

C+CP Engagement Charter

Annual Review 2016

March 2017



This report was prepared for UBC Campus and Community Planning by Susan Abs (*M. Sc. Economics: Urban And Regional Planning*) of Eclipse Environmental Consulting.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
1. Purpose and Process	7
2. Summary of Engagement Activities 2016.....	7
3. Stakeholder Responses	8
4. Priorities for 2017.....	18
Appendix A. Participant List.....	20
Appendix B. Interview Questions	21

Executive Summary

The aims of this 2016 Annual Review of Campus and Community Planning's Engagement Charter are to summarize 2016 consultation activities; gather stakeholder and partner views on strengths and areas for improvement; and identify goals and priorities for 2017. During 2016, C+CP delivered close to twenty engagement initiatives, which were a mix of one-off project-oriented processes, collaborative and partnership programs, and ongoing work with key organizations.

General Strengths: Most stakeholders said that C+CP has significantly improved all aspects of campus and off-campus engagement since 2014. Specific strengths are: skills, dedication and evident commitment to engagement; increased credibility; better working relationships with many key organizations; improved communication and collaboration with central administration and other departments; and use of the Engagement Charter by C+CP and other UBC departments as a valuable planning and stakeholder accountability tool. The Charter and C+CP's experience could be expanded across other departments and at senior levels, as a foundation for strengthening UBC's internal and external communications.

1. Defining the Process: Reaching stakeholders and clarifying the nature of consultation

Strengths

- Increasingly inclusive: C+CP knows who should be involved and how to reach them
- Increasingly broad outreach to internal and external stakeholder and partners
- Improved "pre-consultation" with organizations shapes the consultation plan
- On-going relationships with key internal and external organizations throughout the year
- Better definition and communication of consultation purpose and scope and how input will be used, done early in the process and throughout
- Attention to detail (timelines, information, organized events)
- Successful collaborations that include Musqueam in campus planning initiatives

Possible improvements

- Identify and communicate the scope of each engagement process, i.e., what, why, when, where and potential for community influence, and reinforce these messages at each phase
- Use Charter principles and practices as benchmarks
- Communicate broader UBC strategic, planning, physical and temporal context for specific projects
- Facilitate improved aboriginal engagement
- Engage internal and external stakeholders and partners in decisions about strategic and operational directions for UBC, including academic and infrastructure planning and development

- Derive lessons learned from the comprehensive UBC GamePlan engagement process re: the importance of defining and reinforcing the scope of the project and community consultations
- Work with the Faculty Association, Provost's Office, deans and department heads to expand faculty engagement in campus planning and development, to take advantage of their expertise and integrate their needs and priorities
- Work with large member-based organizations to increase member engagement

2. Designing and Implementing the Process: scheduling and resourcing, using appropriate methods, engaging diverse stakeholders, and two-way information-sharing

Strengths

- Solid best practices in "nuts and bolts" of effective engagement techniques
- Flexibility and responsiveness to emerging issues
- Success of Community Conversations in promoting informal discussion and two-way information
- Multiple, diverse consultation opportunities increase the number and range of participants
- Mix of single and multi-stakeholder consultations achieve complementary goals

Possible improvements

- Continue to expand digital communications and find creative ways to increase the use of social media, e.g., Google, Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, email blasts, digital ads, well-designed and engaging on-line surveys, on-line panels, Skype meetings and webinars
- Consider website improvements; it's as a useful reference but uninspiring
- Simplify language/adopt plain language standards
- Use more graphics, visuals, video and 3-D models
- Reset communications over time, with a focus on the user experience and disruptive marketing

3. Concluding the Process: sharing outcomes and how input was used, evaluating the process, and integrating results with ongoing UBC research and relationship-building

Strengths

- Reporting back on results of engagement has improved; organizations are generally satisfied

Possible improvements

Reporting back could be refined: while C+CP generally does a good job of capturing and reporting what was said, reporting on "the next level of integrating it into the document/project" is less satisfactory. They often don't see their input reflected in final project decisions.

