

Public Engagement Working Group Report

Sept. 2, 2015

This WG has had some challenges gaining momentum, but we did have a very productive conversation in the spring. We agreed on the following:

- the PEWG seeks to find mechanisms for both out-reach and in-reach, and to help all the WGs achieve them
- the PEWG is NOT the publicity wing of the MFPC
- it is important that MPFC WGs do not use only out-reach and in-reach tools that the members of the WGs themselves would use (such as the internet or phone calls to city staff or other means more readily available to people with more privilege)
 - we need to be careful not to confuse *active* out-reach and in-reach programs with *inclusive* out-reach and in-reach programs
- we also need to keep in mind that we don't have the same audiences for all issues, and therefore need to choose our initiatives

plus it is important to consider what the existing network nodes are, and what the existing network "umbrellas" are, in understanding an effective out-reach and in-reach strategy - including considering who is left out by those nodes and umbrellas, and how that might effect the success of out-reach and in-reach

We suggested that WGs could strive for better out-reach and in-reach through a couple of means:

- that the PEWG devise an engagement analysis tool for the WGs, which might be something as simple as a checklist of questions such as

Who is your audience?
How will you reach them?

Who do you need to hear from?
How will they reach you?

- each WG should have a good look at the equity tool that has been developed by the public health community

- Submitted by Michael Bell