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Introduction

Committed to its leadership role to advance the theory and practice of civic engagement CPRN hosted a roundtable with a diverse group who share an interest in furthering collective knowledge in this field. These included academics, policy makers and practitioners (for complete list of participants see Appendix 1).

The purpose of the September 18th half day Roundtable was to contribute a shared understanding of the lacunae and need for stronger citizen engagement in Canada. The discussion on the research and policy implications stemmed from two recent CPRN publications: *Fostering Canadians’ Role in Public Policy: A Strategy for Institutionalizing Public Involvement in Policy* by Peter Aucoin, and Lori Turnbull; and *Assessing the Impacts of Public Participation: Concepts, Evidence and Policy Implications* by Julia Abelson and François-Pierre Gauvin.

These papers were inspired by a considerable and growing interest within policy, academic, practitioner and community circles concerning the potential for, and barriers to, more robust and consistent approaches to public involvement practice and evaluation within Canadian democracy. The papers were designed to stimulate discussion and debate and to provide recommendations for policy makers, practitioners and academics on avenues to be pursued to strengthen both the theory and the practice of public involvement.

Roundtable Objectives

- To bring together practitioners, researchers and policy makers to discuss the challenges and opportunities to strengthening public involvement practices;
- To identify needs for further research;
- To have a rich discussion around the themes of institutionalizing and assessing public involvement as elaborated in the two papers; and
- To help inform and frame CPRN’s thinking about research and policy priorities related to public involvement.

The Roundtable agenda is provided in Appendix 2.

Participants

Initially CPRN had planned to bring together about 15 participants, but expanded the roundtable to accommodate the high level of interest in this issue. A mixture of practitioners, academics and policy makers made for a rich and constructive discussion. A complete list of participants is provided in Appendix 1. In all, 27 people gathered in Ottawa with another six joining by phone.

Discussion Format

Mary Pat McKinnon (Director, Public Involvement Network, CPRN), acted as moderator for the discussion. Following a brief introduction, the authors highlighted key recommendations and shared their perspectives on prospects for positive change in the
current context. Discussants then provided their reflections and offered questions for further exploration. Following these presentations, the roundtable discussion unfolded. Discussants for the two papers were:

- Sue Gardner-Barclay from Health Canada’s Office of Consumer and Public Involvement, and Peter MacLeod from The Planning Desk responded to the Aucoin and Turnbull paper on institutionalization.
- Ian Peach from the Saskatchewan Institute of Public Policy and Leslie Seidle from the Institute for Research on Public Policy commented on the Abelson and Gauvin paper on assessing the impacts of public involvement.

Summary of Authors’ and Discussants’ Remarks

Institutionalizing Public Involvement in Canada

Authors’ Highlights

Peter Aucoin began his remarks by emphasizing what is known about public involvement in public policy:

- The practice of public involvement may take different forms;
- Process, structure and design matter to the effectiveness of public involvement;
- Citizens who engage in quality consultative processes usually are positive about the experience; and
- The demand for public involvement is a long-term trend that shows no signs of going away.

Second, he sketched what he perceives to be major public involvement challenges:

- Difficulty in appropriately framing issues for public discussion;
- Localizing public involvement issues and processes without trivializing them;
- Making better use of technology (the Internet) to reach the masses; and
- Linking public involvement to partisan politics so that public involvement becomes a part of normal politics.

He observed that the paradigm of the “new public governance” works against public involvement due to:

- A concentration of power in the Prime Minister’s Office;
- Increased influence of and role for political staff;
- Increased political attention to staffing senior public-service posts;
- An expectation that public servants be supporters of and cheerleaders for the government’s agenda; and
- Increased political spin on government communications.

While acknowledging that some of these challenges are longstanding, he noted that in recent years they have intensified. Moreover, these developments have occurred throughout the west and have resulted in pervasive effects such as:

- Less access to government information;
- Less impartial or incomplete information to politicians and from government to the public;
- Greater government interest in polling than public involvement; and
- A more negative view of public involvement by government.
Aucoin concluded with recommendations for advancing institutionalization of public involvement:

- Make public involvement processes more independent of the government of the day. A more independent public service would be better positioned to assist public involvement with information and advice;
- Expand the role and use of parliamentary committees to involve the public in ways that are deliberative, on the record, transparent and publicly communicated; and
- Make effective use of referendums on some issues so that public involvement culminates in direct public decision-making, thereby requiring mass political mobilization of citizens.