- Aim to report back in a concise, user-friendly and timely manner
- Seek alternatives/complements to text and narrative-based reporting. Use more graphics, bullet point lists and summary tables
- Report results in “layers”, e.g., “results-at-a-glance”, with more detail for those that want
- If feasible, provide responses tailored to the organization, showing their impact
- Continue with updates after project decisions are finalized and move to implementation to motivate future participation
- Provide opportunities for ongoing input on project implementation, including emerging issues and unexpected impacts
- When there are delays in reporting final consultation and project results, provide updates
- Continue with the Engagement Charter Annual Review process, including reporting on achievement of each year’s goals and priorities

1. Purpose and Process

Engagement is central to the University's academic mission, administration, planning and community relationships. Campus and Community Planning (C+CP) adopted the Engagement Charter in September 2014, after consultation with stakeholders, partners and First Nations organizations.¹ The Charter sets out C+CP's promise to the community on engagement by identifying core principles and guiding practices for consultation on planning and development projects.

C+CP conducts an Annual Review to reinforce transparency and accountability on Charter commitments to its on- and off-campus stakeholders and partners, and to the UBC Board of Governors. The aims of the 2016 review were to:

- a) summarize C+CP's 2016 engagement activities;
- b) gather stakeholder views on the degree to which 2016 engagement activities were consistent with Charter principles and guiding practices, including strengths – i.e., what went well – and areas for improvement next year; and
- c) identify engagement goals and priorities for 2017, based on stakeholder input and executive direction.

For the 2016 review, C+CP engaged a consultant to co-design the review process; conduct semi-structured interviews with 19 key stakeholders and partners from 15 organizations; summarize results; and provide strategic advice on engagement. Appendix A identifies review participants (including organizations and acronyms) and Appendix B lists the questions used for the interviews.

2. Summary of Engagement Activities 2016

During 2016, C+CP delivered close to twenty engagement initiatives, as summarized below, based on the Charter principles and practices, and on stakeholder/partner suggestions during the 2015 Annual Review.

- a) Area, Building and Landscape Planning Processes
 - UBC GamePlan (20-year Athletics and Recreation Facilities Strategy) planning process (completed)
 - UBC Green Buildings Plan (in progress)
 - D.H. Copp Planning Process (in progress)
 - Design Guidelines For UBC Faculty and Staff Housing projects (in progress)
 - UBC Okanagan Campus – Integrated Rainwater Management Plan and University Way Re-design (in progress)
 - UBC Climate Action Plan 2020 (completed)

¹ For brevity, this report uses term "stakeholders"; however, C+CP acknowledges that First Nations organizations participate in UBC initiatives as government entities and not stakeholders.

- UBC Child Care Needs Assessment Survey, focus groups and building of the Vista Point ec4 childcare facility (completed)
- b) Programs, Partnerships and Policy Development
- UBC-UNA-SHHS Joint Programming (ongoing)
 - Utown@UBC Community Grants, including a new volunteer grant selection committee with UNA community members
 - Utown@UBC Youth Leadership Program
 - Utown@UBC Community Bike Clinics
 - Utown@UBC Kids Fit
 - Walk n’ Roll
 - UBC-Metro Vancouver Memorandum of Understanding (ongoing implementation)
 - North Campus Outdoor Event Noise Management (completed)
- c) Ongoing Public and Stakeholder Engagement
- UBC Community Conversations, jointly hosted with the UNA (ongoing – twice a year)
 - Regular meetings with AMS leadership (ongoing – monthly)
 - Meetings throughout the year with other key organizations (ongoing)

3. Stakeholder Responses

This section summarizes the results of C+CP’s annual consultation on the Engagement Charter implementation, conducted in February 2017, including strengths and areas for improvement. Conclusions are presented under the sub-headings of “General” and the three phases of engagement listed in the Charter: 1. Defining, 2. Designing and Implementing, and 3. Concluding the Engagement Process. Each sub-section outlines “Key Messages”, defined as points noted by over half of interviewees and “Additional Points”, which were mentioned by some interviewees. Sample quotes are also included to illustrate these conclusions.

General Comments

Strengths

Key Messages:

Most stakeholders (including many who have been involved with C+CP since before the adoption of the Engagement Charter), said that C+CP has significantly improved all aspects of campus and off-campus engagement since 2014: “exceptional job”; “has moved in a good direction”; “really impressed with this group’s work”; “separating development functions from approval and regulatory functions and related consultation (C+CP) has been an improvement.” General strengths mentioned most often include:

- *Skills, dedication and evident commitment to engagement:* “genuine openness to hearing and engaging with diverse voices;” “Gabby is nice and really good with people”; “knows how

to listen”; “fantastic at her job”; “ideal person for the role”; “Michael’s leadership”; “It’s a great team, guided and being done by the right people and involving the right people”.

