

**High Performance Partnerships (HiPP) Project
Dakota County, Minnesota
Best Practices/Literature Review**

**Submitted by Pepin Hugunin & Associates
March 8, 2004**

**High Performance Partnerships (HiPP) Project
Best Practices/Literature Review
Contents**

Introduction	3
Analysis	4
Scoping	4
Opportunities for Collaboration by Service Area	8
Criteria/Models for Evaluation of Opportunities	13
Appendix A: Bibliographical Essay	18
Academic Studies	18
Association of Minnesota Counties	24
(Other) Association Sources	25
Foundation/Non-Profit Reports	36
Government Reports (not Minnesota)	45
Minnesota Government Reports	50
Miscellaneous Reports	58
Appendix B: Consolidated Bibliography	60
Appendix C: Collaboration Resource List (Amherst H. Wilder Foundation Publishing Center)	66
Appendix D: LMC Survey Results on Local Government Cooperative Efforts	81
Appendix E: What Alternative Delivery Strategies are Right for Your City (League of Minnesota Cities)	--
Appendix F: Examples of Intergovernmental Collaborative Agreements in Dakota County	--

Introduction

As a part of the Dakota County High Performance Partnerships (HiPP) project, a review of published research concerning local government collaboration was conducted. Like the project as a whole, the primary goals of the Literature Review are two.

- Identify a wide range of opportunities for local government collaboration and partnerships for consideration in this project, and
- Identify criteria and/or models for the evaluation of those opportunities.

A need also was found very early in this project to clearly define its scope. Government collaboration “is a huge domain,” as one of our respondents said, and as our Literature Review and other activities confirmed. So, in conducting this review, we also considered various typologies that might be helpful in defining our scope of work.

This analysis will address these three key topics in turn, beginning with the scoping issues. It is not generally the purpose of this Literature Review to resolve issues, but rather to define and frame alternatives. However, a certain degree of project definition has already occurred, specifically in the area of scoping, and where such decisions clearly have been made they will be indicated in this analysis.

This Literature Review consists of the analysis in these three areas, followed by a series of Appendices:

- Appendix A is a bibliographical essay, which provides a brief summary of each of the 63 sources that have been consulted.
- Appendix B is a consolidated listing of the 63 documents included in this review.
- Appendix C is an extensive bibliography of additional sources on collaboration and partnership published by the Amherst H. Wilder Foundation on its Web site.
- Appendix D is a complete list of 1,682 local government partnerships in place throughout Minnesota, as identified in a survey by the League of Minnesota Cities. The printed summary in the appendix consists of only two fields of data out of 30, however. The complete file provides the participants, the age of the partnership, as well as other data.
- Appendix E is a segment of the League of Minnesota Cities’ document, “Resource Guide for Dealing with Budget Cuts: Strategies for Cities,” titled “What Alternative Delivery Strategies are Right for Your City? Issues to Consider.”
- Appendix F is an extensive list of intergovernmental agreements already in place in Dakota County.

All other documents cited in this Literature Review are on file at Pepin Hugunin & Associates and are available upon request.

Analysis

Scoping

1. Various different partnerships or collaborations are defined and differentiated on a variety of parameters. The most basic typology (see sources 3 and 10, pp. 18-19, for more information) is defined by who the partners or collaborators are:

- Public-public
- Public-private
- Public-nonprofit

There are, of course, various types within each category, such as federal-state, state-county, county-county, county-city, city-city and other configurations just within the public-public category. In addition, other sources (especially 31, 40, 42, 43; pp. 36-37, 40-41) explore so-called “Three-Sector Partnerships” among government, business and nonprofits.

For purposes of this project, the scope will be limited to services for which the responsibility and accountability clearly rests with parties to this process. That is, not only is the focus on public-public partnerships, but on those among and between Dakota County and the cities located within the county.

2. A second useful typology characterizes partnerships according to the complexity of problems they are meant to address. First, the Pew Partnership offers this (37, page 37):

“• Type I problems are those that have an obvious definition, a clear solution, and the burden of responsibility lies with one person or a small group.

“• Type II problems can usually be defined with some clarity, but the solution is unclear. They require traditional leaders and stakeholders to work toward the solution.

“• Type III problems are those issues whose definition and solution are unclear, and they require by definition that those affected do the work toward the solution.”

Karen Ray suggests a similar distinction in *The Nimble Collaborative* (41, p. 43):

• Collaborate to integrate services. “Collaborations to integrate services occur most frequently in education, housing, health care, recreation, the arts, law enforcement and social services.... Collaborations to integrate services redesign the way work is done....”

- Collaborate to resolve complex issues. “Some collaborations focus on multiple approaches to address complex community issues. Promoting sustainable agriculture, eliminating drug addiction, or increasing kids’ exposure to the arts in school are the missions of complex collaboratives.... The reason for multiple approaches is that such problems and visions cannot be achieved without many changes across many systems....

Project leadership has indicated a preference for addressing issues that the county and/or cities are already addressing, and for which they have clear responsibility. These might be characterized as Type I problems or opportunities. Emerging issues which the cities and/or county are not already addressing or which could be addressed at a higher level of intensity, might be characterized as Type II or Type III issues. These have not been ruled out.

3. Several sources have developed a continuum of partnerships or collaborations based on the “intensity” of the relationship. Here are three, each showing the highest degree of partnership at the top. Further details of each of these typologies are included in Appendix A.

Table 1: Types of Partnerships

Sources*	Hubbard (2), pp. 18-20, and Wilder (33, 41), pp. 41-42	NAPA (25), pp. 29-32	PSG (49), pp. 58-59
Types of Partnerships (Highest level of commitment to lowest)	Collaboration Coordination Cooperation	<i>High Performance Partnership</i> Partnership Collaboration Contract Cooperative	Consolidate Pool Share Coordinate Exchange

* The page numbers for each source refer to the page number in this review where the source is discussed.

It is tempting to endorse the NAPA typology (25) because the name of this project, High Performance Partnerships (HiPP), comes from it. However, the Hubbard typology (2) is preferred as it comes with a more detailed explanation, a clearer differentiation between the various categories, and therefore more utility as a model to assist in decision-making and evaluation.

For example, several alternative typologies posit a continuum of relationships based on one single variable. Hubbard distinguishes two important variables that help to define the “intensity” of a partnership or collaboration:

- **Power Sharing.** “The degree of power sharing indicates to what extent each partner has a voice in setting the agenda. In some partnerships, for example, all products are jointly produced and reflect the involvement of all partners. In other partnerships, one agency takes the lead...while others only provide occasional assistance.”
- **Resource Involvement.** “The degree of resource involvement suggests the magnitude of resources an agency commits to a partnership.”

Table 2: Nine Types of Intergovernmental Partnerships

Cooperating Using resources to assist other agencies	Coordinating Organizing or combining resources to more effectively reach a mutual goal	Collaborating Collectively applying resources toward problems that lack clear ownership
Contributing Resources Agencies contribute resources to another agency’s project or effort. <i>Primary goal:</i> Help a worthy cause	Reconciling Activities Agencies adjust or combine existing programs (on-going) in order to deliver services more effectively. <i>Primary goal:</i> Improve programs	Sharing Program Responsibilities Agencies come together as a new entity to provide services or manage a resource. <i>Primary goal:</i> Meet a need that can only be addressed by working together
Promoting Others Agencies willingly share information about the work or services of others. <i>Primary goal:</i> Meet the needs of a shared constituency	Sharing Resources Agencies that use the same good or service agree to share in its cost. <i>Primary goal:</i> Save money	Creating New Systems or Programs Agencies work to create and implement a new model to deliver services or address a public problem. <i>Primary goal:</i> Develop a new means of responding to public problems
Sharing Information Agencies share information on a formal or informal basis. <i>Primary goal:</i> Improve performance by keeping informed	Producing Joint Projects Agencies depend (short-term) upon each other for producing a specific event or product. <i>Primary goal:</i> Produce an outcome that no agency could achieve on its own	Collective Planning Agencies develop a collective vision for the management of a resource or alleviation of a social problem. <i>Primary goal:</i> Promote a collective vision.

From Betsy Hubbard, *Making Sense of Public Service Partnerships: Understanding the Why and How of Interagency Efforts* (2), see also pp. 18-20

A higher degree of power sharing is implied as one moves from left to right along the x-axis, while a higher degree of resource involvement is implied by moving from bottom to top along the y-axis. Additional details are discussed on pages 8-11 of this document. Further, the Hubbard typology is also more consistent with the consensus among the models reviewed in that it reserves the term “collaboration” for the most intensive of relationships. NAPA’s use of the term “partnership” to describe the most intensive relationship is somewhat out of step with that consensus.

The Hubbard typology may be used, then, to clarify the types of actions that Dakota County and/or the cities may wish to take to partner with other units of local government. At the very lowest level of collaboration (lowest resource involvement and lowest power sharing represented in the cell at the lower left), for example, are the county and/or cities willing to share information with their partners? At the very highest level (highest resource involvement and highest power sharing represented in the cell at the upper right), are they willing to entertain opportunities which might require the creation of a new entity with (potentially) a separate budget and/or staff? In between these extremes, are they willing to jointly purchase and/or jointly own goods or facilities? Are they willing to share the control of resources and accountability for outcomes? And so on.

While we prefer the Hubbard typology, the NAPA definition of a high performance partnership is useful. We would apply it without hesitation to what Hubbard calls a collaboration: It is “a mutually beneficial and reciprocal relationship among entities that share responsibilities, authority and accountability for results.”

At the present time, we understand the parties to this project to be open to recommendations that entail relationships anywhere along this continuum from less intensive to more intensive partnerships.

4. As a technical matter, too, partnerships among local government are also defined by statute as joint powers agreements, joint agreements, mutual aid agreements or service contracts (21, 23; page 24).

A Wisconsin study of partnership opportunities in the area of street and road maintenance describes the types of collaborations a little differently as including joint ownership, group purchasing and resource-sharing (renting, contracting, etc.).

At the present time, we also understand that the parties to this project are open to any of the various types of formal relationships available to them under Minnesota Statutes.

5. Finally, local governments may choose to privatize—that is, to enter into service contracts with private or not-for-profit firms—selected services.

This process will consider opportunities for privatization, but the primary focus of this study remains in the area of public-public collaboration among Dakota County and the cities located within the county.

Opportunities for Collaboration by Service Area

The 63 reports reviewed were selected for their relevance to the subject of local government collaboration and to represent a range of perspectives on the subject. Yet the central theme or thrust of the reports taken as a whole is one of “environmental change” necessitating government “innovation.” It is also true, however, that many if not most of the “innovations” described in these 63 reports involve some type of collaboration.

It is also true that these 63 reports describe and/or suggest hundreds if not thousands of opportunities for collaboration. We obviously cannot list all of them here, but we can suggest how the information in these reports might be used to create and/or enrich the work of this project.

Specifically, the literature suggests broad categories of local government services and activities. As a first cut at the opportunities for collaboration, we would hope to identify broad categories of services and activities for further analysis. We would then return to the literature to compile more complete lists in those categories.

Tables 3 and 4 provide that first cut. Table 3 shows two separate surveys of the frequency of collaborations already in existence among local governments in Minnesota.

Table 3: Leading Categories of Local Government Collaboration

Local Government Partnerships, MN, 1992*		Local Government Partnerships, MN, 2003**	
Police/Law Enforcement	19%	Police	17.4%
Parks and Recreation	15%	Parks and Recreation	15.8%
Fire Services	13%	General	
General Government/ Administration	12%	(Planning, Purchasing, etc.)	14.6%
Sanitation	11%	Sanitation	7.5%
Economic Development/ Housing	6%	(Water, Sewer, Garbage, Recycling)	
Streets and Highways	5%	Streets	7.3%
Health	5%	Fire	5.6%

* Courtesy League of Minnesota Cities (23), see also Table 19, p. 33

** Courtesy, League of Minnesota Cities (19), see also Table 18, p. 32

Table 4 shows the results of two national surveys that measure the importance of various issues among public officials.

Table 4: Key Categories of Local Government Services

Increasing Demand, 2003*		Priority Issues, 2001**	
Jails and Correctional Institutions	60%	Illegal drugs	2.91
Sheriff	56%	Affordable health care	2.90
Courts	40%	Affordable housing	2.89
Public Safety	39%	Not enough jobs at living wage	2.79
Information Technology	33%	Teen pregnancies	2.76
Public Health	33%	Affordable child care	2.67
Family and Human Services	32%	Public transportation	2.64
Economic Development	32%	Unsupervised children and teens	2.64
Highway/Street Maintenance	31%	Affordable care for elderly	2.53
Highway/Street Construction	28%	City streets/buildings need repair	2.52
911 Emergency	27%		
Parks and Recreation	26%		
Healthcare	25%		
Emergency Medical Services	24%		
Schools	23%		
Homeland Security	23%		
Medicaid	20%		

* Courtesy National Association of Counties (17), see also Table 14, p. 27

** Courtesy Pew Partnership for Civic Change (38), see also Table 20, p. 38

1. If as a result of this first level of analysis, **law enforcement and the criminal justice system** should be identified as a focus for further study, the Literature Review can provide a range of examples of local government collaboration in these areas.

- The LMC analysis (19, p. 32 and Appendix D) of 1,682 local government collaborations includes 265 examples of partnerships in the area of law enforcement, plus 27 examples of collaboration between police and fire departments, and 43 additional examples under the headings of dispatch, rescue and emergency, some of which may be relevant to the law enforcement area. Many are joint police departments and police service contracts, but others represent a variety of more specialized agreements.

- The Office of the Legislative Auditor (61, pp. 50-52) has provided a list of topics which have been considered for Best Practices Reviews, and several of these topics address criminal justice, the courts and public safety. Unlike the LMC report, these are not necessarily selected as opportunities for collaboration—nor even areas of significant innovation—though many or most may suggest or provide such opportunities. See Table 5 (over).

Table 5: Topics Suggested for Best Practices Reviews (partial)

<p>Criminal Justice and Courts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed circuit video instead of transporting people for arraignments • <u>Administrative enforcement of city codes and ordinances</u> • Community corrections and probation services • Enforcement of DWI laws • Handling cases of domestic assault • Public defenders and their relationships with prosecutors/judiciary • Victim advocacy programs
<p>Public Safety</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Paying for ambulance services re. changes to Medicare reimbursement</u> • Controlling the number of peace officer court appearances • Emergency medical services • Fire fighter pensions • Management of crime labs • Nonemergency police efforts such as investigations, patrols, special (e.g SWAT) teams, police/sheriff jurisdictional issues

From Memoranda, Jody A. Hauer, Coordinator, Best Practices Reviews, to Local Government Advisory Council, Best Practices Reviews, “Topic Suggestions for Best Practices Reviews” (61), see pp. 50-52 for details

- A list of “Innovations: Bright Ideas in Local Government” compiled by the Board of Government Innovation and Cooperation (BGIC) in 1999 (48, pp. 54-56) includes 40 examples in the areas of adult and juvenile justice and public safety. The twelve examples in the field of public safety show cooperation between law enforcement agencies (city-county and city-city) whether for routine or emergency services, consolidated dispatch service and community policing.

- Finally, the list of intergovernmental collaborative agreements already in force in Dakota County (49, Appendix F) includes a number of examples in the areas of law enforcement, police and public safety. Dakota County lists twelve such agreements, Burnsville nine, Lakeville 25, Mendota Heights two and Rosemount five. Any or all of these agreements may serve as models for partnerships involving other communities.

Considering the large number of collaborative agreements already in place in law enforcement and public safety—and referring back to the second set of typologies shown on page 3—further opportunities might be expected to be Type I opportunities and/or opportunities to integrate services.

2. A quick review of Table 3 suggests, secondly, a variety of **public health, health care and human services** issues as a possible focus for collaboration in Dakota County. But while local government collaboration is already commonplace in the law enforcement field, this is not true (at least according to the LMC) in the area of health care. Rather, health and human services issues rank highly for “increasing demand” and as “priority issues.” At least some of these opportunities might be characterized as Type II issues and/or opportunities to collaborate to solve complex problems.

Of course, we also recognize that municipalities do not have broad mandates for activity in these areas, while counties do. In any event, if public health, and health care is selected as a focus, the following more specific activities are suggested by our review.

- The LMC survey (19, p. 32 and Appendix F) reports 45 examples of local government collaboration in the areas of public health and/or health care. For example, 14 cities collaborate to provide a range of services through the Northwest Hennepin Human Services Council.
- The BGIC report (48, p. 54-56) combines health and human services, and lists 19 such “innovations.” They range from a collaboration of Faribault and Martin Counties for a fully integrated delivery system for a range of health and human services, to efforts that focus on a single issue—for example, a Families in Crisis collaborative between St. Paul and Ramsey County which addresses issues leading to homelessness.
- Dakota County lists (49, Appendix F) seven areas in which it already participates in collaborative agreements in the area of health. The five Dakota County cities that submitted examples to this list did not include any such examples.

The range and complexity of public health, health care and human services issues, and the public demand for innovation, is clear. So the area is worthy of further consideration.

3. As a third example, **general government/administration** is an area in which numerous partnerships are reported by the LMC (19, page 32 and Appendix F). The NaCo report (19, p. 26) also lists **information technology** as an area of increasing demand. Additional reports that focus our attention on information technology include the various reports of the Center for Technology in Government (3,10; p. 18-19), the West report (12, p. 22) and the Citizen’s League report (29, pp. 40-41).

Table 6: Top Online Urban Services, 2002

Request Service	346	22.1%
Request Information	287	18.3%
Pay Traffic Ticket	248	15.8%
File Complaint	180	11.5%
Apply for Job	167	10.7%
Register for Service	131	8.4%
Pay Taxes	112	7.3%
Request Information	98	6.3%
Report Crime	71	4.5%
Report Abandoned Auto	70	4.5%

From Darrell M. West, Center for Public Policy, Brown University, *Urban E-Government, 2002* (12), p. 12

- The BGIC report (48, p. 54-56) provides ten examples of innovation in the area of “technology improving public service outcomes.”

- The LMC survey (19, p. 32 and Appendix D) lists 245 examples of local government collaboration in the area of general government. These partnerships represent a very wide range of activities, though few appear to be in the area of information technology.
- Dakota County lists (49, Appendix F) three partnerships in the area of information technology and Lakeville two, while the other four cities represented on the list do not show any partnerships in this area.
- The OLA has prepared Best Practices Reviews concerning the maintenance of computer systems (53, p. 54) and E-government (54, p. 53), which note that all Minnesota counties belong to one of three computer collaboratives. There is also a city-oriented collaborative. There are no recommendations of local government partnerships for information technology.

The discussion above might be referred to as a categorical approach to identifying opportunities for collaboration. The Literature Review also allows us to review **case histories** of studies analogous to this one. We have located four such studies.

Table 7: Local Government Collaborations Selected in Similar Studies

Source	NaCo (22, p. 22)	Governance Task Force (45, pp. 41-43)	Governor’s Blue-Ribbon Commission (46, pp. 45-56)	PSG (49, pp. 46-47)
Jurisdiction	Greater Richmond, Virginia (City of Richmond and three counties)	City of Pueblo and Pueblo County, Colorado	State of Wisconsin	Eleven cities in the Chippewa Valley, Wisconsin
Projects	Regional airport Economic development Conventions and tourism Waste management authority Richmond Symphony Baseball complex Emergency services Libraries Training programs	Joint purchasing Transit and fleet maintenance Public works Liquor licensing Fire protection Public information Housing Health departments Hazmat services Police and sheriff --merge fleet maintenance, weapons storage, SWAT, equipment and training --combined communications	Law enforcement Housing Emergency services Fire Solid waste Recycling Public health Animal control Transportation Mass transit Land-use planning Boundary agreements Libraries Parks & recreation Culture Purchasing E-government	Training on state and federal risk management regulations Countywide property assessment and property tax collections Collective purchasing

4. The LMC (23, pp. 33-35) suggests that privatization of services is most appropriate to particular services. “(P)rivatization of public works, public utilities, and some public safety functions, like dispatching, are more likely candidates for privatization with for-profit firms.... Privatization of health and human services and services related to the arts most often involve non-profit firms.”

