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EXECTIVE SUMMARY

The following report reviews the accomplishments and challenges of the 2009 Participatory Budgeting (PB) process at Toronto Community Housing (TCH). Its purpose is to help tenants and staff better understand how PB works at TCH, in order to identify and agree on improvements to the process. After reviewing the evaluation process, the report provides an overview of the results and participant opinions, then focuses on several key issues, and finally proposes new evaluation tools.

The report is one step in a broader participatory evaluation process. Through the 2009 PB Evaluation, two external researchers, a dozen tenant researchers, and dozens of other tenants and staff researched and reflected on the year’s PB process. This research included meeting observations, a tenant survey, tenant and staff interviews, and several trainings and workshops. During the last part of the evaluation, approximately 40 tenants and staff reviewed and revised this report, through two Evaluation & Planning Workshops.

The evaluation indicates that the 2009 PB was in many respects the most successful year yet. Six times as many tenants participated in Allocation Days, the vast majority for the first time. Whereas in previous years tenant budget delegates decided only $1.8 million, in 2009 delegates allocated roughly $7 million. Over 90% of the delegates considered these budget decisions fair, even though many of them did not receive funding. The PB process also took root more deeply throughout the organization, as local staff in the Operating Units took on the primary responsibility for organizing Allocation Days.

With significant changes in the process, new challenges emerged, and some old ones persisted:
- Confusion and overlap between capital and operating spending
- Tensions between young and adult delegates, and inconsistent youth participation
- Doubts about the need for and use of reserve funds
- Inaccurate or late quotes for project costs
- Limited preparation time, for both tenants and staff
- Confusion about staff and tenant roles
- Building meetings that were sometimes poorly organized and sparsely attended
- Insufficient tenant delegate preparation and training
- Irregularities and limited deliberation during the voting process

For each of these issues, the report presents research findings and recommends options for improving the 2010 process. The recommendations include:
- Set aside one budget delegate position for youth in each building with young tenants.
- Provide a menu of typical project costs to tenants at the beginning of the process
- Allocate reserve funds to unfunded projects, but only after Allocation Day
- Extend PB discussions across multiple building meetings
- Organize training workshops for all delegates
- Organize bus tours for delegates to see potential projects in other buildings
- Re-establish a PB Steering Committee that enables tenants to help guide the PB process
- At building meetings present capital improvement plans and the size of the funding pot
- Allow delegates to serve for an optional second year, to encourage peer-to-peer learning
- Allow time for questions after delegate project presentations
- Use electronic voting to select projects
1. The Evaluation Process

Through the 2009 Participatory Budgeting (PB) Evaluation, two external researchers, a dozen tenant researchers, and over 40 other tenants and staff researched and reflected on the year’s PB process. This introductory section explains what the evaluation consisted of and how it worked.

What were the goals of the evaluation?

- To engage tenants and staff in researching and better understanding the PB process and tenant engagement.
- To identify potential improvements to the PB process, based on this research.
- To help reach agreement on a shared framework for the PB process, with broader tenant and staff support.
- To improve tenant and staff capacity to conduct participatory research.

Why a participatory evaluation?

Unlike many evaluations, this process was driven by active tenant and staff involvement. Tenants and staff not just responded to questions, but also formulated and asked them, and figured out what to do with the answers. This approach is known as participatory action research: “research which involves all relevant parties in actively examining together current action in order to change and improve it.”

- It brings together different perspectives and interpretations, which often inspires new observations and ideas.
- It focuses evaluation questions and tools, by creating more opportunities for staff and participants to indicate what kinds of information they are interested in and anticipate using.
- It helps prevent misunderstandings and generate sounder conclusions, as evaluators are constantly checking their ideas with staff and participants.
- It makes evaluation more useful, by generating more support for recommendations. When staff and participants play an active role in evaluation, they are more likely to believe in its findings and take action in response.
- It is consistent with the goals of the tenant participation system, to give tenants “a say on issues that affect their building and community,” to set up structures “for tenants to work with staff to solve problems… and make things work better at the community level,” and to ensure that TCH “is accountable to tenants.”

2 Many of the answers to this question are discussed in more detail in Wadsworth, 1998 and McIntyre, Alice (2007) Participatory Action Research. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
What did the evaluation involve?
The evaluation began as part of the participation action research project “Making Democracy Fun,” led by Josh Lerner as part of his PhD dissertation. Twelve tenant researchers participated in this research process. Based on its initial success, TCH decided to extend the research into a full evaluation of the 2009 PB process. Overall, the evaluation consisted of:

- Five participatory workshops with the tenant researchers, to develop research skills and help design evaluation tools, in June and July
- Observation of three building meetings in April
- Observation of five Allocation Day prep meetings in July
- Observation of all five Allocation Days in July
- Design and analysis of an evaluation survey completed by 171 tenant participants at the Allocation Days
- Short interviews with 14 tenant participants at the Allocation Days
- In-depth interviews with four tenant researchers
- In-depth interviews with eight staff members (head office and local staff)
- A “Participatory Budgeting Policy Day” in July, in which the researchers presented initial findings and recommendations, and tenants and staff discussed the recommendations and voted with dotmocracy for the ones that they most supported. These recommendations are included as Appendix C.
- Two Evaluation & Planning workshops in November, in which a cross-section of tenants and staff reviewed and revised the evaluation findings and recommendations.
2. OVERVIEW OF THE 2009 PB PROCESS

This section presents a general snapshot of the 2009 PB process, before moving on to more detailed findings.

2.1 Meetings Held
- Over 300 Building Meetings, where tenants selected building priorities and delegates
- 7 Delegate Prep Meetings, to prepare building delegates for Allocation Days
- 5 Allocation Days, where delegates presented and voted on building priorities

2.2 Funds Allocated
- $6,716,180 allocated to capital projects
- 188 initiatives funded
- 35 initiatives funded in the Seniors Operating Units (OUs)
- 69 initiatives funded in the Central OUs K and L
- 37 initiatives funded in the East OUs
- 47 initiatives funded in the West OUs

2.3 Participants
- 335 tenant delegates attended Allocation Days
- 15% of delegates had not participated in their own building meeting

How many times had delegates participated in PB before?

Senior delegate at end of Allocation Day: “I just wanted to let you know that this has been the best group I’ve worked with.”

Tenant Delegate: “This is crazy, but I am glad I showed up.”

More than 6 times as many tenants participated in Allocation Days in 2009, compared with 2008

71% of delegates were participating for the first time
2.4 Participant Opinions

How would you rate the PB process? (1=lowest, 10=highest)

Over 90% of tenant delegates said that the decisions made were fair.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were enough tenants at your building meeting?</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you have enough information to set priorities at the building meeting?</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the identified priorities reflect discussions at the building meeting?</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were tenants sufficiently informed about their building’s identified priorities?</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did delegates receive enough support in preparation for allocation day?</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did delegates have enough time to prepare for allocation day?</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the rules of how to participate clear enough on allocation day?</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were presentations/displays easy to understand?</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delegate Survey Responses

- 13% said that their identified priorities did not reflect discussions at their building meeting.
- Almost 70% said that they had enough information to set priorities at the building meeting.
- 43% thought that there were enough tenants at their building meeting.
- 2 out of 5 said that tenants were not sufficiently informed about their building’s priorities.
- 27% said that they did not receive enough support in preparation for allocation day.
- Less than half thought that they had enough time to prepare for allocation day.
- Roughly 90% found the presentations/displays easy to understand.
- Nearly 80% thought that the rules of participation were clear enough on allocation day.
3. ISSUE SPOTLIGHTS

This section focuses on several key issues that emerged in the evaluation. Each issue table includes the key question or questions about the issue, background information, and relevant research findings. The findings are taken from researcher observations of PB meetings, the survey administered to tenant budget delegates at Allocation Days, interviews with tenants and staff, and workshops at which tenants and staff analyzed the research data. The last section of each table lays out recommendations for addressing the issue in the 2010 PB, as proposed by staff, tenants, and the external researchers. The recommendations endorsed by tenants and staff at the final Evaluation & Planning Workshops in November are in bold.

