

## Internal Innovation Advisory Workgroup – evaluation part 1

September 30, 2015

**Attendees:** Grace Cho, Noelle Dobson, Janet Lee, Nicole Lewis, Catherine Moore, Karen Scott-Lowthian, Peggy Morell, Erin Pidot

**Driving question:** How will we know when Metro has meaningfully and successfully engaged underrepresented communities in its decision-making?

### Meeting goals:

- Provide overview of community-sourced evaluation
- Review and revise list of measures that Metro can use to evaluate progress
- Brainstorm ways that we can institutionalize the collection of data

### Meeting notes:

#### I. Introductions and overview

- Everyone introduced themselves
- Reviewed goals for today's meeting
- We are looking at how Metro can evaluate its progress towards meaningful and successful public engagement with underrepresented communities

#### II. Brief overview of some related evaluation efforts at Metro

- Briefly touched on three evaluation efforts at Metro that are relevant to the evaluation that the innovation work is thinking about
- 1. Standardizing collection of demographic information through partnership with Pivot
- Noelle – who is leading effort to standardize?
  - o Karen - headed up by Becca Uherbelau in partnership with Pivot – creating two sets of questions – for online and in-person
  - o We will email out latest version of standardized questions after meeting
- The other two are taking an approach to evaluation that feels new for Metro – a community-sourced or participatory approach that involves community members in the evaluation process
- 2. Transportation Equity Analysis, led by Grace Cho – will analyze how near- and long-term transportation investments perform relative to community-identified priorities
- 3. DEI Equity Strategy – will include an impact evaluation component to look at impact of equity work on intended target of impact.
- Innovation work seeks to share lessons learned with these projects and collaborate when possible

#### III. Introduction to community-sourced evaluation and key terms

- Catherine – is community validated or sourced evaluation an established model or our language to describe what we're doing?
  - o Our language to describe our approach to evaluation, not an established model
- Catherine – why are you calling it community-sourced and not participatory? Participatory comes with baggage, but evaluators know what it means and it also comes with body of literature
- See slide 7 for 'what is it?' and 'why is it important?'
- See slide 8 for key terms defined for purposes of our work together – measure, indicator, data collection strategy and guiding principle
- Noelle – are you focusing on impact or process evaluation or both?
  - o Both, though idea is to base measures on community's ideas about what constitutes meaningful engagement
- Noelle – need to think about how we are defining public engagement – what is considered engagement? Include job recruitment, for example?

- Grace – looking at both engagement effort and impact of decision – we ultimately have no control over how decision goes. What we hear from communities may not end up in decisions. Have to be able to assess engagement process and know whether we’ve done good engagement, even if decision goes another way.
- Catherine – we’re in a funny space that’s difficult to navigate and evaluate – we want more diverse voices and need to help communities understand how the decision-making process works and how the many factors that influence the ultimate decisions.
- Catherine - We want to get more people at Council Meetings, but maybe going isn’t the best way for them to provide input – how to measure impact that community input has?
- Janet – why “historically” underrepresented?
- Noelle – acknowledges there is a history that we hope to change.
- Peggy – replaces “traditionally” underrepresented communities – this is not a tradition that we want to maintain
- Should check with DEI to see if they have a recommendation on what language to use

#### **IV. Review and brainstorm measures for Metro to evaluate progress**

- See meeting handout with table of community-sourced measures – drawn from several sources including feedback from Community Summit, collection of community advocate reflections on public engagement experiences, and previous innovation team meetings
- How do these measures feel? What’s missing? Would this kind of list be useful as a resource for you?
- Nicole – how to actually measure these measures? A list of indicators would be more useful
- Karen – how community feel is one indicator, but need to be backed up by data. Look at what things Metro is already tracking
- Noelle – need to think about how to match quantitative with qualitative data.
- Represent as part of a toolbox – numbers driven and how people feel. Experiential valued on same level as numbers.
- Grace – these seem “experiential”, indicators could be temporal. When to ask, especially if decision goes in a direction other than what community wanted. If just use tool after decision was made, people’s reported experience of engagement will be really different. How do we break indicators in checks along the way – take pulse in between to realign.
- Grace – this list needs to be shared with every project manager – this is making me think differently about public engagement plan
- Janet – need to loop back to let them know how input shaped decision
- Catherine – there are a lot of important things that we won’t be able to measure – relationship to park, experience while there – we are using a tool developed by Duke interns that relies on qualitative information collected through interviews and an assessment rubric.
- Janet – add something to measures about who participates in meetings and work base at Metro
  - o For agency-wide, “does staff and leadership at Metro reflect diversity of the region”
- Noelle – need to parse out “compensation” with other ways to build capacity.
- Noelle – cautious of not over-burdening community by asking them to give us all of this information – what indicators can we collect on our own? Should start adding indicators to chart.

#### **V. How can we collect this data?**

- Catherine – example of customer experience data collection at Heathrow airport – point-in-time – press happy face/sad face to reflect experience
- Grace – gave example of how immediate feedback can be used to re-adjust presentation
  - o Formal and informal feedback
- Noelle – staff reflection tool that can be a way to collect feedback in informal way
- Catherine – difficult to get staff to sit down and do that. When you do, great source of key indicators.
- Noelle – these are evaluation structures, not methods
- Grace –takes engagement plan and summary comment reports through regional committee structure - this should be added. (doesn’t apply to all)
- Tools used differ from project-to-project
- Noelle – web analytics
- Peggy – spectrum of surveys – quick-polls

- Nicole – a lot of this seems focused on planning – also think about engaging through services and visitor experience - customer surveys, secret shopper at parks, etc.
  - o What about other departments? Solid waste?
- Catherine – Partners in Nature designed around going into communities to ask what they need. We try to develop program around their needs.

**VI. Next steps**

- Will send out short meeting survey
- Janet – very focused on CBOs we already have relationships with, but how do we reach community members who we don't have relationships with?
- Grace – for next meeting, thoughts on programs/projects to start guinea pigging some of this stuff with