Department of Justice
Canada

Ministère de Justice
Canada

EVALUATION DOCUMENT

EVALUATION AND CITIZEN ENGAGEMENT

Information Resources

August 2001

Evaluation Division
Policy Integration and Coordination Section

Canada

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE: STUDY METHOD

1. Introduction

In early February 2000, the Department of Justice Canada, Evaluation Division, contacted the Centre for Collaborative Action with a request for it to search for sources of information and expertise on two topics: evaluating citizen engagement and involving stakeholders in evaluation processes. The Division is working to refine its evaluation methods and processes, as well as to contribute effectively and efficiently to the Department's current efforts to strengthen its citizen engagement practices. To this end, the Division wanted to be able to quickly tap into the most up-to-date and leading edge thinking and experience on the two topics.

This report provides the results of the search. The specific terms of reference for the search are summarized below. The remainder of the report is divided into three parts. Part 1 offers a synthesis of the main currents of thought and practice with respect to evaluating citizen engagement and involving stakeholders in the evaluation process. Part 2 contains annotated references to the information resources on evaluating citizen engagement and Part 3 does the same for stakeholder involvement in the evaluation process.

2. Terms of Reference

Our assignment was to:

- Identify current academic and non-academic literature relating to evaluating citizen engagement and stakeholder involvement in evaluation, generally;
- Identify relevant material existing in "grey" areas (i.e., not published or not widely distributed);
- Determine if there are any internet resources that will be useful to the Department;
- Identify organizations, associations or individuals/researchers who may be working or have an interest in either of the two topics;

- Identify recent indicators, models or frameworks that have been developed by public, nonprofit or private sector organizations or individuals/researchers in various settings across North America; and
- Prepare an annotated bibliography of current literature and a description of identified resources and existing indicators or models.

The search required culling through the mass of information available, assessing the potential usefulness of each resource, and choosing the ones most likely to be of value to the Department's efforts to enhance its capabilities to evaluate citizen engagement and its efforts to involve stakeholders in the evaluation process.

The sifting through material was particularly important with respect to internet resources. "Grey literature" has taken on a new meaning with the advent of the Internet. In pre-Internet days, "grey literature" was defined as "not published or not widely distributed." With the Internet, material is being widely distributed that likely would not be published or otherwise given such wide distribution. While this increases the accessibility of material, it also dilutes the overall quality of the information pool.

3. The Search Process

It was agreed that the search for information resources would not duplicate work that had already been undertaken by the Department of Justice or Treasury Board Secretariat. Thus, information resources already known to the Department of Justice (e.g., the Canadian Evaluation Society, American Evaluation Association and the like) were not included in the scope of the search process. Similarly, federal officials were not contacted to obtain information about their evaluation and stakeholder involvement practices since Treasury Board Secretariat had hired a consultant to conduct such interviews.

3.1 Contacts

A key component of the search process involved networking with experts in evaluation, citizen engagement and/or multi-stakeholder processes to obtain information resources they had on hand and guidance as to where to go or who to contact to obtain additional resources.

North America

Eight leading public involvement/stakeholder engagement professionals in Canada and the United States were contacted by telephone and email and asked to assist in identifying relevant literature, reports and studies.

Des Connor, Connor Development Services Limited, Vancouver, BC
Dr. Peter Homenuck, Chair, Institute for Environmental Research Inc., Toronto.
Richard Roberts, President, PRAXIS, Calgary, Alberta.
Ann Svendsen, Executive Director, Centre for Innovation in Management, Simon Fraser University.
Dr. Jo Ann Beckwith, Department of Resource Development, Michigan State University, Lansing, Michigan.
James Creighton, President, Creighton & Creighton Inc., Los Gatos, CA.
Dr. Jerry Delli Priscoli, Senior Policy Analyst, Institute for Water Resources, U.S. Corps of Engineers.
Dr. Mary Deming, Program Manager, International Electric Transmission Perception Project, Southern California Edison Co., Rosemead, CA

Each was asked to provide copies of their own professional reports and studies, search their own professional library for leads to possible other resources, and suggest persons to contact at government and non-government agencies and organizations to obtain copies of relevant literature, reports or studies.

International

Six prominent public involvement/stakeholder engagement professionals outside North America were sent a request by email asking for their assistance in identifying additional relevant literature, reports and studies.

Professor Bernard Barraqué, Laboratoire Techniques, Territoires et Sociétés, Noisey-le-Grand, France.
Dr. Marlene Buchy, Department of Forestry, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.
Dr. Brian Bishop, Senior Research Scientist, Australian Research Centre for Water in Society, Wembley, Western Australia.

Dr. Hans Bressers, Centre for Clean Technology and Environmental Policy, University of Twente.
Dave Huitema, Ph.D. Candidate, University of Twente, Netherlands.
Dr. Helen Ross, Fellow, Centre for Resource and Environmental Studies, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.

One international expert whose work is reviewed herein, *Ortwin Renn* of the Centre for Technology Assessment in Stuggart, Germany, could not be personally contacted due to difficulties in locating his current email address:

Other Contacts

Networking with public consultation professionals led to the identification of others in agencies and organizations that have extensive experience with citizen and stakeholder engagement and/or have undertaken evaluations of citizen engagement. They included:

Mr. G. Fitzpatrick, Executive Director, Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Co-operatives
Barbara Collington, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Judith Bradbury, Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratories
Sam Carnes, Oak Ridge National Laboratory
Elizabeth Peelle, Oak Ridge National Laboratory
Professor Joan Feather, University of Saskatchewan
Marie Fortier, ADM, Home Care, Health Canada (was Executive Director of the National Forum on Health, held in 1997)
Dr. Judith Rosner, School of Management, University of California, Irvine

Everyone was contacted by phone and/or email and asked to provide copies of reports or studies they had prepared. It was determined that Health Canada's National Forum on Health has been evaluated by the Privy Council and so no further inquiries were made to obtain more information.

3.2 Library Search

Holdings and reference material in the libraries of the University of Toronto, the Ryerson Polytechnic University and York University were searched for books and reports on evaluating

citizen engagement and stakeholder involvement in evaluation as well as relevant journal articles.

3.3 Internet Search

A search of the Internet was conducted using the following highly rated search engines to maximize the search results:

Yahoo, Excite, Altavista, Hotbot, Deja News, and OneLook.

In addition, searches were conducted using NetCentre and Microsoft. The searches were conducted using the following key words:

evaluation AND citizen + participation + involvement
evaluation AND stakeholder + participation + involvement
empowerment AND evaluation;
participatory AND evaluation
participatory AND “program evaluation”
participatory AND “evaluation strategies”
community AND self-evaluation
“learning communities”
stakeholder-based AND evaluation
“collaborative evaluation”
“program evaluation” AND strategies

The initial searches were very successful with respect to the topic “stakeholder involvement in evaluation” but much less successful for the topic “evaluating citizen engagement.” To fill in this gap, two powerful search engines – Webferret and WebSleuth – were used, both of which concurrently access multiple search engines. For these search engines the following phrases were used:

evaluating public involvement
evaluating citizen participation
evaluating citizen engagement

An additional search was conducted using “CARL UNCOVER,” a service offered by the Colorado Association of Research Libraries. This site offers access to over 20 commercial

databases and to over 420 individual library catalogues that are part of the CARL system. The search produced no citations on evaluating citizen engagement (using the key words “evaluating citizen participation,” and “evaluating public participation”) and no citations on evaluating stakeholder involvement.

Interactive forums on USENET and listservs were not incorporated into the search process as interaction with professionals in the field was already being done in a more direct way, as described in Section 3.1.

4. Report Preparation

The search process captured a massive amount of information, especially from the Internet, which then had to be carefully reviewed to weed out extraneous and questionable material and organized in the most logical and accessible way. This latter task proved quite a challenge. It required that the terrain be mapped, so to speak, to identify trends and crosscurrents, converging and competing themes, varying methodologies, and contextual factors influencing practice. What emerged from this effort was a synthesis of the main currents of thought and practice for both evaluating citizen engagement and stakeholder involvement in the evaluation process. This synthesis, contained in Part 1 of this report, provided the organizing framework needed to sort and present the search results. It is recommended that the synthesis be read prior to delving into Parts 2 and 3 as this will make it easier to quickly reach in and draw upon the material contained there.

This synthesis was verbally presented on April 18, 2000 at a seminar session organized by the Department of Justice and attended by 52 people from 15 federal departments and agencies as well as 2 persons from non-government organizations.

The main message conveyed in Part 1 of this report is that the field of citizen engagement is highly dynamic at this point in time. A lot of the ground rules are changing in response to societal tensions and shifting values. This makes both the evaluation of citizen engagement and the involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation process more difficult than they would be in less turbulent times. At the same time, because things are in flux, there are more opportunities to be creative and to get outside the box. Although Part 1 was prepared for the practical purpose of helping to organize the information that had been gathered together, it was written with the aim of arming those charged with evaluating citizen engagement efforts with a good understanding of the challenges and opportunities awaiting them.

1. MAIN CURRENTS OF THOUGHT AND PRACTICE: A SYNTHESIS

1.1 Introduction

Developing effective approaches to evaluating citizen engagement and to involving stakeholders in the evaluation process requires a careful assessment of the context for the work. This part of the report begins by discussing the federal government's current interest in strengthening its citizen engagement practices. It then focuses on some broader societal trends currently influencing the field of public involvement and highlights their implications for evaluation professionals charged with assessing citizen engagement initiatives and interested in involving stakeholders in the evaluation process. The final two sections provide an overview of the various approaches being taken to evaluate citizen engagement and stakeholder involvement.

1.2 The Federal Government Context

For the past decade, the Federal Government has been endeavouring to strengthen its approaches to citizen engagement. In 1989 it launched *Public Service 2000* (PS 2000), which advocated consultation with the public in the planning of services, provision of goods, and development of policies and programs. The 1990 *Service to the Public Task Force Report* emphasized that "a shift toward a substantially more active and open consultative relationship with the public is singularly important for the future effectiveness of the public service." At present, Privy Council, as the lead central agency responsible for public consultation in the federal public service, is working to update the 1992 federal consultation guidelines. Treasury Board Secretariat has established an interdepartmental working group to assist in preparing a revised federal policy on citizen engagement, including guidelines for the evaluation of citizen engagement, as a means of fostering shared standards of practice.

During this time, the Department of Justice has been working to improve its own consultation practices. It has conducted an assessment of its consultation activities and is now focusing on developing frameworks and methods that can be used to evaluate its citizen engagement efforts

and to involve stakeholders in its evaluation processes. This report was commissioned as part of this initiative.

Progress is evident with respect to the efforts of federal departments and agencies to involve the public in the development of policies, programs and services. For example, the 1998 report of the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development (CESD) revealed that most federal departments had active public consultation programs and used a variety of techniques to obtain public input to their sustainable development strategies. The CESD's 1999 report found a high level of satisfaction with the consultations, both among participants and among departments. Similarly, in its 1999 *Managing for Results* report, which reviewed the efforts of federal departments and agencies to develop performance measures, Treasury Board noted what it described as "an emerging characteristic" namely that "in an increasing number of cases, citizens and other stakeholders are being more involved in identifying results and indicators for performance reporting."

Still, there is a long way to go before the public consultation aims of the PS 2000 initiative can be considered accomplished. The CESD's 1999 audit of "who is consulted" by federal departments and agencies is quite revealing in this regard. The CESD found that:

- "overwhelmingly, [departments] viewed internal audiences – departmental employees and other federal departments – as the primary ones,"
- "organizations representing business interests were the largest single category, followed by Aboriginal communities, experts, other federal departments and levels of government, social groups and environmental groups," and
- "to date, most of the federal consultation processes have not been aimed at the general public."

Not surprisingly, given the relatively fledgling qualities and limited scope of federal public consultation/citizen engagement efforts, very little has been done with respect to evaluating such activities or involving stakeholders in the evaluation process. The notion of evaluating public consultation activities and programs was part of the public consultation movement within the federal government in the early 1990s. For example, the December 1992 *Program Evaluation Newsletter* of the Evaluation and Audit Branch of Treasury Board in commenting on the push within the federal public service for greater consultation with the public observed that "while a number of government departments and agencies adopted this method of dealing with the public even before the proposed reform by PS2000, very few evaluation studies have been carried out." In an effort to remedy this situation, it put forward a "very general framework" for evaluating

public consultation programs and invited evaluators to rework it. More recently, Treasury Board's 1999 *Managing for Results* report noted "strengthening evaluation and review functions has been a government commitment since 1996." Yet, progress on this front has been very slow, as revealed by the findings of the 1999 *Report of the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development.* The Commissioner observed, "most departments did not do an assessment of their strategy consultation process." Moreover, "most of the guidance provided to departments on the conduct and evaluation of consultations was developed in the early 1990s, and much of it exists only in draft form."

The Federal Government's record with respect to public consultation and the evaluation of consultation processes (and by implication their record of stakeholder involvement in the evaluation process) is far from unusual. The reasons are many but an essential one is that "public involvement" is inherently much more complex a matter than generally acknowledged – a factor which makes the evaluation of efforts to engage the public essential. This complexity will continue to increase with our growing educated public and the rapid and revolutionary advances in communications technologies. Understanding this and its implications for evaluation of citizen engagement and involving stakeholders in the evaluation process is an essential first step in the development of effective evaluation approaches.

1.3 Current Trends in Public Involvement

The evaluation of citizen engagement poses a significant challenge, for many reasons. Prominent on the list is a host of what could be considered "standard" evaluation problems. For example, it is not unusual for public involvement activities to be undertaken without clear goals, often as an end in itself, and to be poorly integrated, if at all, with program development and implementation. Although there are many "guides" to public involvement, there is no, and never has been, widely accepted agreement even among public participation practitioners on the general goals of public involvement or their relative importance (should the aim be to inform the public? build consensus? legitimize government decision-making? build trust? produce better decisions? empowerment? further civil society? all of the above?). In addition, the role of the evaluation exercise itself can often be a source of tension and debate among and between evaluators, program funders, program managers, program recipients and other participants or stakeholders. Should the aim be to measure changes or the impact resulting from the public involvement effort, to monitor and improve program implementation as the program unfolds, and/or to provide a measure of accountability?

These kinds of problems are well known to professional evaluators. What makes the evaluation of citizen engagement a much more difficult matter to deal with at this point in time is the fact that the ground in the public participation field is shifting in rapid and dramatic ways.

The past three decades have witnessed the emergence of three complex and inter-related societal trends, most evident in the industrialized part of the world and now beginning to appear in industrializing societies. They are: a steady decline in public confidence in societal institutions, both governmental and non-governmental, a rise in citizen intervention in the decision-making processes of public and private agencies and organizations, and an increase in the public's ability and willingness to pursue alternative modes of participation and political action, with NGOs and environmental activist groups leading the way. Together, these trends are having significant effects on decision-making processes in both the public and private sectors and on efforts to involve the public in those processes.

These trends were documented in a 1991 World Values Survey involving more than forty industrialized nations, the results of which are reported in a book titled *The Decline of Deference* by Neil Nevitte (Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press, 1996). The World Values Survey built upon the findings of a similar survey conducted over a decade earlier, in 1981. When taken together, the two surveys comprise the largest body of direct cross-time and cross-national data on public values ever collected. The findings of the 1991 Survey are many, but certain ones are especially important for their implications with respect to evaluating public consultation and involving stakeholders in the evaluation process. The World Values Survey:

- confirmed that the structural transformations all advanced industrial states have experienced since the seventies have been accompanied by systematic shifts in basic social values, in particular away from materialist goals (the acquisition of money and commodities) towards post-materialist values such as the need for community, a sense of belonging, meaningful work and other values relating to quality of life, and further that these shifts in values are evident from one setting to the next, that is, they are global.
- revealed that orientations toward authority are also in transition, with deference to authority steadily declining in direct relationship to the emergence of a more highly educated public and post-modernist values.
- confirmed that there has been a sustained loss in the public's trust in social institutions and leaders across nations and, more importantly, revealed a possibly generationally driven, public reaction against all hierarchical institutional arrangements, both governmental and non-governmental, that limit opportunities for meaningful citizen involvement.

- revealed that, while attachments to traditional vehicles for participation (e.g.. voting) have weakened, citizens are becoming more interested in politics, are participating more in political life not less, and are increasingly inclined to try out less conventional forms of participation, with the "protest potential" among publics rising, again in direct relationship to levels of education and a shift to post-modernist values.

The World Values Survey clearly revealed that not only are social values changing but also the capabilities of citizens to process information and grapple with complex issues.

> "…people are better informed, are better able to independently process information and make sense of the information available to them. The expansion of educational opportunities also means people will become more interested in and attentive to public life; and …informed and interested people make decisions differently from those who are less informed and less interested. In short, the rise of an increasingly competent and sophisticated public also means the emergence of a less compliant public…Citizens cut from the newer cloth, certainly, are more attracted to formations that are "bottom up," but they are also better equipped to separate reality from the rhetoric and to act on the basis of judgements they reach." (Nevitte, 1996: 313-14)

What all of this says for public participation efforts is that a new reality is unfolding, one with profound implications. The citizens of the millenium are and no doubt will continue to become more educated and therefore more capable and desirous of participating, in a truly meaningful way, in decision processes potentially affecting their lives. As Nevitte put it, these capable adults "are just the kind of citizens that all democracies should want." However, in what is both a strength and a weakness, social institutions are much slower to change, adding to the tensions of the change process.

Since 1994 Ekos Research Associates Inc., a Canadian consulting firm specializing in social research, has been tracking changing perceptions of the relationships between government, business and citizens. In a presentation to the IPAC National Conference held in Fredericton, New Brunswick in September 1999, they reported that 87% of the general public, compared to 66% of government decision makers, believe that "the government of Canada must place much more emphasis on consulting citizens." They also reported that 68% of the general public, compared to only 29% of decision makers, think "we could probably solve most of our national problems if decisions could be brought to people at the grassroots." Finally, they reported that, when asked who should have the most influence on public policy issues, the general public

ranked the average citizen first but perceived that the average citizen comes last in its influence. (To view the slide presentation Ekos made at the conference see: http://www.ekos.ca/presentations).

The Honourable Andy Scott, in a speech to the Institute on Governance in 1998, clearly recognized the new reality. He described citizen engagement in several ways. He spoke about the need for "inclusiveness," and to allow citizens to have "meaningful input.," both traditional aspects of the call for public consultation. But he also talked about citizen engagement as a " process of social change" and of the need to "rebuild governance around the principle of citizen engagement" and "create an informed public environment that allows us to engage in open, frank dialogue armed with the same facts." The Commissioner on Environment and Sustainable Development in his 1999 report in discussing public consultation echoed these sentiments. He observed that 'citizen engagement' was a newer term for public consultation focusing on "citizens as civic-minded individuals rather than as experts or stakeholders."

This casts "citizen engagement" in a light quite different from the more conventional notions and practices of "public involvement." It puts it in the top section of Arnstein's often quoted "ladder of public participation," where partnership, delegated power and citizen control are essential elements of the participation process. The social trends influencing public participation today are moving it (and other professional fields where public interaction is a feature) away from a technical rationality, logical-positivist paradigm of practice towards a more relativistic, heuristic, post-modern approach. Needless to say, this challenges the status quo. In his speech to the Institute of Governance, the Honourable Andy Scott stated up front "You don't hear many politicians talking about citizen engagement very often." The concept is coming up from the grassroots level, with reinforcement from academic and professional circles, especially in Europe and the United States. As Scott put it, "People want this." That there should be citizen engagement is not at issue. Rather, it is its role in governance and as a force of social change.

Herein lies the dilemma for those charged with developing frameworks and methods for evaluating government efforts at citizen engagement – how to devise a reliable, effective evaluation method when society is evolving at an unprecedented rate and there is such disparity in the way in which citizen engagement is viewed by citizens and government. This report doesn't offer a solution to this dilemma. What it does attempt to do is to provide guidance on what are some of the more promising options.

1.4 Trends in Evaluating Citizen Engagement

Two independent reviews of evaluation approaches applied to public involvement initiatives, a Canadian study carried out in 1993 (Poland, B.) and a European study conducted in 1994 (Renn et al), reported the same finding: *systematic evaluations of public involvement initiatives are rare*. At first glance, it is somewhat surprising that, with all the attention that has been focused on public participation over the past forty years in all sectors in North America and abroad, so little has been devoted to developing systematic methods or procedures that agencies and organizations can use to evaluate their citizen engagement efforts. Admittedly, some effort has been directed towards assessing the relative effectiveness of specific public involvement techniques or formats (such as open houses, workshops, focus groups, etc.). It is the larger issues – the overall quality of the participation effort and the effectiveness of the process – that have tended to be ignored.