Discussants’ Comments

Discussants Sue Gardner-Barclay and Peter MacLeod focussed on some emerging issues and challenges related to institutionalizing public involvement.

They identified the following key challenges:

- As noted in the paper, politicians and senior public servants are sceptical of public involvement. There is a false perception that public input is being advantaged over expert input;
- Most consultations focus on technical issues. Practitioners need to be a voice at the table to push for the important role value-based discussions have in underpinning policy;
- The co-existence of two paradigms in Canada - one predicated on the idea of representation and a belief in the exclusivity of knowledge and the other, emergent paradigm emphasizing individual recognition and collective intelligence;
- The growing number of policy decisions made in international forums pose special challenges for public involvement at the national and regional levels; and
- There are some highly innovative and regarded public involvement initiatives in Canada. How do we ensure they are not “one-offs”? How do we keep the operational know-how from going out the door when an initiative is finished?

In thinking about the role of politicians in public involvement processes, the general thrust of discussants’ views was:

- There is a need to make a stronger case about the value of public involvement in shaping policy if politicians and the policy elite are to agree allocating sufficient resources for and acceptance of the public at the policy table;
- A framework for assessing impacts will help with this, but ideas that address the new ethos and embrace the public demand for a different relationship are essential to restoring trust and renewing the legitimacy of our political actors and institutions;
- Bringing politicians into the picture is essential; the true mandate of contemporary governance must privilege engagement and convening;
- Need to shift from a “representative” mode to a “seeking public input” mode - from standing for and acting for to reaching public judgement with their constituents; and
- Need politicians to understand that public involvement can strengthen rather than diminish their role in Parliament; and

---

1 The summary of discussants’ points does not indicate both discussants agree with every point reported.
• Politicians could play a stronger role in the public involvement processes – to do so will require a change in our political culture. They will also need the skills and resources to convene consultative processes.

Discussants also called for actions to strengthen civic infrastructure and capacity for public involvement within the public service and legislatures:

• Create more civic infrastructure, such as a Centre for Public Dialogue in every province with a university endowed with its care (e.g. the Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue at Simon Fraser University in BC);
• Create mechanisms to transfer internal knowledge on public consultation processes) across departments and agencies and build capacity;
• Create government bodies (e.g. Engagement Canada or Participation Ontario) with a mandate to provide support for civic programming and advice on outreach and engagement;
• Constituency offices can be local hubs for outreach and engagement, providing a national public involvement infrastructure - the root system of Parliament. Provide resources and supports at the constituency level for provincial and federal politicians to engage their constituents in policy (MP and MPP offices could serve as places to mobilize citizens locally); and
• Allocate adequate resources to support greater public engagement.

Assessing the Impact of Public Involvement

Authors’ Highlights
Julia Abelson and François-Pierre Gauvin indicated there are some signs of improvement when it comes to recognizing the importance of evaluation, but cautioned participants to be realistic about the state of public involvement evaluation, given important methodological challenges and the political context.

Challenges from an evaluation perspective:
• There is a paucity of the research evidence.
• The literature is still somewhat underdeveloped.
• There is a lack of sophisticated evaluation frameworks available.
• There are stringent standards applied to evaluation literature.

Challenges from a political perspective:
• There is an absence of an evaluation culture in all levels of government.
• There is a lack of resources (or allocation of resources) to support, nurture, and foster evaluation.
• Given the political culture, is it worth investing in evaluation? Are the results likely to be used?

