



Hwb Gwybodaeth
Knowledge Hub

A toolkit to evaluate engagement

Evaluating your engagement practice
using the National Principles for
Public Engagement in Wales.

By **Alain Thomas** and **Vikki Butler**

Contents

Introduction	2
About this toolkit	2
Acknowledgements	3
Why evaluate engagement	3
Evaluating engagement – where we are now	3
Three steps to evaluating engagement	4
Step One – decide who to involve and how to involve them	4
Step two – evaluate engagement	5
Step three – share the learning	
Appendix One: National Principles for Public Engagement and corresponding evaluation prompt questions	9
Appendix Two: Case study – An evaluation of the Caswell Bay Feasibility Study Consultation	12

INTRODUCTION

About this toolkit

You have just finished your process of engagement, or have you?

'Principle 10: Learn and share lessons to improve the process of engagement.'

It is difficult enough to plan and carry out engagement properly so it is not surprising that not everyone currently puts principle 10, about evaluating and learning, into practice.

This toolkit aims to make evaluating engagement as easy as possible and enable everyone to reflect on their practice and learn and share lessons for the future.

It describes a simple, three step process to help practitioners evaluate their engagement activities using the [National Principles for Public Engagement in Wales](#).

The 10 National Principles for Public Engagement were developed collaboratively between public and voluntary sector agencies, led by WCVA in 2011. They were reviewed and republished through a similar process in 2022.

The National Principles are a good practice guide to enable effective, ethical and meaningful engagement with the public and people that use services. Each principle is written as a straightforward statement and developed by guidance notes. The National Principles are designed for use by professionals and practitioners in a wide range of settings, including but not limited to, government officials, policy makers, public administrators, bodies delivering services and engagement practitioners.

This toolkit includes some prompt questions based around the National Principles for Public Engagement to which you may find useful (Appendix One).

The toolkit provides essential guidance to carry out an uncomplicated evaluation of your engagement practice. It sits within a suite of refreshed resources, and is complemented by [TSSW's new Evaluation guide](#). Those who want to learn more about good evaluation practice in general will find information in the guide about numerous aspects of good practice to help plan and carry out an effective evaluation, including; what and when to evaluate, evaluation ethics, carrying out qualitative and quantitative research, key terms and definitions, case studies and signposts to further information.

This toolkit also includes a case study (Appendix Two), of an evaluation of a consultation which took place in Wales in 2024, which illustrates what might be considered a realistic and achievable model for an evaluation of a piece of engagement.

Acknowledgements

This guide was funded by the Welsh Local Government Association and managed by Wales Council for Voluntary Action who commissioned Alain Thomas Consultancy and C.A.R.P. Collaborations to develop it. We are grateful to Swansea City Council and Innes Associates for the use of the case study, and to those individuals who read earlier drafts of the toolkit and offered constructive feedback.

Why evaluate engagement?

There are usually three main purposes for evaluation: accountability, knowledge, and development.

In terms of **knowledge and development**, it is clearly important to identify what you did well, and where you might have done better, to help you and others improve their engagement practice in the future. The following are some examples of why furthering knowledge and development are important:

- To understand how engagement is experienced by those involved and ensure the engagement activities suit the people you wanted to engage
- To share the benefits of the activity with others, describing what you did so that others can learn
- To support planning and development for further engagement work
- To understand the impact engagement has had
- Keeping up with changing needs for engagement and diversifying accordingly

In terms of **accountability**, it can be useful to be able to demonstrate that you have carried out an effective engagement process, for example to the people you engage with and to current or potential commissioners. Here are some reasons that explain a bit more about why showing accountability is important:

- To give a voice to the people involved, so that they feel listened to, have a say and make suggestions
- To record what happened, and how funds were spent
- To prove to funders that the activity was or is worthwhile
- Being able to evidence what has taken place and the difference it has made
- Improved relationships between the organisation and those involved in engagement activities
- To record achievements and celebrate key milestones

There is also legislation within Wales that is relevant to undertaking engagement and involvement, see for example appendix two of [Manual for Public Engagement](#)¹ for an of particular legislation within Wales that is relevant to undertaking engagement and involvement.

