Master Plan, the public’s input resulted in real changes to the design. Some of those changes included: parking around the community park added capacity for people visiting the area; the built form plan was changed to make housing choices more affordable; concerns over the project’s overall financial viability prompted the team to dedicate more of the land to development without compromising the amenities, and novel ideas from the public on snow removal are being incorporated.

These are not small changes. Too often public consultation only results in small changes such as adding more trees or widening sidewalks. This community engagement changed the very form and function of many elements of the Master Plan, and people really could “see themselves” as the team worked towards the final product.

Core Value 3: How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated?

The community engagement plan specifically aimed to allow the public to have multiple opportunities to engage with the project team. This allowed us to check back, to see if we were interpreting their feedback as they intended, and identify if more adjustments were required.

Another key element was giving the public access to project influencers. The Stakeholder Advisory Committee is chaired by a member of City Council, and senior members of the project team were at all the public engagement meetings/workshops. This ensured decision-makers were getting the public’s comments first-hand, and understood their needs.

This also helped with identifying community needs that were out-of-scope. Though the Master Plan will not be able to address those needs, the key issues received were provided to appropriate civic departments for their consideration, and care can be taken to ensure that the plan is built so that it complements what could be happening in neighbouring areas.

Core Value 4: How did the project seek out and facilitate the involvement of those most affected?

The City did not want the high emotion from the decision to close the airport to be a barrier to participation. Therefore, members of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee were invited through a personal phone call or invitation, so that the City could demonstrate that we were open and ready to involve everyone, despite their stance on the airport issue. The Stakeholder Advisory Committee then provided valuable insights into who else the City should be engaging as the project proceeded; the members were on the committee as representatives for their communities and organizations, thereby providing a direct conduit of information to the most affected groups.

The broader community was reached through print and online advertisements and social media (through the City’s Twitter and Facebook accounts).

The project team was also able to take advantage of the high-profile history of the project. On Twitter, a hashtag used during the airport debate (#ecc) became an easy way to tag our social media posts to reach those who had a vested interest. The history and discussion also made it attractive to local media, which was used to generate a great deal of media interest on the public consultation, which helped inform residents on how to get involved and stay informed. Quarterly reports to Council also helped maintain interest in the project and progress that was being made and ensured that the public was informed and engaged as the initiative moved ahead.
The team also made it easier to be involved by offering options to participate on the City’s website, as Edmonton’s population is very active online. Also, public workshops were held at transit-friendly locations throughout the city to make it easier for people to attend.

**Core Value 5: How did the project seek input from participants on how they wished to participate?**

The community engagement plan recognized from the outset that different groups would want different levels of involvement. Care was taken to offer a range of opportunities. For example, those who just wanted to give input could easily do so online, while those more interested could attend several stakeholder meetings and workshops. The Stakeholder Advisory Committee also reviewed the public engagement activities and made recommendations.

The project team also tailored the engagement to the specific needs of each group. For example, the project has a large urban agriculture component, which was discussed more deeply with the City’s permaculture groups. The project team endeavored to have their content experts available at the consultation focusing on that topic. In addition, on some very ‘hot’ topics, such as transportation, the lead planners met repeatedly with affected stakeholders to ensure they fully understood the concerns being addressed.

An interesting aspect of the public engagement is that people would move in and out of the levels of participation. For example, many people would simply observe, but on a particular topic, would advise the project team on a particular opportunity they felt we should pursue.

**Core Value 6: How did the information provided to participants support or contribute to meaningful participation?**

For participants that we met with several times, such as the Stakeholder Advisory Committee, information was sent out in advance of the meetings so that they had time to read, review and discuss with the groups they represented. Materials were custom-designed for different stakeholder groups to ensure that participants were offered the depth of material they were looking to receive. At the workshops, the presentation was broken into several sections, with the project expert on that area handling their area of expertise. This ensured the public was able to speak to the individual who knew the most about a particular element of the Master Plan.

All materials for the public meetings were posted online. Community members could read a synopsis of reports/events, but could also access the full version of presentations and reports.

**Core Value 7: How did the communication of the project results ensure that participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem?**

The plan to allow for multiple opportunities to participate meant that the public could attend several meetings, and see for themselves the changes made to the Master Plan. This allowed them to clarify their needs if they felt the changes were not sufficient, or give the project team feedback that the plan was on course.

By making the key project leaders available at public meetings, the community knew they were talking with someone who was not just a messenger, but someone who had the ability to make changes based on their comments.

The project team put out a newsletter advising the group on the outcomes from the previous community engagement activities, and news on the project’s progress.

The final report on the Master Plan community engagement has not been finalized, but when it is, the results will be shared publicly. Participants who provided their contact information will also be sent a synopsis of the results, including details on how their input has been incorporated.
Council confirms plan lines with vision

Visions is showing it citizens should be the
planing to build the City Cen ter after
wass nee the last of three public
meetings from Council and the approval
of the Capital Region Be a planning. The
AD full text continuance will occur
May 16th.

"The approval of the City Council and the
Capital Region Board is another key step
on our path to achieving Council’s vision of
building a vital, healthy, sustainable and
family-oriented community in the heart of
our city,” says Plb Sand, the City’s executive
Director of the project.

The project team continues to provide regular
updates to the members of Council and
various other aspects of the project as it
progresses. This includes updates regarding
the implementation of the plan and any
pragmatic aspects such as NAD who are interested in significant
capital works of this project on their campus. The City’s
council, LRT, sustainability, education, recreation
venues and targets, and municipal engagement
of household aviation interests and illegal issues.

Participants like latest look at
redevelopment plan

"I’m excited to see
a development plan
that incorporates
‘green’ principles and
accommodates families
who want to live
close to downtown.”
— Tino McCullagh

City encouraged to
stay the course

Trina McCullagh looks what the sees in the latest
plan proposed for the City Centre Redevelopment project.

"I am very happy to see that development that incorporates green principles and
accommodates families who want to live close to downtown,” said the
residents of the neighboring community. "It shows the
dedication of the city to improving the quality of life and
addressing the needs of the residents. The plan looks good and
we look forward to seeing it implemented."

The residents were especially pleased with the new
proposals for public spaces and the inclusion of
community centers.

Above: Picture from the Edmonton Journal showing Mayor Stephen Mandel showing designs to children.

Beside: Community members became project champions through the community engagement process.

Below: Over 500 people came to City Hall to see the displays over two weeks.
## CASE STUDY SUMMARY TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>Edmonton Downtown Light Rail Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>City of Edmonton &amp; Steer Davies Gleave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Edmonton, Canada. Metro Population ~ 1,160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>The proposals for the routing of the Downtown Light Rail Transit (LRT) line would see a section of the line run along Harbin Road through Edmonton’s China Gate continuing through the surrounding Chinese and local communities and adjacent to the local community facilities on the corridor. Following the initial design development and associated public engagement, the local Chinese and surrounding community groups along a two block section of the route felt that they hadn’t being sufficiently involved and consulted in the development of the proposals for the LRT line, raising concerns about the proposal for the route and the associated impacts to community facilities and the surrounding community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Conducted three location-based community workshops focused on the Chinese and surrounding communities. Transparent workshops encouraged community members to work in groups to identify the issues and important facilities within the community, and they helped to understand the constraints in developing an LRT through the area and design potential options within the proposed and adjacent corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>The results of the community workshops gave the local community groups a voice in the design of the LRT options. They emphasised the identity of the area, the importance of the community facilities, access to the existing buildings for residents, visitors and emergency services, the importance of the Chinese community facilities and walking accessibility. The workshops also provided participants with information on the objectives and challenges faced during the design of the LRT alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Local, Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>5 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>40 Community leaders and residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Problem and Challenge

Background

In June 2010, City Council approved an LRT corridor on 102 Avenue from 109 Street to 95 Street as part of the Capital City Downtown Planning Study. Following this approval, Transportation Services initiated work to develop the LRT Concept Planning study for the approved corridor, defining major infrastructure features, alignment, pedestrian /vehicle /cyclist circulation, and station locations. The development of the LRT alignment and the proposals for the stops through the heart of downtown Edmonton was inevitably going to be emotive and problematic for both those impacted by the route and the decision makers.

An initial Concept Plan recommendation was identified and shared with the public, stakeholders, and Council in December 2010. Following further consultation this was refined by early 2011, with additional consultation undertaken with internal and external stakeholders completed. Following consideration at Council in May 2011, Council directed administration to complete additional analysis and consultation for the LRT on a two block section of the route, that ran predominantly through the local Chinese community.

The Challenge

Throughout the iterations of the developing concept designs the City and the consultant team had met with effected stakeholders, and undertaken public open house events to communicate the options, the proposed design for the corridor and the new style of low floor LRT being proposed.

The challenge now facing the City and the consultant team was that although consultation had been undertaken at each step of the process, this hadn’t resulted in sufficient active engagement with the local community and in particular the local Chinese community on this final 2 block section of the corridor.

It was therefore important to ensure the community felt engaged and given the voice to actively inform the planning process, that they understood the constraints imposed by the LRT design, the wider LRT network and the decision making process. At the heart of the consultation was the need to facilitate and promote dialog between planners, decision makers, engineers and local communities.

Edmonton’s Chinese Community

The study area includes significant historical and cultural connections to Edmonton’s Chinese Community. A number of key community resources including the China Gate, recreational centres, businesses, and cultural centres are located along the 102 Avenue Corridor. In addition, the City has identified this area as a prime area for revitalization under the Quarters Revitalization plan, which envisions a transformation of the area over the next 15-20 years into an environmentally sustainable, walkable, diverse community with appealing design, inclusive housing, and green spaces.
The Role of Public Participation

The team developed a strategy whereby they would start again with the development of the LRT design through the community. The plan for the public engagement was firstly developed with the key stakeholders in the community and clearly set out how the public would be involved and how their input would be used to inform the decision making process. This focused on hearing from the community what was important to them today, what issues they had in the area with or without the LRT and what could be improved. The community was then involved in the development of different designs options for the LRT through the area. The team report back on the evaluation of the options developed and the recommendation and design to be taken forward.

In undertaking the public consultation an important element was the communication of the aims and objectives of the wider LRT network (24km route agreed and the remaining 200m was proposed to run through their community), the difference in the design from the existing high floor system and the proposals for a more integrated community focused LRT network.

Public Participation Process

The consultation process developed and agreed with the key stakeholders for the community involved five distinct phases:-

- Pre Consultation Interviews - Developed and agreed public involvement plan
- Workshop 1 - Walk through (issues and opportunities)
- Workshop 2 - Development of LRT design options
- Information Session - Evaluation of options and recommendation
- Public Hearing - Opportunity to comment at the council committee

Pre Consultation Interviews

Key stakeholder groups were engaged to advise on the status of the project, the role and timing of public input opportunities and to seek input on areas of more significant interest/impact to these stakeholder groups. Feedback was sought on the draft public involvement plan to strengthen the planned approach, timelines, and identify other stakeholder groups.

Workshop 1

This workshop began with a walking tour of the area which allowed residents to identify key landmarks and areas of importance. The workshop provided a forum to discuss key themes in the area and for the members of the community to communicate their issues and opportunities along the corridor.

A workshop followed to allow the community to collectively in small groups discuss the walking tour then mark up a map of the area with the local community facilities and issues and opportunities. The output from the session was the marked up maps from each of the teams.
Workshop 2

The second workshop provided participants with an opportunity to understand the benefits, constraints, and impacts of the various LRT designs through the area. Individuals worked out specific designs while considering the overall impacts and benefits. This was informed by the representation of what was heard from the community at workshop 1 and the comments received on maps of the area.

This interactive segment of the workshop allowed group participation to prioritize cross-section features in the form of a puzzle exercise. These were then used to develop options for the LRT both at grade (street level) or underground using jigsaw pieces. The outputs of this workshop was to understand the communities priorities for use of the available road space and any acceptable impacts to buildings along the corridor. The exercise also enquired of the community if they felt that the cultural identity of the corridor should be reinforced.

Information Session

The session consisted of sharing information on the evaluation of the options developed by the community, the recommendation of the City and the consultant team based on the evaluation and the minor refinement of the recommended option to further mitigate the impacts and issues identified from the first workshop. The session also informed the community on the recommendations that would go to the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to ensure residents and members were aware of and able to share insights and opinions with Council.

Public Hearing

As part of the formal decision-making process with City Council, a public hearing was held to give residents and stakeholder groups an opportunity to share comments on the plans directly with decision-makers.

Removing Barriers

A special outreach strategy was implemented, interpretation services were arranged. Consultation events were advertised in local Chinese language newspapers and information pieces were all translated.
Uniqueness of the Project

The project provided the local community with a significant opportunity to understand the issues, constraints the City faced in developing the proposals for the new style of LRT system proposed, and the opportunity for the City to convey the community shaping benefits that could come from the LRT system and the proposals for a stop within the community. It also resulted in the community developing the design for the LRT through the corridor.

The public engagement process resulted in significant modifications from the original concept, addressing many of the concerns raised during the consultation. The new design being based upon the consensus of the designs produced by the community themselves. This included, additional parking and traffic lanes; LRT alignment revised to avoid major property acquisition; stop position moved; architectural features were proposed to reflect the unique cultural aspects of the area; and, the pedestrian environment was revised to provide appropriate mid-block crossing points.

To aid the process the team used an number of innovative techniques which included a ‘walking tour’ which brought stakeholders and planners together from the beginning. It gave planners a sense of what concerns and ideas stakeholders had, and gave stakeholders a firm idea of what the planners were trying to achieve in their neighbourhood.

For the second workshop session the team had developed a cross section puzzle and a jigsaw puzzle to help the participants allocate the use of the available road space and then develop design options for the two identified corridors.

The option ‘puzzle’ exercise gave stakeholders insight into the various constraints planners were working under to deliver the project as well as the various options considered. This brought stakeholders firmly into the decision making process and provided a sense of ownership and consensus towards the correct option to be taken forward.

This element of the process was very well received, with all the groups managing to develop designs for the four options.

The public participation process advanced the practice of involvement through the development of a focused involvement strategy using innovative tools to engage and involve the local community. It provided opportunities for the communities collective knowledge and ideas to be incorporated within the new design for the LRT through the community. Although not intentional at the outset, the design produced came in the most part from the communities own designs produced at the second workshop.

To monitor the public engagement process, it was documented throughout with all the meeting notes, comments from the community used to inform the on-going LRT design. The most remarkable output was that it resulted in the community developing the design for the LRT through the corridor.
Project Results

The process was highly successful and resulted in the redesign of the proposed LRT alignment through the community, the design being based upon the designs developed at the second workshop with the community. This mitigated the majority of the impacts and concerns raised by the community that where possible given the constraints of the LRT design and its connectivity to the continuing LRT line at each end of this section of the route. The outputs from the process included:

Pre Consultation Interviews – Agreement on the public involvement process the sessions and the communities level of involvement in the decision making process

Workshop 1 – The team heard from the community the importance of the local facilities, the need for continued vehicle access to the Elders mansions and walking connectivity across the corridor.

Workshop 2 -. The four groups at the workshop developed four designs two for each corridor considered one underground and one at grade. The consensus of these design (three out of the four) in each case where used by the team

Information Session – The City and the consultant team shared the evaluation of the four options developed. The proposals for the recommended corridor and the minor changes proposed by the team to those of the collective design to best mitigate impacts along the corridor and provide an acceptable solution for the LRT.

Public Hearing - . The community were then able to continue to raise their remaining concerns to council at a public hearing to approve or reject the recommendations.

Alignment with IAP2 Core Values

The IAP2 core values are reflected in the project outcomes. Specifically:

1. The process was firstly developed and agreed with key community stakeholders.
2. The project provided direct, targeted consultation into communities impacted by the development of the LRT scheme. Including translation of information and promotions into the local Chinese language.
3. The methods and tools developed enabled the participants to design their own LRT solutions for the corridor.
4. The communities involvement resulted in a design primarily developed by the participants with only minor refinement by the project team to help further mitigate the potential impacts.
Completed Cross Section Puzzle

Completed LRT design Puzzle

Photo Montage of Corridor
1. Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>I-69 Driven by Texans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization Group Location</td>
<td>Texas Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>The Texas portion of Interstate Highway 69 (I-69) is a 700+ mile interstate starting in Northeast Texas, running south along the Texas gulf coast, terminating at the Texas – Mexico border. I-69 Texas is part of a national interstate system that runs through eight states.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>In 1991, the U.S. Congress passed legislation creating Interstate I-69. Since this time, some citizens and communities have been working towards the development of I-69 in Texas. Others have been hesitant to support the project because transportation planners haven’t always fully understood the needs and concerns of citizens and communities. The key challenge for this project was developing I-69 Texas with the input and support of citizens and communities in the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Citizen advisory committees, open houses, community presentations, multilingual print material, website, video, social media, Quick Response codes, citizen comment cards, online commenting, community brochure distributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>A citizen-authored plan for I-69 development was created and the first section of I-69 Texas was posted in South Texas with the support of citizens and local communities. These citizen plans will help continue I-69 development while considering the needs and concerns of affected communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Because of the proposed 700+ mile interstate route, this project has a massive impact area that includes Northeast/East Texas, Texas gulf coast communities with the project area continuing into South Texas to the Mexican border.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Nearly 150 citizens served as members on planning committees, over 5,000 citizens were reached through citizen-led community meetings, open houses and other public participation activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The Problem and Challenge

In 1991, the U.S. Congress passed legislation creating Interstate Highway 69 (I-69) which runs from the Canadian border in Michigan through eight states and includes over 700 miles of potential interstate in Texas, terminating at the Mexican border. Since 1991, coalitions of cities and citizens along the I-69 Texas system have been encouraging the Texas Department of Transportation to develop I-69 in the state, because they feel it would bring economic development and job growth to their communities and connect rural areas of Texas to larger, metropolitan cities.

The Texas Department of Transportation has been challenged in developing new projects the last decade because transportation planners haven’t always fully considered and understood the needs of local communities and worked with those communities and its citizens to develop solutions. This has led to some citizens hesitating to support new transportation projects and development in Texas.

Funding transportation projects is also a challenge because there is not enough revenue to satisfy all the needs and wants in the transportation world. In addition to the funding challenge, many times developing new interstate highway systems requires more right-of-way than the current, existing roadways and in some instances affects citizens’ homes and businesses. In some cases, new interstates have to be developed in “green field” areas which sometimes results in the need to acquire property from individual land owners to build the new interstate. This added to some citizens’ hesitancy to support I-69 development in Texas.

3. The Role of Public Participation

A comprehensive, citizen-led planning process was critical to the I-69 project because this process allowed the local transportation needs and solutions to be identified by citizens living in the communities along the proposed I-69 route. The planning process was led by an overall I-69 Citizen Advisory Committee, with specific, local recommendations coming from five I-69 Citizen Segment Committees. The segment committees studied the transportation needs and challenges in their local areas and developed preliminary recommendations to address those needs and concerns in concert with developing I-69 in their communities.

The segment committees undertook a six month public participation process that included reaching over 5,000 citizens, conducting over 100 outreach activities and receiving over 400 citizen comments. This public participation process was vital to the project because citizens voiced their concerns about preliminary recommendations, and based on citizen feedback, the segment committees’ final recommendations were adjusted to reflect the concerns and requests of their neighbors. Because this outreach process was led by citizens living in the communities along the I-69 route, they were able to speak to their neighbors about the benefits of the proposed
interstate and address concerns and questions better than an official from the transportation department who would not be affected by the project.

This entire process was citizen-led and gave the Texas Department of Transportation a clear understanding and knowledge of the priorities and needs of those living and working in the proposed project area. The priorities and needs identified by citizens are being used by the Texas Department of Transportation to decide on critical highway safety improvements and prioritize which projects to fund within the project area.

4. Public Participation Method
Because of the various demographics of the project area it was vital to use a variety of public participation tools and methods to reach non-English speaking citizens, those living in rural areas without internet access and young, tech-reliant groups who traditionally do not participate in the transportation planning process.

- **Website, Social Media and QR Codes** – The I-69 Driven by Texans website, [http://www.txdot.gov/drivenbytexans/](http://www.txdot.gov/drivenbytexans/), was launched to provide an outlet for tech-savvy citizens to read more about the citizen advisory committees, preliminary recommendations, and send in comments and questions. This website included multilingual brochures with links in the respective language to the various brochures. Facebook and Twitter were also used to announce the opening of the citizen comment period, open houses, and encourage citizens to submit comments. Quick Response (QR) codes were printed on all materials which allowed Smartphone users to scan the QR code using a Smartphone app and be immediately directed to the I-69 Driven by Texans website.