However, upon reflection, this situation is understandable. The call for greater public involvement in planning and decision-making processes of the public and private sectors was slow to be embraced. Even now, it is still seen in some quarters as more of a hurdle to get over than a "value added" exercise and as a one-time effort rather than an ongoing and integral part of the organization's mode of operation.

Both Poland and Renn et al attempted to fill this gap. Only two other efforts to develop systematic frameworks were found, both in the U.S. The first was developed by public participation professionals at Oak Ridges National Laboratory and the second at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. Detailed descriptions of all four frameworks are provided in Part 2 of this report. Even with these examples, the reality is that there is no ready-made framework or method for evaluating citizen engagement. Until that is remedied, evaluation methods will have to be tailor-made to suit the specific program or initiative being evaluated. This does not mean that there are no foundations to build upon. In fact, there are a few paths being developed that can be used as starting points. Through networking with professionals in the field, it was determined that four key inter-related approaches were being taken to evaluating citizen engagement efforts. These can be labeled: best practices, subject-centred, concept-related, and normative.

1.4.1 Best Practices

The "best practices" approach to evaluation of citizen engagement is more multi-faceted than the label implies. It can be addressed from at least three different directions. The first is the conventional one and would focus on the espoused principles of public involvement. The second would draw upon the experience of organizational management professionals with performance indicators. And the third would look to efforts to build more cooperative, collaborative relationships with stakeholders.

1.4.1.1 Guidelines for Public Involvement

The traditional approach has been to base evaluations on the principles or guidelines for public involvement set out in formal guides or in theoretical literature. Understandably, with so many "guides to public involvement" around, people have turned to them a touchstone for evaluation. Most public involvement guides set out specific objectives for public involvement and propose methods or procedures of citizen engagement designed to achieve those objectives. These have been and continue to be used as "criteria" for evaluating citizen engagement activities, although what is really being evaluated is whether "best practices" were used rather than the effectiveness or success of the citizen engagement activity overall in achieving context specific objectives and goals.

This approach is still quite popular – it was taken by the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development in his 1999 review of the consultation activities of federal departments in developing and implementing their sustainable development strategies. Usually, such evaluations are done on an ad hoc basis -- case-by-case as the need arises. However, there have been recent attempts to formalize this approach. This is exemplified by the Canadian Standards 1996 "Guide to Public Involvement" which includes a section on evaluating results and the City of Vancouver's 1999 release of a set of evaluation criteria, based on their 1998 report "Guiding Principles for Public Involvement."

Obviously, the quality of the evaluation criteria will be determined by the definition of "Best Practice" put forward in the Guides. Many of the Guides developed over the past decade, including some recent ones, are already out of step with the times. The changes in social values occurring worldwide are very dynamic. Evaluators will be expected to keep pace with current trends in the public involvement field – learning from and internalizing such trends, not just observing them.

It should be pointed out that the tensions created by the shifting of social values discussed above will likely exacerbate a sore point that often arises among stakeholders in planning and decision-making processes, namely the lack of agreement on the purpose(s) of the public involvement program. A public participation program can have many purposes – it can be an end in itself, means to an end, or both. Citizen engagement as an end, in and of itself, is common in the health field and in the community development field where "participation" in community or government-based decision-making processes affecting one's life is regarded as health promoting, if only for the sense of empowerment that comes of such involvement. It is more common for public participation programs to be undertaken as a means to an end. The issue that then becomes the focus of debate is who decides what "ends" are appropriate – the agency engaging with the public? the public participation and/or evaluation expert? or the citizens and other stakeholders? What tends to happen is that conflicting expectations of the public involvement effort remain unresolved, thus setting up a situation where unmet expectations are inevitable. Since evaluation is seldom addressed at the beginning of program design, evaluators of public involvement activities run the risk of being caught in the middle, with the agency on one side arguing for evaluation criteria consistent with its intended purposes and the various stakeholders on the other side arguing that their participation goals and objective should frame the evaluation.

1.4.1.2 Performance Indicators

Recognizing the need to ensure that the evaluation reflects current circumstances and expectations, as well as striving to provide a rigorous basis for the evaluation, evaluators have begun experimenting with the development of performance indicators, *devised in consultation with stakeholders and other participants in the involvement process*. The U.S. Pacific Northwest National Laboratory is doing the most prominent work in this regard. Examples of their work are summarized in Part 2.

A variation on the performance indicator approach and one that is becoming prominent in the business community is social and ethical accounting. The practice of rating corporations against key social and ethical performance criteria emerged in the early 1970s. This paralleled the development of "social indicators" as a way of assessing quality of life and progress in dealing with such matters as unemployment, health, education and environmental quality.

The performance indicator/social accounting approach is consistent with the overall program management approach advocated in Treasury Board's 1999 *Managing for Results* report. It emphasized the need for "performance information" for planning and decision-making and made reference to how federal departments have developed internal performance and accountability frameworks. No mention was made of evaluating processes of citizen engagement using performance indicators but, given the effort being made federal departments to "manage for results," such an approach might be timely. The formidable issue to be grappled with is the selection of the indicators themselves. On what basis are choices to be made and who decides what is an appropriate indicator?

1.4.1.3 Collaborative Relationships

As noted above in Section 3, the radical shifts in public norms and values now occurring in society are calling into question not only many of the traditional practices of public involvement but more fundamentally our basic notions of governance. In this regard, the leading edge thinking with respect to citizen participation in decision-making processes, both within the public and private sectors, emphasizes inclusiveness, consensus building, and joint planning and decision-making. In a word, the process is collaborative.

A collaborative approach to citizen engagement is fundamentally different from conventional forms of public participation. It goes beyond simply consulting with concerned or interested parties to obtain their input to or feedback on proposals. And it involves more than striving for greater cooperation and coordination between and among the various agencies, organizations and groups with a part to play in moving an initiative forward to implementation. A collaborative process is one where people *work together* from start to finish toward common goals or outcomes *for mutual benefit* and *share responsibility and accountability for achieving results*. The building of longer-term relationships – characterized by trust, mutual respect, openness and constructive engagement – is given as much if not more attention than those associated with the specific initiative that is the focus of the collaborative effort.

There are many practical, instrumental objectives accounting for the emergence of interest in collaborative processes, such as the lack of resources and thus the need to work together with others, the prominence and pervasiveness of conflict-ridden decision-making processes and hence the need for consensus building forums, and the often boundless nature of societal and environmental issues and thus the need for coordinated, collective action. That said, this new approach to citizen engagement reflects broader societal trends towards "empowering" of

stakeholders and more "deliberative democracy." In other words, the impetus to pursue collaborative approaches has more fundamental foundations than just its practical advantages – a factor that has to be taken into account in evaluating such processes.

Although experience with collaborative processes of planning and decision-making is limited, the leaders in the field have been astute in recognizing the need to put learning from their efforts on a fast forward track. As a result, some interesting frameworks have been developed to evaluate collaborative processes (in particular those of Chrislip and Larson, and Hargrove) and it can be expected that several more will be put forward in the near future.

1.4.2 Subject-Centred

This approach to evaluating citizen participation comes at it from a subjective perspective, either that of the agency (were its needs and requirements met?) or the participants (were their needs and expectations met?) or both.

It used to be common practice to assess the public involvement efforts based solely on whether regulatory, policy or other mandated requirements were met. This rather limited view is falling into disfavour, although this consideration is still an important factor for most agencies. Prior to 1980, regardless of the scope of the assessment, it was the agency's perspective that tended to dominate evaluation efforts. Slowly, as interactions with the public increased, more effort was made to assess "participant satisfaction," although it wasn't until quite recently that this factor was given much weight in the overall evaluation.

This change from an agency-centred focus to a more participant-centred focus in evaluating public involvement paralleled the movement in the evaluation field generally towards "participatory evaluation." It is also consistent with trends in the health, natural resource management, and business management fields towards "empowerment" of stakeholders. That said, the primary aim in conducting subject-centred evaluations of public involvement efforts still tends to be to meet the information needs of the sponsoring agency (were its efforts effective?) rather than the participants' (was their participation meaningful?).

1.4.3 Concept-Focused

A long-standing criticism of many of the social sciences has been their lack of integration with planning and decision-making processes. Not surprisingly, basing evaluations of citizen engagement on basic concepts drawn from sociology, social ecology, social psychology, community health or political culture -- such as democracy, community, community health, empowerment, mobilization -- has seldom been done.

Of the five fields mentioned above, practitioners in the community health field were among the first to attempt to use basic theoretical concepts, such as "community," "community participation," as organizing frameworks for evaluating public involvement, although noteworthy examples are few. This approach may receive renewed emphasis from community health practitioners and others with the push toward more empowerment of program recipients in developing health promotion outcomes. The field of social ecology, with its systems focus, is beginning to receive attention as a possible source of ideas for the development of evaluation frameworks and criteria for public involvement. Not surprisingly, one of the key examples of a social ecology evaluation framework, based on the concept of "community change," has been developed by a natural resource management agency (the U.S. Department of Agriculture).

The main drawback of this approach is that it is expert-driven. This doesn't have to be the case. Indeed, it would be a mistake if it continued to be. Theoretical concepts of community, for example, are woefully out-of-date and asking citizens to assist in updating them would be an effective course of action.

1.4.4 Normative

The most interesting and creative work on citizen engagement is being done in Europe. "The Modernization of Democracy" has been of strong interest in France and Germany since the early 1980's. Interest in "deliberative democracy" and/or "renewing democracy" has grown substantially over the past ten years in North America as well. These grassroots-based (or oriented) movements are influencing normative expectations in both lay and professional communities regarding the purposes and goals of citizen engagement.

The work being done in this regard by professionals in the public participation field tends to draw upon political theories of democratic society and social interaction, in particular "critical social theory" and the work of Jurgen Habermas. Habermas is a German philosopher and

dominant figure in the tradition of critical theory (also known as the Frankfurt School of critical sociology). The thrust of the "critical theory tradition" is the need for "self-criticism" – to call into question all claims of validity, especially the rational foundations of science and what constitutes "genuine knowledge." For example, in the context of a specific citizen engagement initiative, this would mean encouraging stakeholders to be critical and probe basic assumptions underlying professional judgments and technical analyses as well as the rationale(s) for policy decisions. It would be assumed that "no one has the corner on the truth" and that the "best" course of action would be found only through open, frank and critical discussion among stakeholders.

"Critical Theory" may sound too weighty for everyday purposes but the messages and ideas of critical theorists are very consistent with (and some would say have instigated) the current trends in society noted in Part 1 of this report. At the heart of this school of thought are three essential normative values, which provide the touchstones for the development of frameworks to evaluation citizen engagement. These are *face-to-face interaction* aimed at *discovering shared goals* through a *coordinated process of discourse*.

Efforts made to evaluate citizen engagement activities from a critical theory perspective focus on Habermas' concept of the "ideal speech situation." This is characterized by

- open, respectful dialogue;
- freedom to challenge all "validity claims" or claims to superior knowledge and truth; and
- critical reflection on the type of society desired.

Needless to say, these requirements are qualitatively different from traditional views of what constitutes a good or effective process of public involvement. The most significant effort to develop an evaluation framework in the critical theory tradition is the one put together by Tom Webler and Ortwin Renn in the early 1990's. Interesting work is also being done at MIT's Sloan School of Management by Bill Isaac, Peter Senge and company on "dialogue" as a process of interaction to solve problems or work together towards shared goals.

Clearly, this is a period of radical experimentation in both citizen engagement and evaluation of such processes. Part 2 of this report provides references to the most current information resources on each of these four approaches to evaluating citizen engagement, highlighting the most prominent or leading edge examples.

1.5 Stakeholder Involvement in The Evaluation Process

All of the foregoing bears directly on the matter of involving stakeholders in the process of evaluating citizen engagement efforts for the obvious reason that it is itself a process of citizen engagement. The tensions and difficulties inherent in current efforts to enhance citizen engagement in government decision-making will be part and parcel of the evaluation process once it is opened to stakeholder involvement. For this reason, the methodological problem of how to involve stakeholders in the evaluation process cannot be effectively addressed until some resolution is reached of the more fundamental issue of competing expectations for public involvement programs, discussed above. This is not to say that stakeholder involvement should not be attempted – it is by involving stakeholders in the evaluation process that differing expectations of citizen engagement can be made explicit and worked through. What is does mean is that evaluation professionals will need to become more knowledgeable about citizen engagement and acquire the requisite skills.

Another implication of involving stakeholders in the evaluation process that should not be overlooked is that stakeholders will no doubt expect more and higher quality opportunities for involvement not only in other evaluation initiatives but also in other aspects of the sponsoring department's decision-making process. In his 1999 assessment of the consultation strategies of federal departments, the Commissioner on Environment and Sustainable Development concluded that, while participants were generally satisfied with the efforts made to consult them, "they expect departments to have learned from this first round and not to repeat their mistakes." He also noted that "many participants saw consultations as a staged-step iterative process, not as a one-shot deal."

There is one other implication that merits mention because it speaks to a long-standing problem in the evaluation field and that is the problem of follow through. Stakeholders will expect their views to be taken into account and, more than that, they will want to be provided with concrete evidence (such as revised procedures for citizen engagement) that this has been done. Stated more simply, they want their involvement to result in action. The pressure will be on evaluators to meet this expectation.

Evaluators have had to contend with the issue of having the results of their work routinely ignored or marginalized in policy and program processes. The desire to have more impact in implementation was a basic impetus behind the move in the field during the 1970s towards "participant-oriented evaluation," with its emphasis on understanding and responding to the specific needs of those for whom an evaluation is being done. This called for greater reliance on

naturalistic inquiry (rooted in ethnography and phenomenology) as opposed to the more conventional positivist paradigm of scientific inquiry and the application of qualitative research methods such as participant observation, case studies and "stories." The more recent advocacy of "participatory or empowerment evaluation" represents a logical progression from **being responsive** to those being evaluated to **being a partner** with them. This calls for a more collaborative or co-created evaluation process and the application of consensus-building techniques that facilitate joint decision-making on such matters as evaluation goals, criteria for measurement, and data collection methods.

It would be a mistake, however, to assume that because the profession has embraced participatory evaluation involving stakeholders in the evaluation process will not be a problem for evaluators. So far, the practice of participatory evaluation has tended to be rather constrained in two important ways: the scope of participants (such processes have usually been limited to primary users, that is, those with program responsibilities or a direct stake in the program rather than being more multi-stakeholder in orientation) and the degree of stakeholder involvement (collaboration has tended to be limited to the early stages of the evaluation process when goals and criteria are being chosen rather than being an ongoing effort).

Furthermore, the concept of "empowerment" and its practical implications, especially in terms of how it should be expressed in the structuring of the evaluation process and how it should be measured, are not at all well developed. Thus, the full force of stakeholder involvement, and all that it currently implies, has not yet been incorporated in evaluation practice.

Part 3 on "involving stakeholders in the evaluation process" begins with general references on participatory evaluation, highlighting examples of current experience that offer strong models and methods worth emulating. This is followed by references to the broader field of stakeholder involvement, giving emphasis to the theory and principles of collaboration. The final three sections focus on specific models and methods of stakeholder involvement, namely the committee or task force approach, community dialogues, and collaborative processes.

1.6 Summary

The federal government's commitment to providing citizens with more meaningful opportunities to be involved in the governance process has underscored the need for sound, constructive and timely feedback on its citizen engagement processes. Current societal trends – in particular, the decline in deference to authority, the emergence of a more highly educated public with post-

modernist values, the sustained loss of the public's trust in social institutions and leaders, and the growing desire on the part of citizens to participate in more meaningful ways in governance processes affecting their quality of life – suggest that both strengthening citizen engagement and evaluating these efforts present some formidable challenges.

To date, not much attention has been directed to evaluating the overall quality and effectiveness of public involvement programs. As a result, there are only a handful of systematic evaluation frameworks. Almost all were developed in the context of evaluating a specific program or process, which makes them instructive but not wholly transferable. Thus, it will be necessary to devise context and initiative specific evaluation approaches.

Four inter-related approaches to this task are being pursued by evaluation professionals and others interested in assessing citizen engagement processes:

- **best practices**, which includes using principles or guides for public involvement as evaluation criteria, developing performance indicators in consultation with stakeholders, and/or basing evaluation criteria on the norms and values associated with more cooperative, collaborative approaches to citizen engagement.
- **subject-centred**, which bases evaluation criteria on the subjective views of the agency, the participants, or both.
- **concept-focused**, which seeks to derive evaluation criteria from relevant theoretical concepts such as "community," "community participation," and "community change."
- **normative**, which draws upon political theories relating to democratic society as the basis for determining what citizen engagement should be about and hence how it should be assessed.

Regardless of the approach taken, involving stakeholders in the evaluation process is becoming an accepted practice. So far, the extent of stakeholder involvement has been limited to certain stages in the evaluation process, most notably the early stages when goals and criteria are being set. Likewise, the range of stakeholders brought into the evaluation process has tended to be limited to primary users. Given current societal trends and the kinds of pressures being placed on governments to be more responsive and open to people's desire for involvement, it is very likely that evaluation professionals will find themselves being pressured to take a more inclusive approach to their work. This will require them to develop new knowledge and skills, in particular those relating to consensus building and collaboration.

Parts 2 and 3 of this report combined offer a wealth of annotated references to leading-edge articles, reports, internet sources and organizations that can serve as resources in responding to

the challenges and opportunities open to evaluation professionals in their efforts to evaluate citizen engagement and work with stakeholders.

2. EVALUATING CITIZEN ENGAGEMENT

This Part consists of five sections:

Section 2.1 lists and describes studies offering frameworks, criteria and indicators for evaluating citizen engagement. As indicated in the Terms of Reference for this report, the search for such material was restricted to post 1990 unless prior studies had a prominence that warranted their inclusion in this report. “Framework” was defined as a systematic procedure of evaluation founded on a model or coherent concept of relevant factors to be taken into consideration. Some of the frameworks included in this report were developed in the context of specific initiatives. However, in all cases, a goal was also to develop a framework or method that would have broad application.

Section 2.2 provides annotated references to books, reports and journal articles addressing citizen engagement and providing further information on possible frameworks, criteria and indicators.

Section 2.3 provides annotated references to internet sites offering information that would facilitate the development of effective approaches to evaluating citizen engagement, including theoretical frameworks, concepts, practical guides, case studies, and tools.

Section 2.4 lists organizations in Canada, the United States and elsewhere who have expertise in citizen engagement and the evaluation of such processes as well as leading Canadian professionals in this field.

Section 2.5 provides references for “Other Resources” such as conferences (both upcoming and recently held), research projects, and annotated bibliographies.

In all sections, the aim was not to be comprehensive and include everything but rather to cull through the material and identify leading examples and those resources most likely to contribute in a significant way to the Department of Justice’s effort with respect to evaluation and citizen engagement.

2.1 Frameworks, Criteria and Indicators

2.1.1 Best Practices

2.1.1.1 Based on Espoused Principles of Public Involvement

City of Vancouver. 1999 *Public Involvement Review: Policy Report (July 1999).* Vancouver, BC: PIR Working Group.
Contact: Michael White, Ph (604) 873-7094
http://www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/commsvcs/planning/pubinvolveguide/pirjly99.htm

In 1996, the City's Better City Government initiative and CityPlan identified strengthening public involvement in City decision making as a priority. *Context Research Ltd.* was hired to do an evaluation of the City's public involvement activities. The consultant worked with an inter-departmental Public Involvement Review (PIR) Committee. The review was widely publicized and anyone with an interest in it was invited to participate.

The Consultant recommended sixteen "Directions for Improvement" (one of which was "Commitment to Evaluation of Each Process" of public involvement) and a set of "Guiding Principles for Public Involvement." Council adopted both in October 1998.

The July 1999 PIR report documents the initiatives planned or underway. The PIR Committee has incorporated the "Guiding Principles" into an evaluation framework for Phase II of the PIR program. These were listed in the report and are reproduced below:

Phase II Evaluation Criteria

1. Mandating the Process - The credibility, purpose, and objectives of the public involvement process were clear to all process participants. Was the involvement process legitimate?