- *Increased credibility*: The team has earned the trust of many internal and external constituencies, some of whom have been challenging and/or critical in the past “through their thoughtful approach and follow-through”: “greater transparency and openness”; “they take the process seriously”; “I have a lot of admiration for the group”; “feels like they’re interested in the conversation;” “Michael deserves a lot of credit for what he’s done in a short time”.
- *Better working relationships with many key organizations*, e.g., UNA, UFSTA, SHHS, AMS, Longhouse, Musqueam, Metro Vancouver, City of Vancouver, resulting from increased frequency and continuity of contact and collaboration.
- *Improved communication and collaboration with UBC’s central administration and other departments* during one-off and ongoing planning, development and research processes, and in design and delivery of community engagement: “fantastic colleagues.” “this group is 8 or 9 out of 10: high-functioning, intelligent, open and willing to collaborate”.
- *Engagement Charter is proving to be a valuable engagement planning and accountability tool is increasingly used by other UBC departments*: “well-applied”, “I’m a huge fan”, “the charter is great – consultation is more robust than ever and it’s paying dividends for everyone at UBC”.

Possible Improvements

Key messages:

- *To some degree, C+CP is in the lead on UBC’s engagement commitments: the Charter and C+CP’s experience has potential for expanded application across UBC*, including at senior levels (administration and Board), possibly during strategic planning, and as a foundation for strengthening internal communications at UBC: “could be very powerful for UBC”; “there isn’t one department that couldn’t use it both internally and externally”; “provides a template for good process”; “supports consistent language”; “could be used more for capital planning on the academic side re: facilities to support teaching/learning/research.”

Additional possible improvements:

- *Provide a list of engagement techniques* in the C+CP “tool box” and the “levels of engagement” table (from C+CP website) as a reference for stakeholders and partners.
- (A few participants) would like to see a *clearer commitment to consultation from all C+CP leadership*, as demonstrated by listening, responding to, and integrating input into decisions.
- *The UEL was the only organization that was critical* about all stages of consultation, as they don’t feel their concerns are heard or addressed. Suggestions include: earlier engagement before project planning is advanced; earlier notification of consultations and provision of materials so members to prepare before meetings; and provision of info on how UEL feedback will be/was addressed. A vehicle like “Community Conversations” could allow discussion of ongoing issues about impacts of UBC operations on UEL residents (e.g., facilities noise) and UBC’s plans for the next 10-15 years.

A. Defining the Process: reaching those who are impacted or interested and being clear about how and why stakeholders are being involved

Strengths

Key messages:

- *Increasingly inclusive: C+CP has a growing knowledge of who should be involved in consultation processes, their interests and priorities, and how to reach them:* includes on-campus (faculty, student, staff, residents) and off-campus (Musqueam, City of Vancouver, Metro Vancouver, TransLink): “have made a concerted effort to extend their reach and provide thorough information;”
- *Increased efforts to broaden outreach* and include people haven’t been or might not be involved; have broadened number and range of on and off-campus participants.
- *Improved “pre-consultation”:* *early contact with organizational reps* has improved process design through identifying potential issues, likely levels of interest and the most appropriate techniques for each group – this also allows groups to notify membership and provide more meaningful input.
- *On-going relationships with key organizations throughout the year facilitate involvement of their members in consultation on specific project initiatives.*
- *Inclusion of a broader range of UBC planning and development partners and experts* in consultation events so participants better understand decision processes and who’s involved.
- *Improved identification of who best to involve in external partnerships* and collaborations and “who needs to know what” for integrated planning (e.g., Metro Vancouver, City of Vancouver, Musqueam).
- *Better definition and communication of consultation purpose and scope and how input will be used, early in the process and throughout.*
- *Development notifications are still challenging (how to reach those affected) but have improved;* “people know where to look – bulletin boards, website, email blasts”.
- *Attention to detail:* improved timelines, quality and quantity of information; well-organized events; more effective notification; minimal burden on internal partners.
- *Increasing numbers and broader range of participants* appears to be an outcome of improved notification channels and targeted outreach.
- *Formal agreements have helped build good working relationships,* especially for integrated planning, e.g. MOU with Metro Vancouver on strategic approaches to sustainability.
- *Build on successful consultation and collaboration with the Musqueam First Nation and work with the leadership and community to promote the “specific awareness of Musqueam presence and inclusiveness in campus planning”:* “UBC is in our traditional territory”.
 - “It has taken a lot of time and energy to be heard to the President’s level.” Having Linc Kesler at the Longhouse helps keep Musqueam and other indigenous community members informed about engagement opportunities on campus. There have been “good examples of cooperation and pockets of positive input and outcomes”: collaboration with UBC Ceremonies and Events on new buildings and artwork; use of Musqueam names for new student residences (after considerable effort); some faculties seek out indigenous input.

