Community Engagement Evaluation Framework

A framework for community-based organizations and public transportation agencies to evaluate transportation project community engagements

For the online version of this evaluation, please go to: http://bit.ly/4pr3U57

Name of Your Organization   _____

Email   _____

Name of person filling this out (optional)   _____

Community area   _____

Name of project you engaged on   _____

Description of project you engaged on   _____

Agency leading the project engagement   _____

Section 1. Community-Centered Planning

Goal: Relationships are built with the communities and/or community-based organizations most impacted by the project in the engagement.

1.1. Were engagement methods effective in reaching and involving communities most impacted by the project? Did the agency attempt to identify who was missing from the engagement process (i.e., community organizations or leaders)?

❑ **Very Effective**
Community stakeholders had multiple opportunities and formats to participate in the engagement process at times, locations, and in languages most accessible to them. The agency identified key stakeholders who were missing in collaboration with existing community stakeholders and made clear efforts to engage with those identified as missing from the process.

❑ **Moderately Effective**
A sufficient number of community stakeholders in communities most impacted knew about the engagement process and were able to participate. The agency worked with those at the table to identify who was missing from the engagement process and made some efforts to include those missing.

❑ **Somewhat Effective**

Communication about engagement was unclear. The agency might have worked to identify who was missing from the engagement process but did not work directly with those already at the table to do so.

❑ **Not Effective**
There was no specific or transparent effort to connect with or include key community stakeholders in the engagement process. The agency did not make direct efforts to identify who was missing from the engagement process.

❑ **Unsure/unclear**

What worked well? What would you like to see again?

How would you like this process to be improved in future engagements?

1.2. Did the engagement process effectively identify potential negative impacts on the community and how to mitigate them?

❑ **Very Effective**
The engagement effort provided a collaborative process to identify potential negative impacts of the proposed project and how to best mitigate those harms. The agency was transparent about what it could and could not do and provided a clear process on how the agency would follow up on concerns raised.

❑ **Moderately Effective**
Potential negative impacts were discussed at points, but there was no intestinal effort to collaborate with participants on how harm could be mitigated. It was unclear what was and was not in the agency's control. There was information provided on how the agency would follow up on concerns raised.

❑ **Somewhat Effective**
While the process was there, the agency was not fully transparent about what it could and could not do and did not provide a clear plan on how the agency would follow up to concerns raised.

❑ **Not Effective**

There were no discussions on potential negative impacts or the proposed projects and how to mitigate them. There was no clear process provided on how the agency would follow up on concerns raised.

❑ **Unsure/unclear**

What worked well? What would you like to see again?

How would you like this process to be improved in future engagements?

1.3. How familiar was the engagement staff with the communities they were working with for this project? i.e., had they worked in these communities before?

❑ **Very Familiar**
Engagement staff built upon existing relationships and took proactive steps to build new relationships prior to the engagement process. They partnered with CBOs or community members to lead the engagement because of their experience living or working in the community in a prior context.

❑ **Moderately Familiar**
There was room for improvement in relationships and understanding of the community. Preliminary conversations with the community took place, and efforts were made to close gaps in community relationships/understanding during the engagement process.

❑ **Somewhat Familiar**
Engagement staff made minimal effort to build relationships with community-based organizations or community members prior to the engagement process beginning. Some effort was made to close gaps in community relationships/understanding during the engagement process.

❑ **Not Familiar**
Engagement staff did not make a transparent effort to close these gaps in community relationships/understanding at any point in the engagement process.

❑ **Unsure/unclear**

How did this work well? What would you like to see again?

How would you like this process to be improved in future engagements?

1.4. Was the compensation level accurate for community-based organizations or community representatives who served in a greater capacity (i.e., in an advisory position)

❑ **Very accurate**
Community-based organizations or community representatives were invited to serve in a greater capacity and were compensated to very accurate to the level of participation and hours contributed.

❑ **Moderately accurate**
Community-based organizations or community representatives were compensated moderately accurate to the level of participation and hours contributed.

❑ **Somewhat Accurate**
Community-based organizations or community representatives were given incentives to participate that did not fully match the level of participation or hours contributed.

❑ **Not Accurate**
Community-based organizations or community representatives were not invited to serve in a greater capacity and/or were not compensated for the time they spent participating.

❑ **Unsure/unclear**

What worked well with this process? What would you like to see again?

How would you like this process to be improved in future engagements?

