



Member Engagement Plan

The future organizational structure of the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2)

The Invitation

IAP2 is currently making a decision about its future organizational structure. The Board is proposing that IAP2 move to a federation of affiliates. The Board believes that an organizational change is needed to direct more focus on two critical functions: developing and advancing our practice at the international level, and extending our membership base at a more local level. After examining a number of options the Board has landed on the preferred option of a federation of affiliates.

The Board is now looking for member input to confirm that this is the acceptable way forward and to discuss how that might best work. The Board is inviting members – those who are direct members of the international organization and those who hold their membership with an affiliate – to provide comments, input, and advice; that is, to be involved in the Board's decision-making process.

This member engagement process does not cover the internal organizational structure of the Australasia, France, or UK and Ireland affiliates. However, members of these affiliates are invited along with all other members to be involved in decision that relate to the overall structure of a federation.

Members can be involved by providing comments by email, filling out a work book, or by participating in an online discussion from November 2009 through February 2010.

Current opportunities and challenges being faced by IAP2

Overview

Around the world, IAP2 is currently seeing an expanded interest in engaging communities in decision making; it is an exciting time for the practice. At the same time, IAP2's international membership numbers have stalled, especially in the foundation areas in North America, and it has been facing severe financial concerns.

IAP2, the Board, and various committees have prepared a number of reports on the current challenges, including a governance review, a membership survey, a futures paper, and an Australasian Affiliate review; they also hosted several discussions, including tele-meetings with the President in the lead-up to the September 2009 conference, board meeting, and Annual General Meeting in San Diego, California, USA. All of the reports considered by the Board are available to members at www.iap2.org. A Question-and-Answer document has also been prepared to support member engagement around these issues.

Membership Challenges

IAP2 has around the same number of international members as it did 10 years ago, with about 1600 members worldwide. By contrast, in recent years there has been strong growth in affiliate-only membership, most notably in Australasia, which has grown to over 600 affiliate members in the last four years.

Providing a range of services to members appears to be an important factor in membership growth. For example, the Australasian Affiliate provided over 30 events, several workshops, a national conference, an awards program, and a program of public training for their members in 2009. ([CLICK here for a Snapshot of the Australasian Affiliate](#))

Chapters in North America vary in size and the number of offerings to their members and communities. Wild Rose in Alberta, Canada has the largest number of members and a full calendar of events. Other chapters such as Cascade in Portland, Oregon host annual regional conferences and networking events. Intermountain Chapter has initiated an online presence to reach out to members and connect with others. Other isolated pockets of activity exist in North America and there are some signs of renaissance and energy that need to be captured and fostered to build the next generation of IAP2; these include British Columbia in Canada and the Northern California and Grand Canyon Chapters in the USA. Detailed membership information is contained in the Executive Director's quarterly reports. ([Click here for Q1 2009 Report](#). [Click here for the Q2 2009 Report](#). [Click here for the Q3 2009 Report](#).)

Financial Challenges

IAP2 needs to be financially sustainable. However, IAP2's financial situation has become increasingly difficult over the last few years. A lack of membership growth, reduced training levels in North America, and the annual international conference operating at break-even or loss for several years has meant that our financial base is weak. In 2009, the organization's existence was at risk, which meant that the chapters in North America were also at risk. Only by a dedicated effort across the leadership of the Association to maximize the number of people attending the San Diego Conference and to cut back on every item of nonessential spending allowed the organization to continue operations. This intense focus on the annual conference and maintaining solvency meant that IAP2's leadership and staff were unable to work on other programs and opportunities.

The financial risks do not extend to the Australasian Affiliate, which is legally separate and financially stable. The Wild Rose Chapter also has its own legal and financial status. The France and UK affiliates are legally separate though would not be at the stage of having a sound financial base. More financial information is in the latest annual report. ([Click here for the 2008 Annual Report](#)) In addition, the website contains annual reports back to 2002.

The current organizational model

As described below, IAP2 is currently running a two-model organizational structure with chapters and affiliates operating in parallel, with the structural description further complicated by individual members who are unattached to either chapters or affiliates.