3.1 Operating Funds & the Social Investment Fund (SIF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➔ How, if at all, should PB be used for operating projects or connected with the SIF?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Tenants decide how to spend $9 million each year on capital projects through the PB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A Grant Review Committee (composed of tenants, staff, board members, and community members) decides how to allocate $1 million each year on non-capital programs and projects through the SIF.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Observation: At building meetings, tenants request funding for many non-capital projects, including for maintenance, community gardens, and youth programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Observation: Tenant during a building meeting said, “Haven’t we fixed enough? What about programs?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Observation: Tenant during building meeting dotmocracy said, “I’m not putting my dots on anything. Nothing up there is what I want.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Observation: Even at Allocation Days tenants proposed some operational priorities, such as computers for youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Survey: “[There should be] more flexibility with respect to capital vis-à-vis operational expenses.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interview with Tenant: “PB is a good way to get the community to take ownership of spending funds.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interview with Staff: “The SIF and PB can be joined in some sense, like Day 1 and Day 2…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Workshop: “Tenant inquiries about the difference between capital and operating kept on being raised during allocation days.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Capital vs. Operating Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Provide tenants with more explanation on the difference between capital and operating expenses, and what is excluded from PB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Show tenants pictures of capital and operating projects to illustrate differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) SIF: Integrate the SIF and PB into a single process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2 Youth Fund

**Question**

› Should there be a separate pot of money for youth projects?

**Background**

- The PB process currently does not include any pot of money set aside specifically for youth projects, or any other separate youth component.

**Findings**

- Observation: Youth participation in the 2009 PB ranged from 4% in the East to 22% in the West.
- Observation: “Only one youth was in the room”
- Observation: In 2009, seniors had their own separate funding pot for the first time, and this attracted an extremely high number of new senior participants. At the senior allocation days, 78% were participating in PB for the first time, and only 7% had participated 3 or more times. In the other OUs, 69% were participating for the first time and 22% had participated 3 or more times.
- Survey: “Set up a youth council to have a say in what they want as well as building and issues”
- Interview with Tenant: Adult tenant at building meeting said, “We don’t want youth [delegates], you are just a kid.”
- Interview with Tenant: Young tenant rep at allocation day reported that his building’s youth lounge priority project was removed from the building’s priority list without consultation.
- Interview with Tenant: Young tenant at allocation day said, “I’m not sure if I’ll come back next year…it depends on the respect the youth receive this year.”
- Interview with Tenant: Young tenant delegate said, “If youth trusted adults and adults trusted youth, we wouldn’t have the problems we have in the building.”
- Workshop: Tenant researcher said, “Most of the projects were not very interesting for youth.”
- Workshop: The tenant researcher recommendation that received the most votes of support in July was for a Youth Fund: “Set aside a pot of money for a Youth Fund, which young tenants will decide how to allocate.”

**Recommendations**

1) Do not create a separate funding pot for youth, since this would discourage intergenerational dialogue and collaboration.
2) Set aside one budget delegate position for youth (age 14-28) in each building with young tenants.
3) Improve outreach and education to youth by developing and distributing a PB brochure and other info materials.
4) Clarify that all youth are welcome to participate in building meetings, and that youth age 14 or older are eligible to be PB delegates.
### 3.3 Reserve Fund & Other Funding Streams

**Question**

> Should parts of the funding pot be set aside for a reserve fund, or for other funding streams such as small or urgent projects?

**Background**

- In 2009, each directorate set aside 15% of PB funding in a reserve fund, to be used in case of unexpected costs.
- Besides the reserve fund, no part of the funding pot was set aside for any particular purpose.

**Findings**

- Observation: In some OUs, staff dipped into reserve funds to fund the final project, while in other OUs they did not.
- Survey: “There should be categories for urgent projects.”
- Survey: “Have major issues common to all buildings be voted on separately. Then individual voted on next.”
- Interview with Tenant: “What I liked least was tenant complaints about the reserve funds.”
- Interview with Tenant: “I would strongly suggest that there be two categories based on amount. Some buildings genuinely need simple inexpensive equipment. Put them in a separate category. Then big expenses which in some cases affect many buildings could be voted on in a separate category.”
- Interview with Staff: “What is different this year is that the directors held back a certain amount of funds. And do I think that was fair? Absolutely not! That’s an administrative issue. If we can't get proper quotes that's our fault, but we shouldn't limit the amount of money that tenants get to decide on.”
- Interview with Staff: “Sometimes capital things that we should be covering we leave, assuming they'll pick it up in the PB. We had a building where people had a shared area with a kitchen, but there weren't locks on the cupboards, so things would get stolen. Locks are pretty simple. But we left it like that so long that the ladies had to put it as a capital priority.”
- Interview with Staff: “with the same format, next year would be very competitive, because people now know how much is available. With 1.8 [Day], at first you saw small projects, then people started proposing bigger projects.”
- Workshop: “People don’t understand the reserve funds”

**Recommendations**

1) **Reserve Fund:**
   a. Keep the reserve fund, decide on the amount after the 2009 reserve fund is spent, so that TCH knows how much reserve funding was necessary.
   b. The reserve fund cannot be touched on Allocation Day or used as “extra pot of money” – its only purpose is to finish approved work.
   c. Monitoring Committees can allocate unused reserve funds to un-funded projects that received next most votes on Allocation Days.
2) **Small Projects Fund:** No small projects fund
3) **Urgent Projects Fund:** No urgent projects fund, because these projects are always the responsibility of TCH to address anyway.
4) **Funding Envelopes:** Staff and tenants should be informed about all funding sources for each building, to help with decision-making.
## 3.4 Getting Estimates & Quotes

### Question

⇒ How can staff and tenants get project estimates and quotes more quickly and accurately?

### Background

- After tenants select building priorities in building meetings, housing supervisors request quotes for the priority projects from vendors, and the vendor provides a rough estimate.
- When projects are approved at allocation day, housing supervisors negotiate an exact quote with vendors. This quote is often different from the original estimate, sometimes significantly.
- Before paying contractors, the tenant monitoring committee has to approve the final cost and housing supervisors have to sign off on work completed.

### Findings

- Observation: One project quote was listed lower on the dotmocracy voting sheet than in the Allocation Day program, and it was not fully funded as a result. Tenant delegate: “It wasn’t fair.”
- Survey: “[Staff] should have time to get more accurate estimates”
- Survey: “Give estimates early enough so participants can change their priorities according to the funding”
- Interview with Tenant: “the youth lounge that was identified as a priority during the tenant meeting in my building was initially overprized. We had asked for $50,000 but TCHC quoted the costs at $150,000… Then at the allocation day the project was under quoted by $30,000. We were pissed off.”
- Interview with Tenant: “PB Delegates should be invited to procure quotes from contractors and review scope of work prior to.”
- Interview with Staff: “The floor replacements are the only quotes that haven’t come in. Even if tenants indicate what type of flooring (e.g. vinyl), there are still different kinds of vinyl, so that affects the final cost. Next year if flooring projects come up, the quotes will be more accurate, because now we have quotes per square foot.”
- Interview with Staff: “there’re a whole lot of opportunities for people to manipulate the process... in getting the quotes [for example]”
- Interview with Staff: “There will always be estimates. To ask contractors to give you firm quotes on 120 priorities, many of which won’t be done, isn’t going to happen.”
- Workshop: “Many projects were overpriced or inaccurately quoted”
- Workshop: “Some tenants didn’t receive their quote until the day before.”
- Workshop: The tenant researcher recommendation that received the second most votes in July: “Menu of Project Costs: At building or priority-setting meeting, provide general categories of costs for various types of projects.”