Process challenges:
• We need to think holistically about the impact of public involvement on participants (quality of the process and deliberation), the broader public, decision makers and public policy (how did public involvement affect decisions taken) – they are linked.
• There is very limited evaluation literature on the impact of context on process and policy outcomes.
Nonetheless, there are encouraging developments:

- There is convergence in the literature: practitioners, policy makers and academics have a good collective sense of what is needed for better evaluation criteria (for both process and outcome evaluation).
- People are thinking more vigorously about evaluation across different policy sectors (biotechnology, public health, environment, to name a few).
- Practitioners and researchers recognize that we need to move from purely descriptive to more analytical approaches to documenting experiences. In addition there is growing acceptance that more resources are needed for evaluation infrastructure.
- There is an understanding that one size cannot fit all and that we need to contextualize and tailor overarching frameworks to make evaluation more meaningful.
- There is some movement towards shared learning between the different champion organizations.

They noted a number of questions for discussion and possibly further work:

- In order to evaluate public involvement, what are the contextual factors to account for?
- What are some practical ways to promote dialogue among researchers and practitioners to establish common evaluation standards or criteria for public involvement?
- How do we initiate and achieve the culture shift to move people away from thinking of evaluation as a luxury?
- What tools and measurements do we need in our toolbox? What training is needed and for whom?

Discussants’ Comments

To the discussants Ian Peach and Leslie Seidle, the underdeveloped literature and the lack of research evidence came as no surprise, considering:

- Governments often fail to think through public involvement strategies and meaningful objectives for evaluation;
- There is no locus of expertise on public involvement in government; and
- The fact that more deliberative types of public engagement are still quite new.

The discussants reinforced many of the challenges identified in the paper:

- Despite all the talk about the democratic deficit, too many political and public officials are sceptical about the value of evaluation;
- Senior public servants face resource constraints due to years of cutbacks. Evaluation is thus perceived as a luxury they cannot afford;
- Many parliamentarians see public involvement as a threat to their decision making rather than as supporting it;
- Collectively, we have tended to deal with each public involvement process as a grand experiment. Onus is on governments, researchers and practitioners to systematically evaluate public involvement processes and document our learnings in order to build a critical mass of knowledge and much greater attention to evaluation;
- It is challenging to evaluate impact of public involvement on policy outcomes but we can readily evaluate process outcomes at a minimum. In order to assess impact on decisions, there needs to be a clear connection of the public involvement process to
decision making (e.g. referendum in BC on Citizens’ Assembly recommendation); and

- We need to be humble and cautious about the impact of public involvement on trust in government, noting that a single public involvement event will likely have limited impact. (e.g., Has the BC Citizens’ Assembly had the effect of increasing public trust in government in BC?)

Some key questions identified for consideration:
  o What is needed to build capacity for evaluation? Where is that capacity best placed - inside or outside government?
  o Who should practitioners and researchers be speaking to within government to help change the process?
Synthesis of Roundtable Discussion

Most of the ensuing discussion focussed on the challenges emanating from poorly documented and weak knowledge transfer related to the variety of public involvement practices across jurisdictions in Canada and abroad. The close connection between the subjects addressed in the two papers was reflected throughout much of the discussion. As practitioners, researchers, public officials and advisors, we need to ensure that public involvement processes are designed in such a way that they can be evaluated. Common evaluation criteria will strengthen process design. More evaluations will contribute to building the culture needed to more regularly involve the public in policy decision, while a more institutionalized approach to public involvement will increase the demand for sound evaluations.

The following section synthesizes key discussion points by various themes.

Institutionalization

Roundtable participants broadly agreed that institutionalizing public involvement, although legitimate, is a hugely ambitious goal, for any level of government. Some were more hopeful about the prospects for individual departments within a government to achieve success, rather than an across-the-board approach.

Questions raised and observations made:

- **What would/should institutionalization look like in Canada?** Do we know enough about what and how to institutionalize and what works well in what context? While some argue that the moral and legitimacy reasons are sufficient to make a strong case for institutionalization, others caution that we need to know more about the impacts of public involvement before moving to institutionalize it.

- **Is the ultimate goal of institutionalization more public involvement or better policy?** Is there a risk of increasing the divide between those who participate and those who don’t? According to many participants, in a healthy democracy the two are not mutually exclusive and actually reinforce each other.