    - Were the staff and participants clear on the objectives of the process? To what extent did all parties involved have similar goals and expectations for the process?
    - What was the expected level of public participation in the process (advisory - decision making), and how was this decided? Was it appropriate?

- Were clear roles established for and communicated to all participants in the process?
- Was public involvement initiated early enough?
- Was there sufficient commitment to the process and its mandate from the proponent agency?
- How was conflict of interest in the process addressed (e.g. was City Hall a stakeholder?)

2. Resourcing the Process - The public involvement process had adequate resources (financial, staff, community) to achieve the stated mandate.

- What was the true cost of the process for the proponent, participants, and City Hall? Was there a more cost effective way of achieving the same results?
- Was there sufficient staffing to fulfil the process mandate, and were the staff adequately prepared?
- Did staff have adequate training to conduct the public involvement process?
- Were community resources/energy used effectively?
- Were lessons from experiences in other cities and past experiences applied to this process?
- Was adequate administrative support committed to the process?

3. Process Participants - All stakeholders affected by the issue of concern had an equal opportunity to become involved in the public involvement process and a representative portion of them chose to do so.

- To what degree did all interested parties participate in the process? What kinds of opportunities did they have to do so?
- Was the process responsive to cultural differences?
- Were there any barriers to access -physical, communication, economic, social, and how were they overcome?
- Did the process encourage the involvement of all stakeholders including the silent majority? How was the influence of pressure groups handled in the process?
- Were participants representative of all the interests in the project and were an appropriate number of participants involved?
- Were some participants involved in pursuit of an unrelated political agenda? How were they dealt with?
- Did the public involvement process adequately involve elected representatives?

- Were other City departments invited to be involved in the process by the lead department?

4. Communications Strategies - All communications for the public involvement process were effective, inclusive, and covered all necessary issues.

   - Were all communications, including surveys worded in a "value-free" objective manner?
   - Were participants adequately provided with timely, concise, understandable information in an appropriate medium or format?
   - Was there clarity regarding role of existing policy?
   - Did the process adequately address situations where participants have different levels of information?
   - Were citizens adequately advised on the consequences of specific actions or alternative solutions?
   - Was there an effective relationship with the media during the process?

5. Involvement Strategies - The public involvement process was transparent. Where necessary, it dealt openly with conflict and imbalances of knowledge to maximize participant input.

   - Did participants and proponents have a similar perception of what was being discussed and did the process allow for the development of a clear understanding of the impacts of the proposed project?
   - Did all participants understand the public involvement process structure and timing?
   - What was the tone of the process? Did it foster creativity and encourage civility and mutual respect for all parties? What was the level of reciprocal trust in the process?
   - Did the process need to be value-neutral ? If so, how successful was it?
   - Did the process involve problem solving? If so, how successful was it?
   - How was dissenting opinion treated in the process? Was it necessary to mediate between groups and was this successful?
   - Were there different ways to participate and were they all effective?
   - Was conflict resolution a part of the process? If so, were conflicts addressed at the appropriate time in the process? Was the conflict resolution successful?

6. Feedback and Closure - All stakeholders are convinced that the public involvement process, or a phase of an ongoing process, achieved its mandate and are satisfied with the results.

    - Was there ultimate success in the achievement of the goals of the public involvement process?
    - To what degree is evaluation built into the process?
    - Was there political and administrative support for the results of the process?
    - Did participants feel their involvement was worthwhile? Was participant input reflected in final decisions?
    - Did the public involvement result in greater benefits to the community or did it lead to long-term community rifts?
    - Was the general public good addressed in the process? How?
    - Did the public involvement process meet Council's needs?
    - To what degree did the process lead to win / win results

7. Overarching Criteria

    - Did the process contribute to the development of long term relationships between the participants and the proponent?
    - Are there some types of municipal issues which normally do not have public involvement components but which should?

Government of Canada. 1999 *Report of the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development, Chapter 2.* Ottawa: CESD.
http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/domino/reports.nsf/html/c9menu_e.html

Chapter 2 of the Commissioner's 1999 Report presents findings of an evaluation of the efforts of federal departments and agencies to consult with the public in the preparation of strategies to achieve sustainable development objectives. The Canadian Standards Association's (CSA) "Guide to Public Involvement" (see below) was used as the foundation for the evaluation exercise. The evaluation team derived 12 evaluation criteria from the CSA Guide and developed a set of sub-criteria to use in their review of the consultation processes of 28 federal departments. They are listed in Appendix C of the Commissioner's report and are reproduced here:

1999 Report of the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development: Appendix C

Evaluation Criteria - Consultation Process (External Audiences)

- In the course of preparing its sustainable development strategy, did the department consult with clients, partners and other stakeholders (other than federal departments)?

Planning the Consultation Process

1. The purpose of the process is clearly defined and understood by everyone.
   - Did the department hold a pre-consultation meeting(s) involving stakeholders (other than other federal departments) in the design of the sustainable development strategy (SDS) consultation process?
   - Did the department prepare a consultation plan for the SDS?
   - Did it contain the main elements of a consultation plan? (WHAT - objective of consultation; WHO was to be consulted; HOW - description of activities; WHEN - schedule)
2. The process is clearly linked to when and how decisions are made.
   - Did the department consult early enough in the preparation of the strategy (earlier than final strategy draft) for participants to be able to influence the orientations of the strategy?
3. All relevant interests are represented in the process.
   - Has the department solicited the views of stakeholders with a significant interest?
   - Has the department solicited the views of stakeholders across the country?
4. The process is designed to meet the circumstances and needs of the specific situation.
   - Was a dedicated budget established for the SDS consultation?
   - Did the department co-ordinate its consultations (or part of its consultations) with other government departments for the benefit of participants?

Managing the Process

5. Flexibility is designed into the process.
6. Appropriate measures are in place to support stakeholder participation.
   - Did the department provide financial assistance to any of the participants in the SDS consultation?

7. All relevant information is accessible to stakeholders in a timely and understandable manner.
   - Did the department release a discussion or issues paper to participants in preparation for the SDS consultation?
8. The diverse values, interests and knowledge of stakeholders are recognized and respected.
9. Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined and understood by everyone associated with the process.
10. A reasonable and clear time frame for the process is established.
    - Was the consultation exercise carried out early enough (at least two months before tabling of the strategy) for participants to be able to significantly influence the strategy?

Using the Results to Improve the Strategies/Providing Feedback to Participants

11. The results are communicated and implemented.
    - Did the department produce a summary of the participants' comments?
    - Did the department provide feedback to participants on the consultation results?

Learning and Improving

12. The success and results of the process are measured.
    - Was an evaluation of the consultation exercise carried out?

For those interested in adopting a "Best Practices" approach to the evaluation of citizen engagement, the following public involvement guides can be used as starting points for the development of an evaluation framework based on "Espoused Principles of Public Involvement."

Canadian Standards Association. 1996. *A Guide to Public Involvement*. CSA Reference Z764-96. To purchase the document contact: CSA, 178 Rexdale Blvd., Etobicoke, ON M9W 1R3. Phone: 416-747-4044; Fax: 416-747-2475; Email: **sales@csa.ca**

Connor, D. M. 1994. "A Generic Design for Public Involvement Programs." In Connor, D.M., *Constructive Citizen Participation: A Resource Book.* Victoria, BC: Development Press, Fifth Edition.

Creighton, James L. 1995. *Public Involvement Manual*. Washington, DC: Edison Electric Institute.

2.1.1.2 Based on Performance Indicators

Carnes, Sam A., Schweitzer, Martin, Peelle, Elizabeth, Wolfe, Amy. K., and Munro, John F. 1996. *Performance Measures for Evaluating Public Participation Activities in DOE's Office of Environmental Management.* Oak Ridge, TN: Oak Ridge National Laboratory, ORNL-6905

See also: Schweitzer, Martin, Carnes, Sam A., and Peelle, Elizabeth, B. 1999. "Evaluating Public Participation Efforts." *IAP2 Improving the Practice,* First Quarter: 1-6; and Carnes, S. A., Schweitzer, M., Peelle, E.B., Wolfe, A.K., and Munro, J.F. 1998. "Measuring the Success of Public Participation on Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Activities in the U.S. Department of Energy." *Technology in Society* 20: 385-406.

Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) has developed a performance-based evaluation method for the U.S. Department of Energy. Although developed for specific DOE projects, it can serve as a general framework for such evaluations. The evaluation method was applied to two specific U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) public participation program initiatives.

In evaluating the public participation activities of DOE's Office of Environmental Management, Sam Carnes et al surveyed over 100 individuals in nine different environmental remediation sites across the U.S. where public participation had taken place to solicit their input on which attributes of "successful public participation" are more important and on the specific indicators by which these attributes could be measured. Those interviewed included DOE and contractor project managers, public participation specialists, representatives of local, state and tribal governments, federal and state regulatory authorities and environmental interest groups. The table below shows the attributes identified as most important by the various stakeholders. The performance indicators were developed in consultation with the same stakeholders. The authors advise "a thorough evaluation requires the use of the entire package of attributes and indicators."

Performance Indicators of Successful Public Participation Efforts		
Goals	**Performance Indicators**	**Type of Indicator**
The decision making process allows full and active stakeholder representation	The proportion of all identifiable stakeholder groups that have taken part in the public participation efforts The mechanisms used to attract, engage, and maintain the interest of stakeholders throughout the public participation effort.	Behavioural
The decision making process is accepted as legitimate by stakeholders	Participants' evaluation of decision making processes at various stages in the decision cycle	Perceptual
The sponsoring agency and other stakeholders understand each others' concerns	Internal and external stakeholders' ability to identify each others' concerns and understand the bases of those concerns	Behavioural
The public has trust and confidence in the sponsoring agency	The public's self-reported levels of trust and confidence in the sponsoring agency and its contractors	Perceptual
Key decisions are improved by public participation	Judgements made by internal and external stakeholders that public participation has led to better decisions	Perceptual
Key decisions are accepted as legitimate by stakeholders	Participants' evaluation of the legitimacy important decisions	Perceptual
The agency's site-specific mission is accomplished	The development and implementation of a decision integrating cost, schedule, environmental, safety and health factors plus other external stakeholder concerns	Behavioural

It should be noted that:

- There is no easy way to judge the acceptability of the number produced for the first indicator, except perhaps in comparison to results for the project at different points in time or to results for a similar project.

- "Legitimacy" is defined by the authors as "the extent to which the decision making process was conducted fairly and served the broad public interest." They suggest using a five-point rating scale to assist in the assessment of this indicator.

- The third indicator is operationalized by asking each participant to list the major concerns of other parties and to explain the bases of those concerns, and then comparing the answers received from all respondents.

- It is suggested that the trust and confidence indicator be assessed by asking both the participants and representatives of the broader public the question: "Using the following five-point scale, please indicate the extent to which you have trust and confidence in the ability and intent of the sponsoring agency to perform its duties in a way that serves the

broad public interest. 1 = not at all; 2 = slightly; 3 = moderately; 4 = substantially; 5 = completely."

- The authors suggest assessing whether *or not* public participation led to better decisions because this would acknowledge that some people may perceive that the decision was degraded rather than improved.

- The only attribute not broadly embraced by the survey respondents was the last one: "The agency site-specific mission is accomplished." However, many respondents noted that stakeholders need to be involved in developing mission statements.

Carnes, S. A., Schweitzer, Martin, and Peelle, Elizabeth. 1997 *Review and Evaluation of the Office of Science and Technology's Community Leaders Network.* Oak Ridge, TN: Oak Ridge National Laboratory, ORNL-6922

The Community Leaders Network (CLN) is an informally structured national stakeholder group sponsored by the U.S. Department of Energy to obtain citizen input into technology research and development programs of DOE's Office of Science and Technology (OST). It is not a consensus-seeking body but rather is intended to provide a range of individual opinions from a variety of stakeholders and facilitate information exchange. The CLN was initiated in 1993 and now has 35 members, mostly from jurisdictions hosting DOE waste management and environmental remediation sites. The specific objectives of the CLN are to:

- Provide feedback and input to OST on technology development activities
- Provide information on OST ideas and approaches to key stakeholder groups, and
- Provide input to OST on stakeholder concerns and involvement.

Initially, the CLN focused on OST's Integrated Demonstration activities. This changed, however, as DOE's Office of Environmental Management instituted a new management strategy emphasizing four major remediation and waste management Focus Areas within the DOE weapons complex. The four Focus Areas are mixed waste characterization, treatment and disposal; high-level waste tank remediation; subsurface contaminants; and facility transitioning, decommissioning and final disposal.

Performance indicators were developed for each objective and are listed below. They are based upon those used in the assessment of the public participation activities of DOE's Office of Environmental Management (see above) and give emphasis to the effectiveness and efficiency of

the CLN. Values for the indicators were collected through interviews with and surveys administered to CLN participants and representatives of OST's staff responsible for developing waste management and site remediation technologies.

Performance Indicators to Measure Usefulness of CLN by Objective

Provide feedback and input to OST in technology development activities

- Participants' evaluation of how well CLN participants represent all important stakeholder groups
- Participants' evaluation of the effects of CLN activities on the legitimacy of the process used by OST to make decisions on technology development activities
- Participants' evaluation of the effect of CLN activities on the legitimacy of OST decisions
- Participants' evaluation of the extent to which CLN activities have added to OST's understanding of the interests and concerns of key stakeholders
- Participants' evaluation of the effect of CLN activities on their trust and confidence in OST and its contractors
- Participants' evaluation of the effect of CLN activities on the quality of ey OST decisions
- Participants' evaluation of how CLN activities have affected the speed at which new technologies that address important EM site needs are introduced and implemented
- Participants' evaluation of how CLN activities have affected the public acceptability of new technologies that address important EM site needs
- Participants' evaluation of how their involvement in Focus Areas has affected the CLN's ability to provide feedback and input to OST on technology development activities
- Participants' comparison of the usefulness of Focus Area involvement with the usefulness of CLN's other activities as a means of providing feedback and input to OST on technology development activities

Provide information on OST ideas and approaches to key stakeholder groups

- Participants' evaluation of the extent to which CLN activities have added to key stakeholder groups' understanding of OST's interests, concerns and programs.
- Participants' evaluation of how their involvement in Focus Areas has affected the CLN's ability to provide information on OST ideas and approaches to key stakeholder groups.
- Participants' comparison of the usefulness of Focus Area involvement with the usefulness of CLN's other activities as a means of providing information on OST ideas and approaches to key stakeholder groups.

Provide input to OST on stakeholder concerns and involvement

- List of public involvement program/efforts on which CLN has provided input to OST.
- Participants' evaluation of the value of information on stakeholder interests and priorities provided to OST by CLN.
- Participants' evaluation of the value of information on designing and implementing stakeholder involvement efforts that CLN has provided to OST.
- Participants' evaluation of how their involvement in Focus Areas has affected the CLN's ability to provide input to OST on stakeholder concerns and involvement.
- Participants' comparison of the usefulness of Focus Area involvement with the usefulness of CLN's other activities as a means of providing input to OST on stakeholder concerns and involvement.

2.1.1.3 Based on Collaborative Process Criteria

Chrislip, David D. and Larson, Carl E. 1994. *Collaborative Leadership: How Citizens and Civic Leaders Can Make A Difference.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

This book is one of the best resources available on collaborative processes and how to assess them. The authors conducted an extensive research project, examining over 50 cases of successful community collaborations. The book documents the results of their research. Of most relevance here is the evaluation instrument (a questionnaire) they devised for assessing the success of a collaborative effort. It assesses five dimensions of collaboration: the context for collaboration, the structure and design of the collaboration, the members' skills and attitudes, the process used, and the results accomplished. The instrument has been tested on 23 collaborative groups (at the time of the writing of the book) and the results confirmed the reliability and validity of the measure. The questionnaire consists of 41 statements respondents are asked to scale as "true," "more true than false," "more false than true," and "true."

The authors report that the instrument is sensitive to and discriminates among many features of community collaborations, including urban versus rural groups and general policy versus individual case decisions. The instrument has also been shown to correlate significantly with success in achieving the actual, concrete results sought by the collaborative efforts.

For more information on the theory and scoring of Collaborative Leadership contact: OMNI Research and Training, Inc., 2329 West Main St., #330, Littleton, CO 80120-1951 Ph. (303) 797-2633 or 800-279-2070

Kilvington, Margaret. 1998. *A Multi-stakeholder Approach to Sustainable Catchment Management.* Lincoln, NZ: Landcare Research.
Contact: Margaret Kilvington, Landcare Research, P.O. Box 69, Lincoln, New Zealand; Email kilvington@landcare.cri.nz
A full report of the evaluation is available on-line at http://www.landcare.cri.nz/science/social/index.shtml?whaingaroa

This report presents an evaluation of the Whaingaroa Catchment Management Project (WCMP), the first formal attempt in New Zealand at establishing a community-based, integrated environmental management process on a catchment basis. The WCMP is a demonstration project testing the transferability of an ecosystem-based approach to water management developed by Canada's Atlantic Coastal Action Programme (ACAP). As with ACAP, the cornerstone of WCMP is multi-stakeholder community participation in local resource management, with the aim of accomplishing three objectives:

1. agree upon issues affecting the sustainable management of natural and physical resources,
2. identify and direct investigations to clarify issues and/or cause and effect relationships, and
3. initiate and support community-based action for achieving environmental objectives, and make recommendations to regulatory authorities for plan changes to achieve community objectives.

The project was expected to result in a catchment environmental strategy supported by community and local government, and a final report documenting the project process. It was also expected that the project would result in increased community participation in natural resources management, improved management of the catchment area, and improved health of the harbour.

The evaluation had two functions: to provide information for on-going program improvement (formative evaluation), and to determine the results and effects of the program to date (impact evaluation). Since no baseline data relating to the project outcomes had been collected at the start of the project and no detailed program for their evaluation built into the project structure, a goal-free or needs-based evaluation was determined to be the most appropriate approach. The evaluation process was participatory, in keeping with the nature of the project itself. It is also consistent with the goal-free evaluation method which requires substantial input from

participants since the focus is on what they are experiencing rather than what should have happened.

The multi-stakeholder group, which became known as Whaingaroa Environment or WE, was invited to participate in a facilitated discussion focused on the group's goals, criteria for success, achievements and difficulties, as well as proposals for improvements. Interviews were held with staff of the main environmental agencies operating in the catchment area, the Chairperson of the WE and various key community members who had in some way been associated with the project. The interview method was a semi-structured questionnaire. The participant-provided information was supplemented with information contained in record files.

Svendsen, Ann. 1998. *The Stakeholder Strategy: Profiting from Collaborative Business Relationships.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc. 207 pp.
Contact: Ann Svendsen, Senior Partner, CoreRelations, 3968 Southwood Street, Burnaby, BC V5J 2E6 Ph. (604) 437-6112; Email svendsen@istar.ca & http://www.corerelation.com

While aimed at the business community, the framework, guidelines and practical advice offered in this book about forming and maintaining positive and strong stakeholder relationships are broadly applicable. Svendsen discusses six steps in fostering collaborative relationships: creating a foundation, organizational alignment, strategy development, trust building, evaluation, and repeating/refining the process.

Svendsen discusses using a "stakeholder audit," or social accounting approach, to monitor performance on key social-relationship goals, clarify and improve "social" performance, and increase accountability through the reporting of the results. The audit is done in collaboration with stakeholders, both internal and external. Her framework for a fully integrated stakeholder audit consists of eight steps, reproduced below:

Step 1: Define the purpose and scope of the audit
Step 2: Clarify social mission, values and goals
Step 3: Perform baseline assessment and gap analysis
Step 4: Develop social performance measures
Step 5: Design a social performance monitoring system
Step 6: Prepare a stakeholder audit report
Step 7: Review results with stakeholders
Step 8: Align corporate systems and structures

Chapter 10 provides a step-by-step guide to designing and carrying out a stakeholder audit in a way that provides useful feedback and facilitates on-going learning.

2.1.2 Subject-Centred

Guston, David H. 1998. *Evaluating the Impact of the First U.S. Citizens' Panel on "Telecommunications and the Future of Democracy."* Paper delivered at the 1998 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, September 3-6.

Citizens' panels, also known as consensus conferences, have become quite popular in Europe. The first U.S. experience with this approach to citizen engagement occurred in April 1997. Professor Guston developed a four criterion framework to evaluate its impact: two are standard criteria used to evaluate the impact of policy analyses (actual impact and impact on general thinking), and two are specific to the learning and public participation features of citizen panels (impact on the training of knowledgeable personnel and the interaction of the analysis with lay-knowledge). The framework and a schematic research protocol are reproduced below.