### Recommendations

a. For the building meetings, provide tenants with a menu of estimated costs for common types of projects and with 5-year capital improvement plans, so they have a better sense of typical costs.

b. Provide tenants with photos and visuals of possible priorities at building meetings, so they have better understanding of projects.

c. Clearly define the scope of work for project priorities, indicating desired locations and materials when possible.

d. Allow staff at least one month to get quotes.
### 3.5 What Happens When?

#### Questions

- How many times should tenants in each building and OU meet? What general activities should take place at each stage of the PB process?

#### Background

The basic steps of the 2009 PB process were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before the Building Meeting</th>
<th>Tenant representatives and local staff mobilize tenants to participate in building meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Meeting</td>
<td>Tenants brainstorm building needs, Tenants discuss and prioritize initial project ideas, Tenants vote on project proposals using dotmocracy, Tenants select tenant budget delegates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate Prep Meeting</td>
<td>Budget delegates review quotes for identified project priorities, Staff and budget delegates review agenda, rules, and responsibilities for Allocation Day, Budget delegates prepare display boards and presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Day</td>
<td>Budget delegates present project proposals, Budget delegates discuss proposals, Budget delegates vote on which projects receive funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>Research &amp; Evaluation Team presents findings and recommendations, Staff and tenants meet to evaluate the PB and plan next year’s process, TCH implements projects that received funding, Tenant monitoring committees and staff monitor implementation of projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Findings

- Observation: On average, tenant delegates had less than a week to prepare for allocation day.
- Observation: In many cases, tenants only found out about their building’s priorities a few days before the allocation day.
- Survey: More preparation time was the most common tenant suggestion - 59 Tenants (1/3 of those who wrote comments) specifically requested it
- Survey: Tenant suggestion: “That the time to prepare for allocation day is even weeks in advance to better understand what you are doing on the day”
- Survey: “At least by 2 weeks must be given to discuss and get ready”
- Survey: “Please make sure you give enough time to reps and tenants and not two days before meetings and projects. Spent my whole weekend on project…very tired.”
- Survey: Tenant suggestion: “More time. Housing has a bad habit of giving us 2 weeks’ notice or less. We have lives, families and jobs. Consider that.”
- Survey: Tenant suggestion: “More time, more info, more consensus from a wider pool of tenants”
- Survey: “Let us know when and what time with an agenda”
- Survey: “I would like to know 1st how much money is allocated for the funding, before we ask”
- Survey: Tenant suggestion: “More information on building background”
- Survey: Tenant Suggestion: “More background info prior to building meetings. More outreach to inform tenants of possibilities.”
- Survey: Tenant suggestion: “Information package to be received before day of meeting”
- Survey: Tenant suggestion: “Several meetings leading up to the final allocation meeting also a tour of as many buildings as possible.”
- Survey: “I would ask for more meetings for tenants to really decide priorities.”
- Survey: Tenant suggestion: “Have more than one meeting for priority this way there would be no confusion and have more time for discussions”
- Survey: Tenant suggestion: “A lot letter to follow building meetings”
- Workshop: “Need to figure out timing of PB meetings and other tenant participation meetings – e.g. could have every 3rd building meeting be PB”
- Workshop: “Develop a year-long PB cycle.”

**Recommendations**

Revise the timeline of the PB as suggested below (recommended changes for 2010 in bold), and present it as a flowchart in brochures and other materials. If the final budget decisions need to be made earlier, combine the first and second building meetings for 2010, then include them both in 2011.

| Before the Building Meetings (December) | Tenant representatives and local staff mobilize tenants to participate in building meetings  
Provide basic information about PB to all tenants  
Distribute survey about building priorities to all tenants  
Organize PB training and planning meetings for OU staff |
| First Building Meeting (January) | Staff provide information on the PB process and 5-year capital improvement plans  
Tenants brainstorm building needs and project ideas |
| Second Building Meeting (February) | Staff provide rough estimates for project ideas from first building meeting  
Tenants vote on project proposals using dotmocracy  
Tenants select tenant budget delegates |
| Delegate Training (March) | Budget delegates participate in training workshops  
Budget delegates visit project priorities through bus tour  
Budget delegates review quotes for project priorities  
Staff offer feedback and technical assistance on project proposals |
| Delegate Prep Meeting (March) | Staff and budget delegates review agenda, rules, and responsibilities for Allocation Day  
Budget delegates prepare display boards and presentations |
| Decision Day (April) | Budget delegates present project proposals  
Budget delegates discuss proposals  
Budget delegates vote on which projects receive funding |
### Report-Back Building Meeting (At the Next Quarterly Building Meeting)
- Budget delegates and staff report back to their buildings about PB decisions
- Staff presents 5-year capital improvement plans for next year
- Budget delegates collect feedback on PB process

### Evaluation & Implementation (May-December)
- Research & Evaluation Team presents findings and recommendations
- Staff and tenants meet to evaluate the PB and plan next year’s process
- TCH implements projects that received funding
- TCH publicizes completed projects with ceremonies and announcements
- Tenant monitoring committees and staff monitor implementation of projects

### 3.6 Who Does What?

**Question**

>> What responsibilities should different staff and tenants have?[^5]

**Background**

In 2009 responsibilities were divided up as follows:

| Tenants                      | • Brainstorm building needs  
|                             | • Discuss and prioritize initial project ideas  
|                             | • Vote on project proposals using dotmocracy  
|                             | • Select tenant budget delegates |

| Tenant PB Delegates          | • Prepare project display boards and presentations  
|                             | • Present project proposals at Allocation Days  
|                             | • Discuss proposals at Allocation Days  
|                             | • Vote on which projects receive funding at Allocation Days |

| Tenant Monitoring Committees | • Monitor implementation of funded projects |

| Research and Evaluation Team| • Observe and evaluate Allocation Days  
|                             | • Help design budget delegate survey  
|                             | • Interview budget delegates  
|                             | • Review research findings and propose ways to improve the PB process |

| Superintendents               | • Attend building meetings  
|                             | • Help prepare and promote building meetings  
|                             | • Provide cost estimates for project proposals  
|                             | • Support PB process during Allocation Days |
### Community Housing Supervisors
- Reserve and prepare spaces for building meetings
- Attend building meetings
- Provide cost estimates for project proposals
- Support PB process during Allocation Days
- Report back to monitoring committees
- Consult with monitoring committees on project aesthetics and details

### Health Promotion Officers, Comm.
- Promote tenant participation in the PB process
- Facilitate building meetings and delegate-prep meetings
- Assist budget delegates in their preparation for Allocation Days
- Support the PB process during Allocation Days

### Health Promotion Officers, Safety Promotion Officers, Youth Engagement Coordinators
- Promote tenant participation in the PB process
- Facilitate building meetings and delegate-prep meetings
- Assist budget delegates in their preparation for Allocation Days
- Support the PB process during Allocation Days

### Community Health Managers
- Prepare agendas and materials for Allocation Days
- Facilitate Allocation Days
- Reserve spaces for meetings and Allocation Days
- Support monitoring committees

### Operating Unit Managers
- Facilitate building and delegate-prep meetings
- Co-Facilitate Allocation Days

### Community Health Unit
- Design and administer budget delegate survey
- Support PB process during Allocation Days
- Coordinate distribution of budget funds