- **Community Presentations and Open Houses** – Citizen advisory committee members reached out to their neighbors through nearly 100 community presentations. Because these presentations were led by citizens, rather than the transportation department as usual, it added credibility to the project because those living in the affected area were speaking of the project’s benefits. These events included PowerPoint presentations on the committees’ preliminary recommendations and brochures with comments cards were distributed as handouts. Open houses were also hosted in various communities which allowed citizens an opportunity to review I-69 background information, watch a video about the project ([http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4vuWOIzYKNq&lr=1](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4vuWOIzYKNq&lr=1)), mark up maps of the citizen’s preferred route, and make comments on the project.

- **Print Materials** – Print materials included brochures in English, Chinese, Spanish and Vietnamese which explained the project and included a postage-paid comment card, website address and hotline number to call and ask questions. The number of translated
brochures downloaded on the I-69 Driven by Texans website show that they were well visited with 1,647 downloaded between July 2011 and December 2011 as compared to 1,261 English brochures that were downloaded during that same time period. A small, 4 inch by 6 inch card was also produced as a small take-away to be used when citizen advisory committee members encountered citizens in the grocery store and other public places who wanted more information about the project.

5. **Uniqueness of the Project**

A. **In what ways did public participation improve the decision?**

The decisions and recommendations that came as a result of this process were researched, created and authored by the citizens themselves as a result of public participation. Citizens serving on the advisory committees crafted initial priorities and recommendations then conferred with their fellow community members to find the best final recommendations and priority projects for developing I-69 in their area and throughout the state. The benefit of this planning process is it results in a decision that includes grassroots support.

B. **How did public participation contribute to the resolution of the problem?**

Because it was the citizens authoring the recommendations, public participation was instrumental in resolving the problem of planning for and developing I-69 in Texas. The citizen authored solutions also created more credibility to the project resolution. The I-69 Advisory Committee established guiding principles for I-69 development and using these guiding principles, the citizen-led committees decided on priorities and included public feedback in their final recommendations.

C. **How did the project advance the practice of public participation?**

The success of citizen-driven planning efforts has led to the Texas Department of Transportation using citizen advisory committees for other critical planning projects. This project is also being used as a model for early public participation that exemplifies engaging citizens early in the planning process and deploying a variety of traditional and new outreach techniques to reach various demographics and audiences.

6. **Project Results**

The biggest success in this project was working with citizens in the project area to identify the local needs and solutions to developing I-69 in their towns. Citizen comments reflect support for I-69 Texas showing that this process resulted in understanding of and community support for the new interstate project. This project also resulted in establishing the first few miles of I-69 Texas which was done on the strong recommendation of citizens and communities in the project area. The first stretch of I-69 was unveiled in December 2011 and there is close to 90 miles currently under consideration for interstate designation. In addition to these sections, another 26 sections have funding for construction which totals $400 million USD.
• Engaged citizens early – this process solicited citizen participation and feedback early in the planning process and provided citizens an opportunity to craft solutions that best fit their local needs.

• Increased citizen participation – the community presentations reached more citizens than the typical public participation processes used in the past. The citizen advisory committee members reached over 5,000 citizens and contributed to local cities, planning organizations and chambers of commerce passing resolutions of support for the I-69 project.

• Public appreciation – citizens complemented the new, informal format that allowed them to openly participate and ask questions throughout the public participation process. They also appreciated the direct link to transportation department staff using the I-69 hotline, staff mobile phone numbers and email addresses.

7. Alignment with IAP2 Core Values
Public participation during the I-69 project incorporated the IAP2 Core Values in numerous ways:

A. How did the project ensure that those most affected by the decisions or problem were involved?

The I-69 Driven by Texans project used citizen advisory committees to plan for highway improvements and put the early planning and creation of recommendations in the hands of citizens living along the proposed interstate highway. Traditionally, citizen input for transportation projects has been solicited later in the planning process. During the I-69 process, citizens were the ones to complete the initial planning.

Additionally, the citizen advisory committees held open houses and presented to local community groups along the proposed highway. The citizens knew best who in their community potentially could be impacted by proposed highway improvements. It was vital and successful having citizens reaching out to their neighbors to ensure those most affected by proposed highway improvements were included and involved in the planning process.

B. How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public’s contributions?
Prior to the citizen advisory committees and community engagement, I-69 did not exist in Texas and was still in the planning stages. Throughout this process, at the strong recommendation of the citizen advisory committees and their communities, I-69 was established in Texas and additional parts of this interstate are funded for additional improvements, many of which were also recommended by citizens.
C. How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated?

Mid-way through their planning process, the citizen committees developed a cost estimate for building I-69 in Texas which totals $16.4 billion USD. Knowing this amount of funding was not sustainable for this project, the committee established guiding principles such as, “maximize use of existing highways to the greatest extent possible while seeking to reduce the program costs and impacts to private property, pursue flexibility and efficiencies in the design and construction requirements necessary to obtain interstate designation, and encourage initiatives that will supplement limited highway funds so as many projects as possible are completed along the I-69 system in Texas.”

Using these guiding principles, the citizen committees created preliminary priorities and solicited community feedback before finalizing their recommendations. The committees contributed to the sustainability of their planning by using these guiding principles, citizen input and prioritizing projects to further develop I-69 Texas.

Citizen comments and questions that were gathered during the planning process are posted, with responses, on the I-69 Driven by Texans website, http://www.txdot.gov/driverbytexans/ and published in each of the five I-69 Segment Committee reports. Each of the committees’ sustainable planning solutions and project priorities are also published in the I-69 Segment Committee reports.

D. How did the project seek out and facilitate the involvement of those most affected?

Using guidance from the citizen advisory committee members, Texas Department of Transportation staff created a communication plan to reach affected citizens that incorporated the diversity of the communities and populations along the 700+ mile proposed I-69 route. Communication techniques varied so citizens in rural, towns of less than 100 were involved along with citizens in Houston, the fourth largest city in the USA. In rural areas, word of mouth and posting flyers at community gathering places, such as post offices, was successful in getting citizens involved and commenting on the project. In other areas, email, social media and the I-69 Driven by Texans website, http://www.txdot.gov/driverbytexans/, were good outreach tools to seek out and involve those affected by the project.

Additionally, printed materials were generated in four languages to accommodate the diversity of the planning area. Many areas of Texas, including South Texas have Spanish speaking citizens; the greater Houston area has a large Asian population. To facilitate the involvement of these populations, informational brochures were printed in Chinese, Spanish, and Vietnamese in addition to English. The I-69 Driven by Texans website, http://www.txdot.gov/driverbytexans/, includes links in the respective languages to the various brochures so citizens can also access the multilingual brochures online.
E. How did the project seek input from participants on how they wished to participate?

Prior to launching their formal public involvement campaign, the citizen advisory committee members decided how their communities would best be reached and what methods would be successful in receiving input from citizens in their communities. Using the guidance of the citizen committee members living in affected towns, a communication plan and materials were developed based on the feedback of these local stakeholders.

In addition to the citizen stakeholders deciding on various techniques to gather community input, citizens were given many options on how to participate. Citizens could browse the I-69 Driven by Texans website, http://www.txdot.gov/drivenbytexans/, read a brochure and send in electronic comments; they could attend an open house, speak with a committee member and fill out a comment card at the open house or mail it in at their convenience. Brochures were also available at convenient locations such as grocery stores, libraries and city halls so citizens could read about I-69 and return their comments and questions via a postage-paid card. A hotline was also available so citizens could call and speak with a person to get their questions answered.

Citizen committee members also hosted local open houses and presented at local civic club meetings, providing another opportunity for participation.

F. How did the information provided to participants support and contribute to meaningful participation?

Information provided to participants included preliminary priorities, additional recommended projects and frequently asked questions that were based on questions we were already receiving from citizens, elected officials and other stakeholders. This information supported citizens’ meaningful participation by answering the questions that were on many people’s minds. The preliminary priority and project information allowed citizens to contribute to the process and have a say in the final outcome because the citizen advisory committees changed their recommendations based on citizen input.

Also, materials and tools were tailored towards various populations and demographics which allowed citizens who don’t typically participate in planning processes such as this, the opportunity to learn about the project and provide comments.

G. How did the communication of the project results ensure that participants know how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem?

The recommendations of each Segment Committee are printed and sent to each citizen advisory committee member for distribution in their communities. These reports will also be available on the I-69 Driven by Texans website, http://www.txdot.gov/drivenbytexans/, and press releases will be sent to all media outlets in the area notifying media and citizens of these reports. Social media will also be used to publicize the completion of the citizen advisory committees’ reports and recommendations, which include all citizen questions and comments and responses to those questions. Responses include specific instances of citizen comments and concerns and how the committees address those comments and concerns in their final recommendations and reports.
Title
Let’s Re-imagine the City Together

Organizing Group
Development Action Group (DAG)

Location
Cape Town, South Africa, population ~3.3 million

Key Question/Problem
Cape Town is one of the most unequal cities in the world. DAG wants to demonstrate how working in partnership with citizens who share a pro-poor agenda can lead to sustainable solutions that redress social, economic and spatial inequalities.

Sample Methods
Conducted at a city wide level, horizontal learning platforms, community leadership programmes, pro-poor development proposals, local community events and multi stakeholder forums.

Methods: community visioning exercises; participatory planning, facilitated multi stakeholder forums, video documentary, citizen’s charter, action learning and reflection.

Results
Active participation of 25 citizen’s groups in mobilising Cape Town citizens to become actively involved in re-imaging their city. The support of key urban development experts, both local and international, in supporting the production of pro-poor development proposals. Promotion of active citizenry based on the slogan – the space between passivity and violent action. The adoption of a citizen’s charter. Public meetings bringing together more than 1000 ordinary citizens to discuss re-imagining our city. The co-operation and involvement of city officials. The documentation of the process as it unfolds through written reports and video recordings.

Impact Level
The inclusion of both rich and poor citizens in the process of re-imagining our city. Demonstration of successful pro-poor development projects

Time Frame
24 months

People Engaged
5000 people through workshops, seminars, sms communication, public events.

Web Link
www.dag.org.za
Project of the Year Award Submission Guidelines

The Problem and Challenge
While much progress has been made in democracy’s second decade, its greatest threat remains the increasing levels of poverty in South Africa. Despite South Africa’s middle-income status the rate of poverty remains high. In 2008, 39% of the population did not have R388 per month for essential food and non-food items. Recent figures from Statistics South Africa reveals that unemployment rose to 25.7% in the second quarter of 2011 bringing the total number of unemployed people to a staggering 4 538 million.

Inadequate housing and poverty experienced by the vast majority of urban citizens are the manifestations of continued structural inequalities in South African society. Structural inequality involves unequal relations between categories of people and is often difficult to address because it is not recognized as unjust. South Africa is struggling with structural inequality- differences in wealth and differences in access and power, with both civil society and State interventions attempting to address these issues. Fraser argues that to achieve justice three inter-related components are required viz. distribution (resources), recognition (of the various forms of contributions of different groups) and representation (linguistics). The South African government has been applauded for the advances it has made in the latter two categories through putting in place progressive laws and mechanisms which attempt to advance historically disadvantaged groups e.g. women, the disabled and black citizens. This however remains largely symbolic as government has failed in addressing the distribution of South Africa’s resources equitably, entrapping vast numbers of people in cycles of poverty due to deepening inequalities. The sum result is that structural inequalities persist causing frustration amongst the majority of poor urban citizens. State and civil society interventions often work at cross purposes, with little meaningful progress made at shifting deep inequalities in our society.

There are serious limitations in government’s approach to participation processes and in achieving the meaningful inclusion of the voices of poor and marginal in how land is used and managed within cities and the processes for deciding where low-income housing development will happen. This is evident from the public participation climate in South Africa, where some citizens frustrated by ‘talk shops’ and fatigued by processes that don’t deliver results choose to stop participating or engage in protest. The frequency and intensity of protest action against the State’s pace, quality and scale of delivery illustrates this. Invariably, much of the protest action has been in informal settlements in the larger metros of Cape Town and Johannesburg and linked to demands for better housing. Civil society has been considerably weakened and fragmented over the past 10 years. Recently there has been resurgence in civil society initiatives and demands for inclusive, accountable and participatory governance. Some of these initiatives, if not channelled in a constructive manner and building the social capital available, have the potential to cause greater social and political tension.

The Role of Public Participation
DAG works with the poorest urban communities in Cape Town and aims to support the urban poor as a collective. DAG works with poor households who earn less than R3500 (combined household income) and live in inadequate housing conditions in South Africa’s urban areas. DAG’s target group is mainly comprised of people from informal settlements, people living in backyarder arrangements and those in over-crowded formal housing who have historically been denied access to the resources and amenities of cities. The entire project aims to support those who are the most vulnerable and marginalised among the urban poor.

Within the target group there are significant gender differences. DAG’s experience shows that while women participate actively in housing projects, seeing them through to completion, men are disproportionally over-represented in community leadership positions. Many of the leaders of community organisations are men. Women can be marginalised from participating in training, usually due to the burdens of childcare and reproductive work in the households which leaves them with little time. DAG therefore actively plans to ensure that women’s voices can be heard and that they are able to participate equally with men. DAG actively
recruits women to be included in training courses and provides additional support where necessary including making provision for childcare and transport and holding meetings and trainings at times which are more suited to women’s working patterns. Furthermore in community-driven housing projects women’s needs and concerns are proactively surfaced by DAG staff to ensure that the participatory processes result in outcomes that meet their needs.

The indirect target group includes government (at national, provincial and local level), the private sector, academic institutions, and broader civil society that benefit from DAG’s outputs and advocacy gains. There is a clear case for a process of ‘Re-imagining the City and creating a New Urban Order’ which is inclusive of the aspirations and needs of marginal and poor citizens in South Africa. This includes addressing structural inequalities of access to resources like well-located land and quality housing which progressively shift the conditions of the urban poor and create more equity; as well as demonstrating sustainable community-centred and led models in meeting the practical housing needs of the poor at scale.

DAG’s advocacy work aims to have a long-term impact on poverty and inequality in South Africa by influencing and changing the policies and approaches to planning and managing city land, so that poor and marginalised communities are able to gain access to city resources through accessing low income housing in well-located areas. This will have a sustainable impact on reduction of poverty among the urban poor and reducing the income gap between the rich and the poor. DAG’s process for Re-imagining the City clearly identifies the tools for financing (fiscal and regulatory value capture tools), constructing (community-driven and led housing) and governing (deepening democratic urban governance) such an inclusive city, DAG’s strategy engages both poor urban communities and government in proactively realising a new urban order and creates a new social contract between State and citizens.

DAG purposefully builds partnerships with other organizations addressing similar issues to pool resources, share experiences or create a united voice in advocacy. “Strategic networks are the building blocks of social movements. A strategic network is a temporary alliance of individuals and organisations through which their resources are combined in pursuit of shared, defined and consequential goals that strengthen the movement’s position...” The development of strategic networks is important in the process of democratising our society.

Most of the issues that affect the context of poverty have political and economic implications that are external to the local environment. These can only be effectively tackled through collective action. In this way the strategic network becomes a platform for citizen democracy.

Our target groups and beneficiaries (government and communities) are afforded the opportunity to shape DAG’s projects and activities through formal presentations to DAG staff in our preparation for annual planning. The on-going implementation of DAG’s monitoring and evaluation framework affords flexibility in adapting plans in accordance with the lessons emerging from implementation of projects. This reflexive process enables DAG staff to incorporate emerging needs and trends of our target groups in our unfolding project plans.

**Public Participation Methods**

Community Leadership Programme: The core objective is to support and supplement the work of civil society organisations in the process of designing both a project-based and programmatic approach to practically re-imagining the city. The intention is to aid and support local leaders with the technical skills and capacity building necessary to produce the City Development Framework: this will use the acquisition and development of strategic parcels of land as tools for addressing the current disintegration of the city. The programme has begun by identifying strategic parcels of land which can be used to guide the process of city wide restructuring and conducting a thorough problem analysis linked to developing a long-term vision and mission. The key outcomes of the programme is based on linkages (among NGO’s, CBO’s and civil society groups), to attain collective action towards goals, as well as the utilization of existing platforms and forging of new platforms for lobbying and change-making.

On the 21 January 2012 DAG implemented the fifth module of its Leadership Programme, a full-day learning bus tour. The objective of the bus tour was to visit the selected parcels of land, drawn from the submissions.
received by the respective community organisations/leaders after the fourth module of the leadership course. DAG also shared sites the organisation had identified. The platform on the bus was then used to discuss key issues regarding the development of proposals for these parcels of land and exploring alternative development types that would be appropriate for each site besides residential use.

On the bus community leaders shared experiences of accessing information and sharing lessons on submitting requests / proposals to access land. The programme encompasses seven modules as described:
Module 1: Problem Analysis
Module 2: Considering Proposals
Module 3: Mission and Vision
Module 4: Identification of Land Parcels
Module 5: Learning Bus Tour: Application of Development Principles
Module 6: Lobbying, Institutional Arrangements and Funding
Module 7: Applying Principles to Selected Sites

Twenty six (26) community groups have committed to this process and have been actively engaged in the process since August 201. DAG and the community groups successfully hosted a National Summit on Participatory Pro-Poor City Wide Planning. This Horizontal Learning Platform was planned with community leaders and a the Technical Task Team elected by leaders.

Horizontal Learning Platforms (HLPs): DAG facilitates what we call Horizontal Learning Platforms (HLPs) as part of our Horizontal Learning Programme. This programme facilitates greater experiential learning opportunities where citizens are able to apply their learning, document it and reflect upon it, both individually and with their peers. Horizontal Learning Platforms are designed to maximize learning through the use of experiential techniques and drawing on the knowledge of citizens. Incorporating action learning methods has helped citizens groups to find ways to integrate their learning into their daily practice and to maintain skills and competencies.

Horizontal Learning Platforms (HLP) focus on DAG’s overarching theme of access to well-located land and effective pro-poor land use management to inform policy review and practice. The HLPs will advance DAG’s concept of ‘re-imagining the city’ as a space where all stakeholders can participate.

Horizontal Learning Platforms held include:

- The Right to the City - Urban Development, Democracy and Community Development.
- Democratic Management of Cities - Community Mobilization, Advocacy and Lobbying
- Urban Land Management Planning and Policy – Legal and Policy Frameworks
- Re-imagining the City – Charting A Way Forward

HLPs are collective learning spaces where participants learn from a cross-section of urban development role-players. DAG limits its presentations and creates a space for sharing with input from citizen’s groups and guest speakers from government and civil society. The exercises give citizens the opportunity to document, discuss and engage with their observation of, and participation in, development processes underway in their own communities. Citizens can then benefit from peer support to help them to apply their knowledge and skills to their future practice. At times citizens will be requested to make presentations and or facilitate group work.

Each HLP results in a concrete outcome which documents the learning during the session. The basis may be a document such as an accessible, popular briefing paper, a newspaper article or even a play. This helps not only to embed the learning, but provides documentation which can be widely distributed to other community members, NGOs, and government officials.

The powerful positive impact of such experiential learning techniques can inform changes and revisions to the development process at a project, programme and city-wide level. DAG plans to focus citizen’s leadership training and capacity development towards experiential learning approaches such as those
described above. Furthermore, DAG plans to use the wealth of experience and good practice it has built up during development work and training with communities in the past as a basis for learning in further citizen’s leadership programmes.

Public and Multi-stakeholder Platforms: DAG successfully hosted a Public platform with citizens groups.

**Uniqueness of the Project**

Describe what makes this project special. Some questions to consider in this section include: Exploring and implementing new ways of citizen’s engagement – the space between passivity and protest, is the uniqueness of this project and led to the statement: *To demonstrate how working in partnership with citizens who share a pro poor agenda can lead to sustainable solutions that redress social, economic and spatial inequalities.* DAG traditionally partnered with individual communities on a specific housing development project. The partner community was a geographically fixed and uniform entity. This project is at a city wide level and incorporates a number of complex and diverse communities often with competing interests. Another unique element of this project is the solution orientation. The current discourse within South African civil society is dominated by blame, entitlement, recipients or beneficiaries of development. DAG has consciously challenged this discourse towards citizens taking responsibility for their own future. The promotion of sustainable solutions in the form of development proposals is an attempt to practically change the current urban development discourse.

**Project Results**

Over the past two years DAG, in partnership with 25 citizens groups have managed to activate over 5000 citizens to participate in processes towards re-imaging Cape Town. Over 1000 citizens adopted the Cape Town Citizen’s charter. DAG has in partnership with leading urban development experts, packaged pro-poor development proposals that practically demonstrate a new urban development approach to address social, spatial and economic inequality in South African cities.