In closing, this brief review is not meant to recommend law enforcement, public health, information technology or any other category of services—nor the privatization of any particular service—as focus areas for this study. Rather, it is intended only to illustrate the range of ideas represented in the 63 reports that have been reviewed.

This Literature Review will be supplemented by a survey of Dakota County elected officials, government employees and citizens, as well as workshops/public meetings with all three groups. Recommendations will be based upon all such forms of input.

No decisions have been made, at the present time, to either include or exclude any specific categories of local government activities and services for this project.

Criteria and/or Models for Evaluation of Opportunities for Collaboration

The primary goals of this project are to identify collaborations that can reduce the cost and/or enhance the quality and effectiveness of government services. The Pueblo, Colorado, report (45, pp. 47-48) offers a simple set of evaluation criteria along these lines:

Table 8: Criteria Used for Making and Approving Recommendations

1. Will the change reduce the cost of government services?
2. Will the change increase the efficiency of government services?
3. Will the change increase the effectiveness of government services?
4. Will the change protect and/or improve the rights of the public?

From Governance Task Force of the 2010 Commission, *Final Report: Study and Recommendations: Consolidation of Services: Pueblo County and City of Pueblo* (CO) (45, pp. 47-48)

We recognize, however, that an evaluation that only considers these two to four dimensions may miss some important considerations. A discussion by the LMC in “Resource Guide for Dealing with Budget Cuts: Strategies for Cities” (23, pp. 33-35) provides at the other extreme the most complete and most useful criteria, and so we quote the list in its entirety (Table 9, over).

**Table 9: What Alternative Delivery Strategies are Right for Your City?
Issues to Consider**

Impact on Mission

“• Is this a core service over which government should maintain strong control? If so, can it best be done with public employees or through a contract or cooperative service arrangement?

“• What community values are at stake in this decision? Are there ethical concerns?...

Impacts on Citizens and Quality of Life

“• What is the cost to citizens of changing the way a service is provided?

“• What are citizens' preferences for the service?...

“• How will an alternative delivery method impact the quality of the service?...

“• How much flexibility will the local government have to respond to changing citizen needs and expectations without bearing undue extra expense?...

Impact on costs

“• Will there be cost savings?

“• How can the city council monitor the costs and quality of the service?

“• Are all costs...being taken into account in cost comparisons between different delivery methods?...

Availability of Other Local Participants

“• Are there other local governments nearby that already know how to perform this function well?...

Impacts on City Staff

“• How will the workloads of current city employees change?

“• Can human resources be restructured effectively?...

Impact on Role of Government

“• How does this service delivery decision impact the civic and community building capacity of the city government?

Table 9 (continued)

“• Can service delivery decisions be used to accomplish other city goals, such as economic development or building better relationships with other governments?...

Barriers and Constraints

“• What barriers and constraints to pursuing alternative delivery methods may exist?...

Privatization: Issues to Consider

“• Is the function similar to one already provided by the private sector?

“• How available are private vendors to provide the given service? Is there true competition in the marketplace?...

“• In the long term, can public employees learn the skills to be able to provide this service in-house?

“• Can employees participate in the learning even if the service is contracted out?...

“• If the private vendor goes out of business, what options will the city have? Will there be significant interruptions to service?

“• If the vendor is lost or the quality is unsatisfactory, what would be the costs to the city of reverting to providing the service in-house? What would the transition time be?

“• How can the city ensure that the interests of citizens do not become secondary to those of private firms with whom the city does business?

“• How can the city ensure that friendships and relationships do not get in the way of making good decisions for the city?”

From League of Minnesota Cities, *Resource Guide For Dealing With Budget Cuts: Strategies for Cities* (23), pp. 33-35

Between the two extremes cited thus far, more than a dozen reports (among the 63 reviewed) provide criteria to consider in evaluating collaborations of various kinds. As comprehensive as the LMC list is, other reports raise additional issues worthy of consideration.

The issue of **leadership** is a primary example. It receives great emphasis throughout the literature, while two personal respondents noted that collaboration tends to be “people-centered” (11, p. 21) or “people-driven” (16, p. 28).

The NAPA report (25, pp. 29-32) states that “strong effective leadership is the most critical characteristic of high performance partnerships. Leaders...convene and mobilize.... They champion.... (L)eaders organize the partnership and make it work....” The Center for Technology in Government (CTG) (3,10, pp. 18-19) says, “(L)eadership is crucial...to provide credibility for the innovation being undertaken.” The Three-Sector Collaborative (31, 42; p. 42) states that among the factors “that have helped to make collaborations successful” is “(a) convener (who) suggests an openness in sharing information.”

Related to the issue of leadership is that of **trust**. The CTG report states that “(b)oth public trust and professional trust (are) necessary.... Public trust refers to confidence of citizens and other stakeholders that the project or service is reliable and legitimate. Professional trust is present when all participants have faith in the commitment and skills of others.” PSG (49, pp. 58-59) suggests that the level of trust needed—and whether the necessary trust is present or not—is an important criteria for consideration before entering into a partnership. NAPA (25, pp. 29-32) says that a successful collaboration can “galvanize stakeholders...and build trust among the participants.”

Another pair of issues are **innovation** or **novelty**, and **transferability**. Local governments do not tend to consider such “soft” issues; rather, they tend to be cited in higher-level academic studies or state government reports. Novelty, creativity and transferability are all criteria for the Innovations in American Government Award of the Ash Institute of the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University (1, pp.22-23), for example. “Innovation” is the theme of the report of the Minnesota Board of Government Innovation and Cooperation (51, pp. 54-56). Criteria for the inclusion of government innovations in its report include “the idea is...easily transferred to other communities.”

The Three-Sector Collaborative (31, 42; p. 40) also suggests that the “**geographical dimension**” be considered. In other words, if an issue is regional or statewide in scope, then perhaps a collaborative needs to have the same breadth in order to successfully address it.

In addition to providing these additional ideas for evaluation, these reports also provide additional perspectives on some of the items included in the LMC’s list (Table 9, above).

- For example, the LMC asks, “Is this a core service over which government should maintain strong control?” The Ash Institute asks what is the significance or importance of the issue? Perhaps it is in fact too important not to innovative new ways of addressing it.
- The LMC asks, “Are there other local governments nearby that already know how to perform this function well?” Hubbard (2, pp. 19-21) says it this way: Local governments can sometimes apply greater expertise and gain a better understanding of an issue by collaborating.

- While the LMC asks, “How does this service decision impact the civic and community building capacity of the city government,” Hubbard asks whether a partnership might enhance the image and identity of a local unit of government.
- The LMC asks, “What are citizens’ preferences for the service?” NaCo (22, p. 28) advocates considering the “political feasibility” of the service.
- As a final example, the LMC only indirectly asks how easy (or difficult) is the implementation and management of a particular method of service delivery. NaCo more directly considers the “manageability” or “ease of implementation” of a project.

Overall, then, the LMC checklist provides the broadest base of issues for the evaluation of opportunities for collaboration, but it should be supplemented by the additional issues and perspectives provided by several of the other reports.

A final recommendation of an evaluation model will be made only upon completion of additional information-gathering steps including a survey of Dakota County elected officials, government employees and citizens, as well as workshops/public meetings with all three groups

Appendix A: Bibliographical Essay

Academic Studies

The academic studies that were reviewed for this project, while few in number, proved to be valuable in providing models and/or typologies of different kinds of collaborations, and in suggesting a variety of critical factors for the success of public sector collaborations.

A series of papers published by the Center for Technology in Government, State University of New York, Albany (3, 10) broadly define government collaboration as having the following characteristics:

- “• A minimum of two distinct organizations
- “• A formal agreement about roles and responsibilities
- “• A common objective, activity or project aimed at the delivery of a public service
- “• The sharing or allocation of risks, benefits and resources—both tangible and intangible”

The papers go on to describe three categories of collaboration:

- Public-Public collaboration “between public agencies,” including “horizontal” agreements between agencies at the same level of government and “vertical” agreements between different levels of government.
- Public-Private collaboration, such as in sub-contracting and outsourcing agreements.
- Public-Nonprofit collaboration to deliver a public service.

The report states that “The diversity of collaboration models reflects the degree to which responsibility is shared, as well as the variety of potential partners....” The various models “can be located conceptually on a continuum that ranges from government monopoly (no sharing) to privatization (total transfer of responsibility).”

The types of services offered collaboratively also were found to be three in number:

- “• Public access to a single service type
- “• Public access to multiple services and/or information sources
- “• Support for government operations.... (i.e.) internal management and sharing of information to improve administration of service delivery.”

The studies go on to identify “critical success factors that transcend national boundaries and are present in all (successful) collaborations....” These include:

- Leadership (7). “(L)eadership is crucial...to provide credibility for the innovation being undertaken.”

- Trust (5). “Both public trust and professional trust were necessary.... Public trust refers to confidence of citizens and other stakeholders that the project or service is reliable and legitimate. Professional trust is present when all participants have faith in the commitment and skills of others.”
- Risk Management (9). Both external—relating to the socio-economic and political environmental—and internal risks—relating to the characteristics and relationships of the partners—are discussed and solutions described.
- Information Sharing (8). “(S)uccess relies on adopting tools to ensure a high level of communication and coordination....”

A paper written by Betsy Hubbard as an M.A. candidate at the Humphrey Institute in 1995 (2) provides a more detailed typology of “interagency” partnerships based on the operational characteristics of the partnership. She, too (as above), proposes a continuum of partnership types based on “power sharing,” but she reserves the term “collaboration” for partnerships with “a high degree of power sharing.”

- Cooperation is defined as “using resources to assist other agencies”...but with “little power sharing; organizations choose to work together but make decisions independently.”
- Coordination means “organizing or combining resources to more effectively reach a mutual goal.” There is “some degree of mutual decision making; organizations make their own decisions...after discussion with others.”
- Collaboration means “collectively applying resources toward problems which lack clear ownership.” Here, “decision making is more collective.”

She also goes beyond the continuum: She also defines different types of partnerships on a second dimension, the “degree of resource involvement.” A table showing the nine types of partnerships described in her paper is shown on the following page.

- Power Sharing. “The degree of power sharing indicates to what extent each partner has a voice in setting the agenda. In some partnerships, for example, all products are jointly produced and reflect the involvement of all partners. In other partnerships, one agency takes the lead...while others only provide occasional assistance.”
- Resource Involvement. “The degree of resource involvement suggests the magnitude of resources an agency commits to a partnership.”

Table 10: Nine Types of Intergovernmental Partnerships

<p>Cooperating Using resources to assist other agencies</p>	<p>Coordinating Organizing or combining resources to more effectively reach a mutual goal</p>	<p>Collaborating Collectively applying resources toward problems that lack clear ownership</p>
<p>Contributing Resources Agencies contribute resources to another agency’s project or effort. <i>Primary goal:</i> Help a worthy cause</p>	<p>Reconciling Activities Agencies adjust or combine existing programs (on-going) in order to deliver services more effectively. <i>Primary goal:</i> Improve programs</p>	<p>Sharing Program Responsibilities Agencies come together as a new entity to provide services or manage a resource. <i>Primary goal:</i> Meet a need that can only be addressed by working together</p>
<p>Promoting Others Agencies willingly share information about the work or services of others. <i>Primary goal:</i> Meet the needs of a shared constituency</p>	<p>Sharing Resources Agencies which use the same good or service agree to share in its cost. <i>Primary goal:</i> Save money</p>	<p>Creating New Systems or Programs Agencies work to create and implement a new model to deliver services or address a public problem. <i>Primary goal:</i> Develop a new means of responding to public problems</p>
<p>Sharing Information Agencies share information on a formal or informal basis. <i>Primary goal:</i> Improve performance by keeping informed</p>	<p>Producing Joint Projects Agencies depends (short-term) upon each other for producing a specific event or product. <i>Primary goal:</i> Produce an outcome that no agency could achieve on its own</p>	<p>Collective Planning Agencies develop a collective vision for the management of a resource or alleviation of a social problem. <i>Primary goal:</i> Promote a collective vision.</p>

From Betsy Hubbard, *Making Sense of Public Service Partnerships: Understanding the Why and How of Interagency Efforts* (2)

Hubbard also explains why intergovernmental partnerships have grown in popularity. Drivers include:

- Resource scarcity. Partnerships “maximize available resources.”
- Fragmentation. “Partnerships are...a remedy for the fragmentation which characterizes mostly public service delivery systems.”
- Problem solving. Agencies partner “when they are unable to adequately address a problem alone.”

- Legal mandate/funding requirements.
- Crisis.

Often, “the motivation for forming partnerships is...rooted in altruistic values or professional norms....(rather) than on a direct calculation of benefits.”

Benefits, nevertheless, are important. The benefits of partnerships are described as follows:

- Reduced cost.
- Improved efficiency.
- Improved quality of services or results.
- Greater innovation. Partnerships reduce “risk through dispersing it among many agencies....” This in turn “encourage(s) greater innovation.”
- Broader expertise and understanding.
- Favorable impact on organizational image and/or identity.

“The costs of partnering can be high,” however. The challenges are defined as follows:

- A sacrifice of autonomy.
- The expenditure of scarce resources.
- A loss of flexibility.
- A loss of ability to act opportunistically, make fast responses.
- A loss of glory.

The Hubbard paper was provided to us by Lee Munnich, Senior Fellow and Director, State and Local Policy Program, Humphrey Institute, University of Minnesota. Munnich also shared in an interview (11) his personal experiences with Partnership Minnesota, an informal coalition which for several years recognized leading examples of partnership and innovation in Minnesota government. (Unfortunately, no written records of the now defunct group were available.) Among other observations, Munnich said that in his experience, “there is no underlying pattern to innovation in government. Rather, it is people-centered.” As a result, he said, most innovations and partnerships have a “short life.”

Returning to the theme of electronic (or E-) government, Darrell West of the Center for Public Policy, Brown University, published reviews of E-government at the federal, state and municipal levels in 2001 and 2002. His 2002 review of municipal E-government (12) encompassed more than 1,500 Web addresses representing 70 major American municipalities. He found that “cities have made major strides toward placing information and services online. There has been a substantial increase in the number of city sites that have online services, disability access... foreign language translation... webcams, geographic information systems, and interactive features.”

However, he also found that more cities were charging user fees and using premium service areas that required a fee or registration, thus limiting access.

Following is the frequency with which various services are offered.

Table 11: Top Online Urban Services, 2002

Request Service	346	22.1%
Request Information	287	18.3%
Pay Traffic Ticket	248	15.8%
File Complaint	180	11.5%
Apply for Job	167	10.7%
Register for Service	131	8.4%
Pay Taxes	112	7.3%
Request Information	98	6.3%
Report Crime	71	4.5%
Report Abandoned Auto	70	4.5%

From Darrell M. West, Center for Public Policy, Brown University, *Urban E-Government, 2002* (12)

In support of one or more of these services, 77 percent of the sites offer access to at least one database.

Among the 70 metropolitan areas studied, Minneapolis was rated as having the most effective overall E-government, with 89.5 points out of a possible score of 100.

Finally among the academic “literature,” the Selection Criteria for the Innovations in American Government Award (3) are suggestive. The award is sponsored by the Ford Foundation, and awarded by the Ash Institute for Democratic Governance and Innovation of the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. The awards are based on a total of 17 criteria, but they seem to cluster in four categories of criteria:

- Novelty. “Creativity...fundamental change...substantially new service concept...change(s) the organizational culture or the traditional approach.”
- Significance. “Addresses an important problem...of national import.... Responds to the needs of” a well defined group of clients.”

- Effectiveness. “Has achieved tangible results...make(s) substantial progress in diminishing the problem.... Produce(s) unanticipated benefits...(verified by) independent evaluation.”
- Transferability. “Can be replicated...a model....”

Academic Sources

(1) Ash Institute for Democratic Governance and Innovation, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Innovations in American Government Award, Selection Criteria

(<http://www.innovations.harvard.edu/content.cfm?activeSection=8&activeSubSection=11>)

(2) Betsy Hubbard, *Making Sense of Public Service Partnerships: Understanding the Why and How of Interagency Efforts* (Humphrey Institute, University of Minnesota, August 1995; written in fulfillment of an independent paper requirement for a Master of Arts degree in Public Affairs)

Center for Technology in Government, State University of New York at Albany, *New Models of Collaboration: A Guide for Managers*, including:

(3) Overview and summary at
www.ctg.albany.edu/publications/online/new_models

(4) Sharon Dawes, Center for Technology in Government, *New Models of Collaboration: Lessons from the American Experience* (colloquium presentation: *Public-Private Partnership for Improved Government Performance*, October 24-25, 2002)

(5) Sharon Dawes, Center for Technology in Government, *The role of trust in new models of collaboration*, 2003

(6) Ophelia Eglene and Sharon S. Dawes, Center for Technology in Government, *New York State GIS Coordination Program*, 2003

(7) Patricia Diamond Fletcher, Ph.D. Department of Public Policy, UMBC, Baltimore, MD, *Leadership and Project Success: Lessons from High Impact Government Innovations*, 2003

(8) John P. Gant, Syracuse University, *Information Sharing, Communication and Coordination in E-government Collaborations*, 2003

(9) Lise Préfontaine, Université du Québec a Montréal, *Risk management in new models of collaboration*, 2003

(10) Lise Préfontaine et al (CEFRIO), *New Models of Collaboration for Public Service Delivery*, April 2000

(11) Lee Munnich, Senior Fellow and Director, State and Local Policy Program, Humphrey Institute, University of Minnesota, personal interview, February 4, 2004

(12) Darrell M. West, Center for Public Policy, Brown University, *Urban E-Government, 2002* (www.INSIDEPOLITICS.org/egovt02city.html)

Association of Minnesota Counties

The Association of Minnesota Counties (AMC) currently is midway through the Minnesota Counties Future Project (14). The first phase was qualitative and quantitative research among Minnesota citizens; opinion leaders including legislators, representatives of the Pawlenty administration, news media, business, labor and county officials; and public officials in attendance at AMC district meetings. Key findings were reported to the AMC in December 2003 (13):

“• Counties are generally well respected for their work.... In particular, counties are perceived to provide services in a cost-effective manner.

“• Core county functions are not well understood by the public.... Nor do they understand the extent to which the county’s (services and functions) are mandated by the state....

“• The political environment for tax increases is poor—the public is looking for reform in government.... The public support existing spending...(but) expect(s) restraint in spending increases and innovative new ways to deliver services.

“• Support for change, **but people doubt that counties will be change agents** (emphasis added).... Counties have too many mandates from the state...counties lack broad planning and vision...lack the incentive.... Counties are seen as relying on other levels of government to develop an agenda for them.

“• Counties can lead a reform-based agenda.... Critical elements of this agenda include...more cooperation and joint service delivery between counties and with other levels of government.”

The consultant in this project developed a decision-making model for reform of service delivery. A copy of this model is inserted on the following page (page 9).

Phase 2 of the Minnesota Counties Futures Project will be a series of facilitated discussions, hopefully leading “to organized local community projects around the concept of strengthening (intergovernmental) communication and collaboration.”

The host communities for this phase include (15):

- Clay County and the city of Moorhead
- Stevens, Grant and Traverse Counties
- Jackson County and the cities of Jackson and Heron Lake
- Scott County and the cities of Prior Lake and Shakopee
- Ramsey County

Finally, in a lengthy personal interview, AMC President Jim Mulder suggested that meth is an emerging issue that local units of government will be grappling with in the very near future.