### HSI (Contractor)
- Provide cost estimates for project proposals
- Implement funded projects

### Findings
- **Observation:** In the West, tenants spoke at the start of the allocation day, to give an introduction from their perspective. This conveyed more of a sense of tenant ownership. [Tenant satisfaction was highest on the West surveys.]
- **Observation:** Display rooms in one room at the Allocation Day had more colour and there seemed to be more time invested into them – was this because of more staff support?
- **Interview with Tenant:** “Tenants should have a say in the whole process and the decision-making process.”
- **Interview with Tenant:** “As to the process itself tenants were not at all consulted or involved in the decision-making… the process was imposed on us as is.”
- **Interview with Staff:** “it’s still not clear who’s responsible for different tasks”
- **Interview with Staff:** “I would define my own my priorities and have the tenants discuss both mine and theirs together.”
- **Workshop:** A positive: “Staff and tenant steering committee working together”
- **Workshop:** “No consistency in facilitators for each operating unit.”
- **Workshop:** Some HPOs and staff clearly did not support tenants with materials and supplies.
- **Workshop:** The tenant researcher recommendation that received the third most votes in July: “Staff Time in Field: Allocate a set amount of time for each staff to work in the field engaging communities in the PB process.”
## Recommendations

Distribute responsibilities as follows, and distribute this list of responsibilities to tenants and staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Tenants** |  - Attend building meetings  
  - Brainstorm building needs  
  - Discuss and prioritize initial project ideas  
  - Vote on project proposals using dotmocracy  
  - Select tenant budget delegates  
  - Provide input on project details and specifics |
| **Tenant PB Delegates** |  - Go on bus tour to see potential projects  
  - Attend delegate prep meeting  
  - Facilitate communication between tenants and staff about projects  
  - Prepare project display boards and presentations  
  - Present project proposals at Allocation Days  
  - Discuss proposals at Allocation Days  
  - Vote on which projects receive funding at Allocation Days  
  - Update tenants on PB and capital improvements at each building meeting  
  - Report back to tenant councils and neighborhood councils |
| **Tenant Monitoring Committees** |  - Monitor implementation of funded projects  
  - Communicate tenant complaints about projects to appropriate staff  
  - Review projects that require funds from the Reserve Fund  
  - Approve allocation of unused reserve funds to unfunded projects |
| **Tenant Animation Committees** |  - Promote tenant participation in the PB process |
| **PB Research & Evaluation Committee** |  - Observe and evaluate Allocation Days  
  - Help design budget delegate survey  
  - Interview budget delegates  
  - Review research findings and propose ways to improve the PB process  
  - Present findings and recommendations to PB Steering Committee |
| **PB Steering Committee** |  - Revise PB process based on evaluation findings & recommendations  
  - Help plan Allocation Days |
| **Property Managers, Building Staff, Tenant Service Coordinators, Customer Service Facilitators** |  - Attend building meetings  
  - Attend Allocation Days  
  - Promote tenant participation in the PB process |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Category</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Superintendents                  | • Help prepare and promote building meetings  
                                 | • **Promote tenant participation in the PB process**  
                                 | • Attend building meetings  
                                 | • Provide cost estimates for project proposals  
                                 | • Support PB process during Allocation Days  
                                 | • **Consult with tenants in the building on project aesthetics & details** |
| Community Housing Supervisors    | • Reserve and prepare spaces for building meetings  
                                 | • Attend building meetings  
                                 | • **Prepare menu of common project costs**  
                                 | • Present upcoming capital improvement plans for each building  
                                 | • Provide cost estimates for project proposals  
                                 | • Support PB process during Allocation Days  
                                 | • **Follow-up on maintenance concerns raised at meetings**  
                                 | • Report back to monitoring committees  
                                 | • **Consult with tenants in each building on project aesthetics & details** |
| Health Promotion Officers, Comm. | • Promote tenant participation in the PB process  
                                 | • **Distribute information materials about PB to all tenants**  
                                 | • Facilitate building meetings and delegate-prep meetings  
                                 | • Assist budget delegates in their preparation for Allocation Days  
                                 | • Support the PB process during Allocation Days  
                                 | • **Offer feedback and technical assistance on project proposals**  
                                 | • Organize training workshops for delegates |
| Safety Promotion Officers, Youth Engagement Coordinators | • Organize PB training and planning meeting for OU staff  
                                                                  | • Prepare agendas and materials for Allocation Days  
                                                                  | • **Send delegates rules and guidelines for Allocation Days**  
                                                                  | • Reserve spaces for meetings and Allocation Days  
                                                                  | • Facilitate Allocation Days  
                                                                  | • Support monitoring committees |
| Community Health Managers        | • Organize PB training and planning meeting for OU staff  
                                                                  | • Provide existing capital plan and funding info for each building  
                                                                  | • **Organize delegate bus tour**  
                                                                  | • Facilitate building and delegate-prep meetings  
                                                                  | • Co-Facilitate Allocation Days |
| Operating Unit Managers          | • Prepare PB brochure, flyers, other promotional and info materials  
                                                                  | • Organize training workshops for delegates  
                                                                  | • Determine size of funding envelopes for each OU  
                                                                  | • Design and administer budget delegate survey  
                                                                  | • **Videotape Allocation Days and post videos online**  
                                                                  | • Support PB process during Allocation Days  
                                                                  | • Coordinate distribution of budget funds  
                                                                  | • **Send results of PB process to Board of Directors to publicize** |
| Community Health Unit            | • Prepare menu of common project costs  
                                                                  | • Provide cost estimates for project proposals  
                                                                  | • Implement funded projects |
### 3.7 Building Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ➔ How can building meetings generate project priorities that better reflect tenant desires and budget constraints?  
| ➔ How can building meetings better enable tenants to select delegates who will represent them in the PB process? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• In 2009, each building unit had a meeting in which tenants brainstormed capital project priorities, voted via dotmocracy on the top three priority projects, and selected one or two tenant budget delegates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Observation: Tenants at the building meetings were not informed about the actual pot of money that would be available to them.  
| • Observation: “Some buildings had priorities that cost more than the total pot of money available.”  
| • Observation: At one building meeting, tenants spent less than 10 minutes discussing budget priorities. Then the results of dotmocracy were changed after half of the tenants had left the meeting.  
| • Observation: At one building meeting, only 3 rules were presented, all orally. There were 8 instances of tenants breaking the rules: not respecting speakers list, not discussing capital projects, focusing on personal not building issues, etc. When this started to happen, all the youth left. 70% of participants left before the meeting was over.  
| • Observation: Tenant response to chaotic meeting: “You see what they’ve done – they’ve degenerated us into madness. That’s why my participation has gone down.”  
| • Observation: Tenant: “[staff] need to speak up about ground rules. People need to know.”  
| • Survey: Only 43% of delegates thought there were enough tenants at their building meeting  
| • Survey: 13% of budget delegates said that their identified priorities did not reflect discussions at their building meeting  
| • Survey: “Advertise in different languages”  
| • Survey: Tenant suggestion: “Advertise and identify in the building the purpose of the meetings”  
| • Survey: “I think tenants should have more knowledge of all sources of funding that could be accessed”  
| • Survey: “Allow for more anonymous submissions. We have a lot of people who were cautious about attending”  
| • Survey: “It would have been helpful to see an official list of criteria for funding, it is hard to know what kinds of things do and do not qualify”  
| • Interview with Tenant “It would be helpful to learn about the long term improvement plans for the building so that tenants can make more informed decisions about priorities”  
| • Interview with Staff: “We need to figure out the building meetings. We make decisions and then we backpeddle. We need to figure something out and then let it play out.”  
| • Interview with Staff: “you get priorities that really shouldn't be there - things like fixing a boiler or roof are essentially things that the property manager should have repaired anyway, and shouldn't be things that the tenants put forward as their number 1 thing. And so they put it forward, and then you have all this negotiation and explaining, that this should be funded somewhere else. And tenants say, ‘well you're not funding it through anything else.’ So the process gets taken up with priorities that shouldn't be there.” |
### Recommendations

