# Example community evaluation survey to meet minimum performance indicators

**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 |
| *Comment:* |
| 2 | I am **confident my views were heard** during the engagement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| *Comment:* |
| 3 | I was given an **adequate** **opportunity to be heard**  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| *Comment:* |
| 4 | I was given sufficient **information** so that I could take an informed view. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| *Comment:* |
| 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 |
| *Comment:* |

# 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 | * 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
 |
| *Comment:* |
| 2 | **Engagement was reviewed** throughout the process and improvements put in place, or recommended for future engagement  | * Reviewed and recommendations made in a systematic way
* Reviewed but no system for making recommendations
* Not reviewed
 |
| *Comment:* |
| 3 | Engagement **occurred early enough** for feedback to genuinely influence the planning policy, strategy or scheme | * Engaged when there was opportunity for input into scoping
* Engaged when there was opportunity for input into first draft
* Engaged when there was opportunity for minor edits to final draft
* Engaged when there was no real opportunity for input to be considered
 |
| *Comment:* |
| 4 | Engagement **contributed to the substance of the final plan**  | * In a significant way
* In a moderate way
* In a minor way
* Not at all
 |
| *Comment:* |
| 5 | Engagement provided **feedback to community about outcomes** of engagement | * Formally (report or public forum)
* Informally (closing summaries)
* No feedback provided
 |
| *Comment:* |
| 6 | Identify **key strength** of the Charter and Guide | * Provide drop down list with options based on charter attributes (in future)
 |
| *Comment:* |
| 7 | Identify **key challenge** of the charter and Guide | * Provide drop down list with options based on charter attributes (in future)
 |
| *Comment:* |

# 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 (*Select answer)* |
| 1 | The engagement reached those identified as the community of interest (Principle 2) | * 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
 |
| 2 | Engagement was reviewed throughout the process and improvements put in place, or recommended for future engagement (Principle 5) | * Reviewed and recommendations made in a systematic way
* Reviewed but no system for making recommendations
* Not reviewed
 |
| 3 | Engagement occurred early enough for feedback to genuinely influence the planning policy, strategy or scheme | * Engaged when there was opportunity for input into scoping
* Engaged when there was opportunity for input into first draft
* Engaged when there was opportunity for minor edits to final draft
* Engaged when there was no real opportunity for input to be considered
 |
| 4 | Engagement contributed to the substance of the final plan  | * In a significant way
* In a moderate way
* In a minor way
* Not at all
 |
| 5 | Engagement included the provision of feedback to community about outcomes of their participation | * Formally (report or public forum)
* Informally (closing summaries)
* 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  |  |