**Organizing Group**

The Development Action Group in partnership with 25 citizen’s groups.

---

2. David C Korten, from the People-Centered Development Forum in Philippines
## Case Study Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Old Bronte Road/Khalsa Gate Streetscape Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group Location</strong></td>
<td>Town of Oakville, Ontario Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>Palermo Village was the first community in the Town of Oakville and a popular destination for visitors travelling between Toronto and western Ontario. The village began to deteriorate after the 1950s and worsened in 2007 with the creation of a regional road by-pass. This new road displaced stores and homes, depreciating the character of the community and leaving only traces of the historic village. Today the original main street – Old Bronte Road (which changes names to Khalsa Gate), is unused, unattractive and inaccessible to the community and visitors. A streetscape, or street design plan, was created to ultimately transform Old Bronte Road/Khalsa Gate into a celebrated public space that is safe, attractive and accessible. Public participation to shape the vision for this vibrant destination was essential to the project’s success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>The project incorporated a policy review, site mapping, virtual tour, study webpage, stakeholder meetings, open houses, public meetings with Town Council, an interactive public workshop and a street tour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Through significant public participation, the streetscape plan was supported by the community and endorsed by Town Council. The plan offers a set of guidelines the town and developers can use for redesigning the street. The concepts and standards in this plan take into consideration the entirety of Palermo Village, and are rooted in community recommendations. Further collaboration has been provided by various town and regional departments. The final result is a visioning document that revitalizes Old Bronte Road/Khalsa Gate into a welcoming place for the community in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact level</strong></td>
<td>The local residents of Palermo Village, businesses in the area, as well as visitors to the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time frame</strong></td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People engaged</strong></td>
<td>Roughly 100 residents, stakeholders, land owners and merchants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Problem and Challenge

The Old Bronte Road/Khalsa Gate Streetscape Plan was not the first study conducted with the Palermo Village community. The last planning study recommended a road by-pass that cut through the former village. Studies that proposed attractive, mixed-use development in Palermo Village had long timeframes for implementation, and had not yet yielded any visible changes. Moreover, many older homes were still running on septic tanks and well-water, causing further aggravation.

While the road by-pass improved traffic efficiency in the region, it left the community fragmented and scarred. Gaining public trust in Palermo Village was integral to rebuilding credibility for the project at hand. At the outset, it was determined that the public’s role was to be an active voice – to identify which strengths were important to emphasize and which weaknesses/deficiencies needed attention.

The challenge was to respond to the town’s official plan policy - that Old Bronte Road/Khalsa Gate would reflect its local context, promote a pedestrian-oriented environment and would be designed to be safe, attractive and accessible. Not just a thorough-fare, the street is meant to provide cohesion between public and private space. Redesigning Old Bronte Road/Khalsa Gate could transform it into an inviting, walkable and quaint street in the heart of Palermo Village. Thus, the challenge was not just to develop a streetscape plan to guide Old Bronte Road/Khalsa Gate into an attractive space; it was to create a streetscape plan that was community-rooted and locally-driven.

From a public participation perspective, the main challenge for the study was to overcome the general distrust from the community. The public felt disadvantaged by a road by-pass and had been anticipating that the community would turn around. However, in 10 years, little had changed. External factors, such as the lack of full services along the entire street, left the public skeptical and unwelcoming of further study. The other significant challenge was the competing interests. There were some stakeholders who wanted to see Palermo Village turn into a heritage conservation district, while others wanted the opposite. Many residents asked for a vehicular connection to the north, yet the upper-tier government in charge of the road could not allow it for technical reasons.

The Role of Public Participation

Due to the turbulent history of Palermo Village, the rationale for public participation was to regain community trust and buy-in, build support and develop shared ownership of the plan. Staff needed to understand stakeholder views, concerns, interests and expectations. The impetus for public participation was to promote open, timely, clear and accessible information.

The role of public participation was engaging the community to deal with a common problem. Developing a comprehensive street design meant building a solution together. The objective of public participation for this plan was not only to inform the community, but to involve and collaborate. The study drew a concentrated group of residents, land owners and others who would be directly affected and impacted.

Throughout the study process, the public had opportunities to review and comment on the draft streetscape plan. When the public and stakeholder groups raised concerns on the draft, staff responded by holding two additional public events to further engage the community. Feedback from those meetings assisted in finalizing the plan. Holding these events, outside of the anticipated engagement and communications plan, demonstrated that the voice of the public was an essential one, and had direct impact on the plan itself. The final plan communicated a message the community could support and was unanimously endorsed by Town Council.
Public Participation Methods

The Town of Oakville employs a Public Notice and Engagement policy and Public Engagement Guide based on the foundations of IAP2. The methods used in this study to engage the public were directly tied to IAP2’s spectrum: information-sharing, consulting, involving and collaborating. Because the level of community impact for this project would be high, a wide range of engagement techniques were chosen from the spectrum and deployed through a communications plan:

- **Information on the town’s website**: a study webpage was created to describe the project, post study materials and notify the public of upcoming meetings. [http://www.oakville.ca/business/old-bronte-road-streetscape-plan.html](http://www.oakville.ca/business/old-bronte-road-streetscape-plan.html)

- **Email list**: an email contact list was used to contact stakeholders, invite and remind them of meetings, solicit input and direct them to study documents.

- **Notices for public meetings**: a notice for a large public meeting was created for the webpage, emailed to the contact list and mailed to 430 homes in the vicinity of the subject lands. The poster was visual, written in plain language and included a questionnaire: [http://www.oakville.ca/assets/2011%20planning/ps-OldBronte-WrkshpInvite.pdf](http://www.oakville.ca/assets/2011%20planning/ps-OldBronte-WrkshpInvite.pdf)

- **Newspaper advertisements**: the local newspaper was used to promote the public meetings and reach the broader community, such as stakeholders not on the email list or outside the study area boundary.

- **Open house**: materials, plans and exhibits were displayed for public viewing in a local venue in Palermo Village. Staff was available to offer one-on-one consultation.

- **Staff-led street tour**: staff took participants on a guided tour of the street to point out features in the neighbourhood and provide first-hand knowledge of the project. A virtual tour (depicting the street for those who could not attend the meetings) was taped: [http://www.towntv.ca/oldbronteroad.htm](http://www.towntv.ca/oldbronteroad.htm)

- **Fact sheets**: a resource booklet was developed for community participants to understand the policies in place and the heritage building inventory for Palermo Village: [http://www.oakville.ca/assets/2011%20planning/ps-OldBronte-ResourceBook.pdf](http://www.oakville.ca/assets/2011%20planning/ps-OldBronte-ResourceBook.pdf)

- **Stakeholder meetings**: small meetings to gather ideas from specific groups in the community were held.

- **Public meetings**: there were large scale public meetings held at Town Council and Heritage Oakville Committee to update Council members and give the public a further opportunity to provide comments. Reports for these meetings were posted online and printed for distribution: [http://www.oakville.ca/townhall/agendas-minutes.html](http://www.oakville.ca/townhall/agendas-minutes.html)

- **Public workshop/charette**: there was a public workshop with a large room presentation and smaller groups for an interactive exercise, working through questions and developing solutions on a map (see pictures on page 8).

- **Comment sheets**: for those who preferred to provide written input, comment sheets were provided at each of the meetings.

- **Posting the final plan**: the finished study was posted on the study website after endorsed by Council: [http://www.oakville.ca/assets/2011%20planning/ps-OldBronte-StreetscapePlanMar12.PDF](http://www.oakville.ca/assets/2011%20planning/ps-OldBronte-StreetscapePlanMar12.PDF)
Uniqueness of the Project

Palermo Village is a unique place within the Town of Oakville, with many historical attributes. It was the first settlement in Oakville and part of a commonly travelled route between Toronto and western Ontario. At its peak, Palermo Village thrived with a community hall, a school, two churches, stores and a park. It was an attractive and intact urban centre, with homes, jobs and sidewalks in between. The village began to experience significant pressures from the automobile boom of the 1950s resulting in provincial plans to expand major arterial roads. The community was further affected with the construction of a by-pass for Bronte Road and the expansion of Dundas Street (a major arterial road) into six lanes. This impacted Palermo Village with the loss of stores and homes.

Today, there are only traces left of the village that once was, including some buildings recognized as cultural heritage resources. Along Old Bronte Road/Khalsa Gate there is a residential community and several places of worship, with more development and features for Dundas Street planned in the near future. Currently, Old Bronte Road/Khalsa Gate is marred with overhead utility lines, an absence of pedestrian amenities and little apparent connection to the community.

The uniqueness of the project comes from balancing heritage conservation with new, modern development while reconciling a disparity of road widths through an old village. From a public perspective, there were land owners who wanted to maximize land value, historic societies who lobbied for strong heritage conservation, and residents who were desperate to see the change they had been awaiting. From a staff point of view, the project was challenged by competing interests of providing high quality development objectives, conserving heritage on select properties and having a street that could provide parking, cycling and traffic provisions.

Enabling public participation enriched the study with a diversity of opinions. The final streetscape plan represented a balanced and holistic approach to serve the voices of the community. In addition, the virtual tour and interactive charrette proved to be innovative techniques to gather input and engage the community in a meaningful way.

The project was evaluated against the core values as outlined in the town’s Public Engagement Guide (which is derived from IAP2 Core Values) evaluation questionnaire. Going through an evaluation exercise, it was evident that IAP2’s guiding principles were followed: the project sought out and facilitated the involvement of the direct community; the website and emails provided timely communication that was clear and accessible; the added public meetings demonstrated the value of seeking better ways to engage the community; developing an engagement and communications plan meant that the objectives were defined at the outset; and a guided street tour and hands-on workshop were the right tools to reflect the complexity of the project.

Project Results

The Old Bronte Road/Khalsa Gate streetscape plan was resounding success because of effective public participation. The plan was endorsed by the community and officially by Town Council, allowing staff to start using the plan in meetings with applicants to shape development. It is a guiding document to encourage development in keeping with the shared community vision for Palermo Village.

The plan will be used as a strategy for a better, people-friendly street for the public. The project will be used to guide community-supported wishes such as wide sidewalks, well-marked crosswalks, accessibility features, street parking, bike paths and routes, close integration with transit, street trees, lighting and roadways that accommodate automobile traffic but encourage appropriate speeds.
From the community’s perspective, the plan represented a product of meetings attended, emails written and delegations given. It reflected a vision the public had actively shaped by participating. Nothing but positive feedback was given to staff on the final plan.

The opportunities presented as a result of public participation were invaluable. First was overlap with other municipal projects – staff could share information with the public that had bearing on the project, while informing them of related matters such as pending development applications, transit plans and Ontario Municipal Board (judicial body) hearings. Since it is a tight-knit community, staff was able to get to know the participants and build a relationship of trust. Staff and Council were given the opportunity to experience the enthusiasm of the participants first hand by their interaction and involvement. Because of this, the best opportunity was the chance to add public input to enhance the study, providing it with an additional dimension of community participation.

Implementing IAP2’s core values by the Planning Services department at the Town of Oakville advanced the importance of a creating a public forum for insight into a planning project. The value of designing a comprehensive engagement and communications plan at the onset meant meaningful public participation would be built in, instead of an afterthought. Outside of statutory requirements, there are more opportunities to gain input to shape the project for the better. Instead of simply informing, the public can be engaged to harvest ideas and find solutions to the common challenge at hand. Addressing public concerns and responding in an open forum led to mutual respect. Similarly, not engaging the public would have led to resistance, project delay and a less fulsome result. On an organizational level, the town has a policy to offer open, two-way communication to develop and deliver quality programs and services that meet the needs of the community. The organization as a whole was able to strive for continuous improvement and take a lead in building in public participation into governance.
### Alignment with IAP2 Core Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IAP2 Canada Core Values</th>
<th>Old Bronte Road/Khalsa Gate Streetscape Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public participation...</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project Alignment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. … is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.</td>
<td>From the outset of the study, the local community was directly engaged. Since this was a tight-knit community, the public was closely involved for providing community-driven insight to problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. … includes the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision.</td>
<td>The plan was directly modified based on feedback from stakeholders after public engagement. The revised plan was brought again to further public meetings before finalized. The public acknowledged their recommendations were heard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. … promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.</td>
<td>This was a plan balanced by a range of interests from residents, businesses, staff and councillors. This allowed a diversity of voices to be reflected in the plan: strong heritage focus, bicycling features, building design and safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. … seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.</td>
<td>For the public meeting, 430 mail notices were sent to affected addresses to solicit public participation. The town’s website, correspondence by email and newsletters (on behalf of an external stakeholder group) made the public aware of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. … seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.</td>
<td>Through the process, the public requested additional opportunities to participate in different forums. A variety of methods to maximize participation ranged from small stakeholder meetings, casual open houses, formal presentations in front of Town Council, interactive workshop and informative street tour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. …provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.</td>
<td>Information was given to the public in advance of meetings with regular updates to keep everyone engaged in the process. Material was supplied to participants such as information on hot topics most questioned, resource booklet with existing policies, listing of heritage properties on the street, and photo examples of favourable main streets to facilitate meaningful participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. …communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.</td>
<td>Throughout the process, staff communicated the results of public feedback and how it was incorporated into the plan. In addition, all stakeholders were encouraged to view the final report presented to Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Video

Please visit: [http://www.towntv.ca/oldbronteroad.htm](http://www.towntv.ca/oldbronteroad.htm) to see the project study area details in a 5 minute virtual tour.
Participan quote: “... thanks again for your emails. We appreciate hearing from you and keeping up to date on what’s happening around the corner.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Public Voice Shapes HIV Service Planning at Vancouver Coastal Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Vancouver Coastal Health Authority (VCH) Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Vancouver, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question / Problem</strong></td>
<td>Involving diverse, highly marginalized populations in the shaping of strategies to improve testing, treatment and support services for HIV/AIDS. P2 processes were used to: encourage and support opportunities for dialogue between VCH and the public it serves; collect the experiences and recommendations of people living with and at risk for HIV so that their perspectives would influence service-planning and decision-making; build partnerships between VCH leadership and community organizations; identify and develop ongoing engagement mechanisms for people living with HIV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>P2 strategies, methods and questions (in English and Spanish) developed and implemented in collaboration with HIV + Community Representative, community agencies and HIV activists. Population-specific discussion groups and interviews conducted in settings familiar to target groups (e.g. at regularly scheduled clinics or groups, in shelter housing, drop-ins, etc.). All discussion groups co-facilitated by a member of the specific population (e.g. Latin American youth) and included HIV education as requested by the participants. Anonymous online surveys about HIV testing and treatment services. Flexible and adaptive with questions and methods in order to approach diverse populations with sensitivity and respect, including gay and other men who have sex with men; transgendered, homeless and Aboriginal people; men and women in street-based sex trade; youth living with HIV; women escaping domestic violence; people living with addictions and/or serious and persistent mental illness; refugees and illegal immigrants from the Latin American community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>This multi-phase and broad consultation strategy has involved individuals and organizations from many diverse communities that are affected by HIV and face significant stigma, and also face multiple barriers to accessing services and influencing service planning. Public involvement increased community acceptance of the STOP HIV strategy and its services, and increased trust between community partners and the health authority. Recommendations from participants had direct and ongoing influence on service planning and decision-making. Through continuous attention to scope of public influence in this project, and our commitments to the public on behalf of project leadership, we ensured the integrity and honest of this P2 process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>City-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>May 2010 to April 2012 (24 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>510 participants; 19 community organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Links</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.vch.ca/get_involved/community-engagement/reports/">www.vch.ca/get_involved/community-engagement/reports/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Problem and Challenge
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, is home to one of the highest rates of HIV incidence in North America. In order to reduce HIV incidence in our province, the BC Ministry of Health (our provincial funder for all health services) announced a ground-breaking four-year (2009-2013) $48 million dollar pilot project to improve HIV testing, treatment and support services. Seek and Treat to Optimally Prevent (STOP) HIV/AIDS. The goal of the STOP HIV Project is to improve access to HIV services for the most marginalized and vulnerable in our city, who face multiple barriers to care including addiction, homelessness, serious mental illness, and other social and environmental factors. These populations often avoid contact with institutions, including health services, as much as possible. How could the STOP HIV Project shape service delivery so that services would reach these target populations who are hardest to access, and who don’t necessarily want to be ‘found’?

The provincial STOP HIV funding is shared between three health authorities and a clinical research institute, to pilot-test new strategies, improving diagnostic and treatment models for specific populations for whom access to and continuity of care are constant challenges. A large portion of the pilot project was launched in Vancouver’s inner city, identified as a priority site as it represents the majority of BC’s HIV cases and displays increasing rates of HIV, with particular emphasis in two neighbourhoods: The West End: home to a mixed population of families, seniors and international transient residents, and also home to Vancouver’s substantial gay population; The Downtown Eastside: known as “Canada’s poorest postal code”, noted for a high incidence of poverty, drug use, sex trade, crime, violence, as well as many decades of community activism. Both neighbourhoods, as well as the HIV community in Vancouver, have well-organized activist networks and have formidable reputations for vigorous and effective community activism. Funding to community groups had recently been reduced by the health authority, in response to provincial budgets. Numerous AIDS Service Organizations (ASOs) and activist groups were affected by these cuts, and were cautious about this new provincial project.

The complex relationships between provincial, regional and local stakeholders, the controversial nature of HIV itself and new service strategies, and substantial funding, all combined to create a highly visible and highly politicized project.

The Role of Public Participation
From its initial stages, the STOP HIV Project identified community partnership as critical to an accountable, responsive and effective pilot project. The STOP HIV Provincial Leadership Committee recruited four Community Representatives (nominated by ASOs) to inform the planning process and to support the engagement of the community. For Vancouver Coastal Health (VCH - one of the three health authorities funded by the STOP HIV Project, and the largest health authority in Canada) it was clear that public participation (P2) would be essential in order to meaningfully involve marginalized populations in the shaping of our pilot strategies, and to build trusting relationships with ASOs that would partner in delivery of services. The VCH Community Engagement department was invited to develop and implement a long-term P2 plan that would involve people living with and at risk for HIV in shaping new services, and assist in building community partnerships. We were fortunate to work in collaboration with the Community Representative for our region, Kath Webster (a person living with HIV and a well-known leader in the HIV community) to plan and implement the P2 strategy. We planned a multi-phase strategy, to be implemented on a semi-annual basis throughout the length of the STOP HIV Project, to ensure diverse voices from local communities would have an ongoing and meaningful role in shaping the services that would affect their lives.

Public Participation Methods
A wide range of consultation methods were used across this project so that participation would be accessible and meaningful to vulnerable and hard-to-reach populations. For example, art-
based journey mapping was introduced in Phase 1 (Summer 2010) for some groups, to help participants tell the story of their ‘journey with HIV’, leading to discussion of how to improve services. Phase 2 (Spring 2011) introduced an opening presentation on project updates: how had their feedback from Phase 1 actually influenced service planning for the STOP HIV Project? Questions were also introduced in this phase to target specific STOP HIV service planning. By Phase 3 (Fall 2011), pilot-strategy services had been implemented and no specific feedback was required, so HIV education sessions were offered with update presentations. By Phase 4 (Spring 2012), VCH needed feedback on people’s priorities for services to be continued after STOP funding is concluded in March 2013. Education sessions of various types were also offered in each phase, based on the needs identified by each specific population.

### Populations
- Aboriginal people
- Youth
- Men and women in sex trade
- People with mental illness and/or addiction
- Immigrants and refugees
- Transgendered people
- Gay men and marginalized men who have sex with men
- Homeless persons
- Injection drug users
- Women escaping violent relationships

### Methods
- Art-based journey mapping
- HIV/STI education and clinic sessions
- Discussion groups
- Individual and small group interviews
- Interpreters facilitated Spanish language sessions
- Project update presentations
- HIV medication education

### Uniqueness of the Project

1. **Prioritizing the most vulnerable and hard-to-reach in our consultations**

The STOP HIV Project had identified key vulnerable populations for pilot projects. VCH CE staff then worked collaboratively with ASO staff and HIV activists to identify priority groups and organizations for the P2 process (as listed above). Specialized HIV services for these populations have been designed and tested since the 1990s, yet infection rates continue to increase. As well, HIV disproportionately affects people who already experience strong societal judgment and encounter multiple barriers to accessing services from health care providers and other institutions. VCH leadership realized that involvement of these community members in shaping services would assist with new and truly effective service design, while also building trust with marginalized groups, thereby increasing awareness, familiarity and uptake of services.