#### 1) Sharing Information
- a. Prepare and post standard flyers for PB building meetings in multiple languages
- b. Before the meetings, distribute:
  - summaries of 5-year capital improvement plans for the building
  - PB brochure (including size of funding pot)
  - building priority survey
- c. During the meetings, distribute and present:
  - summaries of 5-year capital improvement plans
  - PB brochure
  - menu of project costs
  - list of un-funded priorities from previous year
  - info sheet on budget delegate responsibilities
- d. Develop standard ground rules for meetings, and present them orally and on a flipchart
- e. Review notes/minutes from previous building meeting
- f. Update tenants about PB in every building meeting

#### 2) Identifying Priorities
- a. Brainstorm possible priorities in 1st and 2nd meeting
- b. Before voting, indicate which priorities can be covered by other funding streams
- c. Each tenant receives 3 sticker dots to vote for priorities
- d. Tenants who cannot attend the building meeting can submit a ballot to the superintendent

#### 3) Selecting Delegates
- a. Each building may select 1 or 2 delegates
- b. Delegates must commit to attending training and Allocation Days
- c. If there are youth in the building, at least 1 delegate should be a young tenant
- d. If a building does not select a delegate, its priorities are not presented for funding at Allocation Days

---

*A former tenant budget delegate advising new delegates at a prep meeting*
### 3.8 Delegate Preparation

#### Question

⇒ How can budget delegates be better prepared to propose and decide on projects?

#### Background

- Budget delegates in the 2009 PB were selected at building meetings to represent their building’s capital priorities.
- Some OUs organized preparation meetings for delegates shortly before the Allocation Days, in which delegates learned about their responsibilities and began to prepare presentation boards.

#### Findings

- Observation: Some delegates received more training and guidance than others. Is this fair?
- Observation: Some tenant presenters had difficulty holding mics, reading their notes, and being heard.
- Observation: Many buildings were not represented.
- Observation: A tenant starts his presentation saying, “Like most of you, I have no idea what I’m doing here, but here it goes.”
- Survey: 27% of budget delegates said that they did not receive enough support in preparation for allocation day
- Survey: “Give lessons on using microphone”
- Survey: “One day training before the meeting is needed”
- Survey: “I would like a history of what priorities were previously awarded in past budget participation meetings and what it was for: say for the past three years. So if they keep asking for funding for same thing, we would know.”
- Survey: “This process is too much like a contest. Those who have good charisma, those who buddy buddy have a better chance of winning. I say this as someone who has these charms and who has won today. What about those who do not speak good English, who are shy, etc?”
- Interview with Tenant: “I don’t think we really did anything to encourage networking and cooperation.”
- Workshop: Many delegate presentations weren’t related to their priorities.
- Workshop: Projects were included that really did not qualify for funds.
- Workshop: In certain districts there were many buildings without reps

#### Recommendations

1) **Hold one training session in each directorate, before the PB delegate prep meetings.** At each session, cover the following topics:
   a. Public speaking, preparing project proposals, budgeting, the difference between capital and operating funds, different funding sourcesstreams at TCH
   b. Critical listening, needs assessments, teamwork, anti-racism, anti-ableism, anti-agism, building maintenance and improvement issues
2) **Provide additional support for delegates:**
   a. Allow delegates to serve for an optional second year, to facilitate peer-to-peer learning and mentoring (old delegates guiding new ones)
   b. Provide delegates with handouts, poster displays, and other materials from the previous year.
   c. Sign a one-page agreement with each delegate describing the position.
   d. Set up a Facebook group and email list for delegates to share ideas.
3.9 Voting & Decision-Making

Question

➔ How can delegate selection of projects be fairer and more democratic?

Background

- At the 2009 Allocation Days, each tenant delegate had two minutes to present their building’s priorities, with no time for questions.
- Tenant delegates voted on projects using dotmocracy, with each delegate receiving between 10 and 15 dot votes each, depending on the OU.

Findings

- Observation: On average, the allocation days ended 1.5 hours before their scheduled end.
- Observation: Ratio of tenant minutes talking to staff minutes talking on Allocation Days – 1.2:1
- Observation: Vote trading often excluded delegates who were new to the process or lacked the confidence to negotiate.
- Observation: At some Allocation Days, staff read off voting results as they were entering them into spreadsheets. Delegates were left waiting as staff manoeuvred back and forth between spreadsheets, and it was confusing because of some data entry errors.
- Observation: At some allocation days, facilitators pointed out the rules in the handout program, but in others they did not.
- Observation: A tenant rep got her friends to stick her dots on her own project.
- Survey: Over 90% of the delegates considered the budget decisions fair, even though many of them did not receive funding.
- Survey: “If changes need to be made to first list priority allow it.”
- Survey: “You have to stop letting people vote for their own priority. Some people stack the vote by using all their votes on their own item.”
- Survey: “Voting is personal so the process should be done confidentially.”
- Interview with Tenant: “There were no rules. They kept changing, we were kind of running by the seat of our parts and there wasn’t really a clear direction for staff or for the tenants.”
- Interview with Tenant: “There was no information provided on absentee tenant reps or delegates.”
- Workshop: The tenant researcher recommendation that received the fifth most votes of support in July: “Use a transparent computer voting system to avoid cheating.”
- Workshop: “Staff not unified in the process for Allocation Day”
- Workshop: A negative: “Reps voting for their building and letting staff know”
- Workshop: A negative: “Reps were able to count the dots and know if they or another building won”
- Workshop: A negative: “# of votes varied per OU”
- Workshop: “In an event there is a tie, the project(s) that can be funded get funding first, instead of a project that costs more than the funds in the pot”
- Workshop: “Communities that don’t show up on allocation day are still able to be voted on and funded while not being present to state their case. Some communities that have presented their case get no funding.”
## Recommendations

1) **Time for presentations: 2 minutes**
2) **Time for Q&A after presentations: 3 minutes**
3) **Voting method for choosing projects:** electronic voting (second option: paper ballots)
4) **Number of votes per delegate:** 15
5) **How to resolve ties votes for the last funding allocation:**
   - a. Revote between the projects that can be funded with the remaining money
   - b. If two or more of the tied projects can be funded with the remaining money, fund those
   - c. Alphabetical order by community name (starting at A one year and Z the next)
4) **Disqualify buildings without PB delegates present from receiving funding on Allocation Days.**
5) **Make the Allocation Day rules consistent across OUs.**

---

Tenant delegates voting and lobbying for projects at Allocation Day.
## 3.10 Making Participation Fun

### Question

➤ How can participation be a more enjoyable experience for tenants and staff?

### Findings

- **Observation:** Some allocation days displayed photos of tenant and community activities, which helped infuse the event with more of a collegial and community feel. Tenants walked around looking at pictures and smiling, often trying to find themselves in the pictures.
- **Observation:** The West Allocation Day included its own theme music, and tenants were tapping their fingers, swaying side to side, and singing along to Michael Jackson songs.
- **Observation:** The West Allocation Day was decorated with balloons and flowers, which made the event feel more inviting and exciting.
- **Observation:** At OUB Allocation Day, many tenants sit at the back of the room, while there are empty chairs at the front. In the back it’s hard to hear, so there are more side discussions.
- **Observation:** Not all staff are clearly labelled, making it harder to understand their roles.
- **Survey:** “Have soft drinks for non-coffee drinkers”
- **Survey:** “Lunch break was too long”
- **Survey:** “Stop allowing speeches during question periods”
- **Interview with Tenant:** “Pick a theme song for each allocation day”
- **Workshop:** All delegates/reps that signed in got childcare and/or transportation reimbursement.
- **Workshop:** Staff communicating while a rep was presenting – lack of professionalism and respect
- **Workshop:** “In large allocation day meetings, when tenants ask a question without a mic, most other tenants can’t hear them, and they begin to talk amongst themselves.”
- **Workshop:** The food was very good
- **Workshop:** Recommendation: “At meetings, communicate rules in at least 3 ways: orally, in handouts, and posted on the wall.”
- **Workshop:** “Materials need to be pictorial, graphic, and in different languages.”

