

**High Performance Partnerships
Best Practices/Literature Review
Executive Summary**



May 17, 2004

Prepared by:

**Marc Hugunin, Principal
Pepin Hugunin & Associates
Office: 651-351-1235
Email: marc@pepinhugunin.com**

**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)	44
Minnesota Government Reports	49
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