Government Works: Profiles of People Making a Difference

James P. Troxel, General Editor

> ***Government Works***[1] *was published in 1995 by Miles River Press, Alexandria, VA. The book included eighteen case studies of public work activity in various setting across the United States that had utilized participatory approaches in their communities organizations and demonstrated the successes they achieved by doing so. Since then, of course, things have changed for these groups. The book itself is out of print. As General Editor, I have captured a synopsis of the key lessons that were distilled from these cases. A list of the titles, the name of the case and the authors appear at the end.*

CITIZENS TAKING INITIATIVE
Rebuilding from the Bottom Up

"The People are the only legitimate fountain of power." The Federalist Papers.

A Chamber of Commerce presented awards to local citizens who were doing what they thought was their basic community responsibility. One man, a young African-American, ran down the street after a purse snatcher and caught him and handed him over to the police. The sound bite that the TV news captured from the young man simply said, "If everyone just does their part..."

One of my fondest memories as a boy growing up was the summer I spent with my grandparents in Sayre, Oklahoma. It was the mid-1950's and I was about 10 years old. Sayre is a county seat in the western part of the state on old Route 66. It is famous for its red clay soil of the 1930's dust bowl era that was still fresh in the memory of some people.

Roots of Citizen Initiatives

One event stands out in my mind from that summer. One morning my Grandmother received a phone call revealing that something unfortunate had happened to her friend, Mrs. Gardner, who lived a couple of streets away. I don't think I ever knew what the particulars were, but I do

[1]

remember that after a brief conference with my Grandfather and my Great-Aunt Ada, Grandmother swung into action. She spent the remainder of the day in the kitchen cooking. Then toward the end of the afternoon I accompanied my Grandparents as we walked up to Mrs. Gardner's carrying the food Grandmother had prepared.

When we arrived I was astonished to find a lot of other people, many of whom also had brought prepared food. Great-Aunt Ada seemed to be supervising things in Mrs. Gardner's kitchen and after a while all the guests were invited to partake of the bounty, though most did not. It seemed as if the whole community had mobilized itself to assist Mrs. Gardner's, to me still very mysterious, misfortune.

On the front porch swing that night sitting between my Grandparents, I asked them how everyone knew what to do? How did Grandmother know to fix the fried chicken? Why was Great-Aunt Ada supervising in the kitchen? Why did all those people show for something so unusual? Before I received an answer, a chain link snapped and we three pummeled to the ground. And the unanswered question has been one that has driven my curiosity for nearly 40 years.

All of us have witnessed similar stressful situations wherein family and friends mobilized to come to the aid of someone. Sayre, Oklahoma, didn't have a Department of Human Services, a state office for social services, or a federal program for distraught people. The ***community mobilized itself*** in its care for Mrs. Gardner. Section I of this book spotlights how government works best with the spirit of citizen responsibility. These are stories of local communities leading the way. Tip O'Neill has reminded us, "All politics is local." Government is the form and structure that houses the political process usually establishing programs to serve its *polis*. Though the term politics usually refers to the activities of politicians within governments, as we use it here, "politics" stays close it its original meaning. It refers to all of those activities required to sustain a *polis* or community.

Politics and Community Action

A neighborhood association revitalizing its community is political. A citizen coalition working for a better education system is political. And all those who involved in these efforts have political interests. Politics, and therefore governing, includes all our common efforts to solve

common problems. Gradually over time, however, in assigning this kind of social responsibility to the plethora of public agencies, we have deluded ourselves in thinking that we have been excused or exempted from the basic care of community. Now, it is obvious we are simply asking more from our public institutions than they possibility can fill.

For example, perhaps you will remember the unfortunate story that came out of Chicago during the winter of 1994 when 19 children were found living in squalor in a two-bedroom apartment. A tragedy to be sure, but what struck me was how quickly the media turned its attention on the negligent social worker from the state's Department of Children and Family Services. Apparently this one case worker was being chastised for not reporting that he or she had been unable to enter the apartment on earlier visits, a basic part of case workers' job responsibilities. The police, in fact, had found the kids during a drug raid on the apartment.

Our society in the last several years has been placing responsibility and accountability at the wrong feet. In the Chicago case, who is holding the parents accountable? Who is asking why the other apartment residents didn't report this outrageous situation? Why do we think this is only a failure of an employee of a public institution? Aren't we expecting too much of government?

William Raspberry, syndicated columnist, has written that,

> Professionalization of the war on poverty had one disastrous consequence: It undercut the indigenous community leaders who had been toiling away for years, unpaid and largely unknown outside their neighborhoods... But part of the damage was done by those who only meant to help. [1]

Resurging Citizen Initiatives

People are beginning to understand that government cannot do everything a community needs. Slowly, local groups are unifying and rebuilding and renewing themselves. Scores of little known, small scale success stories are building into a major force for political and social change. And the change agenda that brings these attempts together is basic social responsibility.

The Kettering Foundation conducted a study of community initiatives across the country and concluded that,

There are certain things that our governments, schools, experts, professionals, and officials - even at their best - can never do. A community has certain undelegable responsibilities. Only the public can define the purposes of the community, choose the directions in which it should move, create common interests, build common ground, and generate the political will to act together. [2]

Community Development Organizations

The Chicago Tribune ran a series of articles in the fall of 1993 about the numbers of people moving out of the city into the suburbs and cited all the negative reasons why this was taking place. Ted Wysocki of the Chicago Association of Neighborhood Development Organizations (CANDO) in his rebuttal to the story simply indicated that "People moving out of the city is an old story. People fighting to save their neighborhoods *is news*." (italics added). [3]

Wysocki and his organization, CANDO, representing 70 neighborhood organizations in Chicago, illustrate a major but oftentimes hidden movement that has swept across the country in the last 25 years or so. It is the movement of grassroots community based organizations - many in low income areas - working and recovering one of the fundamental principles upon which our nation is built - a government by the people. It is the story of local citizens who have banded themselves together in various forms to alleviate some felt need. They go by such names as community development corporations (CDCs), neighborhood development organizations (NDOs), or community based organizations (CBOs). Whatever their title, they have become one of the most critical influences in fostering the self-help approach. Over 5,000 such organizations have sprung up in the past quarter of a century.

The New Community Corporation of Newark, NJ, which began in 1968 in a riot-torn area of the inner city, is now one of the largest CDC's in the nation with a staff of 152 and an operating budget of over $6 million. They have rehabilitated or built 2500 units of housing for 6000 residents utilizing a blended management approach that includes social services along with building maintenance. They have over 1000 graduates of their job training program, operate 8 businesses and have a federal credit Union for 1300 individuals.

The symbolic leader of New Community is Msgr. William Linder, though Linder stresses that it

is the people's project not his. One of New Community's early lessons had to do with hiring the property manager for their housing development. After interviewing several professional management firms, they concluded that none of them really cared in the same way as the local residents did. So they decided to start their own management company. As to why they opted for employing local people over trained professionals, Linder says, "You can acquire knowledge, but you can't make a heart ." Ever since, New Community has insisted upon raising up local people to take on the new jobs that their ventures created. By keeping this earning power in the local community, the group has fostered the spirit of empowerment and self-help, and is building up the local economy as well.

Another successful CDC is The **Northwest Side Community Development Corp.** of Milwaukee which has been working since 1983 to revitalize its neighborhood. The people have improved the commercial street of Villard Avenue, enhanced the industrial area around them, opened a small business incubator, and launched education and job training programs. "We're an example of what can happen if you stay at it long enough and don't get worn down by things that can't be done," says Howard Snyder, Executive Director.

