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Workshop Overview

In the early part of the 21st century, local communities are in the midst of a major transformation in local governance that is resetting roles and expectations about how local government engages with community residents to solve problems and take effective public action. While recognizing that citizen engagement is the ‘right thing to do,’ many local governments still experience at best only mixed results with their community engagement efforts. Poorly designed or misaligned engagement strategies can frustrate residents and community stakeholders, erode public trust, incur project delays and increase costs, and seriously impact the personal health and well-being of local officials and staff.

This interactive workshop for local elected officials and senior executives presents practical online and face-to-face engagement strategies and tools for building the capacity of local government to join with residents in effective public problem solving. Participants will build a foundation for assessing current citizen engagement efforts and strengthen their skills to:

1. Develop a deeper understanding of the term “citizen engagement,” and why an effective program for engagement is important for any local government;
2. Recognize that effective engagement requires more than one-way communication or “three minutes at the microphone,” and that more effective engagement outcomes can be achieved by matching the “promise” of engagement to the “situation” at hand;
3. Improve leadership skills for tackling the “wicked problems” facing local leaders;
4. Identify and overcome common barriers to effective engagement programs;
5. Learn the basics of choosing and using appropriate online and face-to-face strategies and tool; and
6. Understand the components of a 5-step plan for building a more effective engagement strategy for your community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITIZEN ENGAGEMENT GLOSSARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asset Mapping</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asynchronous communication</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blogs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brainstorming</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizen engagement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizen jury</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic index</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civil society</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Code for America</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowdsourcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Hackathon         | A hackathon (also known as a hack day, hackfest or codefest) is an event
<p>| <strong>Keypad polling</strong> | <strong>Keypad Polling</strong> is a wireless polling technology used to enable community participation in events and to bring a focus to discussion and decision-making. Most frequently, participants vote anonymously by selecting the number on their keypad that best represents their preference. The result of the group vote is displayed on the projection screen within seconds. The project team also works with clients to prepare suitable questionnaires and produce report documents that analyze voting results. |
| <strong>Mobile apps</strong> | <strong>A mobile app</strong> is a computer program designed to run on smartphones, tablet computers, and other mobile devices. Often free or costing less than $10, over 900,000 apps are available for the iPhone, and over 800,000 for the Android. |
| <strong>Nominal group</strong> | <strong>The nominal group technique (NGT)</strong> is a group process involving problem identification, solution generation, and decision-making. It can be used in groups of many sizes, who want to make their decision quickly, as by a vote, but want everyone’s opinions taken into account (as opposed to traditional voting, where only the largest group is considered). The method of tallying is the difference. First, every member of the group gives their view of the solution, with a short explanation. Then, duplicate solutions are eliminated from the list of all solutions, and the members proceed to rank the solutions, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and so on. Some facilitators will encourage the sharing and discussion of reasons for the choices made by each group member, thereby identifying common ground, and a plurality of ideas and approaches. This diversity often allows the creation of a hybrid idea (combining parts of two or more ideas), often found to be even better than those ideas being initially considered. |
| <strong>One to one relational meeting</strong> | A one-on-one, face-to-face meeting of two persons lasting at least 30 minutes, where personal topics and stories dealing with values, motivations, self-interest and life are discussed in an often confessional, cathartic sort of manner. A one-one-one involves a conscious exploration of another person’s interests, passions, most important relationships, and stories. |
| <strong>Online community</strong> | An Online Community is a virtual meeting place for people on the Internet designed to facilitate interaction and collaboration among people who share common interests and needs. Online communities can be open to all or by membership only and may or may not offer moderator tools. Common forms include people communicate through are chat rooms, forums, e-mail lists or discussion boards. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Open data</strong></th>
<th>Refers to information and data that are made freely available online in a format that can be opened with commonly used computer applications.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Government</strong></td>
<td>A governing principle and practice that holds that citizens have the right to access the documents and proceedings of the government to allow for effective public oversight. It includes three broad pillars: information transparency (so the public understands the workings of their government, public engagement (so the public can influence the workings of their government by engaging in governmental policy processes and service delivery programs), and accountability (so the public can hold the government to account for its policy and service delivery performance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Podcasting</strong></td>
<td>A method of broadcasting audio or video programs via the Internet. Comes from a combination of the words “iPOD” and “broadcasting.” Podcasting software allows users to receive automatic updates of a particular podcast and then decide when and if they want to listen to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power Mapping</strong></td>
<td>Mapping is a relational problem-solving tool that helps to identify and understand the political and cultural resources that affect and are affected by an issue. Mapping helps work groups gain a deeper understanding of the problem when they have analyzed all potential stakeholders. Maps provide a visual representation of the people you may have to work with to make an action strategy and accomplish your goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public evaluation</strong></td>
<td>A relational problem-solving technique that assists groups in improving the effectiveness of a meeting by asking each participant what worked and what could be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RSS feed</strong></td>
<td>RSS is a technology that is being used by millions of web users around the world to keep track of their favorite websites. <strong>RSS (Rich Site Summary)</strong>; often called Really Simple Syndication, uses a family of standard web feed formats to publish frequently updated information: blog entries, news headlines, audio, video. Requires a RSS Reader such as Google Reader or Bloglines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social capital</strong></td>
<td>Social capital refers to those stocks of social trust, norms and networks that people can draw upon to solve common problems. Networks of civic engagement, such as neighborhood associations, sports clubs, and cooperatives, are an essential form of social capital, and the denser these networks, the more likely that members of a community will cooperate for mutual benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social media</strong></td>
<td>The online tools and platforms that people use to share opinions, insights, experiences, and perspectives with each other. Social media can take many different forms, including text, images, audio, and video. Popular social mediums include blogs, forums, podcasts, wikis, and platforms like Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, and YouTube.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder</strong></td>
<td>People and groups who will or may be affected by the outcome of a dialogue or public participation process, or who would affect the outcome themselves. Typically stakeholders include those sponsoring a project, having an interest or gain in the successful completion of a project, or who may have a positive or negative influence in the project completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values house meeting</strong></td>
<td>Small structured public conversations of 15-20 participants in which participants identify key values and discuss strategies for civic vitality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web 2.0</strong></td>
<td>Web 2.0 is a term (attributed to Tim O'Reilly, 2004) that refers to online...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
applications that allow interactive design of the graphical interface, information sharing, and collaboration on the World Wide Web. Examples of these technologies include online communities, social networks, hosted services, Web applications, podcast and video-sharing sites, wikis, and blogs.