Chapter Model

The original model is the chapter model: people are members directly of the international association, they pay their membership fee directly to the international association, and membership events and networks are led by volunteer local chapters that are legal extensions of the international association within the USA (not legally constituted in their own right). Outside of the USA, chapters do not have the legal and financial support of the international infrastructure and some Chapters have incorporated themselves to enable them to have that protection within their own jurisdiction (e.g., Wild Rose in Canada). The international secretariat handles all membership inquiries. The local chapters are host local events and networking activities. The

chapters are typically small in number, have a large geographic base to cover, and there are many places where a chapter does not exist or is not active.

Affiliate Model

In 2007, after an initial two-year pilot in Australasia, the Board formalized a new affiliate model. In the last year, the model has been under development in two other regions, the United Kingdom and Ireland, and France. Under this model, people are members *directly* of the affiliate organization, they pay their membership fee directly to the affiliate, and membership activities and networks are led by the affiliate. Affiliates are separate legal entities in their own countries and have their own committee or board.

The Australasian Affiliate pays a percentage of its membership fees to IAP2body in recognition of its relationship with the international organization and links to the practice at an international level. The Australasian Affiliate bears all the costs of individual member support. The payment arrangements for France have been waived for a pilot period and they have not been put in place yet for the UK/Ireland Affiliate as that agreement is waiting for the current decision making on a federation of affiliates.

In the case of the Australasian Affiliate, the affiliate structure has provided a platform for growth. The affiliate-only membership has grown from under 100 at the beginning of the pilot program to over 600 at the end of 2009, and at a rate of 25% annually for the last three years. A report on the Australasian Affiliate was completed in 2009. ([Click here for the Australasian Affiliate Report](#))

Governance

The 15-member IAP2 Board is elected directly by international members, and includes one position that is held by a representative of the Australasian Affiliate. Under Article 5 Section 3 of the Bylaws, the Board has also added one representative to the Board from France and one from the UK/Ireland in recognition of their developing affiliate status, and in September 2009 added a second representative from Australasia for this current period of governance review and member consultation.

The Board Proposal

The IAP2 Board believes that IAP2 needs an organizational structure that strengthens local and regional leadership to make decisions and act in a way that delivers value to members and supports local and regional practice. In addition, IAP2 needs a structure that allows for focused international positioning to advocate, promote, and develop our practice. Members need a presence, activities, and experiences at both local and international levels.

After considering the results from the affiliate model experience, member survey, and the options presented in the Governance Review ([CLICK here for the Governance Review Final Report](#)), the Board believes that a federation of affiliates will offer the necessary structural support for growth, innovation, and local leadership. It sees it as the structure that will best enable IAP2 to meet its purpose and objectives as defined in the current bylaws, and to deal with current opportunities and challenges. The Board is therefore recommending to the membership that IAP2 move to a federation of affiliates.

During a period of member engagement from November 2009 through February 2010, IAP2 is seeking member input on the question of whether IAP2 should move to a federation of affiliates. If members support a federation, the Board also wishes to know how this would best be implemented, and what other alternatives and suggestions members would recommend to meet the current opportunities and challenges.

The Board is seeking the views of all members, both international and affiliate-only, to provide as much input as possible to the Board as it makes this decision in early 2010.

Doing nothing is not an option. IAP2 must improve its financial viability, grow the practice, and increase member numbers and services. This is a key non-negotiable in this decision-making process.

With respect of a federation of affiliates, there is considerable flexibility in how this might be implemented across the world. What works in one country may not be the best way in other localities or communities of practice. What has been working in the Australasian Affiliate or in the emerging French or UK/Ireland Affiliate may not be best for other areas. The Board is seeking member input on how an affiliate model might best work in worldwide terms, and also in specific areas. The Board is seeking input on the questions in the section below, Areas for Discussion.

In undertaking this engagement, the Board is not reviewing the organizational structure within the Australasian, UK and Ireland, or French Affiliates, as these are matters for those legally constituted bodies and their own committees.

Why is the Board engaging members?

The Board would like members to have the opportunity to understand the current international opportunities and the membership and financial challenges being faced by IAP2 at the international level, and also to have information about the federation of affiliates model that is being recommended.

The Board is seeking member input and advice on whether they support a federation of affiliates and how that might best work in their area (if they are not already in an affiliate structure); if they do not support a federation, the Board needs ideas on alternatives *that would meet the current opportunities and challenges*. All members are also invited to provide comments on how the overall federation would be put in place.