- **There is a need to go back to basics.** Our public consultation practices often do not fit the purposes / needs. We have been so focused on the means that we have lost sight of the ‘why’. As governments rely more and more on engaging stakeholders, some have forgotten to consider the needs of citizen.

- **Is public consultation just about spin?** Participants flagged the strong scepticism surrounding public consultation because governments are perceived to be obsessed with risk management.

- **When and why does public input become important or valuable?** In a milieu where evidence and science based expertise is considered essential to policy development, are we clear enough about the contributions of lay knowledge especially relating to value-choices and program implementation? How people perceive risk and what risk they are prepared to tolerate has to come from the public. These issues need co-participation by state and citizens. Citizens often have greater expertise when it comes to assessing impacts of particular decisions on their lives.
Are we clear enough about which issues are best suited for public deliberation?

**Related Questions:**
- At what point should public consultation be undertaken and why?
- Who do you want involved and why?
- What is a legitimate process or integrity of process?
- Can we demonstrate that public input leads to better decisions?
- How do we define better decisions: maximum involvement of the public? Publicly palatable? Scientifically rigorous, etc.?

**Scaling up public involvement: does it make sense to go big or go home?**

Is there value in smaller baby steps? Some argue that not paying attention to individual initiatives may mean lost opportunities for routine policy development and program implementation that can cumulatively make a difference. Others agreed that going little/local can contribute to knowledge and incremental institutionalization but that we need to transfer knowledge in order for it to be beneficial.

Others worry that focusing on small, individual public involvement initiatives is not cost effective. One suggestion was to identify generic questions to probe in more micro approaches (such as questions of risk tolerance and mitigation) that can then be brought up to a higher level.

**Public service role and challenges**

Some participants worry that too many public servants are not well connected with the public. Others added that there is also a tendency to confuse stakeholder groups with the public (attributed in part to their frequent contact with them).

**Political and institutional context matter**

- Serving minority governments places demands on the public service that can result in less appetite and fewer resources for public involvement.

- On the other hand, minority governments can offer opportunities for greater public consultation (example given was Nova Scotia where the government is not perceived as a government in transition to majority, and acts accordingly).

- The nature of Federal Provincial Territorial relations makes the practice of public consultation more challenging. Different jurisdictions may be uneasy about public involvement (specific ethnic groups, such as Aboriginal communities).

- At the federal level there is less systematic sharing of best practices in public involvement with the failed effort at establishing public consultation guidelines.

- Some participants spoke about a loss of appetite for citizen engagement within the public service and worry about the implications of this. If the public service is not well connected to citizens, its understanding of the impacts of policy and programs on citizens is limited, with the result that program design and implementation will suffer.
Related Question:
- How should the public service approach citizen engagement on complex technical or scientific issues? “Ordinary citizen” language versus expert knowledge maintains a fiction of rigid categories of ordinary knowledge and expert knowledge. How does the tension between expert and experiential knowledge be managed constructively?

Evaluation imperatives and challenges
- The lack of resources (or proper allocation of resources) to support, nurture, and foster evaluation is serious.
  - In small provinces especially, funds for public involvement are scarce and critical analysis and evaluation are considered secondary.

- Building a better empirical base within the public service would increase internal knowledge. Organizations such as the International Association for Public Participation and the newly created Canadian Community for Dialogue and Deliberation (C2D2) seek to help build this base. C2D2 was created to share and disseminate lessons learned and to expand the network of senior public officials committed to public involvement practice and evaluation.

- While there is a growing number of interesting evaluation initiatives underway, most researchers acknowledge that we have a way to go to achieve the necessary critical mass of knowledge.
  - In particular there must be more work done to better understand how context affects public involvement outcomes.
  - In addition while no one evaluation framework will fit all processes, there needs to be some agreement on what are acceptable frameworks that address both process and output dimensions.

- While Memoranda to Cabinet must include a section on public consultation process, the absence of required evaluation processes, including evaluation criteria is problematic.