Web 2.0 sites allow users to do more than just read or retrieve information by inviting them to comment on published articles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Functions as venues that local governments can use to connect with and engage the public by providing news about community events, updates on programs and projects, public meeting agendas and minutes, and general information about what is happening in the community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wiki</td>
<td>A Wiki is a collaboratively-created web of interlinked pages with edit privileges for all participants. It is a piece of server software that allows users to freely create and edit web page content from their web browser. Wiki supports hyperlinks and has simple text syntax for creating new pages and links between internal pages on the fly. Wiki is unusual among group communication mechanisms in that it allows the organization of contributions to be edited in addition to the content itself. Wikipedia is the most commonly known example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World café</td>
<td>Both a vision and a method of dialogue, the World Café (a version of a conversation café) is a structured conversational process in which groups of people discuss a topic at several tables, with individuals switching tables periodically and getting introduced to the previous discussion at their new table by a &quot;table host&quot;. A cafe ambience is created in order to facilitate conversation. In some versions, a degree of formality is retained to make sure that everyone gets a chance to speak. Alternatively, the café concept can be taken more literally with everyone potentially talking at once. As well as speaking and listening, individuals may be encouraged to write or doodle on the tablecloth so that when people change to different tables, they can see what previous members have expressed in their own words as well as hearing the table host’s view of what has been happening.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ‘New Normal’ in Local Government

For many local governments, disruptions to public services reached crisis proportions following the 2008 housing bubble collapse and global financial market meltdown. In the US the 2008 market collapse seemed the culmination of over a decade of growing fiscal instability and imbalances for many local and state governments.

In working to rebuild a new and sustainable balance of public services, citizen expectations, and fiscal resources, local government leaders find themselves operating more and more in the realm of wicked problems. Wicked problems are complex, interdependent issues that lack a clear problem definition and involve the conflicting perspectives of multiple stakeholders. Solutions to wicked problems are neither right nor wrong, only better or worse. A traditional sequential process in which technical expertise is used to define the problem, identify options, and implement the best rational solution will not will not be successful. Rather, research has shown the most effective strategy for wicked problems is open-ended collaboration and engagement with all stakeholders to find and implement the most acceptable solution.