Section 2. Power and Decision-Making

Goal: The agency or project team clarified the roles community members play in the decision-making process.

2.1. Was the project team effective in creating a clear and transparent decision-making process to develop a shared understanding of the project with community representatives?

❑ **Very Effective**

The project team proactively shared a clear and transparent decision-making process with engagement participants, dedicating time for questions and clarifications on the process to develop a shared understanding of the project.

❑ **Moderately Effective**

The project team outlined the decision-making process with questions and clarifications but did not work to develop a shared understanding of the project and its timeline.

❑ **Somewhat Effective**

The project team shared a decision-making process but did not dedicate sufficient time for questions, clarifications, or for discussing the project and its timeline.

❑ **Not Effective**

The project team did not share a decision-making process unless asked by engagement participants and did not dedicate time to discuss the project and its timeline.

❑ **Unsure/unclear**

What worked well in this process? What would you like to see again?

How would you like this process to be improved in future engagements?

2.2. Did community-based organizations or community representatives have a clearly defined role in project decision-making that helped define the extent of their decision-making power?

❑ **Well defined role**

Community-based organizations or community representatives were given clearly defined roles in the engagement process that helped define the extent of their decision-making power.

❑ **Moderately defined role**

Community-based organizations or community representatives were given roles in the engagement process, but the extent of their decision-making power was not always clear.

- ❏ **Somewhat defined role**
  Community-based organizations or community representatives had implied roles in the engagement process. The extent of their decision-making power was not clear.

- ❏ **No defined role**
  Community-based organizations or community representatives were not given defined roles in the engagement process on the extent of their decision-making power.

- ❏ **Unsure/this was unclear**

  What worked well in this process? What would you like to see again?

  How would you like this process to be improved in future engagements?

Section 3. Resources, Support, and Results

Goal: The engagement process was well-resourced to carry out meaningful engagement.

3.1. Was there enough dedicated staff from the agency or project team to conduct meaningful engagement with the community?

- ❏ **Well-Staffed**
  For the scope of the project, there were more than enough dedicated staff available during the engagement process from the project team.

- ❏ **Adequately Staffed**
  For the scope of the project, there was a sufficient number of dedicated staff available during the engagement process from the project team.

- ❏ **Minimally Staffed**
  For the scope of the project, there were gaps in staffing, but the available staff were able to achieve what was necessary.

- ❏ **Understaffed**
  For the scope of the project, the project was understaffed.

- ❏ **Unsure/this was unclear**

What worked well in this process? What would you like to see again?

How would you like this process to be improved in future engagements?

3.2. Did the pacing of the engagement process feel appropriate for the topics discussed (i.e., did you feel that the timeline for the engagement was sufficient given the content?)

❑ **Well-Paced**
There was more than enough time for robust collaboration on feedback or solutions.

❑ **Adequately Paced**
There was enough time for engagement, but more time would have been beneficial for in-depth understanding and collaboration.

❑ **Minimally Adequate**
There was time to cover the basic engagement goals, but more time was needed to gain a better understanding and collaboration. Some engagement activities felt rushed.

❑ **Too Fast/Insufficient Timing**
The engagement process was too short to cover the project scope and did not allow for meaningful understanding or collaboration essential to the project.

❑ **Unsure/this was unclear**

What worked well in this process? What would you like to see again?

How would you like this process to be improved in future engagements?

3.3. Within the current phase of engagement, do the final outcomes reflect what engagement participants have contributed?

❑ **Highly Reflective**
Community-developed solutions are visible in the outcomes of this project phase. It is clear where community-led ideas can or will be implemented. The agency provided transparency

around why certain ideas could not be implemented. The agency clearly communicated next steps in the process if there was potential for future involvement.

❑ **Moderately Reflective**
Some of the outcomes of this project phase connect to community ideas or solutions, but more clarity is needed. The agency provided transparency around why certain ideas could not be implemented. The agency communicated next steps in the process if there was potential for future involvement.

❑ **Minimally Reflective:**
The engagement outcomes of this phase are not well connected to community feedback provided. It is unclear how information collection from community was used to inform the future phases. The agency communicated next steps in the process if there was potential for future involvement.

❑ **Not Reflective**
The engagement process did not lead to future project outcomes or processes derived from community feedback, and the agency did not communicate next steps in the process if there was potential for future involvement.

❑ **Unsure/this was unclear**

What worked well in this process? What would you like to see again?

How would you like this process to be improved in future engagements?