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IAP2 harvests, generates and disseminates knowledge to improve the practice of public participation.

Our broad goals are to improve the practice of public participation by:

1) Framing the state of P2-related knowledge (including practice and related theory), and identifying/prioritizing knowledge gaps and needs;
2) Building on international networks for communicating and sharing information among P2-related knowledge holders (i.e. scholars, practitioners, decision-makers and “the public”);
3) Supporting the development and dissemination of educational and skill building tools, techniques, strategies and materials, for participants (“the public”), decision-makers and practitioners.
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Introduction

Each year the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) and IAP2 Australasia seek 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 only one nominee can win each year, overall the entries present a wealth of information about the state of public participation worldwide and showcase excellence in practice.

Case studies are a valuable tool for learning about others’ experiences. We can learn from their stories and inform our own practice. The eight case studies presented here are exemplars of good practice. They support IAP2’s core values, and exhibit creative ways to engage the public. The studies provide a range of proactive to reactive examples of engaging the public. They illustrate from local to national levels, with individual case studies ranging from 300 to 25,000 participants. Sectorally, they cross topical areas from national disease control policy, regional economic revitalization, public education, community visioning, wastewater treatment facility development and city budget decision making. They all result in benefits for the agencies, stakeholders, communities and citizens.

The studies can be useful for multiple reasons including that they explore creative techniques, ideas for management or governance structures for participatory processes, methods to engage diverse groups and/or agencies, or providing reflection on lessons learned. The cases also provide examples that can be used for promoting or “making the case” for participatory approaches.

Initially, the case studies were judged against the IAP2 core values award criteria (see below). Only those examples that passed examination, by a panel of esteemed public participation ‘elders’, are presented in this report. First, a summary of the case studies is presented in table form to help identify which cases may be of interest to you. These summaries have been prepared by report authors. Second, the full case study, written by the submitting person/agency, is presented.

Core Values Award Application Criteria

- Describe the challenge or problem faced and how each of the parties involved viewed the role of public participation.
- Describe the methods used to implement public participation.
- Describe what makes this project special. Did public participation significantly improve the decision made? Were innovative participation techniques used? Did it solve a problem that faces the field of public participation? Did it spread the practice of public participation into a new area?
- Describe the project’s effectiveness or results and explain the role that the public participation process played.
- Describe how the IAP2 core values were met.
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.

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.
### Case Study Summaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Our Shared Vision: Living in Brisbane 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Brisbane City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Australia, Brisbane, population 1.77 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>New city vision document, citizen input on high-level themes and emerging issues identified by the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Survey, vision postcards, workshops, discussion forums, blogs, youth drawing activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>A comprehensive methodology to engage all citizens, with additional effort to engage hard-to-reach populations of young people and migrants; ensured that their vision is embedded in the vision document. Testing of all findings through a further survey provided additional support and guidance to council. Outcomes have been incorporated into the City’s Strategic Planning framework in the annual, medium term and long-term plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Metropolitan city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>About 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>18,000 plus citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report</td>
<td>Page 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Tualatin Tomorrow: Community Vision &amp; Strategic Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>City of Tualatin, population 22,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>United States, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Vision document to address rapid population growth and transition from an agricultural economy to a suburban community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>A range of methods ensures public involvement at all levels and through all stages of the process. A particularly interesting method was the creation of VisionCorps, “a pool of volunteers assembled to bring a wide array of talents and perspectives to the project. The interested parties database was used to successfully recruit participants for essential project needs”. A major theme running through this process was building capacity for involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>The results of the project were to be utilized in planning, including direction for “relationships with neighboring jurisdictions, the region and the State”. According to the website (see below), the process has moved forward with the creation of a Vision Implementation Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>18 months: June 2007 Council accepted the Plan unanimously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>750 plus citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tualatintomorrow.org">http://www.tualatintomorrow.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report</td>
<td>Page 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Title
Tamworth Learning 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizing Group</th>
<th>Department of Education &amp; Training New South Wales, Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Tamworth, population of City 35,465; of region 51,861.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Changing needs of education in 21st century, declining student population, controversial discussion paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>The consultants used several methods to involve all those interested in the future of education in Tamworth: workshops, world cafes, deliberative forums, briefings, and project newsletters. Of note were the methods used to involve young people and indigenous groups. Random selection of the local population was consulted to provide representative views. Evaluation was emphasized and utilized at various stages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>“The ultimate vindication of the process was the recognition it received within the Department and their commitment to using similar processes to undertake strategic planning within other regions.” The project has built capacity within the department. Many key themes arose from a comprehensive consultation process &amp; 58 recommendations were developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>9-12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report</td>
<td>Page 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Voices &amp; Choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>The Fund for Our Economic Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>United States, Northeast Ohio, population over 3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Regional economic decline, existing plans lack public engagement or community buy-in. Need to address economic vitality at a regional scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>21st Century Town Meetings, online dialog, appreciative inquiry-based interviews, leadership forums, decentralized community conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Public identified challenges and set priorities. Philanthropic grants in place to provide action support. Six regional challenges shared by the region and form the new economic agenda. The size of this consultation (1000’s of people) has had a political impact putting this P2 on the regional agenda. A database of those involved has been developed. Priorities identified by the people have been incorporated into a three year plan for the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>16 county region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>25,000 citizens, 80 funding organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.advancenortheastohio.org">http://www.advancenortheastohio.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report</td>
<td>Page 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>Brisbane Water Enviro Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Brisbane Water Enviro Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Australia, Brisbane, population 1,763,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>Upgrades to wastewater treatment plants, confrontational public opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Several methods were use to educate and inform such as plant tours, the formation of a CRG (Community Representative Group), scientific presentations, responsiveness to community questions and concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Community concerns over odour put elimination of odour as a core focus of project; through evaluations, it was determined that public satisfaction rose substantially in terms of faith in the process, trust in Council’s commitment, and satisfaction with the overall result of upgrades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>Neighborhood of 3 plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary Report</strong></td>
<td>Page 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>Manningham’s Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Manningham’s City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Australia, Manningham, population 109,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>How to get the public involved in Council budget development process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>The Community consultation process was designed to determine taxpayers’ satisfaction with services and taxes using several methods: public meetings, questionnaire, (mailed and online), focus groups (including one with council), and e-forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Increased public knowledge about council services and costs of service provision, and public input on budget decision-making. Involving the public for this purpose was an unusual step and it was learned that the public can make a difference, and that given sufficient time and information, can provide educated input to the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>1,800 citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.manningham.vic.gov.au">http://www.manningham.vic.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary Report</strong></td>
<td>Page 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Putting the Public in Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Centers for Disease Control &amp; Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Assess public willingness to accept control measures in the event of a pandemic of influenza and identify obstacles to implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Citizen deliberation days, stakeholder organization workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Demonstration of public support convinced some key decision makers to support the strategy, even though the “science” is incomplete and significant negative consequences for the public. “A clear pending national decision was put on the table with the real potential to be shaped by the input received.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>National policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>260 citizens, 50 organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report</td>
<td>Page 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Fiordland National Park Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Department of Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>New Zealand, South Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Controversial management plan that resulted in 2000 submissions from a broad range of stakeholders from hunters, to aircraft operators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Travelling hearing panel, responses to all written submissions, individual meetings where required, special meetings to facilitate opposing groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Several successful outcomes - acceptable position was reached including change in flight allocations and hunting: Aircraft operators having taken responsibility to manage their own performance based on public input; hunters assuming responsibility for protecting endangered species and other efforts. Putting the issues back into the hands of the stakeholders resulted in a plan that was 4 times larger than the original one which sparked so much resistance. A major outcome is that this project is a model for p2 for other similar planning reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>5 years of open dialog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report</td>
<td>Page 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Our Shared Vision: Living in Brisbane 2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Brisbane City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Australia, Brisbane, population 1.77 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>New city vision document, citizen input on high-level themes and emerging issues identified by the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Survey, vision postcards, workshops, discussion forums, blogs, youth drawing activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>A comprehensive methodology to engage all citizens, with additional effort to engage hard-to-reach populations of young people and migrants; ensured that their vision is embedded in the vision document. Testing of all findings through a further survey provided additional support and guidance to council. Outcomes have been incorporated into the City’s Strategic Planning framework in the annual, medium term and long-term plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Metropolitan city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>About 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>18,000 plus citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report</td>
<td>Page 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2007 IAP2 Australasia

Core Values Awards

Award nomination for Robust PP Process

Our Shared Vision: Living in Brisbane 2026

Brisbane City Council
Contact: Glenn Boyd Senior Program Officer
Email: glenn.boyd@brisbane.qld.gov.au
Section 1: Response to criteria

A. The challenge

As Brisbane City Council approached 2010, the need to revisit and stretch the planning horizon beyond the Council's existing Vision 2010 document was clearly evident. Challenges anticipated included: -Brisbane City Council and the State were undertaking significant consultation on growth-management and there was potential for consultation fatigue in the community -A project based on the future would be challenging considering people are generally focused on the issues of the here and now -Residents may not want to be asked the same things again in a different way, and -Any engagement needed to add value to that which had already been garnered through the growth management engagement.

B. Honouring IAP2 Core Values

The robust public-participation process used for the creation of *Living in Brisbane 2026*, strongly aligns with IAP2's Core Values 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Wide-ranging opportunities for community and stakeholder involvement were developed. The process established political support as the foundation to build upon and with the commitment of positive, elected representatives to support the development of an inspirational vision, Council officers looked at exploring with the community how the new vision document could improve upon what was currently in place and identify what gaps existed.

To ensure accessible participation and that the needs of stakeholders were met, a range of engagement techniques were promoted and undertaken across the life of the process:

- The community’s key values were confirmed through a citywide survey with over 14,000 responses -The use of blank reply-paid postcards enabling people to express their thoughts through drawing and brief written reflection were utilised -Face-to-face opportunities were provided at planning workshops and through targeted stakeholder engagement, and -Online surveys, discussion forums and blogs were established, enabling people to share their thoughts for the city’s future.

Information about the current Vision, why it needed to be revisited and how people could become involved was provided in a range of ways. These included:

- Media releases
- Newspaper advertorials
- Spaces within Council’s corporate and youth websites, and
- Newsletters, survey introductions, and information displays.

In developing the city’s Vision, a commitment was made by Council to ensure that young people would help shape their future city. Council’s Community Development
Service’s youth teams worked with a range of young people from different backgrounds. One of the first tasks for each group was to decide how they would like to explore elements of the vision and how they would provide their feedback. When working with new migrants and refugees, Council informed community representatives about the vision so these representatives could then go on to engage with their own communities and subsequently provide feedback to Council.

C. Robust engagement

The development of the vision document was a very robust process involving decision makers, community and Council employees.

Council’s decision makers, elected Councillors and the Lord Mayor, were engaged in the process from the outset. Before taking the idea of refreshing the 2010 Vision to the community, all elected representatives confirmed there was a need for the re-fresh to occur. Councillors were given background reading to stimulate their thinking on issues affecting the future and to think about what they valued most about Brisbane. An initial workshop focused on a number of activities including workshopping a number of future scenarios and applying this thinking to what a future Brisbane may look like. Time was also spent working through the social, environmental and economic design principles that should be explicit in the final vision document. Using a facilitation process, bi-partisan agreement was reached on the high-level themes and outcomes that were necessary for a vision for Brisbane, and which formed the basis for what issues the community would be engaged on.

Subsequently, a range of opportunities was provided to the community to become involved. Awareness was raised around the Vision being refreshed and a concerted effort was made by Council to provide the community with a variety of contribution opportunities. The opportunities for involvement and expression included face-to-face, online, written, drawing and multimedia. Examples are:

- Vision postcards and posters were distributed throughout Brisbane. People were invited to share their vision of Brisbane by drawing a picture, writing a phrase or key words. This engagement process attracted attention and allowed an innovative, non-prescriptive way for residents to participate. The postcards were also effective in appealing to visual, narrative and kinesthetic communication styles. Over 2,500 postcards were received and displayed on the corporate website, with many of the quotations and pictures included in the final vision document.

Illustration 1: Front of Vision postcard.
• Online discussion forums were held covering all of the themes. A youth blog space ran with a number of Vision ambassadors
• Vision displays and engagement activities at Neighbourhood Planning workshops - a Brisbane City Council initiative to engage the community in local planning issues and priorities
• Primary school students were asked to do drawings depicting the future as part of the Neighbourhood Planning ‘Citizen 2026’ initiative -many of which were also incorporated into the final document
• A survey was developed which asked people what was most valued about Brisbane and what should be preserved for 2026, over 14,000 responses were received, and
• A water future vision workshop was held involving creative drama and computer animation.

The Vision 2026 engagement process specifically targeted two ‘hard to reach’ groups; young people and those from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds:

1. Young people

Young people were targeted for consultation via existing partnerships and relationships with young people and youth organizations. Council’s Community Development Youth Team undertook eight different engagement activity projects for each of the vision themes. Including:

- Experiential learning activities
- Elected representatives working with the youth groups on Vision sessions
- School and community presentations
- Presentations to Council’s executive committees
- Involvement of the Lord Mayor’s Youth Advisory Council
- Presentations involving the Lord Mayor and Councillors, and
- Creative multimedia and print-based outputs.