Possible improvements

Key messages:

- *Clearly identify and communicate the scope of each engagement process, i.e., what, why, when, where and the potential for community influence, and reinforce these messages at each phase.* This promotes transparency, shapes participant expectations and helps to counteract cynicism: (“Still skepticism among some stakeholders that C+CP truly wants to be transparent and move away from the old ways.”) Suggestions include:
 - *Use the language of the [C+CP diagram](#) “Types of Engagement” (on C+CP website) to clarify engagement objectives, scope and methods at each phase. Use Charter principles and practices explicitly as benchmarks when designing and communicating engagement plans, and support partners in doing so (create a high-level summary poster version; provide training).*
 - *Communicate the broader UBC strategic, planning, physical and temporal context for specific projects, so that participants better understand decision-making processes, opportunities and constraints: “We’re project-focused but need to show how projects fit into overall campus environment and development directions.” (e.g., While the UBC GamePlan process was widely seen as a successful *process*, there continue to be varied perspectives on the *content and expected results*)*
 - *Identify ways to better facilitate aboriginal engagement in C+CP planning initiatives (and the UBC Strategic Plan) that support the aboriginal way of consultation with the leadership and community. C+CP understand possible engagement objectives with Musqueam and they try, but the methods, short timelines and limited range of topics limits the ability to engage community members: “It feels meaningful to come to me and others at Musqueam for our views, but “my voice is my voice”. “We need to go beyond commenting; we need to actually see results to accomplish reconciliation.”*
- *Identify opportunities to engage internal and external stakeholders and partners in “big picture” decisions about strategic and operational directions for UBC, including academic and spatial/physical/infrastructure planning and development (will necessitate partnerships with other UBC entities). Many interviewees are interested in this high-level engagement, so they can see the context for specific projects and articulate their needs and interests as part of UBC’s evolution.*
 - *For example, the AMS, is consulted on building projects but wants to engage on “high-level strategic decisions that will affect the urban landscape – and eventually students”, such as institutional buildings, residential development and faculty housing. The UNA has a core focus on residential development but is also interested in commenting on other campus developments that may affect them. Strategic issues for residents and students include: housing availability and affordability (faculty and staff); sustainability/livability and transportation, given UBC’s expansion; community-building; inclusiveness; and provision of safe and green family spaces.*
 - *Musqueam are concerned about broad directions and “the overall shape and extent of development at UBC”, but less interested in specific project design details. They have influence at the President and C+CP levels but would like more influence at middle*

[planning] level. They seek to develop “understanding and cooperation at Board and senior executive levels on broad, campus-wise directions in a more meaningful and formalized way”. The MOU with UBC on academic matters could be used for planning collaboration.

- *Derive lessons learned from the comprehensive UBC GamePlan engagement process re: the importance of defining and reinforcing the scope of the project and community consultations.*
 - *UBC GamePlan had many strong elements that can be brought into future consultations (e.g. future Stadium Road Neighbourhood planning process): ambitious scope; broad outreach and participation (“it’s a compliment to C+CP that everyone knew about it”); engaging materials (“unique marketing campaign”); and diverse and innovative techniques (fun video clips, stickers, travelling road show/pop-ups, workshops, open houses, social media, on-line survey).*
 - At the same time, the broad scope (multiple sites and phases) and long time horizon (20 years) presented challenges:
 - Some faculty had concerns about the overall decision-making process for academic and athletics capital projects. C+CP senior management met with faculty to discuss these issues.
 - When two of five proposed options proved to be controversial, C+CP responded to resident concerns (petitions, feedback) by meeting with concerned groups, but the inclusion of those options undermined the credibility of the process for some participants.

