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Public Engagement Evaluation Projects

• CDC Pandemic Influenza Vaccine (2005)
• CDC Community Control Measures (2007)
• CDC Pandemic Influenza Vaccine (2008)
• CDC National Vaccine Policy (2009)
• CDC Novel H1N1 Influenza Response (2009)
• CDC Six State Pandemic Influenza Project (2010)
• Harris County Texas Pandemic Influenza (2011)
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)
US Dept of Health & Human Services

Guidance on Who Should Receive Scarce Vaccine in Severe Influenza Pandemic
Some Options

- Persons with chronic health conditions
- Health care workers
- Children
- Those that offer the most economic benefit
- People responsible for keeping electricity and gas flowing
- Fire fighters/Law enforcement/Emergency management
- Infants
- Public officials
- Transportation workers
- Pregnant Women
- First come first serve
- Elderly
- Military
**Policy Makers**

**Evaluation Question:**
Was this a good process?

- Did the process attract enough participants to engage in effective deliberations?
- Did participants represent a diversity of backgrounds and perspectives?
- Were participants able to engage in informed dialogue?
- Did participants thoughtfully consider the issues and weigh the options?
- Did the process result in a fair and balanced, discussion of the issues?
- Did the process enhance trust in government and increase support for decisions?
- Did the process empower citizens?
- Did policy makers use the information?
- Did the process meet the expectations of sponsors?

**CDC Public Engagement Promoters**

**Facilitators**

**Evaluators**
Public Engagement Pilot Project on Pandemic Influenza (PEPPPI) Evaluation Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Mixed Methods Evaluation Design</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDC process to engage citizens and stakeholders in deliberations about which subgroups in the population require the earliest vaccine protection in the event of an influenza pandemic</td>
<td>The Public</td>
<td>Process was successful in recruiting citizens representing a variety of perspectives/demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Citizens motivated to participate by interest in subject and sense of civic responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumers</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Participants had sufficient knowledge to engage in informed discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providers</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Process promoted a balanced, honest, reasoned deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov't Agencies</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Participant opinions about values, goals and priority groups changed as a result of the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccine Industry</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Citizens produced useful information for stakeholder discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four communities: Georgia, Nebraska, Oregon, Massachusetts</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Policy makers seriously considered stakeholder/citizen input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing Conference</td>
<td>Citizen Input Conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Recommendations</td>
<td>Citizen Feedback Sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Results

• Recruitment was successful and participants were diverse
• Process was perceived to be fair and high quality
• Participants gained knowledge about the topic – they engaged in informed deliberation
• As a result of the process, participants values and perceptions changed – they considered alternative perspectives
Troubling Results

Although all participants gained knowledge, there was not an equalization of knowledge.

Can a deliberative process be fair and balanced when there is a discrepancy in knowledge among groups?
Troubling Results

Although participants changed beliefs about values/options, change was not dramatic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons who are most likely to get seriously ill or die from the flu</th>
<th>3.48 (0.747)</th>
<th>3.46 (0.746)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>3.66 (0.585)</td>
<td>3.44* (0.762)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The elderly</td>
<td>3.56 (0.682)</td>
<td>3.31* (0.784)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People important to everyone’s safety, like firefighters, police or ambulance workers</td>
<td>3.40 (0.755)</td>
<td>3.20 (0.769)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers who help keep communities functioning, such as those who keep on the electricity and those who get food to grocery shelves</td>
<td>3.04 (0.908)</td>
<td>2.84* (0.906)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P<.05
Troubling Results

Although participants changed beliefs about values/options, there was less agreement at the end of the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons who are most likely to get seriously ill or die from the flu</th>
<th>3.48 (0.747)</th>
<th>3.46 (0.746)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>3.66 (0.585)</td>
<td>3.44* (0.762)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The elderly</td>
<td>3.56 (0.682)</td>
<td>3.31* (0.784)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People important to everyone’s safety, like firefighters, police or ambulance workers</td>
<td>3.40 (0.755)</td>
<td>3.20 (0.769)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers who help keep communities functioning, such as those who keep on the electricity and those who get food to grocery shelves</td>
<td>3.04 (0.908)</td>
<td>2.84* (0.906)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SHOULD A DIFFERENT PROCESS HAVE BEEN USED TO ACHIEVE CONSENSUS?
Evaluation Conclusions

The process was fair and balanced involving informed citizens who provided useful information for decision makers.

OR

The process was biased, resulted in discord rather than harmony and could have been conducted more cost effectively.
Which is right?

Are these results important?

...It depends....

Values
Process Experts

• Implications for ensuring complex material is understood by all groups
• Clearly articulate the desired outcome for deliberative processes
• Carefully consider process design and that it matches the purpose
Decision Makers

• The process was substantially fair
• The purpose was input not consensus
• The process yielded additional benefits
  – Interaction between officials and citizens
  – Citizen empowerment
  – Greater trust in government
  – The story is impressive