The youth-based engagement saw a strong level of cross stakeholder engagement with individual Councillor’s joining in with the youth explorations. Presentations were made to elected representatives and Council’s executive management. The outcome was that young people’s vision for their city is embedded in the Living in Brisbane 2026 document.

2. Culturally and linguistically diverse participants.

Brisbane has attracted many new and emerging communities, comprised primarily of former refugees. The most recent emerging communities are from a number of African countries. In partnership with the Ethnic Communities Council of Queensland, leaders from new and emerging cultural communities within Brisbane (including representatives from Afghanistan, Burundi, Congo, Eritrea, Kurdistan, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Somalia and Sudan) were approached to present their unique perspective on the City and their aspirations for the future. To enable the engagement to occur, Council facilitated the up-skilling of community members so that representatives of the community could undertake engagement with their own communities on Council’s behalf.
Feedback from the bi-lingual workers and participants was, that:

- They enjoyed working on the project and gained a sense of achievement
- It was a great opportunity for the community to contribute
- They thought that this was the first time that some emerging communities were consulted on an initiative such as the Vision Draft Paper, and
- Taking part in Vision 2026 promoted communication and friendship, which contributes to a safe city.

The involvement of Council employees in the process has been fully supported by management and elected representatives. Involving Council employees recognizes that they are community members and residents of the city, explores their passion for the city and benefits from the levels of expertise and experience they are able to provide. Another benefit is that Council employees are helping to deliver something of which they have a genuine ownership and understanding.

Rigorous and best-practice public participation is influencing Council’s decision making. Council has set *Living in Brisbane 2026* as its guiding document and is diagrammatically shown at the apex of the Council’s strategic planning framework. All activities that Council undertakes must now demonstrate how they will deliver the community’s vision. Within the document there are eight themes with a further 20 city-wide outcomes. Since the Vision was adopted, Council has established integrated teams relating to these outcomes to explore how best Council can move towards achieving the community’s vision.

*Diagram 1: Vision 2026 is at the apex of Brisbane City Council’s strategic planning framework.*
A. Introduction

In late 2005 and 2006, Brisbane City Council undertook the process of refreshing the Living in Brisbane 2010 Vision and developed Our Shared Vision: Living in Brisbane 2026.

The Vision is inspirational and is the result of extensive consultation with over 18,000 participants giving feedback. It features:

- A history of Brisbane
- A list of Brisbane qualities that people most value
- Eight vision themes with key tasks and targets, and
- Twenty city-wide outcomes

Direct quotations and pictures from the community engagement are included in the final document -adding a personal and creative element to the Vision.

The Vision is the pinnacle of Council’s strategic-planning framework and communicates, “What we want to be”.
B. Engagement process in developing the Vision

Step 1: Emerging issues and analysis – drivers of change
In 2005, Councillors from Civic Cabinet, as well as the organization’s senior executives, examined the key drivers of change and their anticipated impact on Brisbane within the next 20 years.

Step 2: Councillors vision for Brisbane
In late 2005, all of Brisbane’s elected members gathered for a one-day workshop to re-examine the Living in Brisbane 2010 Vision framework and test its robustness in light of anticipated drivers of change in future years. This thinking contributed to the development of the refreshed Vision for Brisbane and also assisted the elected representatives to anticipate and manage change proactively.

Step 3a: Community’s visions – what the community values about living in Brisbane
During Feb-May 2006, residents were invited to express what they valued about Brisbane and what the future city would be like in their vision. They were invited to participate in a number of ways and selected hard-to-reach groups were targeted for engagement.

Step 3b: Employees vision and engagement
At the same time as community engagement activities, parallel processes were happening with Council employees. A number of processes were undertaken:

- Employee workshop representing a wide cross-section of employees
- Vision-refresh forums
- Vision Champion network – Sixteen employees from Divisions and business units in Council nominated to extend the employee involvement from their local areas
- Chief Executive Officer ‘Roadshows’ implemented where the CEO visited all areas of Council and engaged them in a Vision refresh activity, and
- Foyer display in the main Council office building.

Step 4: First draft developed
18,000 responses were received in the form of surveys, vision postcards, children’s
artwork and community workshops. Contributions were analyzed and validated to form a collation of ‘Brisbane qualities that Brisbane people most value’. These values were outlined in the front of the vision document and interspersed in the content of the eight vision themes:

- Friendly, safe city
- Clean, green city
- Well-designed, subtropical city
- Accessible, connected city
- Smart, prosperous city
- Active, healthy city
- Vibrant, creative city, and
- Regional, world city.

A first draft of the vision was developed, incorporating the huge quantity of contributions received. Input and suggestions from Councillors, as community representatives, were invited on the first draft prior to going out to the wider community for feedback.

Step 5: Consultation on the draft vision
A second round of consultation was undertaken on the draft document that was directly distributed to 1,100 groups and individuals including; planning associations, peak bodies, other Councils in the region, State Government agencies, community organizations and schools. The draft Vision document was also made available online. Included was a survey for structured feedback. The community was also invited to make detailed, written submissions and to participate in online discussions.

The feedback was collated and analyzed and a final Living in Brisbane Vision 2026 was produced. Civic Cabinet and Council approved this Vision and it was released to Brisbane residents in December 2006.

C. How public participation influenced decisions
- The key aspects that people felt needed strengthening in the document were:
  - The inclusive/multicultural focus
  - Designing a community of all ages (including older people)
  - More aspiration-oriented content – A stronger regional focus – Incorporating strong visual elements including a map of Brisbane, and
  - Evidence that Council is committed to delivering this vision

These areas were addressed through strengthening the bold aspirations under each of the 8 vision themes.

D. Conclusion
Community input was fed directly into the Vision with more than 80% of consultation participants agreeing on what they value most about living in Brisbane. Public participation has gone beyond the aspirations, quotations and pictures in the document; the ‘Vision is living and has become the pinnacle of Council’ s strategic-planning framework and guides the direction Council takes and what it does for the community.
## Case Study: Tualatin Tomorrow: Community Vision & Strategic Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Tualatin Tomorrow: Community Vision &amp; Strategic Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>City of Tualatin, population 22,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>United States, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Vision document to address rapid population growth and transition from an agricultural economy to a suburban community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>A range of methods ensures public involvement at all levels and through all stages of the process. A particularly interesting method was the creation of VisionCorps, “a pool of volunteers assembled to bring a wide array of talents and perspectives to the project. The interested parties database was used to successfully recruit participants for essential project needs”. A major theme running through this process was building capacity for involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>The results of the project were to be used in planning, including direction for “relationships with neighboring jurisdictions, the region and the State”. According to the website (see below), the process has moved forward with the creation of a Vision Implementation Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>18 months: June 2007 Council accepted the Plan unanimously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>750 plus citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tualatintomorrow.org">http://www.tualatintomorrow.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report</td>
<td>Page 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IAP2 Project of the Year Award Submission

Zenn Associates, a Portland, Oregon-based public involvement firm, is pleased to nominate the development process for *Tualatin Tomorrow Community Vision and Strategic Action Plan* for the IAP2 Project of the Year Award.

The City of Tualatin, Oregon through its City Council, sponsored a community-based long-term visioning process to guide the city’s future. The process included development of a community-driven strategic action plan, which defines specific tasks to move toward the community’s vision, and identifies agencies or organizations to implement those tasks.

The 18-month process actively involved hundreds of community members. Zenn Associates joined City of Tualatin staff as part of the project management team. City staff, the Chamber of Commerce, Tigard-Tualatin School District, TriMet (regional transportation agency), Washington County and a host of non-profit agencies and local service organizations also served as partners in the project.

The resulting *Tualatin Tomorrow Vision and Strategic Action Plan* provides for the city a long-range, adaptable “road map” to Tualatin’s preferred future. In June of 2007, the Tualatin City Council and Mayor accepted the Plan unanimously.

Throughout the process, the main focus was community involvement. Community members comprised the steering and drafting committees and presented the final Plan to City Council. Multiple events such as workshops, forums and the Town Hall invited the entire community into the project, both as participants and organizers.

The process involved and empowered a broad range of community members including representatives of various age and cultural groups, businesses and special-interest groups.

As part of this nomination packet, we’ve present a brief background, specific responses to nomination criteria and an appendix of supporting elements.
Background: Tualatin Tomorrow Vision and Strategic Action Plan

The City of Tualatin is located on the southwestern edge of the Portland metropolitan area. The city has experienced significant growth in the past 30 years transforming it from an agricultural-based economy to a bustling suburban community with a mix of residential, commercial business and manufacturing land uses. The current population is 24,940 and is expected to grow to 28,000 in the upcoming years.

The Tualatin City Council set out to connect with the community to help identify the Tualatin community’s values and emerging issues. The Tualatin Tomorrow Project is the culmination of 17 months of work that included the donated time, effort and creativity of hundreds of community members, community groups, elected officials and city staff.

With extensive community involvement, the community developed a Vision Statement reflecting Tualatin’s core values. This “statement for the future” helped guide the Tualatin Tomorrow process and will provide guidance for future planning efforts. In the second half of the project, the community developed a Strategic Action Plan. The Strategic Action Plan provides steps to move in the direction of the Vision.

The process to create the Vision and Strategic Action Plan featured numerous and diverse opportunities for involvement. By its nature and design, the Tualatin Tomorrow project adhered to each of the Core values of the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2).

At the project’s center was the Tualatin Tomorrow Steering Committee. Appointed by the Tualatin City Council, the committee was made up of residents, business owners, youth, seniors and other community members. Their primary role was to oversee and guide the Vision and Action Plan development. This group served as “shepherds’ of the process.

Though many steering committee members were new to public process, this group evolved into an engaged team and fulfilled their role by ensuring project integrity, reviewing key documents, providing outreach direction, interfacing with the City Council and serving as project resources at Tualatin Tomorrow events. The 18-member committee met 16 times from February 2006 to June 2007. Committee members also had a presence at every Tualatin Tomorrow event.
The project launched in early 2006 with key stakeholder interviews and community discussions about Tualatin’s issues. Based on these conversations, the project team developed the project’s Communications and Outreach Plan. As part of early-project awareness efforts, Speaker’s bureau events were held throughout the community including with Civic Affairs students at Tigard-Tualatin High School. The first community-wide event was designed to inform participants about the process and further capture and define key issues in the community that this process could address.

Community capacity-building was an important aspect of the project, which aimed to engage people who are not normally involved. The process used both time-tested and innovative participation techniques to provide an open door to participation.

An exercise called “Picture Tualatin." served as a centerpiece to the early awareness efforts.

Community volunteers were given disposable cameras to capture five photos: several of things they liked about Tualatin and several of things they thought might be improved.

After shooting five photos, they passed it along to other volunteers to do the same. The volunteer photographers kept log books describing their photographs. The exercise not only brought more than 300 images to the project, it seeded conversations among the community about key issues of the project. Tualatin images were used at community events to stimulate dialogue and also were a central component of multiple community surveys. A sample of the first of three web-based surveys is included in the appendix.

The participation activities helped inform thousands about the project, from which a database was developed of more than 750 community members who expressed interest in being part of the project. The project team used this list strategically in developing the VisionCorps, a pool of volunteers assembled to bring a wide array of talents and perspectives to the project. The interested parties database was used to successfully recruit participants for essential project needs.

The Tualatin Tomorrow project picked up momentum during the late spring and summer with six community workshops to help define the Vision.

A volunteer community drafting committee helped prepare the Vision for community review at the first ever Town Hall, held on October 25, 2006. The Town Hall was a successful way of reaching out to those who were new to the project. At that event, more than 260 community members joined together to learn about the project, provide input on the current progress and kick-off the Action Planning phase.
Six components were developed to encompass the community’s Vision and provide the framework for the Strategic Action Plan:

- **How We Live and Learn**  Arts, Culture, Education, Youth and Family Activities
- **How We Plan and Grow**  Growth, Housing and Town Center
- **How We Connect with Nature**  Parks, Recreation and Natural Areas
- **How We Care for One Another**  Health, Safety and Social Services
- **How We Get Around**  Traffic, Transportation and Connectivity
- **How We Decide**  Governance, Leadership and Community Engagement

Community activities continued during action planning. Three workshops—including a full day transportation and growth issues workshop—encouraged community members to roll up their sleeves and develop action recommendations to bring the Vision to life. Potential lead partners also joined in a workshop to prepare for their roles in leading or contributing to actions. A workshop with City staff was held to prepare them for the types of information they might receive.

Once action planning began, a second staff workshop was held to review community suggestions and assess how those suggestions could be assimilated into the Action Plan. After more refinement, lead partner conversations and Steering Committee review, the Action Plan was presented at the May Action Event. More than 140 community members weighed in on the strategies most important to them.