- Evaluation can become a political game. Without a common evaluation language and commonly accepted frameworks, initiatives are determined in an ad hoc fashion. Interviews are key to evaluation but public servants face difficulties in deciding who to engage: e.g. the general public, patients or consumers?

- There is resistance to public input from organization staff that stems from a belief that they were hired for their expertise, so why ask the public for their input?

The fact that one focus of the roundtable discussion deals with evaluation is seen as a step in the right direction.

The roles of politicians and political parties in fostering public involvement
- Parliamentarians are part of the problem and the solution.
Public involvement raises control and fear issues for politicians but without directly engaging parliamentarians in the pursuit of deeper public engagement, we are missing the point.

Politicians must understand that engagement of citizens and civil society is not intended or designed to subvert representational democracy. Civic engagement should be recast as a key part of renewed representational democracy.

In developing strategies to engage politicians we need to take into account their self-perceptions of their roles. The role of the MP is no longer well defined. Some feel strongly that once elected they are responsible for making decisions; others are more open to engaging their constituents in defining policy directions. And still other politicians see themselves representing particular constituencies of interest that are not necessarily place based.

Institutionalization will require leadership on the part of politicians.
  o The presence of senior officials, such as ministers, in consultation processes, helps increase citizen participation.
  o Use of parliamentary committees to engage different publics is a promising avenue for public involvement, especially when standing committees engage in their own public investigations and when bills are referred to committees after first reading.

Public consultative processes always have a political interface and this will intensify on high profile issues.

The creation of Political Party Foundations, as recommended by the Lortie Commission, would create greater incentives for political parties to more actively engage their members and the public in policy development.

**Related Questions:**
- What is the role of partisanship and political parties in these mechanisms?
- How can we get political parties to become more involved and engaged?
- What triggers could be used?
- How should we speak to government about this?
- Is it important to frame public involvement in a way to address the concerns of those threatened by it?

Mobilizing citizens to engage in policy
- **There is a need to mobilize citizens** because our political culture has traditionally not been very inclusive or welcoming. This is especially relevant today given the fragmentation and diversity of our population.

- **Cultivating a sense of civic duty** is important though there is a need for dissecting what we mean by civic responsibility. Some suggested changing school curricula at elementary school, or implementing voluntary programs. Lowering the voting age was
also evoked by some as a positive step, while others feel that it would have little or no impact on the sense of civic duty.

- **Socialization matters.** It was noted that the family is a main source of political knowledge or awareness for many youth. If young people grow up without a sense of their entitlement to participate and contribute, they will feel little compulsion to participate.

- More attention should be focussed on the role of the public in **informing good policy implementation.** Experts are wrong to assume that citizens have little knowledge in this regard - they often have greater know-how on impacts than experts do.

- **Understanding the citizens’ logic model.** In order to institutionalize the process, it is necessary to first understand how citizens conceive important policy issues.

- **Grasping values shifts.** Some participants argued for a process, at regular intervals (more or less 5 years), on core questions to learn the public’s logic model and preferences. This would build a valuable body of knowledge that would allow us to explain specific decisions, values, and trade-offs. This information would be valuable for different departments and have a long pay-off.

- **Agree to disagree.** We need to understand that public involvement requires one to be open to deliberation, with the possibility of considering a diversity of perspectives and interests. It is difficult to have a discussion if one believes rights are non-negotiable.

- **Need to change public perceptions** about opportunities for engagement. Despite multiple public consultation exercises on the future of health care in Canada, many people (65%) still felt that not enough was being done.

- **Informing communities.** Need to make ongoing public consultations better known to different communities.

**Representational challenges - Citizen versus Stakeholder**
- The notion of unaffiliated neutral citizens is problematic for some. Those sharing this perspective feel that citizens always bring some affiliations into consultations. Analysis of public involvement work must assess where citizens are coming from, what perspectives they bring to the table, and be transparent about it. It was also noted that people who represent an organization or community of interests can, for the most part, be objective and constructive.

- Others argue that there is a valid distinction between an ‘unaffiliated’ citizen who is not serving as a formal or informal representative for an organized interest or group and those who do play such representative roles. Stakeholder participants feel the pressure of their institutional duty not to give way and to represent their absent members.