Lessons learned:

- *Effective engagement results from a combination of a well-designed consultation strategy AND the flexibility and responsiveness needed to address emerging concerns and needs.*
- *Conduct rigorous internal consultation with UBC bodies involved in a proposed initiative to ensure that constraints and risks are identified and options are vetted before proposals go public. Defining “which pieces are up for discussion and which aren’t?” will help shape participant expectations about what is proposed and what can/can’t be influenced.*
- *Pre-consultation with key community groups early in the process can help identify their initial issues and concerns.*
- *Expand faculty engagement in campus planning and development:* The Academy includes a core, year-round, consistent group of (2800 – 3200) stakeholders, some of whom also live on-campus and/or use arts and recreation facilities. They have relevant expertise to offer and are keen to learn more about capital project decision-making at both strategic and project levels; the relative roles of C+CP and other UBC entities in campus development; and how to better integrate their needs and priorities into these processes: “we like Big Ideas”; “how will this project be integrated into the bigger physical and academic space?”
 - *Suggested approaches:* Work with Faculty Association, Provost’s Office, Senate and Deans on how to better involve department heads and faculty (Deans are generally consulted on academic planning but not faculty: “information doesn’t trickle down”.) Build working relationships by meeting with department heads (often overlooked) and faculty reps/allies to discuss academic concerns and how best to engage faculty.

- *Suggested techniques:* send succinct, faculty-targeted consultation information to department heads; distribute notifications and surveys through Faculty Association (could help design); present at departmental meetings; do “pop-up” consultations for faculty; co-design and monitor pilot projects (strategic and infrastructure levels). (Note: Faculty often “speak with authority” and “can be critical”, but usually understand the limits of their expertise, and that their comments will be integrated with other input and decision factors.)

Additional possible improvements:

- *Develop simple graphics illustrating C+CP mandate and structure, and a “road map” of decision-making and accountability* for dissemination to stakeholders and partners. Clarify C+CP’s role in campus and off-campus planning and development, and its relationships with the UBC administration (Presidents and VPs) and other departments. (Many are unclear about this.)
- *Improve consultation efficiency (time and resources)* by integrating engagement activities lock-step with project planning early in the process, and tailor consultation to the likely level of community interest and potential concerns/risks (gauge by internal and external pre-consultation).

B. Designing and Implementing the Process: understanding stakeholder needs and concerns; scheduling and resourcing the process; using appropriate engagement methods; engaging a broad and diverse range of stakeholders; and two-way information-sharing

Strengths

Key Messages:

- *Solid best practices in “nuts and bolts” of effective engagement approaches and techniques:* “They do a thorough job from a technical perspective - good people providing thorough analysis”; “thoughtfulness in timing and framing questions”; “the right type of dialogue”.
- *Flexibility and responsiveness to emerging issues:* “responsive if issues arise and more/focused consultation is needed;” “nimble”; “will meet people anywhere, anytime to talk”.
- *Success of Community Conversations* (delivered in collaboration with the UNA) *in engaging residents and tenants – model could be expanded;* participants liked the informal open house format; chance to express needs and concerns (not just react to proposals); Saturday scheduling; display boards/no presentations; family activities; community-building/meeting neighbours; presence of staff from relevant UBC departments: “these events promote a continuing conversation and allow residents “to let C+CP know what’s brewing in the community”. *Suggestions include:* quarterly or biannual Community Conversations so residents expect them; better outreach/marketing, expand to other groups (students, faculty, staff and neighbours).

- *Multiple and diverse consultation opportunities allow more community members to participate, and to varying degrees, depending on their interest and time.* Interviewees liked: innovative techniques; pop-ups in high traffic areas; non-traditional timing (weekends) and holding events at different times (students participate between classes); incentives – food, family activities.
- *There are advantages to having a mix of single and multi-stakeholder consultations;* the first allows participants to express specific needs and concerns, while the second (e.g., workshop) helps them understand each other's interests and concerns.
- *Work with large member-based organizations (UNA, UFSTA, UEL, AMS, Faculty Assoc.) and the Musqueam community to increase member engagement and representation in campus planning and development.* Suggestions include:
 - continue to develop ongoing relationships with representatives of key organizations (e.g., Musqueam, Longhouse, Faculty Association, UNA, UFSTA, AMS, UEL);
 - build in sufficient time for representatives to consult with members and report back, and/or promote direct member participation in events;
 - continue UBC "Community Conversations" and adapt them for use with faculty, student, resident and off-campus organizations, e.g., Musqueam; and
 - identify techniques (and resources) to engage the membership, including unaddressed ad mail (mailboxes or lobbies) for residents and tenants; attendance at organizations' board meetings and community events; attractive notices and posters for strata councils/chairs and rental managers; email blasts.