Member Engagement Objectives:

(What do members and the Board need from this process?)

1. All IAP2 members and chapter leaders have the information they need to understand the current challenges, the proposed federation model, and related governance issues.
2. All IAP2 members worldwide are able to express their opinion on the proposal for a federation of affiliates (positive or negative), be involved in online discussions, provide ideas on how a new model could be implemented effectively in their area (if they are not already in an affiliate structure) and across the world, and offer alternatives if they do not support the federation model.
3. Chapter leaders in North America are involved in specific online discussions (and possibly face-to-face) to consider how the affiliate model can best be implemented in their area/country, given their current leadership role and the tasks and support needed for implementation.
4. The Board understands what members and chapter leaders think about the federation of affiliates, draws on member ideas for the details to put in place a federation of affiliates, knows what the members want from both the affiliate level and the International level, and in doing so, has the information it needs to make decisions.

Matters for Discussion

The Board is seeking members' involvement on whether they support the recommended federation of affiliates as an acceptable way forward or what other alternatives and suggestions members would recommend to meet the current challenges if a federation is not supported. In addition, the detail of how affiliates are established, their shape, size and nature, has not been decided and the Board is seeking the advice of its members on these elements of the decision. In particular the Board is seeking advice on:

Roles and responsibilities at each level

- > What roles and responsibilities are best undertaken at the international level under a federation structure if it is no longer responsible for direct member services?

The Board's initial thinking on this is that the International organization would concentrate on building international links, supporting the growth of affiliates around the world, facilitating ongoing research and practice development, and developing and managing the training operation.

What are your thoughts?

- > What roles and responsibilities are best undertaken at the affiliate level under a federation structure if affiliates are responsible for direct member services? *(Please note that this review does not cover the internal organizational structure of existing affiliates)*

The Board's initial thought is that affiliates would manage all membership activities, recruit members, and provide services for their members. This would likely include organizing and facilitating the delivery of a mix of professional development, training, networking events, conferences, and communications for members.

The Board also expects that affiliates would collect and retain all membership fees for use as the affiliate sees fit. It is expected, however, that some payment would need to be made to the international organization, possibly in recognition of the international membership and possibly for a program of work to extend the practice.

The Board also expects that affiliates would be constituted organizations in their own right according to the legal requirements of their own country, with their own board or management committee. The affiliates would also likely nominate director/s to the federation, which would continue to be constituted in the United States.

What are your ideas?

- > What value may there be in a level of operation below an affiliate, that is state committees (as in Australasia) or chapters (as in North America)? What roles and responsibilities are best undertaken at a sub-affiliate level? What are your thoughts and ideas?

What constitutes an affiliate?

- > Should an affiliate be a country, part of a country, a group of countries, a community of interest (e.g., research group, a language grouping) or some other option? What do you think would work best, and what are some of the considerations?

Affiliate membership of the international organization

- > What criteria should an affiliate have to meet before it is granted membership in the International organization? Examples of criteria may include evidence of providing member services, number of members, financial standing, or legal constitution in their own country. What are your thoughts and what else would be important?
- > What might be the reciprocal responsibilities between the international and the affiliate organizations? These may include annual reporting. What are your thoughts and what else would be important?
- > If size of membership and activity are important in terms of being admitted as an affiliate member – should there be a category of membership for emerging affiliates as opposed to full membership and should affiliates of different sizes have a right to more or less representatives on the international board?

Transition

- > What are the key steps in the transition process, and what will members and chapters need in order to implement the process of moving to an affiliate structure? What arrangements are needed during the transition? What would assist you?

What else?

- > What is missing? What other comments, ideas, and suggestions can you offer the Board as it makes this decision about the future organizational structure of IAP2?