### Recommendations

a. Play music at Allocation Days
b. Decorate Allocation Days to make them more attractive and exciting
c. Use pictures and graphics in handout and presentation materials
d. Communicate rules orally, on handouts, and on posters/flipcharts, so that they are clearer
4. EVALUATION TOOLS

This section proposes evaluation tools for the 2010 PB process, based on the evaluation experience in 2009. In the Evaluation & Planning Workshops, participants will further revise these tools, to make them more useful. The purpose of these tools is to provide staff and tenants with useful information about the quality of the PB process, in order to improve the process for the following year.

4.1 Observations

4.1.1 Observation Process

- Research & Evaluation Committee members observe at least 10 building meetings, at least 5 delegate preparation meetings, and all of the Allocation Days. (Each committee member would only observe 2-3 meetings.)
- At each meeting, the observer takes notes and fills out an evaluation form.

4.1.1 Observation Form Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION OF THE MEETING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Staging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Transportation provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Child care provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Interpreters provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Food provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Convenient location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Disability accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Room layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Outreach methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) External forums for discussing event</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Goals of meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Clarity of goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Goals of meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Presentation of rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rules generated by participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Rules changed during the event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Enforcement of rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. Facilitation Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Icebreaker activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Flipcharts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Other visual aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Hand out materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Music/sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Exercise or physical activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TENANT PARTICIPATION

### I. Turnout
1) Number of staff
2) Number of tenants invited
3) Number of tenants participating
4) Number of participants who are women
5) Number of participants who are youth
6) Number of participants who are seniors

### II. Quality of Participation
1) Number of minutes staff are talking
2) Number of minutes tenants are talking
3) Number of tenants who talk
4) Number of tenants who move (non-verbal participation)
5) Tenant complaints to staff
6) Tenants breaking the rules
7) Degree of competition between tenants
8) Degree of collaboration between tenants

### III. Engagement
1) Number of tenants who leave early
2) Number of tenants sending phone texts
3) Number of tenants falling asleep
4.2 Building Meeting Evaluations

4.2.1 Building Meeting Evaluation Process
- At the end of building meetings, ask tenant participants to do a quick evaluation, by writing positive feedback and suggestions for next time on post-it notes, and posting them on the wall as they leave.
- After building meetings, a facilitator or other staff person present fills out a short meeting report form.

4.2.2 Building Meeting Report Form Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Basic Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Building Name/Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Number of Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Goals of Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Meeting Organization &amp; Facilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Outreach methods used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Supports provided (childcare, translation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Room layout (circle / rows / board room / other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Were goals of meeting explained clearly?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Were rules presented? (yes/no) If so, how? (orally, on handouts, on flipcharts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Visual aids used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Handouts distributed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Staff present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Number of tenants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Number of units represented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Number of youth (&lt;30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Did the tenant representative play active role?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Did the super play active role?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Number of tenants that actively participated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Did tenants follow the rules generally?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Did any conflict occur during the meeting? (yes/no)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If so, briefly explain the issue. Was the conflict resolved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) How many participants left before the end?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) General tenant mood (content, angry, mix)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Capital priorities selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Building delegate(s) selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Other outcomes or issues that arose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI. Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Rate the quality of the meeting based on the information above (1 = needs improvement to 5 = excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Other observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Surveys

4.3.1 Survey Process
- Hand out surveys as votes are being added up at Allocation Days, and ask tenant delegates to fill them out as they wait for the results.

4.3.2 Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Background Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Sex (Male/Female/Other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Age (under 30, 30-59, over 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) How many times have you participated in a TCHC Participatory Budgeting Allocation Day? (First time, 1-3 times, More than 3 times)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Building Meetings &amp; Priority Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4) Did you attend the building meeting when your building’s spending priorities were identified (in March or April)? (Yes or No)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Did the tenants at your building meeting reflect the demographics of your housing community? (i.e. age, ethnicity, gender) (scale of 1 to 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Did you have enough information to be able to set priorities at the building meeting? (scale of 1 to 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Did the identified priorities reflect the discussions at the building meeting? (scale of 1 to 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Were tenants sufficiently informed about their building’s identified priorities? (scale of 1 to 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Were enough tenants at your building meeting? (scale of 1 to 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) If you could organize the priority setting process next year, what would you do differently?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Delegate Preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11) Were your building’s delegates appointed at your building’s priority setting meeting? (Yes or No) If no, describe how did they were appointed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Did delegates receive sufficient support in preparation for the allocation day? (scale of 1 to 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Did delegates have enough time to prepare for the allocation day? (scale of 1 to 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) If you were a building delegate for next year’s Allocation Day what kind of support would you ask for?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Allocation Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15) Did you have a clear understanding of the purpose of Allocation Day? (scale of 1 to 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Was there enough clarity around the rules of how to participate throughout the day? (scale of 1 to 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Were presentations/displays easy to understand? (scale of 1 to 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) How fair were the decisions made throughout the day? (scale of 1 to 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) On a scale of 1 (lowest) to 10 (highest) how would you rate the TCHC’s Participatory Budgeting Process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Do you have any other suggestions for the Participatory Budgeting Process next year?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4.4 Interviews

### 4.4.1 Interview Process

- Research & Evaluation Committee members conduct short interviews (10-15 minutes) with tenant delegates at the end of Allocation Days, to get their initial feedback on the event.
- Lead researcher(s) conduct full interviews (30-60 minutes) with 10 tenant delegates, to discuss their opinions on the PB process.
- Lead researcher(s) conduct full interviews (30-60 minutes) with 10 staff, to discuss their opinions on the PB process.

### 4.4.2 Interview Questions

#### I. Short Tenant Interviews

1. Why did you come to the allocation day?
2. Have you participated in other tenant participation events before? If so, which?
3. Have you participated in other community organizations, religious institutions, or government programs?
4. Can you explain to me in your own words what you did in the event today?
5. What did you think of the allocation day? Did you like it?
6. What did you like most and least about the allocation day?
7. Do the decisions that were made seem fair?
8. What did you understand as the rules of the allocation day? How clear were they?
9. Would you like to participate in the allocation day next year?
10. Are you planning to suggest to other tenants that they participate in the PB process in the future?

#### II. Full Tenant Interviews

1. Why did you participate in the PB process?
2. Had you participated in other tenant participation events before? If so, which?
3. Have you participated in other community organizations, religious institutions, or government programs?
4. What do you think about the PB process? What are the positives and negatives?
5. How successful do you think the allocation day you attended was?
6. Do you think the decisions made were fair?
7. What was the most difficult moment of the event? Why?
8. How clear and effective are the rules of the PB process?
9. Are there any particular changes that you think should be made to the PB process?