The evaluation was conducted from the perspective of a potential sponsor or organizer of a citizen panel. Data was collected seven months after the panel, through semi-structured telephone interviews with the panelists, experts, professional staff, steering committee, and others associated with the panel.

Framework for Evaluating Impact of Policy Analysis

Category of Impact	Target of Impact	Type of Impact
Actual Impact	Policy	Substantive
General Thinking	Politics	Substantive & Procedural
Training of Knowledgeable Personnel	People (Elite)	Substantive & Procedural & Reflexive
Interaction with Lay-knowledge	People (Mass)	Substantive & Procedural & Reflexive

Schematic Research Protocol

Actual Impact

As a consequence of the analysis (consensus conference), has there been any change in relevant:

- legislation?
- funding?
- regulations?
- or any other concrete consequence to any authoritative public decision?

General Thinking

As a consequence of the analysis (consensus conference), has there been any change in relevant:

- vocabularies?
- Agendas?
- problem statements?
- or any other political aspect?

regarding:

- the substance of the policy issue discussed?
- the process or role of the analysis (consensus conference)?

Training of Knowledgeable Personnel

As a consequence of the analysis (consensus conference), has there been any learning:

- by elite participants?

regarding:

- the substance of the policy issue discussed?
- the process or role of the analysis (consensus conference)?
- the participants' own knowledge, role, organization, contacts, etc.?

Interaction with Lay Knowledge

As a consequence of the analysis (consensus conference), has there been any learning:

- by mass participants?
- and mass non-participants?

regarding:

- the substance of the policy issue discussed?
- the process or role of the analysis (consensus conference)?
- the participants' own knowledge, role, organization, contacts, etc.?

Bradbury, Judith A. and Branch, Kristi M. 1996. *Transportation External Coordination Working Group Evaluation.* Richland, Wash.: Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Environmental Management, Office of Transportation Emergency Management and Analytical Services. (Available from the National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161).

The Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC/WG) was formed in 1992 by two sponsoring offices of DOE, the Office of Environmental Management and the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. It includes State, Tribal and local officials, and representatives of industry and professional groups with responsibility for safety and emergency aspects of DOE radioactive materials transportation. The original objective in setting up the TEC/WG was to engage the various representatives in resolving common transportation issue and to focus and coordinate DOE transportation program efforts. However, between 1992 and 1996 changes in membership, DOE budget cuts and reorganizing, and evolution of the issues being addressed by the TEC/WG prompted DOE to confirm the continued effectiveness of the TEC/WG.

The purpose of the evaluation was to provide DOE and TEC/WG members with feedback about the value and achievements of the TEC/WG and information they could use to correct problems, plan next steps, and improve the usefulness and effectiveness of the Working Group. The evaluation staff worked with the TEC/WG participants to identify, clarify and develop agreement on the TEC/WG performance goals on which the evaluation would be based. This involved a

brainstorming session during one of the regular TEC/WG meetings and then working with a subcommittee of TEC/WG volunteers to refine the goals and develop a conceptual framework for the evaluation. An interview protocol was prepared, consisting of both numerical ratings, on a scale of 1-10, and qualitative comments. Thirty-one TEC/WG members and long-term participants were interviewed to obtain their assessment of the extent to which the working group was achieving its goals, key achievements, factors contributing to effectiveness, problems and possible ways of improving the working group process. A sample of DOE staff was also interviewed.

Six performance goals were evaluated:

- Address important and relevant issues and problems.
- Exchange information and improve coordination among the various representatives' organizations.
- Identify, characterize and reach closure on priority issues.
- Enhance overall transportation program organization, coordination and implementation (consistency, safety, efficiency, cost effectiveness, application of lessons learned).
- Enhance participant organizations' ability to carry out transportation emergency preparedness and safety responsibilities.
- Resolve institutional and coordination issues across the transportation system (remove barriers to safe, acceptable transport of the materials).

Bradbury, Judith, Branch, Kristi and Zalesny, Mary. 1997. Site-Specific Advisory Board Initiative 1997 Evaluation Survey Results: Volume 1, Summary Report and Volume II, Individual Site Results. Washington, DC: US Department of Energy, Office of Intergovernmental and Public Accountability.

Starting in 1993, the DOE Office of Intergovernmental and Public Accountability developed an evaluation component for the Department's multi-faceted public participation program (in response to a congressional requirement that DOE assess methods of improving public participation in its environmental and waste management activities). The evaluation effort was launched with the *Trust and Confidence Survey*, designed to obtain data on stakeholders' view of the Department and its Environmental Management Program. The survey was repeated in 1995 to provide time series data on trends in stakeholders' level of trust and confidence.

In 1994-95, the Office conducted an evaluation the Department's Public Participation Seminars Program and the Public Participation for Managers Training Program.

In 1995, the Office also launched an evaluation process for its Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Initiative. The SSAB Initiative was begun in 1992 when DOE named five sites – Fernald (Ohio), Hanford (Washington), Idaho Falls (Idaho), Rocky Flats (Colorado), and Savannah River (South Carolina) – as sites to take the lead in piloting its Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Initiative for site cleanup and waste management. By 1996, twelve SSABs had been established. The evaluation of the SSAB Initiative had two components: a self-evaluation conducted by each site and a survey conducted by Pacific Northwest National Laboratory for DOE-HQ. The evaluation was carried out in 1996 and then again in 1997, using the same data collection methods and instruments.

The SSAB evaluation was developed in collaboration with SSAB representatives during 1995 and involved four steps:

- Review of evaluation literature in relation to public participation and citizen advisory boards.
- Establishment of a steering committee and expert advisory panel.
- Identification of SSAB Initiative critical goals.
- Evaluation design, which involved identification of relevant SSAB and site issues and development of a self-evaluation survey instrument and guidance document to be applied by each site and a survey to be conducted by DOE-HQ.

The strategy initially focused on articulating in greater detail the expectations that derived from the overarching objective of increasing public participation in key site decisions and clarifying how these expectations translated into goals for success. The six goals resulting from this process, listed below, led to the identification of specific measures or actions to be taken. These then provided the basis for defining indicators of success.

Goal 1: **Establish processes and procedures to provide an effective forum for exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues.**

Measure: Establish effective processes and procedures (including use of a consensus process

Indicators: Board members clarify and agree on roles and responsibilities of all participants

DOE provides clear guidance and prompt resolution of administrative issues

Facilitation, staff support, and meeting management are in place to enable the Board to focus on substantive issues.

Board members agree on the procedures they will use to seek public input, prioritize key issues, develop advice and recommendations, and resolve differences.

Board members use consensus-seeking interaction techniques.

Measure: Provide a regular forum for expression of diverse values and debate of key issues

Indicators: Board membership reflects a diversity of viewpoints

The Board ensures that meetings are publicized, held regularly, are open to the public and are accessible to those who wish to participate.

Discussion of site priorities and issues include opportunities for input from Board members.

Board members solicit input from stakeholders prior to and during Board meetings.

Goal 2: Facilitate interaction and exchange of information and viewpoints regarding DOE site issues.

Measure: Contribute to Board members' and the broader public's understanding of the basis for key site decisions.

Indicators: Site representatives discuss with the Board important policies affecting decisions.

Boards and DOE inform the public on key site issues and decisions through formal and informal mechanisms.

DOE makes information available to the Board on key site issues.

Board members use various methods to acquire sufficient knowledge of the site, key site issues, and broader public viewpoints regarding the site.

Correspondence to the Board includes DOE's rationale or basis for key site decisions.

The Board makes its activities and recommendations known and accessible to the broader public.

Board meetings allow members to discuss among themselves diverse viewpoints and responses to key issues.

Measure: Contribute to DOE and regulators' understanding of the public's viewpoints regarding key site issues.

Indicators: Correspondence from the Board to DOE includes the rationale/basis for its recommendations.

Board meetings allow members to discuss with DOE and regulator representatives, the public's viewpoints and responses to key site issues.

Measure: Contribute to establishing a constructive working relationship among the Board members, DOE, and the regulators.

Indicators: SSAB members interact effectively.

SSAB members perceive their relationship to be constructive.

Collaborative problem solving occurs at Board meetings.

Measure: Seek consensus viewpoints and recommendations.

Indicators: SSABs agree upon the definition of "consensus."

SSAB members perceive that consensus is reached on key site issues.
SSAB members voicing dissenting opinions feel the majority considered their positions fairly.

Goal 3: Provide useful advice and /or recommendations to DOE (and regulators, where appropriate).

Measure: Provide informed advice and recommendations.

Indicators: Board invites expert advice/opinion to discussions, debates, deliberations on key policy issues and proposed solutions.
The Board provides sufficient time for discussions and reflection on the issues and solutions.
The Board summarizes and reports to DOE its discussions, data and values, and the rationale supporting its advice.
SSAB members reach agreement about prioritization of key site issues for Board advice is sought.

Measure: Provide timely advice and recommendations.

Indicators: The Board presents DOE a written document summarizing its advice prior to DOE decision deadlines.
DOE requires Board advice well in advance of decision deadlines.
The Board manages its agenda to address issues in a timely manner.

Measure: Provide advice and recommendations that reflect an understanding of the viewpoints and priorities of the community.

Indicators: Board advice reflects consideration of the diversity of viewpoints on the Board and in the broader community.
The Board solicits feedback from the community on its advice and actions.

Goal 4: Improve DOE's (and where applicable the regulators') site decisions and decision-making process.

Measure: DOE explains its site decision-making process.

Indicators: SSAB members understand the decision-making process used to make key site decisions.
DOE clarifies how site decisions and issues are related to one another.

Measure: DOE's site decision-making process provides for effective public involvement.

Indicators: The Board identifies and addresses site policy-level decisions.
The Board has the opportunity to provide input into problem definition and identification of alternatives.

DOE allows for the expression of various/diverse viewpoints in its decision-making process.
DOE is perceived as willing to listen to all viewpoints.
Stakeholders know the results of DOE's key site decision-making process.
DOE allows for revision or changes in the decision making process as situations warrant.

Measure: Key site decisions reflect consideration of Board advice.

Indicators: Site representatives discuss Board advice with Board members before key site decisions are made.
Boards receive timely, useful responses to their advice from DOE.
Key site decisions and policies reflect Board recommendations or an explanation of why they do not.
DOE identifies areas where Board advice has made a difference.

Goal 5: Lead to more acceptable actions.

Measure: DOE's (and regulators", where appropriate) actions are consistent with stated decisions and reflect Board advice.

Indicators: DOE provides information showing how Board advice is reflected in site decisions.

Measure: Board members support DOE's site actions.

Indicators: Board members support DOE's site actions.
Board members support DOE decision/actions in their communities, national stakeholder, congressional, and regulator interactions

Measure: Board members and the public perceive progress is being made on key issues

Goal 6. Contribute to trust and confidence in DOE.

Measure: Participants in the SSAB Initiative are perceived as willing to be accountable to the public.

Indicators: SSABs make their decisions and actions known to the public.
SSABs respond to public inquiries and comments about their decisions and actions.

Measure: Public trust and confidence in DOE and its site decisions/actions increases (remains high) over time.

Bradbury, Judith and Branch, Kristi. 1999. ***An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Local Site-Specific Advisory Boards for U.S. Department of Energy Environmental Restoration Programs.*** **Washington, DC: Pacific Northwest Laboratory.**

This study is a follow-up to the 1996 and 1997 studies discussed above. The survey data collected over the two-year period revealed wide variations in board performance and significant change from one year to the next. To gain a better understanding of the factors affecting board performance, DOE initiated a more in-depth, qualitative study of nine of the boards.

The study focused on the quality of board discourse and interaction at three levels: among board members, between board members and the broader public, and between board members and DOE and the regulators. The data used to characterize board performance and identify these factors were obtained through observations of board and subcommittee meetings, in-person interviews with board members and staff, telephone interviews with board members unavailable for in-person interviews, and a review of documentation relating to each board.

Where the quality of board discourse and interaction was weak, boards were found to be less able to achieve their basic purpose of seeking consensus among diverse views, providing independent advice to DOE reflecting that consensus, and providing a channel of communication with the surrounding community. Six factors were found to affect the quality of discourse:

- Community Context: extent of local social conflict, whether there was a history of involvement, and/or the degree of controversy associated with site remediation or defense programs.
- Board Composition: extent to which the board reflected the diversity of surrounding communities.
- Purpose, Goals, and Commitment to Consensus: whether basic purpose of the board had been explicitly defined and agreed to, and degree of commitment of individual board members to including a wide range of community viewpoints.
- Internal Process and Functions: Whether leadership was effective in conducting meetings and encouraging the seeking of common ground.
- Public Engagement: efforts made to engage the public.
- DOE and Regulator Engagement: extent to which DOE and regulators became involved in and provide positive feedback on SSAB activities.

Rosener, Judy B. 1983. "The Sanibel Evaluation: What Was Learned?" In ***Public Involvement Techniques: A Reader of Ten Years Experience at the Institute for Water***

***Resources.*, eds. James Creighton, Jerry Delli Priscoli, and Mark Dunning, 409-423. Ft. Belvoir, VA: The Institute for Water Resources, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.**

This somewhat dated study is included here because it offers another good example of a qualitative approach to performance assessment that still has relevance as a methodology for evaluating specific citizen engagement activities. The evaluation criteria and indicators address the perspective of both agency program managers and citizens and were developed in consultation with them. Individuals participating in the consultation process (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers staff and representatives of citizen and environmental groups) were interviewed prior to the commencement of the citizen engagement activity (which involved a series of workshops to inform the public about and gain support for a general permitting procedure relating to the diking and filling of wetlands). The purpose of the pre-workshop one-on-one interviews was to obtain information on people's goals and objectives for the workshops. This resulted in two sets of evaluation criteria, one reflecting the agency's interests and the other reflecting the environmentalists' interests. The workshops were then evaluated in terms of the agreed-upon goals and objectives using three techniques – questionnaires, post-workshop interviews and direct observation by the evaluators.

The following is a summary of the workshop goals and objectives and related evaluation criteria applied in the Sanibel Workshop case:

Sanibel Workshop Evaluation		
Evaluation Criteria for the Goals and Objectives of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers		
Goals	**Objectives**	**Evaluation Criteria**
Create a positive public image	Provide a mechanism for positive interaction	Indications of positive interaction
	Explain Agency responsibilities	Indication that participants understand Agency responsibilities
	Ask citizens to develop their own conditions for a general permit	Indication that the Agency will use the citizen-developed conditions
Conduct a needs assessment re the interior wetlands of Sanibel	Find out what various interest groups want in the way of interior wetlands protection on Sanibel	Indication that citizen concerns are identified and acknowledged by the Agency
	Find out what kind of general permit administration and enforcement are desired	Indication that the citizens expressed their concerns about administration and enforcement of general permit conditions

Share decision making responsibility with the citizens of Sanibel	Provide a mechanism for integrating citizen ideas, alternatives and options into Agency regulatory actions	Indication that ideas, options and alternatives suggested in the workshops are reflected in the conditions for the Sanibel general permit
Streamline permit process and provide certainty to landowners, public officials and environmentalists	Provide a mechanism where criteria can be developed which would allow the Agency to issue one permit rather than several individual permits Provide a forum to identify conflict and consensus prior to issuance of a general permit Provide a forum for resolving conflict regarding future land use	Indication that conditions developed in the workshop generate support for the general permit process Indication that areas of conflict and consensus are identified Indication that land use conflicts are resolved
Facilitate permit enforcement	Develop relationship with local government which will facilitate enforcement	Indication of agreement between the Agency and Sanibel City Council re enforcement responsibilities of each
Train agency personnel in citizen participation techniques	Involve Agency personnel in a real situation of interacting with citizens in a joint learning process and where Agency personnel gain experience acting as neutral facilitators	Indication that Agency personnel learned to act as neutral facilitators and were perceived by participants to have been effective in their role and fostered joint learning
Develop a constructive alternative to the public hearing process	Provide a mechanism other than the public hearing that will address and satisfy citizen concerns about the general permit process	Lack of citizen demand for a public hearing
Evaluation Criteria for the Goals and Objectives of the Environmentalists		
Goals	**Objectives**	**Evaluation Criteria**
Protect the interior wetlands of Sanibel	Agreement between the Agency and workshop participants on definition of “wetland” and “protection” Develop conditions which are restrictive enough to protect the wetlands Develop conditions that are enforceable	Maps which show clearly where wetlands are General Permit conditions are acceptable to the environmentalists Assurance re how conditions will be enforced
Share decision making responsibility with the Agency in its regulatory activities on Sanibel	Provide a mechanism where citizens can help write the general permit conditions and provide input into how they will be administered and enforced	Indications that the Agency’s general permit includes conditions developed in the workshops and that administrative and enforcement

		procedures reflect concerns raised in the workshops
Provide certainty to land-owners about development of the wetlands and settle the issue of wetlands protection	Develop a general permit that is clear about what can and cannot be done in or near wetlands	Issuance of a general permit that is clear about conditions and to what lands they apply

Poland, Brenda. 1993. *A Participant-Centred Evaluation of Public Participation: The Hamilton-Wentworth Case*. Toronto: York University, Faculty of Environmental Studies.

In June 1990, the Ontario Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth established a Task Force on Sustainable Development to develop a vision for the future of the region. It consisted of 16 citizens and 3 regional councilors, representing a broad range of community interests including agriculture, business, community organizations, education, health services, labour, environmental organizations, social services and urban development. The Task Force was directed to establish a public outreach program to increase public awareness of the concept of sustainable development and obtain feedback on potential goals, objectives and policies for the region.

The evaluation was based on participants' perceptions of the extent to which the stated nine public participation goals established by the Task Force, listed below, were met.

Education

- To inform the general population of the basic principles of sustainable development and of the purpose and mandate of the Task Force.
- To inform citizens of the range of regional government activities such as services, public expenditure and investment, the regional official plan and the economic strategy.
- To communicate information generated by citizens back to the public.

Citizen Input Goals

- To gather citizen concerns and perceptions regarding the quality of their environment and life that can be used to identify issues.
- To gather citizen perspectives on basic values and goals that can be used to develop a set of principles to guide the preparation of a regional vision statement.

Quality Goals

- To reach out to groups in the population that do not have a formal place in the decision-making process such as children, youth, the disadvantaged and the non-English speaking community.
- To develop community awareness and support for the work of the Task Force that will result in long term community support for the implementation of the regional vision statement.
- To achieve meaningful citizen participation that provides good quality information to the Task Force and is an empowering exercise for citizens.
- To draw out those citizens who wish to be involved more deeply in the Task Force's work as members of issue working groups.

A focus group was conducted to aid in the design of the survey instrument, as well as gather perspectives on the Task Force's public consultation process. Over 1000 citizens became involved in the Task Force's work. Forty people were randomly selected from the participant list and sent a letter inviting them to take part in the focus group. Assistance with childcare and transportation was offered. Nine people participated in the 2-hour focus group session. Information from the focus group was then used to code possible responses to a close-ended questionnaire. The survey was administered to people who had participated in workshops held by the Task Force. A similar survey was also sent to 78 working group and implementation team members (the Task Force established 8 working groups to explore specific topics in more detail and make recommendations to the Task Force).

Poland concluded that most of the Task Force's goals were not fully met. The mean scores for many of the measures assessed were mid-range between poor and excellent. Her study also revealed that the participants' expectations and goals re their involvement were often different from those of the Task Force (e.g., people became involved because of the opportunity to meet interesting people and because they wanted to experience a more open form of governance).

2.1.3 Concept-Focused

Rifkin, Susan B., Bjaras, Gunilla and Haglund, Bo J. A. 1991. "A New Approach to Community Participation Assessment." ***Health Promotion International*****, 6 (3), 199-206.**
See also: Rifkin S.B., Muller, F. and Bichmann, W. 1988. "Primary Health Care: On Measuring Participation." ***Social Science and Medicine*****, 26, 931-940.**

The work of Rifkin et al offer an example of a "concept-focused" approach to evaluation of citizen engagement. This qualitative method, initially developed in 1988, endeavours to focus attention on meaningful aspects of "community participation." They began by defining community participation as "a social process whereby specific groups with shared needs living in a defined geographic area actively pursue identification of their needs, take decisions and establish mechanisms to meet their needs." The overall aim of the evaluation process, thus, is to assess track the social change process.