It is small wonder that there is growing recognition that the current mix of local governance and public service delivery issues facing local community leaders reflect not a temporary rough spot, but a ‘new normal’ for most local governments.

Writing in the August 2012 issue of State and Local Government Review, researchers Lawrence Martin, Richard Levey, and Jenna Cawley conclude in their article, “The ‘New Normal’ for Local Government” that the bursting of the housing bubble, banking and financial market crisis, and resulting 2008 recession permanently altered the local government landscape, resulting in a “new normal” for local government finances, employment, and services. They suggest that the future for local government will consist of fewer resources, smaller workforces, and an emphasis on new ways of delivering services. Local governments will face hard decisions about which services to keep, how to pay for them, and how they should be delivered. There will a greatly expanded focus on new modes of public service delivery through restructuring, consolidations, and privatization.

The ‘new normal’ means that many of the challenges facing local leaders will be wicked problems and will require extensive collaboration and engagement with local residents, other jurisdictions, and community and associations. Learning when and how to tap into proven collaboration and stakeholder mediation practices will be a key to leading successfully in this new environment.
WICKED PROBLEMS

In 1973 Horst Rittel and Mel Webber, professors of design and urban planning respectively at UCLA, wrote an article on “Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning” in which they observed that many social and organizational problems, which they termed “wicked” problems, which are highly resistant to resolution, and cannot be successfully resolved through traditional linear and orderly problem solving approaches. Such ‘wicked problems’ have also been described as “social messes” and “unstructured reality.”

Their original discussion of wicked problems identified 10 characteristics:

1. There is no definitive formulation of a wicked problem.
2. Wicked problems have no stopping rule.
3. Solutions to wicked problems are not true-or-false, but better or worse.
4. There is not immediate and no ultimate test of a solution to a wicked problem.
5. Every solution to a wicked problem is a “one-shot operation; because there is no opportunity to learn by trial-and-error, every attempts counts significantly.
6. Wicked problems do not have an enumerable (or an exhaustively describable) set of potential solutions, nor is there a well-described set of permissible operations that may be incorporated into the plan.
7. Every wicked problem is essentially unique.
8. Every wicked problem can be considered to be a symptom of another [wicked] problem.
9. The causes of a wicked problem can be explained in numerous ways. The choice of explanation determines the nature of the problem’s resolution.
10. [With wicked problems], the planner has no right to be wrong.

A 2007 report by the Australian Public Service Commission, “Tackling Wicked Problems: A Public Policy Perspective” suggested the following description of “wicked problems” at the level of broad social and economic policy problems:

1. Wicked problems are difficult to clearly define.
2. Wicked problems have many interdependencies and are often multi-causal.
3. Attempts to address wicked problems often lead to unforeseen consequences.
4. Wicked problems are often not stable.
5. Wicked problems usually have no clear solution.
6. Wicked problems are socially complex.
7. Wicked problems hardly ever sit conveniently within the responsibility of any one organization.
8. Wicked problems involve changing behavior.
9. Some wicked problems are characterized by chronic policy failure.

**WHAT ARE YOUR PROBLEMS?**

What are the 5 most challenging problems facing your community?

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

Assess the Diversity and Complexity of each problem according to the definitions below and then locate each problem on the Problem Assessment Matrix on the following page.

**Diversity of Stakeholders**

- **Single Party:**
  One stakeholder with all the relevant information

- **Multiple Parties**
  Multiple stakeholders with each having only partial knowledge

- **Conflicting Parties**
  Multiple stakeholders with each having only partial knowledge and conflicting values and interests

**Complexity**

- **Type I Problem**
  Both problem and solution known

- **Type II Problem**
  Problem known, solution known and cause and effect relationship unclear

- **Type III Problem**
  Neither problem nor solution known
# PROBLEM ASSESSMENT MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity</th>
<th>Single Party (One party with all relevant knowledge)</th>
<th>Multiple Parties (Each party having only partial relevant knowledge)</th>
<th>Conflicting Parties (Each party with partial knowledge and conflicting values/interests)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Both problem and solutions known)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Problem known, solution not known, cause &amp; effect relationship unclear)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Neither problem nor solution known)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Preliminary Organizational Assessment for Citizen Engagement