#### III. Staff Interviews

1. What are your responsibilities in the PB process?
2. What do you think about the PB process? What are the positives and negatives?
3. How successful do you think the allocation day you attended was?
4. Do you think the decisions made were fair?
5. Did you sense competition or conflict between or with the participants at any point during the event? If so, when? How did this affect the event?
6. What was the most difficult moment of the event? Why?
7. How clear and effective are the rules of the PB process?
8. Are there any particular changes that you think should be made to the PB process?
4.5 Workshops & Meetings

- The Research & Evaluation Committee holds three meetings to compare notes and review the data collected so far: After the building meetings, after the delegate prep meetings, and after the allocation days.
- The Research & Evaluation Committee holds Evaluation & Planning Workshops with the PB Steering Committee after the completion of the PB process.

Tenants and staff evaluating the division of responsibilities for the 2009 PB and suggesting revisions for the 2010 version, at the first Evaluation & Planning Workshop
APPENDIX A: RESEARCH WORKSHOP AGENDAS

Workshop 1: Participation, Democracy & Games
June 29, 2009
1) Welcome & Introductions
2) Presentation of the Research Project
3) Participation: Why do tenants participate?
4) Democracy: What makes a meeting democratic?
5) Games: How can game techniques encourage democratic participation?

Workshop 2: Research Methods
June 30, 2009
1) Welcome & Introductions
2) Review of First Workshop
3) Game Design (continued)
4) What do we want to find out?
5) How will we find out?

Workshop 3: Research Methods 2
July 2, 2009
1) Scheduling & Logistics
2) Review of Second Workshop
3) Review of Research Indicators
4) Writing Notes
5) Observations Methods
6) Survey Design

Workshop 4: Practice Observation Debrief
July 9, 2009
1) Welcome & Logistics
2) Reflecting: How we feel, What we observed, What we learned
3) Revising: The Big Picture, Participation indicators, Event mechanics
4) Planning: Researcher roles and assignments

Workshop 5: Research Findings & Recommendations
July 21, 2009
1) Welcome & Introductions
2) How we feel
3) Advise a new researcher
4) What will we do at the meeting with staff?
5) Review Findings
6) Develop Recommendations
7) Prepare for the meeting with staff
Workshop 6: Presentation to Staff
July 24, 2009
1) Welcome & Introductions
2) Research Overview
3) Presentations of Initial Findings & Recommendations
4) Vote on Recommendations with Dotmocracy
5) Tally Voting and Announce Top Recommendations
6) Next Steps

Workshop 7: Evaluation & Planning Workshop with Staff & Tenants
November 9, 2009
1) Welcome & Introductions
2) Presentation of Research & Evaluation Findings (Part I)
3) Presentation of Research Process & Workshop Process
4) Round 1: Funding
   a) Youth Fund
   b) Reserve Fund & Other Funding Streams
   c) Getting Project Estimates & Quotes
5) Round 2: Who does what when?
   a) What Happens When
   b) Who Does What
6) Evaluation & Closing

Workshop 8: Evaluation & Planning Workshop with Staff & Tenants
November 16, 2009
1) Welcome & Introductions
2) Presentation of Research & Evaluation Findings
3) Review of Workshop #1
4) Round 1: Unfinished Business
   a) Who Does What (Individual and Team Responsibilities)
   b) What Happens When (Timeline)
5) Round 2: Key Moments
   a) Building Meetings
   b) Delegate Preparation
   c) Voting & Decision-Making
6) Review & Next Steps
7) Evaluation & Closing
APPENDIX B: 2009 RESEARCH & EVALUATION MATERIALS

B.1 Research Indicators

Event Mechanics

A. Staging
1) Transportation provided
2) Child care provided
3) Interpreters provided
4) Food provided
5) Convenient location
6) Disability accessibility
7) Room layout
8) External forums for discussing event
9) Outreach methods used
10) Time of week

B. Goals & Outcomes
1) Type of goals
2) Clarity of goals
3) Type of outcomes
4) Direct or indirect outcomes
5) Visibility of outcomes

C. Competition & Collaboration
1) Type of competition/collaboration
2) Intensity of competition

D. Rules
1) Total rules
2) Rules visibly displayed
3) Rules handed out
4) Rules orally presented
5) Participant-generated rules
6) Rules changed during event
7) Rulings
8) Rules learned via organic feedback
9) Enforcement of rules

E. Techniques
1) Flipcharts
2) Visual aids
3) Handout materials
4) Music/sound effects
5) Fun & games rhetoric
6) Status indicators
7) Levels
8) Participant resources
9) Points/Score
10) Hidden information
11) Positive/negative feedback loops
12) Choice points
13) Core mechanics

Democratic Participation

A. Turnout
1) Ratio of staff to participants
2) Percent of target population participating
3) Percent of participants who are women
4) Percent of participants who are people of color
5) Percent of participants who are youth (<30)
6) Percent of participants who are seniors (>59)
7) Percent of participants with little prior community participation

B. Quality of Participation
1) Percent of time staff are talking
2) Percent of time participants are talking
3) Percent of participants who talk
4) Percent of participants who move (non-verbal participation)
5) Participant-to-participant comments
6) Complaints to staff
7) Interruptions
8) Participants breaking rules
9) Participants self-policing

C. Decision-Making
1) Decisions made
2) Decisions reached by vote
3) Decisions reached by consensus
4) Whether decisions are considered fair
5) Whether participants feel they have significant influence on decision-making

D. Engagement
1) Phone texts
2) Participants falling asleep
3) Participants who leave for breaks
4) Early departures
5) Unrelated conversations
6) Audible laughs
7) Whether participants say they enjoyed event
8) Whether participants say they want to attend next event
9) Whether participants say they will encourage others to attend next event
B.2 Participant Survey

2009 Participatory Budgeting Evaluation Form

In order to improve the TCHC’s Participatory Budgeting Process, we need your input. The purpose of this form is to reflect on the allocation day and the preparations beforehand. Please circle your answers to the questions.

1) How many times have you participated in a TCHC Participatory Budgeting Allocation Day?

| First time | 1-3 times | More than 3 times |

I. Building Meetings & Priority Setting

2) Did you attend the building meeting when your building’s spending priorities were identified (in March or April)?

| Yes | No |

3) Did the tenants at your building meeting reflect the demographics of your housing community? (i.e. age, ethnicity, gender)

| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither disagree nor agree | Agree | Strongly agree |

4) Did you have enough information to be able to set priorities at the building meeting?

| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither disagree nor agree | Agree | Strongly agree |

5) Did the identified priorities reflect the discussions at the building meeting?

| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither disagree nor agree | Agree | Strongly agree |

6) Were tenants sufficiently informed about their building’s identified priorities?

| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither disagree nor agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
7) Were enough tenants at your building meeting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8) If you could organize the priority setting process next year, what would you do differently?

________________________________________________________________________________________

II. Delegate Preparation

9) Were your building’s delegates appointed at your building’s priority setting meeting?  Yes  No

If no, describe how did they were appointed:

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

10) Did delegates receive sufficient support in preparation for the allocation day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11) Did delegates have enough time to prepare for the allocation day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12) If you were a building delegate for next year’s Allocation Day what kind of support would you ask for?

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________
III. Allocation Day

13) Did you have a clear understanding of the purpose of Allocation Day? Yes No

14) Was there enough clarity around the rules of how to participate throughout the day?
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neither disagree nor agree
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree

15) Were presentations/displays easy to understand?
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neither disagree nor agree
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree

16) How did you generally feel about the decisions made throughout the day? How fair, democratic, and appropriate were they?

17) On a scale of 1 (lowest) to 10 (highest) how would you rate the TCHC’s Participatory Budgeting Process?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

18) Do you have any other suggestions for the Participatory Budgeting Process next year?

   Thank you very much for your valuable contribution to this process!!
B.3 Interview Questions

Questionnaire for Tenant Participants
The lead researcher, research assistant, and tenant researchers used the following questionnaire for short interviews with tenant delegates at the end of PB Allocation Days.