Metro Vancouver-UBC Relationship

- *The MOU between C+CP and Metro has been "very positive" for "issues of mutual interest that also require an interdepartmental approach;"* collaboration has gone beyond original scope" (regional parks) and has "broadened our connection with UBC." (The MOU addresses regional issues related to UBC's rapid growth and development.)
 - Strengths are: face-to-face meetings, especially in early phases (looking at physical maps & old newspaper articles); candid, open communications; learning about each other's institutional mandate, authority, responsibilities and issues; UBC's willingness to share information and research; adaptability in agenda development (for mutual sign-off); taking turns hosting meetings (travel time); and respect for confidential information.
 - Suggestions include:
 - Committee members could better inform colleagues within C+CP and other departments.
 - Aim for more efficient meeting scheduling (time-consuming); things slow in summer due to (UBC) vacations; expertise should reside in several people who can advance the work.
 - An annual MOU review (planned but not done) would go beyond project work to assess progress on goals and refocus priorities; could include an updated research project list.

Additional strengths:

- The multi-stakeholder Child Care Needs Assessment project was seen as open, transparent and successful in its long-term planning outcomes.
- Training UBC departmental staff to facilitate small groups at workshops built their awareness of and skills in two-way communication: "Productive and refreshing to see how well it went."
- C+CP should ensure that team members at public events have the requisite communication skills.

Possible improvements

Key messages:

- *Continue to expand digital communications and social media (used successfully in the UBC GamePlan process);* most communication materials are still print and text-based.
 - *Find creative ways to increase the use of social media at all phases of consultation,* e.g. Google, Facebook, Instagram, Twitter ("relatively few C+CP Twitter followers"), email blasts, digital ads on websites (e.g., UBC, student sites, resident sites); quick, engaging on-line surveys ("that I can do on my phone"). Integrate more video content, especially online. Consider on-line panels, like the City of Vancouver's "Talk Vancouver". Consider Skype meetings and webinars to complement face-to-face meetings.
 - *Consider C+CP website improvements, the website is seen as a useful reference but uninspiring:* "hard to navigate", not useful, "functional but not fun", "boring; no WOW factor".
- *Continue to improve communication approaches and materials* (notifications, posters, displays, background documents, presentations, reports). The design of most C+CP materials has improved; most interviewees like the "look and feel"; however, there were also many suggestions:
 - *Simplify the language:* For some (resident, faculty, student and UBC departmental staff), the content is often overly technical, bureaucratic and/or laden with planning jargon. This is especially true for building and infrastructure proposals, with their focus on technical details.
 - *Suggestions include:* more concise, "crisp", engaging and user-friendly design and content; more graphics (infographics), video and 3-D models; plain language standards/"people-friendly" communications; see UTown@UBC's engaging look, feel and innovative techniques.
 - *Rethink and reset communications over time:* Focus on "the user experience, the architecture of engagement, and design as content; increase story-telling and up the emotional connection" (UBC improving in this area). Adopt innovative "advertising theory and disruptive marketing" for the design process and outreach methods; update branding guidelines and standards to keep up with trends; "students 2, 3, 6 years from now will be desensitized to current practices".
- *Ensure that units within C+CP, and other UBC departments involved in external collaborations are moving forward "in tandem":* "the right hand isn't always aware of what the left hand is doing, which can lead to inefficiency", e.g., some C+CP team member may be working with outdated information. Strengthen internal communication within C+CP and

with other departments, (continue to) have relevant departments at public events and/or ensure they are briefed.

- *Ensure that surveys are well-designed:* There was widespread criticism of the UBC GamePlan on-line survey: “poorly designed”, “dry;” “hard to understand”, “too much jargon,” “too long”, “too much block text;” “no maps or diagrams”; “questions weren’t neutral”, “couldn’t finish it”; “a flawed survey yields flawed data”.
- *Suggestions include:* ensure that surveys are clear and concise; use sound survey design; pilot test; validate survey questions; use multiple methods to get uptake, including social media.

C. Concluding the Process: sharing project outcomes and how input was used; evaluating the consultation process; and integrating results with ongoing UBC communication, relationship-building and research processes

Strengths

Key messages:

- *Reporting back on results of engagement has improved;* the organizations that C+CP collaborates with on a regular basis are generally satisfied with feedback and updates: “vast improvement in sharing results, especially on the website”; “more written summaries of what was said and final decisions, but could be more on how they got there;” “good regular reporting to the Board of Governors on consultations, how discussions evolved and how input was used.”

Possible improvements

Key messages:

- *Reporting back could be refined.* While C+CP generally does a good job of capturing and reporting what was said, reporting on “the next level of integrating it into the document/project” is less satisfactory. Some interviewees said they often don’t see their input reflected in final project decisions. This may result from a mix of communication and reporting issues (see notes on clarifying the scope of consultation in Section A). Reporting challenges include disseminating results; getting people’s attention; being thorough yet succinct; showing the impact of community input; and meeting participant expectations regarding their influence: “Following up is really important but can be tricky”; “these can be hard conversations.”