## Within our local government/department...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Unknown / Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our <em>local government</em> has a comprehensive and coordinated citizen engagement plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our <em>department</em> has a comprehensive and coordinated citizen engagement plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a formal process in place for <em>initiating</em> citizen engagement efforts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a formal process in place for <em>planning</em> citizen engagement efforts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a formal process in place for <em>implementing</em> citizen engagement efforts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a formal process in place for <em>evaluating</em> citizen engagement efforts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen engagement efforts are carried out through informal/ad hoc processes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are existing legal mandates that restrict the ways in which we can interact with the public</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local officials and staff have the <em>skills and training</em> necessary to work productively with citizens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local officials and staff have the <em>cultural awareness</em> necessary to work productively with citizens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local officials and employees have the <em>organizational support</em> necessary to work productively with citizens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff have the <em>resources</em> (time, money, facilitation skills, etc.) necessary to work productively with citizens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff have generally positive attitudes towards engaging citizens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public officials have generally positive attitudes towards engaging citizens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a strong likelihood that decision makers will give full consideration to public input</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have had successful experiences engaging with citizens in the past</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the broader community there are various and varied opportunities for public engagement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflection
1. How does your local government set goals for public engagement and make decisions about what kinds of activities will fit these goals? What is the process by which public officials and employees make these decisions?

2. Where does the responsibility for citizen engagement lie?

3. What resources are available or allocated towards doing this work?

4. What is your general motivation for involving citizens?

(FROM ICMA Center for Management Strategies http://icma.org/en/results/management_strategies/leading_practices/civic_engagement)
IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation

Inform
To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.

Consult
To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.

Involve
To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.

Collaborate
To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.

Empower
To place final decision-making in the hands of the public.

Public participation goal

Promise to the public
We will keep you informed.
We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.
We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.
We will look to you for advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.
We will implement what you decide.

Example techniques
- Fact sheets
- Web sites
- Open houses
- Public comment
- Focus groups
- Surveys
- Public meetings
- Workshops
- Deliberative polling
- Citizen advisory committees
- Consensus-building
- Participatory decision-making
- Citizen juries
- Ballots
- Delegated decision

© 2007 International Association for Public Participation
Technical and Design Criteria for Choosing Online Tools

Technical Considerations

- Range of public input features and how the functionality of each fits the anticipated engagement purpose
- Attractive, clean design with easy-to-understand intuitive interface for the public
- Technical interface with your organization’s website and other relevant IT assets
- Ease of use for local agency administrators and the ability to coordinate administrative function across department
- Reporting and export capabilities
- System’s flexibility and ability to adapt to changing public engagement needs
- Available supplemental services that match desired needs such as graphic support, content production, survey design, etc.
- Level of staff training and amount of staff time required for successful implementation

Design Considerations

- How much participant registration and information is required? (Less registration may mean it’s easier to use, but more information may provide a richer understanding of who is participating)
- Is there a limit on how many times or how frequent people can participate? Less control may encourage continuous engagement, but some controls may be necessary to prevent spamming and enhance civility.
- What kind of real-time facilitation and monitoring is needed and who will provide it? To what extent will the host agency intervene and under what circumstances?
- What kind of incentives will participants have to provide input? While awarding points or other kinds of ‘gamification’ can build traffic, some may question whether such incentives might distort or dilute the quality of the input.

VALUES HOUSE MEETING

When called upon, people can take up the challenge of becoming architects of a democratic way of life and positive civic culture, not simply democracy’s spectators and consumers. One of the approaches used is a small public conversation, or “values house meeting.” These are structured conversations through which participants will identify civic values and discuss strategies for civic vitality. Below is a guide for meeting leaders.

Planning the meeting:
- Invite participants directly, through personal contact.
- An ideal size is 7-14 people. It can work with as few as 4 or 5, but a bigger group with a more diverse mix will yield better discussion. If you have more than 14 people, consider holding two separate forums.
- All participants should read a short thought piece (in advance) on, for example, values, democratic/public work, or similar processes done in other communities.
- The discussion part of the meeting will last an hour and a half. There can be informal socializing after or before.
- Choose a casual, informal setting.
- Identify someone to take careful notes.