2. **The Impact of HIV Stigma**

An early and continuing theme through all consultations was the continuing and profound impact of HIV stigma on people’s willingness to be tested, acknowledge their HIV status or engage with healthcare providers. CE staff recognized that, for some groups, it would be potentially harmful to ask participants about their HIV status, or to ask them to comment on services specific to HIV treatment. Various discussion and interview guides were developed with sensitivity to this concern, while maintaining integrity with the stated purpose of each phase.

There are also still many myths about HIV transmission and infection. We realized that people may attend our discussions in order to anonymously obtain HIV information, and incorporated education sessions into our work, in ways that would not ‘label’ participants as a person living with or at risk for HIV. Finally, having an HIV+ representative co-facilitate all sessions was very empowering for participants living with HIV. It was particularly important that CE staff work in collaboration with the Community Representative, and other trusted peer-leaders from each
respective population, so that participants would see an HIV+ person co-leading these processes. By Phase 4 we were hearing from participants that the STOP project, including its P2 processes, had started to significantly diminish HIV stigma in some populations.

3. Continuous and collaborative community partnerships
How could the STOP HIV Project involve vulnerable groups who are the hardest to access? To navigate this complex and diverse breadth of populations, CE staff met with ASO staff and HIV activists (several times in some cases) to explore how to collaborate in conducting the consultation process, to discuss the goals of the work, and to engender trust in the intention of the project. These initial discussions were often challenging since ASO staff were cautious regarding the intentions of the STOP HIV Project, as well as the CE department’s intentions about how (or if) public feedback would actually be used in decision-making. Their role as ‘gate-keepers’ and community leaders was essential in helping us plan our approaches so that they were accessible, and helping us recognize and respect the norms and needs of each population, so that the consultations would be positive and empowering for participants. By collaborating with community peer leaders, our project demonstrated to participants our respect for each population’s culture (whether by ethnicity, sexuality, substance-use, etc.). As well, co-facilitation with a respected HIV+ peer-leader, and other HIV activists and peer leaders was key to building trust AND role-modeling an empowering, collaborative process.

4. Flexible and adaptive approaches
Questions, discussion guides and approaches were developed in collaboration with ASO partners, and adapted continuously to meet the unique needs of each specific group, e.g.:

- One large discussion group would not be effective for homeless clients living with severe mental illness, so several small discussion groups and one-to-one interviews were conducted during their regularly-scheduled breakfast at a clinic.
- Latin American youth living illegally in Vancouver cannot access health services and are understandably cautious about being identified by institutions. Spanish-speaking outreach workers arranged health testing and education in addition to the consultation – co-facilitated by the outreach workers and youth, and arranged in partnership with street nurses – during a late-night anonymous ‘clinic and pizza’ event.
- Aboriginal women from rural areas in BC often come to Vancouver for a range of services. A discussion group was co-facilitated with a First Nations HIV educator, providing basic HIV information (rarely available in remote areas) in a shelter for women who have experienced domestic violence.

Project Results
The breadth of participants in our consultations reflected the wide diversity of the populations affected by HIV. The recommendations gathered over two years had direct impact on service plans. By involving community partners and demonstrating meaningful use of feedback, there was increasing trust with our P2 process. For VCH STOP leadership, the P2 process contributed to: 1) building trust with partners, stakeholders and the public that VCH is committed to community involvement and partnership; 2) consequent increased trust and reduced barriers to partnerships with ASOs, improving services for clients; 3) strengthened partnerships with and between key communities, resulting in population-specific engagement strategies now facilitated by ASOs themselves (not mediated by VCH CE department).

Monitoring and evaluation of P2 processes was discussed on a continuous basis with community leaders. Evaluation forms were also given to participants to gather ongoing feedback about the P2 process. Where there were low literacy rates or low capacity to complete forms, The Community Representative or co-facilitator asked general questions about the session format, and recommendations for future participation.
Alignment with IAP2 Core Values

1. How did the project ensure that those most affected by services were involved?

VCH leadership articulated and demonstrated a strong commitment to community involvement, to ensure that pilot-projects would be tailored to the actual needs of marginalized communities, to strengthen partnerships with ASOs, and to increase project awareness and effectiveness among hard-to-reach populations. Community participation was built into the foundation of VCH’s planning and decision-making for this project, in that the VCH Community Engagement (CE) department was invited at the outset of VCH’s involvement in order to develop and facilitate mechanisms for ongoing community discussions. CE staff worked ‘shoulder-to-shoulder’ with the Community Representative in developing and implementing the P2 strategy. VCH CE staff also sought advice from and collaborated with individuals and organizations in the HIV community throughout the length of the STOP HIV Project, so that their experience and recommendations would guide the ongoing implementation of the P2 strategy.

2. How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public’s contributions?

For the STOP HIV Project, recommendations from public participants have had direct influence as follows:

- **Peer Involvement**: A large new network of community-based peer workers has been created to provide HIV tests and support to newly diagnosed patients, and also work with the STOP Clinical Team to provide outreach services.
- **Provision of medical services in non-clinical locations**: The STOP HIV Clinical Team provides testing and treatment in partnership with many non-clinical locations, including shelters, drop-ins and community centers.
- **Services for immigrants and refugees**: A clinic for people who do not have medical insurance is now established, services for uninsured individuals with HIV are now available at all VCH clinics, and access to interpreters is now embedded in this work.
- **Public health messages**: Messages to encourage testing and treatment have been specifically tailored to meet community standards and norms (e.g. ‘What’s Your Number’ for the gay men’s community, www.checkhimout.ca/testing).

3. How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated?

CE staff wrote a detailed project charter, signed by CE & VCH leadership, clearly outlining: the scope of influence of this P2 process; commitment to public release of the P2 results; and commitment to develop sustainable mechanisms for ongoing and meaningful public involvement for the length of the Vancouver STOP HIV Project. At the start of each phase of community consultation, CE staff would meet with STOP leadership to ensure the discussion topics were carefully selected and phrased so that the public feedback sought would be directly relevant to upcoming plans, ensuring VCH’s ability to utilize the feedback. Regular and ongoing communication between VCH CE staff and STOP HIV leadership continued outside of consultation phases also. As well, we formally agreed that the CE department would consult with members of the public only (and not with ASO staff), with agreement that VCH leadership would consult with ASO staff. Because VCH, as the health authority, was distributing funds to ASOs, there was concern that ASOs may feel pressured to participate in P2 processes in order to obtain the STOP funding. By drawing a clear boundary between public and ASO consultations, the integrity of the P2 process was protected from potential perception of unfair bias in VCH’s funding decisions.
4. How did the project seek out and facilitate the involvement of those most affected?

Through our intensive preparatory work with ASOs, and with the Community Representative, CE staff were able to access highly marginalized populations. We were invited to meal programs for the homeless and people living with serious mental illness, a drop-in centre for male sex-trade workers, several support groups for people living with HIV, community lunch programs for Latin American families, a late-night anonymised health clinic for illegal immigrants, a peer-based advocacy group for injection drug users, and many more. Some discussions were scheduled to coincide with an already-existing event. Others were recruited via posters, phone calls, personal contact and online outreach. For all these locations and populations, we adapted our questions and methods as indicated by the comfort of the population with whom we were meeting. To further ensure the comfort of participants, all discussions were co-facilitated by CE staff and the STOP Community Representative and/or a representative from the target population, or trusted ASO staff person. As well, groups for the Latin American community were facilitated in Spanish by community partners who are well-known and trusted in refugee communities. CE staff were present for these groups, and Latin American facilitators translated results later (sometimes in collaboration with group participants who stayed after the group to contribute to the analysis).

5. How did the Project seek input from participants on how they wished to participate?

A pilot-test of the Phase 1 group model was conducted with HIV activists for initial feedback. For all subsequent phases, participants were asked for ideas on how to improve future P2 processes. Participants agreed that the model of semi-annual report-back and discussion was effective so that STOP leadership and members of the public would maintain an ongoing dialogue for the length of the project. People also suggested that some discussion groups should include HIV education (on a variety of topics), and online surveys should be available. These were incorporated into future phases and, as always, developed in partnership with members of the HIV community.

6. How did the information provided to participants support meaningful participation?

A brief presentation was given at the beginning of each discussion, reporting on: overview of the STOP HIV project; themes and recommendations from the previous phase; results of how public feedback from the previous phase had been incorporated into service plans; and questions for the current phase of consultation. Information was presented on large posters and in handouts, in plain language, and translated into Spanish for Latin American groups. Facilitators presented this information and allowed lots of time for questions and discussion. We would then review the specific questions for the current phase of consultation. Also, because CE staff had worked closely with STOP leadership to plan the questions for each phase, we could confidently vouch for the integrity of the specific topics we asked about, demonstrating the value placed on ‘public voice’ by STOP leadership. Provision was also made to welcome people’s experiences and ideas that may lie outside the prescribed topics, and commitment was made to bring forward these additional concerns as ‘Community Alerts’ in all reports.

7. How did the communication of the project results ensure that participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem?

Maintaining honesty and transparency in communications with partners, stakeholders and public were key factors in the success of the Vancouver STOP HIV Project and the P2 strategy. CE staff prepared a report of participant experiences and recommendations after each phase of consultation (reviewed and approved by the Community Representative) for presentation to STOP HIV leadership. These reports were made widely available to the public: mailed/emailed to all participants and stakeholders, available on the VCH and other public websites, and distributed through email networks.
Images from the STOP HIV Community Consultations

Phase 1: Art-based journey-mapping: My Journey with HIV

Phase 2: Project Overview Poster

Phase 3: Sample Project Update Posters

Phase 4: Wall Banners in English and Spanish
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Resident and Family Voice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Community Engagement Team of Vancouver Coastal Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Vancouver Coastal Health Region, British Columbia, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>How can VCH support sustainable and effective mechanisms for resident and family involvement that could enhance quality of life for residents at all Vancouver Coastal Health and Providence Health Care owned and contracted complex care facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Workshops, focused discussions, interviews, advisory committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>The development and launch of a toolkit to support facility administrators to more effectively gather and use the voice of residents and family members to improve the quality of life for residents. The toolkit was distributed, in the form of a memory stick, to every owned and operated and contracted residential facility in VCH. It is also available on the VCH website. In addition indicators for measuring resident and family involvement were developed through consultation and those indicators were implemented in April 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>Region of Vancouver Coastal Health (22 municipalities and regional districts, and 16 first nations communities, covering approximately 25% of BC’s population). Spreading throughout the province of BC through access on website to toolkit, and collaboration and sharing provincially in Home and Community Care networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>Workshops, discussions, interviews held November through December 2010 Report and recommendations delivered February 2011 Planning and development for toolkit completed September 2011 Launched and distributed September 2011 Posted to public website November 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>In initial consultation 58 In toolkit development phase 15 In implementation and launch all staff and residents in VCH owned and operated and contracted facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.vch.ca/get_involved/community-engagement/reports/2011-reports/">Resident and Family Voice</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**The Problem and Challenge**

The Complex Residential Care Working Group (CRCWG) of Vancouver Coastal Health (VCH) and Providence Health Care (PHC) is made up of senior leadership within residential care. This group was interested in establishing increased rigor in the process of gathering and utilizing resident and family voice, to inform the operations of residential care in order to positively impact the quality of life for residents.

The CRCWG felt there was a weakness in the current family council model - the usual way to bring the voice of the residents and family members to inform planning and care delivery within residential care facilities. An inventory of current practice was conducted, which included information on the status of the councils, existence of terms of reference, number of participants and attendance of a facility representative. The inventory confirmed there is inconsistency in both the functioning of family councils and their effectiveness in ensuring the voice of residents and family members is considered in planning for services and care. The need to further examine this issue became more urgent when the BC Ombudsperson released the first of two reports on her investigation into the care of seniors in British Columbia, in December 2009. It included 10 specific recommendations in three categories; seniors’ rights, transparency and the role of family councils. To address this gap, the CRCWG worked with VCH Community Engagement in the development and implementation of an engagement process to inform effective resident and family involvement at all VCH and PHC owned and contracted complex care facilities. Community Engagement at VCH was asked to explore sustainable and effective mechanisms for family involvement that could enhance quality of life for residents.

Most facility residents and their family members desire to partner closely with administration and care teams, in order to personally benefit from safe, quality care. Importantly, residents and family members also desire this relationship to benefit the facility and the care providers. There is a distinct advantage to facilities when they deliver care and service in a resident–centred way. Planning together with residents and family members can often mitigate issues that can be costly to remedy.

Family members are not always sure of how they can best communicate and feel part of the residential facility. A relationship with facility staff, acceptance as a member of a care-giving team, who is able to share information, be recognized as a resource, and be involved in decisions, is important to family members. A facility that practices open communication with residents and family members develops relationships of trust. When a facility makes the effort to provide numerous mechanisms for residents and family members to express their ideas and concerns it benefits from the relationships that evolve. The benefits can far outweigh the investment required to develop such relationships.

The Community Engagement team of VCH designed a consultation process featuring participatory workshops to bring together residents, family members, caregivers and staff to develop a consensus among residents, families/loved ones, VCH staff and other stakeholders on a shared vision for resident/family involvement.

**The Role of Public Participation**

The project objectives included:

- To develop shared values that would guide meaningful involvement in residential care facility operations
- To develop a range of effective mechanisms for meaningful resident/family involvement at all VCH and contracted residential facilities
To propose a number of indicators that would effectively capture the level of satisfaction with those involvement mechanisms, which can be monitored by VCH and will support improved quality of care. Workshop findings were intended to support VCH Managers and contracted facility leaders to actively involve residents and family members in the ongoing operations of residential facilities.

Public Participation Methods:
The primary participants were residents and family members or friends, as well as all existing family council members. Also invited were VCH and PHC staff from owned and operated residential care facilities, staff from VCH area residential care facilities that are contracted by VCH, and residential facilities that are privately operated within the VCH Region. Community organizations that provide direct service to residential care facilities within the VCH jurisdiction were invited to attend, as well as non-governmental organizations and advocacy groups. Seven workshops were held in the region in November and December 2010. Recruitment for the workshops began in early October with the support of the CRCWG and administrators of VCH/PHC facilities. Posters were created to promote each of the workshops and a letter was sent out to the facility administration detailing the workshop goals and intended participants. Convenient locations and different times were offered to potential participants. A total of 58 people participated in the workshops.

The workshops were participatory, allowing people the opportunity to contribute fully to the discussion. Each workshop lasted three to four hours and was designed to gather feedback on four main areas of resident and family voice. First, participants were asked to brainstorm a list of values, tenets, principles that would be used to guide resident/family involvement and enhance the voice of residents and their families. Then, participants were asked to consider how the values they determined could be measured to demonstrate these values are being upheld in gathering and using resident and family voice. In the third part of the workshop sessions, participants were asked to generate a menu of methods that residential care facilities could use to effectively gather resident and family voice. Finally, participants discussed what would be apparent and how a residential care facility would demonstrate that they are in practice, collecting, responding to and utilizing the feedback of residents and family members.

Uniqueness of the Project:
This consultation involved a high level of participation and commitment from those involved. The challenge existed to define the values that underpin effective involvement and voice for residents and family members. As well as to develop indicators, that would be used by VCH, to hold facilities accountable for demonstrating the implementation of methods and enhancing their practice of really listening and using resident and family voice for the purpose of improving the quality of life of residents. This project used public participation to generate practical solutions that reflect the needs of key stakeholders. It demonstrated a capacity building nature as the goal of the project was to more meaningfully include residents and family participation. This project was an opportunity, for VCH Community Engagement, to model best practice of public participation and to build the capacity of health care staff to endorse and promote the active participation of the clients and communities they serve.

Project Results:
Workshop findings supported facility managers and contracted facility leaders to actively involve residents and family members in the on-going operations of residential facilities. CE, with support from workshop findings, developed a toolkit to support facility administrators to more effectively gather and use the voice of residents and family members to improve the quality of life for residents. The Residential Voice toolkit provides residential care staff with resources and tools to assist them in implementing and enhancing involvement of residents and family...
members in residential care planning and services. The Residential Voice toolkit was distributed to every owned and operated and contracted residential care facility in VCH.

As result of the workshops, indicators to measure the involvement of resident and family members were developed and were implemented for reporting in April 2012. VCH’s efforts were also recognized and complimented by BC’s Ombudsperson (see letter, pg.7)

Alignment with Core Values:

**How did the project ensure that those most affected by the decision or problem were involved?**

Residents of care facilities, and those who love and care for them, indicated a desire for a greater level of involvement and voice in the decisions that affect their quality of life. Due to increasing communication from residents and family members, on the current state of care in facilities and their inability to know how to get involved and impact change, the B.C. Ombudsperson initiated a province wide investigation to look at seniors’ care. With a specific focus on issues of access to information, access to services, quality of care, standards of care, monitoring and enforcement, and complaints processes the Ombudsperson’s findings reinforced the need for rigorous and measurable involvement of residents and family members in the decisions that impact their quality of life. This project ensured that residents and their loved ones were integrally involved in the workshops that resulted in the recommendations and the development of the toolkit and indicators to embed consistent practice and rigour into involvement of residents and family members in the decisions that impact them.

**How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public’s contributions?**

The information generated from the workshops directly influenced the decision to develop a resource, the Residential Voice Toolkit, which was infused with the public view that partnership in care was necessary to improve outcomes. The defining of values, to guide resident and family involvement, set the foundation for awareness of the benefits of increased resident and family involvement. The suggested methods to gather voice provided practical ways for facilities to implement increased involvement. The indicators developed by participants provided a clear direction for VCH to more rigorously measure effective involvement.

**How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated?**

This project collected the voices of residents and families who are invested in the new ways their input will be collected and included; as well as residential care staff that would be responsible for implementing the recommendations. Bringing all these voices together, allowed residents and families to share what was important to them and also provided staff a safe space to identify any barriers or opportunities for meaningful resident and family involvement. In terms of sustainability, the new practices have been implemented across the VCH region, not just as a pilot project. It has the endorsement of senior leadership, as well as the commitment to continue to operationalize it at the local level. The cost impact of the new practices is minimal and thus does not present financial impediments to its sustainability.

**How did the project seek out and facilitate the involvement of those most affected?**

The primary participants were residents and family members or friends and existing family council members at residential care facilities. However, the consultation also invited VCH and PHC staff, from owned and operated residential care facilities, staff from VCH area residential care facilities that are contracted by VCH, and residential facilities that are privately operated within the VCH Region. Each of these stakeholders will be directly affected by the project. In addition, community organizations providing direct service to residential care facilities within the VCH jurisdiction were invited to attend, as well as non-governmental organizations and
advocacy groups since they have experience supporting residents and family members and can contribute insight on how to support their involvement.

**How did the project seek input from participants on how they wished to participate?**
When we began the project we had committed to accommodating various opportunities and methods for participants to provide feedback. Because of the diverse audience and expanse of VCH’s region a range of convenient locations and different times were offered to potential participants. As well those who could not attend the workshops at the times offered were able to contribute through one-on-one discussions.

**How did the information provided to participants support or contribute to meaningful participation?**
At the outset of the project the CE team worked with partners in the community and providers within VCH to identify residents, family members, relevant community organization and staff that would be willing to participate. With that partnership support, we were able to gain an understanding of, and incorporate the communication needs of, various user groups in order to effectively communicate the project goals and the reasons their input was being sought. When participants attended they were provided with background information on the CRCWG, the project and the report from the BC Ombudsperson to provide context to the workshop. The questions asked of each group were designed to invite feedback within the scope of each user group’s capacity. Because this discussion was about resident and family voice, most participants were informed by the wealth of personal or advocacy experiences.

**How did the communication of the project results ensure that participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem?**
The initial intent of the project was to develop a list of core values and indicators that underscore meaningful resident and family involvement. The consultation report was sent to all participants but the commitment to resident and family voice guided the project and lead to the development of a toolkit for staff which was distributed to all facilities in the Vancouver Coastal Health Region. When the toolkit was completed and posted for public access the link was distributed to all participants. As facilities employ the tools, in the toolkit, resident and family stakeholders will experience how their input has influenced and impacted how residential care facilities across the region develop more robust mechanisms for resident and family involvement.
November 26, 2010

File: 08-97413

Dr. David Ostrow
President and Chief Executive Officer
Vancouver Coastal Health Authority
601 West Broadway, 11th Floor
Vancouver BC V5Z 4C2

Dear Dr. Ostrow:

It was recently brought to my attention that the Vancouver Coastal Health Authority (VCHA) is hosting four events this month throughout the region, in order to engage interested stakeholders in a discussion concerning improvements to residential care services. I am writing to compliment you on taking this initiative.

The Ombudsperson Public Report Number 46: The Best of Care: Getting it Right for Seniors in BC (Part 1) focused on seniors in residential care facilities and made several recommendations to strengthen the role of resident and family councils. Residents and family councils play a constructive role in allowing residents, or the representatives they choose, to have greater influence over the decisions made about their lives. This increases resident satisfaction and self-determination.