These are a small selection of thousands of such groups operating across the country. Not all these initiatives are found in the cities. Small towns also know the importance of framing a vision for the future. Ponca City, Oklahoma, a town of 26,000 in the northern part of the state, began a highly participative approach to involve every member of the town in shaping its vision for the future. Launched through the efforts of the town's Chamber of Commerce, what began as a novel idea has evolved into an independent, nonprofit foundation called Ponca City Tomorrow. Its purpose is to improve upon the quality of community life continuously for all the citizens of Ponca City. Its mission is to create and maintain an on-going community dialogue which will encourage citizens of Ponca City to become involve and proactive in creating and building the future, to recognize and respect each other for their individual differences and collective, and to become better informed on the issues and challenges confronting the community. The group decided that the issues which will guide their future actions include: exemplary educational systems, diversified industrial and retail base, outstanding tourism and recreation opportunities, responsive, responsible local government; effective public transportation, quality retirement living, environmental awareness, and city beauty.

"It's just community planning," says Cheryl Fletcher, chair of Ponca City Tomorrow. "The idea is to empower our community residents with the sense that they can create and control their future and the future of the community."

Community Empowerment

A boost from the Federal government that supports programs like Ponca City Tomorrow is the Empowerment Zone Act. Enacted in 1994, this piece of legislation gives Washington a chance to respond to locally-based partnerships of government, business and community institutions. The legislation mandates that before a local community can be designated as an empowerment zone, a strategic planning process within the community must bring together all the elements of an area to analyze the locally available assets.

Ouachita Parish, in the northeastern part of the Louisiana, worked in earnest to complete an application for Empowerment Zone designation during the spring of 1994. A participatory process kept everybody at the table to ensure that no one sector would dominate the deliberations. Within the course of eight weeks, over 1000 residents attended one of about 20 different community forums to inventory the assets within their county. A vision workshop one Saturday brought together 400 people. George Cummings, President of the local Capital Bank in Monroe and chair of the Task Force appointed by Parish's Jury Police to guide the process reports,

The most important thing that's happened this spring has been the relationships that have been built and the seeds planted for long term trust. During this process the people talked to each other for the first time. You know, you can talk about race relations all day; but the way to deal with it is to pick a common problem and solve it together.

The Ouachita process was guided by the concept of "asset-based planning" that has been made popular by local indigenous organizations who have learned how to garner their limited capital resources and multiply them for larger results. [4]

Making Use of Political Capacities

If all of these local experiences and lessons could be summarized in one statement, it would be

that effective communities make use of political capacities not normally called into play in politics as usual. Effective communities go beyond conventional wisdom. The difference is reflected in the way they define and respond to their problems, and in the type of actions that flow from a resurgence of political will. A community's citizens are more likely to support programs, initiatives and decisions they understand and in which they have participated in creating. It can take the responsibility off government and put it back where it belongs - with the citizens themselves.

"Right now most people view government as a vending machine," says Rick Cole, mayor of Pasadena, California. "You put in your 25 cents and you want back 50 cents' worth of services. But what government really ought to be is a barn raising," a community effort in which everyone works together for an end that benefits all. [5]

Citizen Initiatives at Work

One of America's best kept secrets is that in many places, such as the following [6], local democracy is alive and well, in fact, thriving through creative experiments and fresh initiatives:

+ St. Paul, Minnesota, a city of 270,000 has developed one of the most comprehensive participation systems anywhere in the country with a system of 17 district councils, each elected by the neighborhood, with specific responsibilities for zoning, housing and development oversight, and the capacity to hire and fire its own staff. One of these councils has organized 500 block clubs within its boundaries.
+ Birmingham, Alabama, with a population of 180,000, has some 95 neighborhoods electing leaders by open ballot. City-funded mailings communicate monthly to every resident. Some of the 22 community coalitions serving to represent the neighborhoods in a citywide Citizens Advisory Board have created tool-lending libraries and neighborhood-painting programs as well as extensive neighborhood festivals and street fairs.
+ Dayton, Ohio, boasts seven priority boards and 74 neighborhoods intricately linked with a model of performance-oriented public administration. All city agencies work under a detailed set of goals; a key measure of agency success is whether the public likes the results. They had better, because every five years the city has had to face an all-or-nothing public vote on the local income tax.

One of the nation's leading practitioners of citizen-based government is Anne Dosher, an organizational development consultant based in San Diego. In responding to an interviewer's question about how a local community can be assured of its right to citizen initiatives, she responded:

The individualism, consumerism and materialism of our society are antagonistic to the creation of community. This is why we have to create community over and over again.. ..Individualism and property rights, the basis of our society, created a desouled, despirited reality by design. People are becoming more and more disenchanted with it. Community is the opposite of that. It's about connectedness, bondedness, wholeness and spirit. If community isn't an ensouled, spirited reality, then it becomes meaningless. [7]

Lessons Learned

The case studies in this book embody this spirit of basic social responsibility. They tell us that government works best when it works with local communities. Some of these lessons include:

-Increased participation in community planning fosters increased responsibility;

-Participation by individuals enhances their self-image and moves them from victimization to empowerment;

-With participation, the group determines the issues; the more broad-based the group, more comprehensive the list of issues and solutions;

-Increased participation can turn the table on adversarial relationships;

-In identifying problems people need to see how they participate in perpetuating the problem;

-Increased participation in community planning offers the possibility of the practical recovery of democracy.

References

[1] *USA Today*, Thursday, February 10, 1994, page 11A.

[2] *Community Politics*, by David Mathews and Noelle McAfee. David Mathews, executive director of the Kettering Foundations, has written another book detailing many of the same themes, *Politics for People: Finding a Responsible Public Voice*, 1994, Urbana, IL, University of

Illinois Press.

[3] Letter to Editor, *Chicago Tribune*, December 19, 1993.

[4] The book, *Building Communities from the Inside Out, A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets*, authored by John Kretzmann and John McKnight, of the Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research at Northwestern University (1993, Northwestern University, 2040 Sheridan Road, Evanston, IL 60208), serves as a field manual for communities who want to learn how to leverage their own available resources for development.

[5] *Governing*, February, 1994, page 56.

[6] Taken from information provided by the Lincoln Filene Center, Tufts University, Medford, MA.

[7] Interview by John Burbidge under the title "Guarding Community in America," pages 31- 35, *Edges*, Vol. 4, No. 2, Toronto, Ont., Canada.

ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN GOVERNMENT:
Putting the Citizen Customer First

"We need to make government customer-friendly - by giving people more choices, better services, and a bigger say in how their government works."
President Bill Clinton, Remarks to the Cabinet, February 10, 1993.

"It's time we had a new customer service contract with the American people,
a new guarantee of effective, efficient and responsive government.
It's time we cut the red tape and trimmed the bureaucracy.
It's time we took off our bureaucracy the words, 'We've always done it this way.'"
Vice-President Al Gore, National Performance Review, March 3, 1993.

"... (T)here are always those who're smart enough to know that the power that comes with government service is an illusion.
The duty that comes along with it is always greater in magnitude."
Tom Clancy, The Sum of All Fears

As I watch the evening news I have a strange "deja vu" sensation; once again I am witnessing the annual debate over whether there should be additional runways at Chicago's O'Hare Airport. The Mayor of Chicago wants them; the mayors of the suburban jurisdictions surrounding O'Hare don't. It's that simple, so the news broadcast portrays.

The news media desire to makes things simple for us, because if the complexity were really known, we wouldn't listen, watch, or read their news. So we allow ourselves to fall into the simple paradigms of "the-good-guys-versus-the-bad-guys" approach. This adversarial mind-set is an easy perspective from which to view the world. Simple, but narrow.

Citizens Thinking for Themselves

We cannot allow the media to tell us, the American public, what and how we must think. We need to stand back, see the issues in their larger complex context, and genuinely assume

responsibility for what is needed in today's world.

Pitting the urban against the suburban is a convenient way to avoid seeing the bigger picture. What would it mean to take a different look at the need for those runways at O'Hare? What if we eliminated all the political jurisdictions all around O'Hare field for a moment and viewed this area from a satellite ten miles up? From up there, we can't tell where one municipality ends and the other begins. We need to see things in wholes, rather than in pieces, if we are to make responsible decisions.

A line on a piece of geography is artificial to the exchange of money, capital, and information. Wouldn't it make sense if our political institutions were transformed to reflect the way we actually operate rather than try to uphold a world gone by?

The O'Hare runway issues is recounted to set the stage for the stories of government reinvention which follow to remind us that the purpose of all the efforts to transform government are for the common public good as Carolyn Lukensmeyer in Chapter 2 asserts. Until we can really focus on the big picture of just what the public good is, then perhaps all we are really doing is engaging in fruitless rhetoric. As Vincent Lane, Chairman of the Chicago Housing Authority said,

> Sometimes we need to start out with a blank slate and say, 'Hey, we've been doing this for the last forty, fifty years. It doesn't work.' Let's throw out everything, clear our minds . . . Let's have as a goal doing the right thing for the right reasons, even if it entails taking risks. [1]

As Professor Henry Mintzberg has reminded us, "the big picture is painted with small strokes."[2] In this section of *Government Works: Profiles of People Making a Difference* is a series of case studies describing the creation of pockets of success around the country by the people from within their administrative system. Maybe one day a "critical mass" of such efforts will occasion an avalanche of change.

Certainly, there appears to be a growing awareness of the need for change in our political institutions. Liz Hollander in Chapter 1 reported on the work of the National Commission on the State and Local Public Service, referred to most frequently by the name of its Chair, William F. Winter, former Governor of the State of Mississippi. The 27-member Winter Commission issued a series of recommendations in a report entitled "Hard Truths/Tough Choices" in 1993 [3].

The Council for Excellence in government, a network of private sector leaders who have previously served as public officials, has initiated a program to foster what it calls "mission-driven accountability."

Efforts to reform the public sector from within have sparked the use of total quality management (TQM) methods and tools used extensively in the private sector. The Federal Quality Institute (FQI) monitors the implementation of TQM inside federal government and each year awards select federal agencies who have woven TQM into their operations.

The National Academy of Pubic Administration (NAPA) sponsors frequent roundtable discussion on the topic of government reform. One of its affiliate groups, the Alliance for Redesigning Government, is a clearinghouse of public innovations from all across the country. (Governor Barbara Roberts has more to say about the Alliance in the Afterword.)

These experts, organizations and their studies and reports recount instances of reorganizing government from within. They demonstrate, along with the stories in this section, that there are many reasons to be enthusiastic about the future of government as agencies guide their own attempts to reinvent themselves.

One place that cries out for reform lies in relation between the various levels of government itself. Too frequently state and local government bureaucrats become what could be described as "sub-federal level functionaries." An extreme example of this blurring of responsibility happened in Indiana when the head of the Department of Environment reported, "We have all these environmental mandates coming down, and we have all these cities and counties asking, 'Why are you doing this to us?'" Not surprisingly, the federal mandates have outstripped the state's ability to comply, and so Indiana is considering turning environmental programs back to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.[4] Clearly, unfunded federal mandates are of critical concern for future reinvention efforts.

Revolutionizing Bureaucratic Complexity

For example, during the 1980s, urban areas especially experienced decreasing federal support of

social programs. Many times the rules that accompanied the reductions in funding increased the complexity of administering those fewer assistance dollars. Sometimes when that happened, the number of program administrators at the state and local levels increased in inverse proportion to the number of program beneficiaries. Something was wrong with the way government was doing its business. Jefferson said we needed an American revolution every ten years or so to think through what kind of government we wanted. Stories in this section reflect the hope of just such a revolution. They show that an American Perestroika is underway.

Perhaps the greatest single effort underway in our country to reinvent government is being undertaken by the federal government, as Carolyn Lukensmeyer reported on in her Chapter 2 interview. Under the auspices of the Vice President's office, the National Performance Review (NPR) report, published on September 7, 1993, after a 6-month study, identified myriad of success stories happening inside government.[5]

Once the NPR report was published it then became a matter of implementing its proposals. Twelve months after its publication, the Vice-President announced to the President that 90% of the 255 agency-specific recommendations were being implemented, proposed in pending legislation, or were to be included in the fiscal year 1995 federal budget.
Some of the highlights of the federal government's early attempts to reorganize in the first year of NPR include:

-The government is shifting billions of dollars in benefits to electronic payment; for example, the Department of Agriculture is operating electronic benefit transfers for food stamps in seven states; 22 more states are in the planning stages;

-Nine federal agencies are beginning major streamlining initiatives, cutting headquarters staff, reducing management layers, and moving workers to the front line;

-Over 100 agencies set customer service standards for the first time. For example, Social Security promises to mail out cards within five working days, and if you need a social security number quickly, it will provide it in a day;

-Federal agencies are buying fewer "designer" goods and more off-the-shelf products. For example, the Department of Defense is aggressively eliminating military specifications in favor of commercial purchases and uses "electronic commerce," cutting supply purchase time from 270 to 30 days;

-One office of the Department of Energy cut the time to investigate hazardous substances

releases from 40 weeks to 17, saving $17,000 per report;

-The Department of Health and Human Services eliminated 16 unnecessary personnel regulations;

-The Department of Housing and Urban Development gives field employees greater discretion to tailor programs to local needs, cutting back on its traditional "cookie-cutter" approach to federal programs;

-The Office of Personnel Management cut the Federal Personnel Manual from 10,000 to 1,000 pages.

These are but a sampling of the kind of small scale efforts that are adding up to a big difference in the way the federal government operates. And they are being done not by the politicians but by the loyal public servants in the trenches of the war on bureaucracy.

Listening to Citizen Needs

One common denominator running through all the reinventing studies, reports and successful efforts is recognizing the need for government to listen more closely to what the citizens want. A simple truth in democracy, one might say. But somehow, over the years, layers of government have increasingly obscured this basic tenet. Attempts to resurrect it, however, have been underway for several years.

In the 1960s, citizen participation became one of the hallmarks of the new government social service assistance programs. For every new program, it seemed a citizen advisory board came into being to monitor it. Formal public hearings to review major development plans became common. However, too frequently, these citizen advisory groups were bankrupted by the process, co-opted by the political forces, or mesmerized by the complexity of the bureaucracy they were charged to monitor. The political equation merely added another subset; the formula stayed the same.

The state of Virginia, though, is one state that is taking citizen input seriously. Its Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) is charged with assembling the federally mandated CHAS - Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy. Most states and municipalities merely go through the motions, only masquerading citizen input; Virginia's

DHCD saw this as an opportunity to do something different. In keeping with their in-house version of greater employee involvement, DHCD arranged for a series of regional forums - usually called public hearings - sprinkled across the state to ensure equitable citizen access to deliberations about the state's CHAS.

The first DHCD statewide public hearing took place in Williamsburg, a mere 15 miles from Jamestown, where English colonists first set foot in the New World. That April 27, 1991 morning, the people streaming into the nondescript meeting room were puzzled by the room arrangement, and searched unsuccessfully for a speaker sign-up sheet. Instead of the normal theater-style seating with a head table for state officials and a podium from which experts and dignitaries could expound on the needs of the citizens, there were many tables scattered around the room, each with a stack of bright yellow index cards and a pile of colored felt tip markers. Clearly someone had something else in mind besides a traditional public hearing.

Four hours later, the 70 citizens had participated in a new form of government policy-making. Each one was a part of an interactive process rather than a victim of a mind-numbing procession of those 3-minute presentations that traditionally drag on to 15. On this day DHCD raised the curtain on a transformation which reached from the very core of its internal operations to its public relations with the citizens of the state. A public sector culture of participation had been born in the birthplace of America. Bob Adam, DHCD's Housing Division Director comments on this success:

Aside from simply being the right thing to do to respect the views of citizens, the public participation process which Virginia used to develop its CHAS yielded a variety of benefits. The result is a much richer diversity of ideas including some which are created on the spot through interaction. Unlike other states where citizens may not even recognize the plan that emerges at the end of the process, in Virginia there are no surprises.

Fashioning Community Forums

Not every area of the country is as successful at involving its citizens. While being pressured by federal and state agencies to take more and more responsibility for solving community problems, local governments are frequently losing the trust of their constituents. The siting of new

facilities, landfills, waste management treatment sites, half-way houses, prisons and other developments, even when widely recognized as beneficial to the community, are being blocked by the Not-In-My-Backyard (NIMBY) syndrome. A "Proposition 13" tax revolt has led to the repeated failure of governmental initiatives and bond measures that are vital to the health and welfare of the community.

In Suburban Chicago, though, local municipalities and park districts have been working with the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA) in fashioning a type of community forum to allow citizen input that would provide village leaders with some sense of direction. Local community leaders in towns such as Aurora, Tinley Park, Buffalo Grove, Mt. Prospect, Deerfield, Bensenville, Woodbridge, and Norridge Park convened workshops where they asked residents what programs, services, facilities, and capital improvements they want to see in place in three to five years. Across the Fox Valley Park District, where seven such forums were held, the process netted new aquatic sites. In Bensenville, where this process of citizen forums has been institutionalized into a semi-annual event, the input and feedback from the citizens is then required to be reflected in each of the village's department plans.

ICA consultant and facilitator Dennis Jennings, who leads most of these workshops, reports that one of the benefits of this kind of town meeting is that it becomes an opportunity for village leaders to clarify misperceptions citizens have about the constraints, the complexity, and the high cost of ready-made solutions that many bring to the meetings. "Participants learn that it's not so easy to adjust an expressway access and exit ramp to accommodate their own narrow purposes."

In all, as many as 40 Chicago suburban municipalities have employed these kind of "listen to the citizen-customer" town meetings. The village of Downer's Grove has seriously taken to heart this approach and has undertaken a year-long effort to seek citizen input and participation into their "Village Vision for the 21st Century." In turn, over 100 citizens served on committees and volunteered over 5,500 hours of time. They established 14 goal arenas with 132 objectives which were then approved by the village and assigned to the various village staff for implementation.

Village Manager Kurt Bressner:
It takes a tremendous amount of energy to sustain the momentum of citizen involvement, but once you start, there is no turning back. People learned to expect to be informed and

> involved and when they weren't, they became very upset. We learned that the rewards for taking the time to keep the citizens involved and informed were quite handsome. One of the rewards is that the citizens have become committed and involved and they don't take things for granted any more. We do everything now in collaboration and partnership rather than in any kind of antagonism. We like to say we play softball, not hardball, in Downers Grove. One of the things it takes - and fortunately we have it - is a group of elected officials not afraid of sharing their power with the people. They've learned that if they give up some of their power, they get a lot more back in return. We call our five elected officials the "community stewards." And we really have created a great partnership style with our professional village staff. This whole thing has evolved and we know to keep it going we have to keep at it.

States also are employing large-scale town meetings to gain citizen involvement. Ohio used a state-wide town meeting to address the drug issue. Colorado used one to tackle rural housing, and Illinois designed a two-day program to design initiatives for its park and recreation system.

Recovering Civic Responsibility

Until such time as the ethic of civic responsibility is recovered, we can delight in the heroic attempts made by our public servants working from within their institutions. While applauding the efforts to make government more customer-oriented, citizens must never be complacent with being **mere** customers. Staying within the business language analogy, citizens are not just customers; they are owners as well. Admittedly, government reform has been supported by the carryover from the consumer movement in the private sector in the last few years. Nonetheless, citizen participation is more than focus groups and surveys. It is a hands-on partnership with the elected officials and professional staff.

Take a look at the stories that follow. They include the transformation of a state government, federal government agency, various county and municipal agencies, a court system, as well as a tribal nation itself.

References

[1] The National Performance Review: From Red Tape to Results: Creating a Government that Works Better and Costs Less, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993, pg. 37.

[2] "The Fall and Rise of Strategic Planning," Harvard Business Review, January-February, 1994, page 111.

[3] National Commission on the State and Local Public Service, Hard Truths/Tough Choices, A report published by the Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government, State University of New York, Albany, NY, 1993.

[4] Congressional Quarterly, Inc., Governing, Vol. 7, Number 4, January 1994, p. 53.

[5] National Performance Review, From Red Tape to Results: Creating a Government That Works Better and Costs Less, Washington, DC, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1993.

EMPOWERING EMPLOYEES
Recovering the Role of Public Servant

The Mayor of a city was being driven to work one morning when he noticed something odd.
Along the edge of the boulevard, a municipal workman was digging a row of holes.
But as soon as he finished digging one hole, another workman would step up and fill it in again!
The mayor had his driver pull over and sent his aide to investigate.
The aide returned to the car looking relieved: "Nothing out of the ordinary, sir.
They're usually a three-man crew, but the fellow who plants the trees is out sick today!"

One hopes that the story above is apocryphal. Especially since it is possible these days to find public servants who model the best in public sector behavior. They don't deserve the cynical government-bashing that many find fashionable today.

Joan Hyatt Wickersheim, an inspector for the Department of Labor's Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) in Denver, Colorado, is a prime example of one such model. [1] She is part of team of people whose job it is to ensure the safety of our country's workplaces. OSHA's mission is to investigate reports of unsafe working conditions, instruct workplace managers to correct bad conditions, and propose fines for workplace violations. Previously, inspectors had to consult with their supervisors during every step of the review process, ultimately passing off their cases to administrative personnel and other specialists.

Initiatives from Within

However in 1993, OSHA held what Vice President Gore's National Performance Review calls a "reinvention lab" or conference in which Joan and 50 other frontline workers and supervisors participated. They were asked to determine ways that they could make their jobs better, reduce their excess paperwork, and focus instead on their main assignment of inspecting the workplaces. At the end of that reinvention conference, the 50 participants had come up with 22 initiatives and called in top OSHA management officials to approve or disapprove of those initiatives on the spot. Nineteen of the initiatives were approved.

One of 19 called for a revision of what OSHA inspectors call their "field operations manual," a tome of 400 pages. This manual dictates to workers like Joan the large amounts of paperwork they must fill out and the kinds of documentation they need to provide. And, as Joan says, "It also tells how to put one foot in front on the other and walk down the aisle of a workplace to do our inspections."

As a result of their management-approved initiatives, Joan and her colleagues whittled the manual down to 100 pages. The end result is that OSHA inspectors now will have fewer paper barriers to jump before they can get into the field. "I'll be able to walk down the workplaces and protect the American workers," Joan says. The revised manual (called the Field Inspection Reference Manual, "FIRM") has been distributed to all OSHA offices and became effective agency-wide on October 1, 1994.

In the new system which Joan and her colleagues created, the OSHA field investigator "owns" the case from start to finish. Now, inspectors ask for advice when they need it, and are responsible for making decisions on site. Freed from their desks, these inspectors are able to fix unsafe conditions faster. And when they visit a worksite, they are now taken more seriously.

Empowering Public Servants

In this illustration of one federal agency initiative, one sees in microcosm what is meant about worker empowerment. Joan, like most of us, simply wants to do her job and do it well. But she has become frustrated by the sheer weight of unnecessary bureaucracy. Reinventing government does not require millions of dollars paid to high priced consultants. Rather, it can be done by asking the front line people like Joan to simply be what they were called to be - public servants.

Many people - both inside and outside of public sector - believe government is simply a big jobs program, another entitlement to be taken advantage of. If success stories like Joan's are to increase, everyone must reject this cynical view while inspiring those inside government to remember what initially lured them to government work.

Nineteen million Americans are public servants who work for either the federal, state, local levels of government. If this powerful human potential can be fully tapped what a wonder one

would behold. Cynics may ask, "Isn't the empowerment of public servants an oxymoron?" As the case studies in our text show, the answer is "no."

Take Meg Denman for example; she doesn't look like a revolutionary. Indeed, she doesn't even think of herself that way. But leading a revolution is just what Meg is doing at the Waukesha, Wisconsin, County Department of Human Services. When the County Executive mandated that each department undertake a strategic planning process in which all employees would participate, Meg recognized an opportunity. At the orientation session for the process, Meg realized that her years of training as a human resource specialist and as a volunteer facilitator for the Institute of Cultural Affairs enabled her to lead her own division through a lengthy planning process. She also became an instrumental member of the core planning committee which evaluated the process and outlined recommendations or next steps for key administrators.

Like many such planning efforts the implementation was not considered in advance and the process petered out. But Meg discovered a new sense of self-esteem and her department is better off having done the process.

Meg's Department of Human Services is like many we have established in government in the last 25 years. Human Services, designed to be responsive to a population temporarily depleted of resources or faced with circumstantial crisis, now finds itself challenged by a political climate which demands measurable outcomes. The term "customer" has become conceptually familiar when analyzing the expectations varying collateral systems have of Human Services. No longer is the term "customer" limited to the client, but includes the courts, police departments, schools, legislatures, and the community. Meg, along with her colleagues, saw the necessity of creating a plan which encompassed strategies to meet heightened expectations while at the same time engaging in educational outreach program to address the criticality of total community response. While the strategic planning process was not without blemishes for its first time through, the consensus of all who participated was that the focused mission statement followed by targeted internal and external concerns, had a strategic sharpness to it never accomplished in traditional meeting formats. Meg and her colleagues are anticipating year two in what appears now to be the standard form of planning and she intends to be more active than she was the first round.

Many public servants have become institutionalized by the very institutions that were meant to

care for others. They've become hardened in their efforts to carry the weight of society's problems while at the same time being constrained by a framework of paperwork geared to the needs of the 19th century. They've become mere functionaries. Yet, at one time, public service was the most noble of professions, second only to the priesthood. Plato said that the only ones capable of running government were the philosopher-kings.

Encouraging Entrepreneurs Within Government

Happily, the nobility of public service may be resurfacing as we witness more and more heroes emerge. Exceptional government performances are recognized by The Public Employees Roundtable, which has a Public Service Awards program identifying federal, state and local governmental agencies that have recognized the achievement of empowered public servants.

One agency winning the Roundtable Award in 1993 was the Office of the State's Attorney, 18th District of Florida, Titusville. Workers in that agency concentrate on crime victims and witnesses who for decades have been ignored, inconvenienced, and re-victimized by the very system designed to protect them. This is true not only in Florida, but in all states. Workers in the Florida office began a Victim/Witness Services program to ensure that victims and witnesses receive the attention, assistance, and support they need and deserve throughout every step of the court process. Individual needs assessments are made of the emotional, psychological and physical state of victims. Intervention is then often provided to help them deal with employer relations, financial hardships, creditor problems, landlord difficulties and questions about the return of property. Both staff and volunteers work closely with other public agencies - the police, the courts, hospitals, and community services. The result has been an increase in the number of successful prosecutions and convictions.

In another instance, New York City's Sanitation Department transformed their equipment maintenance shop from a demoralized and inefficient mess into a national model; it now even advises private-sector trash haulers how to handle maintenance. At one time, half the city's trucks were out of service each day; one-third of those that left the garage broke down on the road. Today, 100 percent of the trucks are ready to go each day, with only a 1 percent break-down rate.

How did they do it? Just a good shakeup in the old lines of authority and giving the people on the shop floor a stronger say in how the job gets done. The department doesn't follow a traditional workforce model. Roger Liwer, deputy commissioner of Support Operations says, "When you look at our lines of communication now, it comes out like a bowl of spaghetti." Liwer fears, however, that if this were replaced by an autocratic model of hierarchy, the improvements they have made "would die in a day." [2]

Beyond Labor-Management Confrontation

Governing magazine conducted a poll of readers in regards to the recommendations of the National Commission on the State and Local Public Service in its report, "Hard Truths/Tough Choices: An Agenda for State and Local Reform." A high-performance work force was the number one area of concern for readers who enthusiastically endorsed the report's recommendations for improvement, including new styles of labor-management communication and skill-based pay systems. More than 66 percent of the respondents gave that recommendation top priority. [3]

Governing magazine and the Council for Excellence brought together 120 top state and local officials gathered to discuss the recommendations of the Winter Commission Report. The officials identified two road-blocks to empower front-line workers and shaking up the old bureaucratic governance model: the historical mistrust between labor and management, and the resistance of many mangers who are not interested in a closer working relationship with the front line people. The participants identified a variety of ways to deal with the issues, but ultimately confirmed there is no secret to success. It remains the task of leadership to guide the transformation process.

The San Bernadino County Probation Department in California has instituted the Probation Leadership Council and created what they call "link pin committees" comprised of 8 people, 4 from management and 4 from labor. These committees solve many of the day to day issues that arise within the department.

So, for example, when Deputy Chief Probation Officer Joe Lenz was told he had to let go 1 of 18 probation officers due to funding cut back, take that officer's case load and spread it across the

remaining officers, he had a sinking feeling. This dilemma is familiar to many other public and private agencies. In most others, however, spreading the workload would be an executive decision simply announced to the employees who would bear the brunt of its implementation.

Joe Lenz, though, had another idea. He referred the issue to one of his management link committees to figure out how to spread the workload. Since the committee operated within a framework of trust, they quickly claimed the problem as theirs and were able to figure out how to deal with it Employee participation helped the traditional wall between management and labor to crumble.

Consulting from Within

One of the ironies of the desire to reinvent government is the notion that high-priced reengineering consultants will be needed. As the stories in this Section indicate, just opposite may be true. Once competent facilitators, who engage stakeholders in agency change, are injected into an organization, management frequently discovers that the only consultants they need are the ones already working for them - their dedicated employees. This became evident at Chicago's Department on Aging (CDoA).

Midway into the first year of implementing the CDoA staff-designed strategic plan, Nora Jones, the department's union steward, found a smaller number of employee grievances being brought to her attention. As she studied the phenomena, she saw that it wasn't so much a matter of their being fewer concerns. Instead labor and management were dealing with the issues more openly and frankly at the source long before the concerns festered into actual labor complaints.

This, most agreed, could be attributed to the new found candor that resulted from the strategic plan being designed by all 200 department employees. In these facilitated planning sessions, everyone had a chance to articulate their vision for the department, and vent their dreams and frustrations. This openness led to real implementation of their strategy, because, as everyone knows, no one implements someone's else plan.

Government Works: Profiles of People Making a Difference goes to press too soon to report all the progress that will have been accomplished at CDoA. However, one anecdote stands as a

testimony to the hard work of the people there. When Alexandria Cooney returned to the department after having being assigned to work in another city department for over a year, she quickly was able to tell the difference in morale. "People don't complain as much. They are more willing to work together. There's a new spirit around the place."

There is no secret to these kind of happenings. All it took at CDoA was a means by which every employee was welcome to contribute to the strategic plan. Then senior management, relying on that input, was able to not only ensure that the quality of programs improved, but that employees could readily identify with the management' suggestions and be more willing to assist in implementing them. In the process a new kind of open corporate culture is developing at CDoA. Fragile? Yes, but the compassionate interaction growing within the department has already had a positive effect on the more caring ways CDoA actually treats its customers, the senior citizens of the Chicago.

CDoA illustrates one way to energize the roles of public servants. It is very cost effective to have facilitators to design such planning occasions. This approach is also more effective than hiring high-priced management consultants to come in, analyze the situation in isolation, and then write a report that sits on the commissioner's shelf. One has to wonder why organizations would spend meager tax dollars on an outside consultant when there are already thousands of ready consultants at hand waiting to have their experience affirmed, implement changes they design, and release their rediscovered energies into serving citizens better.

As these stories and the rest of the case studies show, when the employees are engaged in the planning process on the topics that affect their jobs and when they are genuinely asked to participate on an equal basis, something akin to a "mind-shift" occurs. This does not happen without top management's support. Top the people in charge must give their blessing to authentic employee involvement, not just tacit consent. This will require a new type of leader - one who will seize today's new way of doing the business of government. For public sector leaders to reinvent their units of government, they must "reinvent themselves." Dedicated public servants are not merely a "cost." They represent an investment, and if leaders want to make long term improvements in their organizations, they will wisely make long term investments in their people.

As our case studies will demonstrate, managers create boundaries, walk them, and create a "safe space" to allow employee participation to take root. Providing time for training and planning, is not a luxury but an integral way of life in an organization. Wise leaders know the important role of training seen as an investment in the human factor; people come first.

Turn to see how change agents emerged at a state university, a city truly invests in its workforce, a federal agency becomes o prototype of service, and labor and management cooperate to solve municipal problems together.

References

[1] The story of Joan and OSHA is retold from a White House transcript of a ceremony on the occasion of the six-month report of the National Performance Review.

[2] *Governing*, February 1994, page 59.

[3] Results were reported in their February 1994 issue, page 60.

FACILITATING COLLABORATION
The New Business of Government

Collaboration is a mutually beneficial and well-defined relationship entered into by two or more organizations to achieve common goals.... The relationships include a commitment to: mutual relationships and goals; a jointly developed structure and shared responsibility; mutual authority and accountability for success; and sharing of resources and rewards." From Mattessich and Monsey, Collaboration: What Makes It Work, (St. Paul, Minnesota: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation), 1992)

It takes a whole village to raise a single child.
An African Proverb

Networks, coalitions, alliances, partnerships, collaboration. Buzzwords to be sure, but their increased use in our vocabulary of government - and in all walks of life - point to a new way of organizing the political landscape. This new approach vests our public institutions with confidence and the capacity to reform themselves, so that they can fulfill their missions. Part of the reason for this is the growing awareness that we live in an integrated world. Everything we do affects the whole. This new science of organizations is beginning to permeate how we think about getting things done.

The real stories of collaboration are still being written. While this section of our text focuses on preliminary attempts, it points to the future, and begins to predict how our public institutions of tomorrow will look and act. The difficulty is that we are trying to build the bike while learning to ride it.

Actually, government has used collaboration for many years, but has not necessarily called it by that name. In a commentary in the December, 1993, issue of *Governing* magazine, Steven Ratgreb and Michael Lipsky, point out:

Prior to the 1960's, social services consisted of private charities on the one hand and, on the other, a few government agencies that provided services, usually through large, impersonal institutions such as training schools for youth and mental hospitals. After 30

years of extensive contracting with nonprofit organizations to provide key social services, American governments have made these organizations hidden partners. From prenatal clinics to home health care for the elderly, 65,000 nonprofit service organizations currently serve American from cradle to grave. As such they are subject to government demands regarding regulations, minimum requirements."[1]

While the idea of using this network of nonprofits works well, a problem persists: the government unwittingly intervenes too much in determining how these "ear to the ground" groups deliver their services. Presumably, accountability is the reason. For example, instead of allowing competent lay leaders to serve in a shelter for battered women, the government contract requires the shelter to replace them with professional social workers. Of course, some argue that it is warranted to challenge the lay person to become certified, gain additional training, and learn valuable new career skills. Such advancement will produce more effective care. But when this argument gets carried too far, no one is served.

A Vision Beyond the Present

Therefore, establishing common ground where partnerships of service can flourish is the most important step in the collaborative process. There must be a shared vision that everyone "builds" together. If there is no shared vision, then no one will own its implementation. No one can create a vision for someone else; each partner has to be part of the visioning process. That is why key partners gather together around a table and allow a facilitator to guide them through a process that generates a shared vision of their common future. This is also the reason the role of the facilitator who has experience in guiding this kind of vision session has become important.

Because there is an increasing awareness for the need to deal with problems of government and society at large from a holistic perspective, many groups and organizations are stretching themselves to think beyond their boundaries. They are attempting to form alliances with other groups who can help them fulfill their charge. This necessity has given rise in recent years to all kinds of coalitions, partnerships, and strategic alliances.

Healthy Communities

An important example of the partnership approach is the worldwide Healthy Communities movement that developed out of a renewed understanding of the relationship between the health and well-being of a community and the decisions and responsibilities of local government. The World Health Organization (WHO) is sponsoring Healthy Community initiatives around the world. The Canadian Healthy Communities Project, established in 1987, has been the catalyst for the development of over 200 local Healthy Community projects across that country.

Dr. Trevor Hancock, a public health consultant for the WHO and one of the architects of the Healthy Communities movement, says:

It is customary to equate health with doctors, hospital and the health care system, but in the past ten or fifteen years, we have come to recognize, or rather to relearn, that a community needs much more than a good health care system to be truly healthy.... Ultimately, a community's health will only improve if the community itself, through its members, increases its control over the determinants and prerequisites of its own health. [2]

Healthy Community Projects are based on three strategies:

1) fostering public participation;
2) strengthening community health services; and,
3) co-coordinating healthy public policy.

Each community assesses its own situation, proposes strategies for action, and implements its own solutions.

The Healthy Communities movement is designed to encourage and support collaborative efforts of neighborhood groups, social issues groups, business, community services, civic government, and others. In so doing, it creates a framework for community decision making that ensures public policies contribute to the quality of life in a community. It is also stresses building on and celebrating the strengths of all parts of a community.

An example of the Healthy Communities approach appears as one of our case studies, the story from Escondido, California, and its Youth Empowerment Project (Chapter 19). Stories such as these illustrate a primary collaboration: wedding the new image of the citizen as responsible change agent and of government to the new image of the public servant as the facilitator/collaborator who is the broker of resources.

Community Policing

Another new form of collaboration is "community policing," the concept of getting police officers out of the cruisers and back on foot patrol so that they can become more familiar and "user-friendly" to the citizens they serve. In this way, police officers work more closely with the network of community associations in a given patrol area.

This community policing strategy is emerging as the center piece in the national war on crime. Several large cities have pronounced it a winning workable solution. One of those is Portland, Oregon. A city of 470,000, Portland has one of the lowest police per population: 1.9 police offices to every 1,000 citizens.

One key to Portland's success is its holistic approach of marshalling neighborhood residents in the battle against crime. During the program's first four years in operation, Portland's crime rate dropped. Police respond more quickly to emergency calls, and residents say they are satisfied with the performance of the police and feel more secure. Portland's Community Policing program trains police officers to be enterprising problem solvers who prevent crime, not just report it, through such initiatives as carrying blue pocketbooks stuffed with information about the city's social service agencies. [3]

When city officials assess what makes community policing work for Portland, they cite several factors, including the addition of nearly 200 officers. Another reason is that the program was implemented throughout the entire police department, not just in special police units or districts. While not pronouncing the program a complete success, city officials in Portland are very pleased with the results.

"Policing in this country is most effective with people who want to be policed," says Police Chief Charles Moose, who, with his wife, bought and moved into a house in one of the city's toughest neighborhoods as a sign of their faith in community policing's approach. One problem Portland has had in implementing the program - a problem which has been reported in other cities where community policing is being implemented - is that not enough police officers have bought into it yet. It will take time for this new image and role of the community police officer to take root

before the program wins full support.

Over the Bureaucratic Boundaries

A critical place where collaboration in government is needed - and in a few cases is - lies between the different layers of government itself. The myriad number of federal programs and how local governments have to wind their way through the labyrinth of complex rules and regulations is a serious detriment to delivering quality services to local citizens. To avoid these mazes, some state governments have come with innovative approaches:

+The Texas Dept. of Human Services took the 14 separate federal programs for the 22 different children and family eligibility groups and designed a single enrollment form.

+West Virginia merged all of the state's federal funding for children and families into one pool focused on improving their health and well-being, thus avoiding the current mismatch between federal money and the real needs of low income families.

Being called "joint powers agreements," or "inter-agency contracts," the main cry from state and local governments is for greater flexibility. One role for the federal government is helping state and local governments build the capacity to pursue street-level discussion and to fashion goals developed at the grassroots level. Such a role would fit well with another potential function for the federal government: acting as a conduit for communication among states and localities and evaluating innovative programs in the field for possible replication elsewhere.

Collaboration Experiments

In San Diego

Regional cooperation among municipalities is another arena where collaboration is being experimented. San Diego County, California, is region place working on the forging new relationships between its various local government agencies and its network of nonprofit organizations.

Faced with yet another year of a sizable state deficit and subsequent downsizing of budgets in the regional government, David Janssen, Chief Administrative Officer, approached the executives of

the not-for-profit corporations providing services to the population of over 2,800,000 citizens residing in the eighteen cities, neighborhoods, and unincorporated areas of the County. His questions to them were:
"How can we streamline costs, maintain quality service without losing our committed staff? What new ideas in cooperative initiatives, coalitions and collaboration could we jointly employ?

What services and activities are the County currently providing that the community based system could provide more effectively and efficiently?"

Receiving a better reception than he anticipated, Janssen continued to provide a format that allowed the groups to meet. Soon, however, it became evident that the two groups of "partners" needed to build a common language, create guiding principles, and work out mutual agreements on the administrative requirements of a genuine, community partnership. So, in March of 1993, 30 public officials and 30 community leaders spent a two-day retreat to create a new way of doing business together. The object was to leave all preconceived ideas at the door and come up with a new community service model.

The retreat began by discussing the book, *Reinventing Government*. Taking this perspective helped set the tone for innovation. Then everyone turned to designing the partnership system itself. Retreat participants received all suggestions and recorded repetitive and key ideas. Slowly, over a series of follow-up meetings, a new kind of partnership model was conceived.

One year later, Janssen reconvened the group to see what had happened with their plan. A one-year birthday party was held on March 3rd, 1994, and many successes were celebrated. On balance, participants are both encouraged and discouraged and one person said in a sober tone, "Let us hope we don't burn out due to collaboration."

CAO Janssen said a few months into the collaboration's second year,
Government organization as we have known it is simply not working. Resources that once were available are no longer. It is critical that government adopt a new paradigm of thinking, of being, of acting. We have begun this collaborative undertaking in San Diego with out community partners and expect that it will take years to implement.

In Chicago

Many feel that collaborative approaches hold special promise for the life of the city. For example, in Chicago, in response to the growing numbers of citywide and neighborhood-based collaborative efforts, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and the Donors Forum of Chicago undertook a study to learn how the collaborative process works. [4] They identified 14 citywide and 17 neighborhood collaborations that all shared three characteristics:

Active and inclusive democracy;
Consensus-driven, achievable action plans; and
Capacity-building for community development and policy impact.

In-depth interviews with the practitioners of these 31 demonstrations revealed that because collaboration is a human endeavor, it can be a messy affair. Researchers also discovered some misconceptions about the use of collaboration: It is not true that collaboration is always more efficient; it is not true that collaboration always saves money; and it is not true that collaboration is the only way to go all the time. Nonetheless, they identified five important understandings among those that emerged as members of each collaboration worked together:

1. Establish a common vision.
2. Recognize the need to collaborate.
3. Define the focus and criteria for action.
4. Establish and act through the collaboration.
5. Evaluate and transform the collaboration.

Chicago's Mozart Park is a case in point illustrating a companion study of collaborations in government. [5] There researchers learned that collaboration is not an abstraction, but an action performed in the trenches of the efforts to preserve the quality of community life. They found the neighborhood surrounding Mozart Park is primarily Puerto Rican, but that Park Supervisor John Duda is Polish. Because Poles once comprised the major ethnic group in the area, the situation had all the ingredients for a classic confrontation between the past and the present. Yet, Duda has not only survived 11 areas as supervisor, he has made Mozart Park one of the city's most innovative.

Unlike most other city parks, Mozart has instructional programs in parenting, health, and English

as a Second language. The park staff runs drama, art and other cultural enrichment programs, as well as several sports leagues. And sometimes there are such events as a Paint-a-Thon which 1,000 volunteers gathered and painted the homes of 100 senior citizens.

Duda accomplishes his tasks by intentionally working with the local businesses, nonprofit groups, churches and city agencies - 40 all together - on a regular basis. Sixty-five percent of his projects are collaborations. Fondly referred to as John "Zippety-Duda," he has succeeded where many others flounder. Learning Spanish helped. Living in the area that he serves helps. So does spending 14 hours a day on the job, along with dropping in on weekends while the park is open. Duda keeps six directories of business cards he has collected over the years and calls his key contacts regularly to keep in touch. "If you do good social marketing the park will run itself, given the staff, space, and program."

Of course with success comes criticism. In Duda's case it involved the way he deals with the local gangs. When Duda allowed the gangs to come into the parks on his terms, tensions mounted among some older community residents. Duda describes the situation this way:

> *We work with all the gangs. That is why there is no graffiti here. So part of the tension is that gang members hang out here. But they are part of the community. So the community has to make a choice. Do you want them here, or, do you want them around the corner where no one can see what they are doing?*

Duda has a chance to spread his message. He was reassigned to another park in mid 1994.

In Idaho

Another place where collaboration seems to be working is in Island Park, Idaho, where irrigators and conservationists battled angrily from the early 1980's until 1993, disputing water quality in the Henry's Fork of the Snake River, one of the country's premier trout streams. [6] Through all the tumult, conservationists won a couple of limited victories, but failed to arrest the decline of the fishery. "We felt that there had to be a better way," said Jan Brown, a longtime resident and environmentalist . Brown heads the Henry's Fork Foundation which represents fly-fishermen. But it is now cooperating with its former adversary, the Fremont-Madison Irrigation District, which represents potato and grain framers. As of October, 1993, the two organizations began to "co-facilitate" the state chartered Henry's Fork Watershed Council.

While the council accomplished no miracles in its early stages, Brown and her counterpart, Dale Swensen of the irrigation district, are optimistic. They feel the council can improve both and quality of Henry's Fork and the civility of eastern Idaho. "We've had dinners together," Brown said. "We're on parallel tracks. Our people have learned that they aren't Neanderthals, and they've seen that not all environmentalists wear ponytails." Swensen agreed: "As we talk to one another, we find that we have more common ground that what we thought we had."

In Ohio

This same spirit of collaboration is manifest in other walks of life as well, such as life at the Wraparound Services at Huckleberry House in Columbus, Ohio. Modeled after similar programs in Alaska and Vermont, Wraparound Services provides highly individualized services to troubled youth and family. Its approach requires a fundamental shift in our vision we have of serving the needs of families. It is a process that gives both the youth and family a voice, access to, and ownership of, the interventions and outcomes. Wraparound Services wraps the resources of the community around the youth, based on what they need. It is a matter of "seeing" the world through the young person's eyes as best as possible.

Sheryl Nordin-Caruso, Executive Director of Alternatives for Children and Teens (A.C.T.) in Columbus, Ohio, which oversees the "Wraparound" projects in several private agencies in Central Ohio, says:

It's clear to me when programs are owned by the people they're serving, the success rate is much greater. Building on the strengths of a family and community, rather than looking for the limitations, allows creativity and hope to emerge. Participation by each member of the child's system is the key element to a positive outcome.

A Government By the People

Is collaboration the new business of government? We think it is. The stories in our anthology point to the kind of success that happens when local groups and government agencies come together to form a level playing field and solve social problems together. Some collaborative efforts involving community groups and public sector agencies represent a form of "counter

government." Local residents are taking the initiative and using the resources available to them from their own governmental agencies.

As a result, programs and policies are being shaped outside the mainstream of the traditional government activities. Gradually these activities create a change process within government itself. They represent an "in but not of" tradition of public service, giving rise to a new sense of hope for the future. In these collaborations, the citizen regains the role as the primary owner and user of government. At the same time, the role of the public servant is transformed from "solver of all problems" to "resource-provider," enabling local citizens themselves to be the change agents of their own destiny. The role of the public servant then becomes akin to a midwife - enabling and supporting but not causing. Ultimately, our government is a government by the people. Before people learned to collaborate, mediation meant confrontation followed by compromise. But as we have come to learn, frequently compromise is the fastest way to achieve something neither party really wants.

In the case studies that follow we provide five stories of how local citizens and government agencies are working together in new ways to solve some of society's most serious issues: how to deal with the environment, child care, health care delivery, gangs, and mental illness. We hope the readers see in them how the new role of the public servant as resource linkage broker and a new sense of civic responsibility on the part of the local people themselves come together in a new model of government that works.

References

[1] Smith, Steven Ratgreb and Michael Lipsky, "Commentary" *Governing*, V. 7, No. 3, December, 1993, pg. 10-11.

[2] "The Healthy Cities Project," *Edges*, V. 3, no. 4, March, 1991, pg. 34.

[3] Dellios, Hugh. "Residents Like New Approach," *Chicago Tribune*, Feb. 25, 1994, p. 1.

[4] Lloyd, Susan. Collaborating for Change in Chicago, A Progress Report on The

Collaboration Project, 1993.

[5] As of the publication of this book, the study mentioned had not been published nor titled. It will be co-published by the MacArthur Foundation and the Government Assistance Project of the DePaul University Egan Urban Center.

[6] "Virtues of mediation changing old politics," *Chicago Tribune*, May 14, 1994, pg. 1.

GOVERNMENT WORKS:
PROFILES OF PEOPLE MAKING A DIFFERENCE
James P. Troxel, General Editor
A Miles River Press Professional Book

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	New Vision of Public Service	Elizabeth L. Hollander
Chapter 2	Making Government Work: An Insider's View	An Interview with Carolyn J. Lukensmeyer
SECTION I	**CITIZENS TAKING INITIATIVE** **Rebuilding from the Bottom-Up**	
Chapter 3 Arizona	Winds of Change in the Valley of the Sun The Phoenix Futures Forum	Shirley Heckman & Tammy Bosse
Chapter 4 Massachusetts	The Young Men of Dulie's Dory The Gloucester Prevention Network	Philip L. Salzman, Carol R. Coles, & Kathryn Roberts
Chapter 5 Wisconsin	Hope Takes Root Racine 2000	Brenda Walsh, O.P. & Helen Peddle, O.P.
Chapter 6 California	The Gnatcatcher Battle Competing Interests in Three California Counties	Douglas Wilson
SECTION II	**ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN GOVERNMENT** **Putting the Citizen Customer First**	
Chapter 7 Minnesota	Building Habit of Transformation Minnesota State Government	Sue Laxdal & Mirja Hanson
Chapter 8 Illinois	Why Do We Do It This Way? Chicago's Models of Excellence	Catherine A. Rategan & Kenneth O'Hare
Chapter 9 California	Reshaping a Judicial System Sacramento County Courts	Heidi Kolbe
Chapter 10 Montana	Tribal Nation Building Ft. Peck Assiniboine & Sioux Tribes	Kim Epley & Jackie Miller
Chapter 11 Utah	The Quality Flag Flies Proudly Internal Revenue Service: Ogden	Betty Katz & Nancy Sandals

SECTION III **EMPOWERING EMPLOYEES**
Recovering the Role of Public Servant

Chapter 12 Indiana	Change Agents in Purdue University Libraries Purdue University	Nancy Hewison & Donald O. Bushman
Chapter 13 Texas	Back to the Basics: A City Invests in its Workforce Austin	Beret Griffith
Chapter 14 Colorado	The FDA as Maze and Model Food and Drug Administration: Denver	David Dunn
Chapter 15 Florida	Labor Management Partnerships Miami's Municipal Union Committees	Ellie Haydock

SECTION IV **FACILITATING COLLABORATION**
Managing Competing Interests

Chapter 16 Louisiana	Rallying to Save the Wetlands Barataria-Terrebonne Estuary Program	Jean Watts w/ Kirk Cheramie
Chapter 17 Oregon	Do It for the Kids: Collaboration Works State Office of Child Care	Sandra True & Janis Elliot
Chapter 18 Mississippi	Handing Over Not Handing Out Partners for Improved Nutrition & Health	Michelle Bressler & Teresa Lingafelter
Chapter 19 California	Turning Neighborhood Energy Right Side Up Escondido	John Burbidge
Chapter 20 New York	Empowering Disempowered Patients State Mental Health Association	Ike Powell & Ed Knight, Ph.D.

Afterword Barbara Roberts, Former Governor of Oregon