Meeting format:
- The moderator, who may be a convener or host or someone else, begins with a welcome. Tell the group why you think this is an important discussion.
- Follow with round-robin introductions and brief statements—what interested people in this meeting? Why did they choose to come?
- Then the moderator (may be convener or host or someone else) poses three questions:
  - What values and traditions are important to you (from family, faith, civic, or other traditions)? What are the values and traditions of this community?
  - What are the trends or forces that endanger these values and traditions?
  - What can we do in our neighborhood, organization, or larger community to strengthen our civic life?

After the meeting:
- Document your reflections on the forum, the key themes and notable quotes.
- Follow up with participants who agreed to take action as a result of the discussion.
ONE-TO-ONE RELATIONAL MEETING

A one-on-one relational meeting is an intentional process of getting to know what motivates another person. It helps to develop respect for people different backgrounds and is the foundation for work across differences. Some call the one-on-one the genius of the new generation of civic efforts because it breaks down stereotypes and it also changes the rules of involvement.

A one-on-one involves a conscious exploration of another person’s interests, passions, most important relationships, and stories. One-on-ones depend on putting aside prejudices and stereotypes and listening carefully and strategically.

**Tips**
- **Be prepared**-think about what you know about the person, and questions you want to ask
- **Schedule** the interview for a specific time and location to minimize distractions.
- **No phone** interviews.
- Keep the interview **informal**. Go with the flow; look for body language, sources of passion, personal histories.
- Keep the interview to about **30 minutes or less**.
- **Do not take notes** or use a recorder.
- **Look for connections** in experience between yourself and interviewee, but resist launching into long stories about yourself.
- **Ask direct questions** to find what is important to the other person. Ask about connections to home, job, family. Find out about public issues that energize the interviewee. Focus on “why” and “what”. Possible questions include:
  - What is important to you? What are you most concerned about in your community (or school, or neighborhood)? Why?
  - Tell me about a time when you were angry.
  - Where is your energy now?
  - What is something you’re avoiding?
  - Could you tell me a story about how that has affected you? Why is that problem happening? What should be done about it?
  - What could our community/organization do differently on this issue?
  - What would improve our community? What would make the ideal community?
- **Avoid yes and no questions.** If you do ask them, follow up with “why.”
- **Listen actively** by paying close attention. Maintain good eye contact.
- Keep the **80/20 rule**: listen 80% of the time.
- Be sure you understand and **clarify** what the interviewee is saying by **restating** what you’ve heard and verifying you go it right.
- **Look for energy** from the interviewee about a public issue or concern. Has the person ever take action on the concern? Are they interested in working with others on the issue?
- **After the interview**: jot down notes about what the person said that you want to remember.
- **After the interview**: evaluate how you did and what you could do better next time.
POWER MAPPING

Why map  Mapping is a tool that helps to identify and understand the political and cultural resources that affect and are affected by an issue. It can narrow and clarify a complex and broad issue into something more concrete and workable. Maps can expand a narrow school or community issue by helping your group to consider others who might have an interest or investment in your topic. Mapping gives your team a deeper understanding of the problem when they have analyzed all potential stakeholders. It also provides a visual representation of the people you may have to work with to make an action strategy and accomplish your goal. Your map will evolve and change as you talk to new people, get new information, and implement your plan.

How to map: As you map, keep these in mind:

• Interests  What are the interests of the proposed stakeholders?
• Power  What power do the stakeholders have and what power is needed to accomplish our goals?
• Rules  What is the protocol to engage with various stakeholders?

Pre-mapping: Put your problem, issue or project goal in the middle of the paper and begin to brainstorm all of the people and organizations that may have a stake or power in relation to your topic. Write the names of people and organizations in spokes stemming from the issue.

Research: Create assignments for team members from the spokes to research the interests and power of stakeholders identified in your pre-map. Role-play by yourselves first to prepare them to go into public. What questions do they need answered? With whom do they need to speak or be in relationship?

Re-mapping: After reporting back to the large group the information gathered during the research phase, revise your map accordingly. Add to and detract from your map as your group learns and work towards its goal.

Action Plan: Work with your group to determine next steps that will evolve into an action plan. Put names and dates down on the map to hold the group accountable to accomplishing its goals. Celebrate when tasks are achieved in order to keep the momentum strong.

Continue mapping: Research, re-mapping and revising the action plan are all part of a complete power mapping process.
PUBLIC EVALUATION

Leave time at the end of every meeting to have your team sit in a circle and answer a series of evaluative questions. Try having the members evaluate their individual and collective work as well as the impact of their project on the community. During this debriefing time, you can also focus on an individual core concept to reinforce it and begin to add to the team members’ understanding.

Evaluation improves the quality of your team’s work because it ensures they are staying true to their initial goals, provides space for learning and strategic thinking, and develops accountability. It requires the team members to think critically about what they have done personally, and then collectively as a team. For evaluation to be truly effective, the team should do it every step of the way. It helps them operate smoothly, examine how their work is progressing, prevent misunderstandings, clarify roles, and assess the overall impact of their project. Evaluation is also the time to identify and reinforce things that a group has learned from the session, work, or event.

Here are some sample evaluative questions:

- What did we set out to accomplish today? Did we complete that? Why or why not?
- What worked well and what didn’t?
- What can we do differently next time?
- What did I learn about civic problem solving, myself, the community?

It is also useful to evaluate how individuals and teams performed specific assignments - focusing the critique on the work, problem, event or goal (not the person's character). This type of formative evaluation not only reinforces accountability, but also helps improve future work.

While evaluation helps your team move forward on its project, it is also important to reflect upon what has been learned. You need to provide the space so that individual team members can link their experiences to the broader world, ways of thinking, and ways of being. This is a good opportunity to question the assumptions of your work, and even the assumptions of civic problem-solving itself. Taking the discussion to a higher level will enable you go beyond everyday ways of thinking. This is the perfect time to talk about concepts, how they relate to your work and the broader world. Nonetheless, this type of reflection will not occur if space is not given for it. Periodically take the time to engage society’s big questions, and you will be surprised what you find.

Challenge the direction of the team's work and end goals by asking and recording questions such as:

- What is being done or created that has long lasting civic value?
- How are we building new relationships and collaborations?
- How are we developing individual and team civic skills and capacities?
- How is change happening on an institutional level? Are we breaking down barriers?
**PERSONAL PLANNING WORKSHEET**

**Citizen Engagement Project**
*Describe a future program or project that will include a specific citizen engagement component.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the overall problem you are trying to address?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the decision that needs to be made? Who will make that decision?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you want to achieve by involving the public?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Level of Public Participation**
*(Review the IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation.)*
*What is the overall level of public participation you will seek for your project?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the promise you will make to the public about the level of impact they will have on the final decision or outcome?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Organizational Assessment
(Review the results of the Preliminary Organizational Assessment you completed earlier).

What are the top 3 organizational assets available to you in designing your citizen engagement strategy?

1.

2.

3.

What are 3 aspects of organizational capacity that need improvement?

1.

2.

3.

Organizational Planning

What has been your organization's experience with citizen engagement over the past 5 years?

Who are potential internal champions and sources of support for expanded citizen engagement?
What are potential obstacles or areas of resistance to expanded citizen engagement?

How supportive is the governing body to expanded citizen engagement?

Community Planning
Over the past 5 years, what public participation activities have been conducted by other community organizations?

How receptive was the community to those public participation efforts?

Which existing community organizations or groups might be key stakeholders to consider in planning your citizen engagement strategy?
Online Engagement Capacity

What has been your organization’s experience with social media and social networking sites over the past 3 years?

Who are potential internal champions for developing and using online platforms?

What are potential obstacles or areas of resistance to implementing online engagement?

How comprehensive is your organization’s social media policy guidelines?

How supportive is the governing body to expanded online citizen engagement?

What community networks or organizations might have an interest in supporting or collaborating with you for online engagement?
Brainstorming

For **Five Minutes** brainstorm a list of all the possible things you might need to do design and implement an effective citizen engagement strategy for your project. Don’t worry about sequence, or grammar, or logic. Try to keep your pen or pencil moving for the full five minutes.
**First Five**
Review your brainstorming results. Identify the **First Five things** you need to do to move forward with your citizen engagement strategy. Be a specific as possible in describing the task, the intended outcome, the completion date, and who’s responsible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

ICMA Center for Management Strategies, Civic Engagement Documents and Articles Library
www.icma.org/cmsresources

Civic Engagement Organizational Assessment Tool

Center for Management Strategies Leading Practice Service Providers

National Civic League Civic Index
www.ncl.org

International Association of Public Participation Spectrum and Core Values
www.iap2.org

National Coalition on Dialogue and Deliberation Resource Center
http://ncdd.org/
TACKLING WICKED PROBLEMS TAKES Resident Engagement

Managers need to be leaders in nurturing civic action

By Mike Huggins and Cheryl Hilvert
Local governments throughout the United States and many of the world’s democracies are struggling to adapt to a paradigm shift—one that is resetting the roles and responsibilities of local governments, residents, and the private sector in how communities govern themselves. In the United States, disruptions to public services reached crisis proportions following the 2008 collapse in the housing market and global financial meltdown. Fiscal instability continues to plague many U.S. local and state governments.