Resident and family councils are especially important to seniors who do not have family members to assist them and speak on their behalf. Therefore, I am especially pleased to note that VCHA has invited broad and inclusive participation in these events.

Yours sincerely,

Kim S. Carter
Ombudsperson
Province of British Columbia

cc: Ms. Shannon Berg, A/Executive Director, HCC, VCHA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Southeast Fort Worth Passenger Rail Feasibility Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>The T - Fort Worth Transportation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Fort Worth, Texas, population: 741,206; approximately 111,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>The City of Fort Worth is one of the fastest growing cities in the nation's fourth largest metropolitan area; and with that growth comes the issue of expanding public transportation options. The southeast area of Fort Worth represents the highest ridership for the Fort Worth Transportation Authority's (The T) public transportation system. Recognizing this, the agency engaged rail consultant R. L. Banks and Associates (RLBA) to perform a feasibility study of the area that incorporated public input and technical evaluation towards the determination of the physical, operational and financial feasibility of passenger rail service in Southeast Fort Worth. This information will be also used to set future transportation priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>During the study period both traditional and non-traditional methods were used to engage the public and get their input. Tools included: QR codes, a partnership with a local neighborhood association for billboard space, community meetings, &quot;person on the street&quot; interviews, and online survey tools. Input was gathered not just from the immediate community, but from business owners and their employees, students and others in Tarrant County. This line would is seen as a catalyst for future economic development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>The study provided recommendations for the implementation of passenger rail in Southeast Fort Worth. These recommendations were based on stakeholder preference and technical evaluation, which included alignment, technology, service and phasing priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>City and county-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>December 2010 - October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Approximately 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.the-t.com/SERailStudy/tabid/265/Default.aspx">http://www.the-t.com/SERailStudy/tabid/265/Default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Problem and Challenge
Fort Worth is the fastest growing city in the nation’s fourth largest metropolitan area. As with most major cities, public transportation and its expansion is a top priority. The T is a late bloomer in the passenger rail arena, however, the agency recently began to move forward with TEX Rail, a passenger rail service connecting southwest Fort Worth to Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport (DFW).

Although the new line will originate from southwest Fort Worth, the southeast area of Fort Worth represents the highest ridership for The T and residents were very vocal regarding the implementation of passenger rail in their community, as well as the decision to implement the southwest Fort Worth line first. While The T Board of Directors made a commitment to build and operate a rail system as soon as feasibly possible, funding and route alignments had not been identified.

Our challenges included:

• Engaging residents, businesses and commuters in Southeast Fort Worth and ensuring they had a voice in the study process
• Overcoming the perception that public transportation was mainly used by impoverished populations
• Establishing an open, inclusive and transparent process
• Setting realistic expectations on the implementation of the service
• Providing a blueprint for future rail expansion that included proposed alignment, technology, service and phasing recommendations, as well as an estimated cost to implement the service

The Role of Public Participation
Southeast Fort Worth is an economically disadvantaged area and it was extremely important for our team to engage the stakeholders throughout the process. Historically, this community has been excluded from the planning process and is now very concerned about its future growth. In addition to understanding the mindset of stakeholders in the study area, we needed to understand the current and future public transportation needs of residents, businesses and commuters. One of our main goals was to determine whether or not the community even wanted the service or would be comfortable with enhanced bus service. We also needed to know who the current riders were and their thoughts on improving and expanding service, as well as get input from those who did not use public transportation.

Public Participation Methods
In order to efficiently gather the intel needed, traditional and non-traditional methods were implemented to engage first, second and third-tier stakeholders. The first step in the process was to develop a community outreach plan that identified goals and objectives, tools and techniques and project stakeholders (local elected and appointed officials, City of Fort Worth, residents, major employers, commuters, current and potential users of The T, and neighborhood and community organizations).

To fully engage the community and ensure no one was excluded, Open Channels Group (OCG) worked with stakeholder groups, community leaders, businesses, and elected officials to ensure the community was given adequate opportunities to participate in the process. Our final outreach plan included the following:

• Organizing and facilitating community meetings
  Three community meetings were held during the study. The goal of the first meeting was to educate stakeholders on the study process, set realistic expectations, gather input on their preference as it relates to route alignment, station placement, speed and type of technology (the type of rail car to be used).
Performing “person on the street” interviews
The impact of a passenger rail line in Southeast Fort Worth would be enormous. The possibility of being better connected to employment and quality of life opportunities is important to this community. In order to expand the reach of the study and capture the thoughts of future riders, OCG partnered with a communications class at the University of Texas at Arlington to perform “person on the street” interviews at various locations and along bus routes throughout the study area and the Trinity River Express (commuter train that ran from downtown Dallas to downtown Fort Worth). These face-to-face meetings allowed OCG to understand the community’s perspectives as it relates to current and potential usage of The T, alignment preference number of stations, station placement, and traffic impacts.

Developing and implementing surveys
In addition to the face-to-face interviews, interested citizens were also able to complete a survey through an online tool and paper surveys strategically placed throughout the study area and distributed during community meetings. This allowed the team to obtain input from those indirectly impacted by the implementation of the rail line or those who may not have been able to attend meetings.

Creating marketing materials
The team developed a newsletter that provided a recap of each community meeting and an overview of the study’s progress. Advertisements were placed in local newspapers to promote meetings and encourage participation in the survey. In addition, OCG partnered with a local community development organization to use their billboard space to promote the study.

Uniqueness of the Project
The Southeast Fort Worth area has been studied extensively, and there are even more studies dealing with passenger rail. The study our team performed is different because there is a strong commitment from The T Board of Directors to implement passenger rail in the area. This study represented the first step in making a project so desperately needed a reality.

Public participation improved the decision by allowing an inclusive process that took into account the needs of the community the project would primarily serve and affect. Only Southeast Fort Worth knows how it feels about passenger rail and hearing the thoughts of the community first-hand gave our team a much better foundation for making a final and recommendation.

The project was able to advance the practice of public participation by using almost every level in the IAP2 spectrum and promoting partnerships to meet the project goals. From the inform level all the way though collaboration, our team made sure the southeast Fort Worth community was heavily involved in all aspects of the project and decision-making process –which further solidified the value of the public participation process.

Stakeholders were extensively involved in the process, including determining whether the community wanted the service, potential alignments, types of rail cars and station placement. During each community meeting, the rail consultant would provide an overview of the study and the stage it was currently in. After the presentation, there was a facilitated conversation to dig deeper into the stakeholders’ preferences. Attendees would leave the meetings with a clear understanding of the project, as well as the next steps.

The OCG team was able to employ several techniques based on its analysis of the stakeholder groups affected by the project – from traditional techniques to the incorporation of social media tools and strong partnerships with the community.
During the project, OCG was able to establish two important partnerships that added to the success of the study. Working with students at the University of Texas at Arlington allowed us to expand our reach, while working within the confines of a small budget. The incorporation of the students in the process allowed the study to also reach people who were indirectly impacted by the addition of a passenger rail line. In addition to working with the students, OCG established partnerships with several neighborhood and community organizations to communicate study information to stakeholders. The partnership with Southeast Fort Worth, Inc., a community development organization working to grow the area and the Handley Community Development Corporation were crucial to the success of the project. The Handley CDC allowed our team to use billboard space to promote meetings and study information.

QR codes were also used on meeting notices to direct interested citizens to the project Web page.

The survey tool, community meeting participation and feedback from the project web page allowed OCG to monitor and evaluate public participation. The survey tool not only gauged the preferences of the participant, but the reach, as it asked questions regarding home and work location. The survey was also an effective way to grow the stakeholder database.

Once the study was complete, a final report was first presented to the community to make them aware of the study findings and include any additional input prior to the presentation to The T Board of Directors.

Project Results
RLBA was able to develop a detailed recommendation for the T Board of Directors that included a technical evaluation and feedback from stakeholders. The recommendation was presented to The T Board of Directors and stakeholders in December 2011. As the agency works to launch TEX Rail, it has also taken the first steps in making good on its promises to bring relief to Southeast Fort Worth. Prior to the study ending, The T implemented bus rapid transit (BRT) service along its busiest corridors in Southeast Fort Worth. BRT is a step between regular bus service and rail service.

Alignment with IAP2 Core Values
Outreach for the project was closely aligned with IAP2 Core Values as we worked to make sure the Southeast Fort Worth community had a say in the future development of their community. The OCG team was able to develop a very thorough stakeholder list. It not only included neighborhood groups, businesses and local appointed and elected officials, but also contained those from other cities that would benefit from the project as well as regional transportation agencies and supporters.

The outcome of the project was influenced by the public’s contributions because it dealt with preferred alignments, station placement and type of technology to be used, which were all identified at community meetings, through surveys and person-on-the-street interviews.

At each and every meeting, our team stressed that this was the first step in transportation planning and that we had many more to go, including the securing of funding. In addition, survey results were shared during the meetings. Each and every option, as it related to alignments, station placement and type of technology was fully explained to assist participants in decision-making.
During the planning phase of the project, OCG immediately identified the most obvious stakeholders and moved out from there to include other interested and affected parties (municipalities, businesses, regional transportation authorities, etc.). In addition to hosting meetings, our team also attended the monthly meetings of other organizations (neighborhood and business associations) to gather input. Through each phase of the project the public remained top of mind, with the Southeast Fort Worth community and other stakeholders being engaged through traditional and non-traditional methods.
## CASE STUDY SUMMARY TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th><strong>Shape Your Future Victoria – The City of Victoria’s Official Community Plan</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organising Group</strong></td>
<td>The City of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Victoria, BC, Canada, population ~ 80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>The problem was to develop a 30-year plan for Victoria with a broad base of community support. Unlike a lot of communities, Victoria has groups of citizens who are highly engaged and vocal about land use decisions and very attached to their neighbourhoods. The unique challenge for the City of Victoria was to shift the role of citizen participation from its focus on neighbourhood planning issues, which are often site-specific, to a future-oriented and citywide conversation about a sustainable city.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Sample Methods** | Citizenship Advisory Committee  
Project website; social media (Facebook, Twitter); discussion papers; topic sheets; e-newsletter distribution list.  
Mobile kiosks survey; information booths at community events; community forums; visioning workshops with stakeholders incl. hard to reach groups such as youth; Citizen Insight Councils; citizen-led community circles; community cafe; coffee talks; staff presentations; formal submissions. |
| **Results** | Through public participation, the project was able to develop an OCP that reflects the interests, perspectives, values and ideas of citizens through public policy on land use and related issues which have broad public support. Along the way, a new relationship was fostered between the City of Victoria and neighbourhoods. |
| **Impact Level** | Municipal boundaries |
| **Timeframe** | January 2010 – April 2012 |
| **People Engaged** | 7500 participants |
| **Web-link** | [www.shapeyourfuturevictoria.ca](http://www.shapeyourfuturevictoria.ca) |
THE PROBLEM AND CHALLENGE

Every local government in British Columbia, Canada, must have an official community plan ("OCP") with public policy on land use planning and development and related areas such as social wellbeing, economic vitality and protection of natural environment. Under provincial legislation, the OCP directs Council decisions, budgets and resource allocation and subsidiary plans, policies, programs, projects, and capital works.

The problem for the City of Victoria was to develop a 30-year OCP for a sustainable city with a broad base of support among community members. While this goal is not unique, the challenge facing Victoria was unusual. Unlike a lot of communities, Victoria has groups of citizens who are highly engaged and vocal about land use decisions and very attached to their neighbourhoods. The difficulty for creating a new OCP was to shift the focus of public participation from City planning and development issues in each neighbourhood, to a citywide conversation about ‘shaping the future of Victoria’.

In 2009, Victoria City Council identified citizen engagement as one of its top priorities. The corporation hired a consultant to prepare a Civic Engagement Strategy, based on IAP2 principles, which advised the City on how to improve public processes for better decision-making and municipal service delivery. The OCP was the first opportunity to pilot the Civic Engagement Strategy in a City project.

Throughout the OCP process, City staff sought to foster a new relationship with community associations, which are responsible for review of land development applications in neighbourhoods, and to expand the base and mix of participants. The project learned from a diversity of stakeholders, including the insight, knowledge and experience of Victoria’s highly engaged citizens. To achieve this, the project had the challenge of how to make city planning relevant, understandable, engaging, and fun.

The OCP is the outcome of finding ways for organisations, groups, businesses and individuals to have open conversations with staff. Their interests, perspectives, values and ideas are the foundation of the citywide plan, which has broad community support.

THE ROLE OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Learning from IAP2 values, the City of Victoria created a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) for the OCP in 2009 to help foster a new relationship with highly engaged and vocal groups in neighbourhoods, and to expand the base and mix of participants. CAC members were citizens who advised staff on planning and other neighbourhood issues and were highly effective as partners on development of the OCP Public Engagement Strategy, which Council approved in early 2010. The CAC continued to meet with staff on a monthly basis in 2010 and 2011 to review methods and materials for participation, generously sharing invaluable insight.

To shift citizen participation from planning and development issues, which are often site-specific, in neighbourhoods to a future-oriented and citywide conversation about Victoria, the project sought to inform the public about the OCP, and to involve citizens in community visioning, and comments on a Draft Plan. Over 6,000 individuals contributed to the plan vision and 1,500 people took the time to come to events on the Draft Plan, in a city of less than 80,000 residents. By the end of the project, the OCP had involved more of the public than any engagement process in the history of the City of Victoria.
While learning from Victoria citizens who are highly engaged in neighbourhoods, the project also identified and involved a diversity of stakeholders. These included social service providers and facilities and staff working with “hard-to-reach” groups, such as single parents, urban poor, cultural organisations, new immigrants and youth:

- Business community
- City public advisory committees
- Community-building organisations
- Community centres
- Cultural organisations including immigrants settlement agencies
- Disability centres and groups
- Downtown social services
- Employment centres and services
- Groups serving families and children including single parents
- First Nations (aboriginal) facilities and programs
- Neighbourhood associations
- Planning and development
- Senior centres and organisations
- Sustainability advisors/practitioners
- Young professionals (24-40)
- Youth (13-24)

Through public participation, the project was able to develop an OCP that reflects the interests, perspectives, values and ideas of citizens through land use and related policy with broad community support.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION METHODS**

Public participation methods were selected at each phase of the OCP process: (1) Plan Research (October 2009 – February 2010); (2) Plan Vision (March – June 2010); (3) Draft Plan (July 2010 to March 2011); and (4) Draft Review (April 2011 to April 2012). During Phase 2, the methods were chosen to inform public, and to learn from citizens about the issues that face different groups, and aspirations for the future. Phases 3 and 4 sought feedback loops with the public on plan vision and Draft Plan respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION METHOD AND DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>INDIVIDUALS ENGAGED</th>
<th>PLAN RESEARCH</th>
<th>PLAN VISION</th>
<th>PLAN DRAFT</th>
<th>DRAFT REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Techniques to share information</td>
<td>5,350 unique “hits” Feb – July 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website: A dynamic, interactive website was developed to serve as the online “go-to” place for the latest information on the OCP including events and research.</td>
<td>5,350 unique “hits” Feb – July 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Sheets: Eighteen topic sheets on OCP issues including a fact sheet on the project process and engagement.</td>
<td>Distributed via website and events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Papers: Eleven online research papers on OCP topics, prepared by topic experts.</td>
<td>Distributed through website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Newsletter Distribution List: Regular updates on OCP</td>
<td>Distribution list</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Techniques to consult and involve were used for community feedback on analysis, issues and alternatives, and to work with the public to ensure that aspirations and concerns had been understood, and fully considered.

| Survey: Survey 1: community priorities through mobile kiosks; Survey 2: online survey on urban growth options; Survey 3: comments on Draft OCP. | 3000 | 150 | 400 |
| Survey: Survey 1: community priorities through mobile kiosks; Survey 2: online survey on urban growth options; Survey 3: comments on Draft OCP. | 3000 | 150 | 400 |
| Presentations: Overview of OCP process, content and engagement options for the public. | 700 |
| Open Houses: Displays and presentations on the OCP process, public input and the Draft Plan. | 300 |
| Visioning Workshops: Facilitated small group discussions with representatives of stakeholders such as youth; social services; & developers. | 90 organisation representatives (23 workshops) |
| Local Area Planning Workshops: Workshop 1: facilitated small group discussions on how, where and when to focus planning for areas larger and smaller than neighbourhoods. Workshop 2: review of Draft OCP section on Local Area Planning to discuss major issues. | 30 (x 2) |
| Community Forums: Forum 1: presentations and broad discussions on OCP topics. Forum 2: review and refine ideas from the public input on plan vision. | 500+ | 200+ |
| Community Circles: Citizen-led “kitchen table discussions” of community members (no staff) to discuss OCP topics and send input through OCP website. | 300+ | 47 circles |
| Citizen Insight Councils: Facilitated event to explore issues and policy solutions with randomly selected citizens. | 21 |
| Community Café: Event with facilitated activities to engage youth in identifying issues and proposing ideas / solutions. | 30 |
| Coffee Talks: Staff visits to coffee shops, community centres and other public venues/events to advertise the Draft Review. | 300 |

UNIQUENESS OF THE PROJECT

Unlike a lot of communities, Victoria has groups of citizens who are highly engaged and vocal about land use decisions and very attached to their neighbourhoods. The unique challenge for the City of Victoria was to shift the role of citizen participation from its focus on neighbourhood planning issues, which are often site-specific, to a future-oriented and citywide conversation about a sustainable city. Throughout the process, the project sought to involve the public in plan development in meaningful and innovative ways:

1. **Talking things through:** The project sought to foster and support a citywide conversation on shaping the future of Victoria. The City created a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) early in the project, and collaborated with members on the OCP Public Engagement Strategy. Through the discussions at CAC meetings, methods and tools were evaluated, selected and refined. Conversations between staff and the CAC built a high level of trust, and this approach of “talking things through” became a keystone of the project. One example is two workshops on local area planning. Despite
a long history of friction between community associations, developers and City staff, small groups discussed through their differences, built more trust and reached some agreement on where the City should update plans in neighbourhoods.

2. Social diversity and inclusion: The project identified and involved a diversity of stakeholders including social service providers and facilities and staff working with “hard-to-reach” groups, such as single parents, urban poor, cultural organisations, new immigrants, and youth. The project also ensured there were options for “active” and “passive” public participation that were easy to fit into busy lives and fun. For example, citizens could self-organize “community circles” with a workbook posted on the website, or attend the Community Forums to learn about the OCP project from displays and staff.

3. Awareness and accessibility: To raise public awareness from the beginning, the project “went to where people are” using a mobile kiosks for a public survey, setting up booths at community events, and sitting in cafes in neighbourhoods to chat with local residents about the future of Victoria. The project was branded with the tag line “Shape Your Future Victoria”, a visual identity for materials, and a website that was a “one-stop-shop” of information on the OCP project, including discussion papers, topic sheets, and how to participate in events and activities. In addition, all public input into plan visioning and comments on the Draft Plan were posted as raw data, or in reports, on the website.

4. Learning from doing: Given the ability to discuss the public participation with the CAC, the project sought to continuously learn from feedback and event outcomes to adapt the methods as needed. For example, fairly low attendance at an early Open House on the Draft OCP led to the addition of neighbourhood walking tours at the other Open Houses, which was advertised to the public and proved to be popular. For the City of Victoria, the project is also an educational example of best practice in community planning, through commitment to IAP2 values, which will inform future City projects.

PROJECT RESULTS
Through public participation, the project was able to develop an OCP that reflects the interests, perspectives, values and ideas of citizens through public policy on land use and related issues which have broad public support. Along the way, a new relationship was fostered between the City and neighbourhoods.

ALIGNMENT WITH CORE VALUES
How the project ensure that those most affected by decision or problem were involved?
Everyone in Victoria has a stake in the official community plan. Two examples of how the project ensured the involvement of those most affected are Visioning Workshops, and youth participation. Twenty-three workshops, facilitated by the project team, were held in May to June 2010, each focused on one stakeholder group, ranging from inner city services to developers. One Visioning Workshop was organized with the Victoria Youth Council. Other activities involving youth included training high school students as volunteer facilitators for a “Youth Café” where people could join conservations to share visions of the future, or to map “favourite places” in the city.

How was the outcome influenced by the public’s contributions?
The OCP is a direct product of public contribution. What the project learned from neighbourhoods, organisations, groups, businesses and individuals was carefully considered and integrated with research from discussion papers and internal input from City of Victoria departments to develop an initial draft of the plan. After the community
reviewed and gave feedback on the Draft OCP, this round of comments and concerns were also carefully considered through changes that are reflected in the final plan.

How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated?
The engagement process sought to involve a broad diversity of public participants and to learn from Victoria’s highly engaged citizens as a resource so that the OCP would reflect the interests, perspectives, values and ideas of all community members. One example of how this approach promoted sustainable decisions is two workshops on local area plans. Despite a history of friction between community associations, residents, developers and City staff, representatives talked through differences, increased mutual trust and worked together to identify where and when the City should update plans in the neighbourhoods.

How did the project seek out and facilitate the involvement of those most affected?
The project sought and facilitated the involvement of those most affected through collaboration with the CAC and the Youth Council. The Mayor attended an assembly at Victoria’s sole high school to invite participation through OCP survey kiosks brought to the location. The students also submitted essays on their vision for the future of Victoria. Some organisations working with “hard to reach” with staff who had participated in the Visioning Workshops, enabled the involvement of youth on their own terms. One inner city service provider for youth who are homeless hosted a free meal and invited clients to share their visions for the future.

How did the information provided to participants support or contribute to meaningful participation?
Information was provided through marketing and research. The project was branded with the tagline “Shape Your Future Victoria”, a visual identity for materials and a website that was a “one-stop-shop” on the OCP project, background research and topic sheets, and events. Topic sheets were developed to inform the public and to start the conversation. Each was focused on one topic – from land management to arts and culture – and includes related questions about the future. Topic sheets are downloadable on the website, and were made available at Victoria City Hall, and every project event.

How did the project seek input from participants on how they wish to participate?
City staff worked directly with the Victoria Youth Council to co-design and co-deliver interactive events to engage youth from early in the project. The Youth Council was asked how they would like to engage other youth; their advice was trendy locations, night-time events and interactive activities, such as a workshop on public space. The result was youth-friendly advertising and two fun, well-attended, events at local cafes.

How did communication of project results ensure that participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem?
During the visioning phase, the project sought to learn from citizens about the issues that face different groups and aspirations for the future. Perspectives, interests, values and ideas on shaping the future of Victoria were brought to the public at Community Forum 2, where people could participate in workshops to discuss and refine OCP objectives for ten land use topics, which staff had developed from community input. There was also a feedback loop with the release of the Draft OCP. The project met with citizens to share how the public input was reflected in the plan and carefully considered the comments received through changes in the final plan.
The OCP project website was a “one-stop-shop” for information.

Citizen Advisory Committee members helped the project reach the public at Community Forum #1 in March 2010.

Citizens could lead Community Circles on OCP topics in the plan vision phase.

OCP events attracted a diversity of people across the community.

Youth mapped favourite places in Victoria at a Community Café with high school facilitators.

At Community Forum #2, public input on plan vision was shared with citizens who helped to decide policy options.
## St Elizabeths East Transportation Network Environmental Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizing Group</th>
<th>District of Columbia Department of Transportation and PRR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Ward 8, District of Columbia, population 70,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Engage Ward 8 citizens to provide public input as part of the St Elizabeths East Campus transportation environmental assessment (EA) and Master Plan recommending a solution that reflects the community’s needs and wants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Public meeting series, one-on-one briefings, walking tours, online comment forms, student art competition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Results          | 1. Formed a Community Action Team of Ward 8 residents who were employed to engage their fellow citizens on a grassroots level.  
2. Engaged Ward 8 leaders through one-on-one community briefings to ensure meetings were designed to suit their constituents’ preferences.  
3. Achieved widespread participation in the EA from Ward 8 residents. |
| Impact Level     | Thousands of Ward 8 residents and leaders, and DC area leaders, media, and citizens were reached as part of the public outreach process, and hundreds attended public meetings facilitated by the project team. |
| Time Frame       | March 2011 – February 2012 |
| People Engaged   | Ward 8 residents and leaders were the key target of public outreach by the project team; the team also engaged citizens from the DC area. |
| Web Link         | [www.stelizabethseast.com](http://www.stelizabethseast.com) |
The Problem and Challenge
St Elizabeths Hospital’s two campuses spread over 350 acres, straddling Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue SE in Washington DC’s Ward 8. This self-contained mental health community was constructed starting in the 1850s. The west campus is the future headquarters of the Department of Homeland Security, a consolidation achieved by a nearly $4 billion federal investment. The east campus was transferred to the District of Columbia in 1987; since that time, mental health services have been consolidated and in 2010, a new hospital opened on the campus to continue serving mental health patients. With mental health services removed from the historic east campus buildings, the site is planned for mixed-use redevelopment that will inject federal funding into a neighborhood with the nation’s highest unemployment rate.

The economic story is just the beginning: The St Elizabeths Campus Redevelopment will literally tear down walls dividing Washington DC’s poorest ward from a beautiful and historic campus, providing an opportunity to prioritize community building, employment opportunities and mixed use re-development. Red brick buildings that formerly housed the government hospital will transform to mixed-use development, and an enhanced transportation infrastructure system will bring multimodal access to the campus. The Department of Homeland Security will bring an influx of federal employees to Ward 8; the redevelopment of St Elizabeths east campus will provide an opportunity for local businesses to serve the local community and support these workers.

As part of this suite of redevelopment, the District Department of Transportation (DDOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) set out to construct a series of improvements to the transportation infrastructure serving the St Elizabeths Campus area. PRR was brought on during the environmental process to ensure that the project would provide connectivity and access to adjacent neighborhoods, with a priority to:

- Provide connections to the community and neighborhoods.
- Make St Elizabeths East Campus accessible and open to the community.
- Provide increased transportation connections.
- Make the campus walkable.
- Remove the roadway deficiencies by reconstructing the roadways and connecting the network.
- Provide multimodal transportation options including transit, bikes and pedestrians.
- Manage the expected growth in travel.

The St Elizabeths Campus East Transportation Network Environmental Assessment (EA) would analyze three alternatives: a No Build Alternative; Alternative 1, which would make use of existing roadways on campus and provides six roadway connections to the two adjacent neighborhoods; and Alternative 2, which would provide seven roadway connections to the two adjacent neighborhoods, creating a comprehensive network that eliminates current deficiencies and accommodates a multimodal system that includes transit, bicyclists and pedestrians.

In real terms, Alternative 1 would construct a system focused on “Nodes” of activity and redevelopment hubs; and Alternative 2 would reinforce a “Spine” through the campus rather than pockets of activity. Ward 8 residents’ input was needed to select a transportation alternative, which would ultimately define the path of redevelopment through the campus.
The Role of Public Participation
As the seat of the national government, one of Washington, DC's key goals is to develop a world-class capital city that is a symbol of diversity, democracy and vitality both to the nation and the world. The St Elizabeths East Campus redevelopment and transit improvements represent one of the largest single redevelopment opportunities of publicly owned land in Washington, DC, and FHWA and DDOT saw it as crucial that the local community be reflected in the final design.

To incorporate the Ward 8 community in every step of the project design, rather than study the area and infer what the residents would want, PRR and the project team decided to put the community in the driver's seat. PRR hired three Ward 8 residents to form the project's Community Action Team (CAT). Employing the CAT allowed PRR to interact with the community as a trusted insider rather than an outsider representing government—a role that could have been polarizing in this disadvantaged neighborhood.

Public Participation Methods
Each CAT member was responsible for a public participation task. One of the project's most successful participation tactics was led by CAT member Dorenda Canty. Dorenda's vision for this project was to engage the community's youth in creating a vision for the St Elizabeths redevelopment. She led development of two drawing contests for schools in the Congress Heights neighborhood. Students from 11 neighborhood schools were invited to submit drawings showing their vision for St Elizabeths. The results overwhelmingly reflected the importance of the St Elizabeths hospital to the community and the desire to see the redevelopment feature a place to play, for families to gather and that trees and flowers were an important addition.

Another CAT-led project was the creation of public materials. CAT member Tendani Mpulubusi El is a well known film maker and artist in Ward 8. He designed the project ads, fliers and posters with bold, textural designs that blended images of community members and views of campus buildings to highlight the community's pride in the campus. More than 6,000 fliers and 100 posters were distributed throughout the life of the project.

To present a united front and ensure that the plan for the St Elizabeths redevelopment was presented as a cohesive unit, the District Office of Planning, which drafted the Master Plan, and DDOT held two joint public meetings at the start of the project. These meetings addressed scoping and alternatives. DDOT held an additional public hearing on the draft environmental assessment later in the project.

Uniqueness of the Project
The St Elizabeths redevelopment will be driven by the decision reached through the transportation environmental process. The environmental impacts from each alternative were compared, so that the environmental process was, in essence, asking the Ward 8 residents how they wanted to focus redevelopment of this community treasure.

A key tenant of the environmental process is to address the concerns and issues expressed by those impacted by a particular project. In this case, the project team knew it would be a hurdle to obtain feedback from the community because of long held trust barriers between the community and government agencies. As such, the project team was committed to building trust through a network of community members—the Community Action Team and area leaders—to obtain that feedback. The extensive public outreach process allowed the team to collect substantial feedback from the community.
The project team tackled the issue of trust as a starting point. By attending community meetings, changing the format of the public meetings and creating a Community Action Team, the public participation process improved the community’s direct access to the agencies. Questions were answered. Details were discussed. In the end, community members gave their support to the Environmental Assessment. Throughout the public process, the Ward 8 community showed its tenacity: community members pushed for an open discussion format that challenged the agency comfort level. The project team responded by opening the public meeting floor to a facilitated question and answer format. The team also met with residents in smaller community meeting formats to further discuss concerns and potential impacted caused by new development and the new transportation network.

The public participated directly in the decision-making process through a series of public meetings in which participants used stickers to indicate preferences on display boards, small groups broke out to discuss options, and feedback was collected via small- and large-group discussion sessions and comment forms. Members of the public were also invited to voice their opinion by submitting comments online, over the phone or by mail. A large part of the project’s public outreach campaign was aimed at making Ward 8 residents aware of the means and methods to comment on the proposed alternatives.

The most important outreach and monitoring tool was the stakeholder database. It included contact information for all public meeting attendees, as well as information for civic associations, community leaders and elected officials, and neighborhood schools and churches. It also included the email database used to send out meeting notices. The project website allowed viewers to submit comments and contact information. Interested persons were able to submit their comments for inclusion in the EA.

The team also tracked in detail comments received at the public meeting and feedback through participatory activities like using stickers on display boards to indicate preferences.

Project Results
Released in January 2012, the St Elizabeths East Transportation Network Environmental Assessment was evaluated by the public who gave testimony at the January 19, 2012 public hearing. Community members expressed a commitment to the land use and transportation network development process. One resident stated in the public testimony, “We have gone over all of the issues that we have heard in all the meetings that we had. Some we agree with, some we didn’t agree with. But clearly we heard them. We spoke to the city about them, to try to resolve as many issues as possible.”

On June 26, the Federal Highways Administration signed a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the project, which states that the FHWA has determined the project “will not have a significant impact on the natural, human, or built environment.” This decision is reached in large part through analysis of public involvement methods and essentially states that public concerns have been addressed by the project team and incorporated into the final decision.

The document also states that the public’s clear support for Alternative 2 (the “Spine” option helped identify that option as the Preferred Alternative. With this hurdle cleared, the development of a transportation network to support the East Campus redevelopment can move forward.
Alignment with IAP2 Core Values

1. Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.

First and foremost, to ensure that those most affected by the decision were involved, our team went straight to the source, hiring three Ward 8 residents for the Community Action Team. This team involved the Ward 8 community in a robust and grassroots public process.

2. Public participation includes the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision.

In addition to the public meetings, residents met with team members in smaller Office of Planning Advisory Group and Ward 8 Transportation Task Force meetings. Residents highlighted the relevance of their past relationships to the campus and identified transportation issues in the project area. Environmental justice was an issue; area residents were concerned that they would be driven out of the community as the campus is developed. They were also concerned about the possible taking of property, especially of homes along streets that will connect directly to the campus. Not only because the EIS process requires that each submitted comment is addressed in the EA, but also because of the open format of the public meetings, these concerns were directly addressed to the community. Private property will not be taken and the community level advisory neighborhood commissioners assured the residents that they will continue to meet with the agencies to assure development success. Public comment and support was specifically noted by the FHWA in the FONSI and decision to move forward with Alternative 2 as the Preferred Alternative.

3. Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants.

The St Elizabeths campus has been a part of the Ward 8 community for decades, and with the current redevelopment, this historic and economic hub will be an important landmark for many more years. One of the project’s key criteria was to develop a transportation infrastructure network that would meet project growth demands for the next 20 years, so every decision made with the intention of creating a long-term solution to the area’s transportation needs. Another key component of the project was a focus on historical preservation. While some of the campus’ buildings will be maintained through any redevelopment scenario because of their landmark status, the public was given the chance to comment on the preservation, repurposing or removal of a number of historic properties. Throughout the public involvement process, a community priority on green space became apparent, and alternatives were examined with an eye toward maintaining and creating green space on campus.

4. Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.

The project team sought to seek out and facilitate the involvement on those most affected by hiring local community members to serve as a Community Action Team that would help break down barriers and build trust. The CAT guided project staff in the best means and methods to reach out to the community and facilitated projects like the school art competitions.
The team also worked with local officials and community advocates to reach the community through word of mouth. Information, handouts and posters were provided to these individuals to hand out among their networks – one local official distributed 1,200 fliers before a public meeting!

At public meetings, the team asked attendees to provide address information and prioritized comments or questions by Ward 8 residents. During follow up documentation, the team noted comments or concerns voiced by Ward 8 residents.

5. Public participation seeks out input from participants in designing how they participate.

The project team knew gaining trust of the community would be a huge obstacle, so at every step of the way, community feedback was sought out in methods of participation. The CAT team played a big part in this by making recommendation on the best ways to engage community members. After meeting with Ward 8 Advisory Neighborhood Commissioners and other active community members, the team adjusted the design of the public meetings to provide a brief question and answer period before breaking into group discussions around display tables and boards. This more open format assured that community concerns were broadly shared and understood by everyone. The team also kept in mind that public involvement is a fluid process – one public meeting’s agenda was thrown out and revised mid-way through the meeting based on the feedback of community members present.

6. Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.

Information was provided throughout the project in a variety of methods in hopes that members of the community would digest information in a way easiest for them and be better able to provide feedback. The team gradually built on information to facilitate understanding, starting with a broad framework and goals, narrowing to general alternatives and finally talking specifics. This approach allowed community members to learn new information about the project over time.

7. Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.

Presentations, display boards and interactive maps during public meetings were used to highlight how community concerns would be addressed in the EA. The project team met with the community in three public meetings. In the first meeting the public shared their concerns and identified issues and opportunities on the campus and the surrounding area. In the second public meeting the team presented a range of concepts for the East Campus roads and phase one development based on feedback from the first public meeting and the 2008 Framework Plan. After a brief presentation participants interacted with project team members by marking directly on maps and using board displays to help facilitate discussions. Comments were captured on flip charts and handouts and collected at the end of the meetings. The final public hearing began with an open house format which allowed participants to view copies of the Draft Environmental Assessment, watch a traffic flow video simulation and meet with team members at board displays. Following the presentation, participants were invited to make a 3-minute statement at a microphone or as an alternative could speak directly to a court reporter during Open House. The presentation and community comments were captured by a court reporter. All submitted comments were addressed in the EA, and at each meeting, the team addressed comments from prior meetings and how those comments had been incorporated into the material being presented at the current meeting.
The Center Building is one of the oldest buildings on the campus, dating to the American Civil War era.

Certificate of Appreciation for the October 2011 Imagine St Elizabeths Drawing Contest.

Community participants at the Public Scoping meeting held May 12, 2012 at Imagine SE Public Charter School.

A full room of participants at the public meeting held on July 12, 2011 at the Imagine SE Public Charter School.

Design for the poster and handout for the January 19, 2012 Public Hearing.

St. Elizabeths Factsheet

Contest entry from winner Myniah Sweetney of Mary Church Terrell Elementary School.

Capturing participant input at the Public Scoping meeting at Imagine SE Public Charter School.
# CASE STUDY SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Strong Schools, Strong Communities – Districtwide Action Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Saint Paul Public Schools (SPPS), the largest urban school district in the State of Minnesota, supported by the Greater Twin Cities United Way and the Saint Paul Public Schools Foundation, both independent non-profit organizations serving our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Saint Paul, Minnesota, United States; population: 285,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>Paramount for our school district is supporting our student-focused mission: Premier education for all. With achievement gaps too predictably tied to race and home language, in 2004 SPPS began aggressively rethinking how we deliver public education, which much more intentionally involved our students, families, and community stakeholders. Going deeper in 2008 with broad-based community involvement to examine large-scale system change, we accelerated our efforts in 2010 to develop our new strategic plan. With IAP2 training and public support by the Superintendent and elected Board of Education for the IAP2 Core Values, we comprehensively engaged stakeholders to frame the effort to deliver a <em>premier education for all</em>, which meant closing achievement gaps. In 2011, it was time to translate that community-based plan into specific implementation activities, which required a new engagement design with unique objectives and tools that drove the work much deeper. Again reaching out to our stakeholders, nine Districtwide Action Teams (DATs) were formed and met regularly for seven months to develop specific recommendations to the Superintendent around topics critical to student success: Achievement gap, transition to middle grades, specialized academic programming (immersion, Montessori, etc.), aligned instruction, racial integration and school choice, external partnerships, shared community accountability, site governance, and budget and finance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Advisory groups brought together diverse and dynamic groups of stakeholders in facilitated, focused discussion leading to specific actions in a key area on questions critical to ensuring high-quality public education for all students in our community. Advisory group conversations and the background information they gathered and developed was documented and supported by web sites and e-mail communications. Staff provided briefings to DATs to ensure they had the information they needed to accomplish their tasks together. Public forum format brought all the teams together with district leadership and other interested community members for the presentation of recommendations. This event was also recorded and rebroadcast on cable television.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Major policy and implementation decisions have been and continue to be guided by the DAT recommendations. In a follow-up evaluation, almost all respondents (93% agree or strongly agree) said that they felt their voice was heard and that it was a good experience overall (86% agree or strongly agree).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>District-wide (~39,000 students) / City-wide (285,068 residents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>May 2011 – February 2012 (SSSC public participation work is still ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>191 total (Board of Education, staff, family and community) members on the nine Districtwide Action Teams, standing advisory groups that in turn connected with hundreds of others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Web Link** | [http://accountability.spps.org/actionteams](http://accountability.spps.org/actionteams)  
[http://accountability.spps.org/strongschools](http://accountability.spps.org/strongschools) |
THE PROBLEM AND CHALLENGE
With 40,000 exceptional students who speak scores of languages and dialects, Saint Paul Public Schools encompasses all of Saint Paul, the capital city of the state of Minnesota. Minnesota has one of the highest high school graduation rates – and levels of volunteerism – in the USA. At the same time, Minnesota is not at all proud of also having one of the highest achievement gaps in the country, especially between Black and White students.

Throughout our 150-year history, Saint Paul Public Schools (SPPS) has reflected the community’s high expectations and standards for public education, and has been at the center of public school reforms for generations – a great many of which advanced student achievement. Over the last decade, with educational expectations increasing alongside generational poverty and huge increases in new immigrants and refugees, SPPS has needed to adapt ever more quickly.

With our long-standing commitment to continuous improvement and responsiveness to evolving community needs, SPPS began an ongoing community-wide discussion of how to adapt our teaching and learning environment in order to improve results and close achievement gaps. To dedicate more resources to these academic goals, over the last five years we have actively engaged our school and community stakeholders to help make major changes in facilities and operations, including increased energy efficiency, reorganizing administrative and support staff, school bus transportation (that serves over 90% of our students), and – perhaps most notably – co-locating, merging, and repurposing school programs to ensure that resources are first and foremost focused on delivering successful instruction for all students.

While most school districts view academic and operational restructuring as the role of “expert” administrators, the culture of SPPS and our city has recognized the impact of these decisions on our community. From this perspective, the journey has been not only about the improvement of our academic environments; it is also about the continuous improvement of the school district’s orientation toward public participation in critical actions that will affect our shared future. We began this current phase of authentic public participation in 2004, expanded in 2008 as we extensively engaged stakeholders in large-scale system planning, and then accelerated in 2010 with our collaborative Strong Schools, Strong Communities (SSSC) strategic planning process. That year we developed a comprehensive public engagement design informed by IAP2 training and the Superintendent’s and Board of Education’s formal public recognition of the Core Values and Spectrum. We conducted community forums and other regularly-scheduled public gatherings, including Board of Education listening sessions. That planning process yielded three enormously challenging and energizing goals: achievement, alignment, and sustainability.

Each goal had a number of descriptors to reflect the district’s direction under the SSSC plan, encompassing problems, challenges and opportunities. SPPS staff recognized the common issues/questions and translated them into nine topic areas around which broadly inclusive and robust advisory groups were formed. Specifically:

- **Achievement Gap**: Understand the impact of race on achievement; Identify effective practices within SPPS that are closing the achievement gap; Propose plan for bringing successful practices to scale across district
- **Transition to Middle Grades**: Identify issues of implementation from student, staff, curriculum and operational perspectives; Define priorities for ensuring a smooth transition for students
- **Aligned Learning** (originally known as Managed Instruction): Communicate clear expectations for components of managed instruction; Propose system for consistent and sustained implementation and monitoring of key instructional practices
- **Specialized Academic Programming** (includes Secondary Gifted/Talented articulation, language immersion and Montessori): Clarify articulation of specialized programs to ensure consistent and equitable access; Identify areas where specialized academic programs are
not aligned with managed instruction practices and propose solutions to address; Monitor how programs meet learner needs and propose solutions when they do not

- **Integration/Choice**: Revise SPPS integration plan to align with SSSC Goals; Define attendance areas, transportation zones and student placement criteria to ensure equitable education across the city and for all students
- **Partnerships**: Develop a comprehensive partnership framework to: Align partnerships with learner needs; Measure the quality of aligned partnerships
- **Shared Accountability** (includes culturally relevant practices and culturally proficient human resources): Align processes for monitoring and reporting on SSSC progress; Maintain commitment, communication and coordination across diverse stakeholder groups
- **Site Governance**: Define the role of sites in implementation of SSSC; Propose capacity building to ensure site staff, families, students and community members know how to support SSSC
- **Budget and Finance**: Track budgetary implications of SSSC implementation; Propose solutions to align resources with SSSC goal

THE ROLE OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The vision of SSSC is “Schools at the Heart of the Community” and that has been the guiding philosophy of public participation. SPPS recognizes that to achieve significant and ambitious student achievement goals, we will need the full commitment, expertise and support of everyone in our community. Public participation serves the role of not only helping to shape the work we need to do together for our children and youth in our community, it also ensures that key opinion leaders and community members have common language and understanding about how we will move forward in a common direction for the success of our city’s next generation.

Beginning in 2004 with Community Conversations on School Choice, continuing with facilitated forums, guided by the IAP2 Spectrum and Core Values, on “Large-Scale System Change” in 2008 and many broadly inclusive public budget and planning discussions along the way, SPPS has sought to find the right fit between the critical issues at hand and building the necessary participation capacity and perceived stake among our broadly diverse stakeholders.

The district’s commitment to IAP2 Core Values, tools and techniques deepened in 2009, when the Superintendent and Board of Education determined and publicly declared IAP2 to be the best fit to support the continuous improvement of SPPS engagement. That year, approximately 40 district leaders completed the decision-makers workshop, and then a corps of 11 diverse staff from all areas of the district completed IAP2 certification.

When it came time for public participation in a range of highly technical and impactful areas around SSSC (see the nine topic areas above), SPPS turned to IAP2-trained staff to facilitate and guide others in their facilitation of advisory teams, which became known as Districtwide Action Teams, or DATs. Facilitator training and quarterly check-ins were structured around the IAP2 materials, including the spectrum and values. The DATs’ mission, membership, roles and responsibilities, operations, documentation and evaluation were guided by the advisory group materials from IAP2 training and publication *Techniques for Public Participation*.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION METHODS

Based on our IAP2 training and experience, the DATs were intentionally designed and structured as advisory groups, and SPPS turned to our internal corps of IAP2-trained staff to facilitate and guide others in their facilitation of these teams. Each DAT also had a dedicated web page that served as a public repository for information about each DAT’s focus, membership, and all its work including meeting summaries, supporting materials, and discussions leading up to and including final recommendations, the Superintendent’s response, and Board of Education actions. SPPS continues to improve and update web-based resources.
The final presentation of the recommendations took shape in a public forum, where participants selected by their teams presented their work. This event was not initially part of the design but arose from DAT participants who wanted to present their work directly to each other and the district’s leadership. This serves as an example of how participants helped to shape how they were involved, and resulted in what some described as the most positive and community-building aspect of the entire project. This event is documented in the supplementary video clip “Strong Schools, Strong Communities: Districtwide Action Teams Recommendations to the Superintendent” available at http://accountability.spps.org/actionteams.

UNIQUENESS OF THE PROJECT
When the Board passed the SSSC plan unanimously in March 2011, Board members and the Superintendent made it clear that SPPS would depend heavily on public participation to guide and support SSSC implementation in key areas – in fact, the vision of the plan is “Schools at the Heart of the Community.” Ultimately, the critical issues became nine thematic areas, each of which became the focus of one of the advisory groups that became known as DATs.

Each DAT began by reviewing, clarifying and modifying their topic area in an iterative process with SPPS leadership (who were literally at the table as members of the DATs). This led to, among other revisions, the change in name of the DAT that had been initially called “Managed Instruction” to “Aligned Learning,” which that DAT determined to be a more accurate descriptor for the work that was needed to ensure equity in the learning environments across the district’s various schools and programs. This is one small but significant example of how the DATs helped to design how they would be involved, beginning with helping to frame and name the problems and challenges themselves.

In December 2011, DAT participants presented the recommendations directly to the Superintendent’s Cabinet, with all Board of Education members (who were also DAT members) in attendance in a public forum (see above and the supplementary video clip). This event itself was a result of the input of DAT participants in terms of how they would like to have their work presented and recognized. The recommendations were all posted to the DAT web page along with supporting documentation for each team.

In the months that followed, the Superintendent’s Cabinet reviewed and conducted a feasibility analysis on each recommendation, and then reported those results to the Board at their regular public meeting (DAT members received invitations to attend either in person, on television or live-streaming video on the web) and posted them on the SSSC and DAT web pages. Implementation of specific areas of SSSC have been shaped around the DAT recommendations, and the work of the DATs has been aligned under themes within each of the three SSSC goals.

- Achievement: Curricular Improvements; Targeted Supports and Interventions; and Professional Development
- Alignment: Partnership Coordination; and Stakeholder Engagement
- Sustainability: Revenue Enhancements; Outreach and Marketing; and Performance Management

The recommendations have now been fully integrated into the SSSC, guiding implementation in all of the above areas and forming the basis for regular progress monitoring and reporting.

PROJECT RESULTS
Following the December 19, 2011 presentation of recommendations to Superintendent Valeria Silva, SPPS asked participants to provide feedback on their experiences through a brief survey. All DAT participants were sent the survey, regardless of whether they continued through the end of the DAT process. Of the 203 individuals who were at one time assigned to a DAT, all of
whom were sent the survey and a follow-up reminder if they did not respond, 113 (56%) completed a survey.

Among the 113 respondents, almost all (93% agree or strongly agree) agreed that they felt their voice was heard and that it was a good experience overall (86% agree or strongly agree). A majority of respondents also reflected that their impression of the SSSC strategic plan improved, with 35% saying “a little better” and an additional 23% saying their impression of the plan is now “a lot better” than at the beginning of the DAT process. All feedback was presented to the Board of Education, sent to all those who had applied to be on a DAT (even if they were not selected) and posted on the web (http://accountability.spps.org/StrongSchools.html).

In terms of district actions, the DAT recommendations affected a number of prominent district decisions and actions, including:

- Policy changes, including allowing certain types of advertising as a source of revenue generation, as well as communicating with the public through social media.
- Partnership efforts and staffing structured around the DAT recommendations to align those efforts with the areas defined in SSSC.
- Recently-approved budget for school year 2012-13, which include more resources for additional science specialists, based on a recommendation from the Aligned Learning DAT.
- A steering committee formed to guide the transition of sixth grade (from elementary schools to junior high schools); this group began by reviewing the extensive work of the Transitions to Middle Grades DAT – not just the final recommendations but the detailed analysis the DAT conducted of specific issues to be addressed in the transition.
- The placement priorities and process defined by the Integration/Choice team is on track for implementation in the coming school year.

ALIGNMENT WITH IAP2 CORE VALUES

The initial SSSC discussions involved an extensive explanation of how individual schools and programs might be impacted – including a fact sheet customized for each school or program – which allowed for family and community members to begin to see the potential impact of the decisions and identify their interests in the ongoing discussions. These discussions fostered understanding of the interests around SSSC, connections with stakeholders with interests in the effects of the plan, and knowledge of particular aspects of the plan. SPPS turned back to these sources including, for example, the local and state chapters of the NAACP, who had expressed both support and concern about the impact on students of color.

The process for determining membership of the DATs typified the way that SPPS ensured participation of diverse stakeholders who would be affected by SSSC. SPPS opened up applications to the public and reached out specifically to staff, parent/guardian, business, faith/religious, partner/supporting and other community groups – with particular attention to those who had expressed interest in SSSC. Given the demographic make-up of the students we serve, special attention was paid to recruiting members to reflect the diversity of SPPS.

Communities of faith and other non-profits, including support and service providers, were specifically sought for participation – and recruiting other community members to participate – because of their connections with students and families who often do not feel welcomed in school or district discussions. They helped to identify potential DAT members as well as provide connections for further input and information to be shared with those who were not directly involved in the process.

A similar approach was used for engaging our diverse families, many of whom do not speak English and a large number who have little or no formal education. In addition to invitations sent out to parent/guardian groups and site councils already in our schools, the District Parent
Advisory Committee (DPAC), a diverse group representing other parent/guardian groups, sent delegates to each of the DATs to bring information, questions and feedback back and forth between the DATs and the diverse communities they represent. The Superintendent also reached out directly to the Saint Paul Federation of Teachers (SPFT), the Principals’ Association, and the local chapter of the NAACP to nominate members to each of the teams as well as co-chairs for specific DATs with issues relevant to the interest of those organizations.

The design of the teams included staff and community co-chairs working together to facilitate; designated notetakers to ensure timely and consistent meeting summaries; and content specialists to respond quickly to questions whenever possible and make connections to bring in other resources, notably briefings from staff and other DATs. This ensured that discussions began with issues and information relevant to participants and the specific topic of the team, and were shared broadly and quickly with others through dedicated web pages.

When the co-chairs convened the DATs, the initial meeting was set aside to develop shared expectations and norms for the work ahead. At the initial meeting, each DAT was provided with background information on SSSC, which was reviewed along with their specific areas of focus. That first meeting agenda, which was common to all DATs to ensure the same foundational knowledge and equitable processes, included discussion of who else needed to be at the table and what questions DAT members had about SSSC or any other aspect of their topic. For example, the Achievement Gap team expressed a need for a team-building approach and used on-line discussion tools in addition to face-to-face meetings to keep open the lines of communication and resource-sharing. The Specialized Academic Programming DAT decided it would be best to work in subcommittees to focus on the different types of programs, and then to bring the work of those subcommittees back together to see the common challenges and opportunities.

Every team took a different approach to identifying and sharing the information they needed for their work. This was supported by a dedicated “content lead,” an SPPS staff person who worked directly in that topic area, who was a part of the team and responded with information immediately if possible, or with additional resources, including bringing in other staff and members of other DATs as needed to present specialized information. For example, the Budget/Finance team spent significant amounts of time in the first few meetings with the SPPS Chief Budget Analyst walking through the budget process and the SPPS budget itself. The Transitions to Middle Grades team identified significant research, for example, in the fields of adolescent development and curricular design, and divided up the reading amongst the members to bring back summaries to the DAT so everyone would start with the same common knowledge and language.

SPPS continues to give periodic updates on implementation of the recommendations through e-mail and web pages. For example, when the Superintendent presented her response to the recommendations, DAT members received an e-mail invitation and reminder; the main SPPS web site was updated with the presentation and response. Anyone who applied for a DAT, even if they did not serve on one, has also been added to regular SPPS communication lists, including SPPS partner/community e-newsletters, and will continue to receive regular updates on SSSC implementation, framed around the DAT recommendations, to keep them up-to-date on how their input affects actions and decisions.

The next step in implementation is to convene a single, overarching standing advisory group, the District Achievement Accountability Council (DAAC), which will give ongoing feedback on critical themes identified by the DATs: closing the achievement gap, ensuring equitable outcomes and resource allocation. The DAAC will also provide guidance on ongoing communications with DAT members and the community as a whole.
PAGE 8: SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

1) Evaluation results (full summary at http://accountability.spps.org/strongschools)

2) Superintendent Feasibility Analysis Results (excerpt) as presented to Board of Education

- School day/calendar and professional learning time (Aligned Learning, Achievement Gap, Transition to Middle Grades)
  - Middle school scheduling needs to support interdisciplinary teams
- Online K-12 school option
- Consistent assessment tools and/or skills measurement to determine whether student is prepared for Specialized Academic Programming
- Financial commitment for ongoing Pacific Educational Group (PEG) racial equity work, Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS), and other support systems—dependant on cost and timeline
Case Study Summary

Title
City of Edmonton

Location
Edmonton, Alberta; Population (2011): 812,201

Key Questions/Problem
The City of Edmonton’s is developing a comprehensive City-Wide Food and Agriculture Strategy (CWFAS) to address issues in the food system. Many citizens have voiced a wide array of concerns about food, urban development, and sustainability with many divergent perspectives on the relationship between urban development and food. Within a short timeframe of little over a year, the City intends to engage a broad, diverse, and representative group of stakeholders and citizens through the public involvement process to build awareness and knowledge, establish networks, and develop the best recommendations for food and agricultural policy.

Sample Methods
The City of Edmonton worked with HB Lanarc Golder and the University of Alberta’s Centre for Public Involvement to implement a Public Involvement Plan (PIP) for the CWFAS. This plan includes questionnaires, public and landowner surveys, information events, stakeholder workshops, Citizen Panels (details to follow), and internal and external advisory committees. For the Citizen Panels, the City collaborated with randomly selected citizens who met six times weekly in a series of sessions to discuss about the developing food policy. At the end, the groups met together to summarize and finalize their recommendations that contributed to the development of the CWFAS.

Results
Input and recommendations from a wide and broad range of representatives provided guidance to the development of the CWFAS and the model for the Food Policy Council. Over 110 unique individuals representing groups and organizations came to a series of stakeholder focus groups discussions. The Public Opinion Survey was completed by 2378 people. The Citizen Panels engaged over 2000 people, with 66 directly involved as panelists and approximately 1000 completing surveys. There was a high retention rate in the Citizen Panels with 98% of participants attending all six weekly sessions. Citizens felt their opinions were respected and they had an important role in the discussions.

Impact Level
City-Wide.

Time Frame
12+ months, ongoing

People Engaged
8000+ Edmontonians

Web Link
http://edmonton.ca/city_government/urban_planning_and_design/food-and-agriculture-project.aspx
The Problem and Challenge
Edmonton is in a unique position to address the sustainability of its food and agricultural system. The Alberta Research Council and the University of Alberta make Edmonton the home of agricultural and food expertise and research in the province. With over 60 food-processing businesses in the city-region and large tracts of prime farmland within the city’s civic boundaries, many significant opportunities exist for Edmonton. Despite these features, many citizens had divergent perspectives on urban development and its relationship to agriculture preservation and food. In response to public demand, The Way We Grow, Edmonton’s Municipal Development Plan, identifies food and agriculture as one of the nine themes towards the achievement of the City of Edmonton’s vision.

As a strategic goal, the City aims to have a resilient food and agriculture system that contributes to the local economy and overall cultural, financial, social and environmental sustainability. Consequently, policies were developed to support the establishment of a community-based Food Policy Council, the creation of a City Food Charter, and the development and implementation of a comprehensive City-Wide Food and Agriculture Strategy (CWFAS). The Strategy provides vision, principles or values, broad policy direction as well as a framework and action plan to address issues in the food system. The City is engaging a diverse and representative group of stakeholders and citizens to build awareness and knowledge, establish networks, and develop the best recommendations for the CWFAS. While most cities create food policy councils and strategies during a two to five year period, these initiatives will be developed little over a year. It is thus essential that the City execute an effective public involvement process that is representative of all Edmontonians under this shorter timeframe.

The Role of Public Participation
Public engagement is important for the development of the CWFAS because food touches upon a broad range of issues that impacts everybody. Many citizens have already voiced a wide array of concerns including food accessibility, nutrition, hunger, local foods, landowner rights, urban development, protection of agricultural lands, economic development, and sustainability. Public engagement needs to represent the public as much as possible to ensure that no concerns are left out and that there is political support for such initiatives. A diverse and representative sample of participants helps ensure a comprehensive Strategy that takes into account all of the complex issues and potential impacts of the Strategy. Additionally, awareness and education are key components of this Project as food and agriculture policy is a relatively new and progressive area for municipal policy development.

Information and recommendations received by stakeholders and citizens help improve and refine the proposed policies to ensure the best fit and relevance to the Edmonton context. It also informs Administration and City Council of the interest, awareness, and understanding of citizens and stakeholders in terms of food and agriculture policy and work. Lastly, the information gathered helps identify specific areas of focus for future projects and work in the implementation phase.

Public Participation Methods
The public involvement process that is being used for the City-Wide Food and Agriculture Project is multi-faceted to ensure widespread engagement of Edmontonians, ranging from relevant interest groups to targeted groups who often do not get heard.

It began on May 28th 2011, with the launch of the Project at a public event held in Dr. Wilbert McIntyre Park. This event featured displays from a number of local food-related organizations, speeches by the Mayor, Councilor Loken and Janine de la Salle. Administration invited citizens
to fill in the questionnaire. The questionnaire was available on the City Internet site and was taken to six different events over the course of the summer, including Farmers Markets. The results of the questionnaire were compiled in November 2011. A highly active City website and public electronic mail address for the Project were created so that citizens could read about updates to the Project and make inquiries.

In November of 2011, a 15 member Advisory Committee was formed. The Committee is comprised of key stakeholders representing a diverse range of interests and was tasked with advising Administration on the development of the Strategy. Meetings were initially held once a month and advanced to every two weeks as the public involvement process progressed. A Technical Advisory Committee will also be consulted internally to gather feedback on the potential impacts of the Strategy across the corporation and the City. It will also help identify potential challenges and opportunities in terms of implementation for the CWFAS.

The project consultant led two series of stakeholder focus groups in early May and mid-June of 2012. Over 110 unique individuals representing groups and organizations attended these workshops. Participants were connected with various aspects of the food and agriculture system including public health, social services, business, culture, and the environment. The consultants also interviewed individually all thirteen City Councilors on their perspectives on the developing policy.

There was also a series of Citizen Panels delivered in partnership with the Centre for Public Involvement using an innovative process never before used in Edmonton. More details on this process are outlined below.

All residents of Edmonton were also able to provide individual feedback and input to the Project using other appropriate technologies and media, including online forums, electronic mail address, document downloads and toolkits for use with informal group discussions, Facebook, YouTube, and discussion on the City’s blog. A Public Opinion Survey was sent out through the University of Alberta’s Evaluation and Research Services Unit with a total of 2378 complete responses, with 700 more showing attempts to complete the survey.

A food conference was held at the Shaw Conference Centre on May 25 and 26, 2012. This conference included workshops to gather feedback and input from delegates, a presentation by the Project Consultants on the policy work to date, an address by the Mayor and other Dignitaries, and a keynote address by Wayne Roberts, a nationally renowned expert on food and agriculture policy. The conference attracted 267 attendees and widespread media attention and there were 85 responses from the conference evaluations.

Uniqueness of the Project
The City-Wide Food and Agriculture Project is one of the few City-led strategic projects that has received large attention from a diverse and conflicting range of interests. What was initially a discussion between land developers and agricultural conservationist, the CWFAS has expanded to include food-related businesses, institutions, and non-profit organizations to discuss concerns in all aspects of the food system. Given the complex nature of food systems, the impacts of the Strategy are widespread and will influence the City departments, city and community development, local economy, biodiversity, poverty, public health, energy use, waste management, and livability. Unlike many food initiatives developed in other cities, the CWFAS is the first of its kind to integrate land use policy into a food strategy.
**Citizen Panels: Conversation, Information and Transformation**

The City-Wide Food and Agriculture Project partnered with the Centre for Public Involvement to create a cutting edge, participatory public engagement process. The public involvement initiative that the Centre for Public Involvement carried out is intended to assist the City of Edmonton as it seeks to build increased understanding and support of citizens in for a City-Wide Food and Agriculture Strategy. The method of public involvement introduced an innovative technique for engaging and informing citizens called, "Conversation, Information, and Transformation" (CIT).