Member engagement plan – summary and timing

Decision Statement for Engagement:	Key Steps/Tasks	Timing
<p>The decision being made is the future organizational structure of IAP2 and whether IAP2 moves to a Federation of Affiliates (as proposed by the Board), and how it would best work.</p> <p>Decision maker IAP2 Board</p> <p>Level on the spectrum Involve</p> <p>Stakeholders and target audiences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > IAP2 international members -all classes of membership > IAP2 affiliate-only members > IAP2 chapter leaders > IAP2 affiliate leaders > Younger members > Newer members <p>Member Engagement Goals Involve members and chapter leaders in discussions to obtain their feedback on all elements of how a federation of affiliates will work for them, and ensure that their concerns are consistently understood and considered.</p> <p>Member Engagement Promise We will keep you informed and listen to you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are reflected in the overall model developed, and provide feedback on how your input influenced the decision.</p>	<p>1. Notification and Information Notify members of the engagement and provide all available information to members, chapter leaders and affiliate leaders</p> <p>2. Member Discussion Invite members to provide comments and ideas by way of an online discussion forum, online workbook, email, or letter. Delegated board working group and ED to provide answers and information to encourage ongoing online discussion.</p> <p>Hold up to 6 focus groups (via teleconference) with randomly chosen members, young members, and new members (3 different groups).</p> <p>3. Chapter leaders discussion Invite chapter leaders to an online or face-to-face meeting in Canada and the United States to discuss how the model could be implemented in their areas.</p> <p>4. Analysis, reporting and evaluation Contract an independent third party provider (at no cost) to collate and analyze the information from steps 2 and 3 above into a <u>Report on the Engagement</u> for consideration by the board and to be made available to all members.</p> <p>Survey members on whether they knew about the engagement, whether they felt they could participate, and any comments on the overall process; provide an <u>Evaluation Report</u> to the Board</p> <p>5. Decision Decision by the International Board at its meeting in March 2010</p> <p>6. Feedback to Members Feedback - Provide information to members on the decision that was made and how their input influenced the decision</p>	<p>Nov 2009</p> <p>Start Nov 2009</p> <p>Finish end of Feb 2010</p> <p>January 2010</p> <p>March 2010</p> <p>Immediately following the engagement and prior to the March Board meeting</p> <p>March 2010</p> <p>April 2010 following the IAP2 Board meeting</p>

Member Engagement Plan:

Activity	Stakeholder	Format	Purpose
STAGE 1 NOTIFICATION & INFORMATION			
Notification	Members Chapter leaders Affiliate leaders	Email or phone alert to all and postcard alert to those not on email	Inform members of engagement
Information	Members Chapter leaders Affiliate leaders	Information provided on website/forum tool being used	To provide information to enable them to be informed and participate in discussions
STAGE 2 MEMBER DISCUSSION			
Online consultation	Members	Online forum site, providing background information and survey/feedback form, together with forum	An accessible site that allows members to participate at their own convenience. Provide opportunity for members to engage in dialogue about the elements under discussion
Workbook	Members	Detailed workbook providing information on federation model and key questions	Provide detailed information for consideration by members
Online consultation	Affiliate members	Online forum site, seeking feedback from existing affiliate members on what works for them in their affiliate, what doesn't, and what they need from the international	Capitalize on the opportunity to identify lessons learned from existing affiliates and clarify expectations of international body
Teleconference or other discussion	Affiliate leaders	Hold discussion between affiliate leaders to provide comments in relation to affiliate relations to the international body	
Focus Groups	Randomly selected members, young members, and new members	Focus groups held by teleconference	To obtain feedback from members who may otherwise not participate
STAGE 3 CHAPTER DISCUSSION			
Chapter Leaders meeting	Chapter Leaders	An initial teleconference;	Allow chapters to explore the affiliate

Activity	Stakeholder	Format	Purpose
		option for two participative meetings supported by Board members	model in detail and develop a process for implementation that is appropriate for the area
Workbook	Chapter Leaders	Detailed workbook providing information and key questions	Provide detailed information for consideration by existing chapters
Technical specialists	Chapter Leaders	Panel of people with experience in an affiliate and chapter models (particularly governance) available via email and Skype	Chapters and individuals can pose questions and scenarios for testing and answers
STAGE 4 ANALYSIS & REPORTING			
Online analysis	Board Members	Online forum site to provide analysis from their site including all surveys	A summary of information
Analysis and report	Board Members	Third-party provider to manage, analyze, and report on all submissions, feedback, and surveys including the information from online forum; produce a report on the engagement for the Board and members	A robust and efficient method for managing information and provided by an independent agent
Evaluation	Members Board	Survey to all members	Information to Board on the “robustness” of the process
STAGE 5 DECISION			
Reporting	Board	Report on the engagement provided for March Board meeting	Ensure the Board understands what chapters need to implement the decision, how the new model will work and what the membership needs from the organization
STAGE 6 FEEDBACK TO MEMBERS			
Feedback to members	Members Chapters Affiliates	Website update IAP2 Newsletter Email alert	Inform the membership of the final details of overall model, the support that will be provided to chapters and members in