Drawing upon an analysis of over 100 case studies of community participation in health programs, Rifkin et al identified five factors as appropriate measures of community participation as a social process:

- Needs Assessment – how were needs identified?
- Leadership – how were decisions made?
- Organization – how were goals achieved?
- Resource Mobilization – how were resources mobilized and allocated?
- Management – who was involved in managing the program?

A list of standardized questions/indicators was developed for each factor. The model calls for the ranking of the five indicators, on a five-point scale. This can be done by expert evaluators or by the stakeholders.

Needs Assessment

- Who identified them?
- What role if any was foreseen for community people in conducting needs assessments?
- If surveys were carried out, were the surveys used merely to get information or also to initiate discussions with various possible beneficiaries?
- Were potential beneficiaries involved in analyzing the results?
- Was only one assessment made or is it an exercise for change, review and further involvement of community people in program planning?
- How were the results of the assessment used in the planning of the program?
- If community people were involved in the assessment, did they continue to be involved in the implementation?
- Was the needs assessment able to include various representatives from the wide range of possible beneficiaries?

Leadership

- Which groups are represented in the leadership and how are they represented?
- How was the leadership chosen and how has it changed?
- What type of leadership (democratic, inherited, authoritative) is it?
- How are decisions made?
- How does the leadership respond to the poor and marginalized people?
- How does the leadership respond to the demands of outside organizations in terms of gaining resources for the poor as well as the better off?
- How does the leadership mobilize support?
- What is the attitude of the leadership towards the intervention?
- Have most of the decisions by the leadership resulted in improvements of the majority of people, for only the elites, for the poor?

Organization

- How was the organization focusing on community needs development?
- If new organizations were created, how do they related to existing organizations?
- Are the goals shared by other organizations?
- How does the organization get resources?
- How do the leaders mobilize support?
- What kind of input do the resource holders have in the organization?
- Has the representation and the focus of the organization changed and, if so, how and to whose benefit?
- Who staffs the organization?
- Who ‘owns’ the program?
- Is there a need for a separate, program-specific organization?
- How is the organization funded?
- What is the relationship of health professionals to the organization?
- How flexible is the organization in responding to change?

Resource Mobilization

- What have beneficiaries contributed?
- What percentage of total requirements comes from these groups?

- What resources are being brought into play?
- Who decided how indigenous resources should be used?
- Do all groups that contribute have decision-making role?
- How do the poor benefit from allocations to which, because of their poverty, they can make little contribution?
- How are resources mobilized from the community?
- Which groups influenced mobilization and how do they do it?
- Whose interests are being served in both the mobilization and allocation of resources?
- How are mechanisms developed to decide upon allocations and are they flexible or rigid?

Management

- What is the line of responsibility for management and what are the roles of the beneficiaries in managing the program?
- On whom does the ultimate responsibility lie?
- Who decides on the activities and allocation of resources?
- Has the decision-making structures changed to favour certain groups and, if so, which groups?
- Have the management structures expanded to broaden the decision-making groups?

Each factor is placed on a continuum, from no participation (professionals take all decisions) to full participation (community people plan, implement and evaluate the program, using professionals as resource people). The assessment of participation is to be done at different times in the program thereby charting the extent and nature of change occurring in the community. The method is descriptive and does not attempt to determine whether the participation is "good" or "bad." This would require further in-depth analysis of the dynamics of the community's participation in the program. Nonetheless, it does offer a fairly explicit way of evaluating community participation in program delivery.

The framework was refined in 1991 in an assessment of a specific community intervention program aimed at preventing accidents. The assessment was accomplished during a 2-day workshop using data gathered during two periods, 2 and 4 years after the program started. Participant observations and structured interviews with 15 selected key persons from both the health sector and the community were the methods used to collect data during the two periods. This information, together with data kept in a logbook by the project leader during the four years, was made available to the participants in the workshop. In addition, the workshop participants were given the opportunity to ask questions directly of the project leader. The workshop

participants adjusted the list of standardized questions developed by Rifkin et al and changed the five-point evaluation scale to a three-point scale. The ranking scheme they devised is shown below.

Ranking Scale for Process Indicators of Community Participation - Degree of Participation			
Indicators	**Narrow (1)**	**Medium (2)**	**Wide (3)**
Needs Assessment	Professionals decide	Professionals and community defined needs together	"Community" asks for program
Leadership	Represents a small group of people	Combination of groups' interests	Represents many groups' interests
Organization	Rigid purpose, run by one or few organizations, run by professionals	In between	Flexibility in meeting goals. Includes non-professionals.
Resource mobilization	No contribution from beneficiaries (only official funds)	In between	Beneficiaries providing the major contribution
Management	"External" professionals make all decisions	Joint decisions by professionals and community	"Community" makes the decisions using professionals as resources

In this case, the workshop participants were all professionals actively involved in evaluation of community involvement in various health programs, none of whom had been involved in the program that was assessed.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Cooperative State Research, Education, Extension Service and the University of Arizona, Cooperative Extension Service. 1999. *Evaluating National Outcomes: Community.* Special Project Number 98-EXCA-3-0707.
Available on-site at: http://ag.arizona.edu/fcr/fs/nowg/comm_index.html

A "community change" concept, rooted in an ecological or systemic view of change processes, is being used by the Community National Outcome Workgroup, as the basis for evaluating community program outcomes. The Workgroup consists of expert educators, program developers and evaluators from 14 states. The framework they developed consists of four interdependent "indicator areas" relevant to assessing change at the community level: process development, resource development, policy development and citizen development.

With respect to "citizen development," the Workgroup identified four factors thought to be key to citizens becoming mobilized and able to take an active role in their community: citizen capacity building/human capital; community assets; empowerment, and citizen participation.

Although this framework is focused on evaluating outcomes of community programs and not citizen engagement, it would be an appropriate framework to use, with some adaptation, in cases where "community change" is a goal of the citizen engagement.

2.1.4 Normative

Webler, Thomas. 1995. "Right Discourse in Citizen Participation: An Evaluation Yardstick." In *Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation: Evaluating Models for Environmental Discourse*, eds. Renn, Ortwin, Webler, Thomas and Wiedeman, Peter, pp. 35-86. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Tom Webler, a U.S. academic and practitioner, and Ortwin Renn, a German academic and practitioner, have been instrumental in making "critical theory" and the work of Jurgen Habermas central to current debates about what is needed to improve citizen engagement processes. Their emphasis is on assessing the fairness and competence of the process of citizen engagement as opposed to the outcome of such processes. "Fairness" in their framework means "people presume each other to have equal chances to affect the formulation of the agreement." When a process is "fair" everyone has equal opportunities to set the agenda and rules for discussion, access information, and ask questions and discuss issues. Competent understanding of the matters at hand is essential for people to exercise their personal freedoms effectively. "Competence" thus refers to the personal qualities of the people involved and, equally important, to the way in which their competence is supported. "All participants must be provided with the support they need to make competent decisions."

Working with these two meta-criteria and drawing upon Habermas' theories of democracy and communicative action, Webler devised a framework for evaluating citizen engagement processes. It consists of 3 criteria and 9 indicators to assess fairness and 4 criteria and 23 indicators to assess competence. Each indicator also has a set of specific evaluation questions. Only the criteria and indicators are reproduced below.

Fairness

Criterion 1 Agenda and Process Rule Setting

Indicators The process should provide everyone with an equal chance to put their concerns on the agenda and to approve or propose rules for discourse.

The process should provide everyone with an equal chance to debate and critique proposals for the agenda and the rules.

The process should make certain that everyone has an equal chance to influence the final decision about the agenda and the discourse rules.

Criterion 2 Process Facilitation

Indicators The process should provide everyone with an equal chance to suggest a moderator and a method for facilitation.

The process should provide everyone with an equal chance to challenge and support suggestions by others for a moderator and a method for facilitation.

The process should provide everyone with an equal chance to influence the final selection of moderator and moderation method.

Criterion 3 Open Dialogue

Indicators The process should provide everyone who is potentially affected by the decision proposal (positively or negatively) an equal chance to be present or represented at the discourse.

The process should make certain that everyone has an equal chance to put forth and criticize validity claims about language, facts, norms, and expressions.

The process should make creation that the method chosen to resolve validity claim redemption dispute be consensually chosen before the discourse began.

Competence

Criterion 1 Standards and Definitions

Indicators The process should provide everyone equal access to the sources for commonly agreed-upon standards and definitions.

The process should confirm that everyone has an understanding of each others' terms, definitions, and concepts.

The process should make certain that disputes about definitions, terms, and concepts take advantage of pre-established reference standards.

Criterion 2 Information

Indicators The process should provide everyone equal access to the available and relevant systematic knowledge about the objective world.

The process should provide everyone equal access to the available and relevant anecdotal and intuitive knowledge about the objective world.

The process should make certain that the uncertainty of factual information is considered along with content.

The process should include a mechanism to check if factual claims are consistent with the prevailing opinion in the expert community or consistent with the anecdotal knowledge of other people not involved in the discourse.

The process should provide a means to separate cognitive claims from normative claims.

The process should provide the participants with the option to delegate determinations of factual truth to an outside expert panel.

The process should make sure that legal experts examine cognitive legal claims.

Criterion 3 Inclusiveness

Indicators The process should not contain any implicit barriers that will bias the distribution of interests that participate.

The process should determine the affected population using objective criteria but also allow the people in the general region to make subjective determinations.

The process should promote both the discovery and the development of mutual understanding of values among all the participants.

The process should make certain that the factual implications of normative choices are considered in practical discourse.

The process should promote, through rational and formal discourse procedures that build compromises, the discovery and development of a mutual understanding of values in order to formulate a generalized will.

The process should make certain that normative choices are not inconsistent with themselves or with the general will.

	The process should make certain that normative choices are not incompatible with laws. The process should make certain that normative choices are compatible with present expectations.
Criterion 4	Authenticity
Indicators	The process should promote discussion about the authenticity of the speaker's expressive claims. The process should promote an examination into the speakers' sincerity. The process should promote an examination into the qualities of the situation. The process should provide individuals time enough to accurately state and defend their expressive claims. The process should use a translation scheme that is acceptable to everyone.
Criterion 5	Consensus Process
Indicators	The process should reduce the misunderstanding before reaching for agreement. The decision as to which validity claims are redeemed by the group should be made using a technique that was consensually pre-approved.

For additional examples of critical theory/normative frameworks for evaluating citizen engagement see Section 2 B, journal articles by William Boyce, B.D. Crawley et al, T.B. Lauber et al, and G. J. Syme et al.

2.2 Books, Reports and Journal Articles

2.2.1 Books and Reports

Cousins, J. B., Donohue, J.J. and Bloom, G.A. 1995. *Collaborative Evaluation: Survey of Practice in North America.* Education Resources Information Centre. 120 pp.
See also: Cousins, J. B., Donohue, J.J. and Bloom, G.A. 1996. "Collaborative Evaluation in North America: Evaluators' Self-Reported Opinions, Practices and Consequences." *Evaluation Practice* 17 (3), 207-226.

Forms of evaluation that involve evaluators working collaboratively with practitioners on applied social research projects are becoming increasingly common, but a body of empirical literature that warrants firm conclusions about collaborative evaluation has not yet been accumulated. This study surveyed the views of North American evaluators and program practitioners. The survey approach was based on a conceptual framework incorporating pragmatic, philosophical, and political interests. It also took into account three key dimensions of the evaluation process: control of evaluation decision making, stakeholder selection, and depth of participation by program practitioners.

An 8-page questionnaire was completed by 564 North American evaluators from professional association mailing lists. A subsample of 348 also selected and provided data on a recently completed collaborative evaluation. Sixty-seven practitioners who had collaborated returned parallel questionnaires. Findings revealed that evaluators tend to support pragmatic over political or philosophical justifications for collaborative evaluation and subscribe to a stakeholder-service orientation to the role. Attitudes toward such evaluation were generally positive, but they were found to depend on evaluators' experience with and involvement in such activities. Evaluators reported that stakeholder involvement was generally more extensive than might be considered typical for traditional stakeholder-based evaluation, but was limited to mostly non-technical research tasks. A wide range of stakeholder groups participated. Evaluators also tended to lean toward evaluator control rather than a balanced approach to evaluation decision making. In general, these self-reports found the impacts of the evaluation projects to be very favorable.

Renn, Ortwin, Webler, Thomas and Wiedeman, Peter. 1995. *Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation: Evaluating Models for Environmental Discourse.* London: Kluwer Academic Publishers. 381 pp.

The book presents the results of an evaluation of 8 prominent examples of key methods of public participation, using the normative critical theory framework developed by Tom Webler in collaboration with Ortwin Renn. The methods evaluated were: citizen advisory committees, citizen juries, planning cells, consensus roundtables, regulatory negotiation, mediation, voluntary siting of noxious facilities, and the Dutch national debate on energy policy that used a multiple group approach.

INTRAC. 1999. *The Monitoring and Evaluation of Empowerment: Resource Document.* Oxford. 58 pp. Available on-line at: http://www.intrac.org
Contact: intrac@gn.apc.org

This report provides an overview of common approaches to empowerment in development, key issues for monitoring and evaluating, and methods and instruments for collecting information. It addresses the question "how can we know when previously powerless, marginalized or disadvantaged groups have been empowered and thus better able to confront and deal with those forces which influence their development?" The conclusion presented in the report is that "there is no single method or instrument that we can use in order to monitor, and ultimately evaluate a process of empowerment. The evidence from both studies and from the practice is that we cannot simply prepare a questionnaire – the classical instrument of development research – and expect to be able to understand the evolution of a process of empowerment. The process does not easily reveal itself; nor is it easy to quantify." Their main conclusion is that qualitative processes of development demand qualitative approaches to their monitoring and a radically different framework of evaluation. "Basically, "empowerment" cannot be evaluated if it has not been monitored."

2.2.2 Articles

Boyce, William. 1993. "Evaluating Participation in Community Programs: An Empowerment Paradigm." ***The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation/La Revue Canadienne D'Évaluation de Programme*** **8 (1): 89-102.**

The author argues that an *empowerment paradigm* is more appropriate for evaluation of community participation than the *paradigm of efficiency*, and further that evaluation methods should focus on determining whether *justice* was served. He points out that the stakeholder approach to evaluation does not resolve conflicts among diverse groups or address the distribution of power among stakeholders with the result that the views of the most influential stakeholders, and the most likely to be less in need, tend to prevail.

Boyce proposes that empowerment evaluation be based on an explicit *code of participatory ethics* that would provide the basis for specifying evaluation criteria (fairness, equality and justice) and indicators.

Fairness:	Non-coercion
	Universality
	Community self-interest

Equality: Lack of bias
Degree of influence

Justice: Rationality
Respect for Individual Rights

He proposes that the code be developed by a provincial community panel through a process of public hearings. The panel would include government officials and representatives of community groups as equal partners. Professional evaluators would take on the role of advisors. He outlines the participatory values that should be incorporated into the code (equity, autonomy, impartiality, reciprocity, and equality of power relations among groups).

Cawley, B.D., Keeping, L.M., Levy, P.E. 1998. "Participation in the Performance Appraisal Process and Employee Reactions: A Meta-Analytic Review of Field Investigations." ***Journal of Applied Psychology*** **83 (4): 615-633.**
Contact: plevy@uakron.edu

The relationship between participation in the performance appraisal process and various employee reactions was explored through the meta-analysis of 27 studies containing 32 individual samples. Various conceptualizations and operationalizations of participation and employee reactions also were discussed and analyzed. Overall, appraisal participation was most strongly related to and value-expressive participation (i.e., participation for the sake of having one's "voice" heard) had a stronger relationship with most of the reaction criteria than did instrumental participation (i.e., participation for the purpose of influencing the end result). The results are discussed within the framework of *organizational justice*.

Lauber, T.B., Knuth, B.A. 1999, "Measuring Fairness in Citizen Participation: A Case Study of Moose Management ». ***Society and Natural Ressources Journal*****, 12 (1).**

This is a case study of the citizen participation processes used by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) when deciding whether to reintroduce moose to New York. It focused on how citizens perceived the *fairness* and *quality of the process* and identified the criteria on which they based their perceptions. The work was grounded in research on the social psychology of *procedural fairness*. Research was conducted in three phases: a document analysis, a series of interviews, and a mail survey of citizens who commented on the issue. Citizens' perceptions of the fairness of the process were related to four criteria: DEC's receptivity to citizen input; the influence citizens had over the decision; the quality of DEC's

knowledge and reasoning; and the degree to which relationships improved during the process. Perceptions of the fairness of the process were related to satisfaction with the process, perceptions of fairness of the decision, and satisfaction with DEC.

Lawrence, R.L., Daniels, S.E., Stanley, G.H. 1997. "Procedural Justice and Public Involvement in Natural Resource Decision-Making." ***Society and Natural Resources*** **10 (6): 577-559.**

The public involvement programs of natural resource agencies tended to be broadly criticized as unresponsive to public desires. Historically, improving natural resource decisions has been the primary goal of public participation programs. The authors advocate the adoption of *procedural justice* as a new conceptual basis for public involvement and the recognition of the importance of procedures as well as outcomes. They note that procedural justice theory is based on a balancing of the self-interest and group-value models of behavior. Issues that arise in the operationalization of this theory for natural resource decision-making include (I) the impact on interest group in addition to individual participants, (2) impacts on non-participants, (3) effects of historical mistrust, and (4) measures of procedural fairness.

Robertson, Q.M., Moye, N.A., Locke, E.A. 1999. "Identifying a Missing Link Between Participation and Satisfaction: The Mediating Role of Procedural Justice Perceptions." ***Journal of Applied Psychology*** **84 (4): 585-593**

This study examined the mediating role of *procedural justice* in the relationship between participation and satisfaction. The study design used 3 possible goal-setting methods: assigned, self-set, and participative. A total of 235 undergraduate students participated in 3 trials of a class-scheduling task. Structural equation modeling of the predicted model showed that the perceived degree of participation affected people's satisfaction through effects on their perceived fairness of participation in decision-making procedures. Tests of an alternative model further supported the hypothesized relationship. The results suggested that perceived justice may be responsible, at least in part, for people's sense of satisfaction.

Rowe, G., Frewer, L.J. 2000. "Public Participation Methods: A Framework for Evaluation." ***Science Technology and Human Values*** **25 (1): 3-29.**

Given that the quality of the output of any public participation exercise is difficult to determine, the authors suggest the need to consider which aspects of the process are desirable and then to measure the presence or quality of these process aspects. To this end, a number of theoretical

evaluation criteria thought to be essential for effective public participation are specified. These comprise two types: *acceptance criteria*, which concern features of a method that make it acceptable to the wider public, and *process criteria*, which concern features of the process that are liable to ensure that it takes place in an effective manner. Future research needs to develop instruments to measure these criteria more precisely and identify the contextual and environmental factors that will mediate the effectiveness of the different participation methods.

Syme, G.J., Nancarrow, B.E., McCreddin, J.A. 1999. "Defining the components of fairness in the allocation of water to environmental and human uses" *Journal of Environmental Management* 57 (1): 50-70.

This work provides an excellent example of application of social science research to decision making in a natural resource management context. Although focused on natural resource management, both the research approach and findings offer valuable insights for addressing stakeholder involvement in public decision-making processes, especially where fairness of the allocation of goods or services is an issue. This paper summarizes a research program undertaken by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization of Western Australia. It involves seven studies conducted over 10 years since the late 1980s and has developed social psychological theories of justice, equity and fairness for application to the implementation and evaluation of water allocation decisions.

The initial study tested the adequacy of *equity and procedural justice theories* in providing explanations about people's evaluation of decision-making about water allocation. These theories were found to be to limited in scope.. Therefore, the second and third studies developed alternative *universal fairness principles* and adopted the fairness heuristic as a concept for judging the *justice* of individual water allocation decisions. The most recent four studies shifted the focus to the local or *situational fairness* contexts. Three of the studies were survey-based and one was an action research project to develop fairness-based rules for community management.

Of primary interest here are the authors' findings with respect to "procedural justice" or the characteristics of the decision making process that make it seem just to people vulnerable to the consequences of the decision. The first three studies revealed that the public's universal fairness principles when it came to the allocation of water were relatively stable over a decade and thus could provide useful criteria for judging water allocation decisions in specific situations. Water was consistently seen as a public good; the environment was seen to have rights to water; and procedural issues – everyone should have a right to have a say in the decision being made -- were

important in allocation decision-making. This suggests that similar universal fairness principles might be found for other kinds of allocation issues.