There is an increasing level of legislation and accompanying policy that spans Social Care, Health, Environment and statutory services planning which requires those delivering services to involve people in decision making and delivery of those services. There are also duties to ensure Rights and Equity are upheld within delivery of services and that well-being is enhanced.

You should therefore also make sure you are meeting your statutory obligations and you may want to show you are following best practice and documenting how you can innovate to further improve your involvement work.

Evaluating engagement – where we are now

This toolkit is based on the premise that very few people currently evaluate their engagement activities. It therefore sets out a very simple, three stage process to make it realistic and achievable for everyone to evaluate their engagement without spending a great deal of time and other precious resources. The toolkit also suggests what would be best practice for those who want to do a little more in the way of evaluating engagement.

THREE STEPS TO EVALUATE ENGAGEMENT



Step one: Decide who to involve and how to involve them

You have just finished your engagement process, analysed the findings and either used them to co-produce actions (co-production) or provided your conclusions and recommendations to the people who will decide how to act on them (consultation). You have of course also fed-back the outcomes of your engagement to everyone who was involved. It is now time to evaluate and learn from your engagement.

¹ <https://knowledgehub.cymru/all-courses/manual-for-public-engagement/>

Those who evaluate the engagement process will need to be sufficiently informed about how engagement was planned and carried out.

If you have been involved in planning and conducting the engagement then the simplest and quickest way would be to do the evaluation yourself and that would be better than not doing it at all. However, ask yourself whether you can involve others relatively easily.

For example:

- Can you involve anyone else from the team who carried out the engagement?
- Did you work with any partner agencies? If so, is there someone from any of these who is sufficiently informed and who might contribute their perspective to the evaluation?
- If the engagement activity was commissioned is there someone you could involve from the commissioning body who is well informed about what you did?

- Were there any members of the groups you engaged with who were particularly keen and who might want to help you assess how you did from their points of view?

Do not over complicate things – aim for no more than six or so people to take part in the evaluation.

Once you have decided who to involve you need to make a judgement about how much you should try to involve them (or how much they will want to be involved).

The easiest way would be to involve them as reviewers. You would evaluate the engagement, send them your rationale and your conclusions, and ask for their comments. You would then amend your evaluation to take into account what they said.

A better, but more resource intensive approach would be to bring people together face to face (or online) to evaluate the engagement process.

Best practice

Best practice would be to involve a range of stakeholders who were involved in the engagement process: from the engagement team, stakeholder groups you engaged with, partners you involved and the commissioners (if these are not already included in the preceding list). This would ensure you gain insights from a range of perspectives.

Best practice would also involve these stakeholders in co-producing the evaluation, perhaps through a facilitated workshop.

Step two: Evaluate engagement



Step two will produce a short report (case study) of between 1500 and 2500 words. This will be an important resource to inform your future engagement practices so make sure it is filed where anyone who may need to refer to it in the future can easily find it.

Once you have set out this overview, use the National Principles for Public Engagement as a structure for your evaluation of engagement.

Refer to each principle in turn and identify what you did to try and meet it. Then, make an assessment of how far you were successful in achieving the principle. Appendix two suggests some prompt questions for each principle that you might find useful.

Headings to structure your assessment of each principle might be:

- What worked well
- What did not work so well/what we would do differently next time.

Once you have analysed your activities and made your assessment use a graded scale to assign a score for how successful you were.

For example:

- 5 = Almost entirely successful
- 4 = Largely successful
- 3 = Successful enough
- 2 = Some signs of success
- 1 = No real indications of success

When you come to write up your notes try not to write too much, 100 to 200 words per principle should be enough as you want people to read it. However, experience suggests you might struggle to keep to the suggested word limit in the case of some principles.

If you are carrying out the evaluation alone, circulate your written up qualitative analysis, conclusions and scores to your reviewers.