This Community Vision and 20-year Strategic Action Plan is intended to be a living, dynamic document. Using the Community Vision as a guide, the Strategic Action Plan will be updated periodically to reflect progress on Actions and amended to ensure further progress on Strategies.

On June 25, 2007 members of the Tualatin Tomorrow Steering Committee presented the Vision and Strategic Action Plan to the Tualatin City Council and Mayor Lou Ogden.
Steering Committee Co-chair Frank Bubenik led the presentation team. “We now have a Vision and Strategic Action Plan to present to you,” he told the council. “These tools are designed to place the Tualatin community in a more powerful position to proactively respond to considerable opportunities and significant challenges into the future. The Vision provides a voice to the common values and interests of our community. The Strategic Action Plan will focus our collective energies on making real progress towards fulfilling that Vision. For you, our elected officials and policy-makers, these tools illuminate what the community believes is important. It is a powerful framework to use in your important work.”

The council accepted the Vision and Strategic Action Plan unanimously.

IAP2 Core Values Awards – Criteria and Questions

The City of Tualatin, sponsoring agency
Mayor Lou Ogden, City of Tualatin
Sherilynn Lombos, City Manager
Doug Rux, Community Development Director
Elizabeth Stepp, Senior Planner
Email: drux@ci.tualatin.or.us

Doug Zenn, Zenn Associates, email: dzenn@jlainvolve.com
QUESTIONS

1. Describe the challenge or problem faced and how each of the parties involved viewed the role of public participation.

City officials in Tualatin are facing several challenges due to significant growth and change within its population, urban growth boundary and transportation system. During the past 30 years, Tualatin has transformed from an agricultural-based economy in 1970 with 750 residents to a community with a mix of residential, commercial business and manufacturing land uses, and a current population of over 24,940. Recent Urban Growth Boundary changes adjacent to City limits are setting the stage for future growth.

Facing numerous decisions related to these challenges, the Tualatin City Council sought broader and more inclusive input from its community and community groups. Unless a matter reached a high level of controversy, many Tualatin residents would not become involved. Council looked to the Tualatin tomorrow process to provide opportunities for ALL Tualatin residents to have an opportunity to participate in decision making.

City of Tualatin staff stayed involved in the project as a way to inform both existing and future projects. “We looked for a multitude of opportunities to engage the community in this process,” said Community Development Director Doug Rux. “We included a variety of venues, beyond traditional, to engage those who might not otherwise get involved.”

2. Describe the methods used to implement public participation.

Public participation involved multiple approaches, growing the initial small base of involved community members to an interested party network of more than 750 people. The following techniques and methods were used:

- Key stakeholder interviews
- Community Group Discussions
- Creation of the Tualatin Tomorrow Steering Committee (TTSC)
- Creation of the Tualatin Tomorrow VisionCorps, a pool of volunteers assembled to bring a wide array of talents and perspectives from which the project could draw.
- Preparation and facilitation of two community forums (one to kick-off the visioning phase and one for community review of the action plan)
- Preparation and facilitation of the first Tualatin Town Hall
- Preparation and facilitation of multiple community workshops during the visioning and action development phases
- Facilitation of multiple vision and action development drafting workshops
- Development and distribution of newsletters, E-news bulletins
- Development and distribution of press releases to local media sources
• Participation at Community events, parades and festivals (Tualatin Tomorrow float was awarded second place in the annual Crawfish Festival Parade)
• Hand-delivered distribution of tabloids to every household during two key points of the project (assisted by the a core of high school students and the Tualatin High School Choir)
• Outreach to local churches and apartment complexes
• Organization of the first Tualatin Tomorrow Town Hall (assisted by high school students and boy scout troops)
• Preparation of Tualatin Tomorrow website content
• Development and facilitation of Picture Tualatin (a visual survey process in which community members were given cameras and logbooks to record things they liked and didn’t like in Tualatin. The images were compiled and used as slide shows at community events and for several community-wide surveys)
• Creation of three website visual surveys utilizing Picture Tualatin images (resulting in more than 1100 responses)
• Creation of three flipchart-style visual surveys for community events utilizing Picture Tualatin images
• Production of a 15-minute project overview video, shown periodically on the local cable access channel
• Presentations at Tualatin High School to government classes
• the Tualatin Youth Advisory Council for youth outreach
• Development of a student outreach team to expand awareness about the project, collect data and have a presence at community events.
• Utilization of volunteer help such as the Tualatin High School Performing Arts class students managing lighting and sound at the second community forum.

3. Describe what makes this project special.

Several project elements stand out above others in contributing to this project’s success:

1) Involvement of the VisionCorps. The Tualatin Tomorrow VisionCorps was a group of volunteers outside of the Tualatin Tomorrow Steering Committee. This group tapped available resources in the community and in doing so brought new faces to the project. The VisionCorps provided community members with multiple opportunities for involvement and greater awareness of decision-making processes within the city building much new capacity for civic engagement. The VisionCorps expanded as necessary to meet the needs at community events, the Town Hall, visioning and action planning workshops and drafting meetings. Through the VisionCorps, anyone who desired to roll up their sleeves had opportunities to be involved. The VisionCorps included many members new to the community and many long-time residents who had not previously been involved in city government.

c 2) Maturation and empowerment of the Tualatin Tomorrow Steering Committee. This group evolved from a quiet group of community members new to leadership positions into a functional and collaborative body that provided informed guidance and injected much energy into the process. The steering committee has helped develop much new leadership capacity within the community. The Steering Committee and their spheres of influence now provide the City with increased opportunities for future community
involvement. This committee’s developed talent was recognized by the city council when it appointed one of the committee’s co-chairs to a vacated City Council seat.

3) Engagement of Tualatin’s Youth. As those most affected by plans for 2030, the Steering Committee targeted youth for a higher level of participation in this project. The project team tapped an existing Youth Advisory Group to recruit a youth representative on the Steering Committee. The steering committee recommended additional youth involvement as part of its enhanced outreach leading up to the community-wide Town Hall event. It included funding a five-member youth “foot patrol” to hand-out information about Tualatin Tomorrow at community gathering spots (soccer games, picnic areas, summer concerts, etc.)

Also, the local high school civics class awarded extra credit to students who volunteered to assist and participate with the vision development. More than 100 civic class students participated in class discussions about the future of Tualatin, and more than 40 students helped record comments and participated at the Town Hall event. The Tualatin High School Coir also chipped in. More than 50 choir members and their parents delivered project tabloids door to door. The delivery team was briefed about the project so they could talk to community members as they delivered. In exchange for the choir’s services as “delivery ambassadors,” the project made a contribution to the choirs fund-raising campaign for a spring choral competition in Washington D.C. The expenditure was less than the cost of postage.

4) Further development of more visual and active public engagement approaches. Through “Picture Tualatin,” community members were given cameras and logbooks and asked to photograph things they liked about their community and things they felt needed attention. The result was more than 300 images. These images were then utilized to seed dialogue among the community. The pictures were shown as slide shows at events, used in web-based surveys (with more than 1100 responses), and in flip-chart style surveys at community events. The pictures also provided a library of images for more visual presentations about topic matters at Tualatin Tomorrow events.

The steering committee also initiated participation in the Crawfish festival parade as a means of enhancing program awareness. Not only did the float reach thousands of
parade watchers, mini-float and banners carriers brought more than 20 new participants to the process.

5) Involvement of City Staff. Engaged most-often with the community as part of controversial issues, City of Tualatin staff served as expert resources during this project’s workshops and events. This enhanced both the community’s perceptions of staff and staff’s perception of community members.

3b. Did public participation significantly improve the decision made?

As a community process from the start, community input not only affected decisions, it drove them. Through workshop discussions and community reviews of results, community members established the vision and provided the base of suggestions for the strategic action plan. Moreover, the results of this project will have a huge impact on many other city projects.

Many significant decisions were put on hold, awaiting the delivery of the Vision and Action Plan. Participants recognized the value of their involvement and responded brilliantly. Through monthly briefings, City officials were kept informed throughout the process as community input was developed.

*Tualatin Commons, a redeveloped industrial site in the city center*

3c. Were innovative participation techniques used?

Yes. The Tualatin City Council asked the project team to involve those who are not usually involved. The Picture Tualatin exercises (outlined earlier in this submission) expanded the core group of interests in the project and opened the door to involvement of all ages and abilities. The Steering Committee’s decision to participate in the local signature event (Crawfish Festival) parade expanded the awareness of the project and engaged numerous people who might not otherwise be involved. The development of the VisionCorps enhanced the community network to expand the reach of the project and bring valuable skill sets to the project.

3d. Did it solve a problem that faces the field of public participation?

Yes. Tualatin officials expressed concerns that too few people were involved in the decisions of the city. The Tualatin Tomorrow project opened the doors to higher levels
participation and significantly expanded the capacity of the community to be involved. Moreover, the project put in place the framework for ongoing community involvement.

3e. **Did it spread the practice of public participation into a new area?**

Yes. By breaking the Vision and Action Planning into six focus areas, the project was able to involve anyone who wanted to be involved. Participants had many avenues in which to be involved and venues in which to participate.

4. **Describe the project’s effectiveness or results and explain the role that the public participation process played.**

The project was effective in developing balanced and authentic outcomes reflective of the broader community. The project outcomes are expected to help link current and upcoming planning efforts. It will also advise direction for Tualatin in its relationships with neighboring jurisdictions, the region and the State. Perhaps most importantly, the project helped expand Tualatin’s civic capacity for involvement.

The public participation process was critical in achieving all elements of the project. With the wide-spread involvement, the partnerships developed can move forward with significant weight behind them.

5. **Describe how the IAP2 core values were met.**

By its nature, the Tualatin Tomorrow project follows all the Core Values of IAP2. The work program was built around these core values. The project was based on the premise that the public should have a say in decisions that affect them (Core Value #1). In fact, it goes one step further in helping to define the issues that most affect the community.

As a city-sponsored, community driven project, the community was empowered to develop the vision and guide the partnerships to move forward on the strategic action plan. In this way, the community influenced all the decisions (Core Value #2) leading up to council’s acceptance of the plan.

Moreover, the steering committee established partnerships with groups and organizations beyond the government agency ensuring that progress will be made on the plan. The broad support among community agencies and groups lends itself well to a strategic action plan that is implementable and sustainable (Core Value #3).

The decisions to move forward on actions were influenced both by the community at large and community partners that volunteered to lead specific actions. All were involved closely in crafting the details of the final plan (Core Value #4).

The project team, including the Steering Committee, conducted ongoing assessments to determine how people would like to be involved (Core Value #5). The team adjusted its approaches throughout the project to meet emerging needs of the community.
Whether participants wished to participate in a 15-minute web-based exercise, or preferred to participate in half- or full-day workshops, briefings materials and/or presentations were available to bring them “up to speed.” Steering Committee members, servicing as community resources at Tualatin Tomorrow events, were well versed in project background: where the project’s been, where it is and where it’s was going. This allowed stakeholders to join the process in a meaningful way (Core Value #6) at anytime and at any level.

Finally, the final product—the Vision and Strategic Action Plan—depicts clearly how input affected decisions (Core Value #7). No ideas where discarded. In cases where partners were not available to lead an action, the ideas were placed in a section called “Thinking Forward” for periodic review by an implementation team.

SURVEY

The sample represents one page of a twenty page online survey.

Three of these surveys were posted throughout the visioning phase of the project.

An additional three surveys, also based on Picture Tualatin images were created in flipbook formats and used at community events.

Combined, the surveys received more than 1,100 responses from community members.

---

**Picture Tualatin Survey 1**

This survey’s pictures were taken by community members who were asked to share their ideas of what they like about Tualatin and what they feel needs attention.

What do you think about these pictures?

It takes as little as two minutes to complete the survey. Use the buttons under each picture to record your choices. If you have time, please type in comments about your choices.

This is the first of three Picture Tualatin Web Surveys. If you enjoyed this survey, please visit the website again to take the second Picture Tualatin Survey. It will be posted July 15.

The survey results will be used to help create the community Vision, which will be presented at the first Town Hall in October. Watch the website for details. Thanks for participating.

1. Indicate your choice for this picture.
  - I would like to see MUCH MORE of this in Tualatin’s future
  - I would like to see A LITTLE MORE of this in Tualatin’s future
  - I would like to see the SAME AMOUNT of this in Tualatin’s future
  - I would like to see A LITTLE LESS of this in Tualatin’s future
  - I would like to see MUCH LESS of this in Tualatin’s future

Please tell us a little more about your choice (optional).
## Case Study: Tamworth Learning 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Tamworth Learning 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Department of Education &amp; Training New South Wales, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Tamworth, population of City 35,465; of region 51,861.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>Changing needs of education in 21st century, declining student population, controversial discussion paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>The consultants used several methods to involve all those interested in the future of education in Tamworth: workshops, world cafes, deliberative forums, briefings, and project newsletters. Of note were the methods used to involve young people and indigenous groups. Random selection of the local population was consulted to provide representative views. Evaluation was emphasized and utilized at various stages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>“The ultimate vindication of the process was the recognition it received within the Department and their commitment to using similar processes to undertake strategic planning within other regions” The project has built capacity within the department. Many key themes arose from a comprehensive consultation process &amp; 58 recommendations were developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>9-12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary Report</strong></td>
<td>Page 38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tamworth Learning 2020 was a long term strategic project that sought to define a vision for public education in Tamworth over the next 15 years.

Enrolment imbalances across Tamworth’s 13 public schools, changing demographics, a shift in the region’s economic base, local skills shortages, changes in learning and teaching approaches and inequity across school facilities meant that the NSW Department of Education and Training had to undertake strategic long term planning to determine the future of public education provision in the area.

Specifically, demographic trends indicated an ageing community with a declining youth population, which, coupled with increased competition from the private sector, was predicted to reduce demand for public education services. A number of schools were in decline and the patterns of rising and falling enrolments across the schools did not necessarily coincide with areas of population growth and decline.

These challenges presented an opportunity for the people of Tamworth, together with the Department, to develop a vision for the future of education.

The Department released a discussion paper in mid-2006 that outlined five scenarios for education reform. The Department’s intention was to undertake limited consultation with the school community to get feedback on the scenarios in order to identify a preferred future direction.

The discussion paper generated a stronger than expected response and drew significant interest from the local media. Consequently, the Department recognized the need to get ‘buy-in’ from both the school community and the broader Tamworth population in order to identify future directions that would be broadly supported.

Recognizing that school amalgamation, possible closure or operational reforms are highly emotive issues, the Department decided to expand the scope of the project. The slate was ‘wiped clean’ and the Department went back to the ‘drawing board’ and committed to undertake widespread consultation in order to identify a preferred future direction.
A governance structure was established that consisted of a large project reference group (PRG) with wide representation from across all 13 schools, parents, staff, students and the teachers association and a smaller project management group (PMG) with representation from the Department, teachers association and an independent academic from a local university. The roles of each group were clearly established at the outset; the PRG provided advice and feedback to the Department on the project as it progressed and the PMG provided governance and advice to the consultant team. In liaison with the Department, the PRG developed a set of broad objectives that were used to guide future strategic planning and which project recommendations had to be based on.

The project was therefore born out of an increased awareness that the future of education in the area was an important issue that students, teachers, other departmental staff, parents and members of the local community held strong and important views about that needed to be considered before taking action to reform public schools.

Through an open tender process, Elton Consulting was chosen to undertake further consultation to identify the challenges facing Tamworth over the next 15 years, understand the changing needs of education in the 21st Century and make recommendations on how public education in the area could meet these challenges. The consultation process was designed to ensure inclusiveness and deliberation and involved:

- Interactive sessions with a sample of students from each school – kindergarten to year 12
- Parent and teacher discussions and focus groups at each school
- Three community workshops that combined station rounds and ‘world café’ techniques
- Two deliberative forums, based on the citizens jury model - one for a representative sample of community members and the other for a representative sample of senior students
- Specific Aboriginal consultations including meetings, youth groups and workshops
- More than 20 interactive briefings and workshops with key stakeholders, welfare, local industry and other interest groups
- Regular information updates through production of 13 project newsletters
- Ongoing meetings with the Department and PRG.

The outcome of the project was a report that consolidated the outcomes from the abovementioned consultation processes and made recommendations for education reform. By and large, the recommendations were fully supported and promoted by all stakeholders – parents, teachers, students, indigenous and non-indigenous community members, government and business.

The Department is now prioritizing recommendations and identifying strategies for funding and implementing the recommendations over time.
2. Describe how each of the IAP2 Core Values noted below were honoured in the Tamworth Learning 2020 process

a. 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

The Tamworth Learning 2020 process was premised on the recognition that all those with an interest in education could offer valuable insights that would benefit the project.

With input from the PRG, we shaped a highly transparent process that provided for inclusive public participation – no one was left out! Indeed, we made a significant effort to engage those communities of interest that could have been underrepresented. We gave special attention to tailoring a process that was appropriate and appealing to Aboriginal, student and teacher interests.

Aboriginal interests

Aboriginal people account for almost seven percent of Tamworth’s population, as compared to just two percent across the state. Almost 20 percent of public school students in Tamworth are Aboriginal and the majority struggle at school which impacts their future health and welfare. The proportion of Aboriginal enrolments in Tamworth’s public schools is growing. The Aboriginal community, therefore, had a lot to gain from the project because it provided opportunities to ‘turn around’ the school experience for young Aboriginal people. We recognized it was absolutely critical to provide adequate opportunities for Aboriginal people to help us understand their needs and priorities for education.

From experience, we know that it is often difficult to connect with Aboriginal communities and know that it is important to work with them on their terms.

Accordingly, we recognized that it would be appropriate to engage Joe Craigie, a local Aboriginal consultant, to work with us to frame the issues and to facilitate meaningful consultations with the indigenous community. Activities included specific workshops with elders, representatives of regulatory agencies concerned with Aboriginal issues, schools with high Aboriginal enrolments and youth groups.

Youth interests

Young people make up 30 percent of Tamworth’s population and more than 5,800 students are currently enrolled in the area’s public schools. As such, young people, whether just starting, in the middle or nearing the end of their education were recognized as having a huge stake in the outcomes of the project.

We tailored opportunities to meaningfully engage students from year one through to year 12. This involved drawing exercises for younger students, group drawing and preparing ‘report cards’ complete with red pens for older students. Senior students completed questionnaires about their aspirations and how school could help them achieve their goals and then worked in groups to design a school that would better meet the changing needs of students.

Teacher interests

As professionals who have dedicated their working lives to assisting young people to realize their potential and equipping them for lifelong learning and employment, teachers had a big role in the project. Furthermore, because the project focused on education reform teachers had a vested interest in the outcomes and some felt conflicted about the project because they initially thought it would lead to job losses associated with restructuring. Therefore, we adopted a very flexible...
approach to meet teachers needs and met with them in small and large groups and through the PRG.

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

All consultations, both formal and informal, outlined respectfully the positions of all stakeholders. Throughout the process issues were framed to:

- Reinforce the Department’s need for long term strategic planning to achieve efficiencies in education delivery

- Recognize that the teaching environment was subject to constant change and increasing demands with a limited resource base

- Reinforce that the project was not about judging individual schools, but looking at what was best for Tamworth and how education facilities and resources could be optimally used

- Appreciate that parents bought a range of ‘baggage’ to the table and as a whole tended to view education form their own experiences, which meant that perceptions had to be broken down to explore how learning and teaching needs have and will continue to change.

During the project we proactively communicated that all stakeholder voices were one part of a complex community of interest. This occurred consistently through the project newsletters, at the introduction and framing of all consultation activities and through media releases and media coverage.

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

Whether people went to a public school, had children who attended a public school, or had no connection with the public school system, we recognized them as a member of the Tamworth community. Given that everyone receives an education, in some shape or form, we based the project on the premise that everyone had an essential right to have a say about the future of education delivery in the area. We recognized the need for the community as a whole to understand what the world would look like in the future and to consider the skills and aptitudes that young people would need to acquire through their education in order to find their place in that world.

Therefore we framed issues to inspire all members of the community to get involved, so that they recognized it as an important local project that affected the future of their area and that they could contribute to.

A robust, participatory and effective consultation approach was planned and delivered that provided for interested people to get involved and have a say. Consultation events were communicated extensively through project newsletters distributed to all families (via students) and teachers at each school, adverts in the local paper, radio and television interviews.

To give a voice to others who may not have identified themselves as either a stakeholder or a stakeseeker, we randomly selected members of the
local population to meet on behalf of the wider community. This meant that instead of only hearing from the loudest people in the community, or those with the biggest vested interest, there were people who were broadly representative of the community as a whole. Consequently, we were confident that a more balanced point of view was heard.

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

We embraced a flexible approach to designing the engagement approach and spent the first round of consultations refining the process and understanding issues from a stakeholder perspective. Initial newsletters established a feedback loop whereby stakeholders could provide feedback on process design and key issues. This was critically important because as a team of out-of-town consultants and non-education specialists we had to ensure we understood the range and relationship between issues in order to frame the consultations.

We used the PRG as a sounding board to get advice and feedback on the proposed methodology. There was significant dialogue around opportunities to achieve both breadth and depth around core project issues. Almost all stakeholder groups represented on the PRG expressed reservations about random selection and whether ‘normal’ people, not involved in Tamworth’s school community, would have the ability to identify valid ideas for future education reform. Given that the project provided multiple opportunities for interested stakeholders to get involved, the PRG accepted that the combination of techniques would enable an informed and balanced point of view to be identified – which is exactly what happened.

Several examples highlight the flexible approach we adopted to provide stakeholders with power to influence how they participated in the project:

We originally proposed two workshops on consecutive Saturdays, but in response to feedback from the PRG we agreed to run three workshops mid week and to hold one of them in a low socio-economic area with a high Aboriginal population to encourage active participation from this demographic.

We used the first round of consultations to enter into dialogue with teachers, students and parents from each school. This enabled us to draw out the inherent tensions associated with specific issues so that we could understand the complexity of the project and undertake targeted research. Consequently, we framed issues using storyboards that provided balanced information to increase participant knowledge and prompt informed dialogue - as opposed to reactive debate.

We used an innovative approach for the community workshops and combined station round and ‘world café’ techniques that empowered participants to choose how actively they participated. PRG volunteers were trained to be ‘station hosts’ to champion particular issues and invite participants to read the information presented on 52 storyboards displayed around the room and respond using post-it notes. Participants were then encouraged to expand other peoples post-it note comments, thereby building a web of connected commentary. This approach enabled people to ‘vent’ anonymously about specific issues and understand that other participants had different viewpoints. It also meant that the ‘world
café’ conversations were pertinent and focussed on the right issues. Like the sensation of walking into an Indian restaurant, smelling the spices and instantly knowing you are about to eat Indian food, so too the station round process put people on the same page and centred them so they knew they were going to have a big conversation – not about closing schools or the inadequacy of facilities, but about the future of education in the area.

The deliberative forums involved randomly selecting participants – students and adults. As they were time constrained events, we recognised the necessity to ascertain the information needs of participants prior to the forums to ensure constructive use of time. As such, we brought participants together six weeks before the forum to disclose the charge and identify information needs. This enabled participants to meet one another, ask questions about their role and the deliberative process and helped to ‘demystify’ the project. Importantly, it allowed us to set about and find independent specialists who could talk to the issues that participants had identified they needed information on in order for them to deliberate over the charge.

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

We provide two examples of how the project responded to participants need for information in order to participate fully.

A combined process using station rounds and ‘world café’ was developed. This innovation of combining two well used engagement techniques was adopted to ensure that workshop discussions were informed and focussed. We researched and prepared 52 plain-English storyboards. Staff from the Department and members of the PRG were trained in how to engage in dialogue and facilitated one-on-one discussions with people who were encouraged to record annotate storyboards to comment on the accuracy of information and highlight gaps.

Prior to the deliberative forums participants were called together to meet each other, ask questions about the process and their involvement in it and to discuss the issue. The storyboards used as the basis for station rounds, were adapted and issued as a series of factsheets which we sent before the forum to inform participants and provide gravitas to the project. This approach allowed people to prepare, gave them the opportunity to understand the process and issues and ensured productivity in a tight timeframe.

3. Provide an assessment of what made the process significantly robust or different, including whether opportunities were taken during the process to improve the process

The project was one of the most comprehensive engagement projects the company has ever delivered. We purposefully designed the process to be both innovative and robust. There were a number of factors that enabled us to design and deliver such a strong process and a number of outcomes that highlight the robustness of the project.

We undertook significant advance planning and preparation which gave us the flexibility to be responsive to the needs of different stakeholders during project delivery. For example during the deliberative forums participants requested additional information and we were able to adjust...
the agenda and bring in principals from two of the schools to respond directly to questions.

We structured the process as a series of interconnected dialogic conversations to enable us to drill deeper and deeper into the issues so that finally there could be meaningful deliberation. Each round of consultation was planned and shaped to feed into the next round.

We were fortunate to have a project that provided a lot of breadth and to have the budget, time and team to design and deliver a comprehensive process. The project would not have been delivered in the same way without the support of a truly exceptional client. There was a lot at stake for the Department, especially given the heated response the discussion paper had generated. It was therefore highly unusual that our client recognised that ‘true’ engagement was not a risk, but a means by which to improve strategic planning outcomes. Our client, Des Gorman, the Regional Director for the New England Region, demonstrated a real commitment to engagement and total respect for all voices regardless of where they came from. He demonstrated total trust in us and championed the process within the Department enabling it to be delivered during the election.

We tested the process with a number of parties throughout the project delivery to ensure that it was solid and locally appropriate and that all information was accurate, balanced and presented in a meaningful way. For example, the advisory group for the deliberative forums reviewed all information before it was issued to participants. We also sought advice from academics from two universities to refine and get input to the process design.