Suggestions include:

- *Aim to report back in a concise, user-friendly and timely manner.* As suggested in part B, seek alternatives/complements to text and narrative-based reporting (emails, newsletters, reports): “get to the point”; use more graphics, bullet point lists and summary tables.
- *Report results in “layers”,* e.g., “results-at-a-glance”, with more detail for those that want; provide “nuggets/teasers/sound bites”, linked to more details.

- *If feasible, provide responses tailored to the organization:* Interviewees know that decision-makers must consider diverse views and that final decisions may not please everyone, but they still want to know if their input was/wasn't used and why, and how views were weighed and integrated." Closing the loop in this way builds long-term credibility and cooperation and encourages future participation: "provide a user-friendly summary we could cut and paste into a newsletter or website on how our views were considered".
- *Continue to provide updates after project decisions are finalized,* during construction, completion, opening ceremonies and operations, to help motivate future participation: "tell us – how did things turn out?" Suggestions include:
 - Invite more on and off-campus community members to celebrate openings; have project champions (Deans, organizational representatives) talk about their influence on the project.
 - Consider open houses and info materials during construction (not just design), especially after a Development Review Process.
 - Include on-site info on project signage about how the project reflects community input (boards currently highlights sustainability and design features).
 - Provide opportunities for ongoing input on project implementation, including emerging issues and unexpected impacts: "we didn't hear the final results of the W16th Ave. crosswalk discussions"; "we didn't expect to lose parking in that location". This could be done through the website or during Community Conversations and visits to organizations.
 - When there are delays in reporting final consultation and project results, provide updates.
- *Continue with the annual Charter Annual Review,* which is appreciated, including reporting on achievement of each year's goals and priorities: "glad they are continuously looking at it and trying to improve"; "what were the action items since the last one was done?"; "like the idea of a table of planned improvements, so we can provide feedback".

Additional possible improvements:

- Meet with multicultural organizations to find ways to engage those that may not be inclined to participate. Ensure that processes are inclusive and address barriers to participation: "This unit is well-positioned to break barriers and set a standard and example for other departments".
- Include a thank you for participating from senior managers and personal invitations to upcoming engagements in follow-up correspondence.
- Collect contact information from willing participants, even at short contact events like pop-ups, to enable follow-up and reporting to them on results, develop email lists, and invite them to future consultation events, based on their interests, as indicated in tick boxes.

4. Priorities for 2017

This section identifies C+CP's goals and priorities for 2017, based on stakeholder suggestions during the 2016 Engagement Charter Review and executive and management direction.

General Comments

Drawing on C+CP expertise and experience, continue to work with UBC central administration, executive and other departments to promote adoption and systematic use of the Engagement Charter as:

1. a planning and stakeholder/community accountability tool, and
2. a foundation for strengthening UBC's internal and external communications.

A. Defining the Process: reaching stakeholders and clarifying the nature of consultation

Continue to:

- Ensure broad outreach to stakeholders and community partners, including "pre-consultation" with key organizations to tailor the level and type of consultation to the specific situation.
- Build relationships with key internal and external organizations year-round, through on-going communication and one-on-one meetings (possibly annual), to identify their needs and priorities and facilitate one-off engagements (e.g., Musqueam, UNA, AMS, UFASTA, Faculty Association, UBC departments such as Provost's Office).
- Work with the leadership of the large, member-based organizations on ways to engage membership, e.g., Community Conversations, social media, admail and pop-ups.

Priority refinements:

- Engage internal and external stakeholders in decision-making about higher-level strategic and operational directions for UBC, including academic and infrastructure planning.
- Identify and communicate the scope of each engagement in a simple way, i.e., what, why, when, where and potential for community influence, and *reinforce this at each phase*. Identify the broad UBC strategic, planning, physical and temporal context for each project.
- Use Charter principles and practices systematically as benchmarks when designing and communication each consultation. Develop/refine a Consultation Plan template that incorporates the "[types of engagement](#)" graphic from the C+CP website.
- Work with Musqueam and Longhouse on increasing Aboriginal engagement at the strategic level of UBC planning and development.
- Work with the Faculty Association, Provost's Office, deans and department heads to expand faculty engagement, better integrate their needs and priorities, and draw on their expertise.