If you are evaluating as a team through a group discussion, make sure someone writes up the scores, and the analysis and conclusions, and circulates these to group members for final thoughts and comments.

Be prepared to revise the score and your conclusions depending on what emerges from the review process or the discussion.

Best practice

If you were to aim for best practice you would have brought a group of people together to help plan the evaluation, before the engagement process started. You would have involved the group in envisioning what success would look like for your engagement process, in relation to each of the principles, and written this down as a set of ten clear statements (one for each principle). These statements would be better tailored to the specifics of your engagement project than the generic National Principles. You would then follow the same process as above.

3.

Step three: Share the learning

Start by writing an overview of what your engagement aimed to achieve, what you actually did and additional basic factual information e.g. the dates or timespan of your engagement, methods used, stakeholder groups, and numbers of people engaged, events held, etc.

Identify who else should definitely see the report, and make it available to them. This could include partner agencies and commissioners or funding bodies.

Consider whether any stakeholders you engaged with may want to see the report. While stakeholders will always need feedback on the outcomes of the engagement activity to learn what difference their contributions have made, they are less likely to be interested in evaluating engagement so not all of them may need to see the evaluation.

Best practice

Best practice might take the form of a collaborative effort to identify a wider audience who might benefit from the evaluation. The audience could include a range of organisations that practice engagement. You might also want to consider presenting the evaluation in different formats tailored to the various audiences.





APPENDIX 1:

National Principles for Public Engagement and corresponding evaluation prompt questions

This section provides prompt questions for you to consider when devising your evaluation. Depending upon the engagement work you have done and the exact principle, some prompt questions will be more relevant than others. The evaluation toolkit discusses the differences in goals, process and impacts with regards to what to evaluate. This table brings together ‘what to evaluate’ with possible questions you could use to evaluate different aspects of your engagement work.

National Principles for Public Engagement in Wales	Prompt questions for an evaluation		
	Goals/ outputs	Processes	Impact/ outcomes
1. Design your engagement to make a difference	What design did your work have? Did you set out to measure any differences? Are you running a consultation? If so, then the people you engage with should influence decisions. Are you co-producing? If so, then the people you engage with should share in developing outcomes or creating solutions.	How did you do it?	What differences do participants report? What differences can you see? What differences do partner agencies report? What evidence is there of the people you engaged with having influenced or shared in producing outcomes or solutions?

National Principles for Public Engagement in Wales	Prompt questions for an evaluation		
	Goals/ outputs	Processes	Impact/ outcomes
2. Invite people to get involved, if they choose to	Did you carry out a stakeholder analysis? How many people were invited? How many participated?	How were people invited? How did people participate?	What encouraged people to participate?
3. Plan and deliver your engagement in a timely and appropriate way	What planning activities did you do? Who with?	How long did you spend doing what?	What difference did timing and scheduling make to participants?
4. Work with relevant partner organisations	Did you check whether anyone had carried out similar engagement recently? Did you contact any organisations to see if they would be interested in collaborating on engagement? How many organisations? How many were new to you? How much outreach did you do?	What partnership work did you do? How did you share decision making?	What do partners say are the outcomes of working with you? What benefits have there been?
5. Provide jargon free, appropriate, and understandable information	How much information did you produce about what? Did you check with people whether your information was clear enough? Which people?	What formats did you use and why?	What did participants like about your communications and why?

National Principles for Public Engagement in Wales	Prompt questions for an evaluation		
	Goals/ outputs	Processes	Impact/ outcomes
6. Make it easy for people to take part	What special steps did you take to reach seldom heard groups? How many took part, in what?	What kind of involvement has your work entailed?	What made it easy? What could be done differently next time?
7. Ensure people benefit from the experience	What did you do to try and make sure the process was a positive experience for all involved? How many people stated they benefited from what?	What processes helped people benefit?	What did people say the benefits were to them? How have they gained from these benefits long term?
8. Ensure the right resources and time are in place for your engagement to be effective	Did you have enough resources (time, money, people, skills etc) to carry out an effective engagement process? What resources did you use? How much time did it take?	What did you do with the resources to try and be effective?	What is meant by 'effective engagement'? Why is it important to your communities?
9. Let people know the impact of their contribution	Did you ask people whether they wanted feedback? Did you provide feedback to everyone who wanted it?	How have people contributed and what to?	What have been the personal, organisational and wider social impacts of their engagement?
10. Learn and share to improve your engagement	Are you carrying out an evaluation of your engagement? Where have you shared learning, who to and how many people were involved?	What did you do to learn and share? How did you involve participants in learning and sharing?	What improvements have you identified for next time? What were the wider outcomes on participants and the audience of sharing your learning?



APPENDIX 2:

This section provides a case study to demonstrate how the toolkit has been used in practice to produce an evaluation of engagement activity.



Case Study: Caswell Bay Feasibility Study Consultation

Between January and April 2024 Innes Associates² conducted a consultation on behalf of Swansea Council (Funded by UK Govt, Shared Prosperity Fund) about possible improvements to Caswell Bay, as part of a Feasibility Study.

Innes Associates engaged two local engagement practitioners³ to carry out the public engagement aspects of the study.

Caswell Bay is an extremely popular beach destination for local residents and visitors from further afield. It is located on the Gower Peninsula near Swansea and adjoining communities include Bishopston, Murton, Mansfield and Mumbles.

The council in their brief highlighted a number of specific areas they felt may need improvement but were clear that nothing had been decided yet and that they were keen to hear the views of a range of stakeholders about what they saw as the priorities for improvement at Caswell Bay.

The Council also wanted to communicate that any improvements would depend on securing additional funding.

The aim of the consultation was to enable the creation of a working document that could be used strategically to implement changes once funding became available.

A range of methods were used to engage stakeholders. These were: one to one, part structured in-depth interviews (online and face to face), shorter opportunistic face to face interviews (with beach users) and an online survey. A trusted intermediary was also engaged to consult with one specific stakeholder group.

² <https://www.innesassociates.net/>

³ <https://www.alainthomasconsultancy.wales/>, <https://www.mandywilliamsconsulting.cymru/>



Principle 1. Design your engagement to make a difference

Engagement offers an opportunity to inform or influence decisions, policy or services.

This principle is about making sure that engagement makes a difference.

What worked well

This was a consultation and a key principle for all consultations is ‘do not consult on what you cannot deliver’. As any improvements would be dependent on the Council securing additional funding it was therefore very important to manage expectations.

Every opportunity was taken to emphasise that any changes would require additional funding and that no promises could be made at this stage. This crucial message was delivered when participants were first approached (whether by email, via social media or face to face), and restated at the end of each interaction. The message was then communicated again when feedback was provided following the end of the consultation. It is notoriously difficult to manage expectations but, in this case no more could have been done and we hope we were largely successful.

The engagement activities resulted in numerous suggestions for improvements. These were captured on a site map which

proved a highly effective way of recording them. It ensured that even suggestions made by one or two people could be recorded which was important as some of these were useful and relatively easy to implement but could easily have been lost. Strong themes also emerged about issues that many people wanted addressed⁴.

As well as the suggestions for improvements the consultation identified a strong desire to retain the special characteristics of Caswell Bay and not to ‘over-develop’.

The final feasibility study report responded to most of the strong themes that were identified and included many of the more detailed suggestions that were made. The study provides strong evidence that people’s views were heard, recorded, and transmitted to Swansea Council. The report was well-received by the Council who are making plans to try and take forward many of the options it set out. The Council also accepted the importance to not over-develop and as one participant put it ‘keep the wildness’ of Caswell Bay.

What did not work so well/what we would do differently next time.

Everything worked as well as we could have hoped given the context.

Score



⁴ Some such as water pollution and poor wi-fi connection could only be noted as they were not the responsibility of Swansea Council.



Principle 2. Invite people to get involved, if they choose to

People have opportunities to engage as an individual or as part of a group or community, in an inclusive and welcoming way which does not put them under obligation or pressure.

This principle is about engaging with the right people.

What worked well

We identified seven important and distinct stakeholder groups and devised methods to engage with each of these. These methods included: one to one, in-depth, part structured online interviews with local authority officers, elected members, some businesses based at Caswell Bay, and representatives of other interested organisations; an online survey of local residents via two community social media platforms, shorter, opportunistic, face to face interviews with beach users and some businesses based at Caswell Bay, and; in-depth, part structured face to face interviews with residents of a local 'off-grid' community. All these methods proved effective

All the methods worked well. The interviews used many open questions to allow participants to say what was most important to them and also included a graded scale (Likert scale) to quantify responses and provide a clear outcome. The online survey proved very popular and received over 500 responses. The face to face interviews with beach users also included many open questions and a Likert scale and took place at the beach which ensured that we spoke with people who actually used the beach.

What did not work so well/what we would do differently next time.

The beach interviews took place around Easter. Ideally, they would have been carried out in the summer holidays when there would have been more people at the beach including those who only used the beach in the summer. This could have elicited additional ideas about what might encourage summer-only users to use the beach all year round.

Score





Principle 3. Plan and deliver your engagement in a timely and appropriate way

The engagement process is clear, communicated to everyone in a reasonable way that's easy to understand, takes place within a reasonable timescale, and uses the most suitable method(s) for those involved.

This principle is about proper planning and timely delivery.

What worked well

Innes Associates were required to tender for the feasibility study. Swansea Council's brief to tendering organisations was very clear and detailed which assisted the planning process. It set out the aims of the study, indicated a likely budget, identified the key limitation that funding would be required to take forward any improvements identified by the study, and provided a list of potential stakeholders.

All of the above factors helped the engagement team to develop a detailed consultation plan as part of the tendering process. This involved conducting a simple stakeholder analysis, identifying the numbers we aimed to involve from each stakeholder group (the budget estimate was very helpful in this respect), the methods to engage with them, and some key messages to communicate (notably that any improvements would be subject to funding in order to manage expectations).

The engagement team also set out a clear timetable for delivery. Each stakeholder group was engaged in turn with engagement scheduled to last for about a month for each group. We began with the easiest to engage in order to be able to make a quick start while also creating some time for us to plan in more detail how to engage with the other stakeholder groups. Three consultants divided the work between us which also enabled rapid progress and created some flexibility in scheduling appointments.

A separate report of findings was produced for each stakeholder group as soon as engagement with them was complete. This enabled information to be fed in to the feasibility study planning process in stages (making it easier to assimilate) and more quickly (one or two short reports each month) than if we had waited until the end of the engagement phase to produce a single, much longer, report.

What did not work so well/what we would do differently next time.

Nothing

Score





Principle 4. Work with relevant partner organisations

Organisations communicate with each other and work together wherever possible, to ensure that people’s time, and organisation’s resources are used efficiently.

This principle is about working with other organisations to avoid duplication and make the best use of resources.

What worked well

We were alert to the possibility of finding that other organisations might have carried out similar or complementary work however we did not devote time to exploring this in any depth because we thought it was unlikely we would identify any suitable partners or previous relevant studies.

In the course of conducting the beach interviews we were told of a beach use survey that had been carried out several months before by ‘students’ but we were unable to track down the educational institution involved.

What did not work so well/what we would do differently next time.

Ideally, next time we would consider including in the budget perhaps half a day’s work to contact organisations that could have carried out similar or complementary work. This might have helped us track down the ‘beach user survey’ for example. However, this would increase the financial costs for the tender and potentially reduce chances of success. A judgement would therefore need to be made about the likelihood of finding partner organisations to work with (actual benefits), and the value a commissioner might place on engaging with partner organisations (perceived benefits). The same consideration applies to the evaluation of principles 5, 9, and 10 below where an increase in the budget would have allowed for better practice.