A powerful shift occurred in the mindset of the school leadership team as a result of the project. At the outset, some principals from ‘good’ schools with stable enrolments felt the project had nothing to do with them. Through participation principals embraced the ethos of ‘all for one and one for all’ to the extent that by the end of the project there was a real recognition of the benefits of working together as part of one learning community instead of in competition.

We endeavored to set the process apart from other processes by really consciously creating space for dialogue and deliberation. For example, table cards were used at the workshops that were visually appealing and presented as ‘menus for good dialogue’. This tool encouraged participants to actively listen and suspend judgement and was a playful and effective way of emphasising the need to work together to identify common ground upon which decisions could then be made. Likewise, hundreds of inspirational quotes were displayed at workshop tables to encourage participants to reflect on their ideas and positions.

![The Good Dialogue Cake](image)

Table cards were used at workshops to prompt dialogue.
The project was unique, in terms of its scale, scope and complexity, and provided an exceptional opportunity to realise best practice principles of inclusion, deliberation and influence. Accordingly, the company committed to accurately documenting the process to ensure its legacy was recognised. As a result we produced a DVD of the process as a tool for use by the industry. The one hour production does not promote Elton Consulting or the Department and has been produced solely as an educational resource.

The Department had never before used such a highly inclusive consultation approach to long term strategic planning – it was a first! The ultimate vindication of the process was the recognition it received within the Department and their commitment to using similar processes to undertake strategic planning within other regions.

The project has built capacity and confidence within the Department. Recently, we received feedback that our client had adapted the ‘world café’ techniques to workshop recommendations with the PRG. They undertook to do this independently without any guidance from us, which we really believe demonstrates the value they now place in collaborative decision making.

We engaged an independent evaluation of the deliberative forums to further test our process. This was a rewarding experience for both us and the forum members, providing them with an avenue to provide critical reflection during the process (which we were at times able to act on immediately) as well as the value of an independent review of the process as whole. We focussed on evaluation as a way of improving our own practice. For example, we sought feedback at the workshops to test whether participants felt they had been exposed to a diversity of perspectives, had gained valuable information and insight about specific issues and understood the challenges of the project better having actively participated. As such, we tested whether the emphasis on ‘dialogue’ had successfully enabled participants to deepen their understanding of their own position in light of other peoples positions. As mentioned above, we also employed an independent evaluator to test whether participants understood the purpose and role in the deliberative forums, felt that sufficient information was provided, their opinions were valued and heard, adequate time was given for deliberation and whether they would participate in future community decision making processes.
### Case Study: Voices and Choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Voices &amp; Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>The Fund for Our Economic Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>United States, Northeast Ohio, population over 3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Regional economic decline, existing plans lack public engagement or community buy-in. Need to address economic vitality at a regional scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>21st Century Town Meetings, online dialog, appreciative inquiry-based interviews, leadership forums, decentralized community conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Public identified challenges and set priorities. Philanthropic grants in place to provide action support. Six regional challenges shared by the region and form the new economic agenda. The size of this consultation (1000’s of people) has had a political impact putting this P2 on the regional agenda. A database of those involved has been developed. Priorities identified by the people have been incorporated into a three year plan for the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>16 county region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>25,000 citizens, 80 funding organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.advancenortheastohio.org">http://www.advancenortheastohio.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report</td>
<td>Page 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Voices & Choices
Nomination for the 2007 IAP2 Core Values Project of the Year Award
On Behalf of AmericaSpeaks and the Fund for Our Economic Future

1. Describe the challenge or problem faced and how each of the parties involved viewed the role of public participation.

Four years ago, it became apparent to local leaders that Northeast Ohio was in a “quiet crisis”, the likes of which threatened the well-being of the 15-county region. While the rest of the nation seemed to be emerging from the recession, Northeast Ohio continued to spiral downward, with unemployment rates higher than the national average and the average annual wage of workers remaining stagnant. In just two years, Northeast Ohio lost over 15% of its manufacturing jobs, with devastating impact to all facets of life. Per capita income rates were losing ground against national averages, sliding from 98% of the national average in 1990 to 94% by 2002.

Within this environment, the philanthropic organizations of Northeast Ohio came together to found the Fund for Our Economic Future with a mission of revitalizing the regional economy. The Fund launched in February 2004 with 30 founding members and a goal of pooling $30 million dollars for economic development grant making over a three-year period. Today, just three years later, the Fund includes more than 80 funding organizations, corporate giving offices, and individuals who have stepped forward to commit their dollars, ideas, and hard work to improving the region’s economic future. The Fund and its members have directed over $33 million to its grantees for the purpose of fostering large-scale economic transformation.

In early 2005, the Fund awarded a $3 million grant to AmericaSpeaks to launch a unique program to engage tens of thousands of citizens and leaders in setting the region’s economic priorities, called Voices & Choices (www.voiceschoices.org). The Fund created Voices & Choices out of the recognition that many plans have already been developed for the future behind closed doors and by a handful of leaders, but not enough work has been done to engender the public support needed for any of them to succeed. Such support is critical if the region is to muster the political will for change and create an environment in which regional initiatives can flourish.

2. Describe the methods used to implement public participation.

Between August, 2005 and June 2006, Voices & Choices engaged nearly 20,000 citizens and leaders in deliberations to identify the greatest challenges facing Northeast Ohio. The next phase of the process (where the public will make choices about solutions) engaged an additional 5-10,000 people in deliberation before transitioning to implementation of the regional economic agenda this past November.

AmericaSpeaks and the Fund for Our Economic Future designed a unique public engagement strategy for Voices & Choices that would engage thousands of citizens and leaders through the integration of multiple models of participation. The strategy is based on a national blueprint created by AmericaSpeaks for engaging millions of Americans in national discussions.
In the Fall and early Winter of 2005, Voices & Choices engaged nearly 5,000 citizens and leaders in launching the process through three kinds of forums.

- **Leadership Workshops:** Over the course of three weeks in late August and early September, the program engaged more than 1,000 regional leaders in a series of eleven 4-hour workshops across the region, supported by keypad polling and groupware computers. Each workshop involved about 100 leaders, including elected officials, business leadership, university presidents, nonprofit directors and other community leadership. The workshops were intended to generate buy-in and support from leadership, while beginning to identify regional challenges and strengths. In order to organize the workshops and create a strong leadership infrastructure, Voices & Choices founded nine diverse sub-regional leadership groups, each of which has remained active in advising Voices & Choices throughout the process and will eventually transition into implementation committees.

- **Citizen Interviews:** Working with a team of local universities, Voices & Choices launched its Citizen Interviews effort in August of 2005. Based on an Appreciative Inquiry methodology, Voices & Choices prepared an interview protocol that helped individual citizens interview other citizens about the region’s greatest strengths and assets. Over a four-month period, more than 8,000 interview protocols were distributed with commitments to conduct interviews and 3,000 reports were collected. The regional assets identified through the interviews have been used to build upon as the region develops its economic agenda.

- **Regional Town Meeting:** In November 2005, Voices & Choices convened a 21st Century Town Meeting for a demographically representative group of 750 citizens in Akron to begin prioritizing regional challenges. The large-scale town meeting integrated keypad polling, groupware computers and intimate facilitated deliberation. To bring additional spirit and energy to the process: a graphic
illustrator created a mural during the meeting of the themes emerging from the process, a team of hip hop poets created and performed poetry based on themes from the discussions, and an artist painted an oil painting on a massive canvas depicting the discussions in the room.

Following the November Regional Town Meeting, Voices & Choices sought to bring thousands of additional people into the process of prioritizing the region’s greatest challenges. To do so, Voices & Choices launched its **Community Conversations** – decentralized discussions that take place in homes, schools, churches, community centers and places of work. Most Community Conversations last 1-2 hours and may include between 8 and 200 people. To support the Conversations, Voices & Choices designed a Conversation Kit that enables individuals to facilitate their own discussions. The Conversation Kit includes: (1) a dvd that serves as a discussion leader, (2) a host guide that provide Conversation hosts with detailed instructions for convening a conversation, (3) a participant guide and fact sheets for participants, (4) a feedback form for collecting ideas generated at a Conversation, and (4) flyers for hosts to advertise their Conversations. More than 13,000 people have participated in the Conversations.

The two completed phases of the Voices & Choices process have identified a set of six top challenges facing the region. In response, the initiative has convened six Tough Choices committees to identify options for addressing each of these challenges. The options (or Tough Choices) will represent the diverse set of alternatives open to the public. After an extensive process of vetting the Tough Choices with citizens and leaders, the process rolled out the options in late June. The public reviewed the options and made choices in order to set the region’s economic agenda over the Summer and early Fall:

- **Online Choicebooks**: Voices & Choices contracted with Ascentum to design online interactive workbooks that allowed thousands of people to learn about the Tough Choices and express preferences between them. The results of the workbooks feed into a second Regional Town Meeting.

- **Regional Town Meeting**: In September 2006, Voices & Choices convened 1,000 citizens in Akron to review the Tough Choices and make decisions about the regional priorities for Northeast Ohio. The priorities articulated at the Regional Town Meeting constituted the primary strategies that will drive implementation of the region’s economic agenda.

- **Dialogue via Media Outlets**: Voices & Choices teamed with state media outlets at or around the Regional Town Meeting to expose more people to the final agenda setting discussions and give them a chance to express their preferences online or through a toll-free phone number.

- **Dialogue Circles**: Following the Regional Town Meeting, the public was invited to go online to participate in small group discussions, called Dialogue Circles, to discuss the priorities that emerged from the process and what they mean for implementation.

- **Leadership Workshops**: Voices & Choices also convened 1,000 leaders for a second round of leadership workshops to transition the process to
implementation and began discussions of accountability for implementing the regional agenda.

3. Describe what makes this project special.

Voices & Choices is unique and special for three critical reasons:

- **Scale of Participation:** Voices & Choices is one of the largest public deliberations ever convened in the United States. The program engaged more than 25,000 people before transitioning to implementation. By seeking to engage thousands of people in the process, Voices & Choices has sought to create a public constituency to drive economic change. Special attention has been made to invite each person who participates in the process to remain involved. Bi-weekly newsletters are sent to the initiatives database with updates on the process and ways to get involved.

- **Integration of Models:** Voices & Choices has integrated multiple models of public engagement, including 21st Century Town Meetings, online dialogue, appreciative inquiry-based interviews, leadership forums, and decentralized community conversations. The effort’s experimentation with the integration of these models has yielded substantial learning about the complimentary strengths of the methods and the potential for leveraging the different approaches for greater impact.

- **Regional Economic Development:** The scale of the regional collaboration that has been formed to drive Voices & Choices on an issue like economic development is also significant. The problems facing the region are not unique to Northeast Ohio. The precedent of large-scale collaboration by the philanthropic community and the choice by foundations to serve as public conveners could be an important model for other regions across the country.

4. Describe the project’s effectiveness or results and explain the role that the public participation process played.

The primary output from the Voices & Choices process has been a set of six regional challenges that are shared by thousands of leaders and citizens across the region. These challenges serve as the framework for the region’s emerging economic agenda, which will be implemented by citizens and leaders beginning in the Fall.

More importantly, however, the scale of public participation in Voices & Choices has had a dramatic impact on the political environment of the region as the notion of regional cooperation has started to take root across Northeast Ohio. The Mayor of Cleveland, for example, has adopted regionalism as one of his most prominent agenda items. Regional cooperation was a focal point for the mayor’s first state of the city address and the mayor recently proposed a series of ambitious proposals to foster greater cooperation between Cleveland and suburban governments. Similarly, other mayors and leaders have begun to take steps in response to the regional conversation. For example, Doug Lewis, the City Manager of the city of Conneaut committed with other Ashtabula County leaders to increase dialogue between village mayors and city managers in their county at a Voices & Choices leadership workshop. Since the first meeting between the mayors and city managers, Doug has been meeting regularly...
with the Mayor of North Kingsville to discuss joint projects. “Because of Voices & Choices, we are collaborating across traditional geopolitical boundaries,” he said.

Voices & Choices has made substantial progress in forming a new regional public infrastructure, which includes an active database of several thousand citizens who receive regular updates about the process and ways to remain involved, nine committees of regional leaders (each with 15 – 45 members) dedicated to advancing regional priorities, a network of several hundred facilitators and growing media partnerships.

From the success of Voices & Choices, administrators created its current initiative, Advance Northeast Ohio. Opinions garnered from Ohio residents guided the region’s leaders during the drafting stages, turning priorities earmarked by project participants into actions and results. On March 30, 2007, representatives from political, civic, education and business organization joined to official launch this three-year plan. The strategy, focusing on the region’s economic growth, targets four specific areas:

- Business Growth and Attraction.
- Workforce Preparation and Educational Excellence
- Growth through Racial and Economic Inclusion
- Government Collaboration and Efficiency

As with Voices & Choices, citizens are being asked to take an active role in the plan’s implementation. Feedback is encouraged, both through mail and on the web (www.advancenortheastohio.org).

5. Describe how the IAP2 core values were met.

IAP2’s Core Values are central to the Voices & Choices process, which seeks to empower the public through diverse, informed public deliberation that is linked to real action and sustained involvement. Thousands of citizens have taken part in the Voices & Choices process through multiple forms of deliberation and discussion. In every venue, citizens are provided with detailed discussion guides to ensure that their deliberations are informed. Every citizen who participates in the process receives regular reports about the progress of the initiative and is encouraged to remain involved with the process and to deepen their involvement. A team of 13 community organizers has worked to ensure demographic diversity in the deliberations – focusing their efforts on ensuring that marginalized voices are well represented in the process.

Voices & Choices has made substantial efforts to work with government, business and nonprofit leaders to build a multi-sector implementation process that will carry the region’s economic agenda forward and ensure follow through on public priorities. In addition to a commitment from the 80 philanthropic organizations that represent the Fund for Our Economic Future, Voices & Choices has worked deeply with county commissioners, mayors, chambers of commerce and many others to prepare for implementation and action.

Voices & Choices (www.voiceschoices.org) is a project of AmericaSpeaks (www.americaspeaks.org) and the Fund for Our Economic Future (www.futurefundneo.org)

Joe Goldman, AmericaSpeaks Email: jgoldman@americaspeaks.org
### Case Study: Brisbane Water Enviro Alliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Brisbane Water Enviro Alliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Brisbane Water Enviro Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Australia, Brisbane, population 1,763,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Upgrades to wastewater treatment plants, confrontational public opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Several methods were use to educate and inform such as plant tours, the formation of a CRG (Community Representative Group), scientific presentations, responsiveness to community questions and concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Community concerns over odour put elimination of odour as a core focus of project; through evaluations, it was determined that public satisfaction rose substantially in terms of faith in the process, trust in Council’s commitment, and satisfaction with the overall result of upgrades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Neighborhood of 3 plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report</td>
<td>Page 54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Donna Marshall
MarCom Communication
donna.marshall@marcomcommunication.com.au
BRISBANE WATER ENVIRO ALLIANCE

The Brisbane Water Enviro Alliance (BWEA) was formed by Brisbane City Council in 2003 to design and construct a $187 million upgrade to three Brisbane wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) over a three-year period from January 2003 to March 2006.

From the outset, effective and ongoing public participation was a major and necessary focus of the Alliance, as a number of pre-existing issues threatened to erode public support, generating negative publicity and neighbour protest about the treatment plant upgrades.

MarCom Communication was sub-contracted as part of BWEA’s management team to ensure successful public participation and the best possible outcome for this high priority Council project.

1. Challenges and Problems

BWEA wanted to create an ongoing legacy that would both establish Council as a leader in public participation and change the existing negative public perceptions about WWTPs. Public support was also vital in generating positive media coverage and a perception that the large budget allocation was “money well spent”.

This was made extremely difficult by the fact that the plants were surrounded by residential properties which, for many years, had been subjected to odour impact from the ageing plants. In many cases plant neighbours had been unaware of the existence of the plants until after purchasing their properties, moving in and experiencing regular odour incidents.

This, understandably, caused a great deal of anxiety within the local communities and when coupled with concerns about the environmental impacts of the plants, public opinion was overwhelmingly negative.

In its efforts to engage the public, BWEA was faced with the challenge of generally apathetic publics with misinformed opinions and a lack of understanding about WWTPs and the reasons for the upgrades. Specific challenges encountered in BWEA’s efforts to engage each of its target publics are listed in the table below.
2. Methods used to implement public participation

BWEA developed a strategic community relations program in an effort to engage its target publics and gain support for the upgrades. Of particular focus was engaging those most affected by the plants to gain their input into upgrade priorities. Strategies were tailored to the needs of target publics as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Public</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plant Neighbours</td>
<td>Promotion of the environmental and social benefits of the upgrades</td>
<td>Opportunity to maximise support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of the three upgrades as a “Brisbane-wide” strategy to avoid a NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) response</td>
<td>De-personalisation of project impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Communities Media</td>
<td>Mass distribution communication</td>
<td>Broad reach of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Education” in addition to “information” focus in all communication</td>
<td>Maximise opportunity to generate understanding as well as awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In keeping with a strategic approach, communication tools implemented throughout the three-year operation of the project were tailored specifically to the needs of each target public, to address all communication challenges and ultimately achieve project objectives.
### Why this project is special

Obtaining public participation in this project was challenging, as generally, WWTP upgrades are not interesting to the community, despite the fact that they provide a vital service and have the ability to directly impact the community. Many years of odour impact with no resolution made this even more challenging, as the plants were a negative topic among local residents – those who would be interested in the project. In fact negative opinions were so strong that in the initial stages the project team was met with residents wearing gas masks, demanding the plants be shut down.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Public</th>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plant Neighbours</td>
<td>Direct mail letters</td>
<td>Provide regular progress reports, construction disruption advice and promote project benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>53 distributed</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 hour free-call telephone line</td>
<td>Immediate issues identification and resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air quality presentations</td>
<td>Eliminate plant emission concerns of hydrogen sulphide poisoning - independent scientific data used to explain emissions and plant safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doorknock satisfaction surveys</td>
<td>Part of research and evaluation as well as an opportunity for issues discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings and Community Representative Group (CRG)</td>
<td>Provide opportunities for issues discussion and promote benefits of upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plant tours</td>
<td>Provide a “real” picture of plant operation and how the upgrades will improve this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Groups</td>
<td>Direct mail letters</td>
<td>Provide project information, invite involvement and provide regular progress updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>12 distributed</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRG <em>16 meetings held</em></td>
<td>Workshop issues of concern, promote upgrade benefits and involve opinion leaders in the project’s journey – also assisted in identifying areas for further community education and communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Communities</td>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>Generate awareness, promote environmental benefits and responsible wastewater management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public displays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fact sheet</td>
<td>Educate community on clean operation of the upgraded plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Advertorials</td>
<td>Promote community awareness of the project, its benefits and environmental focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media releases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opening events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite this strong opposition, closing the plants was not an option, so solving the issues was a must and this could not be done without community participation at a level beyond protest. To achieve this, BWEA recognised the need to allow those most affected to have a say in the decision making process.

BWEA sought to take the community on a journey with the project to demonstrate its genuine commitment to achieving exceptional outcomes for their benefit. This involved the use of a number of innovative participation techniques including:

- the formation of a Community Representative Group (CRG) with which detailed engineering information about the wastewater treatment process was shared – most wastewater projects only gloss over this information assuming the community will not understand

- site tours to show odour sources and explain what could be done to address it

- atmospheric scientist presentations to explain odour modelling and how success would be gauged and also to dispel myths of hydrogen sulphide poisoning

- regular meetings with key opinion leaders to discuss issues and share project design and investigation outcomes

- financial key performance indicators (KPIs) set on gaining plant neighbour satisfaction with the outcomes of the project to focus project manager and engineering team on the importance of community satisfaction to ensure its priority

- residents kept informed of construction activity over the life of the project – any activity causing noise or out of hours work was notified in advance resulting in a total of only nine complaints over the three year project.

These techniques provided opportunities for community input into the project plans, input which led directly to the decision to make odour elimination a core focus of the project, with attached financial KPIs. They also enabled the project team to correct any misinformation or inaccurate perceptions and led to the following outstanding public participation outcomes:

- gave residents faith in the public participation process – opinions were very negative to start, but very supportive of the process in the end [using a five point scale (with “5” being excellent), neighbour perceptions and support improved from a negative rating of “2” in 2003 to an extremely positive rating of “4.5” in 2006]
• demonstrated Council’s commitment to obtaining genuine community “involvement”, not just “consultation” or “information” using a five point scale the CRG rated their satisfaction with the project at “4.2” in 2006

• showed the exceptional outcomes the community can expect from being involved in public participation projects – BWEA has successfully upgraded the plants to achieve extra capacity, environmental sustainability and no odour impact on neighbours following the addition of two odour treatment facilities (not originally planned) as part of the upgrade.

4. How participants were informed

To overcome the effect of years of odour impact and negative perceptions, BWEA understood the need to allow those most affected by the upgrades to have a say in the decision making process. This was facilitated by inviting plant neighbours and environmental groups to participate in the CRG and by providing feedback opportunities for the broader community to have a say in the project.

Input from the CRG and feedback from the local community was fed directly into the project plans. This input directly influenced BWEA’s decision to make odour elimination a core focus of the project rather than a secondary goal. It also resulted in additions and refinements to the project plans such as additional odour treatment measures and the refinement of plans to address concerns regarding outlet pipes in the local creek being struck by trawlers.

Participants were informed about the effect of their input on project plans through the CRG, regular community newsletters, direct mail, letterbox drops and the media. These mediums clearly showed how input about odour shaped this issue to become a major focus of the project.

Community newsletters were used to inform the community about the project and the outcomes of consultation.
5. How the IAP2 core values were met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IAP2 core value</th>
<th>How BWEA met this value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Public participation includes the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision.</td>
<td>Input from the CRG and feedback from the local community directly influenced BWEA’s decision to make odour elimination a core focus of the project. It also resulted in additions and refinements to the project plans such as additional odour treatment measures and the refinement of plans to address concerns regarding outlet pipes in the local creek being struck by trawlers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7. Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision | The outputs of community involvement in the project were shared through the CRG, regular newsletters, letters and the media, clearly showing how input about odour shaped the major focus of the project.  
A final survey of CRG members to gauge their satisfaction with their involvement, input and ability to influence the project resulted in a score of 4.6 out of a possible 5. |
### Case Study: Manningham’s Voice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Manningham’s Voice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Manningham’s City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Australia, Manningham, population 109,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>How to get the public involved in Council budget development process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>The Community consultation process was designed to determine taxpayers’ satisfaction with services and taxes using several methods: public meetings, questionnaire, (mailed and online), focus groups (including one with council), and e-forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Increased public knowledge about council services and costs of service provision, and public input on budget decision-making. Involving the public for this purpose was an unusual step and it was learned that the public can make a difference, and that given sufficient time and information, can provide educated input to the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>1,800 citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.manningham.vic.gov.au">http://www.manningham.vic.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report</td>
<td>Page 62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
International Association of Public Participation (IAP2)
Core values Award Nomination and Submission.

Award Category: Project of the Year

Project Name and Brief Description
Manningham’s Voice: a large scale deliberative democracy project involving ratepayers in determining annual budget priorities.

Sponsoring Organisation and Contact Details
Ms Mona Malouf, Director Quality and Corporate Services
Manningham City Council
Email: mona.malouf@manningham.vic.gov.au

Other participating organisations
Mr Mark McKenzie-Mcharg, Principle
Mach II Consulting
Email: machii@yackandandah.com

Mrs Rebecca Pio, Research Manager
Flying Sources
Email: rebeccapio@bigpond.com

Mrs Glenda Crane, Principal
Australian Fieldwork Solutions
Email: Glenda@fieldworkssolutions.com.au
Background

(Describe the challenge or problem faced and how each of the parties involved viewed the role of public participation).

The Manningham’s Voice project was an innovative community consultation initiative regarding ratepayers’ satisfaction with the level of Council service and the amount they pay in rates. Manningham’s Voice provided the community with the opportunity to provide specific input into the early stages of the budget development process. The project utilised deliberative democracy principles which encourage residents to participate in Council’s decision-making process in an informed and enlightened way. The Manningham’s Voice initiative was in marked contrast to the traditional method of relying on the statutory two week public display period for responses to the proposed budget. In the past, consultation on the proposed budget has only involved minimal participation but the Manningham’s Voice project allowed Council to consult with approximately 1800 residents.

Methods

(Describe the methods used to implement public participation).

The consultation process involved:

- Two public meetings (28 residents attended);
- A questionnaire which was letter box dropped to 43,000 Manningham households (1657 replies were obtained);
- A duplicate questionnaire on Council’s website (40 replies were obtained);
- Eight focus groups with a total of 115 participants representing various age groups;
- An additional focus group/briefing session with Manningham Councillors;
- An e-forum (an online discussion panel between Council and residents).

The questionnaire, which was the core component of the project, consisted of seven key questions:

- Do you feel like you get value for the rates you pay?
- Should Council increase any of its services?
- Should Council decrease any of its services?
- Should Council stop providing any of its services?
- Would you be prepared to pay more rates for improved services?
- Should Council take out rates-financed bank loans to improve infrastructure?
- Are there any general comments you would like to make?

The survey used for Manningham’s Voice. Ratepayers had the opportunity to complete the questionnaire online.
The focus groups, which were facilitated by Mach II Consulting, addressed the same questions. However, rather than focusing on the statistical value of the responses, the focus groups captured residents' feelings and thoughts. Residents were encouraged to explore issues about rates and Council services.

**Discussion**

(Describe what makes this project special. Did public participation significantly improve the decision made? Were innovative participation techniques used? Did it solve a problem that faces the field of public participation? Did it spread the practice of public participation into a new area?).

The Manningham’s Voice project incorporated a unique blend of different consultation methodologies to paint a complete picture of residents’ views. The use of questionnaires, focus groups, public meetings and an e-forum is a highly unique combination of disparate consultation techniques.