AMC Sources

(13) Association of Minnesota Counties, *Current Assessment of Minnesota County Government: Report of Quantitative and Qualitative Research Findings* (December 2003)

(14) Association of Minnesota Counties, *Minnesota Counties Futures Project*

(15) Jim Mulder, Executive Director, Association of Minnesota Counties, personal interview, February 5, 2004

Associations

Other major government associations find that their clients are “in crisis” (17) and in “transition” (28), which drives a need for “thinking differently” (18) including “high performance partnerships” (24, 25). The National Association of Counties (NaCo) recognizes innovation in government with its annual Achievement Awards (26), many of which have in recent years recognized collaborative efforts.

Here in Minnesota, the League of Minnesota Cities (LMC) has in a recent survey of its members identified 1,682 examples of “cooperative efforts” in 280 of its 820 member cities (19). (By comparison, Dakota County and just four Dakota County cities alone report more than 200 “intergovernmental collaborative agreements.” One might infer from this that the number of collaborative agreements statewide is very substantially underestimated by the LMC’s data.) In any event, LMC provides a variety of consulting services and resource documents to assist cities in partnering for service delivery (20-23).

The National Association of Counties published about one year ago a major study entitled *Counties in Crisis: A Survey of Current Budgetary Situations Facing America’s Counties* (17). The study found that “nearly 72 percent of counties are facing budget shortfalls...while...the demand for county-provided services continues to rise.” The responses to these shortfalls include (Table 12, over):

Table 12: Have these shortfalls caused you to implement any of the following?

Expenditure of previous year's reserves	47%
Service delivery cutbacks	38%
Contingency fund expenditures	34%
Hiring freezes	33%
Tax increases	32%
Fee increases	31%
Elimination of services	17%
Layoffs	16%
Early retirement incentives	6%
Privatizing services	4%
Furloughing employees	2%

Surprisingly and disappointingly, the study did not ask whether counties have implemented such service delivery models as intergovernmental partnerships. Among those counties that reduced service levels, following are the services most frequently affected by the cutbacks.

Table 13: Percentage of Counties Planning Decreases in Services

Highways and Streets Construction	26%
Public Health	25%
Family and Human Services	24%
Highways and Streets Maintenance	23%
Healthcare Programs	23%
Sheriff	23%
Infrastructure Maintenance	19%
Parks and Recreation	17%
Arts and Culture	14%
Public Safety	14%

Tables 3 and 4 are from Richard L. Clark, *Counties in Crisis: A Survey of Current Budgetary Situations Facing America's Counties*, Prepared for The National Association of Counties (17)

A wide variety of additional service cuts—e.g. planning and zoning administration, public transit, solid waste collection, police, fire, etc.—were reported by less than 10% of respondents.

As noted above, counties face the paradox of a demand for reduced revenues and for increased services. Table 14 (over) shows what services have experienced increased demand most widely.

Table 14: Has your county experienced an increase in demand for any of the following services while experiencing budget shortfalls?

Jails and Correctional Institutions	60%
Sheriff	56%
Courts	40%
Public Safety	39%
Information Technology	33%
Public Health	33%
Family and Human Services	32%
Economic Development	32%
Highways and Streets Maintenance	31%
Highways and Streets Construction	28%
911 Emergency	27%
Parks and Recreation	26%
Healthcare Programs	25%
Emergency Medical Services	24%
Schools	23%
Homeland Security	23%
Medicaid	20%

From Richard L. Clark, *Counties in Crisis: A Survey of Current Budgetary Situations Facing America's Counties*, Prepared for The National Association of Counties (17)

Increases in demand for such additional services as fire protection, arts and culture, public transit and police were reported by less than 20% of counties.

While the NaCo report focused almost exclusively on fiscal conditions, a major report of the National League of Cities (NLC) took a wider view. Yet even then, the Foreword to the report (28) notes that “over the last ten years, growth in city revenues has lagged well behind growth in the national gross domestic product, as well as federal and state revenue growth.” The major thrust of the report, as its title suggests, looks at *Major Factors Affecting America's Cities*. Officials at NLC member cities reported six such factors:

“• The ‘New’ Economy. The services sector has overtaken manufacturing as the core of our economy (and) globalization (is also a major factor).

“• Limited Revenue Capacity.

“• The Movement of People and Businesses. As people and businesses move into and out of our cities, they affect the level of services that cities must provide, as well as the revenues cities can raise.... (M)any new arrivals do not immediately ‘fit in’....

“• Suburbanization and Sprawl.

“• Education.... (S)chools must cope with and try to solve a variety of deep-seated social problems.

“• Changing City Government Roles and Relationships.... (I)ncreases in citizen participation...a decline in trust...(and) a more business-oriented approach to local government (are key themes). (M)any citizens (are) looking to the city to provide core services in a more efficient manner.”

The report states that many of these “key factors affecting America’s cities cross conventional departmental lines.... As a result, a city government’s ability to work across organizational divisions is critical to its ability to adequately address these key factors.”

“Cities (are) striving to become more efficient.... Many cities are outsourcing services to private concerns that can provide them less expensively, or are reconfiguring their local staff to achieve greater efficiency.... Making government efficient is the number-one concern for Orlando (Florida) officials. The public wants ‘out-of-sight, out-of-mind’ government.... (T)his leads to a focus on the bottom-line and core services.”

These NaCo and LMC reports are more descriptive than prescriptive. They offer only brief examples of ways in which cities and counties are—or should be—responding to the crisis and/or transition in which they find themselves. NaCo does offer annual Achievement Awards, however, which provide numerous examples of local government innovation, many of which come in the form of partnerships and collaborations (22).

For example, a 1995 Achievement Award went to the Metro Richmond Regional Initiative of Chesterfield, Hanover and Henrico Counties and the city of Richmond, Virginia. The Initiative identified and assessed 20 possible collaborative projects. The assessment was based upon “manageability, cost, ease of implementation, planning, expected results, political feasibility, control and other factors.” Those which were assessed as being “feasible joint projects includ(ed) the regional airport, ...regional economic development, ...regional conventions and tourism, ... (a) waste management authority, the Richmond Symphony,...(a) baseball complex,...emergency services,...librar(ies)...and shared training programs.”

NaCo spokesperson Jacqueline Byers stated in an interview (16) that intergovernmental collaboration is usually “people driven.”

The National Association of Local Government Environmental Professionals (NALGEP) similarly recognizes “local innovation” including collaborative efforts (27).

For reports which look more broadly at local government responses to crisis and/or transitions, we turn to the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA). Many of the specifics of the AASA report (18) are not applicable to issues of city-county government, but the broader theme of “leadership” certainly is. In this, the AASA report echoes one of the key findings of the study, cited above, of the CTG (3,10), when it (AASA) says:

“Strong, collaborative leadership by local school boards and school superintendents is a key cornerstone of the foundation for high student achievement. That leadership is essential to forming a community vision..., crafting long-range goals and plans..., improving...professional development..., and ensuring that the guidance, support, and resources needed for success are available.”

The report recommends several “key strategies to strengthen leadership and teamwork....

“• A strong, unified leadership and governance body....

“• New state laws on...governance....

“• Mobilizing communities....

“• A new approach to preparing and training....

“• Public consciousness-raising....”

Like the report of the AASA, the NAPA report (25) is not entirely analogous to the present effort. In the case of the NAPA report, this is because it is focused upon “cross-sector” partnerships—that is, partnerships between or among units of government on the one hand, and non-profit and/or civic organizations on the other. The report is the first phase of a two phase program funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation (24).

NAPA’s efforts spring from a recognition that “American government is at a turning point. Social, economic and technological changes...(and) public discontent with politics and government (have) triggered self-scrutiny, reform and redesign.” Despite its focus on public-nonprofit partnerships, it provides much food for thought for any public entity thinking of partnering or collaborating. The NAPA report defines a continuum of organizational relationships (Table 15, over).

A high performance partnership features the highest level of shared authority and accountability, and is defined as “a mutually beneficial and reciprocal relationship among entities that share responsibilities, authority and accountability for results. The partnership is high-performance when it achieves goals and outcomes that are meaningful and could not be reached by an individual partner alone.”

The report states that each of the types is progressively more difficult to implement but has correspondingly greater community impact. The high performance partnership, then, is the most difficult and the most rewarding. Like the Hubbard paper (2), the report goes on to list the defining characteristics, benefits and pitfalls of high performance partnerships. The defining characteristics are shown following Table 6:

Table 15: Comparatively Defined Organizational Relationships

--	--	--	--

	Cooperatives	Contracts/ Grants	Collaboration	Partnerships	High Performance Partnerships
Definition	Association of organizations that pursue a common benefit	Formal agreement between two or more organizations to undertake a specific service, but goal-setting is one sided	Joint work effort with shared responsibilities for mutually defined goals	Shared resources, authorities and accountability for mutually decided goals	Partnerships that produce results
Accountability	No common resources, responsibilities or accountability	Accountability for outputs, but one-sided decision making and goal setting	No prescribed results	Produces benefits but not outcome-oriented results	Achieves extraordinary results for communities and clients that could not be accomplished by individual partners

From National Academy of Public Administration, *Powering the Future: High-Performance Partnerships* (25)

“• Results.

“• Leadership.... (S)trong effective leadership is the most critical characteristic of high performance partnerships. Leaders...convene and mobilize.... They champion.... (L)eaders organize the partnership and make it work.... (But) a collaborative endeavor cannot be sustained indefinitely by a single leader.

“• Mission and Planning. The shared, compelling and clear purpose for the partnership.... Developing a written statement of the partnership’s mission and goals should be the first order of business.” The planning follows a partnership rather than a bureaucratic model (Table 16, over).

“• Resources. Essential tools...including such tangibles as staff, assets, technology and information, and such intangibles as knowledge, access, relationships, political support and in-kind contributions.

Table 16: Bureaucracy versus High Performance

Bureaucracy Model	High Performance Partnership Model
--------------------------	---

Process driven Hierarchical Stable Linear work process Organization focused	Mission driven Collaborative Rapid change Networks Customer focused
---	---

From National Academy of Public Administration, *Powering the Future: High-Performance Partnerships* (25)

“• Organizational Infrastructure. The entities that comprise the partnership and their organizational structure and capacity.... A partnership’s decision-making structure can be composed solely of investors or a combination of investors and other stakeholders.

Table 17: Investor versus Stakeholder Model

	Investor	Stakeholder
Decision-Maker	Limited to those who contribute	Open to all who are interested
Structure	Board of Directors	Coalition
Operating Style	Plan and implement simultaneously	Plan until all interests are addressed
Bias	Action	Consensus building
Works Best	When quick decisive action is required	When seeking to develop a broad base of support to establish a need to act

From National Academy of Public Administration, *Powering the Future: High-Performance Partnerships* (25)

The benefits of the high performance partnership are as follows:

“• More Strategic, Effective Results. Collaborative efforts provide the opportunity for greater effectiveness in defining the issue....

“• Leveraged Resources. A high performance partnership leverages partners’ individual strengths, whether they are financial, political, organizational or experiential. It also can maximize opportunities to obtain additional resources....

“• Stakeholder Commitment and Participation. A high performance partnership creates relational benefits.... It can expand dialogue...galvanize (stakeholders)...and build trust among the participants.

“• Sector Specific Benefits. The public sector benefits by its expanded...capacity to deliver quality services.”

The pitfalls to avoid include this: “An organization should not use...partnerships as a means to shirk or transfer its responsibility or accountability.”

Finally, and at the most practical level, the LMC provides a variety of resource documents to help cities in partnering by a variety of different names including “combining government services” (20), “intergovernmental cooperation” (21) and “cooperative agreements” (23). In its recent survey, 280 LMC member cities identified 1,682 “cooperative efforts.”

Table 18: Local Government Cooperative Efforts, 2003

Services	Number	% of Efforts
Police	292*	17.4%
Parks and Recreation	265	15.8%
General (Planning, Purchasing, etc.)	246	14.6%
Sanitation (Water, Sewer, Garbage, Recycling)	126	7.5%
Streets	122	7.3%
Fire	95*	5.6%

From League of Minnesota Cities, city survey results (raw data), February 2004 (19)

* Combining the categories (police + police/fire) and (fire + police/fire)

Other services which accounted for less than five percent of cooperative efforts each, listed in order of frequency, include economic development, fire, public works, health/social services, housing, conservation, libraries, building inspector, transit, police AND fire,* dispatching, utilities and cable television, ambulance, emergency management, airport, animal control and rescue team.

Chapter 19 of the *LMC Handbook for Minnesota Cities*, titled “Intergovernmental cooperation” (21), provides an overview of services which Minnesota statutes allow cities to provide jointly with other units of government. It discusses key terms of the Joint Powers Act, then goes on to list and discuss more specific statutes in the areas of:

- “• Employ(ing) an assessor jointly with other communities.
- “• Join(ing) with towns to maintain public cemeteries (MS471.24).
- “• Operat(ing) a joint municipal police department (MS436.06)....
- “• Planning assistance and enforcement of land use controls....
- “• ... (J)oint purchasing (MS471.64)....
- “• Joint hiring of a city administrator (or) finance director (MS452.25)....”

Many other examples also are discussed, including city-county cooperation (MS 394), regional development (MS 462), extra-territorial powers, parks and recreation (MS 471), and so on. This is a useful checklist of ideas for local government cooperation.

A more recent resource is a *Resource Guide For Dealing With Budget Cuts*, published in 2003 for use in preparing 2004 city budgets (23). The guide discusses various ways for cities to reduce expenditures in line with reduced revenues, including reducing or eliminating service, revenue enhancements, purchasing alliances and joint purchasing. Of greatest interest is a chapter entitled, “Alternative Service Delivery Methods.” The chapter covers cooperative arrangements, such as those discussed in the Handbook, and privatization.

Cooperative arrangements include:

- Joint powers agreements under MS471.59
- Joint agreements
- Mutual aid agreements
- Service contracts

The report cites a 1992 survey, in which the LMC categorized some 718 agreements in the following categories. These 1992 data, compared with 2003 data (Table 18), suggests that cities have continued to look at cooperation and partnering in essentially the same service areas over the past decade with little change. The only significant trend would seem to be a drop in the percentage of partnerships for the delivery of fire services from 13 percent of “joint agreements” in 1992 to six percent of “cooperative efforts” in 2003.

Table 19: Categories of Minnesota joint agreements, 1992

Services	% of Agreements
Police/Law Enforcement	19%
Parks and Recreation	15%
Fire Services	13%
General Government/Administration	12%
Sanitation	11%
Economic Development/Housing	6%
Streets and Highways	5%
Health	5%

From League of Minnesota Cities, *Resource Guide For Dealing With Budget Cuts: Strategies for Cities* (23)

Other services account for less than five percent of joint agreements each, including transit, cable/utilities, combined police and fire, libraries, natural resources, public works and airports.

Regarding privatization, the report notes that private outsourcing “works better when the service can be easily specified, there is competition among suppliers, and...citizens do not directly experience (the service)... (P)ublic works, public utilities, and some public safety functions, like dispatching, are...likely candidates.... (H)ealth and human services...most often involve non-profit firms.”

The report also provides a long list of “issues to consider” when deciding “What Alternative Delivery Strategies are Right for Your City.” These include:

- “• Is this a core service over which government should maintain strong control? If so, can it best be done with public employees or through a contract or cooperative service arrangement?
- “• What community values are at stake in this decision? Are there ethical concerns?...
- “• What is the cost to citizens of changing the way a service is provided?
- “• What are citizens’ preferences for the service?...
- “• How will an alternative delivery method impact the quality of the service?...
- “• How much flexibility will the local government have to respond to changing citizen needs and expectations without bearing undue extra expense?...
- “• Will there be cost savings?
- “• How can the city council monitor the costs and quality of the service?
- “• Are all costs...being taken into account in cost comparisons between different delivery methods?...
- “• Are there other local governments nearby that already know how to perform this function well?...
- “• How will the workloads of current city employees change?
- “• Can human resources be restructured effectively?...
- “• How does this service delivery decision impact the civic and community building capacity of the city government?
- “• Can service delivery decisions be used to accomplish other city goals, such as economic development or building better relationships with other governments?...
- “• What barriers and constraints to pursuing alternative delivery methods may exist?...
- “• Is the function similar to one already provided by the private sector?
- “• How available are private vendors to provide the given service? Is there true competition in the marketplace?...
- “• In the long term, can public employees learn the skills to be able to provide this service in-house?

- “• Can employees participate in the learning even if the service is contracted out?...
- “• If the private vendor goes out of business, what options will the city have? Will there be significant interruptions to service?
- “• If the vendor is lost or the quality is unsatisfactory, what would be the costs to the city of reverting to providing the service in-house? What would the transition time be?
- “• How can the city ensure that the interests of citizens do not become secondary to those of private firms with whom the city does business?
- “• How can the city ensure that friendships and relationships do not get in the way of making good decisions for the city?”

The report then goes on to provide numerous examples of local government partnerships in a variety of areas.

The LMC's guide to *Combining Government Services: Issues to Consider* (20) includes an even lengthier “checklist of considerations” for cities exploring joint agreements for service delivery.

Association Sources

(16) Jacqueline Byers, National Association of Counties, personal interview (telephone), January 27, 2004

(17) Richard L. Clark, *Counties in Crisis: A Survey of Current Budgetary Situations Facing America's Counties*, Prepared for The National Association of Counties (February 2003)

(18) Richard H. Goodman and William G. Zimmerman, Jr., *Thinking Differently: Recommendations for 21st Century School Board/Superintendent Leadership, Governance, and Teamwork for High Student Achievement* (American Association of School Administrators)

(19) League of Minnesota Cities, city survey results (raw data), February 2004

(20) League of Minnesota Cities, *Combining Government Services: Issues to Consider* (www.lmnc.org/pdfs/combining%20governmental%20services.pdf)

(21) League of Minnesota Cities, *Combining Police Departments: Issues to Consider* (www.lmnc.org/pdfs/jointpowersmemo.pdf)

(22) League of Minnesota Cities, “Intergovernmental cooperation,” Chapter 19, *LMC Handbook for Minnesota Cities* (www.lmnc.org/library/handbook.cfm)

(23) League of Minnesota Cities, *Resource Guide For Dealing With Budget Cuts: Strategies for Cities* (<http://www.lmnc.org/pdfs/BudgetCutsResourceGuide.pdf>)

(24) National Academy of Public Administration, *High Performance Partnerships* (www.napawash.org/pc_local_state/ongoing_high_performance.html), a project funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation

(25) National Academy of Public Administration, *Powering the Future: High-Performance Partnerships* (April 2003)

(26) The National Association of Counties, *Achievement Awards* (case studies archives home at http://www.naco.org/Template.cfm?Section=Achievement_Awards&Template=/cfiles/awards/achieve_srch.cfm)

(27) National Association of Local Government Environmental Professionals, *Local Innovations* (case studies at <http://www.nalgep.org/issues/localinnovation/>)

(28) The National League of Cities, *Major Factors Affecting America's Cities: A Report from the National League of Cities' Municipalities in Transition Project*

Foundation and Non-Profit Reports

A wide range of foundations, non-profits and advocacy groups have studied collaboration and partnerships in the delivery of public services—including the Wilder Foundation (33-35, 41) and the Citizen's League (29) here in Minnesota, the Annie E. Casey Foundation (43) and the Pew Partnership for Civic Change (32, 36-40) nationally, and others.

Very little, if any, of the effort focuses explicitly on public-public partnerships, however. The over-riding themes of this category of work are in two areas—1) leadership and organizational development in support of change, innovation and collaboration, and 2) so-called cross-sector partnerships, mostly public-nonprofit but also including public-private and so-called three-sector partnerships.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation (AECF), for example, is a private charitable organization dedicated to helping build better futures for disadvantaged children in the United States. It encourages “three sector” (business-government-non-profit) partnerships focused on the needs of children. Similarly, the mission of the Pew Partnership for Civic Change “is to identify promising solutions crucial to strong communities.”

Both organizations have funded community collaboration consistent with their respective missions. An AECF program called New Futures granted “roughly \$10 million apiece over five years to five cities that showed a willingness and capacity to experiment with collaborative, comprehensive, public-private approaches to the multiple problems of ‘at-risk’ children” (43). The Pew Partnership awarded \$6 million in grants and technical assistance to 14 communities in an effort “to discover new knowledge about how citizens accomplish significant, lasting improvements in their communities” (40).

The AECF issued an unusually candid report at the end of that ten-year period. “None of the New Futures cities made such measurable improvements in five years.... ‘We all assumed that somebody somewhere knew what a comprehensive, community-based integrated support system really looked like,’ (Foundation President Douglas W.) Nelson recalls. ‘And we were wrong.’”

The AECF also reported that “the political components of the work (need attention).... The rhetoric of collaboration frequently minimizes the conflict that real system change requires. Too often, collaborative initiative planners seem to be looking for an extra-political solution to what is essentially a political problem.... Change requires both collaboration and confrontation....”

The Pew Partnership reported that its participating cities “made significant advances in such arenas as increased school attendance, decreased vandalism and adjudication, business development, downtown invigoration, and extending the opportunity of home ownership to formerly excluded people.”

In a companion report (32), Pew attributes these successes to “planned serendipity”—that is, the “creat(ion of) the conditions that help to generate their own magic.”

“Ideas with Currency.... bubble up from the community and are captured just at the moment when they are ripe,” they reported. “(N)ew insights (are important)...such (as) could never have been known before starting the journey; but they can be found along the way through creating the right conditions.”

A third analysis coming out of this effort stresses the importance of collaborative leadership to these successes (37). The paper goes on to suggest that “(p)ublic problems fall into three categories.”

“• Type I problems are those that have an obvious definition, a clear solution, and the burden of responsibility lies with one person or a small group.

“• Type II problems can usually be defined with some clarity, but the solution is unclear. They require traditional leaders and stakeholders to work toward the solution.

“• Type III problems are those issues whose definition and solution are unclear, and they require by definition that those affected do the work toward the solution.”

In 2001, the Partnership conducted a survey of business, government and non-profit executives, as well as the general public, in America’s 200 largest cities (38). The subject was “Community Partnerships.” Among the key findings is the identification of top priority issues among the four stakeholder groups (Table 20, over).

Table 20: Priority Issues*

<p>Business</p> <p>Illegal drugs 3.03 Teen pregnancies 2.90 Traffic congestion 2.86 Affordable child care 2.83 Affordable health care 2.81 Affordable housing 2.80 Affordable care for elderly 2.77 Unsupervised children and teens 2.75 Not enough jobs @ living wage 2.72 Public transportation 2.68</p>	<p>Non-Profit</p> <p>Affordable housing 3.56 Affordable health care 3.56 Illegal drugs 3.49 Affordable child care 3.45 Not enough jobs @ living wage 3.43 Teen pregnancies 3.28 Unsupervised children and teens 3.24 Public transportation 3.21 Affordable care for elderly 3.15 Crime and violence 2.94</p>
<p>Government</p> <p>Illegal drugs 2.91 Affordable health care 2.90 Affordable housing 2.89 Not enough jobs @ living wage 2.79 Teen pregnancies 2.76 Affordable child care 2.67 Public transportation 2.64 Unsupervised children and teens 2.64 Affordable care for elderly 2.53 City streets/buildings need repair 2.52</p>	<p>General Public</p> <p>Not enough jobs @ living wage 3.20 Illegal drugs 3.10 Affordable health care 3.10 Unsupervised children and teens 3.00 Affordable housing 3.00 Affordable care for elderly 3.00 Teen pregnancies 3.00 Traffic congestion 2.90 Affordable child care 2.90 Crime and violence 2.70</p>

*Issues are rated on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 = “not a problem at all” and 5 = “a very serious problem. Mean scores within the group are shown. From Pew Partnership for Civic Change, *In It for the Long Haul: Community Partnerships Making a Difference* (38)

Not only do the four groups rate and rank the issues in differing order of priority, the non-profit executives are likely to view the problems as being substantially more serious than the other stakeholders while both business and government tend to minimize the issues to some degree. Other key findings are shown on Table 21 (over).

The Pew Partnership also operates an ongoing program, Solutions for America (40), which recognizes innovative and collaborative community projects that achieve significant results.

One of the recognized programs is the Prevention and Health Communities Network (PHCN). PHCN is an initiative of the Region Nine Planning Commission and consists of 13 community coalitions operating in 36 communities in nine counties to reduce alcohol, tobacco and other drug abuse by young people. The Network involves youth, parents, law enforcement, schools, elected officials, health care providers, area businesses and religion institutions. The coalition has achieved reductions of 4 to 40 percent in the use of the targeted substances by different age groups.

Table 21: Key Findings of “Community Partnerships Make a Difference”

Question	Business	Non-profit	Government	Public
Working with other organizations to solve problems takes more time, but works in the long run.	92% agree	94% agree	93% agree	87% agree
What is the most important thing your organization has to offer (to cooperative relationships)? (>20%)	Volunteers/ people 43% Financial support 39%	Expertise/ understanding the issues 42%	Financial support 35%	
Do the partnerships tend to be long-term or more short-term in nature?	Long 45% Short 15% Both 37%	Long 52% Short 23% Both 24%	Long 41% Short 18% Both 39%	
What is it about the relationships that made them successful? (>20%)	Collaborative 29% Long-term 25%	Collaboration 32% Multiple resources 20%	Collaboration 31%	
What sort of expertise or special services do you provide? (>20%)			IT 20%	
Do you participate in welfare-to-work job placement programs?	Yes 43%	Yes 53%	Yes 57%	
People don’t get involved enough in efforts to improve my community.	34% agree	44% agree	33% agree	70% agree
Importance of various partners (highest importance ratings) to community problem-solving.	Nonprofit 4.00 Business 3.64 Churches 3.60 Police 3.60	Nonprofit 3.99 Police 3.59 Churches 3.56	Govt 4.23 Police 3.95 Business 3.53	Nonprofit 3.60 Churches 3.60 Police 3.60

From Pew Partnership for Civic Change, *In It for the Long Haul: Community Partnerships Making a Difference* (38)

Meanwhile, the Three Sector Collaborative—a project of The Conference Board, Council on Foundations, Independent Sector, National Academy of Public Administration, National Alliance of Business and National Governors’ Association—has also studied so-called “three sector” alliances among business, non-profits and government. Its findings

(31, 42) are very general, including a finding that the following factors “have helped to make collaborations successful:”

“• A common goal...a ‘win-win’ arrangement where all parties gain more than they give up....

“• A convener (who) suggests an openness in sharing information....

“• A structure to organize and manager the core talents of each participant....
(R)esponsibilities need to be clearly understood so that participants can be accountable for carrying them out....

“• Awareness of the geographical dimension (because) (m)ost principal social institutions are organized on a national, state and local basis, while many of the principle problems and opportunities are manifested at the global, regional and neighborhood level....

“• Effective communication....

“• Periodic assessment....

“• Trust and confidence...(which) results from the experience of people working together and seeing that they can have confidence in their partners....”

Another foundation, the Coalition for Effective Change, has as its focus “preserving the basic values associated with the federal civil service even while that service is substantially downsized in coming years. Many of their principles of reform (30) would make sense in any setting. They include:

“1. Change should be synonymous with improvement.

“2. The rationale for change should be clear, cogent and public.

“3. All parties in the enterprise should be parties in its redesign.

“4. Before changes are widely adopted, they should be tested and evaluated.

“5. Changes in resources...should be accompanied by appropriate changes in...functions, work methods and responsibilities.

“6. Contracting out and devolution of functions...should be done only when:

- ...federal purposes are not jeopardized;
- the cost savings or other public interests justify the effort;
- accountability...can be assured....

The Citizens League (of the Twin Cities) has studied innovation specifically in the area of online government (29). “Reform in the state’s service delivery systems is essential,

and the set of tools that fall under what has been...termed “e-government”...offer(s) an excellent opportunity to facilitate this necessary transformation,” the report states. “Such initiatives can also help build civic confidence....” Its recommendations also make sense for any example of government innovation and/or collaboration:

“1. Provide Sustained Leadership.... Local agency cross-jurisdictional cooperation should also be encouraged. Citizens care about the service they receive, not about which government agency is responsible.

“2. Capture Cost Savings.... Make high volume, high cost services a priority.

“3. Emphasize Customer Service.... (E)fforts must be refocused on end-user customers, rather than on internal operations.”

Finally, among foundation and non-profit sources is Minnesota’s own Wilder Foundation, which has built a substantial practice in the area of collaboration—including organizational development/leadership and the delivery of social services as particular emphases. For our purposes, highlights are found mainly in *Collaboration* by Mattesich, Murray-Close and Monsey (33) and *The Nimble Collaboration* by Ray (41).

Both books posit a spectrum of partnerships (Table 22, over), which are very similar to those described by Betsy Hubbard (2) on page 3 of this report.

- “**Cooperation** is characterized by informal relationships that exist without any commonly defined mission, structure, or planning effort. Information is shared as needed, and authority is retained by each organization so there is virtually no risk. Resources are separate as are rewards.
- “**Coordination** is characterized by a more formal relationship and an understanding of compatible missions. Some planning and division of roles are required, and communication channels are established. Authority still rests with the individual organizations, but there is some increased risk to all participants. Resources are available to participants and rewards are mutually acknowledged.
- “**Collaboration** is a mutually beneficial and well-defined relationship entered into by two or more organizations to achieve common goals. The relationship includes 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.”

“Collaboration connotes a more durable and pervasive relationship. Collaborations bring previously separated organizations into a new structure with full commitment to a common mission. Such relationships require comprehensive planning and well-defined communication channels operating on many levels.... Risk is much greater because each member of the collaboration contributes its own resources and reputation....”

Table 22: Cooperation, Coordination and Collaboration

Essential Elements	Cooperation	Coordination	Collaboration
Vision and Relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missions and goals are not taken into account • Interaction as needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missions and goals are compatible • One specific project or task of definable length 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common, new mission and goals are created • Projects are undertaken for long-term results
Structure, Responsibility and Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationships are informal; each organization functions separately • No joint planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizations function relatively independently • Project planning is needed • Definite channels of communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New organizational structure • Comprehensive joint planning • Many levels of communication
Authority and Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rests with individual organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rests with individual organizations, but with coordination • Sharing of leadership and control • Some shared risk 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is determined by the collaboration to balance ownership • Leadership is dispersed, and control is shared and mutual • Equal risk is shared by all
Resources and Rewards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources are separate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources are made available to others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources are pooled or jointly secured

From Paul Mattesich, Marta Murray-Close and Barbara Monsey, *Collaboration: What Makes It Work, 2nd Edition* (33) and Karen Ray, *The Nimble Collaboration: Fine-Tuning Your Collaboration for Lasting Success* (41)

The Nimble Collaborative proposes three fundamental strategies to achieve success in a collaborative setting.

1. Focus on results. “Nimble collaborations revolve around the results participants want to achieve. Partners need to know whether all the member organizations embrace the desired results as doable and important. As you and your partners discuss desired results, you become more certain about exactly how to produce them....”
2. Shape relationships. “As in any relationship, trust is the key, and wise partners carry out action plans designed to build trust.... (S)elf-interest and trust are two sides of the same coin....”

3. Structure for resilience. “Collaborations use complex ideas to resolve complex problems. The challenges are complicated and the conditions often fluctuate. Resiliency implies that the partners move and shift to accommodate circumstances they cannot control.... That requires a structure that can flex without breaking....”

The Nimble Collaborative goes on to suggest that there are two “types” of collaboration.

- Collaborate to integrate services. “Collaborations to integrate services occur most frequently in education, housing, health care, recreation, the arts, law enforcement and social services. Many professions are innovating the way they interact with consumers and the way they create outcomes. Collaborations to integrate services redesign the way work is done....”
- Collaborate to resolve complex issues. “Some collaborations focus on multiple approaches to address complex community issues. Promoting sustainable agriculture, eliminating drug addiction, or increasing kids’ exposure to the arts in school are the missions of complex collaboratives.... The reason for multiple approaches is that such problems and visions cannot be achieved without many changes across many systems....”

“The remarkable thing about these collaborations is sheer numbers—the number of people involved, (and) the number of agencies that are collaborating....”

Wilder offers what it calls *The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory*, both within the book *Collaboration* (33) and as a separate publication (34). The inventory is also available online at http://www.wilder.org/pubs/collab_wmiw_inv_tool/index.html. The inventory is an excellent way for organizations to evaluate their own readiness and, therefore, their likelihood of success in a collaborative relationship.

The Wilder Foundation also offers a comprehensive bibliography re. collaboration at www.wilder.org/pubs/collab_bibliography/collaboration_bibliography.htm (35). The bibliography is attached to this report as Appendix D.

Foundation and Non-Profit Sources

(29) Citizens League: *Getting Online Government Back on Track: How Minnesota Can Capture Savings and Improve Customer Service: Report of the Citizens League Study Committee on e-Government Services for Minnesota* (February 2003)

(30) Coalition for Effective Change, *Principles for Reforming Government Operations in the 21st Century* (2001)

(31) R. Scott Foster, *Working Better Together: How Government, Business and Nonprofit Organizations Can Achieve Public Purposes Through Cross-Sector Collaboration, Alliances and Partnerships* (The Three Sector Initiative)

- (32) The Harwood Group, *Planned Serendipity* (The Pew Partnership for Civic Change, 2002)
- (33) Paul Mattesich, Marta Murray-Close and Barbara Monsey, *Collaboration: What Makes It Work, 2nd Edition* (Saint Paul, Wilder Research Center, 2001)
- (34) Paul Mattesich, Marta Murray-Close and Barbara Monsey, *The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory* (Saint Paul, Wilder Research Center, 2001) Take the inventory online at http://www.wilder.org/pubs/collab_wmiw_inv_tool/index.html
- (35) Compiled by Kirsten Nielsen, *Collaboration Resource List* (Amherst Wilder Foundation Publishing Center, January 2002, www.wilder.org/pubs/collab_bibliography/collaboration_bibliography.htm)
- (36) Pew Partnership for Civic Change, Celebrating Results Across the Nation (www.pew-partnership.org/programs/solutionsForAmerica/index.html)
- (37) Pew Partnership for Civic Change, Collaborative Leadership (www.pew-partnership.org/collableadership.html)
- (38) Pew Partnership for Civic Change, *In It for the Long Haul: Community Partnerships Making a Difference* (December 2001)
- (39) Pew Partnership for Civic Change, “Just Call It Effective:” *Civic Change: Moving from Projects to Progress* (2002)
- (40) Pew Partnership for Civic Change, Solutions for America: Celebrating Results Across the Nation (www.pew-partnership.org/programs/solutionsForAmerica/index.html)
- (41) Karen Ray, *The Nimble Collaboration: Fine-Tuning Your Collaboration for Lasting Success* (Saint Paul, Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 2002)
- (42) The Three Sector Initiative, *Changing Roles, Changing Relationships: The New Challenge for Business, Nonprofit Organizations and Government*
- (43) Joan Walsh, The Annie E. Casey Foundation, *The Eye of the Storm: Ten Years on the Front Lines of New Futures* (www.aecf.org/publications/eyeofstorm/alltext.htm)

Government Reports (other than Minnesota)

Reports from California, Colorado and Wisconsin were reviewed for this project. Two high-level studies—the Final Report of the California Constitution Revision Commission and the Report of the (Wisconsin) Governor’s Blue-Ribbon Commission on State-Local Partnerships for the 21st Century—were found. Both are too general to be of much help to this effort, unfortunately.

The California report (44), completed in 1996, includes a chapter entitled “Strengthening Local Government: Clarifying Roles, Enhancing Collaboration and Strengthening Home Rule.... Within California, a fragmented and confusing array of local agencies provide a myriad of services.... California needs to review and revise its local governments to make them more efficient and effective....

“(T)he Commission identified two key problems. First the organization and provision of local government services is far too complex...confusing and fragmented.... It is hard to accept that services provided through this structure are cost-effective....

“(S)econd...the power of local governments and schools to make choices about the level and quality of local services has eroded over the last 20 years.”

Following a lengthy analysis of these problems, the Commission gave consideration to several models of governance. One would eliminate the municipal services functions of counties. Another would eliminate counties as agents of the state.

The Commission rejected all such models, however, and recommended the creation of Citizens Charter Commissions on Local Government Efficiency and Restructuring (CCC) in each county. It is the work of the CCC’s that would be interesting, but a Google search suggests that no such commissions have been created. The city of Fresno passed a resolution in support of a joint commission sponsored by the city and Fresno County. The idea never came to a vote before the County Board. And no mention of action by any of California’s other 57 counties or 469 cities was found.

The Wisconsin report (46), published in January 2001, produced vastly more satisfying results in that the Commission itself made very specific recommendations for change rather than leaving it to others to further define what needs to be done.

The analysis was similar to California’s: The need for the study arose from “fiscal pressure” and “deep distrust” between state and local governments. The goals include “protect(ing) taxpayers...focus(ing) on results...reduc(ing) duplication and overlap of government services,” and so on. As in California, the report bemoans the complexity of local government, as Wisconsin has 2,738 units. It ranks 13th among the United States in number of local units, but third or fourth on a per capita basis.

The study is candid in noting the tension inherent in a system that attempts to dedicate itself to the principles of local control and equalization. Any effort to achieve one of these goals conflicts with the other.

The key recommendations address the relationship of state and local government, and so local government collaboration is a by-product, not a focus, of the report. But Chapter 7 proposes, and is titled, “Building Collaboration Among Local Governments.” The report forces the issue by proposing that “local governments should write Area Cooperation Compacts with at least two other governments in at least two function areas (including law enforcement, housing, emergency services, fire, solid waste, recycling, public health,

animal control, transportation, mass transit, land-use planning, boundary agreements, libraries, parks, recreation, culture, purchasing or e-government.... These compacts will specify a collaboration plan, performance benchmarks and cost savings for taxpayers.... Communities that do so will receive growth-sharing payments (from the state)....”

Also of interest is a recommendation that “each municipality should, as a matter of principle, be located in only one county. The citizens of any municipality currently located in more than one county should be empowered to choose, through referendum, the county in which the municipality should be completely located.”

Other recommendations include:

- “Wisconsin should encourage neighboring governments that wish to consolidate to do so.
- “(L)ocal governments ought to explore...using information technology for collaborative service delivery across jurisdictional boundaries.
- “Current state restrictions on local governments’ ability to collect user fees ought to be removed...(and) (e)xisting state caps on local fees ought to be removed.
- “Statutes restricting the ability...to cross-train...police and fire officers ought to be repealed. Statutes restricting the merger of police and fire departments ought to be repealed.
- “The state...ought to lower any barriers that prevent local governments from joining voluntarily with each other in area-wide fringe benefits pools.

More specific and therefore more helpful is “A Best Practices Review: Local Cooperation to Maintain Roads and Streets” by the Wisconsin Joint Legislative Audit Committee, published in 1999 (47). The report notes that Wisconsin Statute “gives local governments broad authority to contract with one another....” It finds that local governments do so through three types of cooperative agreements: joint ownership agreements, group purchasing agreements, and unique resource sharing agreements.

- Joint ownership is appropriate to specialized equipment that is not needed for emergency service and is used infrequently.
- Group purchasing is used for such materials and supplies as culverts and road salt, which are subject to bulk discounts. Group purchasing also allows local governments to reduce their administrative costs.
- Resource-sharing includes renting equipment from another municipality, contracting for road maintenance services, trading in-kind services and the like. One municipality may plow streets and roads in the winter, and another grade those same streets and road in

summer. Perceived barriers to such cooperation include maintenance responsibilities for equipment, liability and insurance concerns and union contract prohibitions.

Finally, the Final Report of the Governance Task Force of the 2010 Commission (45) which explored the consolidation of services by the City and County of Pueblo, Colorado, was also reviewed. The goals of the study were “(s)ignificant changes...to reduce the cost, increase the efficiency...increase the effectiveness...(and) improve...accountability....”

The Task Force made seven recommendations:

- “(F)ormalize cooperative efforts through intergovernmental agreements.
- “(J)oint activities between the City and county should receive the full support of elected and appointed officials....
- “City and County employees and officials should continue to work together to find creative, innovative ways to provide better service...while striving to increase governmental efficiency.
- “Efforts at co-locating similar departments or functions...must be fully supported with funding and appropriate policies....
- “Proper evaluation tools are needed....
- “The City of Pueblo and Pueblo County should examine ways to save taxpayer funds through better cooperation, coordination and consolidation of similar services....”

The “criteria used for making and approving recommendations in the final report” include:

- “Will the change reduce the cost of government services?
- “Will the change increase the efficiency of government services?
- “Will the change increase the effectiveness of government services?
- “Will the change protect and/or improve the rights of the public?”

The report notes that the city and county have already undertaken a variety of joint efforts—the creation of a City-County Health Department and a Regional Building Authority; co-location of purchasing departments; coordination of animal control, recreation and housing programs, among others.

It recommends additional collaboration in the following areas:

- “Closer cooperation and formal agreements between City Public Works and County Public Works.... Consolidation...should be considered....
- “(A) greater degree of cooperation between City Transit and the City’s Fleet Maintenance Division.
- “(A) streamlined ‘one-stop’ liquor licensing process....
- “Improvement of information dissemination...through closer coordination of the City’s Information Office and County Administrative Support Services.
- “Divest(iture)...of seasonal equipment, substituting leased or rented equipment....
- “Co-location of Police and Sheriff...and combining Sheriff and Police fleet maintenance, weapons storage, SWAT Teams, equipment,...training center...(and) Communications Centers including reverse 911...under the jurisdiction of one entity.
- “Cooperation and coordination...of purchasing for both the City and County” (currently co-located, but with “very little coordination or cooperation....”)
- “(C)ombining the two information services departments....
- “The City...and the County Housing...Department(s) should be combined as a cooperative effort under the jurisdiction of one entity.
- “The City-County Health Department...could be more direct(ly) accountab(le) if (it) was a department of one government entity.
- “Privatization of clerical services is possible....

The report further defines the various different “organizational structures for combined and/or consolidated agencies.” (See Table 23, next page.)

Government Reports (other than Minnesota)

(44) California Constitution Revision Commission, *Final Report and Recommendations to the Governor and Legislature*

(45) Governance Task Force of the 2010 Commission, *Final Report: Study and Recommendations: Consolidation of Services: Pueblo County and City of Pueblo* (CO) (May 8, 2002)

(46) Governor’s Blue-Ribbon Commission on State-Local Partnerships in the 21st Century, *Report* (Madison, WI, January 2001)

Table 23: Types of Combined and/or Consolidated Organizational Structures

Contracted Services	Combined Government Efforts	Independent Agencies or Authorities
<p>Complete Outsourcing Governmental function is contracted to an outside profit or non-profit company. Government maintains control through contract specifications.</p>	<p>Co-Location Similar government agencies share the same physical location</p>	<p>Quasi-Independent These agencies cannot be wholly controlled by any one government. They can raise their own fees. Employees are under the control of the agency itself.</p>
<p>Partial Outsourcing A piece of governmental function is contracted out.... Government retains control of the performance of the overall agency function.</p>	<p>Combined Operations-Separate Authority Operations can be jointly planned. Employees of each agency work interdependently. Each government keeps its own organizational structure.</p>	<p>Independent Contract Agency Provides services to government on a daily or frequent basis. Dependent on the governments that created it. Wholly funded by the agencies/governments it serves through contract agreements. Rules do not need the approval of the elected bodies. Employees are under the control of the agency itself.</p>
<p>Outsourcing to a Government Agency Government function (partial or whole) is operated by another governmental entity. Contract specifications or intergovernmental agreements delineate functions.... Legal authority and responsibility remains with the government contracting for services.</p>	<p>Combined Operations-Single Authority Similar governmental operations are performed by one entity. Employees are under direct supervision of only one government.</p>	<p>Independent Agency Provides services to the general public. Not dependent on the governments that created it. Funded by fees, little or no funding from local governments. Employees are under the control of the agency itself.</p>

From Governance Task Force of the 2010 Commission, *Final Report: Study and Recommendations: Consolidation of Services: Pueblo County and City of Pueblo (CO)* (45)

(47) Legislative Audit Bureau/Joint Legislative Audit Committee (State of Wisconsin), *Local Cooperation to Maintain Roads and Streets: A Best Practices Review*, May 1999

Minnesota Government Reports

The Office of the Legislative Auditor (OLA) has conducted a series of Best Practices Reviews of local government service delivery since 1996 (51-60). Note that the best practices recommended in these report rarely address local government collaboration directly. But some do, and all of the reports contain at least tangential references to

collaborative approaches to the activities described. The subject matter of the reviews includes:

- Snow and Ice Control (1995)
- Property Assessments: Structure and Appeals (1996)
- Non-Felony Prosecution (1997)
- 9-1-1 Dispatching (1998)
- Fire Services (1999)
- Preventive Maintenance for Local Government Buildings (2000)
- Managing Local Government Computer Systems (2001)
- Local E-Government (2002)
- Preserving Housing (2003)

In addition to these Reviews, the OLA published “State Mandates on Local Government: A Summary” (60) in 2000, though this was not described as a Best Practices report.

Before looking at the details of these ten reports, it is interesting also to look at the extensive list (61) of subjects that the Auditor’s office and its Local Government Advisory Council has considered for review over the years (Table 24, over).

Following is a summary of the Best Practices Reviews, specifically insofar as they address opportunities for local government collaboration.

- Snow and Ice Control (1995). The report (59) identifies “twelve actions for effective snow and ice control” on local roads. The second recommendation is to “encourage cooperative snowplowing services and facilities,” which may enable local governments to “curtail expenditures, avoid duplication of services, eliminate unnecessary purchases of equipment and facilities, and use employees more effectively. Salt storage sheds and refueling stations” are suggested, while the report goes on to acknowledge that “many local jurisdictions already share snowplowing equipment, duties or personnel.”

The report also encourages local governments to “contract for service, or parts of service, when appropriate,” as for specialized areas (cul-de-sacs, alleys, etc.) that may require specialized equipment.

- Property Assessments: Structure and Appeals (1996). This report (58) compares the various assessment systems operating in the state. In 1994, 23 counties had a “county-wide assessment system” in which the county assessor offices assessed the value of all properties in the county. In ten other counties, the county assessor does not inspect properties, but provides oversight of assessments produced by local assessors working for cities and/or townships. In 54 counties, county assessors assess some parcels while local assessors assess others. In slightly more than half of such counties the local assessors assess more than half of all properties, while in fewer than half of such counties the county assessors assess more than half of the properties.

Table 24: Topic Suggestions for Best Practices Reviews*

General Category	Topic
Criminal Justice and Courts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed circuit video instead of transporting people for arraignments • <u>Administrative enforcement of city codes and ordinances</u> • Community corrections and probation services • Enforcement of DWI laws • Handling cases of domestic assault • Public defenders and their relationships with prosecutors/judiciary • Victim advocacy programs
General Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Vehicle fleet management</u> • Building inspections/building permits • Performance budgeting • Carrying out mandates • <u>Fair administration of contracts with other local governments</u> • <u>Obtaining citizen input</u> • <u>Consolidation, partnering, cooperative service delivery</u> • Obtaining state permits (wetlands, etc.) • <u>Collecting local government fines and fees</u> ◦ Deregulation of electric and gas utilities • Materials purchasing and handling • Maintenance of computerized systems • Nonprofessional contract services • Personnel issues—e.g. pay equity, surveys, etc.
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehabilitation programs • Creating affordable housing
Human Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing child protective services
Information Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information services • Use of Internet to provide public information and services
K-12 Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing public works to K-12 schools
Other Topics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shade tree disease prevention • <u>Tax-base sharing</u> • Welfare fraud investigation
Parks and Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parks and trail maintenance • Nonresident use/differential fees/special park districts • Wildlife control • ADA

Table 24: Topic Suggestions for Best Practices Reviews (continued)*

<p>Public Safety</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Paying for ambulance services re. changes to Medicare reimbursement</u> • Controlling the number of peace officer court appearances • Emergency medical services • Fire fighter pensions • Management of crime labs • Nonemergency police efforts such as investigations, patrols, special (e.g SWAT) teams, police/sheriff jurisdictional issues
<p>Public Works</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Bituminous patching, seal coating, crack fillings, roadside mowing, slurry seals, fog seals, etc.</u> • Composting • Gravel road maintenance • Fresh water maintenance—water mains, hydrants, storage • Mosquito control • Purchasing new road maintenance equipment • Road striping • Sanitary sewer maintenance and rehabilitation • Selecting roads and setting priorities for reconstruction • Road maintenance—e.g. sharing facilities among units of government, sub-contracting to other units • Sign surveying and roadside maintenance • Storm sewer maintenance, drainage and storm sewer management • Street sign inventory

From Memoranda, Jody A. Hauer, Coordinator, Best Practices Reviews, to Local Government Advisory Council, Best Practices Reviews, “Topic Suggestions for Best Practices Reviews” (61)

*Topics shown in **boldface** subsequently were studied. Topics that are underlined were identified in the memoranda as “worthy of future reconsideration.”

The point of this analysis was, in part, to determine which system is more efficient, more fair, etc. County-wide systems proved to be more efficient and also to have a significantly higher usage of computerized tools and sophisticated mapping systems.

- Non-Felony Prosecution (1997). The report (55) compares the performance of county and city attorneys on a variety of performance criteria. The report also notes that a variety of systems, as in the case of property assessments, are in place around the state. About 14 percent of county attorneys prosecute all non-felony offenses in the county. About 59 percent prosecute non-felony offenses for some but not all cities in the country, and 27 percent do not prosecute non-felony offenses for any cities.

County attorneys are more efficient both in terms of cases per FTE legal and supporting staff. County attorneys offices are more likely to have victim/witness assistance programs, misdemeanor-related training for peace officers (by 85 percent to 47 percent for city attorneys), a higher percentage of cases disposed at arraignment, and formal prosecutor communication with local elected officials and citizens. County attorneys are

twice as likely to have written guidelines setting guidelines among cases and to reimburse prosecutors for continuing legal education.

- 9-1-1 Dispatching (1998). This report (51) notes that Minnesota had 112 local public safety answering points (PSAPs). Of the 87 counties, 78 operate a single answering point and one operates two. In the other eight counties, the county operates a PSAP and local governments operate separate PSAPs. The report goes on to note that counties (and citizens) have four levels of service, which are largely unrelated to the number of PSAPs in an area.

The report recommends (best practice number four) that local governments “consider opportunities for coordinated use of dispatching equipment and for cooperative dispatching.” It goes on to say, however, that “we cannot assume that cooperative dispatching will automatically produce benefits for every locale,” and that joint dispatching may “have...operational, political and governance difficulties.”

- Fire Services (1999). Fire services is one area in which local government collaboration appears to be well established and yet (or, paradoxically, perhaps because of this) this report (52) makes little mention of local government partnership. In an introductory paragraph, the report “recommend(s) that more fire departments...tak(e) full advantage of cooperative opportunities.” But none of the seven formal recommendations mention local government collaboration. Further, the report identifies four different types of departments, from a fully volunteer to an entirely full-time, paid professional department. Given the range of expenditures—from \$16 per capita in volunteer departments to \$76 per capita in full-time departments—there is no suggestion that it is feasible for any but the very largest jurisdictions to aspire to a full-time department. The report merely implies that some communities may be able to better meet the report’s recommendations collaboratively. This would seem to apply particularly to such non-emergency services as assessing risks, ensuring fire code compliance, training, etc.

- Preventive Maintenance of Local Government Buildings (2000). The report (57) makes little mention of collaboration. One example of recommendation number five, however, is of a collaboration of six school districts to jointly provide certain maintenance functions.

- Managing Local Government Computer Systems (2001). The report (54) notes that local governments use a variety of options to manage their computer systems, including intergovernmental computer consortia, vendors and in-house staff. Cities (40 percent) are most likely to work with computer vendors, and are least likely to participate in a consortium or to have in-house staff. Yet 71 percent of cities have in-house staff, compared with more than 80 percent each of cities and school districts.

The recommended best practices include: an inventory and framework should be in place to guide the management of a computer system, knowledgeable staff should maintain and use the computer system, and the computer system should be secure.

- Local E-Government (2002). One of the recommendations of this report (53) is to “assess opportunities for collaboration.” As an example, the Red Rock School District in southwestern Minnesota collaborated with a farmer’s cooperative to develop the infrastructure for wireless, high-speed Internet access.

- Preserving Housing (2003). “Local governments should follow best practices in preserving housing and when” (not if) “they work with others—housing and redevelopment authorities (HRAs), economic development agencies, community action organizations, and regional development commissions—they should ensure that best practices are followed” (56). Recommended best practices include:

- Thinking Strategically. “Cities that have not identified their housing needs should do so.” Examples of cities working with HRAs and the Greater Metropolitan Housing Corporation are cited.

- Implementing Regulatory Strategies. “(I)mplementing such strategies (as local codes and standards for property maintenance) may require outside expertise.”

- Implementing Supportive Strategies. “Supportive housing strategies encourage people to preserve their buildings. Providing access to financial assistance is one supportive strategy.” Examples of cities working with HRAs and nonprofit agencies are cited.

Finally, the report concerning State Mandates on Local Government (60), published in 2000, specifically addresses the partnership (or lack thereof) between state and local government. It calls on local government associations to do a better job of helping its members cope with those mandates, and of encouraging legislators to provide greater clarity as to legislative intent.

Like its legislative namesake (the OLA), the Office of the State Auditor (OSA) published a report (50) in 2003 which bears upon the relationship between state and local government—a study on Local Government Aid (LGA) which “finds that the more LGA a city receives, the higher its spending.” The report goes on to say that “it is possible to lower LGA on an adjusted basis by 51 percent for cities over 2,500 (population) and these cities will still be able to provide essential services without raising taxes.” The report does not address the issue of local government partnerships, but one might infer that in order to “provide essential services without raising taxes” in the faces of LGA cuts that local governments may have to adopt (and may be expected by the OSA) to adopt collaborative service delivery methods.

Finally (in the category of state of Minnesota reports), the Board of Government Innovation and Cooperation did much work in this area before it was abolished in 2000. Unfortunately, its records are not readily accessible, so we have only been able to obtain one report called “Innovations: Bright Ideas in Local Government: A Resource Listing of Minnesota Innovations (First Edition, February 1999). As in the OLA reports, the focus is

on “innovation,” not on collaboration or partnership per se, and yet most of the examples demonstrate collaborative approaches.

The report (48) contains 110 “examples of public services and service delivery systems that are perceived to be unique.” The examples were submitted by the local units of government. No submitted example was excluded from the publication, which cautions, “What may be perceived to be innovative by some local officials may be considered common practice in other jurisdictions.”

Representatives of local government were asked to submit innovative programs that meet the following criteria:

- “(T)he innovative strategy program or project...improves operations... (and) meets the mission or vision of the community. What is different about it?”
- “How does (the) idea...foster effective and constructive citizen involvement...or connections with other organizations.”
- The program is being evaluated, it has achieved “results,” and “there (are) indications that (the) efforts will be sustained over time.”
- The idea “is...easily transferred to other communities.”
- “(T)he innovation...save(s) money...or...provide(s) services in a more effective way (or both).”

The examples are classified into 13 different categories including:

- K-12 Education. Most of the twelve cases are collaborative in nature, usually among school districts, higher education institutions, social service agencies (both government and non-profit), local units of government and others for the delivery of social services or specialized curriculum.
- Development Needs of Youth. The vast majority of these 27 examples represent collaborative efforts, mostly for integrated delivery of services to at-risk youth.
- Community and Economic Development. This catch-all category includes everything from citizen participation to housing, plus libraries and recreation as well as classic economic development activities. Most are collaborative efforts among cities and their neighborhoods, among counties, and involving many other entities.

Two of the examples reside in Dakota County: 1) GIS for economic development, and 2) a collaboration among the county, the City of Inver Grove Heights, the Inver Heights Public Schools and Inver Hills Community College for a shared library facility.

- **Diversity.** Most of these 10 examples represent collaborations among cities, counties, school districts, social service agencies, minority communities and others concerning the needs of those minority communities.
- **Environmental Protection and Solid Waste Management.** These nine examples probably represent the broadest collaboratives, typically representing multiple counties or multiple levels of government.
- **General Governmental Administration and Intergovernmental Cooperation.** Many of these 15 examples are collaboratives. Communities in the Rush City area conducted a feasibility study of service sharing opportunities, for example. Several are cases of mediated settlements of annexations and municipal mergers. Meanwhile, 18 cities and seven counties in west central Minnesota have created a cooperative for the development of shared programming.
- **Health and Human Services.** Most of the 19 examples represent collaborations, among local units of government, generally involved social service agencies as well. Topics range from the general (integrated human services, a crisis referral system, general assistance, public health records) to the specific (healthy eating, hand washing, child care, transportation).
- **Justice Programs—Adult.** These 17 examples are least likely (among the various categories) to represent local government collaborations. Where partnering is involved, it tends to encompass units within the criminal justice system and/or social services. All but two of the programs are located in Ramsey County. Dakota County is represented, however, with its sentence-to-serve restoration work crews.
- **Justice Programs—Juvenile.** All but one of these nine cases are located in Ramsey County, and most represent partnerships among units of the juvenile justice system, social services and community volunteers.
- **Public Safety.** These twelve examples include cooperation between law enforcement agencies (city-county and city-city) whether for routine or emergency services, consolidated dispatch service and community policing.
- **Public Works and Transportation.** Only three of these eleven cases represent collaboration among local units of government, including city-city, city-county and city-county-state. Activities include cooperative equipment maintenance, shared facilities and a multi-county transit system.
- **Strategic Planning and Citizen Involvement.** About half of these nine examples represent collaborative efforts, including three examples of multi-unit planning and zoning. Also cited is a study by the seven metro counties and the AMC redefining the appropriate role of the counties in service delivery.
- **Technology.** Finally, about half of eleven information technology projects represent partnerships among local units of government, or between local units and school districts.

Finally, Dakota County provided a lengthy list of examples of intergovernmental collaboration agreements presently in force in the county (49).

State of Minnesota Reports

(48) Board of Government Innovation and Cooperation, *Innovations: Bright Ideas in Local Government: A Resource Listing of Minnesota Innovations, First Edition*, February 1999

(49) Dakota County, “Examples of Intergovernmental Collaboration Agreements in Dakota County”

(50) Government Information Division, Office of the State Auditor, State of Minnesota, *Special Study: Local Government Aid and Its Effect on Expenditures* (February 10, 2003)

Program Evaluation Division, Office of the Legislative Auditor, State of Minnesota

(51) *9-1-1 Dispatching: A Best Practices Review* (April 6, 1998)

(52) *Fire Services: A Best Practices Review* (April 14, 1999)

(53) *Local E-Government: A Best Practices Review* (April 30, 2003)

(54) *Managing Local Government Computer Systems: A Best Practices Review* (April 30, 2002)

(55) *Non-Felony Prosecution: A Best Practices Review* (April 17, 1997)

(56) *Preserving Housing: A Best Practices Review* (April 16, 2003)

(57) *Preventive Maintenance for Local Government Buildings: A Best Practices Review* (April 12, 2000)

(58) *Property Assessments: Structure & Appeals: A Best Practices Review* (May 1996)

(59) *Snow and Ice Control: A Best Practices Review* (May 11, 2003)

(60) *State Mandates on Local Government* (January 26, 2000)

(61) Program Evaluation Division, Office of the Legislative Auditor, State of Minnesota; Memoranda, Jody A. Hauer, Coordinator, Best Practices Reviews, to Local Government Advisory Council, Best Practices Reviews, “Topic Suggestions for Best Practices Reviews,” dated March 30, 2000; March 21, 2001; and March 4, 2002

Miscellaneous Reports

Two media reports originating in central Minnesota caught our eye about the time this project got started. Rep. Joe Opatz, St. Cloud, has been encouraging the consolidation of government services in the St. Cloud area for many years—the area consisting of five cities, three counties, several townships and four police departments. The recent article (62) says “Perhaps Opatz’s latest idea, with support from Gov. Tim Pawlenty, will finally push area governments to step outside their comfort zones and really make some major changes.... But based on recent history, we aren’t holding our breath.”

The second article (64) concerns a \$150,000 study, funded by the state legislature, concerning PSAP consolidation. The study is being conducted by the Management Analysis Division, Department of Administration. The article quotes at great length several law enforcement and emergency services personnel who oppose joint dispatch.

Finally, the work of the Public Strategies Group is not generally available for our review, but a short summary of some work for eleven local governments in the Chippewa Valley, Wisconsin, recently was posted on the company’s Web site (63). The company constructed a continuum of cooperative efforts:

Table 25: Continuum of Cooperative Efforts

	Formality Needed	Trust Needed	Financial Savings Likely	Need to Measure Results
Exchange	Low	Medium	Low	Low
Coordinate	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low
Share	Medium to High	High	Medium to High	Medium
Pool	High	Medium	Medium to High	Medium to High
Consolidate	High	High	High	High

From The Public Strategies Group, “’Tis the Season for Sharing—Services, That Is,” http://www.psgroup.com/display_content.jsp?top=1747&mid=2503&siteObjectID=3077 (49).

- Exchange. “The simplest form of cooperation involves informal exchange of information.”
- Coordinate. “Governments coordinate...when they work together in the areas of planning, problem solving and service delivery.”

- Share. “Sharing of facilities, equipment, or staff increases the complexity of cooperation....”
- Pool. “Pooling (purchasing power, risk) can give governments the ability to cut costs and provide access to benefits they otherwise would not be able to afford on their own.”
- Consolidate. “Consolidation of programs or organizations typically requires more complex and formal cooperative arrangements. For example, in Eau Claire and in Kenosha, city and county law enforcement records, evidence and vehicle maintenance have been consolidated. Even entire organizational units can be consolidated, such as the Eau Claire City/County Health Department or the Neenah-Menasha Fire Department.”

Using this continuum, these eleven cities considered various collaboration opportunities, and chose three as their top priorities.

- “Training on state and federal risk management regulations
- “County-wide property assessment and property tax collection services
- “Collective purchasing”

“For each (of the three priorities), they have clarified the opportunity, the likely barriers, and charted the first steps to take to advance these ideas....”

Miscellaneous Reports

(62) “Our view: Proposal to merge area governments faces barriers,” *St. Cloud Times*, December 19, 2003

(63) The Public Strategies Group, “’Tis the Season for Sharing—Services, That Is,” http://www.psggrp.com/display_content.jsp?top=1747&mid=2503&siteObjectID=3077.

(64) “Sharing dispatchers not well received,” *West Central Tribune* (Willmar, MN), December 12, 2003

Appendix B: Consolidated Bibliography

Academic Sources

(1) Ash Institute for Democratic Governance and Innovation, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Innovations in American Government Award, Selection Criteria
(<http://www.innovations.harvard.edu/content.cfm?activeSection=8&activeSubSection=11>)

(2) Betsy Hubbard, *Making Sense of Public Service Partnerships: Understanding the Why and How of Interagency Efforts* (Humphrey Institute, University of Minnesota, August 1995; written in fulfillment of an independent paper requirement for a Master of Arts degree in Public Affairs)

Center for Technology in Government, State University of New York at Albany, *New Models of Collaboration: A Guide for Managers*, including:

(3) Overview and summary at
www.ctg.albany.edu/publications/online/new_models

(4) Sharon Dawes, Center for Technology in Government, *New Models of Collaboration: Lessons from the American Experience* (colloquium presentation: *Public-Private Partnership for Improved Government Performance*, October 24-25, 2002)

(5) Sharon Dawes, Center for Technology in Government, *The role of trust in new models of collaboration*, 2003

(6) Ophelia Eglene and Sharon S. Dawes, Center for Technology in Government, *New York State GIS Coordination Program*, 2003

(7) Patricia Diamond Fletcher, Ph.D. Department of Public Policy, UMBC, Baltimore, MD, *Leadership and Project Success: Lessons from High Impact Government Innovations*, 2003

(8) John P. Gant, Syracuse University, *Information Sharing, Communication and Coordination in E-government Collaborations*, 2003

(9) Lise Préfontaine, Université du Québec a Montréal, *Risk management in new models of collaboration*, 2003

(10) Lise Préfontaine et al (CEFRIO), *New Models of Collaboration for Public Service Delivery*, April 2000

(11) Lee Munnich, Senior Fellow and Director, State and Local Policy Program, Humphrey Institute, University of Minnesota, personal interview, February 4, 2004

(12) Darrell M. West, Center for Public Policy, Brown University, *Urban E-Government, 2002* (www.INSIDEPOLITICS.org/egovt02city.html)

AMC Sources

(13) Association of Minnesota Counties, *Current Assessment of Minnesota County Government: Report of Quantitative and Qualitative Research Findings* (December 2003)

(14) Association of Minnesota Counties, *Minnesota Counties Futures Project*

(15) Jim Mulder, Executive Director, Association of Minnesota Counties, personal interview, February 5, 2004

(Other) Association Sources

(16) Jacqueline Byers, National Association of Counties, personal interview (telephone), January 27, 2004

(17) Richard L. Clark, *Counties in Crisis: A Survey of Current Budgetary Situations Facing America's Counties*, Prepared for The National Association of Counties (February 2003)

(18) Richard H. Goodman and William G. Zimmerman, Jr., *Thinking Differently: Recommendations for 21st Century School Board/Superintendent Leadership, Governance, and Teamwork for High Student Achievement* (American Association of School Administrators)

(19) League of Minnesota Cities, city survey results (raw data), February 2004

(20) League of Minnesota Cities, *Combining Government Services: Issues to Consider* (www.lmnc.org/pdfs/combining%20governmental%20services.pdf)

(21) League of Minnesota Cities, *Combining Police Departments: Issues to Consider* (www.lmnc.org/pdfs/jointpowersmemo.pdf)

(22) League of Minnesota Cities, "Intergovernmental cooperation," Chapter 19, *LMC Handbook for Minnesota Cities* (www.lmnc.org/library/handbook.cfm)

(23) League of Minnesota Cities, *Resource Guide For Dealing With Budget Cuts: Strategies for Cities* (<http://www.lmnc.org/pdfs/BudgetCutsResourceGuide.pdf>)

(24) National Academy of Public Administration, *High Performance Partnerships* (www.napawash.org/pc_local_state/ongoing_high_performance.html), a project funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation

(25) National Academy of Public Administration, *Powering the Future: High-Performance Partnerships* (April 2003)

(26) The National Association of Counties, *Achievement Awards* (case studies archives home at http://www.naco.org/Template.cfm?Section=Achievement_Awards&Template=/cfiles/awards/achieve_srch.cfm)

(27) National Association of Local Government Environmental Professionals, *Local Innovations* (case studies at <http://www.nalgep.org/issues/localinnovation/>)

(28) The National League of Cities, *Major Factors Affecting America's Cities: A Report from the National League of Cities' Municipalities in Transition Project*

Foundation and Non-Profit Sources

(29) Citizens League: *Getting Online Government Back on Track: How Minnesota Can Capture Savings and Improve Customer Service: Report of the Citizens League Study Committee on e-Government Services for Minnesota* (February 2003)

(30) Coalition for Effective Change, *Principles for Reforming Government Operations in the 21st Century* (2001)

(31) R. Scott Foster, *Working Better Together: How Government, Business and Nonprofit Organizations Can Achieve Public Purposes Through Cross-Sector Collaboration, Alliances and Partnerships* (The Three Sector Initiative)

(32) The Harwood Group, *Planned Serendipity* (The Pew Partnership for Civic Change, 2002)

(33) Paul Mattesich, Marta Murray-Close and Barbara Monsey, *Collaboration: What Makes It Work, 2nd Edition* (Saint Paul, Wilder Research Center, 2001)

(34) Paul Mattesich, Marta Murray-Close and Barbara Monsey, *The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory* (Saint Paul, Wilder Research Center, 2001) Take the inventory online at http://www.wilder.org/pubs/collab_wmiw_inv_tool/index.html

(35) Compiled by Kirsten Nielsen, *Collaboration Resource List* (Amherst Wilder Foundation Publishing Center, January 2002, www.wilder.org/pubs/collab_bibliography/collaboration_bibliography.htm)

(36) Pew Partnership for Civic Change, *Celebrating Results Across the Nation* (www.pew-partnership.org/programs/solutionsForAmerica/index.html)

(37) Pew Partnership for Civic Change, *Collaborative Leadership* (www.pew-partnership.org/collableadership.html)

(38) Pew Partnership for Civic Change, *In It for the Long Haul: Community Partnerships Making a Difference* (December 2001)

(39) Pew Partnership for Civic Change, “*Just Call It Effective:*” *Civic Change: Moving from Projects to Progress* (2002)

(40) Pew Partnership for Civic Change, *Solutions for America: Celebrating Results Across the Nation* (www.pew-partnership.org/programs/solutionsForAmerica/index.html)

(41) Karen Ray, *The Nimble Collaboration: Fine-Tuning Your Collaboration for Lasting Success* (Saint Paul, Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 2002)

(42) The Three Sector Initiative, *Changing Roles, Changing Relationships: The New Challenge for Business, Nonprofit Organizations and Government*

(43) Joan Walsh, The Annie E. Casey Foundation, *The Eye of the Storm: Ten Years on the Front Lines of New Futures* (www.aecf.org/publications/eyeofstorm/alltext.htm)

Government Reports (other than Minnesota)

(44) California Constitution Revision Commission, *Final Report and Recommendations to the Governor and Legislature*

(45) Governance Task Force of the 2010 Commission, *Final Report: Study and Recommendations: Consolidation of Services: Pueblo County and City of Pueblo* (CO) (May 8, 2002)

(46) Governor’s Blue-Ribbon Commission on State-Local Partnerships in the 21st Century, *Report* (Madison, WI, January 2001)

(47) Legislative Audit Bureau/Joint Legislative Audit Committee (State of Wisconsin), *Local Cooperation to Maintain Roads and Streets: A Best Practices Review*, May 1999

Minnesota Government Reports

(48) Board of Government Innovation and Cooperation, *Innovations: Bright Ideas in Local Government: A Resource Listing of Minnesota Innovations, First Edition*, February 1999

(49) Dakota County, “Examples of Intergovernmental Collaboration Agreements in Dakota County” (see also Appendix B)

(50) Government Information Division, Office of the State Auditor, State of Minnesota, *Special Study: Local Government Aid and Its Effect on Expenditures* (February 10, 2003)

Program Evaluation Division, Office of the Legislative Auditor, State of Minnesota

(51) *9-1-1 Dispatching: A Best Practices Review* (April 6, 1998)

(52) *Fire Services: A Best Practices Review* (April 14, 1999)

(53) *Local E-Government: A Best Practices Review* (April 30, 2003)

(54) *Managing Local Government Computer Systems: A Best Practices Review*
(April 30, 2002)

(55) *Non-Felony Prosecution: A Best Practices Review* (April 17, 1997)

(56) *Preserving Housing: A Best Practices Review* (April 16, 2003)

(57) *Preventive Maintenance for Local Government Buildings: A Best Practices Review*
(April 12, 2000)

(58) *Property Assessments: Structure & Appeals: A Best Practices Review*
(May 1996)

(59) *Snow and Ice Control: A Best Practices Review* (May 11, 2003)

(60) *State Mandates on Local Government* (January 26, 2000)

(61) Program Evaluation Division, Office of the Legislative Auditor, State of Minnesota; Memoranda, Jody A. Hauer, Coordinator, Best Practices Reviews, to Local Government Advisory Council, Best Practices Reviews, "Topic Suggestions for Best Practices Reviews," dated March 30, 2000; March 21, 2001; and March 4, 2002

(51) Board of Government Innovation and Cooperation, *Innovations: Bright Ideas in Local Government: A Resource Listing of Minnesota Innovations, First Edition*, February 1999

(52) Government Information Division, Office of the State Auditor, State of Minnesota, *Special Study: Local Government Aid and Its Effect on Expenditures* (February 10, 2003)

Program Evaluation Division, Office of the Legislative Auditor, State of Minnesota

(53) *9-1-1 Dispatching: A Best Practices Review* (April 6, 1998)

(54) *Fire Services: A Best Practices Review* (April 14, 1999)

(55) *Local E-Government: A Best Practices Review* (April 30, 2003)

(56) *Managing Local Government Computer Systems: A Best Practices Review*
(April 30, 2002)

- (57) *Non-Felony Prosecution: A Best Practices Review* (April 17, 1997)
- (58) *Preserving Housing: A Best Practices Review* (April 16, 2003)
- (59) *Preventive Maintenance for Local Government Buildings: A Best Practices Review* (April 12, 2000)
- (60) *Property Assessments: Structure & Appeals: A Best Practices Review* (May 1996)
- (61) *Snow and Ice Control: A Best Practices Review* (May 11, 2003)
- (62) *State Mandates on Local Government* (January 26, 2000)
- (63) Program Evaluation Division, Office of the Legislative Auditor, State of Minnesota; Memoranda, Jody A. Hauer, Coordinator, Best Practices Reviews, to Local Government Advisory Council, Best Practices Reviews, "Topic Suggestions for Best Practices Reviews," dated March 30, 2000; March 21, 2001; and March 4, 2002

Miscellaneous Reports

- (62) "Our view: Proposal to merge area governments faces barriers," *St. Cloud Times*, December 19, 2003
- (63) The Public Strategies Group, "'Tis the Season for Sharing—Services, That Is," http://www.psgrp.com/display_content.jsp?top=1747&mid=2503&siteObjectID=3077.
- (64) "Sharing dispatchers not well received," *West Central Tribune* (Willmar, MN), December 12, 2003

Appendix C: Collaboration Resource List

Compiled by Kirsten Nielsen, Amherst H. Wilder Foundation Publishing Center. January 2003.

(This bibliography is available online at www.wilder.org/pubs/collab_bibliography/collaboration_bibliography.htm)

The following resources deal directly with the topic of collaboration or are resources deemed useful to collaborations and collaboration consultants. The sources for these are listed at the end of this document. At the end of each entry below, a number in parentheses is keyed to one of the sources listed at the end of the document. Sources include books published by the Wilder Foundation and respondents to an e-mail sent to contacts with collaboration expertise.

Some of the resources were provided with a description of the content, which we've included. It would be a mistake to assume that those resources without an annotation are less useful. The presence or absence of an annotation simply reflects what we received from the source.

Abbott, Beverly, Pat Jordan, and Niaz Murtaza. "Interagency Collaboration for Children's Mental Health Services: The San Mateo County Model for Managed Care." *Administration and Policy in Mental Health* 22, no. 3 (1995): 301–313. (1)

Agranoff, Robert, and Valerie Lindsay. "Intergovernmental Management: Perspectives from Human Services Problem Solving at the Local Level." *Public Administration Review* (May/June 1983): 227–237. (1)

Alaszewski, Andy, and Larry Harrison. "Literature Review: Collaboration and Coordination Between Welfare Agencies." *British Journal of Social Work* 18 (1988): 635–647. (1)

Albrecht, Karl, and Ron Zemke. *Service America*. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones/Irwin, 1985. Details challenges and solution for nonprofit work in the 1990s. (2)

Altman, Lawrence. "New Method of Analyzing Health Data Stirs Debate." *New York Times*. 21 August 1990, p. B5. (1)

Andress, Shelby, and Eugene C. Roehlkepartain. *Working Together for Youth: A Practical Guide for Individuals and Groups*. Minneapolis, MN: Lutheran Brotherhood, 1993. How to begin with individual motivation and move on to building a vision, taking action, and widening the circle of involvement. (2)

Angelica, Emil. *The Wilder Nonprofit Field Guide to Crafting Effective Mission and Vision Statements*. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 2001. (3)

Angelica, Marion Peters. *Resolving Conflict in Nonprofit Organizations: The Leader's Guide to Finding Constructive Solutions*. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 1999. A hands-on guide to understanding, identifying, and resolving conflict constructively in nonprofit organization. (2)

Annie E. Casey Foundation. *The Path of Most Resistance*. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation, 1995. (4)

———. *Evaluating Comprehensive Community Change*. Baltimore, MD: Research and Evaluation Conference, Annie E. Casey Foundation, 1997. (4)

———. *The Eye of the Storm*. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation, 1998. <http://www.aecf.org/publications/eyeofstorm/alltext.htm> (4)

- Aronstein, David M., and Michael A. Connolly. "Access to Life-Saving Medicine: A Collaboration Between a Not-For-Profit HIV Clinical Research Agency, a State Public Health Department, and For-Profit Pharmaceutical Companies." *Crossing the Borders: Collaboration and Competition Among Nonprofits, Business and Government*. Washington, DC: Independent Sector, 1999. (1)
- Ashman, Darcy. "Promoting Corporate Citizenship in the Global South: Towards a Model of Empowered Civil Society Collaboration with Business." *IDR Reports* 16, no. 3 (2000). (1)
- Aspen Roundtable on Comprehensive Community Initiatives. *Voices from the Field*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute, 1997. <<http://www.aspenroundtable.org/voices/index.htm>> (4)
- Atkinson, Philip. *Creating Culture Change: Key to Successful Total Quality Management*. United Kingdom: IFS Publications, 1990. Collaboration often requires organizations to change; this book lays out the steps for making changes in the context of continuous process improvement. (2)
- AtKisson, Alan. "The Innovation Diffusion Game: A Tool for Encouraging Participation in Positive Cultural Change." *In Context*, no. 28 (Spring 1991): 58. Describes nine role types usually found in the process of cultural change, and five critical characteristics of successful innovations. (2)
- Auluck, Randhir, and Paul Iles. "The Referral Process: A Study of Working Relationships Between Antenatal Clinic Nursing Staff and Hospital Social Workers and Their Impact on Asian Women." *British Journal of Social Work* 21 (1991): 41–61. (1)
- Austin, James E. *The Collaboration Challenge: How Nonprofits and Businesses Succeed Through Strategic Alliances*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000. (1)
- Ayre, Darwin, Gruffie Clough, and Tyler Norris. *Facilitating Community Change*. Boulder, CO: Community Initiatives, LLC, 2000. A comprehensive guide to designing, organizing and implementing community partnerships that generate positive outcomes.(6)
- Ayre, Darwin, Gruffie Cough, and Tyler Norris. *Trendbenders: Building Healthy and Vital Communities*. Chicago: Health Research and Educational Trust, 2002. (6)
- Bailey, D., and K. M. Koney. "Community-Based Consortia: One Model for Creation and Development." *Journal of Community Practice* 2, no. 1 (1995): 21–42. (4)
- . "An integrative framework for evaluation of community-based consortia." *Evaluation and Program Planning* 18, no. 3 (1995): 245–257. (4)
- . "Interorganizational Community-Based Collaboratives: a strategic response to shape the social work agenda." *Social Work* 41, no. 6 (1996): 602–611. (4)
- . *Strategic Alliances Among Health and Human Services Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2000. (4)
- Bastien, David T., and Todd J. Hostager. "Jazz as a Process of Organization Innovation." *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, 23 October 1988. An analysis of how a jazz group's ability to share information, communicate invention strategies, and coordinate complex ideas can be applied to organizations.(2)
- Bennis, Warren, and Patricia Ward. *Organizing Genius: The Secrets of Creative Collaboration*. New York: Addison-Wesley, 1997. (The Nimble Collaboration)

- Bennis, Warren. *Why Leaders Can't Lead*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989. Bennis explains that fragmentation of service delivery is an unconscious effort to stop change. Becoming a conscious leader of change is key to creating change on a system-wide basis. (2)
- Berger, Renee A. "Teamworks." Speech delivered to the Minnesota Council on Foundations. 27 September 1989. Outlines the steps for successful partnerships. (2)
- Berkowitz, B., and T. Wolff. *The Spirit of the Coalition*. Washington, DC: American Association of Public Health, 2000. (4)
- Bernard, Bonnie. "Working Together: Principles of Effective Collaboration." *Prevention Forum* (October 1989): 4. A selection of research-based attributes which result in effective collaborations. (2)
- Bierly, Eugene W. "The World Climate Program: Collaboration and Communication on a Global Scale." *The Annals* 495 (1998): 106–116. (1)
- Billitteri, T. J. "United Ways Seek a New Identity." *The Chronicle of Philanthropy* 12, no. 10 (2000): 1, 21, 23–26. (4)
- Blake, Robert, and Jane Mouton. *Consultation*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1976. Strategies for helping organizations identify issues and apply solutions. (2)
- Blanchard, Ken, et al. *Empowerment Takes More Than a Minute*. New York: MJF Books, 1996. (3)
- Blank, R. M. *It Takes a Nation: A New Agenda for Fighting Poverty*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997. (4)
- Block, Carolyn Rebecca, Barbara Engel, Sara M. Naureckas, and Kim A. Riordan. "The Chicago Women's Health Risk Study." *Violence Against Women* 5, no. 10 (1999): 1158–1177. (1)
- Block, Peter. *Flawless Consulting*. San Diego: Pfeiffer, 1981. (3)
- Blockson, L. C., and H. J. VanBuren III. "Strategic Alliances Among Different Institutions: An Argument for Multi-Sector Collaboration in Addressing Societal Issues." *Crossing the Borders*. Alexandria, VA: Independent Sector Spring Research Forum, 1999. (J4)
- Brick, Philip, Don Snow, and Sarah Van de Wetering, eds. *Across the Great Divide: Explorations in Collaborative Conservation and the American West*. Washington, DC: Island Press, 2001. A selection of case studies and lessons learned in collaboration in the natural resources and conservation arena. (5)
- Brown, P., and S. Garg. *Foundations and Comprehensive Community Initiatives: The Challenges of Partnership*. Chicago: Chapin Hall Publications, 1997. <<http://www.chapin.uchicago.edu>> (4)
- Brumburgh, Scott, et al. "Literature Review and Model Framework of Nonprofit Capacity Building." *Innovation Network*. Washington, DC: Environmental Support Center, 2000. (3)
- Bruner, C. *Realizing a Vision for Children, Families, and Neighborhoods: An Alternative to Other Modest Proposals*. Des Moines, IA: National Center for Service Integration, 1996. (4)
- Bruner, Charles. *Thinking Collaboratively: Ten Questions and Answers to Help Policy Makers Improve Children's Services*. Washington, DC: Education and Human Services Consortium, 1991. A policy maker's guide to designing effective collaborations at state and local levels by providing an understanding of the basics of collaboration—what it is and how to know when it is working—and strategies for states and state policy makers to use. (2)

- Buhl, Alice. *Patterns of Cooperation Among Grantmakers*. Washington, DC: Council on Foundations, 1991. Explores the process for developing joint projects, examines what funders should consider, and explains the advantages and disadvantages of current practices of collaboration. (2)
- Burt, M. R., P. Resnick, and E. R. Novick. *Building Supportive Communities for At-Risk Adolescents*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 1998. (4)
- Campbell, Jacquelyn C., Jacqueline Dienemann, Joan Kub, Terri Wurmser, and Ellyn Loy. "Collaboration as a Partnership." *Violence Against Women* 5, no. 10 (1999): 1140–1157. (1)
- Center for Ocean Sciences Education Excellence. "Report of a Workshop Sponsored by the National Science Foundation, in Cooperation with the University of Southern Mississippi, Institute of Marine Sciences." Seattle, WA: University of Washington, 2000. (1)
- Center for the Study of Social Policy. *Changing Governance to Achieve Better Results for Children and Families*. Washington DC: Center for the Study of Social Policy, 1995. <<http://cssp.org/kd12.htm>> (4)
- . "The New Futures Initiative: A Mid-Point Review." Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Social Policy, 1991. (1)
- Chalmers, Alan F. *What Is This Thing Called Science?* Buckingham, England: Open University Press, 1999. (1)
- Chaskin, R. J., and S. Garg. *The Issue of Governance in Neighborhood-Based Initiatives*. Chicago, IL: Chapin Hall Publications, 1994. <<http://www.chapin.uchicago.edu>> (4)
- Chaskin, R., and A. Abunimah. *A View from the City: Local Government Perspectives on Neighborhood-Based Governance in Community-Building Initiatives*. Chicago: Chapin Hall Publications, 1997. <<http://www.chapin.uchicago.edu>> (4)
- Chaskin, R. *Defining Community Capacity: The Framework and Implications from a Comprehensive Community Initiative*. Chicago: Chapin Hall Publications, 1999. <<http://www.chapin.uchicago.edu>> (4)
- Chrislip, David. *The Collaborative Leadership Fieldbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2002. A practical guide to collaboration with illustrative case studies using the framework developed in *Collaborative Leadership*, Chrislip and Larson, 1994. (5)
- Chrislip, David D. and Carl E. Larson. *Collaborative Leadership: How Citizens and Civic Leaders Can Make a Difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994. (1)
- Chynoweth, Judith K., et al. *Experiments in Systems Change: States Implement Family Policy*. Washington, DC: Council of Governors' Policy Advisors, 1992. Discusses systems change, factors supporting the status quo and promoting systems change, and various change strategies that have been employed in nine states. (2)
- Coe, Barbara. "Open Focus: Implementing Projects in Multi-Organizational Settings." *International Journal of Public Administration* 11, no. 4 (1998): 503–526. (1)
- Cohen, Arthur M., and R. Douglas Smith. *The Critical Incident in Growth Groups: Theory and Technique*. San Diego: University Associates, 1976. Looks at shaping the growth and development of groups through verbal interventions and the role of the group leader in influencing the development of a common point of view. (2)

Cohen, Larry, Nancy Baer, and Pam Satterwhite. "Developing Effective Coalitions: An Eight Step Guide." Pleasant Hill, CA: Contra Costa Health Services Department, (unpublished) 1991. A description of eight practical steps for creating community coalitions. (2)

Collaboration and Conflict: Selected Readings on Collaboration. Selected readings for participants of the 1991 Annual Meeting of Independent Sector. Washington, DC, 1991. Selected readings gathered for the 1991 annual meeting of the Independent Sector on different aspects of collaboration, including understanding collaboration, patterns of collaboration, thinking collaboratively, and collaborative problem solving. (2)

The Community Collaboration Manual. Washington, DC: National Assembly of National Health and Social Welfare Organizations, January 1991. A manual for building collaborations with lists of items to consider. (2)

Connolly, Paul, and L. C. Klein. Looking Ahead and Embracing Change: How Nonprofit Organizations Can Prepare for the Future. Philadelphia, PA: The Conservation Company, 1999. (4)

Connolly, Paul, and Carol Lukas. Strengthening Nonprofit Performance: A Funder's Guide to Capacity Building. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 2003.

Connor, Joseph A., C. H. Ventrelle, and Stephanie Kadel-Taras. "Learning from Funder Collaboratives." Foundation News & Commentary 41, no. 2 (March/April 2000): 44-47. (4)

Connor, Joseph A., and Stephanie Kadel-Taras. Community Visions, Community Solutions: Grantmaking for Comprehensive Impact. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 2003. (4)

———. "Organizing Community Work to Reach Solutions." PNNOnline. 15 December 2000. <<http://www.pnnonline.org>> (4)

———. "The Community Support Organization: Linking Not-for-Profits to Community Impact." The Not-for-Profit CEO Monthly Letter 7, no. 8 (June 2000): 1-3. (4)

———. "From Board Governance to Community Governance." Board Member 9, no. 3 (March 2000): 6-7. (4)

———. "Relevant Review: Book Review of Letts, Ryan, and Grossman's High Performance Nonprofit Organizations: Managing Upstream for Greater Impact." Nonprofit World 18, no. 4 (July/August 2000): 38-39. (4)

Connor, Joseph A., Stephanie Kadel-Taras, and Diane Vinokur-Kaplan. "The Role of Nonprofit Management Support Organizations in Sustaining Community Collaboration." Nonprofit Management and Leadership 10, no. 2 (1999): 127-136. (4)

Cook, Thomas D., Harris Cooper, David S. Cordray, Heidi Hartmann, Larry V. Hedges, Richard J. Light, Thomas A. Louis, and Frederick Mosteller. Meta-Analysis for Exploration. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1992. (1)

Cooper, Harris, and Larry V. Hedges, eds. The Handbook of Research Synthesis. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1994. (1)

Cox, Gary. "Model Agreement for Children's Collaboratives in Minnesota." Saint Paul, MN: Minnesota Department of Human Services, January 1998. (3)

Danegger, E. A., D. C. Hayes, and E. Lipoff. A Look at Costs, Benefits, and Financing Strategies. Washington DC: The Finance Project, 1995. <<http://www.financeproject.org>> (4)

Davidson, Stephen. "Planning and Coordination of Social Services in Multiorganizational Contexts." *Social Service Review* 50 (1976): 117–137. (1)

Dayton, Carol, Georgia J. Anetzberger, and Doris Matthey. "A Model for Service Coordination Between Mental Health and Adult Protective Services." *Journal of Mental Health and Aging* 3, no. 3 (1997): 295–308. (1)

Doyle, Michael, and David Straus. *How to Make Meetings Work*. New York: Jove Press, 1976. Tools for facilitating collaborative engagements. (5)

Dukes, E. Franklin, Marina A. Pisolish, and John B. Stephens. *Reaching for Higher Ground in Conflict Resolution: Tools for Powerful Groups and Communities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000. Tools for facilitating collaborative engagements. (5)

Dyer, B. *The Oregon Option: Early Lessons from a Performance Partnership on Building Results-Driven Accountability*. Washington DC: U. S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1996. <<http://aspe.os.dhhs.gov/progsys/oregon/lessons.htm>> (4)

Empowering Learners Collaborative. *Empowerment Through Collaboration: Learnings from a Literacy Collaborative*. Saint Paul, MN: United Way of the Saint Paul Area, 1992. Looks at collaboration, what it is and how it can be used, as well as the components of collaboration, the impact on the partners in the project and the learnings from the effort. An independent evaluation of the project is also available. (2)

Felty, D. W., and M. B. Jones. "Human Services at Risk." *Social Service Review* 72, no. 2 (1998): 192–208. (4)

Finance Project. *Business Process Redesign*. Washington DC: The Finance Project, 2000. <<http://www.financeproject.org/businessprocess.htm>> (4)

———. *Community Systems*. Washington DC: The Finance Project, 2000. <<http://www.financeproject.org/communitysys.htm>> (4)

Fischer, Lucy Rose, and Kay Schaffer. *Older Volunteers: A Guide to Research and Practice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1992. (1)

Flower, Joe. "Collaboration: The New Leadership." *Healthcare Forum Journal* (November/December 1995). (3)

Friedman, M. *From Outcomes to Budgets: An Approach to Outcome-Based Budgeting for Family and Children's Services*. Washington DC: Center for the Study of Social Policy, 1995. <<http://cssp.org/kd13.htm>> (4)

———. *Reforming Finance, Financing Reform for Family and Children Services*. Sacramento, CA: Foundation Consortium, 2000. <<http://www.foundationconsortium.org/site/commapp/finance/index.htm>> (4)

Gans, S.P., and G.T. Horton. "Integration of Human Services." New York: Praeger, 1975. (1)

Gardner, J. W. *Self-Renewal: The Individual in the Innovative Society*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1963. (4)

Gardner, John. *On Leadership*. New York: MacMillan Free Press, 1990. Effective collaborations require effective leaders; Gardner identifies key skills for effective relationships between leaders and followers. (2)

Gardner, Sid. "Failure by Fragmentation." *California Tomorrow* (Fall 1989). Argues that funders diminish effective human services by fragmenting delivery among too many agencies, and that improvements can be made by building collaborations focused on accountability. (2)

Gilbertsen, Beth, and Vijit Ramchandani. *The Wilder Nonprofit Field Guide to Developing Effective Teams*. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 1999. A concise guide to help a team get going, deal with predictable problems, and improve teamwork at any stage of a team's development. (2)

Goodman, Robert. *After the Planners*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1973. A provocative look at the impact of changing urban systems. (2)

Gozali-Lee, Edith. "Family Involvement to Promote Student Achievement." Saint Paul, MN: Wilder Research Center, 1999. (1)

Gray, Barbara. *Collaborating: Finding Common Ground for Multiparty Problems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989. Describes the need for collaboration; its dynamic processes: conflict, politics, and power; various designs for collaborations; and the need to move toward a collaborative world. (2)

———. "Cross-Sectoral Partners: Collaborative Alliances among Business, Government and Communities." *Creating Collaborative Advantage*. Edited by Chris Huxham. London, England: Sage, 1996: 57–79. (1)

———. "Obstacles to Success in Educational Collaborations." *School-Community Connections: Exploring Issues for Research and Practice*. Edited by Leo C. Rigsby, Maynard C. Reynolds, and Margaret C. Wang. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995: 71–99. (1)

Gray, B., and J. D. Wood. "Collaborative Alliances: Moving From Practice to Theory." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 27, no. 1 (1991): 3–22. (4)

Greenleaf, R. K. *The Power of Servant Leadership*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc., 1998. (4)

Gummer, B. "Social Planning." *Encyclopedia of Social Work* 19, no. 3 (1995): 2180–2186. (4)

Guza, Terry, et al. *OIS Service Integration Needs Assessment Project, Final Report*. Portland, OR: Oregon Department of Human Services, May 2001. (3)

Hackstaff-Goldis, Lynn, and Susan T. House. "Development of a Collaborative Geriatric Program Between the Legal System and a Social Work-Directed Program of a Community Hospital." *Social Work in Health Care* 14, no. 3 (1990): 1–16. (1)

Hammer, M., and J. Champy. *Reengineering the Corporation*. New York: Harper Business, 1993. (4)

Harbert, Anita S., Daniel Finnegan, and Nancy Tyler. "Collaboration: A Study of a Children's Initiative." *Administration in Social Work* 21, no. 3–4 (1997): 83–107. (1)

Harbin, Gloria, Jane Eckland, James Gallagher, Richard Clifford, and Patricia Place. "Policy Development for P.L. 99–457, Part H: Initial Findings from Six Case Studies." Chapel Hill, NC: Carolina Institute for Child and Family Policy, University of North Carolina, 1991. (1)

Harrison, Patrick J., Eleanor W. Lynch, Kendra Rosander, and William Borton. "Determining Success in Interagency Collaboration: An Evaluation of Processes and Behaviors." *Infants and Young Children* 3, no. 1 (1990): 69–78. (1)

- Havelock, Ronald. *Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Education Technology Publications, 1973. Explains how to diagnose problems in educational institutions and intervene to create change. (2)
- Hawthorne, Joyce. "Working Together for At Risk Youth." Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1988. A discussion of common barriers to coordination of services for children needing medical and social services. (2)
- Heider, John. *Tao of Leadership*. New York: Bantam Books, 1988. Applies ancient Chinese thinking to leadership strategies for a new age. (2)
- Heifetz, Ronald. *Leadership Without Easy Answers*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1994. An analysis of the complexities of public issues and their implications for leadership. (5)
- Herrman, Margaret S. ed. *Resolving Conflict: Strategies for Local Government*. Washington, DC: International City/County Management Association, 1994. (8)
- Hesselbein, F., M. Goldsmith, R. Beckhard, and R. F. Schubert. *The Community of the Future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998. (4)
- Hequet, Marc. "Poof! Myth and Fable Appear as Human Development Tools." *Training* (December 1992): 46–50. Discusses the emerging use of myth, fable, and archetype as workplace human development tools. (2)
- Hicks, Bone. *Self-Managing Teams*. Los Altos, CA: Crisp Publications, 1999. (3)
- Himmelman, Arthur T. "Communities Working Collaboratively for a Change." *Resolving Conflict: Strategies for Local Government*. Edited by Margaret S. Herrman. Washington, DC: International City/County Management Association, 1994. pp. 24–27. Presents two models of power and decision-making in collaboration—betterment and empowerment—including the key components and activities of each, as well as how to move from betterment to empowerment. (2)
- . "On the Theory and Practice of Transformational Collaboration: From Social Service to Social Justice." *Creating Collaborative Advantage* Edited by Chris Huxham. London: Sage, 1996. pp. 19–43 (8) Provides a critique of the political economy and power relations that often determine the nature and scope of collaboration seeking community change.
- Hodson, Norma, Mary Ann Armour, and John Touliatos. "Project Uplift: A Coordinated Youth Services System." *The Family Coordinator* 25, no. 3 (1976): 255–260. (1)
- Holman, Nicole, and Margaret Arcus. "Helping Adolescent Mothers and Their Children: An Integrated Multi-Agency Approach." *Family Relations* 36, no. 2 (1987): 119–123. (1)
- Hord, Shirley M. "A Synthesis of Research on Organizational Collaboration." *Educational Leadership* (February 1986): 22–26. Distinguishes between cooperation and collaboration in the areas of beginning process, communication, resources and ownership, requirements and characteristics, leadership and control, and rewards. (2)
- Horwitch, Mel, and C.K. Prahalad. "Managing Multi-Organization Enterprises: The Emerging Strategic Frontier." *Sloan Management Review* 22, no. 2 (1981): 3–16. (1)
- Huxham, Chris. *Creating Collaborative Advantage*. London: Sage, 1996. (1)
- Huxham, Chris, and Siv Vangen. "Working Together: Key Themes in the Management of Relationships Between Public and Non-Profit Organizations." *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 9, no. 7 (1996): 5–17. (1)

———. “Ambiguity, Complexity and Dynamics in the Membership of Collaboration.” *Human Relations* 53, no. 6 (2000): 771–806. (1)

Isles, Paul, and Randhir Auluck. “Team Building, Inter-agency Team Development and Social Work Practice.” *British Journal of Social Work* 20 (1990): 165–178. (1)

Iyengar, Satish. “Much Ado About Meta-Analysis.” *Chance: New Directions for Statistics and Computing* 4, no. 1 (1991): 33–40. (1)

Johnson, David, and Frank Johnson. *Joining Together*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990. This handbook helps inexperienced group facilitators lead a series of powerful group development activities. (2)

Kagan, Sharon L. *United We Stand: Collaboration for Child Care and Early Education Services*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1991. Provides an excellent overview of collaboration, including its social context, rationale, and benefits, and an understanding of the collaborative process in the context of early childhood care and education. (2)

Kagan, Sharon L., Ann Marie Rivera, and Faith Lamb Parker. “Collaboration in Practice: Reshaping Services for Young Children and Their Families.” *The Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy*, Yale University, 1990. (1)

Kaner, Sam. *Facilitator's Guide to Participatory Decision-Making*. Philadelphia: New Society, 1996. Tools for facilitating collaborative engagements. (5)

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. *Change Masters*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1983. This classic text promotes innovation in organizations. (2)

Karasoff, Patricia. “Collaborative Partnerships: A Review of the Literature.” *San Francisco State University*, 1998. (1)

Keirse, David, and Marilyn Bates. *Please Understand Me*. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis, 1984. Describes individual behavior styles according to the Myers-Briggs Inventory. (2)

Kerka, Sandra. “Developing Collaborative Partnerships.” Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1997. (1)

Kohm, Amelia, David La Piana, and Heather Gowdy. *Strategic Restructuring: Findings from a Study of Integrations and Alliances Among Nonprofit Social Service and Cultural Organizations in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago, Chapin Hall Center for Children, 2000. Includes descriptions of the primary types of strategic restructuring partnerships; profiles of nonprofits involved in each type of partnership; and survey findings on the motivations, goals, benefits, and challenges involved in strategic restructuring. (7)

Kretzmann, John, and John McKnight. *Building Communities From the Inside Out*. Chicago: ACTA Publications, 1993. A guide for helping communities define strengths and assets through collaboration. (5)

La Piana, David. *Beyond Collaboration: Strategic Restructuring of Nonprofit Organizations*, Revised Second Edition. San Francisco: James Irvine Foundation, 2000. This monograph offers an analysis of restructuring efforts among nonprofits and describes several strategies that funders might develop to support activity in this arena. A Revised Second Edition was released with an expanded reference section demonstrating the considerable advancements made in the field of strategic restructuring over that three-year period. (7)

———. *The Nonprofit Mergers Workbook*. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 2000. (3)

———. *Real Collaboration: A Guide for Grantmakers*. New York: The Ford Foundation, 2001. This guide for grantmakers makes recommendations on how program officers can make better, more effective use of collaboration among grantees. (7)

Lennett, Judith, and Mary Ellen Colten. "A Winning Alliance: Collaboration of Advocates and Researchers on the Massachusetts Mothers Survey." *Violence Against Women* 5, no. 10 (1999): 1118-1139. (1)

Light, Richard J., and David B. Pillemer. *Summing Up: The Science of Reviewing Research*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984. (1)

Linden, Russ. *Working Across Boundaries: Making Collaboration Work in Government and NonProfit Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2002. A guide for collaboration between agencies and organizations. (5)

Loch, Heather, Daniel P. Mueller, and Edith Gozali-Lee. "Key Issues in the Implementation of School Linked Services." Saint Paul, MN: Wilder Research Center, 1997. (1)

Lukas, Carol A. *Consulting with Nonprofits: A Practitioner's Guide*. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 1998. A step-by-step guide through the six stage consulting process. The book also includes information on how to run a consulting business. (2)

Lukas, Carol VanDeusen, and Heather B. Weiss. "Evaluation of the Head Start/Community Health Center Collaboration: A Final Report to the Prudential Foundation." Harvard Family Research Project, Cambridge, MA, 1995. (1)

Luke, J. S. *Catalytic Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998. (4)

Mattessich, Paul W. "Characteristics of Successful Community Building and Collaborative Efforts." Edited by Sandra Schrujfer. *Multi-Organizational Partnerships and Cooperative Strategy*. Tilburg, Netherlands: University of Tilburg Press, 2000. (1)

Mattessich, Paul W., and Barbara Monsey. *Community Building: What Makes It Work*. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 1997. A review of research literature that reveals twenty-eight factors influencing the success of community building initiatives. Each of the factors includes an in-depth description, examples, and practical applications, helping community builders assess their work and diagnose what's needed. (2)

Mattessich, Paul W., Marta Murray-Close, and Barbara Monsey. *Collaboration: What Makes It Work*, 2nd ed. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 2001. A review of research literature on twenty factors influencing successful collaboration. The report includes a description of each factor, implications for collaborative efforts, and illustrations from case studies. (2)

Mattessich, Paul W., Marta Murray-Close, and Barbara Monsey. *The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory*. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 2001. A tool for assessing how a collaboration is doing on the twenty success factors described in *Collaboration: What Makes it Work*, 2nd Edition.

Mayfield, Loomis, and Edgar P. Lucas. "Mutual Awareness, Mutual Respect: The Community and the University Interact." *Cityscape* 5, no. 1 (2000): 173-184. (1)

McCann, Joseph E., and Barbara Gray. "Power and Collaboration in Human Service Domains." *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 6, no. 3 (1986): 58-67. (1)

The McKnight Foundation. *The Aid to Families in Poverty Program*. Minneapolis, MN: The McKnight Foundation, 1991. (1)

McLagan, Patricia, and Peter Krembs. *On-the-Level*. Saint Paul, MN: McLagan International, 1988. Action ideas for communicating about work performance that people in partnerships can use to address problems. (2)

Means, Robin, Lyn Harrison, Syd Jeffers, and Randall Smith. "Co-Ordination, Collaboration and Health Promotion: Lessons and Issues from an Alcohol/Education Programme." *Health Promotion International* 6, no. 1 (1991): 31–39. (1)

Melaville, Atelia I., and Martin J. Blank. *What It Takes: Structuring Interagency Partnerships to Connect Children and Families with Comprehensive Services*. Washington, DC: Education and Human Services Consortium, 1991. Looks at what is needed in interagency partnerships and the state's role in local initiatives as well as the dynamics of working together, guidelines for new partners, and questions to mobilize action. (2)

Melaville, Atelia I., Martin J. Blank, and Gelareh Asayesh. *Together We Can: A Guide for Crafting a Profamily System of Education and Human Services*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1993. Discusses a vision of improved coordination of education, health, and human services for families and provides a five-stage process for achieving that vision. (2)

Mobilization for America's Children. Standards for Success: Building Community Supports for America's Children. Alexandria, VA: United Way of America, 1993. Provides standards for mobilization of local coalitions and programs as well as standards for tracking the well being of children and families. (2)

Monsey, Barbara, Greg Owen, Carol Zierman, Laura Lambert, and Vincent Hyman. *What Works in Preventing Rural Violence: Strategies, Risk Factors, and Assessment Tools*. Saint Paul, MN: Wilder Foundation, 1995. (1)

Morse, Suzanne W. *Building Collaborative Communities*. Charlottesville, VA: Pew Partnership for Civic Change, 1996. (1)

Mueller, Daniel P. "Characteristics of Successful Urban Elementary Schools." Saint Paul, MN: Wilder Research Center, 1997. (1)

Mueller, Daniel P. and Paul Higgins. *Funders' Guide Manual: A Guide to Prevention Programs in Human Services*. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 1988. (1)

Mulroy, Elizabeth A. "Building a Neighborhood Network: Interorganizational Collaboration to Prevent Child Abuse and Neglect." *Social Work* 42, no. 3 (1997): 255–264. (1)

Mulroy, Elizabeth A., and S. Shay. "Motivation and Reward in Nonprofit Interorganizational Collaboration in Low-Income Neighborhoods." *Administration in Social Work* 22 no. 4 (1998): 1–17. (4)

National Network for Collaboration. "Collaboration Framework: Addressing Community Capacity." Fargo, ND: National Network for Collaboration, 1995. <<http://crs.uvm.edu/ncco/collab/framework.html>> (4)

Nelson, D. W. "Found Difficult and Left Untried: The Governance Necessary for Service Integration." *Annie E. Casey Focus* 3 no. 1 (1993): 2–3, 19. (4)

Norris, Tyler, Alan AtKisson, et al. *Community Indicators Handbook*. Oakland, CA: Redefining Progress, 1997. (6)

O'Donnell, Julie, James Ferreira, Ralph Hurtado, Ellen Ames, Richard E. Floyd, Jr., and

Lottie M. Sebren. "Partners for Change: Community Residents and Agencies." *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 25, no. 1 (1998): 133–151. (1)

O'Looney, J. "Beyond Privatization and Service Integration: Organization Models for Service Delivery." *Social Service Review*, 67 no. 4 (1993): 501–534. (4)

Osborne, D., and T. Gaebler. *Reinventing Government*. New York: Penguin Group, 1992. (4)

Osten, M., and M. F. Weis. "Developing enabling networks and systems of support." *Nonprofit Quarterly* 7, no. 1 (August 2000). <<http://www.nonprofitquarterly.org/technology/enabling.htm>> (4)

Parker-Carlson, Jessica, et al. *Points of Access Research Report*. Anoka, MN: Anoka County Children and Family Council, 2001. (3)

Peirce, Neal, and Curtis Johnson. *Boundary Crossers: Community Leadership for a Global Age*. College Park, MD: Burns Academy of Leadership Press, 1997. Case studies and lessons learned from an analysis of collaborative regional initiatives. (5) (4)

Perspectives on Collaborative Funding: A Resource for Grantmakers. Northern California Grantmakers, 1985. A collection of twelve articles on collaborations among funders. (2)

Pew Partnership. *Planned Serendipity*. Charlottesville, VA: The Pew Partnership for Civic Change, 1999. http://www.pew-partnership.org/research/exec_seren.html (4)

Pfeiffer, J. William, and John E. Jones, eds. *A Handbook of Structured Experiences for Human Relations Training Volume V*. San Diego: University Associates, 1975. Part of a series of handbooks of structured experiences to facilitate group beginnings, decision making, communication, leadership, team building, and so forth. (2)

Pitt, Jessica. *Community-Based Collaboratives: A Study of Interorganizational Cooperation at the Neighborhood Level*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute, 1998. (1)

Porter, Lyman, et al. *Behavior in Organizations*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975. People and teams share the same kinds of problems no matter what organization they work in, but each human is a unique contributor to that group. Porter recommends many different strategies for resolving teamwork issues. (2)

Potapchuk, William R., and Jarle P. Crocker. "Exploring the Elements of Civic Capital." *National Civic Review* 88, no. 3 (1999): 175–201. (1)

Powell, Douglas R. "Evaluating Family Resource Programs: Guidelines for Appropriate Practice." Highlights of a keynote address from a meeting on program evaluation sponsored by the Oregon Family Resource Coalition, Purdue University, June 1992. Provides five guidelines for tailoring evaluation to the unique characteristics of a family resource program. (2)

"Public/Private Ventures: The Next Step." *The Ford Foundation Letter* 20, no. 1 (February 1989). Two case studies of collaboration in a public-private partnership.

Ray, Karen. "Advanced Teamwork: Collaboration Among Scattered Teams." Minneapolis, MN: Karen Ray Associates, (unpublished) 1991. Describes four major tasks of working closely together while separated by distance. (2)

———. *The Nimble Collaboration: Fine-Tuning Your Collaboration for Lasting Success*. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 2002.

Reilly, Thom, and Nancy Petersen. "Nevada's University-State Partnership: A Comprehensive Alliance for Improved Services to Children and Families." *Public Welfare* 55, no. 2 (1997): 21–28. (1)

Rist, Ray C., Mary Agnes Hamilton, Wilfred B. Holloway, Steven D. Johnson, and Heather E. Wiltberger. "Collaboration and Community." Interim Report #4, Youthwork National Policy Study. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 1980. (1)

Rogers, Kristen, Jill Duerr Berrick, and Richard P. Barth. "Collaboration and Community Empowerment for Primary Prevention." Child Welfare Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, CA, 1996. (1)

Rosenthal, Robert. *Meta-Analytic Procedures for Social Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1991. (1)

Rubin, Victor. "The Roles of Universities in Community-Building Initiatives." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 17 (1998): 302–311. (1)

Sabatino, Frank. "How Collaboration Is Influencing Boards' Strategic Plans." *Trustee* (August 1992): 8–10. Looks at the community forces that are pushing hospitals to consider collaboration: resources, ethics, cost control, physician input, business input, and chief executive officer accountability. (2)

Sandfort, J. "The Structural Impediment to Human Service Collaboration: Examining Welfare Reform at the Front Lines." *Social Service Review* 73, no. 3 (1999): 315–339. (4)

Scherer, J., and J. Sherwood. "A Model for Couples: How Two Can Grow Together." *Journal of Small Group Behavior* 6, no. 1 (February 1975). (3)

Scholtes, Peter. *Team Handbook*. Madison, WI: Joiner Publications, 1988. An eminently usable set of exercises to build teamwork. (2)

Schorr, L., K. Sylvester, and M. Dunkle. *Strategies to Achieve a Common Purpose: Tools for Turning Good Ideas Into Good Policies*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1999. <<http://www.policyexchange.iel.org>> (4)

Schrage, Michael. *No More Teams: Mastering the Dynamics of Creative Collaboration*. New York: Currency-Doubleday, 1995. (3)

Schwarz, Roger. *The Skilled Facilitator*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994. Tools for facilitating collaborative engagements. (5)

Senge, Peter. *Fifth Discipline*. New York: Doubleday/Currency, 1990. Ideas for changing organizations and systems drawn from an eclectic collection of sciences.

Sharfman, Mark P., Barbara Gray, and Aimin Yan. "The Context of Interorganizational Collaboration in the Garment Industry: An Institutional Perspective." Special Issue on Collaboration in *The Journal of Applied Behavior Science* (1991). (1)

Size, Tom. "Managing Collaborations: The Perspective of a Rural Hospital Cooperative." *Health Care Management Review*. New York: Aspen Publishers, 1994. (3)

Spekman, R.E., L. A. Isabella, and T. C. MacAvoy. *Alliance Competence: Maximizing the Value of Your Partnerships*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2000. (4)

Stacey, Ralph. *Managing the Unknowable: Strategic Boundaries Between Order and Chaos in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992. (3)

Stone, R., and B. Butler. *Core Issues in Comprehensive Community-Building Initiatives: Exploring Power and Race*. Chicago: Chapin Hall Publications, 2000. <<http://www.chapin.uchicago.edu>>(4)

Straus, David. *How to Make Collaboration Work*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 2002. A useful history of collaboration in organizations and communities including a framework for working together. (5)

- Strong, Michael. *The Habit of Thought*. Chapel Hill, NC: New View, 1997. A guide for using Socratic inquiry for understanding texts. (5)
- Study Circles. *The Study Circle Handbook*. Pomfret, CT: Topsfield Foundation, 1993. Tools for facilitating collaborative engagements. (5)
- Subramanian, Karen, Elizabeth J. Siegel, and Christiane Garcia. "Case Study of an Agency-University Research Partnership Between a School of Social Work and a Medical Center." *Journal of Social Service Research* 19, no. 3-4 (1994): 145-161. (1)
- Susskind, Larry, et al, eds. *The Consensus Building Handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1999. Tools and case studies for facilitating collaborative engagements. (5)
- Sussman, Tara. "Interagency Collaboration and Welfare Reform." Washington, DC: Welfare Information Network, 2000. (1)
- Tannen, Deborah. *You Just Don't Understand*. New York: Ballantine, 1990. The best intentions are not always enough for men and women to communicate successfully while solving problems. Tannen has written a volume about interpreting one another accurately. (2)
- Tapper, Donna, Paula Kleinman, and Mary Nakashian. "An Interagency Collaboration Strategy for Linking Schools with Social and Criminal Justice Services." *Social Work in Education* 19, no. 3 (1997): 176-188. (1)
- Tjosvold, Dean, and Mary Tjosvold. *Leading the Team Organization*. New York: Lexington Books, 1991. Building an effective team at the senior management level is critical to being a successful partner. The Tjosvolds lay out key steps for team building. (2)
- Trubowitz, Sidney, and Paul Longo. *How It Works: Inside a School-College Collaboration*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1997. (1)
- Urban, Beverly Younger, and Larry W. Bennett. "When the Community Punches a Time Clock." *Violence Against Women* 5, no. 10 (1999): 1178-1193. (1)
- Van de Ven, Andrew. "On the Nature, Formation, and Maintenance of Relations Among Organizations." *Academy of Management Review* 4 (1976): 24-36. (1)
- Wachter, K. W., and M. L. Straf, eds. *The Future of Meta-Analysis*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1990. (1)
- Walls, Wendell J. *Anatomy of a Collaboration: An Act of Servant Leadership*. Indianapolis, IN: Greenleaf Center for Servant-Leadership, 2000. (1)
- Walton, Richard. *Interpersonal Peacemaking/Third Person Consultation*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Organizational Development Series, 1987. A primer for intervening effectively in other people's conflicts. (2)
- . *Managing Conflict/Interpersonal Dialogue*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Organizational Development Series, 1987. A primer for helping people resolve work-related conflicts. (2)
- Weiss, H. B., and M. E. Lopez. "New Strategies in Foundation Grantmaking for Children and Youth." *Community Youth Development Journal* 1, no. 1 (2000): 1-12.
<<http://www.cydjournal.org/2000Winter/weiss.html>> (4)

Wiewel, Wim, and Ismael Guerrero. "Long-term Collaboration—Building Relationships and Achieving Results through a Neighborhoods Initiative Program: The Resurrection Project." *Metropolitan Universities* 8, no. 3 (1997): 123–134. (1)

Wiewel, Wim, and Michael Lieber. "Goal Achievement, Relationship Building, and Incrementalism: The Challenges of University-Community Partnerships." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 17 (1998): 291–301. (1)

Wilson, Betsy. "The Lone Ranger Is Dead—Success Today Demands Collaboration." Chicago, IL: Association of College and Resource Libraries, 2000. (1)

Winer, Michael, and Karen Ray. *Collaboration Handbook: Creating, Sustaining, and Enjoying the Journey*. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 1994. (3)

Wolff, Tom. ed. "Community Coalition Building: Contemporary Practice and Research." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 29, no. 2 (2001). A comprehensive examination and analysis of the relationship of collaboration to the design, implementation, and evaluation of coalition. (8)

Wondolleck, Julia. M., and Steven. L. Yaffee. *Making Collaboration Work*. Washington, DC: Island Press, 2000. Lessons from collaboration in Natural Resource Management (5)

Yon, Maria Grace, Roslyn Arlin Mickelson, and Iris Carlton-LaNey. "A Child's Place: Developing Interagency Collaboration on Behalf of Homeless Children." *Education and Urban Society* 25, no. 4 (1993): 410–423. (1)

Sources for these references

(1) From the bibliography of *Collaboration: What Makes It Work*, 2nd Edition (Wilder Publishing Center, 919 Lafond Avenue, Saint Paul, MN 55104, www.wilder.org).

(2) From the bibliography of *Collaboration Handbook* (Wilder Publishing Center).

(3) From the bibliography of *The Nimble Collaboration* (Wilder Publishing Center).

(4) From Joseph Connor, *The Collaboratory*, 2410 Newport RD, Ann Arbor, MI 48103, jcrubicon@aol.com.

(5) From David Chrislip, *Skillful Means*, 3045 5th Street, Boulder, CO 80304, dchrislip@att.net.

(6) From Tyler Norris, *Community Initiatives LLC*, 2119 Mapleton Ave, Boulder, CO 80304, tyler@tylernorris.com.

(7) From David La Piana, *La Piana Associates*, 43 Estrella Avenue, Piedmont, CA 94611, lapiana@lapiana.org.

(8) From Arthur Himmelman, *Himmelman Consulting*, 210 Grant ST W STE 422, Minneapolis, MN 55403-2245, ArthurTHimmelman@aol.com

Appendix D: League of Minnesota Survey on Cooperative Efforts

The cooperative efforts listed on the following pages are grouped into the following “types.”

- 1=general government (planning, purchasing, etc)
- 2=police
- 3=streets
- 4=sanitation (water, sewer, garbage, recycling)
- 5=health/social
- 6=libraries
- 7=parks and recreation
- 8=transit
- 9=airport
- 10=housing
- 11=economic development
- 12=conservation
- 13=ambulance
- 14=public works
- 15=fire
- 16=both police and fire
- 17=building inspector
- 18=animal control
- 19=utilities and cable
- 20=dispatching
- 21=5
- 22=rescue team
- 23=emergency management