Score





Principle 5. Provide jargon free, appropriate, and understandable information

People have easy access to relevant information that is tailored to meet their needs.

This principle is about communicating in a way that people understand.

What worked well

The engagement team took care to avoid jargon and communicate in simple and understandable language. We feel we achieved this.

One of the team was a fluent Welsh speaker and was therefore able to carry out interviews in Welsh with anyone who wanted this.

What did not work so well/what we would do differently next time.

We prioritised cost-effectiveness over communicating in different languages or formats. All our materials were produced in English only and, although we used simple and understandable language we did not, for example, provide Easy Read versions.

We believe this was the correct choice in the context of the available budget and the composition of the local population and other key stakeholders. However, it would have been more inclusive and better practice to have at least produced bilingual (Welsh-English), and Easy Read versions of our materials.

Score





Principle 6. Make it easy for people to take part

Any barriers are identified and addressed, so that people can engage easily.

This principle is about engaging with seldom heard groups.

What worked well

We were aware of an off-grid community adjacent to Caswell Bay. Our main method for engaging with local residents was an online survey and we wondered whether this community would be prepared to use precious electricity to fill in such a survey. We also wondered whether the alternative lifestyle of this community would mean that they could have different priorities for improvements at Caswell Bay. For these reasons we decided to employ a resident of the community to act as a ‘trusted intermediary’ and conduct face to face interviews with her neighbours.

This worked well and we were able to include separate sections to reflect the views of this community in the consultation report. It turned out that their priorities were mainly (although not entirely) in line with the rest of the local community. The use of a trusted intermediary therefore resulted in a useful form of additional triangulation of source and method, adding confidence to the survey findings.

Innes Associates are based in London but deliberately employed local consultants to lead the engagement process. The consultants were therefore aware of this off-grid community which might otherwise not have been identified. The local consultants were also able to bring a good knowledge of the local area and community which assisted with stakeholder analysis, facilitated some contacts, and brought additional insights.

We were fortunate that a specialist surf school for people with disabilities was located at Caswell Bay. This allowed us to include the perspective of this stakeholder group which might otherwise have been more difficult for us to engage with.

What did not work so well/what we would do differently next time.

Nothing.

Score





Principle 7. Work with relevant partner organisations

Engagement contributes to developing the skills, knowledge, and confidence of all participants.

This principle is about making sure all participants have a positive experience.

What worked well

We did not prioritise everyone benefiting from the experience but rather aimed to make sure everyone had a positive experience by being respectful and providing accurate information at all times, including about the uncertainty regarding securing future funding.

There is one example of a benefit to a participant in that we employed a local resident from an off-grid community to conduct some interviews with her neighbours.

She had some previous experience of interviewing but this opportunity added to her experience and we were then able to employ her to conduct additional interviews with beach users. She later became a full team member for a subsequent consultation we carried out. This benefited the engagement process as without her we may not have reached this group, and she gained experience which led directly to future employment.

What did not work so well/what we would do differently next time.

We feel this principle does not fit the context of this consultation very well. People already had the knowledge required to participate in the consultation and they were motivated to do so because they wanted to improve and protect an area they cared about. Therefore, they needed no further information or training, neither did they need any incentives.

We believe that the provision of information or training could be more needed when participants are being asked to take more of a decision making role, for example if they are involved in co-production. Incentives would be more needed if participants were reluctant to engage for any reason. These factors do not apply here.

Score





Principle 8. Ensure the right resources and time are in place for your engagement to be effective

Enough time is allowed for both planning and meaningful engagement for the decision, policy or service design. Appropriate training, guidance, support and financial resources enable all participants to engage effectively, including community participants and staff.

This principle is about engagement being well enough resourced.

What worked well

As stated under Principle 3, the tendering process allowed a detailed and costed engagement plan and timetable to be drawn up. The quality of the information provided to tenderers by Swansea Council greatly assisted this process.

As stated above no training or additional information was necessary.