The overall conclusion from last four studies was that local procedural justice issues, particularly those pertaining to the involvement of local people in the decision-making process, were significant determinants of judgements of the fairness of the outcomes of the decision-making. This finding reveals the dynamic inter-relationship between process and product and underscores the importance of meeting people's process needs and expectations.

2.3 Internet Resources

2.3.1 Public Involvement – Sources for "Best Practices" Criteria

http://www.americaspeaks.org/

The mission of AmericaSpeaks, a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization, is "to strengthen democracy by creating mechanisms that are accessible to the public and reflect the realities of the 21st Century." In 1995 and 1996 the Principals of AmericaSpeaks spent 8 months going across the country to study communities that had successful stories of citizen initiated and led projects addressing specific community issues. The website summarizes what was learned about sustainable citizen engagement, drawing as well upon the experience of ten civic engagement practitioners.

http://www.candcinc.com

This is the web site for Creighton and Creighton Inc., a U.S. consulting company that specializes in the development of guides on public participation, dispute resolution, and related topics for government agencies and the utility industry in the United States. Many of the guides they have produced can be sourced through their website.

http://www.indepsec.org/pathfinder/innovations/index.html

This site is a collaboration between an organization called Independent Sector and the University of Maryland Civil Society Initiative. The section of this web site titled "Innovations," found under the heading "Independent Sector Resources," provides profiles of programs involving "innovative experiments that demonstrate new possibilities for addressing human needs while revitalizing democratic participation across sectors." The sectors include arts & culture, economic development, education, environment, food & hunger, governance, health, housing,

security & justice, senior citizens, technology, transportation, and youth. The mini case studies are described as "innovative models" and are all U.S. based.

http://www.massey.ac.nz/nrm/changelinks/co_man.html

This page is authored by Will Allen, Natural Resource Management Program, Massey University, New Zealand. It provides an excellent gateway to other internet sites providing information on organizations, projects, studies and handbooks/guides relating to collaborative approaches to planning and management of natural resources.

http://www.partnerships.org.uk/guide/index.htm

This WebPage offers "The Guide to Effective Participation" developed by David Wilcox in 1994 for "community activists and professionals seeking to get other people involved in social, economic and environmental projects and programs."

http://www.pin.org/PIN%20Links/pinlinks.html

This site is part of IAP2's web site. It lists 64 public involvement links.

http://www.pip.org.uk/models.htm

See also: http://www.pip.org.uk/reference.thm; http://www.pip.org.uk/links.htm; and http://www.pip.org.uk/opinion.htm

The "models" Web Page is an excellent one for those interested in learning about the latest trends in public participation. It provides a good introduction current innovative approaches including citizens' juries, deliberative opinion polls, standing panels, community issue groups, consensus conferences, electronic methodology, and future search conferences. The site's "Literature Page" offers several references on evaluation methods. The "opinion" section contains a report of an IPPR/LGA Seminar titled "Best Value in Public Consultation Guidance, Guidelines, Minimum Standards, which sets out a set of "indicators of good practice."

http://www2.conferenceboard.ca/ccbc/knowledge-areas/stakeholderrelations/stakeholder-relations.htm

This Web Page, titled "Taking Action on Stakeholder Relations," is under construction. For updates and information call CCBC at (613) 526-3280 or email them at CCBC@conferenceboard.ca

2.3.2 Evaluation General

http://agmconnnect.org/agmwebmanager.nsf/hf/Evaluation-Central
This is a page on the website for AGMConnect, the Associated Grantmakers of Massachusetts, Massachusetts Evaluation Central. This page provides several links to websites that focus on evaluation.

http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/rde/manual1.htm
This site offers "The Program Manager's Guide to Evaluation," developed by the Administration on Children, Youth and Families.

http://www.cyfernet.mes.umn.edu/eval/univeval.html
Cybernet Evaluation, a web site of the National Children, Youth and Families at Risk Initiative, provides useful links to university and non-profit evaluation sites.

http://www.ehr.nsf.gov/EHR/REC/pubs/NSF97-153/start.htm
This site offers a "User-Friendly Handbook for Mixed Method Evaluations," produced by the Directorate for Education and Human Resources, Division of Research, Evaluation and Communication, National Science Foundation. It includes a review of common qualitative methods (e.g., observations, interviews, focus groups) and an evaluation design for a hypothetical project.

http://hogg1.lac.utexas.edu/gen/welcome.htm
This is the site for the Grantmakers Evaluation Network (GEN), an organization for the staff and trustees of foundations who share an interest in evaluation and philanthropy. The purpose of GEN is to strengthen foundations' ability to achieve desired outcomes by "using evaluation to build a culture of critical thinking and informed decision-making."

http://gseweb.harvard.edu/~hfrp/index.html; http://hugse1.harvard.edu/~hfrp/eval/issue2/
These are web sites for the Harvard Family Research Project, Harvard Graduate School of Education. The first contains information about research projects and a publications list. The second is the site for "The Evaluation Exchange" which is the newsletter for the HFR project.

http://www.house-of-hope.org/evaluation.htm
This site provides a list of links to evaluation handbooks, tools, and organizations.

http://www.inetwork.org

InnoNet is a nonprofit organization that provides participatory evaluation services to other nonprofits. They offer a good evaluation toolbox at this web site that includes a "Workstation" to create evaluation plans and other documents, and a "Repair Center" to improve, create and download tools such as surveys, interviews, focus groups, and questionnaires.

http://www.kcenter.com/Mersuite/Mer_down.htm

This is a web page featuring a Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting software package developed by i2K (information to knowledge) – a Division of CARE Canada. The software can be downloaded on a trial basis. Manuals and training materials are available on site. The software is geared toward disaster-relief situations, but has more general applicability as well.

http://www.maec.org/magnet.html

The Mid-Atlantic Equity Consortium (MAEC) has been contracted to evaluate a project undertaken by the District of Columbia Public School in partnership with the Smithsonian Institution's Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. The project involved establishing two school assistance programs with goals of desegregating students and increasing student achievement. The project is using a multidimensional evaluation design to monitor implementation, measure outcomes and assess progress toward achieving goals. MAEC is taking a participatory and empowerment approach to the ongoing evaluation process.

This web page lists what the MAEC considers to be the most important trends in evaluation, provides links to organizations with interest and expertise in evaluation, and provides a selected bibliography on evaluation.

http://www.meaf.org/roadmap.html

This site contains document produced by the Mitsubishi Electric America Foundation titled "Creating and Sustaining Project Impact: Guidelines for Evaluation and Dissemination." This paper is essentially a primer and outlines guidelines for evaluating projects, integrating evaluation throughout the life span of the project, and disseminating the information learned to stakeholders and others who may be interested or whose projects could benefit by learning about yours. It would be a useful document to provide to stakeholders when they become involved in the evaluation process.

http://www.ocjs.state.oh.us/pei/clearhse.htm

This is the website for Ohio's Office of Criminal Justice Services' Clearinghouse for Evaluation Information. It is part of a program evaluation initiative project. The web page provides a

database and library of evaluation findings to assist in providing guidance on evaluation findings and programmatic best practices. Topics covered include: corrections, law enforcement, courts, prevention, juvenile justice, gangs, drugs, as well as "how to do evaluations."

http://oerl.sri.com
This Online Evaluation Resource Library provides plans, instruments and reports that have been used to conduct evaluations of projects funded by the Directorate for Education and Human Resources of the National Science Foundation. The site also contains glossaries of evaluation terminology, criteria for best practices, and scenarios illustrating how evaluation resources can be used or adapted.

2.3.3 Evaluation of Citizen Engagement

http://cf.uwex.edu/ces/pubs/pdf/G3658_8PDF
This document, titled "Evaluating Collaboratives: Reaching the Potential" (July 1998), offers a step-by-step guide to the evaluation process. Although comprehensive, it is conventional in approach.

http://www.joe.org/joe/1999april/tt1.html
This is a journal article from April 1999 issue of the *Journal of Extension* (Volume 37, Number 2): Borden, Lynne and Perkins, Daniel. "Assessing Your Collaboration: A Self-Evaluation Tool." Collaborations are rated on 12 key factors: communication, sustainability, research and evaluation, political climate, resources, catalysts, policies/laws/regulations, history, connectedness, leadership, community development and understanding community.

http://www.landcare.cri.nz/science/social/index.shtml?mon_eval
This site provides several papers on "Monitoring and Evaluation for Adaptive Natural Resource Management." The emphasis is on collaborative approaches to monitoring and evaluation – "the process is concerned with how people and groups work together and maintain relationships."

See also**:** **http://www.landcare.cri.nz/sal/index.shtml?otherint** for links to related internet resources., in particular MandE News, an internet-based news service focusing on innovations in monitoring and evaluation methods relevant to development projects, and NEM_Changelinks which provides links to on-site material on collaborative learning and other current methods of stakeholder involvement.

http://www.pip.org.uk/opinion.htm
This site provides a summary of new IPPR commissioned publication by Dr. Marian Barnes of the University of Birmingham titled "Building a Deliberative Democracy." She proposed four criteria for assessing the deliberative methods of public involvement practice which she applies to the assessment of two cases involving citizen juries: the characteristics of those taking part in the process (how inclusive are they? How informed are they?), the impact of the process on participants, the nature of the deliberative process, and the impact on policy making.

ftp://psy.uq.edu.au/lists/arlist/areol_intro04
"AREOL" stands for "Action Research and Evaluation on Line." The site provides a description of various files archived from the mailing list areol-r-1, an on line course in action research and evaluation. It includes a description of the Snyder Evaluation model referred to in Volume 3 of this report (see summary of journal article by W.J. Allen). To access this material a subscription is required. This can be done through **majordomo@psy.uq.edu.au**

2.4 Organizations and Leading Professionals

2.4.1 Organizations

Centre for the Study of Public Participation, Politics and Public Policy, University of Luton
Contact: Dr. Peter McLaverty, Director
http://www.luton.ac.uk/humanities/politicspublicpolicy/cspp/index.html
The Centre was established in 1995 and engages in applied research and consultancy in relation to policy evaluation, needs assessment and democratic audits. It recently conducted an evaluation of "Urban Community Councils" and evaluative research into health authority consultation and public participation strategies.

Human Dimensions Research Unit, Department of Natural Resources, Cornell University
http://www.dnr.cornell.edu/hdru/index.html
The Human Dimensions Research Unit focuses on the human behavioral aspects of natural resources management and policy. The Unit has conducted numerous evaluation studies and the website contains a list of selected HDRU Publications on program planning and evaluation concepts and applications.

Institute for Public Policy Research, Public Involvement Program (PIP)
http://www.pip.org.uk/whatis.htm

See also: http://www.pip.org.uk/links.htm for links to other sites

PIP is a collaborative project of the Institute, aimed at furthering the development of new ways of involving the public in decision making. The specific models of interest to PIP are citizen juries, deliberative polls, consensus conferences, citizens' panels and electronic meetings. A key objective of the program is "to develop shared criteria for assessing the effectiveness of different models and identifying appropriate practice."

National Network for Collaboration

http://crs.uvm.edu/nnco

The National Network for Collaboration seeks "to expand the knowledge base and skill level of Cooperative Extension System Educators, agency and organizational partners, youth and citizens by establishing a network that creates environments that foster collaboration and leads to citizen problem solving to improve the lives of children, youth and families." Evaluation is one of the topics of interest to the NNCO.

Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6285

Contacts:

Elizabeth Peelle, Research Staff Member, Environmental Analysis and Assessment Section, Ph. 865- 574-5948 peelleb@ornl.gov

Sam Carnes, Ph. 865-574-5950

Oregon's Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee (CIAC)

http://www.lcd.state.or.us/backinfo/ciacdesc.htm

The CIAC advises the Land Conservation and Development Commission and local governments on matters pertaining to citizen involvement.

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, 901 D Street S.W., Suite 900, Washington, D.C. 20024-2115

Contacts:

Judith Bradbury, Ph.D., Senior Policy Analyst, Technology Planning and Analysis Centre, Ph. 202-646-5235 ja_bradbury@pnl.gov

2.4.2 Leading Canadian Professionals

There are many Canadian experts in public consultation and experts in evaluation. Professionals skilled in both are more limited in number. The development of a comprehensive list of such

professionals was not feasible during the timeframe of this study and the names provided below are of those who were already known to the authors of this report.

Des Connor, Connor Development Services Ltd.
5096 Catalina Terrace, Victoria, BC V8Y 2A5
Ph. (250) 658-1323
connor@connor.bc.ca; http://www.connor.ba.ca/connor
Mr. Connor is an expert in public consultation with experience in evaluation processes.

Ekos Research Associates Inc.
99 Metcalfe Street, Suite 1100
Ottawa, ON K1P 6L7
Contact: Patrick Beauchamp
Ph. (613) 235-7215 Fx. (613) 235-8498
pobox@ekos.com
Ekos specializes in program evaluation and social research.

Brian Johnston, Context Research Ltd.
201-12837 76th Street, Surrey, BC V8W 2V3
Ph. (250) 596-3531 Fx. (250) 596-4473
brian@perconline.com
Mr. Johnson conducted the evaluation of Vancouver's public involvement activities.

Richard Roberts, PRAXIS
2215-19 Street S.W.
Calgary, AB, Canada T2T 4X1
Ph. (403) 245-6404 Fx. (403) 229-3037
praxinc@praxis.ca
http://www.praxis.ca
Mr. Roberts is an expert in public consultation with experience in evaluation processes.

2.5 Other Resources

2.5.1 Conferences

Mosaic International will be holding six-day international workshop in Ottawa on Participatory Development on the following dates: June 19-24, 2000 or July 3-8, 2000. The title of the workshop is "*Participatory Development: Concepts, Tools and Application in PRA Methods*."
For further information go to: http://www.mosaic-net-intl.ca

The **Community Development Society** will be holding its 33nd Annual Conference in Saint John, New Brunswick. The Conference theme is "*Rising Tide: Community Development for a Changing World.*" The agenda includes numerous sessions on community participation and collaboration, capacity building, and empowerment strategies.
For further information go to: http://www.mta.ca/research/rstp/year2000/en.htm

The "**First International Conference on Direct Democracy**" took place in August 1998 in Pribram, near Prague, Czech Republic. There is an on-line forum to follow-up the Pribram Conference: http://www.auburn.edu/tann/prague/index.htm

For further information on the next conference contact: **Movement for Direct Democracy** (MDD). P.O. Box 38, 149 00 Prague 415, Czech Republic,
http://www.pangea.ca/kolar/misc/Dde.html

2.5.2 Research Projects

Australia Land and Water Research and Development Corporation has just commissioned a research project involving the review of participation in Australian natural resource management and the development of a typology. It is intended to provide a more current foundation of knowledge for "best practices," and recognizes that "setting natural resource management goals and evaluating progress towards them is a more complex process under participatory management systems."

The principal researchers, from The Australian National University, are: Dr. M. Buchy, Forestry and Dr. H. Ross, Centre for Resource and Environmental Studies.
Contact: Dr. M. Buchy, Ph. 02 62 49 35 34 and marlene.buchy@anu.edu.au
Dr. H. Ross, 02 62 49 21 59 and hross@cres.anu.edu.au

2.5.3 Annotated Bibliographies

Two extensive bibliographies on evaluation methods can be found at:

http://hogg1.lac.utexas.edu/gen/booklist.htm

http://www.lib.cmich.edu/ocls/bibs/psc714.htm

3. STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

This Part consists of five sections:

Section 3.1 describes research efforts and case studies offering models and methods for stakeholder involvement generally and as it applies to evaluation processes. As indicated in the Terms of Reference for this report, the search for such material was restricted to post 1990 unless prior work had a prominence that warranted its inclusion in this report.

Section 3.2 provides annotated references to books, reports and journal articles addressing stakeholder involvement in evaluation processes as well as further information on possible models and methods.

Section 3.3 provides annotated references to internet sites offering information that would facilitate the development of effective approaches to involving stakeholders in the evaluation process including conceptual models, process manuals, and case studies.

Section 3.4 lists organizations in Canada, the United States and elsewhere who have expertise in stakeholder involvement and leading Canadian professionals in this field.

Section 3.5 provides references for “Other Resources” such as conferences.

In all sections, the aim was not to be comprehensive and include everything but rather to cull through the material and identify leading examples and those resources most likely to contribute in a significant way to the Department of Justice’s effort with respect to evaluation and citizen engagement.

3.1 Models and Methods

3.1.1 Participatory Evaluation – General

Fine, Allison H., Thayer, Colette E. and Coghlan, Anne. 1998. *Program Evaluation Practice in the Nonprofit Sector.* Washington, DC: Innovation Network, Inc.

This study was funded by the Aspen Institute Nonprofit Sector Research Fund and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Its aim was to determine which of two broad evaluation approaches – the traditional scientific model with an external evaluator collecting, interpreting and presenting data or the new participatory evaluation model – are being used by non-profits, to what extent, and with what effects. The research revealed that the approaches being taken do not fall neatly into one or other category. The study focused on exploring the role of stakeholder participation in program evaluation "since it is the key element that distinguishes between the traditional and participatory approaches to evaluation."

For those with a strong interest in stakeholder involvement in evaluation, this report is essential reading. The study examined whether different levels of stakeholder participation are associated with various organizational characteristics, evaluation characteristics and evaluation outcomes. The findings, in this regard, offer useful guidelines for designing evaluation approaches emphasizing stakeholder involvement.

The following is a brief summary of key findings.

- Recent evaluations focus outcome measures and include a mixture of quantitative and qualitative data collection methods.
- Regardless of stakeholder participation levels, evaluations are highly likely to use a combination of qualitative and quantitative data.
- High stakeholder participation evaluations tended to be conducted more often for volunteers.
- High stakeholder participation evaluations were more likely than low stakeholder participation evaluations to be used to improve outcomes, promote the program to potential participants, and/or design on-going monitoring/evaluation systems.
- Increased stakeholder involvement was credited with improving evaluation design, ensuring available resources to implement the evaluation and its recommendations, increasing stakeholders' understanding and appreciation of an agency, and improving stakeholders' understanding of the evaluation.

- At the same time, most respondents in the study stated that the evaluations conducted by an external expert are perceived to be more credible. The main reasons were the objectivity and expertise of the professional evaluator.

Office of Evaluation and Strategic Planning. 1997. *Who Are The Question-makers? A Participatory Evaluation Handbook.* New York, NY: United Nations Development Program. Available on-line at: http://www.undp.org/eo/who.htm

This is the first of a new handbook series being produced by the UNDP Office of Evaluation and Strategic Planning (OESP). It reflects UNDP's research and testing of participatory approaches to evaluation and, in this sense, offers a benchmark of lessons learned. It is one of the best guides available in terms of its easy to follow, comprehensive and practical discussion of participatory evaluation. Although developed for use by UNDP staff, it has much wider applicability.

Parts one to four of the handbook provide an overview of participatory evaluation (its evolution, a comparison with more conventional approaches, the role of participation in UNDP programs, and issues associated with practice). The fifth part is a stand-alone training module consisting of a case study (rural water supply and sanitation project) that documents an attempt at participatory evaluation. It helps to reveal some of the practical aspects of applying participatory evaluation techniques. The handbook offers a framework for the evaluation process, summarized below. It also discusses issues such as cost, timing, role and skills required of a participatory evaluation facilitator, and how to prepare terms of reference.

UNDP Framework for Participatory Evaluation

Pre-Planning and Preparation

- Outline a conceptual framework based on participatory evaluation principles.
- Define parameters for the participatory evaluation (i.e., what can and cannot be achieved).
- Assess constraints and resources or enabling and inhibiting factors.
- Identify the participatory evaluator facilitator, team members and stakeholders.
- Negotiate the purpose and objectives of the participatory evaluation with key actors.

Generating Evaluation Questions

- Facilitate participatory workshops in, or field visits to, stakeholder workplace or residence.
- Collectively identify the main focus of the evaluation.

Data-Gathering and Analysis

- Provide necessary training in data-gathering methods.
- Gather data collectively.
- Analyze data collectively.

Reflection and Action

- Prioritize problems to be solved or questions to be answered.
- Coordinate resources for resolving problems identified during the evaluation.
- Take collective action.

3.1.2 Stakeholder Involvement

Chrislip, David D. and Larson, Carl E. 1994. *Collaborative Leadership: How Citizens and Civic Leaders Can Make a Difference.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. 192 pp.