- There is a role in the policy process for both citizens in their own right as well as for citizens organized in formal and informal civil groups but we need to recognize that tensions are a normal part of the process.
Related Questions:
- How do we know that civil organizations are really representative of the public?
- How can civil society organizations be supported to engage their members?

E-consultation: Using technology to engage the public
- Several participants raised the question about how to maximize the potential of the Internet and other electronic means of engagement to foster citizen and civic involvement, especially for younger people. Is using text messaging a new force? What roles can we play in creating on-line community space for exchange, collaboration and knowledge?

- How can we strengthen our existing institutions to reach the broader public through various means, including technology? This requires political leadership. There are several excellent examples of Parliamentary Committees using technology to reach beyond the usual witnesses to engage a broad community of Canadians using deliberative processes and other techniques, but there is resistance to making such approaches a normal part of reaching out to the public.

- We need to improve our ability to use a combination of avenues to engage the public, including face-to-face and technology. While young people are thought to be technologically savvy, it was noted that on-line public consultation engages the 30 to 54 age cohort much more than those under 30. In order to engage youth, the process has to be specifically tailored for them, with their involvement (as was CPRN’s Youth National Dialogue and Summit).

Concluding Note
CPRN thanked all the participants for their valuable and generous contributions. While the conversation pushed further on institutionalization, all agreed that assessing the impacts of public involvement requires no less attention if public involvement is to evolve to a more mature state. This acknowledgement is itself a step in the right direction. The roundtable provided good ideas about where research and practice need to be deepened.

As promised, this summary report will be posted on the CPRN Web site, in the spirit of sharing knowledge and allowing others to benefit from this fruitful discussion.
Summary of Recommendations and Suggestions

All agreed that we need to better document and share our individual and collective work in order to advance the institutionalization and evaluation of public involvement in policy.

1. Create / support public involvement processes that are arm’s length from government of the day so they become a common and expected part of the policy process.

2. Encourage and build support for the public sector’s role in providing objective advice to government.

3. Develop the capacity and role of the public service to support public involvement in policy and program development and implementation as well as provide sufficient resources.

4. Communicate the important role to be played by the public in identifying and defining value-based policy directions.

5. Use multiple avenues to engage citizens (face-to-face dialogues, on-line workbooks / surveys, dialogues with Parliamentarians, better use of civil society to reach out to their members, Web sites, etc.).

6. Create new Centres for Public Dialogue in every province and improve support to existing civic infrastructure.

7. Engage political parties and politicians (of all levels) in discussion on the benefits and merits of greater public involvement in policy and ensure that politicians are part of the public involvement processes - linking citizen input into the decision-making process.

8. Make better use of existing public institutions for public involvement, especially constituency offices of MPs, Parliamentary Committees and political parties.

9. Learn how to effectively use referenda for appropriate political issues to support the political mobilization of citizens.

10. For greater institutionalization, we need to keep the pressure on, both from the inside and the outside to insure greater public involvement.

11. Work towards agreement on some common frameworks for the evaluation of public involvement.

12. Systematically evaluate each public involvement initiative, document and share findings.

13. Create, disseminate and use common lexicon for public involvement. This includes securing agreement on key definitions and understanding of the key components of standardized public involvement processes.
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Roundtable on Public Involvement in Canada: Institutionalization and Assessment of Impacts

CPRN Roundtable – September 18, 2006
1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

IDRC Building
250 Albert Street, 14th Floor, Zone 3
Ottawa, Ontario

AGENDA

1:00 Welcome and Roundtable Introductions

1:10 Panel: perspectives on the papers
- Authors’ highlights, key recommendations and perspectives on prospects for positive change in the current context
- Discussants
  - Sue Gardner-Barclay and Peter MacLeod for Institutionalization
  - Ian Peach and Leslie Seidle for Impacts

2:50 Roundtable discussion
- Discussion
  - Share perspectives
  - Explore ideas on how best to improve evaluation and move the public involvement agenda forward on three fronts: government, academia and civil society

3:55 Summary and wrap up

4:00 Closure