Conversation, Information, and Transformation (CIT) involved both small-group discussion and learning by citizens, and also polling to measure change in both opinion and learning by citizens over the period of time that the engagement initiative occurs. The results of the ongoing learning and change in informed opinion will be made public for all citizens, who may also contribute to the process indirectly by expressing opinions using the Internet. The purpose of this combination of methods ensure that citizens are given the opportunity to become informed about key issues related to food policy in Edmonton and in particular to address the tradeoffs for individual groups represented by a food policy of the kind being developed for City Council.

A random sample of a representative group of citizens was invited to participate in a series of discussions about the developing food policy. Eleven groups of six citizens (a total of 66) met once a week for a period of six weeks. At the end of the six weeks, the groups met together for a summary discussion and finalization of recommendations. There were polls taken at the beginning of the process, then after each of the six weekly sessions, and finally after the summary discussion, for a total of 8 polls. The polls were carried out using a combination of in-session clicker technology and after-session Internet questionnaire surveys. The polls measured change over time in terms of citizen knowledge of food-policy issues and the tradeoffs required for individuals and groups in Edmonton who will be affected by the policy.

Each of the discussion sessions featured in-depth consideration of thematic issues related to food policy and were highlighted by involvement of experts with opposing and wide range of views on the weekly themes. In this way, citizens have maximum opportunity to assess the advantages and disadvantages of components of the food policy and eventually to offer their considered opinion on the policy's likely acceptance by the larger population in Edmonton. A moderator, facilitators and note takers for each of the groups, along with training for these roles, were provided by the Centre for Public Involvement.

Video reports were produced for each week that the Panels were held. The videos were posted on the project website ([http://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/urban_planning_and_design/video-gallery-food-project.aspx](http://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/urban_planning_and_design/video-gallery-food-project.aspx)). The videos were intended to summarize the sessions, promote the work of the Citizen Panels, and communicate to the public the innovative and important work underway with the project. The reports included carefully selected comments by members of the Panels.

The design of the CIT initiative was based on ensuring that citizens, elected representatives, and senior city administrators can be confident that the larger population of citizens (i.e., those beyond the walls of the discussions carried out by the 66 selected citizens) would have come to similar conclusions if they had the opportunity, information, and resources of time and energy to participate in the same process. To evaluate the effectiveness of the Citizen Panels, the Centre of Public Involvement engaged approximately 1000 people through surveys that were provide with supplementary information from the weekly sessions and a control group survey without the additional information.
Project Results
This innovative public involvement process was successful in reaching out to a wide and broad range of interests and citizens to help guide the development of the CWFAS. The Advisory Committee, stakeholder focus groups, Citizen Panels, and conference brought together individuals who would not normally meet together to seriously discuss food and agricultural systems. This lively dialogue helped establish goals, identify opportunities and conflicts, and build networks as well as potential partnerships. Many felt that this process has increased their awareness, understanding, and knowledge of food systems and policy. In the Citizen Panels, nearly all participants attended the six weekly sessions with a retention rate of 98%. There was evidence of opinion change as well as feelings of respect and responsibility among citizens.

The Strategy will establish the City of Edmonton as a leader in municipal food policy as it is the first plan of its kind to integrate land use with food issues. This work will be ongoing as food issues evolve and can be addressed by a Food Policy Council that represents various stakeholders in the food cycle. The process has allowed the City of Edmonton to build capacity for future public involvement initiatives through established partnerships with the Centre of Public Involvement as well as knowledge and experience gained by staff. It has also raised the standards and expectations on how the public should be involved in city projects.

Alignment with Core Values
How did the project ensure that those most affected by the decision or problem were involved?
The first consultation process undertaken to ensure that the key groups most affected by the project were involved was the creation of a project Advisory Committee. The Committee is made up of 15 representatives from diverse organizations, with extensive knowledge, expertise, and community respect. The two rounds of stakeholder group meetings involved invitations to all other key organizations and groups who were not represented on the Advisory Committee, but felt that they would be significantly impacted by the project.

The overall process has been responsive to all citizens and groups who express their desire to be involved. Individual meetings have also been uniquely held to allow opportunities for groups to be heard and to provide input. A survey was developed specifically for landowners as a special group, in order to gain their unique input. A master database of contacts was also created and maintained for regular communication from the project team to keep all interested parties up to date on the progress.

How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public’s contributions?
The outcome will be a draft policy that will be presented to City Council. The policy could not have been developed without the influence of the public, including key stakeholder groups and organizations from the public, private and non-profit sectors, citizens and residents. Specifically, the input gathered from the public involvement process will have been instrumental in determining what key opportunities make the most sense for a “made in Edmonton” food policy, while simultaneously demonstrating to City Council what level and depth of interest and willingness exists in the community to take ownership of the plan and the future work.

How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated?
The project consulted broadly and deeply, ensuring that a critical mass of participants were not only involved, but had extensive opportunities to provide input and take ownership of the results of the project. Simultaneously, involvement efforts were aimed at
building capacity in the community in terms of education of the issues and awareness of the challenges and opportunities, leveraging the interest resident in the public. Diverse perspectives and opinions were sought throughout the project, from the membership of the Advisory Committee to the recruitment of the Citizen Panelists. Decision makers were also consulted, including one-on-one interviews with every City Councilor.

**How did the project seek out and facilitate the involvement of those most affected?**

Similar to the response from the first question, the project public involvement plan included direct and formal invitations to representatives to participate on the Advisory Committee, as well as a strong media and communications strategy to let the public know about the work of the project. Stakeholder groups were based on many direct invitations to organizations that were seen to be potentially impacted, or who previously expressed interest. Again, regular communication with the public was maintained using regular emails to those who requested to be a part of our master database of interested contacts, an active website with up-to-date information, dissemination through our Advisory Committee members’ networks, an active blog and Twitter feed, and regular media coverage.

**How did the project seek input from participants on how they wished to participate?**

The Advisory Committee members were given significant flexibility in how they would operate their regular meetings and how decisions were made. The Committee greatly influenced the development the production of public reports and policy development. The Citizen Panels were designed and delivered with a process that was highly respectful of participants’ feedback, including the addition of an “integration committee” which was made up of select panelists who helped to write the final report. Public feedback also led to significant changes in how the public conference was delivered, primarily in an effort to make the conference more accessible.

**How did the information provided to participants support or contribute to meaningful participation?**

Information provided to the participants was designed from the start to be high quality, well-researched, reviewed and vetted material with an aim for balanced and generative content. This was true especially of the processes that involved more time and deliberation for deep conversation and thinking. Public documents and reports have been thoughtfully created and shared with education and building awareness in mind.

**How did the communication of the project results ensure that participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem?**

Closing the loop has been an integral part of every process undertaken in the public involvement plan. Summary reports have been regularly communicated back to participants for each consultation activity. The integration committee of the Citizen Panels process was created to ensure that the participants saw their work reflected in the final reporting. Proper recording of input has allowed the project team to reflect back input accurately to participants. A library of reports and documents allows all participants, and even non-participants, to see who was consulted, what was heard, where the input went and how it was used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Winter City Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Edmonton, population 812,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Questions / Problems</strong></td>
<td>By far and large, Edmontonians have fallen out of love with winter and our perpetual summer state of mind has impacted our quality of life during a significant portion of every year. The opportunity is to develop a strategy to become a great winter city: to engage Edmontonians, to build on good things already happening, to identify challenges and opportunities to becoming a great winter city, and to identify policy changes. It looks at events, but also urban design and daily living, civic identity and business/tourism. It is also as much about shifting the culture – changing our collective mental models that impact on patterns lived – as it is about changing the way we plan, program, develop and redevelop the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Held an exploration forum with key stakeholders to gauge support for the initiative and determine initial direction. Created a WinterCity Think Tank (citizen panel) to lead the development of the goals of the strategy. Held a publicized kick-off event followed by a half-day symposium. After kick-off, launched a contest with Global TV, a postcard campaign, twitter and facebook posts, and the City’s first online crowdsourcing tool, Ideascale. Held a lunch-time forum/presentation, a dozen presentations to various stakeholder groups, and almost twenty in-depth dialogue sessions and workshops with key targeted groups. Methods were all along the IAP2 continuum, with an emphasis on Collaborate and Empower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>This multi-faceted engagement strategy enabled us to understand where Edmontonians would like the strategy to take us. The Think Tank ensured that ownership of the strategy rested with the community. The groundwork has been laid for the successful implementation of a strategy that is built from the ground up, reflecting our local assets and issues, and telling our uniquely Edmonton story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>City but also Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>June 2010, mainly December 2011 – October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>700 individuals in Edmonton and region, plus undetermined number of people through radio, TV and newspaper media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.edmonton.ca/wintercitystrategy">www.edmonton.ca/wintercitystrategy</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Problem and Challenge

**VISION**

“Imagine Edmonton being world-renowned for celebrating our northern climate. A city where people like coming out to public spaces even in the darkest, cold days of winter. A city where streets and buildings are designed with our climate in mind, where light is used to create warmth and luminescence during long winter days, a place where snow and ice are considered valuable resources. This is what Edmonton’s WinterCity Strategy is all about: creating a city that’s inviting, vibrant and exciting for residents and tourists, throughout the winter months.”

The challenge is to make this vision a reality. In tackling this challenge, we knew that we had to look at the entirety of the systems at play. We couldn’t just look at winter festivals or winter recreational programming, or any singular aspect of winter life. We knew that we had to consider all aspects that influence our quality of life – including how we design and program our public spaces and streets, how we design and operate our transportation systems, how we talk about the weather, how we identify with our city, and how our businesses fare in winter vs summer. At the core of our challenge was to try to figure out how to shift our culture so that the stories we tell ourselves about our lives in Edmonton could change to be more positive, more embracing of this important and challenging season. The iceberg model for change shows the multiple levels that we looked at and knew we had to try to impact.

The Role of Public Participation

This entire initiative was led by a Think Tank, made up of community leaders from various sectors, organizations and interests. (See IAP2 Core Value 1 on page 5) This Think Tank led a public involvement process that was very creative, diverse and broad in its reach.

Public participation was instrumental to developing the strategy; it is about quality of life for Edmontonians and this cannot be properly addressed without involving the community in a meaningful way. During the project, we worked collaboratively with members of the public. We asked for lots of input and also informed people. There were different levels of participation based on differing degrees of interest and ability to participate. The design of the public participation processes used took into account the characteristics of each community (neighborhood, business, professional, etc.) we wanted to engage with, and provided opportunities for participation at multiple levels.
Public Participation Methods

WinterCity Kick-off and Symposium January 2012:
We wanted Edmontonians to learn about how and why we were developing this WinterCity Strategy, and to get their ideas for transforming Edmonton into a great winter city. Music, skating, activities, food, hot chocolate squads kept people entertained, but the highlight of the evening was guest speaker John Furlong, former CEO of the Vancouver Olympics Organizing Committee. He talked of believing in our vision; and making sure that every Edmontonian has a chance to be involved and own that vision. The magic of what we’re trying to do, he told us, is in the effort and power of uniting people.

The next morning, 170 people turned out for an interactive half-day working symposium to provide input into developing this strategy. The day began with presentations from winter experts, including world-renowned Danish architect and urban designer Lars Gemzoe and local urban design, tourism, business and quality of life experts. Collaborative partnerships were formed as business and media were eager to offer sponsorship and support this initiative. Excerpts from Gemzoe’s and the other presentations can be found at wintercitystrategy.ca

Public Consultations January – June 2012:
During winter and spring, the WinterCity project team and Think Tank began a series of public consultations, which were divided into two categories. Leadership sessions took place with small groups of specific individuals of key decision makers including: Northlands and the Edmonton Oilers, Inner City Executive Directors and key agency directors, the Chamber of Commerce and the Business Revitalization Zone Council, local media meteorologists, post-secondary institution leaders, to name a few. These sessions tended to be quite focused and in several cases discussions developed around potential partnerships for going forward with this strategy.

The Dialogue Workshops were lengthier, with larger groups representing a broader range of expertise including: urban designers, Aboriginal serving agencies, Business Travel and Events Marketing Committee of EEDC, service providers working with newcomers, civic staff, marketing professionals and the tourism industry. In all, more than 20 public sessions were held.

The WinterCity project team also made shorter presentations to twelve groups in the city, including Wichiitowin, M.A.D.E (Media, Design and Art Exposed), the Community Services Advisory Board and NextGen.

Blizzard of Ideas January – June 2012: What Would Make You Fall In Love With Edmonton?
Engaging Edmontonians, getting their ideas for creating a great northern city, was one of the most important tools in developing this strategy. We asked everyone the same question: what would make you fall in love with Edmonton? We received close to 500 rich, diverse and creative ideas – altogether they gave us a good idea of where the strategy needs to take us. They came to us in a variety of ways:

Ideascale: The WinterCity Strategy was the first City of Edmonton initiative to use this crowd-sourcing tool as a way to engage and encourage public discussion among
Edmontonians. People submitted their ideas, which were then voted on and discussed by others. Between January and May 2012, the WinterCity Ideascale had 209 users who posted 103 ideas and cast 1447 votes for those ideas.

_global TV Winter City Contest:_ Global TV Edmonton generously promoted and sponsored a WinterCity contest from January 30 to March 15, 2012. There were 139 entries, which were judged on uniqueness, creativity and do-ability.

_WinterCity Postcard Campaign:_ Close to 200 people wrote ideas on postcards which were available at all WinterCity public events, at City Hall, and at other 25 sites across the city, including recreation and seniors’ centres and other public places.

_Email, telephone, Face Book and City Hall School:_ We also received ideas from people on the City of Edmonton’s Face Book page, by phone and email (contact information was posted on the WinterCity Website), and from elementary school students on field trips to City Hall.

_Public Presentation on Quebec City’s Winter Success Story February 2012:_ We hosted Pierre Labrie, former head of Quebec City Tourism, at City Hall for a free public presentation and discussion around Quebec City’s journey to becoming a winter destination for Quebecers and international tourists. This event was promoted through ads in the Edmonton Journal and through a morning interview with Mr Labrie on Global TV.

_WinterCity Goals Validation Workshop May 2012:_ Participants of the January symposium and all the public consultations were invited back for a half-day workshop in May, to review draft one of the WinterCity Strategy goals. The results provided the Think Tank with both validation and direction for further improvement.

**Uniqueness of the Project**

In developing this strategy we didn’t simply look to national and international experts, and apply their expertise and identified international best practices here in Edmonton. To be truly transformational, to change our ‘Edmonton in winter’ story, this strategy was designed to be uniquely Edmonton. It is rooted in what Edmontonians know to be real and true to this place we call home. And so at its base are the ideas, expertise and dreams of Edmontonians – both those who are experts in urban design, tourism, business, marketing and quality of life, and those who simply know what would make them enjoy winter more.

This project was also unique in that it didn’t just look at winter related events, or any singular aspect of life in winter. It crossed topic/areas of service boundaries and examined all aspects of the systems related to these areas. As shown in the description of the problem/challenge above, it looked at all aspects of our systems right down to the mental models that underpin them.

The project was also unique in that it used such a diverse and multi-faceted consultation approach. This approach was planned but also was responsive to emerging needs and interests. It was unique in the contrasts it contained in the consultation: it was targeted
and also very broad and open. It involved some traditional meetings, the use of social media, the first online crowdsourcing tool for the City of Edmonton, untraditional luncheons in pubs/restaurants, and creative dialogue that brought together people that normally do not get together.

What was also unique is that the discussions we were having were an important part of beginning to shift our winter culture. In consulting on how to become a great winter city, we already began the process of getting there. The way the consultation was designed was already addressing the desired outcomes of the future implementation.

**Project Results**

This strategy is a coming together of Edmontonians ideas and suggestions, combined with a strong body of urban design expertise, best practices from other well-known winter cities and the experience and success of our existing winter festivals. It also draws heavily on the expertise of the WinterCity Think Tank; a volunteer group of Edmontonians who spent almost a year developing and fine tuning this strategy. The 10 goals fall under four themes:

- Winter Life
- Winter Design
- Winter Economy
- Our Winter Story

Each goal is bold and visionary, accompanied by ambitious actions. Successful implementation will depend upon shared responsibility. Neighborhoods, developers and builders, programmers, policy makers: all have a role to play. The groundwork has been laid to achieve the vision. Careful implementation and time will determine its success.

**Alignment with IAP2 Core Values**

1. Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.

With the WinterCity Strategy, do we not only believe that the public has a right to be involved in the decision making process, we made the Think Tank (a volunteer group of 36 Edmontonians with expertise in urban design, business, tourism, marketing and livability) the direct decision makers in our process. The process was championed by a City Councillor who ensured that people thought boldly and outside of current constraints. Councillor Henderson’s leadership empowered groups to share concrete recommendations. The Think Tank themselves decided what the goals for this strategy should be. City Council will accept the strategy and its goal as information, and hopefully direct City Administration to develop a detailed implementation plan. Moreover, it is important to note that this group of citizens didn’t craft the goals on their own; they had the benefit of a much larger consultation process with varied methods. They participated and were informed of issues and ideas that came up through these other methods, and could take them into account. So, through the numerous in-depth dialogue sessions and workshops, and other creative methods, the larger public had many opportunities to share their issues and ideas and these were taken into consideration by the Think Tank.
when they created the goals. In this case, it was public consultation by the public, for the public.

2. Public participation includes the promise that the public's contribution will influence the decision.

Through all our consultation, we made it clear that we wanted to know what people thought. As one of our guiding principles was focused on authenticity – we needed to know what would work for Edmontonians – it needed to be built from the ground up, based on local assets, telling our own uniquely Edmonton story. Another guiding principle, sustainability, referred to the need for the strategy to be inclusive in order for it to be successful and endure. We shared the guiding principles and emphasized that we would listen as best as we could. We made sure to share all the input gathered with the Think Tank, so that they ultimately could take the larger public's contribution into consideration. Also, we invited all public consultation participants back to a validation meeting; to review and comment on the goals that had been developed.

3. Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision-makers.

This IAP2 core value was essentially one of the guiding principles of the WinterCity Strategy. The three guiding principles for the project were: Authentic, Attitude-Changing and Sustainable. These three guiding principles were developed through public consultation (with input from the symposium and then worked on by the Think Tank). They became the key criteria in evaluating all the ideas and recommendations and developing the 10 WinterCity Strategy goals. We meant 'sustainable' in the green sense, but also in the sense of being inclusive and enduring. If the strategy does not recognize and communicate the needs of all Edmontonians, if Edmontonians do not see themselves somehow in the strategy, then it will not be successful in making lasting changes; it will not endure. It will not be sustainable.

4. Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.

Through ads in the Edmonton Journal, promotion of the kick-off and the winter contest on Global TV and CBC radio, through direct invitations to the symposium and other events, as well as targeted in-depth consultation sessions, we sought out and facilitated the involvement of a wide range of people. When meeting with various groups of stakeholders, we would ask if they thought that any other specific stakeholders should be involved, and we would include them in subsequent consultations or else set up additional consultation sessions for them.

5. Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.

Though we did have a public involvement plan that was prepared at the beginning of the process, we did revisit it periodically and make changes based on input from participants. At all of our in-person sessions, we asked participants how they saw themselves being involved, what role they would like to play. This influenced the strategy goal development but also put new processes in motion right away. For example, Northlands, a large non-profit organization, expressed an interest in meeting with winter
festival producers to begin a conversation to explore options of how they might work together for their mutual benefit. (These festival producers all sat on the Think Tank as well.) The project team facilitated these initial meetings, and will continue to be involved to ensure that the identified actions in the strategy (which will be finalized in August) accurately reflect the direction they take.

6. Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.

Very often, we asked a simple question which was “What would make you fall in love with winter in Edmonton?” This question did not require much explanation. Background and contextual information related to the project was available on our website, in brochures, and at every presentation made. When we did ask more detailed questions in the more lengthy sessions, we provided very good context and food-for-thought for these questions.

7. Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.

The project results are being finalized now. However, the draft goals were prepared in May and we held a Goal Validation Workshop where we tested and validated them with 80 representatives from the many groups/sectors we consulted. We shared with them how we used their input and they could see how it affected the draft goals. The Think Tank is meeting on July 6 to give final approval to the revised goals and on August 30th, they are meeting to approve the final draft of the strategy document. Once these are approved, and the strategy document is printed, we are planning to hold a public launch to celebrate and to communicate how their input is reflected in the strategy.

We are targeting to take the completed strategy to City Council for their consideration in October. Hopefully, they will direct City Administration to help craft a detailed implementation strategy.

Appendix:

Video Link to excerpt from John Furlong’s keynote speech from the Kick-off event in January:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0L1hAKWN34M
The January Kick-off

The January Symposium

The Think Tank

Dialogue Luncheon with TV Meteorologists

A Dialogue Workshop

The May 14 Goal Validation Workshop