This book is one of the best resources on collaborative processes. The authors conducted an extensive research project that involved examining over 50 cases of successful community-based collaborations. The book documents the results of their work. Most importantly, the authors offer an insightful guide to initiating and sustaining collaborative processes, highlight the factors that make collaborations successful in terms of producing results that matter, and identify the kinds of skills needed for effective collaboration leadership.

They identified ten keys to successful collaboration:

- Good timing and clear need
- Strong stakeholder groups
- Broad-based involvement
- Credibility and openness of process

- Commitment and/or involvement of high-level, visible leaders
- Support or acquiescence of "established" authorities or powers
- Overcoming mistrust and skepticism
- Strong leadership of the process
- Interim successes
- A shift from less narrow parochial interests to the broader community interests

They also noted that collaborative leaders adhered to and were skilled at applying four principles:

- Inspire commitment and action
- Lead as peer problem solver
- Build broad-based commitment
- Sustain hope and participation

The book is organized to lead the reader through each phase of the collaborative process, with case studies illustrating alternative approaches, pitfalls and effective methods.

Daniels, Steven E. and Walker, Gregg, B. 1996. "Collaborative Learning: Improving Public Deliberation in Ecosystem-Based Management." ***Environmental Impact Assessment Review*** **16: 71-102.**
See also: Walker, G. and Daniels, S. 1993 "Improving Debate in Soft Systems Methodology: Collaborative Argument About Change.' In ***Argument and the Postmodern Challenge: Proceedings of the Eighth SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation,*** **ed. R.E. McKerrow. Annedale, VA: Speech Communication Association.**

"Collaborative learning" brings together two methodological streams – soft systems methodology (SSM) and alternative dispute resolution (ADR). At the same time it has an extra dimension – communication competence, that is, constructive dialogue of ideas and issues. This requires participants to be skilled at listening, questioning and clarification, providing feedback, modeling, social cognition, dialogue and collaborative argument. Thus, collaborative learning is a process of citizen participation that emphasizes systems thinking, joint learning by doing, and an open, creative communication.

This paper presents a 9-part framework for a Collaborative Learning process and a detailed case study illustrating the application of this framework.

The Collaborative Learning Framework

Phase I: Introduction to CL process
- Ia Phases of the process
- Ib Communication process

Phase II: Identify situation (problem) to be improved (addressed)
- IIa Perceive situation
- IIb Describe situation

Phase III: Share situation perceptions and descriptions
- IIIa Visualize the situation as a system

Phase IV: Dialogue about interests and concerns
- IVa Short-term and long-term concerns
- IVb Situation flexibility and areas of transformation
- IVc From present concerns to future improvements

Phase V: Develop transformative models
- Va Subsystems
- Vb Parameters
- Vc Process and outcome measures
- Vd Old models
- Ve Future focus

Phase VI: Compare models with collective reality
- VIa Compare with ideas in Phases II, III, and IV
- VIb Develop criteria for judging models

Phase VII: Collaborative argument about desirable and feasible change
- VIIa Apply criteria
- VIIb Systems view

Phase VIII: Implementation
- VIIIa Change needs/requirements
- VIIIb Kinds of change
- VIIIc Communicate change

Phase IX Taking stock
IXa Feedback
IXb Future Improvement

Repeat as necessary

The case where this framework was applied involved updating the management plan for the Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area (ODNRA), a multi-resource, multi-use area. A Collaborative Learning workshop was held, organized into three stages and involving five meetings.

Stage I: Inform stakeholder groups and involve them in process design; one meeting.

Stage II: Provide a common base of knowledge about major dunes issues; identify concerns about ODNRA management; generate suggested improvements; three meetings.

Stage III: Organize improvements based on different strategic visions for the ODNRA; debate the improvement sets; one meeting.

The workshop process was subsequently evaluated using a questionnaire survey involving those who took part in the workshops. Six factors were addressed in the evaluation process:

Factors Evaluated

- Perceptions of the ODNRA management situation
- Factors contributing to the usefulness of the workshop
- Judgements concerns the ODNRA workshop process
- Assessment of specific workshop activities
- Effect of the workshop on participants' views of ODNRA parties
- Preferences concerning processes for achieving ODNRA goals

The survey results revealed strong support from participants of the CL workshop process.

Hargrove, Robert. 1998. *Mastering the Art of Creative Collaboration.* Toronto: McGraw-Hill, Business Week Books. 253 pp.

For those interested in understanding the concept of collaboration, this book is a "must read." Hargrove starts with the basics – collaboration is not just a matter of technique but of attitude – and then proceeds to define what it takes to be "a collaborative person" and to launch and sustain creative collaborations.

He offers a five-phase framework for "collaborative conversation" that builds shared understanding, deals with seemingly incompatible views in a creative rather than destructive way, and produces results. It involves:

- Clarifying the purpose of the conversation
- Gathering divergent views and perspectives
- Building shared understanding of divergent views and perspectives
- Creating "new" options by connecting different views
- Generating a conversation for action

Hargrove also sets out various strategies for a "lateral leader" in facilitating collaborative processes. He notes that collaborative leaders:

Embrace three values

- commitment to truth (or valid information),
- free and informed choice, and
- internal commitment to process

Take on four roles

- Community builder: brings people together and fosters commitment
- Creator of space: providing a "neutral" forum or place for people to talk and the "intellectual space" to explore possibilities in creative ways.
- Intervener: makes skillful interventions the keep the dialogue and process on track and productive
- Go-between: acts as an intermediary when dialogue is hampered by unresolved issues.

Isaacs, William. 1999. *Dialogue and the Art of Working Together.* Toronto: Currency. 428 pp.

At the heart of successful relationships, and certainly the key to successful stakeholder involvement in evaluation or any other process is dialogue. Isaacs, the founder of the Dialogue Project at MIT, draws upon over ten year's of research into the art of dialogue. Although aimed at business leaders, his suggested approach to dialogue has wide applicability, especially to stakeholder relationships. Isaacs distinguishes between "discussion" which is about making a decision, and "dialogue" which is about exploring the nature of choice. He defines dialogue as "a conversation with a centre, not sides." It is a way of taking the energy of our differences and channeling it toward something that has never been created before." He identifies four pathologies of thought that inhibit dialogue and four principles for dialogue:

Pathologies of thought

- Abstraction – holding on to the images of reality as if they were reality themselves
- Idolatry – confusing memory with thinking
- Certainty – seeing partial understandings as complete
- Violence – imposing our views on others and maintaining defensiveness

Principles of dialogue

- Participation – experiencing the world more directly
- Unfolding – perceiving potential, within ourselves and others, and being willing to bring this out
- Awareness – developing the capacity to perceive that everything is in motion, in process
- Coherence – seeing how things fit together and appreciating the whole

Isaacs emphasizes that dialogue requires a special quality of listening and attention, one that has to be practiced. He suggests that it takes three languages to have a genuine dialogue: the language of meaning, the language of feelings, and the language of power (dialogue is not in the end merely about talking, it is about taking action).

This is not a practical, "how to" book. Its usefulness is in the thought provoking insights it offers, which in and of themselves point the way to more positive and productive stakeholder interactions.

Mattessich, Paul W. and Monsey, Barbara R. 1992. *Collaboration: What Makes it Work. A Review of Research Literature on Factors Influencing Successful Collaboration.* St. Paul, Minn: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation. 53pp.

This report is packed with useful information, presented in a straightforward manner. The authors identified 19 factors, grouped into 6 categories, that influence the success of collaborations formed by human service, government and other nonprofit agencies.

Environment

- History of collaboration or cooperation in the community
- Collaborative group seen as a leader in the community
- Political/social climate favourable

Membership Characteristics

- Mutual respect, understanding and trust
- Appropriate cross-section of members
- Members see collaboration as in their self-interest
- Ability to compromise

Process/Structure

- Members share a stake in both process and outcome
- Multiple layers of decision-making
- Flexibility
- Development of clear roles and policy guidelines
- Adaptability

Communication

- Open and frequent communication
- Established informal and formal communication links

Purpose

- Concrete, attainable goals and objectives
- Shared vision
- Unique purpose

Resources
- Sufficient funds
- Skilled convenor

Svendsen, Ann. 1998. *The Stakeholder Strategy: Profiting from Collaborative Business Relationships.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc. 207 pp.

The framework, guidelines and practical advice offered in this book about forming and maintaining positive and strong stakeholder relationships is broadly applicable. Svendsen discusses six steps in fostering collaborative relationships:

Creating a foundation
- assess relationship building as a strategic direction
- review and refine social mission, values and ethics
- communicate commitment

Organizational alignment
- assess organizational readiness
- identify gaps and inconsistencies
- assess systems and structures
- makes changes as needed

Strategy development
- inventory and assess existing relationships
- benchmark special practices
- meet with stakeholders
- refine goals and prepare strategy
- set up internal structures
- begin action planning

Trust building
- exchange information
- clarify expectations and perspectives
- identify common goals

Develop organizational structures

- clarify roles and responsibilities, short-term objectives, and timelines
- develop and implement "first projects'
- identify and resolve areas of conflict
- ensure availability of resources

Evaluation

- design and conduct stakeholder audit
- celebrate successes
- learn from failures

Repeat

- re-do steps and refining the process

3.1.3 Committee/Task Group Approach

Bradbury, Judith, Branch, Kristi and Zalesny, Mary. 1997 Site-*Specific Advisory Board Initiative 1997 Evaluation Survey Results: Volume 1, Summary Report and Volume II, Individual Site Results*. Washington, DC: US Department of Energy, Office of Intergovernmental and Public Accountability.

In 1995, the DOE Office of Intergovernmental and Public Accountability launched an evaluation process for its Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) initiative. This initiative was begun in 1992 when DOE named five sites – Fernald (Ohio), Hanford (Washington), Idaho Falls (Idaho), Rocky Flats (Colorado), and Savannah River (South Carolina) – as sites to take the lead in piloting its Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Initiative for site cleanup and waste management. By 1996, twelve SSABs had been established. The evaluation of the SSAB Initiative had two components: a self-evaluation conducted by each site and a survey conducted by Pacific Northwest National Laboratory for DOE-HQ. The evaluation was carried out in 1996 and then again in 1997, using the same data collection methods and instruments.

The SSAB evaluation was developed in collaboration with SSAB representatives through the establishment of a steering committee and expert advisory panel. The Steering Committee was composed of representatives of each of the SSABs, DOE Area Office staff involved with their site SSAB, DOE Headquarters staff responsible for the SSAB Initiative, and the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) technical support team. It was managed by the Office of

Intergovernmental and Public Accountability with technical support provided by researchers from the PNNL. Through a series of meetings, the Steering Committee assembled a list of expectations for the SSAB Initiative. This list was then used as the starting point for the development of a set of mutually agreed-upon goals and a general approach for the evaluation.

This evaluation process is described in more detail in Part 2, Section 1 B.

Bradbury, Judith A. and Branch, Kristi M. 1996. *Transportation External Coordination Working Group Evaluation.* Richland, Wash.: Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Environmental Management, Office of Transportation Emergency Management and Analytical Services. (Available from the National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161).

The Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC/WG) was formed in 1992 by two sponsoring offices of DOE, the Office of Environmental Management and the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. It includes State, Tribal and local officials, and representatives of industry and professional groups with responsibility for safety and emergency aspects of DOE radioactive materials transportation. The original objective in setting up the TEC/WG was to engage the various representatives in resolving common transportation issue and to focus and coordinate DOE transportation program efforts. However, between 1992 and 1996 changes in membership, DOE budget cuts and reorganizing, and evolution of the issues being addressed by the TEC/WG prompted DOE to confirm the continued effectiveness of the TEC/WG.

The purpose of the evaluation was to provide DOE and TEC/WG members with feedback about the value and achievements of the TEC/WG and information they could use to correct problems, plan next steps, and improve the usefulness and effectiveness of the Working Group.

The evaluation staff worked with the TEC/WG participants to identify, clarify and develop agreement on the TEC/WG performance goals on which the evaluation would be based. This involved a brainstorming session during one of the regular TEC/WG meetings and then working with a subcommittee of TEC/WG volunteers to refine the goals and develop a conceptual framework for the evaluation. The volunteers provided substantial input into the final statement of six TEC/WG goals that formed the core of the evaluation design.

This evaluation process is described in more detail in Part 2, Section 1 B.

Cousins, J.B. and Earl, L.M. (eds.) 1995. *Participatory Evaluation in Education: Studies in Evaluation Use and Organizational Learning.* London: Falmer Press
See also: Cousins, J.B. and Earl, L.M. 1995. "Participatory Evaluation in Education: Studies in Evaluation Use and Organizational Learning." *Evaluation Exchange* 1 (3/4).

This is a collection and analysis of empirical studies on participatory evaluation. The editors are proponents of an approach to participatory evaluation that is focused on maximizing the usefulness of the data for intended users rather than the more common goals of empowerment and emancipation. Their model calls for joint sharing of the control of the evaluation process or "partnership" with the stakeholders. This requires the extensive involvement of stakeholders in all stages of the evaluation process, including defining goals and objectives, developing instruments, collecting data, processing and analyzing data, and reporting and disseminating results. However, they limit the stakeholders to the primary users – "those with program responsibility or a vital interest in the program." This is done both for practical reasons (easier to manage) and "because data are more likely to be used if those in a position to do something with them help to inform the evaluation.'

The analysis of the empirical studies yielded some useful insights into the viability of participatory evaluation "partnerships":

- Partners derive a powerful sense of satisfaction and professional development from their participation.
- Data are used in program decision-making and implementation, although they are often subject to political influences.
- This approach helps to foster organizational learning, to the extent that the evaluation process is repeated regularly and the organizational culture is receptive to learning.
- Participation of primary users with organizational authority and power to act is essential to avoid frustration.
- Close involvement of evaluators can create unrealistic expectations and it would be best if the evaluators assumed the role of technical resources and consultants.
- Support of the stakeholders involved in the evaluation (e.g., assistance with the normal duties while they devote time to the evaluation) is critical.
- It is more time efficient to leave highly technical activities, such as quantitative data analysis, to the evaluators or consultants.

3.1.4 Community Dialogues

Folkman, Daniel V. and Kalyani, Rai. 1997. "Reflections on Facilitating A Participatory Community Self-Evaluation." ***Evaluation and Program Planning*** **20 (4): 455-465.**

In the early 1990s, the Ford Foundation began funding a multi-year , multi-community inner city revitalization project called the "Neighbourhood and Family Initiative" (NFI). The project involved bringing together a group of stakeholders (residents, community leaders, private citizens and business representatives) to oversee the neighbourhood planning process and design and implement programs targeted to specific needs in the neighbourhood. The Ford Foundation called for a national cross-site evaluation as well as a local assessment in each community. The national cross-site evaluation was a conventional formative evaluation. However, the local assessment for the City of Milwaukee was different. It adopted a community dialogue approach to assessing the project that involved forming a "Learning Community" composed of twelve members: six from the NFI and six residents from the neighbourhood. The Learning Community provided a forum for exploring the multiple realities of different stakeholders regarding the project (making it constructivist in approach), questioning values and assumptions, and developing a shared understanding about the effects of the project.

The Learning Community met monthly, beginning in March 1993, and continued to meet through January 1995. It reviewed specific strategies and initiatives of the NFI, including a leadership development strategy, job development initiatives, and youth task force initiatives.

This article focuses in on the tensions that arose in this community dialogue approach to evaluation between the local assessors and the NFI Project Director and the national evaluators. Tension arose because the local assessors were attempting an unconventional, constructivist approach to evaluation when the larger context for evaluation was conventional and formative. The Project Director and the national evaluators questioned the validity of anecdotal information and the length of time it took for the dialogue to result in product (a report). The other source of tension was inherent in the dialogue process itself – it brought to the surface differences in opinion regarding the project vision and differing expectations and experience of the project.

Folkman and Rai advise that evaluators needs two key skills to be effective in undertaking a community dialogue approach: process facilitation skills to help groups and organizations manage conflict and resolve issues, and learning facilitation skills to help individuals, groups and organizations develop the necessary interpersonal and critical thinking abilities. More importantly, Folkman and Rai document the insights they gained. Key among them are:

- The Learning Community Strategy is not a substitute for conventional evaluation designs.
- Informal conversations among stakeholders regarding program activities and outcomes represent an important but untapped source of information about the impact a program is having in the community.
- Fostering trust and building a sense of community is essential and pre-requisite to critical, reflective dialogue.
- Intense feelings and critical assessments about the project are likely outcomes of a community dialogue.
- When Learning Community members identify gaps in program performance and opportunities to address unmet needs, they must have authority to take initiative in ways they feel are appropriate to help the project fulfill its mission and goals.
- How stakeholders with authority and influence respond to Learning Community assessments reveal underlying organizational values, assumptions, policies and practices, which themselves must be open to inquiry.

3.1.5 Collaboration

Papineau, Danielle and Kiely, Margaret. 1996. "Participatory Evaluation in a Community Organization: Fostering Stakeholder Empowerment and Utilization." ***Evaluation and Program Planning*** **19 (1): 79-93.**

This is an account of a collaborative approach to participatory evaluation. The objectives were to assist a community economic development (CED) organization to assess its impact, improve its services and broaden stakeholder understanding of the programs it offered. The CED organization offers training to assist low-income community members in starting a business. A collaborative approach to the evaluation was taken as it was consistent with the democratic values of the organization itself. It was hoped that this approach would also have the added benefits of promoting the empowerment of stakeholders and fostering greater use of the findings of the evaluation.

The overall evaluation plan, shown below, was developed by the professional evaluators (the authors) and was approved by the organization's Board of Directors.

The selection of evaluation questions occurred over a six-month period of in-depth consultations, involving small group sessions (each focused on a specific program) and individual meetings

with stakeholders unable to attend the small group sessions. While the level of active participation was fairly high throughout the process, the data analysis had to be undertaken with only one staff member and a volunteer, owing to the reluctance of stakeholders to take on this task.

Blueprint for the Participatory Evaluation Process

Initiation Phase

- Presentation to the Board of Administrators for their approval
- Identification of interested stakeholders

Selecting the Topics and Questions to be Addressed

- Interested stakeholders meet several times in small groups, each centering on one of the services offered by the organization, in order to brainstorm ideas for questions
- Questions are rephrased clearly, regrouped for each program, and collated into one document.
- A general meeting of stakeholders is called to prioritize questions according to their potential utility, and to plan how the evaluation results will be utilized once they are available.

Instrument Design and Data Collection

- Small groups are reconvened to decide on the final wording and format of questions retained at the general meeting.
- Data is collected by the program evaluator and other interested participants who are given appropriate training.

Data Analysis and Reporting

- Data analysis proceeds in small groups, with the evaluator participating in all groups.
- Individual reports are drafted for each program; the evaluator is responsible for writing reports in consultation with stakeholders; the reports are to be geared for use in drafting the next year's funding proposals, in discussions regarding strategic objectives to be adopted in a 3-year plan and in writing the annual report and summary of activities.

Strategic Planning

- A series of strategic planning meetings are convened to study the evaluation reports and decide on follow-up steps in view of the utilization plan developed earlier.

- The evaluation questions are revised for future use on an ongoing basis; program workers are expected to coordinate future evaluation efforts.

The collaborative approach is reported to have (a) strengthened the organization's internal group process and cohesion, (b) deepened stakeholders' commitment to the organization, and (c) increased stakeholders' sense of self-efficacy as well as their knowledge and skills. The evaluators noted that one of the factors accounting for the success of the evaluation was that there was a good fit between the social ecology of the organization and the PE methodology. The participants had good process skills and were trained in democratic decision-making.

O'Sullivan, Rita G. and O'Sullivan, John M. 1998. "Evaluation Voices: Promoting Evaluation From Within Programs Through Collaboration." ***Evaluation and Program Planning*** **21: 21-29.**

"Evaluation Voices" is a collaborative evaluation of the "Community Voices" project, a leadership development program initiated in 1988 by the North Carolina A & T University with funding from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. The evaluation process brings together program stakeholders, evaluators and network partners (people from other Community Voices projects in other states) to (a) identify program goals/outcomes/results, (b) develop a set of evaluation questions, (c) gather data or evidence regarding current resources, barriers, and training needs, (d) analyze the data and summarize the results, and (e) prepare an action plan.

The evaluation process can be conducted in as little at three hours or through a three-day workshop and is most effective when several iterations are carried out. Those brought together to participate in the evaluation work through each step of the process, breaking into small groups as necessary.

3.2 Books, Reports and Journal Articles

3.2.1 Books and Reports

Fetterman, David M., Kaftarian, Shakeh J. and Wandersman, Abraham. Eds. 1996. ***Empowerment Evaluation: Knowledge and Tools for Self-Assessment and Accountability.*** **Thousand Oakes, CA: SAGE.**

This book represents a benchmark of sorts in that it attempts to stake out the territory of empowerment evaluation, and making explicit its ideological foundations. Fetterman's

introductory chapter provides a comprehensive overview of the developing theory and practice in the field. The 15 other essays contained in the book provide a good overview of current practice, as well as examples of tools, forms and checklists.

Jackson, Edward T. and Kassam, Yusuf, Editors, 1998, *Knowledge Shared: Participatory Evaluation in Development Cooperation.* Connecticut, USA: Kumarian Press and Ottawa Canada: IDRC.

The book consists of 13 papers in two parts: the first presents 4 discussion papers dealing with issues, strategies, and methods of participatory evaluation, and the second provides 9 case studies. It offers a good introduction to the topic. Chapter 3 contains a matrix illustrating how participatory evaluation and results-based evaluation could be brought together, showing outputs, outcomes and impacts by level of intervention (macro, meso and micro). An in-depth and critical review of this book can be found on a website called Capacity.org
http://www.capacity.org/pubs/annotations/issue2_jackson.htm

McTaggart, Robin, Ed *1997. Participatory Action Research: International Contexts and Consequences.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. 283pp.

The collection of 13 essays in this book illustrates commonalties and differences among the theories, practices, and organization of participatory action research in different countries. Participatory action research expresses the recognition that all research methodologies are implicitly political in nature, and this is reflected in the various essays.

Winer, Michael and Ray, Karen. 1994. *Collaboration Handbook: Creating, Sustaining, and Enjoying the Journey.* St. Paul, Minn: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation. 192 pp.

This practical, easy to follow guide shows how to get a collaborative initiative going, manage the process and evaluate the results. It includes a case study of one collaboration from start to finish, many tips on how to avoid common problems, and various worksheets.

Whitmore, Elizabeth. Ed. 1998. *Understanding and Practicing Participatory Evaluation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
***See Also: New Directions for Evaluation*; 80: 1-104, 1998**

Practical and transformative participatory evaluation streams are identified, and participatory evaluation is illustrated through case studies.

3.2.2 Articles

Allen, W.J. 1997. "Towards Improving the Role of Evaluation Within Natural Resource Management R&D Programmes: The Case for 'Learning by Doing'." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies XVIII, Special Issue, Results-based Performance Reviews and Evaluations:* 629-643.
Available on line at: http://nrm.massey.ac.nz/changelinks/cjds.html

The author addresses the need to develop participatory and systems-based evaluation processes that allow for on-going learning and adaptation. He puts forward an evaluation process that incorporates the Snyder (input-output) Evaluation Model, illustrated below:

↱	INPUTS:	Resources: time, money, materials, scarce skills
FEEDBACK PROCESS:		What is done as part of the project by the people involved
↰	OUTPUTS:	Immediate effects, intended and unintended Identified project outcomes which are sought Future vision to which it is hoped the project will contribute

Allen notes that stakeholder involvement in both process evaluation and outcome evaluation allows them to gain a deeper understanding of the links between process and outcomes. He describes that application of this model to a specific resource management problem in New Zealand, namely the management of an invasive weed (*Hieracium* ssp.) in the South Island mountain lands. Since 1997, Hieracium Management Programme has involved the active participation of a number of interest groups including farmers, local government, scientists and a range of central government funding agencies.

Aubel, Judi. 1995. *Participatory Program Evaluation. A Manual for Involving Program Stakeholders in the Evaluation Process.* Washington, DC: Peace Corps, Information Collection & Exchange. 77pp.

This manual was designed for Catholic Relief Services staff who want to improve the health and nutrition component of maternal and child health programs. The methodology presented had already been used in two country programs in Africa, and the experiences in those program evaluations made this guide to participatory evaluation useful for other evaluation situations.

Chapters 1 and 2 discuss a number of concepts that underlie a participatory approach to evaluation, setting the stage for the discussion of practical evaluation steps in chapter 3. These include: (1) pre-planning meetings; (2) the evaluation planning workshop; (3) field data collection and analysis; (4) a workshop to formulate the lessons learned; (5) development of an action plan; and (6) the finalization and dissemination of the evaluation report.

Chapter 4 presents some conclusions about the use of participatory evaluation. It stresses the importance of careful planning and the availability of certain human and other resources. Chapter 5 presents some cautions related to the use of the participatory methodology, and chapter 6 contains a list of 19 practical references for evaluators.

Burroughs, Richard. 1999. "When Stakeholders Choose: Process, Knowledge, and Motivation in Water Quality Decisions." ***Society and Natural Resources*** **12 (8): 797-809.**

The author examined two attempts at public involvement in the development of a water quality plan. The first involved the conventional "command-control" approach with public involvement limited essential to a hearing process. This attempt resulted in no major action being taken. The second time around, a "stakeholder" approach was tried with successful results. The author documents the differences between the two approaches and what is was about the stakeholder approach that made it more effective. He shows that the more collaborative effort resulted in better dissemination and use of information as well as much greater motivation on the part of members of the public to stay involved in the decision making process. He notes that stakeholder involvement required significant staff and financial resources and advises that it should be reserved for larger and important issues.

Dixon, Jane. 1995. "Community Stories and Indicators for Evaluating Community Development." ***Community Development Journal*** **30 (4): 327-36**

Two approaches for evaluating community development are examined: "community stories" which are locally developed ethnographies for community-led change; and sponsor-backed evaluation using co-produced indicators and standards.

Duhon, Karen et al. 1996. ***Evaluation of Complex Programs Using Participatory Evaluation.*** **Papers presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in New York, NY, on April 8-12, 1996.**

Summaries are presented of papers from a symposium entitled "The Evaluation of Complex Programs Using Participatory Evaluation" that focused on a comprehensive school service program in a south Texas alternative high school. "Theoretical Framework and Objectives" explores the problems of evaluating such programs. Problems result from the complexity and flexibility of the programs, difficulties in evaluating collaboration, and the interdisciplinary nature of the endeavours. A paper titled "New Research and Evaluation Designs for Comprehensive Service Models" by Jane Stallings provides an overview of the conceptualization of a research and evaluation agenda for complex models in general, and comprehensive service models in particular. "Implementing a Model for Participatory Evaluation: Findings from Three Studies" by Stephanie L. Knight and Karen Duhon describes the use of participatory research and evaluation to assess the Options in Education Program. "Evaluation of Complex Programs Using Participatory Evaluation" by Jane A. Stallings provides further information on the Options program and its evaluation.

Duram, Leslie A. and Brown, Katharin G. 1999. "A Survey of Public Participation in U.S. Watershed Planning Initiatives." *Society and Natural Resources* 12 (5): 455-467.

This article presents the results of a mail survey of 126 federally funded watershed planning initiatives involving 26 states. The survey identified, among other things, the kinds of methods used to involve the public in the planning process. It was determined that collaborative approaches tended to have more long-term success and that two-way methods of communication were more effective (interestingly, although respondents stated this, they also reported that one-way methods were used more often). It was also found that door-to-door contact and information programs were the most effective means of soliciting public involvement.

Greene, Jennifer G. 1988. "Stakeholder Participation and Utilization in Program Evaluation." *Evaluation Review* 12 (2): 91-116.
See also: Greene, Jennifer G., "Communication of Results and Utilization in Participatory Program Evaluation." *Evaluation and Program Planning* 11: 341-351.

This paper provides a detailed description of a participatory evaluation process applied to two situations (a youth development program and a day-care information and referral program). The PE process has five elements:

> **Definition of stakeholders**: included "people whose lives are affected by the program and people whose decisions can affect the future of the program."

Meaningful participation: this was defined as "shared decision making." The role of the evaluator was to direct and guide the evaluation process (including conducting the technical work) and to maintain technical quality.

Loci of participation: active participation of stakeholders was sought in the initial question-identification design phase and then again during the communication and interpretation of results phases but not during the data collection phase.

Iteration in participation: the phases of the evaluation process were iterative, involving on-going sharing of results.

Ongoing communication: the process incorporated ongoing communication and dialogue among the stakeholders and the evaluator. Stakeholders has full access to and potential control over all information generated during the evaluation process.

For those interested in participatory evaluation this paper offers strategies, specific techniques, and insights drawn from experience.

Lipps, Garth; Grant, Peter R. 1990. "A Participatory Method of Assessing Program Implementation." ***Evaluation Review*** **14 (4): 427-34.**

Previous research on program implementation is integrated and extended to form a participatory approach to evaluating program implementation. This method focuses on the continuous active involvement of program developers, managers, and staff in the evaluation process. The methodology is applied to an actual program to highlight the steps involved.

McKenzie, Brad. 1997. "Developing First Nations Child Welfare Standards: Using Evaluation Research within a Participatory Framework." ***Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation/La Revue Canadienne D'evaluation de Programme*** **12 (1): 133-48.**

A program to develop culturally appropriate child and family service standards in First Nations communities was evaluated. Process and outcome benefits were achieved through multiple focus group interviews and using a feedback and data consultation stage to involve community residents.

Mercier, Celine. 1997. "Participation in Stakeholder-Based Evaluation: A Case Study." ***Evaluation and Program Planning*** **4:467-475.**

This paper, an account of a participatory evaluation of the "Joint Program for the homeless population of Montreal," offers a sobering look at participatory evaluation by focusing on the factors that can interfere with such a process. Key factors included:

The Organizational Context
The program to be evaluated was complex and large, involving 14 operational directives, 27 activities and some 50 people or agencies.

The stakeholder-based evaluation was imposed from the outside and carried out by an external group with the result that the credibility of the process and impartiality of the evaluators remained in question.

Characteristics of Stakeholder Groups
Imbalance in the various agencies' organizational cultures and experience with program evaluation led them to experience the evaluation process very differently.

Disparity in financial and human resources caused inequities in the evaluation process.

Data Collecion Procedures
Data were collected using quantitative methods that favoured participant observation and semi-structured interviews, which resulted in considerable anxiety and feelings of intrusion on the part of the "observees."

Very few people who sat on the evaluation steering committee were involved in the actual evaluation process.

Patton, Michael. 1997. "Toward Distinguishing Empowerment Evaluation and Placing It in a Larger Context." ***Evaluation Practice*** **18 (2): 147-63**

Patton argues that fostering self-determination is the defining focus of empowerment evaluation, but that this type of evaluation overlaps participatory, collaborative, stakeholder-involving, and utilization-focused approaches to evaluation. He advises that it is important to distinguish empowerment evaluation from other approaches as the field debates its boundaries and

implications. A good paper for those interested in understanding the differing conceptualizations of current trends in evaluation practice.

Ryan, Katherine; Greene, Jennifer; Lincoln, Yvonna; Mathison, Sandra; Mertens, Donna M 1998. "Advantages and Challenges of Using Inclusive Evaluation Approaches in Evaluation Practice." ***American Journal of Evaluation*** **19 (1): 101-22.**

The authors deliberate what *inclusive evaluation* approaches look like in current practice and explore what it takes to implement these approaches in practice successfully. The importance of respecting stakeholders is emphasized.

Uphoff, Norman. 1991. "A Field Methodology for Participatory Self-Evaluation." ***Community Development Journal*** **26 (4):271-85**

This reference outlines the participatory self-evaluation methods of the People's Participation Programme of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization. Benefits, six steps for introducing the method, problems of language, comparability of numbers, and objectivity are described.

Whitmore, Elizabeth. 1990. "Empowerment in Program Evaluation: A Case Example." ***Canadian Social Work Review*** **7 (2): 215-229.**

This describes a committee-based participatory evaluation of a prenatal program funded by the Health and Welfare Canada. The evaluator worked with a subcommittee of the local advisory committee. The author notes that social workers are well positioned to develop empowerment approaches to evaluation given that they possess the interactive skills necessary to negotiate process arrangements with stakeholders as well as the understanding individual and social needs in an empowerment process.

3.3 Internet Resources

http://www.aspenroundtable.org/vol1/index.htm
This is the web page for the Aspen Institute Roundtable on Comprehensive Community Initiatives. At this web site a number of papers are available addressing such topics as a historical view of community-wide initiative evaluation, the effect of communities on youth, the role of the evaluator, problems that develop in performing community-wide evaluation, and the use of community-wide indicators of child well-being in community level evaluation.

http://comm-dev.org/partres.htm

This is the web site for the "Community Development Society: Participatory Research." Their aim is to build a participatory research network. The site includes online resources, and linkages and contacts for off-line resources.

http://crs.uvm.edu/nnco/

This is the web site for the National Network for Collaboration. It offers a link to the Collaboration CD-ROM Training Program Manual. The site also provides a number of other linkages to documents, tools, and resources related to collaboration.

http://hc-sc.gx.ca/hppb/familyviolence/html/1project.htm

The Health Canada Population Health Directorate, "Guide to Project Evaluation: A Participatory Approach," August 1996 can be found at this site. Note that, although the guide speaks about "collaboration with community groups," the participation process is narrowly focused on those involved in project implementation/program delivery. In addition, unlike the more inclusive process advocated by other proponents of participative evaluation, Health Canada advises that the project sponsors should be responsible for defining the specific project evaluation questions, the indicators of success and timeframes.

http://www.exnet.iastate.edu/cyfar/welreforminfo/empower/empower_4.html

This site of the Iowa State University Extension program is titled "Community Empowerment Resources: Information on Collaboration and Citizen Participation." It provides references to books, reports, and organizations relating to community mobilization, community building, assessment/evaluation and empowerment.

http://www.ids.ac.uk/particip/index.html; http://www.ids.ac.uk/eldis/hot/pme.htm

The first site is the home page for the Participation Group at the Institute of Development Studies, Sussex, UK. The second site provides a primer on " Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation." It briefly discuses different aspects or issues in the field and then refers the reader to a number of web sites where more detailed information can be found. The site includes an extensive bibliography and list of case studies that may be accessed by the reader.

http://www.iied.org/bookshop/pubs/6141.html

This web page provides an overview of a volume of papers concerning Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation. This volume is part of a series called *Participatory Learning and Action Notes*. Information on how to order the papers is provided.

http://iisd1.iisd.ca/casl/CASLGuide/EvalPax.htm
Participatory Research for Sustainable Livelihoods: A Guide for Field Projects and Adaptive Strategies

http://www.maec.org/magnet.html
This is the web site for the District of Columbia/Smithsonian Institution Museum Magnet School Evaluation Project. It contains information on evaluation methods and practices. The project uses a "multidimensional evaluation design which will monitor program implementation, measure outcomes and assess progress towards objectives." The section of the site providing information on evaluation methods and practices contains links to other organizations with interests and expertise in participatory evaluation.

http://www.meaf.org/roadmap.html
This site contains document produced by the Mitsubishi Electric America Foundation titled "Creating and Sustaining Project Impact: Guidelines for Evaluation and Dissemination." It would be a useful document to provide to stakeholders when they become involved in the evaluation process. This paper is essentially a primer and outlines guidelines for evaluating projects, integrating evaluation throughout the life span of the project, and disseminating the information learned to stakeholders and others who may be interested or whose projects could benefit by learning about yours.

http://www.mapnp.org/library/
This site is a "Free Management Library, Resources for Nonprofit and For-Profit Businesses." It has links to information about all kinds of evaluations (69 topics) and on-line guides.

http://www.Pactpub.com/PMEonl.html
This site provides a guide called the "Participatory Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting Online Manual." The guide focuses on the needs of South African NGOs particularly with respect to building sustainable organizational capacity and offers and in-depth discussion of the Organisational Capacity Assessment Tool.

http://webx.stanford.edu/webx?14@154.QNmVPdRf^1@.ee6bc6f
This is the site of a web discussion forum called the "Empowerment Evaluation Virtual Conference." It is sponsored by the Centre for Teaching and Learning at Stanford University.

http://www.stanford.edu/~davidf/empowermentevaluation.html
This is the site of the American Evaluation Association; Collaborative, Participatory, and Empowerment Evaluation topical interest group. This group is dedicated to the exploration and refinement of collaborative, participatory, and empowerment approaches to evaluation. The site provides information on evaluation software, on-line guides and book reviews.

3.4 Organizations and Leading Professionals

3.4.1 Organizations

The Action Evaluation Project
http://www.aepro.org/training/default.html
This site offers information on "tools to facilitate and merge effective program design with evaluation." This includes: a computer assisted and interactive goal definition process involving key stakeholders, a process for consensus building with regard to possible action initiatives, a system for on-going data analysis and program monitoring to track progress towards achieving goals, and project evaluation.

Centre for the Study of Public Participation, University of Luton,
Contact: Dr. Peter McLaverty, Director
http://www.luton.ac.uk/humanities/politicspublicpolicy/cspp/index.html
The Centre for Study of Public Participation (CSPP) engages in applied research and consultancy in relation to policy evaluation, needs assessment and democratic audits.

Community Action Program for Children, St. Joseph's Women's Health Centre has been funded to evaluate Community Action Program Children projects across Ontario by Health Canada.

Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Co-operatives.
Contact: Mr. Glen Fitzpatrick, NLFC, Ph. (709) 726-9434
The NLFC used an empowerment evaluation process to restructure their organization and put in place a results-based programming and management approach. The evaluation process involved a self-administered monitoring and assessment process.

Participation Group, Institute of Development Studies, Sussex, UK.
http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/particip/index.html
The Participation Group's work involves providing support of participatory approaches to development. The group's website is linked to many other individuals and networks in over 50 countries.

National Network for Collaboration (NNCO)
http://crs.uvm.edu/nnco/index.htm
This website has a number of good linkages to others practicing collaboration, an available training program, and a number of other references.

United States Environmental Protection Agency, Stakeholder Involvement Office Contact: Brenda Collington Ph. (202) 260-7417 email: collington.brenda@epa.gov
http://www.epa.gov/reinvent/stakeholders/
For several years, the US EPA has been working to improve its approach to stakeholder engagement. This web site provides information on the EPA perspectives on and approaches to stakeholder engagement as well information about specific initiatives.

3.4.2 Leading Canadian Professionals

There are many Canadian experts in stakeholder involvement and experts in evaluation. Professionals skilled in both are more limited in number. The development of a comprehensive list of such professionals was not feasible during the timeframe of this study and the names provided below are of those who were already known to the authors of this report.

Professor Bradley Cousins, University of Ottawa
Ph. (613) 562-5800 x4075 email bcousins@uottawa.ca
Professor Cousins' research interests focus on the nature of, conditions supporting and effects of participatory and collaborative forms of evaluation and applied research.

Des Connor, Connor Development Services Ltd.
5096 Catalina Terrace, Victoria, BC V8Y 2A5
Ph. (250) 658-1323
connor@connor.bc.ca; http://www.connor.ba.ca/connor
Mr. Connor is an expert in stakeholder involvement with experience in evaluation processes.

Ekos Research Associates Inc.
99 Metcalfe St., Suite 1100
Ottawa, ON K1P 6L7
Contact: Patrick Beauchamp
Ph. (613) 235-7215 Fx. (613) 235-8498
pobox@ekos.com
Ekos specializes in program evaluation and social research. They conduct research relating to stakeholder involvement.

Brian Johnston, Context Research Ltd.
201-12837 76th Street, Surrey, BC V8W 2V3
Ph. (250) 596-3531 Fx. (250) 596-4473
brian@perconline.com
Mr. Johnson conducted the evaluation of Vancouver's public involvement activities.

Richard Roberts, PRAXIS
2215-19 Street S.W.
Calgary, AB, Canada T2T 4X1
Ph. (403) 245-6404 Fx. (403) 229-3037
praxinc@praxis.ca
http://www.praxis.ca
Richard Roberts is an expert in stakeholder involvement.

Ann Svendsen, CoreRelation Consulting
3968 Southwood Street, Burnaby BC V5J 2E6
Ph. (604) 437-6112 Fx (604) 437-6122
svendsen@istar.ca
Ms. Svendsen is an expert in stakeholder relations and collaborative processes.

3.5 Other Resources

Mosaic International will be holding a ten-day international workshop in Ottawa on "Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation" on the July 10-15, 2000.
For further information go to: http://www.mosaic-net-intl.ca