The budget therefore enabled all the core elements of an effective consultation process which led to the desired outcomes.

What did not work so well/what we would do differently next time.

The planned budget allowed engagement to be carried out effectively and on time. Additional funding would have allowed a systematic exploration of any potential synergy to be gained from working with other organisations (Principle 4), the production of bilingual and Easy Read materials (Principle 5) , and guaranteed funding for feedback and evaluation (see Principles 9 and 10 below).

However, as stated under Principle 4 a judgement has to be made about the potential benefits of providing for these in the budget against the risks of higher costs making a successful tender less likely.

Score





Principle 9. Let people know the impact of their contribution

Timely feedback is given to participants about their contribution, and the decisions or actions taken as a result, using methods and forms of feedback that take account of participants' preferences.

This principle is about providing feedback to the people we engaged with.

What worked well

We used the 'You said – we did (or didn't do because...)' format to provide feedback.

We kept in mind the maxim 'honesty and bravery'⁵ when preparing the feedback. It is very rarely possible to act on every suggestion that is made and some people will inevitably be disappointed, even angry when they care deeply about an issue which is not acted upon. However, it is always better to be honest and provide an explanation straight away than to avoid the issue and allow uncertainty and frustration to build up.

A summary of the consultation findings ('you said') was produced by the engagement team and provided to Swansea Council who responded ('we did or didn't do because ...'). This resulted in a fairly short (5 page) document setting out clearly the main suggestions for improvement and Swansea Council's response.

Swansea Council said they were not in a position to implement some suggestions, even though they knew this would not be popular; they also gave the reasons why they could not, or did not feel it was appropriate for them to act on them.

Conversely, they were able to say that there were many suggestions they were going to explore further and also that they accepted the need to preserve the special characteristics of the area. The feedback was therefore honest and brave and we think people will have felt heard.

We adopted the principle of using the same feedback methods as we used to engage with stakeholders, as far as possible.

We asked face to face interviewees whether they wanted to receive feedback and if so asked them to provide an email address. This allowed us to send them the feedback directly.

A post was placed on the same social media groups we used to engage with local residents, allowing people to access the 'You said- we did' summary.

A graphic with an abbreviated version of the 'you said-we did' summary was produced and placed at Caswell Bay for beach users to see.

⁵ Attributed to Lee Hind, a participant in WCVA's accredited public engagement course in February 2024.

What did not work so well/what we would do differently next time.

We wanted to make the initial tender as cost-efficient as possible so did not include a budget for feedback. We hoped to be able to find cost-savings as we implemented the engagement plan and use these to fund feedback and evaluation (see below). We were able to make these savings and sufficient funding was made available for these purposes. However, in future it would be good practice to include a budget for feedback.

Score





Principle 10. Learn and share to improve your engagement

People’s experience of the engagement process is monitored, along with the accessibility, inclusion and diversity, and the outputs and results. Lessons learnt from the evaluation are shared and inform future engagement.

This principle is about evaluating engagement.

What worked well

The lead member of the engagement team evaluated the engagement process using Wales Council for Voluntary Action’s Toolkit.

His evaluation was then circulated to lead members of staff for the feasibility study within Inness Associates and Swansea City Council together with a second member of the engagement team. These commented on the draft evaluation which was amended.

The final version of the evaluation was then made available to Swansea City Council, Innes Associates and the local engagement specialists for future reference and learning.

What did not work so well/what we would do differently next time.

As with principle 9, a budget was not allocated to evaluation. It would be better practice to include one in future.

The draft evaluation was circulated for comment to key internal stakeholders only. It would have been better practice to include other stakeholders and to involve everyone in an interactive process of evaluation, but resources did not allow this.

The final evaluation was, once more, circulated only to internal stakeholders, it would have been better practice to circulate it more widely⁶.

Score



⁶ The learning from the evaluation has, of course, been circulated more widely because it is included in the WCVA toolkit to evaluate engagement, but this was not planned as part of the consultation.