Activity	Stakeholder	Format	Purpose
			implementing it, the issues the membership identified they wanted from the Board and how these are being responded to

Tools and techniques (details)

Tool	Information	Questions	Outputs
Workbooks	Background on Board decision – why a change is needed Information on what the new model is Space for answers on the questions	How can this model work for you? What do you need to do in order to implement your affiliate? What is it that you want and need from the international association?	Third party report identifying: Elements of how the model will work for each chapter What chapters need to implement What members want and need of the International body
Chapter meetings	Workbooks PowerPoint summary Board leaders from the jurisdiction	What do you need to know in order to answer the consultation questions? How can this model work for you? What do you need to do in order to implement an affiliate? What is it that you want and need from the international association?	Chapters and their committees have access to the information and support they need to participate in the consultation Report from each chapter detailing: Elements of how the model will work for each chapter What chapters need in order to implement What members want and need of the international body
Technical specialists	Personal experience in either establishing or working within the affiliate structure, with a particular emphasis on governance	Any questions generated by the chapter committees pertaining to the affiliate model	Chapter committees have access to the information they need in order to participate in the consultation
Online consultations (members, chapters, affiliates)	Summary of background information Summary of proposed changes Links to more detailed information Forum for online	Does this model work for you? How would the model work in your area? What do you need to do in order to implement an affiliate?	Report on: Responses to each question Analysis of discussion Hits and visits to the site

Tool	Information	Questions	Outputs
	discussion	What is it that you want and need from the international association?	
IAP2 International newsletter	Outline of Board decision Invitation to participate in consultation process Information on how to be involved Timeframe Nonnegotiable and parameters of consultation	How can this model work for you? What do you need to do in order to implement the affiliate? What is it that you want and need from the international association?	Member awareness of: Board decision Consultation process How they can participate Consultation activities and where to find more information Parameters of process including negotiables, nonnegotiables, and timeframes
Affiliate and Chapter newsletters	Outline of Board decision Invitation to participate in consultation process Information on how to be involved Timeframe Non-negotiables and parameters of consultation	How can this model work for you? What do you need to do in order to implement the Affiliate? What is it that you want and need from your international association?	Member awareness of: Board decision Consultation process How they can participate Consultation activities and where to find more information Parameters of process including negotiable and non negotiable and timeframes
Email alerts	1) Introduce and remind membership of consultation process Reinforce timeframe and provide countdown Provide links to BTT, newsletters etc 2) Alert members of the final decisions of the Board and direct them to the website for more information	Have you participated yet?	Member awareness of process and timeframe Member awareness of the outcomes of the process
Website updates	1) Outline of Board decision Invitation to participate in consultation process Information on how to be involved Timeframe Non negotiable and parameters of	How can this model work for you? What do you need to do in order to implement an affiliate? What is it that you want and need from the international association?	Member awareness of: Board decision Consultation process How they can participate Consultation activities and where to find more information Parameters of process

Tool	Information	Questions	Outputs
	consultation Links to discussion forum Details of chapter meetings 2) Inform members of the final decisions of the Board following the engagement process		including negotiables, non-negotiables, and timeframes Members have access to more detailed information about how the outcomes of the engagement process have been considered by and responded to by the Board
Focus Group meetings	Information on website and online forum completed	Same questions as workbook and online forum	Report on: Responses to each question Analysis of discussion

Schedule of Activities & Budget:

Date	Activity	Resources/Dollars	By who:
	Workbook		KW, JG, LCE, ED
	Website update	Probably can be done without cost	LCE, KW, ED
	Focus group teleconferences	Teleconference charges Volunteer facilitator	ED Volunteer facilitator
	Postcard or phone notification	Internal printing & postage cost as only to members not on email	ED
	Newsletter text	No cost within existing resources	ED
	Organize 2 meetings of Chapter leaders	Budget of \$5K USD Board members from local jurisdiction to attend/assist	ED
	Establish online forum	Pro bono	ED
	Establish independent report writer and evaluation survey	Pro bono	ED
	Organize email alerts	Within existing resources	ED/ admin

KW Kimbra White

JG John Godec

LCE Lucy Cole-Edelstein

ED Executive Director

Member Engagement Plan – Some additional notes

Notifying the members

Members will be notified by email. Members not on email will be advised by other means such as a postcard. The engagement process will be supported by the IAP2 and Affiliate newsletters or email alerts that feature information and invite participation. In addition, regular email alerts will be sent to all members to prompt their participation.