B. Designing and Implementing the Process: scheduling and resourcing, using appropriate methods, engaging diverse stakeholders, and two-way information-sharing

Continue to:

- Offer multiple, diverse consultation opportunities, including single and multi-stakeholder formats, and at diverse times and locations, increase the number and range of participants and elicit both broad and deep input.

Priority refinements:

- Put a strong focus on expanding digital communications and social media, e.g., Google, Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, email blasts, digital ads, on-line surveys, on-line panels, Skype meetings and webinars. Consider website improvements.
- Simplify communications: adopt plain language standards; provide sound bites, information-at-a glance, tables, etc.; use more visuals, graphics (e.g., infographics), video and 3-D models; provide information in results in “layers”, e.g., with differing levels of detail.
- Reset communications over time, focusing on the user experience and disruptive marketing.

C. Concluding the Process: sharing outcomes and how input was used, evaluating the process, and integrating results with ongoing UBC research and relationship-building

Continue to:

- Refine reporting back approaches, formats and timing, with a focus on concise, user-friendly and timely reporting and showing how stakeholder/community input affected the project.

Priority refinements:

- As above, seek alternatives/complements to text/narrative reporting.
- If feasible, provide responses tailored to the organization, showing their impact.
- Continue updates after project decisions are finalized through the implementation phase. Provide opportunities for ongoing input on emerging issues and unexpected impacts.
- When there are delays in reporting consultation and project results, provide updates.
- Continue Annual Charter Reviews, with reporting on achievement of each year’s priorities.

Appendix A. Participant List

Community or Stakeholder Group	Names (19 interviewees)
1. Alma Mater Society (AMS)	Samantha So (VP Academic) and Ava Nasiri (President)
2. Provost's Office	Pam Ratner (Vice-Provost)
3. UBC First Nations House of Learning	Linc Kesler (Director and Advisor to the President on Aboriginal Issues)
4. UBC Athletics	Kavie Toor (UBC Athletics and Recreation)
5. UBC Student Housing and Hospitality Services	Andrew Parr (Managing Director, Student Housing and Hospitality Services)
6. UBC Infrastructure Development	John Metras (Managing Director, Infrastructure)
7. UBC Treasury	Peter Smailes (Treasurer)
8. UBC Properties Trust	Paul Young (Director)
9. University Neighbourhoods Association	Jan Fialkowski (Executive Director) and Richard Alexander (Elected Board Chair)
10. University Faculty/Staff Tenants Association	Corrine Larson (Acting President)
11. UBC Faculty Association	Mark MacLean (President) and Deena Rubuliak (Executive Director)
12. City of Vancouver	Marnie McGregor
13. Musqueam First Nation	Leona Sparrow and Jessica Carson
14. Metro Vancouver	Ann Rowan, Project Manager, Corporate Strategies (was Project Manager, Collaboration initiatives)
15. University Endowment Lands	Peter McConnell (Community Advisory Council, Secretary-Treasurer)

Appendix B. Interview Questions

A. Defining the Process: reaching those who are impacted or interested and being clear about how and why stakeholders are being involved

1. What have been the 1-3 greatest strengths of C+CP in identifying and reaching stakeholders, and defining how and why they are being invited to participate?
2. To what degree, if any, has C+CP improved its notification and communication channels to reach all stakeholders that might be affected by, or interested in a project?
3. What 1-3 additional things could be improved during this phase of consultation?

B. Designing and Implementing the Process: understanding stakeholder needs and concerns; scheduling and resourcing the process; using appropriate engagement methods; engaging a broad and diverse range of stakeholders; and two-way information-sharing

4. What were the 1-3 greatest strengths of C+CP in designing and implementing engagement processes last year?
5. Have you used any online engagement tools? If so, how did you find them?
6. Do you have any suggestions for expanding C+CP's "toolbox" of engagement techniques and materials, including online engagement?
7. What additional 1-3 things could be improved during this phase of consultation?

C. Concluding the Process: sharing project outcomes and how input was used; evaluating the consultation process; and integrating results with ongoing UBC communication, relationship-building and research processes

8. What are the 1-3 greatest strengths of C+CP in concluding engagement processes?
9. Did C+CP improve its reporting back to stakeholders on the results of consultation and how they were used in project and planning decisions last year?
10. What additional 1-3 things could be improved during this phase of consultation?
11. Do you have any other comments and suggestions you'd included in the report?
12. How could the Engagement Charter be used to help other UBC departments conduct more effective engagement? (time-permitting)