Public participation gave Council confidence that the projects funded in the 2007/08 budget actually reflected the areas where residents wanted to see improvement (i.e: improvements to hard garbage collection, upgrading of footpaths, etc).

The Manningham’s Voice project incorporated innovative community consultation techniques such as the use of an e-forum which was an internet based chat room between Council and Manningham’s residents.

The project attempted to address a specific problem that faces the field of public participation: how do you equip residents with enough information and knowledge so that they can make an informed choice? In order to address this problem, the Manningham’s Voice project was conducted in the spirit of a deliberative democracy. A common feature of the deliberative democracy approach is the generous amount of time and space given for citizens to meet, be informed and understand conflicting points of view.

The project spread the practice of public participation into a new area in the sense that Manningham was the first local council to have such an extensive consultation on their annual budget.

**Outcome**

(Describe the project’s effectiveness or results and explain the role that the public participation process played).

The results of the Manningham’s Voice project are as follows:

**Questionnaire**

- 2.6% of the respondents were male and 47.4% were female.
- With regard to the age demographics of the respondents, there was a very large representation of ‘above 60’ residents (700) and only 9 respondents aged ‘18 to 25’.

---

**Question 1: I feel like I get value for my rates (mail out survey)**

- Agree: 53%
- Disagree: 44%
- 3% - No response

N = 1657
Regarding the geographical location of the respondents, most of the replies were clustered around Templestowe, Lower Templestowe, Doncaster, Doncaster East, Donvale and parts of Nunawading. Bulleen, Warrandyte, Warrandyte South, Park Orchards, North Ringwood and Wonga Park had very low response rates.

Question 1: 53% of residents were in agreement that they get value for the rates they pay.

Question 2: 43% of residents felt that Council should increase current services while 52% disagreed and 5% provided no response.

Question 3: 18.5% of residents felt that Council should decrease current services while 76.5% disagreed and a further 5% provided no response.

Question 4: 14.5% of residents felt that Council should stop providing some of its services while 77.5% disagreed and 8% provided no answer.

Question 5: 75% of residents disagreed with the idea of paying higher rates for improved services.

Question 6: 70.5% of residents disagreed with the idea of Council taking out bank loans to improve infrastructure.

Question 7: 64% of residents provided additional comments while 36% did not.

Public participation was essential to obtaining these results and without public interest in Council’s budget, this snapshot of residents’ views would have not been possible.

Focus groups

A total of eight focus groups were conducted with the public and an additional one was held with Manningham Councillors. The focus groups each lasted for one and a half hours and fifteen residents participated in each group. Mark McKenzie-McHarg (Mach II Consulting) facilitated the focus groups with the assistance of David Iacuone, Manningham’s Market Research Co-ordinator.

An eight page discussion paper was prepared for the focus groups. The discussion paper provided an overview of Manningham’s community profile and gave information on how Council goes about determining the level of rates. The discussion paper was aimed at allowing focus group participants to have an informed discussion about the budget.

The participants in the focus group were recruited by a research company called Flying Sources. The research brief provided to the company specified that they must recruit participants who are residents of Manningham in different gender and age categories.

Many themes were raised by the residents in the focus groups, including:

- Roads: many roads in Manningham need to be upgraded.
- Waste collection and recycling: they should occur more often.
- Hard rubbish pickups: more per year and nonselective collection.
- Manningham’s public sculptures: too much money is spent on this.
Footpaths: in some suburbs, there is a lack of footpaths.

Aged care: there needs to be an increase of services.

Street cleaners: they do not come around often enough.

Pocket parks: Council should not sell them off.

Guttering: some roads in municipality need sealed guttering.

Public transport: insufficient infrastructure in Manningham.

Lack of public awareness of Council services.

Cost shifting: Council should lobby government to pay for services.

Repair works: too much inefficiency.

Loans: generally good if the money is used on capital works.

Parking: inadequate enforcement of illegal parking.

Disabled parking: this should be strongly enforced.

Community directory: Council should circulate this annually.

For the most part, the participants appreciated being asked to contribute to the focus groups. The responses to the sessions were generally positive and many residents felt that Council should hold them on a regular basis. Also, the focus groups raised awareness of Council services with many participants commenting that before they attended the session, they were not aware of some of the services that Council offered.

In accordance with ratepayers’ suggestions, Council is devoting $40,000 to the enforcement of parking and other related issues. Council is setting aside $100,000 in order to improve footpaths. Council is also devoting $98,000 to the strategic review of traffic management.

The Manningham’s Voice budget consultation project is another step in Council’s ongoing quest to be a leader in the creation of a deliberative democratic process.

**Appropriateness to IAP2 values**

*Describe how the IAP2 core values were met.*

The public should have a say in the decisions about actions that could affect their lives.
The Manningham’s Voice project was designed to do precisely as the name suggests: give ratepayers a ‘voice’ to empower them on issues about rate payments and the level of services they receive. Council rates and the services that go along with it are clearly a large part of the experience of living in Manningham. Council strongly believes that ratepayers should have input into these crucial matters and should have a say in the long term planning of Council’s budget; this is the backbone of the Manningham’s Voice project.

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

The Manningham’s Voice project provided valuable feedback on community opinions and provided Council with a number of key issues to be considered when preparing Council programs and capital allocations. The 2007/08 annual budget contains a number of initiatives expressly designed to address the concerns raised in the Manningham’s Voice survey. Projects arising from the Manningham’s Voice survey and funded in the 2007/08 budget include:

- A hard garbage study to improve satisfaction levels with the service;
- The upgrading of footpaths to improve safety;
- Aging strategy implementation;
- Bushland and parkland development;
- Local law enforcement for dumped rubbish, overhanging branches and parking at Westfield shopping centre;
- Improvements to parks and open space maintenance;
- Strategic transport advocacy including light rail and community bus feasibility study, and;
- Strategic review of traffic management.

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

Council widely promoted and advertised the Manningham’s Voice project by:

- advertising in The Leader newspaper,
- promotion on Council’s website,
- providing promotional material at Council’s customer service desk,
- having officers dedicated to answering residents’ questions about the Manningham’s Voice project,
- providing a interpretation service for residents who speak Cantonese, Greek and other languages,
- running two public information sessions about the project, and;
- sending letters to all 43,000 ratepayers inviting them to participate in the Manningham’s Voice project.

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

It is vital to provide participants with a substantial amount of information so that they can fully and completely comprehend the issue under discussion.

Furthermore, this information must be provided in an easy to comprehend fashion to insure that all the participants fully understand the subject matter. With the Manningham’s Voice project, the Manningham Council developed two discussion papers, one which was
presented to the focus group participants. In order to ensure that all participants were able to comprehend the discussion paper, we created information bubbles in order to provide simple and easy to understand information about the discussion paper. While a simple idea, the bubbles served to quickly clarify the key points of the discussion paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rates and Service Levels: Making Informed Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manningham at a Glance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a population of 107,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96% of eligible properties are owner-occupied.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Council’s Program to Replace Buildings and Fruits</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a need to replace aging roads, drains, and bridges.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Other participants</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mark McKenzie-McHarg: Principal of Mach II Consulting (a local government consultancy that works in the area of community consultation. Mach II Consulting facilitated the focus groups).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Rebecca Pio: Research Manager of Flying Sources (a focus group recruitment company. Flying sources was responsible for recruiting the focus group participants).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Acknowledgements</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manningham City Council wishes to acknowledge the contributions to this project from Cr. Charles Pick, David Iacuone, Robert Spargo and Mary-Beth Hayes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

This IAP2 core value was one of the cornerstones of the Manningham’s Voice project. After the community participation project was completed, Council published the results in Manningham Matters (Council’s newsletter). The article outlined the findings of the Manningham’s Voice project and how residents’ input was utilised. In addition, letters were sent to all participants advising them of the outcomes of the community participation project. A public meeting was also held which highlighted the outcomes and the
**Case Study: Putting the Public in Public Health**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th><strong>Putting the Public in Public Health</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Centers for Disease Control &amp; Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>Assess public willingness to accept control measures in the event of a pandemic of influenza and identify obstacles to implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Citizen deliberation days, stakeholder organization workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Demonstration of public support convinced some key decision makers to support the strategy, even though the “science” is incomplete and significant negative consequences for the public. “A clear pending national decision was put on the table with the real potential to be shaped by the input received.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>National policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>260 citizens, 50 organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary Report</strong></td>
<td>Page 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Application for the IAP Project of the Year Award
July 2007

“Putting the Public in Public Health”

Submitted by Roger Bernier, PhD, MPH
National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Disease
MS—E05
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Atlanta Georgia, 30333
Email: rbernier@cdc.gov

Introduction

A federal decision making process was undertaken by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) in mid to late 2006 to develop recommendations to the nation about community control measures in the event of a pandemic of influenza. A public engagement project, entitled “The Public Engagement Project On Community Control Measures for Pandemic Influenza”, was one of several streams of input into the decision-making carried out between October and December 2006 prior to the issuance of CDC’s interim recommendations in early 2007. (See <http://www.pandemicflu.gov/plan/states/index.html>). A final report of the public engagement project was released in May 2007 and is available at <http://www.keystone.org/spp/health-practice.html>.

The Problem

The driver for this project was CDC’s need to develop and issue national guidance to communities and health departments on how best to control pandemic influenza in the early days of a new pandemic when vaccine will still not be available. During this early period, community control measures such as 1) treating sick persons at home, 2) keeping contacts of sick persons at home in quarantine, 3) closing schools, 4) canceling mass gatherings, and 5) altering work schedules and patterns might be the only control measures available to slow the spread of the pandemic in a community. Having seen an earlier successful pilot project on public engagement and prioritization of vaccine against pandemic influenza, CDC became interested in obtaining public input on yet another
difficult pandemic planning issue. More specifically, CDC was interested in knowing the extent to which citizens and stakeholders would support, if at all, early implementation of a five-part control strategy which could be very socially disruptive and possibly entail large financial sacrifices for businesses and workers. If citizens and stakeholders proved willing to trade-off social and economic benefits for the benefits of slowing the spread of the pandemic, CDC also wanted to learn what participants considered to be the most serious obstacles to successful implementation of the control strategy. Federal agency officials, representatives of organizations with a clear stake in the issue, and members of the public-at-large were all clear about the main objectives and viewed the public participation as an innovative approach which had the potential to be useful in shaping the national guidance on this issue.

The Methods

Both citizens-at-large and stakeholders participated in this public engagement exercise. The project was sponsored by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials and the Keystone Center in Keystone Colorado serving as a third party neutral facilitator. Fourteen other organizations participated, including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. To conduct this public engagement, the sponsors made use of an innovative model for engaging BOTH the organized stakeholder public and the general public. Participants met in separate sessions but the viewpoints were integrated into a single public judgment on the issues at hand.

A. Methods for citizens

The model used sought to recruit approximately 100 citizens-at-large from each of the four major regions of the United States (North, South, Mid-West, and West). The sites selected were Syracuse New York, Atlanta Georgia, Lincoln Nebraska, and Seattle Washington. Four full deliberation days took place, one full day (Saturday) in each location.

In each city, citizens heard presentations from subject matter experts from CDC or from the local health departments about the essential information they needed to have an informed discussion about community control measures for influenza. Multiple experts were on hand and answered numerous questions from the audience both immediately after the presentations and throughout the day during the deliberations.

To frame their deliberations, citizens were given a hypothetical scenario describing how an influenza pandemic might unfold in the US, including assumptions about the severity of the pandemic, the efficacy of control measures, and possible negative consequences caused by the control measures.
The citizens accomplished five tasks—

1) learned the facts essential to have an informed discussion about pandemic influenza and proposed community control measures
2) discussed the pros and cons of five proposed control measures,
3) decided if they supported implementation of these measures, and if so, when,
4) identified the most important concerns surrounding implementation, and
5) proposed actions that could assure successful implementation.

To accomplish these deliberative tasks, citizens participated in small group facilitated discussions of about 10 persons each and in two large group sessions with all participants to review the challenges and to discuss possible solutions. Voting on the five control measures individually and in combination was carried out by electronic devices which produced instantaneous results for the participants and organizers.

B. Methods for stakeholders

Approximately 50 representatives from organizations that would be affected directly by a severe pandemic attended a two-day meeting on November 29-30, 2006 and participated in the deliberations. Among the sectors included were health professional organizations, federal agencies, state and local government organizations, business, education, faith community, minority organizations, consumer advocates, and labor sectors.

Participants heard a presentation on the basic information they needed to obtain to have an informed discussion. There were several subject matters experts on hand to answer questions. The participating stakeholders heard the results from the four citizen meetings described above. In addition, citizen representatives from each of the participating cities were present at the stakeholder meeting and gave their perspectives on the deliberations in their cities.