Date:       Time:       Location:       Name:       Pseudonym:       Sex:       Age:

1) Why did you come to the allocation day?
2) Have you participated in other tenant participation events? If so, which?
3) Have you participated in other community organizations, religious institutions, or government programs?
4) Can you explain to me in your own words what you did in the event today?
5) What did you think of the allocation day? Did you like it?
6) What did you like most and least about the allocation day?
7) Do the decisions that were made seem fair?
8) In your opinion, what results will the allocation day actually have?
9) What were the rules of the allocation day, in your opinion? How clear were they?
10) Would you like to participate in the allocation day next year?
11) What happened with the tenants who didn’t show up? Why didn’t they come?
12) Are you planning to suggest to other tenants that they participate in events like this in the future?
13) Do you think that the activities today were like a game, in any sense?

Questionnaire for Staff and Tenant Researchers
The lead researcher used the following questionnaire for 1-hour interviews with staff involved in PB and some tenant researchers. Not all questions were used for all interviewees.

Date:       Time:       Location:       Name:       Pseudonym:

1) What is your position? What are your responsibilities?
2) When did you start working with the TCHC? How did you get involved?
3) What do you think about the PB process? What are the positives and negatives?
4) How successful do you think the allocation day you attended was?
5) Do you think the decisions made were fair?
6) How did the event rules affect participation?
7) Did you sense competition or conflict between or with the participants at any point during the event? If so, when? How did this conflict affect the event?
8) What was the most difficult moment of the event? Why?
9) Do you think the process used in the event was like a game in any way? If so, how?
10) What are signs of how democratic a meeting is? What do you look for?
11) What are signs of how engaging or enjoyable a meeting is? What do you look for?
12) What are things you as a facilitator can do to make a meeting more democratic and engaging?
13) Are there any particular changes that you think should be made to the PB process or tenant participation system?
### B.4 Event Mechanics Form

**Event Name:**  
**Researcher name:**  
**Location:**  
**Date:**  
**Start time:**

#### A. Staging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) child care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) interpreters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) convenient location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) disability accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) room layout:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) outreach methods:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) external forums for discussing event:

#### B. Goals & Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>high</th>
<th>mid</th>
<th>low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) goals of meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) __________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) __________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) __________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) clarity of goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) money: ____________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) infrastructure:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) policies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) political access:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) election:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) action:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) direct or indirect

5) visibility of outcomes

#### C. Competition & Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>high</th>
<th>mid</th>
<th>low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) type of competition/collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) participant v participant:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) participant v group:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) participant v system:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) group v group:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) group v system:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D. Rules

**When and What**

1. **rules:**

2. **displayed:**

3. **handed out:**

4. **orally presented:**

5. **participant-generated:**

6. **changed during event:**

7. **rulings:**

8. **organically learned:**

9. **enforcement:**

Extra Notes:

---

### E. Techniques

**When and What**

1. **flipcharts:**

2. **other visual aids:**

3. **handout materials:**

4. **music/sound:**

5. **fun rhetoric:**

6. **status indicators:**

7. **levels:**

8. **resources:**

9. **points:**

10. **hidden info:**

11. **pos feedback loops:**

12. **neg feedback loops:**

13. **choice points:**

14. **core mechanics:**

Extra Notes:
### B.5 Participation Form

**Event Name:**

**Researcher name:**

**Location:**

**Date:**

**Actual start time:**

**End time:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>:00</th>
<th>:10</th>
<th>:20</th>
<th>:30</th>
<th>:40</th>
<th>:50</th>
<th>1:00</th>
<th>1:10</th>
<th>1:20</th>
<th>1:30</th>
<th>1:40</th>
<th>1:50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**A. Turnout**

- 1) facilitators
- 2) support
- 3) invited
- 4) total present
- 5) women
- 6) people of color
- 7) youth (<30)
- 8) seniors (>59)

**B. Participation**

1) minutes talking: staff
2) minutes talking: tenants
3) tenants talking for first time
4) tenants moving
5) tenant-to-tenant comments
6) complaints to staff
7) interruptions of staff
8) breaking rules
9) self-policing

**C. Decision-Making**

1) decisions made
2) made by vote
3) made by consensus

**D. Engagement**

1) tenants texting
2) tenants nodding off
3) tenants taking breaks
4) departures
5) unrelated conversations
6) audible laughs
Appendix C: Initial Tenant Researcher Recommendations

The following recommendations were presented by the researchers on July 24, 2009 after initial analysis of the data. Tenants and staff voted on which recommendations to endorse using dotmocracy (10 votes per person). The recommendations are presented below in order of votes received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Youth Fund</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set aside a pot of money for a Youth Fund, which young tenants will decide how to allocate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Menu of Project Costs</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At building or priority-setting meeting, provide general categories of costs for various types of projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Staff Time in Field</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate a set amount of time for each staff to work in the field engaging communities in the PB process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Q&amp;A</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be Q&amp;A time after presentations (3 minutes presentations, 2 minutes Q&amp;A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Electronic Voting</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a transparent computer voting system to avoid cheating.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) PB Committee</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A PB committee should be set up again, to establish rules for the process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Presentation of Rules</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At meetings, communicate rules in at least 3 ways: orally, in handouts, and posted on wall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Rules in Advance</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules and guidelines should be handed out at least 3 weeks before the allocation days.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Staff Interruptions</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer staff interruptions of meetings: phone ringing, answering phone, pacing back and forth, talking with tenants or staff, entering and leaving the room.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Allocation Day Participation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities that are not represented on allocation day should be disqualified from receiving funding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Number of Votes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify how many votes/dots each community gets, and why.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Resources on International PB Experiences

1 This process was similar to the “autorreglamento” (participatory rule-making) processes used in many PBs in Spain. In these cases, PB delegates and participants reflect on the past year’s PB process, in order to write and revise rules for the following year. These rules are then published in a rulebook, which is given to new participants the following year. This approach is used to generate greater community ownership over the PB, legitimize the rules, and correct shortcomings each year. A similar process was used in the first PB in the US, in Chicago’s 49th Ward. Many PB rulebooks are available online (in Spanish), such as at:

2 Many cities have separate Youth or Children’s PBs, generally for youth under 21 years old. In some cases, these take place through school or educational budgets, while in others they rely on a pot of municipal funding. Examples include:
   - http://grupo.us.es/laboraforo/
   - http://eau.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/18/1/195

3 Many cities use cartoons and videos to better communicate PB to youth. Examples include:
   - http://www.presupuestosparticipativos.tv/

4 The steps of the PB process, as outlined in the “What Happens When” section, are typically publicized through timeline diagrams printed in brochures, posters, and websites. These flowcharts allow participants to get a sense of the overall process visually. Examples include:

5 Lists of the responsibilities of different actors in the PB, such as those outlined in the “Who Does What” section, are often distributed during the PB, as part of rulebook or a separate handout. This helps new participants situate themselves and understand the roles of those around them, while reducing confusion or replication of work amongst staff and participants.

6 Seville (Spain), for example, uses “grupos motores” (motor groups) for this purpose. The groups are composed of local residents that are particularly enthusiastic about the process, and they are responsible for generating community interest, helping publicize the PB, and organizing local PB meetings with other residents. See:

7 In many PBs, delegates are elected for staggered two-year terms, so that each year there are 1st year delegates and 2nd year delegates. Most cities also place term limits on delegates, allowing them to serve for only 2-3 years total.

8 Internationally, voting techniques vary, from paper ballots to stickers to electronic systems. Increasingly, PBs are using machines and online voting processes. Belo Horizonte (Brazil) and Berlin present some of the best examples of technological innovation for PB voting: