

Tool – Measuring success guidance and templates

The Charter sets minimum performance indicators (or measures of success) that must be used to evaluate engagement. These measures help to gauge how successful the engagement has been in meeting the Charter's principles for good engagement.

The evaluation process

Step 1 Initiation - prepare engagement plan

- An outline of how the success of engagement will be measured against the Charter's principles is required as part of the engagement plan. This engagement plan needs to be agreed to by the Commission at the initiation stage.
- The minimum performance indicators to be used for evaluation are provided in Table 1. Additional performance indicators can be included if desired.
- These measures of success will be used to evaluate whether the principles of the Charter have been met throughout the engagement process.

Step 2 Consultation - collect evaluation data

- During the engagement, the engaging entity (planner, proponent or engagement manager) needs to ensure that the appropriate evaluation data is gathered.
- This can be done by distributing a survey to participants at the end of an engagement activity or at the end of the entire engagement process. This survey should ask at least the minimum performance indicator questions for "community" as identified in Table 1 (see also example survey in Appendix 1).
- The engaging entity can also complete an evaluation exercise at the end of an engagement activity or at the end of the entire engagement process. This exercise should at least respond to the minimum performance indicator questions for "project manager or equivalent" in Table 1 (see also example template in Appendix 2).
- Completing these exercises at the end of engagement activities enables the project team to review the success of their activities - what went well and what didn't - and make improvements for the next engagement stages. Participants may also be more likely to fill out a survey immediately after an activity, rather than some time later.
- Quantitative data should also be collected as the engagement rolls out including: number of people reached, number of participants at events, number of submissions received, etc.
- Workshop attendance sheets or online bookings are a great way of recording participant numbers while also building a distribution list for future engagement activities and the circulation of engagement reports.

Step 3 Consider feedback – report on engagement success

- Upon completion of engagement, the information gathered from the evaluation activities needs to be compiled, analysed and summarised.
- The evaluation needs to be included within the s73 statutory engagement report that is provided to the Minister for decision-making. This engagement report is also published on the PlanSA portal. Refer to the engagement report template.

TABLE 1

Charter criteria	Charter performance outcomes	Respondent (to answer the evaluation question)	Indicator	Evaluation tool Exit survey / follow-up survey	Measuring success of project engagement (prepared by project manager of engaging authority for inserting in engagement report)
Principle 1: Engagement is genuine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People had faith and confidence in the engagement process. 	Community	1. I feel the engagement genuinely sought my input to help shape the proposal	Likert scale - strongly disagree to strongly agree	Percent from each response.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement occurred before or during the drafting of the planning policy, strategy or scheme when there was an opportunity for influence 	Project Manager or equivalent	2. Engagement occurred early enough for feedback to genuinely influence the planning policy, strategy or scheme	Engaged when there was opportunity for input into scoping	Project Manager or equivalent
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement contributed to the substance of a plan or resulted in changes to a draft 	Project Manager or equivalent	3. Engagement contributed to the substance of the final plan		Project Manager or equivalent
Principle 2: Engagement is inclusive and respectful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affected and interested people had the opportunity to participate and be heard. 	Community	4. I am confident my views were heard during the engagement	Likert scale - strongly disagree to strongly agree	Per cent from each response.
		Project Manager or equivalent	5. The engagement reached those identified as community of interest. <i>Note: The Community of Interest are those Community groups identified in the stakeholder analysis in the engagement plan.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representatives from most community groups participated in the engagement Representatives from some community groups participated in the engagement There was little representation of the community groups in engagement. 	Provide chosen answer
Principle 3: Engagement is fit for purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People were effectively engaged and satisfied with the process. People were clear about the proposed change and how it would affect them. 	Community	6. I was given sufficient information so that I could take an informed view. <i>Note: Sufficient information includes whether the information was understood i.e. in plain English language, another language, and visuals in addition to the extent of information.</i>	Likert scale - strongly disagree to strongly agree	Per cent from each response.

Charter criteria	Charter performance outcomes	Respondent (to answer the evaluation question)	Indicator	Evaluation tool Exit survey / follow-up survey	Measuring success of project engagement (prepared by project manager of engaging authority for inserting in engagement report)
Principle 4: Engagement is informed and transparent			7. I was given an adequate opportunity to be heard	Likert scale - strongly disagree to strongly agree	Per cent from each response.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All relevant information was made available and people could access it. People understood how their views were considered, the reasons for the outcomes and the final decision that was made. 	Community	8. I felt informed about why I was being asked for my view, and the way it would be considered.	Likert scale - strongly disagree to strongly agree	Per cent from each response.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement includes 'closing the loop' Engagement included activities that 'closed the loop' by providing feedback to participants/ community about outcomes of engagement. 	Project Manager or equivalent	9. Engagement provided feedback to community about outcomes of engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formally (report or public forum) Informally (closing summaries) No feedback provided	Provide chosen answer
Principle 5: Engagement processes are reviewed and improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The engagement was reviewed and improvements recommended. 	Project Manager or equivalent	10. Engagement was reviewed throughout the process and improvements put in place, or recommended for future engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed and recommendations made Reviewed but no system for making recommendations Not reviewed 	Provide chosen answer
Charter is valued and useful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement is facilitated and valued by planners 	Project Manager or equivalent	Identify key strength of the Charter and Guide Identify key challenge of the charter and Guide	General Comments	

Appendix 1 - Example community evaluation survey to meet minimum performance indicators

This survey can be completed by those participating in an engagement activity or at the conclusion of the entire engagement process.

It may be completed online or in hard copy. It could be handed out at events, emailed to attendees or those who submit submissions or provided on a website. It could also be added to existing templates for evaluations.

Activity: e.g. stakeholder workshop, submission, open day

Date:

I am a: resident, stakeholder, etc.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

(1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree)

Evaluation statement		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree
1	I feel the engagement genuinely sought my input to help shape the proposal	1	2	3	4	5
	<i>Comment:</i>					
2	I am confident my views were heard during the engagement	1	2	3	4	5
	<i>Comment:</i>					
3	I was given an adequate opportunity to be heard	1	2	3	4	5
	<i>Comment:</i>					
4	I was given sufficient information so that I could take an informed view.	1	2	3	4	5
	<i>Comment:</i>					
5	I felt informed about why I was being asked for my view, and the way it would be considered.	1	2	3	4	5
	<i>Comment:</i>					

Appendix 2 - Example project manager evaluation exercise to meet minimum performance indicators

This exercise can be completed by the engaging entity (planner, proponent or engagement manager) following an engagement activity or at the end of the entire engagement process.

It may be completed online or in hard copy.

Please consider your engagement process as a whole and provide the most appropriate response.

Evaluation statement		Response options
1	The engagement reached those identified as the community of interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Representatives from most community groups participated in the engagement <input type="checkbox"/> Representatives from some community groups participated in the engagement <input type="checkbox"/> There was little representation of the community groups in engagement
	<i>Comment:</i>	
2	Engagement was reviewed throughout the process and improvements put in place, or recommended for future engagement	<input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed and recommendations made in a systematic way <input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed but no system for making recommendations <input type="checkbox"/> Not reviewed
	<i>Comment:</i>	
3	Engagement occurred early enough for feedback to genuinely influence the planning policy, strategy or scheme	<input type="checkbox"/> Engaged when there was opportunity for input into scoping <input type="checkbox"/> Engaged when there was opportunity for input into first draft <input type="checkbox"/> Engaged when there was opportunity for minor edits to final draft <input type="checkbox"/> Engaged when there was no real opportunity for input to be considered
	<i>Comment:</i>	
4	Engagement contributed to the substance of the final plan	<input type="checkbox"/> In a significant way <input type="checkbox"/> In a moderate way <input type="checkbox"/> In a minor way <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all
	<i>Comment:</i>	

Evaluation statement		Response options
5	Engagement provided feedback to community about outcomes of engagement	<input type="checkbox"/> Formally (report or public forum) <input type="checkbox"/> Informally (closing summaries) <input type="checkbox"/> No feedback provided
	<i>Comment:</i>	
6	Identify key strength of the Charter and Guide	<input type="checkbox"/> Provide drop down list with options based on charter attributes (in future)
	<i>Comment:</i>	
7	Identify key challenge of the charter and Guide	<input type="checkbox"/> Provide drop down list with options based on charter attributes (in future)
	<i>Comment:</i>	

Appendix 3 - Example evaluation template to include in report to the Commission

Engagement reach

For each engagement activity (include promotion too) provide the following information. This could be done in a table. Add any discussion to clarify any of the results.

For example:

Stage of engagement	Engagement or promotion activity	Number of people reached e.g extent of distribution, number of webpage hits, etc	Number of participants e.g. number workshop attendees, submissions received, surveys completed, etc.

Discussion...

Consistency with the agreed engagement plan

Explain how the engagement plan approved by the Commission was adhered to (or not). Describe any changes made to the engagement approach and provide a rationale for this.

The engagement occurred in accordance with the engagement plan endorsed by the State Planning Commission on x date (engagement plan attached) with exception of the below variances (if relevant).

Variances were made to the engagement plan as follows (if relevant):

Variance	Justification

Engagement evaluation results

The purpose of this section is to enable the State Planning Commission to determine whether the requirements of the Community Engagement Charter have been met.

Summary of the evaluation

Include a brief analysis of the success of the engagement, including the 'story behind' the evaluation data collected. This is where you can help the Commission to interpret the data (below) by explaining what you believe the data is telling you about the effectiveness of your engagement.

For example: "There was significant emotional objection to (outline issue/s) that was connected to the proposal but not part of this engagement process. The community found it difficult to understand that this issue was not part of the engagement process."

How evaluation was collected

Describe how evaluation data was collected.

For example: "Evaluation data was collected that addressed the Charter's minimum performance indicators. For the 'community' indicators, the data was collected through an evaluation survey. This survey was provided to participants at each engagement event, emailed to those who lodged a written submission and made publically available from council websites and the SA Planning Portal". For the 'project manager' indicators, the evaluation was completed by [XYZ]."

Results of the mandatory community evaluation

[X number] community feedback surveys were received. The outcomes of these surveys are summarised in Table [X].

Indicate the percentage of respondents who chose each category, below. For example, if four out of twenty people indicated that they strongly agreed that the engagement genuinely sought their input to help shape the proposal, then you would enter '20%' in 'strongly agree' column.

Table [X]

	Evaluation statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree
1	I feel the engagement genuinely sought my input to help shape the proposal (Principle 1)	%	%	%	%	%
2	I am confident my views were heard during the engagement (Principle 2)	%	%	%	%	%
3	I was given an adequate opportunity to be heard (Principle 3)	%	%	%	%	%
4	I was given sufficient information so that I could take an informed view (Principle 3)	%	%	%	%	%
5	I felt informed about why I was being asked for my view, and the way it would be considered (Principle 4)	%	%	%	%	%

Results of the evaluation by the engaging entity ('project manager')

The engagement was evaluated by the project manager/project team/engagement manager. The results of this evaluation are shown in Table X.

Table [X]

Evaluation statement		Response options (<i>Select answer</i>)
1	The engagement reached those identified as the community of interest (Principle 2)	<input type="checkbox"/> Representatives from most community groups participated in the engagement <input type="checkbox"/> Representatives from some community groups participated in the engagement <input type="checkbox"/> There was little representation of the community groups in engagement
2	Engagement was reviewed throughout the process and improvements put in place, or recommended for future engagement (Principle 5)	<input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed and recommendations made in a systematic way <input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed but no system for making recommendations <input type="checkbox"/> Not reviewed
3	Engagement occurred early enough for feedback to genuinely influence the planning policy, strategy or scheme	<input type="checkbox"/> Engaged when there was opportunity for input into scoping <input type="checkbox"/> Engaged when there was opportunity for input into first draft <input type="checkbox"/> Engaged when there was opportunity for minor edits to final draft <input type="checkbox"/> Engaged when there was no real opportunity for input to be considered
4	Engagement contributed to the substance of the final plan	<input type="checkbox"/> In a significant way <input type="checkbox"/> In a moderate way <input type="checkbox"/> In a minor way <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all
5	Engagement included the provision of feedback to community about outcomes of their participation	<input type="checkbox"/> Formally (report or public forum) <input type="checkbox"/> Informally (closing summaries) <input type="checkbox"/> No feedback provided
6	Identify key strength of the Charter and Guide	
7	Identify key challenge of the charter and Guide	

Summary and results of any additional evaluation

Insert a summary and results of additional evaluation undertaken, if applicable

Applying the Charter principles in practice

Consider how your engagement met the principles of the Charter. For examples of how the Charter principles may look in practice, see the 'Guide to the Community Engagement Charter'.

The Charter principles were applied to the engagement as outlined in Table X.

Charter principle	How the engagement approach/activities met the principles
Engagement is genuine	
Engagement is inclusive and respectful	
Engagement is fit for purpose	
Engagement is informed and transparent	
Engagement is reviewed and improved	