Information being provided

- Key documents and information to enable participation
 - Membership Engagement Report – the information in this report will be used to provide the consistent text for the workbook and the online discussion forum
 - The Story So Far – a pictorial view of the organization (PowerPoint)
 - The Workbook (document for providing information and seeking feedback)
 - Online forum information – the structure of the online forum and information provided will be the same as the workbook
 - Q&A document (to be added to both in hardcopy and online during the process). A website page to be established with the invitation to participate and links to the online forum and all information listed here.

- Key Reports submitted to the Board on governance and organizational review – links will be provided to these documents that have been available to members since they were written
 - The Governance Review Report (some recommendations adopted)
 - The Futures Paper (not formally adopted)
 - The Affiliate Review including the Australasian Affiliate Snapshot (not formally adopted)

- Supporting documents that have information about the current challenges - links will be provided to these documents that have been available to members since they were written
 - Member Survey
 - Quarterly reports (for member info)
 - Annual Report (for financial info)
 - Chapter and affiliate comparison table
 - President's presentation to the 2009 AGM (PowerPoint)

Ongoing answers to any questions raised during the process by working group members to be listed in the hard copy and the online forum

The online discussion elements

Engagement will occur mostly via web-based methods and this is being done to ensure that all members where ever they are in the world can participate in the discussions. An online forum will enable members to engage in a dialogue with each other on the issues.

There is the capacity among IAP2 members to provide this online forum and an expression of interest has been sent out to them. It is expected that this will be provided at no cost to IAP2 due to the marketing benefits that will be gained by the provider.

Location of the information

Information will be placed on the website with a link from the front page plus a link out to the discussion forum. The same information will be on the online discussion forum and in the workbook.

Ways to be involved

Members can provide input to the International Board by:

- Completing a workbook – downloading it from the website and returning it by post it to IAP2 Office in Denver, Colorado by February 28, 2010. If possible, this will be managed in an online environment as well as hard copy.
- Participating in an online discussion that will have identical sections as the workbook hosted on [TO BE ADVISED](#)
- Sending an email to yoursay@iap2.org with your comments
- Chapter leaders are being invited to specific conversations

Workbook

A workbook will provide information and a set of questions on which the Board is seeking comment. These questions will be common to the consultation including the online discussion forum.

Face-to-face meeting

Chapters in North America and Canada are key stakeholders in this engagement process. It is proposed to hold an initial conference call with them early in the process during which they will be asked how they would like to participate in the engagement. An option will be offered for them to meet face-to-face, with one or two members of the Board, to explore the implications of the proposal and what they may need in order to implement it.

Answering questions during the process

The Board working group and the Executive Director will be available to answer any questions raised during the engagement process, mostly expected to be within an online forum. Questions received in other ways will be answered and made visible to all on the online forum and Q&A document. The working group has agreed that the Executive Director will draft all answers and these are to be approved by at least two members of the working group from different jurisdictions before being posted.

In addition, a small panel of people has been identified to provide information about how the various affiliates and chapters operate or might expect to operate. This panel includes Joanna Janiw from France, Nicky Leggatt from the UK, Kimbra White from Australasia, Blair McNaughton from Wild Rose chapter in Canada, and Jeanna Hall from the Cascade chapter in the USA.

Managing feedback and submissions

It is proposed at this stage to employ a third party provider on a pro bono basis to collate and analyze all the information collected from the online forum discussion, the workbooks, any teleconferences, focus group meetings, and emails. This Report on the Engagement will be provided to the Board for consideration at its March 2010 meeting and will be available to members via the website. An request for proposals has been issued in relation to the discussion forum and report.

Evaluation

It is important to evaluate the process and provide this information to the Board as part of its decision making process. A simple survey could be sent to all members asking whether they were aware of the engagement, felt they could participate if they wished, and have any comments on the process.