The stakeholders were given the same five tasks assigned to citizens as noted above, but with the additional task of integrating the results of the citizen deliberations into their discussions, and of identifying which proposed actions were considered the most important to carry out. More specifically, the stakeholders were asked to prioritize those actions "without which implementation of pandemic influenza control measures would fail."
To accomplish these tasks, the stakeholders participated in four small group discussions organized around each of four categories of challenges or obstacles to implementation previously identified by the citizens (the soundness of the planning, the economic impacts on the population, the information needs of the population, and the social stresses that will be created). On day two, the stakeholders participated in a large group discussion to further clarify and elaborate on the key actions proposed on day one. Also on day two, stakeholders voted electronically on a series of questions designed to evaluate their level of support for the proposed control measures.

**Special Elements of the Project**

This project was special both because of its design and the results it achieved.

On the design side, the special and innovative elements of this project were:

- Both stakeholders and citizens-at-large participated
- A clear pending national decision was put on the table with the real potential to be shaped by the input received.
- The decision selected was especially well suited for public input (it required learning only a limited amount of key technical information which could be transmitted feasibly in a short period of time, and the decision required making choices between competing public values which the public participants were the best qualified to know and understand). This “public values expertise” was recognized by the subject matter experts and decision makers responsible for the ultimate decision.
- The stakeholders were assigned the dual responsibility of reaching not only their own group viewpoint but of integrating the citizens’ viewpoint into a final joint “societal or public perspective” on the issue at hand.
- The project was tightly linked to the decision makers. Federal officials participated as stakeholders and conveyed the results of the consultations directly to the high agency level decision makers.
- Neutral convening and respectful facilitation was provided
- Feedback to the participants on the decision taken was provided both by the federal government recommendations that were issued and by a detailed report completed and distributed in May 2007.
- An independent process and outcome evaluation by the University of Nebraska Public Policy Center was carried out and distributed to all participants as part of the final report.

On the results side, the special elements of this project were:

- Over 300 persons participated in the process, including a total of approximately 261 citizens-at-large from diverse age, sex, and ethnic groups from the four parts
of the United States and 50 stakeholders from all of the affected sectors.

- Clear collective judgments were furnished to the decision makers which described the high level of public support for the control measures along with 13 priority recommendations for assuring successful implementation.

- The high level of public support for the control measures weighed heavily in convincing some of the key decision makers to recommend the five part control measures even though the science behind them is still incomplete and uncertain, and even though the measures are expected to impose serious negative consequences both socially and economically. The guidance that was issued was compatible with the public viewpoint on the matter.

- The project met all 9 of its process goals, including those to achieve an adequate number of citizen participants and with significant diversity on age, race, and sex.

- The project has helped to lead the way in “putting the public in public health” by effectively beginning to spread the practice of public participation in policy and agenda-setting types of decisions at CDC. Public participation remains a “hard sell” in many government circles despite all of the accomplishments in the field to date. This project provided further “proof of principle” for an important federal agency that public engagement is possible and can be productive. As a result, the demand for public participation by the leadership is increased now within the CDC and the creation of a new “hub” for public engagement is being discussed along with a support team to provide technical assistance to the interested operating units within CDC. Also, the model is being extended to the state level in a $2M demonstration grant program for six states beginning in the fall of 2007.

Core Values

The IAP core values were met in the design and execution of this project. More specifically, the project was carried out with the belief that citizens who would be primarily affected by the social disruption and economic consequences associated with the control measures should have a say in whether or not those control measures are implemented and how the negative consequences of implementation could be mitigated. Because federal officials participated and because these federal participants were linked directly to the final decision makers, the participants were assured that their input would at a minimum receive serious consideration and possibly be influential in shaping the national guidance. Because this model included input from all of the key sectors to be affected and from citizens-at-large, the process effectively sought out and involved the affected parties or their representatives. By including a “pandemic influenza 101” type of session for all participants and by preparing a booklet entitled “20 Answers You Need To Know To Have An Informed Discussion About Pandemic Influenza”, all of the participants received the information they needed to participate in a meaningful way. A final report issued in May 2007 gave a complete rendering of the project to the participants, including the independent evaluation. Also, a copy of the official CDC national interim guidance on pandemic influenza community control measures was made publicly available and included a description in the report on the results of the public input and how it was used as one of the streams of input into the final decision.
Project name and sponsoring organization:
"The Public Engagement Project on Community Control Measures for Pandemic Influenza" sponsored by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials, the Keystone Center, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and 13 other participating organizations (see online report <http://www.keystone.org/spp/healthpractice.html>.
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Dan Noble
Jacquelyn Polder
JR Ransome
Kristine Smith
Caitlin Wills-Toker
### Case Study: Fiordland National Park Management Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Fiordland National Park Management Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Department of Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>New Zealand, South Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Controversial management plan that resulted in 2000 submissions from a broad range of stakeholders from hunters, to aircraft operators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Travelling hearing panel, responses to all written submissions, individual meetings where required, special meetings to facilitate opposing groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Several successful outcomes - acceptable position was reached including change in flight allocations and hunting: Aircraft operators having taken responsibility to manage their own performance based on public input; hunters assuming responsibility for protecting endangered species and other efforts. Putting the issues back into the hands of the stakeholders resulted in a plan that was 4 times larger than the original one which sparked so much resistance. A major outcome is that this project is a model for p2 for other similar planning reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>5 years of open dialog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report</td>
<td>Page 78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Nomination
Project of the year award

Project – Fiordland National Park Management Plan

Organization – Department of Conservation
New Zealand
Value outcome

This nomination looks at how, through public participation, the Department of Conservation was able to work through contentious issues to the point where the strongest opponents of the project are now helping the department achieve significant conservation gains for the benefit of all New Zealanders.

Overview

The Department of Conservation is charged with looking after New Zealand’s conservation lands and regularly encourages and seeks opportunities for public participation through formal submission processes and by getting the community involved.

A proactive consultation approach has contributed not only to conservation gains and a better working relationship with the public but has also led to a greater understanding of the value of public involvement.

However, the gains have not been without a lot of hard work. During the more than five year review of Fiordland National Park management plan the issue of consultation and public participation dominated the news media. It generated heated discussions around the country, and the ensuring criticism made the department look at how it consulted and engaged with its largest stakeholder - the New Zealand public.

Project background

In 2002 the Department of Conservation released a draft management plan for Fiordland National Park, one of 14 national parks in New Zealand, and the country’s largest.

For many users of the park, the draft plan was the first they knew of the department’s position on a number of management issues – and, in many cases, it came as a surprise. The plan’s policies were met with fierce opposition by the public who felt their activities and livelihoods were at stake. The department felt the full brunt of this opposition.
Hunters, so enraged by the draft plan’s policies, took out full page colour advertisements in the local paper to discredit the Department of Conservation, there were verbal threats of releasing stoats onto predator free islands, intimidation tactics and intense and hostile public meetings which the department had to front.

Aircraft operators, another of the park’s user groups, were so incensed with the plan’s policies over the fear it would end their businesses, also went public against the department, generating a lot of emotion and negative media attention.

With this media attention, public confidence in the department was affected and so was the relationship with some key stakeholders.

**The situation today**

The plan is now operative. At more than 450 pages, the new management plan is nearly four times the size of the 1991 edition. The larger size reflects the importance of the area and the detail that has been worked through with affected parties.

Some issues were difficult to resolve such as aircraft access which had not been tackled for over 50 years, hunting and visitor pressure, but all parties put in thousands of hours to find appropriate balances.

The valuable input from submitters influenced many of the policies set out in the plan. Working together to find solutions has given submitters more ownership of the document and their buy-in is now fundamental for the plan’s effective implementation.

**The new plan is not only widely supported by the public, but a number of new relationships and partnerships have been established as a result of the public participation process the department carried out.**

What was thought to be a well considered and robust document internally was torn apart by the public because the department hadn’t done its homework – staff had not adequately consulted with key stakeholders prior to developing the draft plan.

With more than 2000 submissions to the draft plan, the majority in opposition, the
department realized it had to find a balance in its position - outcomes that took into
account society’s values, nature’s inherent qualities, and scientific criteria in its decision making.

After 30 days of public hearings, held over 14 months in which submitters were able to express their fear, anger and emotion (often resulting in a thank you to the panel for listening), the department had a clear and strong understanding of what the public wanted for Fiordland National Park. This public input was vital to the success of the plan.

It was an interesting and challenging position for the department to be in because the issues that generated the most debate involved different user or advocacy groups lobbying the department as decision maker.

**Innovative participation techniques used**

The more than 2000 submissions received highlighted this area of New Zealand was one people felt very passionate about and wanted to be involved, however, many submitters were seeking almost completely opposing outcomes from one another. For the department this meant finding the right public participation tools for the issues to be worked through and to achieve outcomes that were workable and acceptable to the public while protecting the value of Fiordland National Park.

With so many individuals, groups, businesses and communities wanting to be involved the department established a hearing panel which travelled to the communities to hear their concerns. The objective of the panel was to listen extensively, clarifying rather than disputing, and for submitters to feel that they had been heard.

The panel consisted of department representatives and the Southland Conservation Board chair who gave his own time for almost every hearing, something which was well respected.

Submitters were also provided with a response to their written submission before they arrived at the hearing so they could see how the department had interpreted their concern and were thanked in person by the panel for attending.
For stakeholders whose concerns could not be fully discussed, individual meetings were set up. One example is with aircraft operators who the department met with 20 times, including a significant number of telephone conferences. Special meetings were also held to facilitate concerns between opposing groups which was one of the most successful tools used.

Outcomes

After five years of open dialogue on the submitters’ ground an acceptable position was reached between the department, representative groups for aircraft access and other park users.

This saw the department move from the initial position of significantly reducing flight allocations to one that allows for the flight industry to take direct responsibility for the effects of their activity on other park users. Their performance will be monitored through visitor surveys. If visitors are satisfied with the noise level from aircraft the number of landings can increase, if not, the number of landings may decrease. The approach achieves the same outcome, less noise, but with much better buy-in from operators.

Another of the many successful outcomes was with deer hunters. What went from full page colour ads in the local paper opposing the plan has shifted to taking responsibility and directly contributing towards animal control in the Wapiti area of the park. Hunters are also working stoat trap lines in the park to help the department protect the endangered whio/blue duck. This highlights how far the relationship between hunters and the department has come since the draft plan was first released.

Working with the hunting groups and communicating directly on the issue and listening to their solutions has resulted in a far better understanding of each other’s concerns to the extent that both parties are now actively working together to manage the effects of deer on the national park

Exemplifying the spirit and purpose of public participation

The challenge or problem faced was the strong opposition to the Fiordland National Park draft management plan. In this instance the department commenced public participation
after the fact and the public saw it as a process that had no value.

The methods used to implement participation included putting the issues back in the hands of those who will be impacted and demonstrating through other policy adjustments, driven by submitters, that within the legislative framework there is flexibility.

The department also sought to get people involved in the process by understanding their views, carrying out onsite inspections, bringing the opposing fractions together to discuss a way forward and providing significant opportunities for people to be heard.

When the draft plan was launched it was contentious, but today, by working with key stakeholders, the policies have not only been accepted but the process has generated a number of other conservation gains as well such as new partnerships and projects many of which have been initiated by the plan’s opponents. These changes are what makes this project so special.

The Fiordland National Park draft management plan is a very different document to what it was in 2002, reflecting the significant amount of public input. It also means that the people who the decisions impact now have more ownership of those decisions as they contributed to the plan’s development, and therefore providing for better direction for the management of Fiordland National Park.

Establishing a dedicated hearing panel to hear people, on their own ground, express their views without interjection was one of the key drivers to the project becoming more outwardly focussed. Bringing together the opposing fractions and liaising with representative groups to address concerns was also well received by the communities.

The practices used following the launch of the draft plan have made dramatic improvements to public participation. Development of the Rakiura National Park management plan has now started and department staff have gone straight to the community before drafting anything. Working through the community’s requirements and having buy-in from the very start has meant more energy can be put into the outcomes, not the process.

For stakeholders to have responsibility for monitoring and mitigating the impact of their activities as well as directly contributing to conservation work means public participation into the management of the park is on-going. These tools provide the opportunities for
both parties to develop a greater appreciation and understanding for each other’s views and activities and therefore creating a better working relationship.

The effectiveness of the project is highlighted in the size of the operative management plan, four times larger than its previous edition thanks to the incredible public response and the strength of key stakeholders’ views.

**In summary**

The project, which started off surrounded in controversy, is now used as a model for public participation on other management plan reviews and the methods developed for allowing greater communication and involvement has assisted considerably in the implementation phase.

It was through the approaches instigated by the department following the initial opposition which has helped shape public participation channels and for the public to recognise the value of their input.

The spin-off benefits from engaging the public and addressing their concerns, such as complementary stoat trapping, animal control and a greater awareness of conservation, are fantastic outcomes, especially considering the environment from which they emerged.

Over the five years of review, an immeasurable amount of energy and commitment has been devoted by all involved parties to ensure that Fiordland National Park will be well served by the new management plan.

**Contact person** Martin Rodd, Department of Conservation, community relations manager, Email: mrodd@doc.govt.nz.

After September 12, 2007, Nyia Strachan, Department of Conservation, community relations officer, Email: nstrachan@doc.govt.nz.