The impact of these changing conditions is compounded by a half-century trend of local government, education, and community civic institutions becoming more task- and service-oriented, as well as organizational cultures becoming increasingly hierarchical, narrow in scope, and expert defined.

As a result, local community governance and public problem solving have become more detached from the ordinary citizen. This has led to more limited and fragmented public roles for residents, while at the same time, greatly diminishing the capacities of communities to collectively take action on the issues that confront them.

In dealing with the local impacts of national and global issues and the myriad other problems confronting local governments, managers must do so in a public policy context more frequently characterized by widely dispersed expertise in the community, rapidly expanding social media platforms and venues for sharing information and opinions, more organized and active...
advocacy groups, more incivility in public discourse, and a declining public trust in government.

“Wicked” Problems
The difficult issues and challenging environments confronting local governments result in managers operating more and more in the realm of what may be called wicked problems: complex, interdependent issues that lack a clear problem definition and involve the conflicting perspectives of multiple stakeholders.

Solutions to these problems are not right or wrong, only better or worse. Wicked problems rarely yield to a linear approach in which problems are defined, analyzed, and addressed in a sequential and orderly fashion.

Rather, the most effective strategies appear to be more open-ended and focused on producing ongoing collaboration and engagement with all stakeholders, including community residents and nongovernmental organizations, to find the most acceptable solution.

While collaboration and engagement are suggested as an appropriate approach to wicked problems, to many this represents a challenge that is wicked in and of itself. Many managers simply don’t know where to begin, how to plan effective programs for engagement, how to measure their efforts, or where to turn for resources and assistance.

Emerging Engagement Strategies
Ray Kingsbury, cofounder of the Montgomery, Ohio, Citizens’ Leadership Academy, believes it is essential for local government to take a more robust approach to engagement—one that empowers residents to take action, rebuilds trust with local government, and “harvests the experience dividend” that residents bring to public problem solving.

Billed as the “Coolest Civics Class You’ll Ever Take,” the Montgomery Leadership Academy takes a different twist on the traditional local government citizens’ academy by minimizing the use of organizational charts and PowerPoint presentations to describe what city and county departments do. Instead, Montgomery’s 10-session academy engages participants in conversations about aspirations for their communities and creating opportunities for participants, officials, and staff to work together on community issues and projects.

Kingsbury issues a challenge to managers saying, “Local government leaders need to understand that government is not the epicenter, but rather a subset of the community,” adding that successful and positive community engagement requires local governments to move from:
• Directive to facilitative leadership.
• Monologue to dialogue.
• Customer service to collaboration and co-creation.
• Distrust to trust.
• Entitlement to ownership.

In her book Bringing Citizen Voices to the Table: A Guide for Public Managers,1 Carolyn Lukensmeyer explores the concept of shared responsibility for civic engagement and identifies three essential roles to ensure that engagement becomes the mechanism through which local government business is accomplished:
• Residents need to have to embrace an active role in their communities and demand that they be given authentic opportunities to participate on a regular basis.
• Elected officials need to ensure opportunities for civic participation.
• Public managers need to embed citizen engagement in the work of the local government.

While collaboration and engagement are suggested as an appropriate approach to problems, to many it represents a challenge that is wicked in and of itself.

The Alliance for Innovation white paper Connected Communities: Local Government as a Partner in Citizen Engagement and Community Building (see Endnotes for website link) discusses how local governments can be active contributors and facilitators for meaningful resident engagement.

The report draws a distinction between exchange activities that provide information, build transparency, invite input and survey opinion, and engagement activities that move involvement to a higher level of interaction and provide opportunities for residents and officials “to listen to and learn from each other and to work together over time to address issues or problems they feel are important.”2

The report concludes that “citizen engagement focuses on revitalizing democracy, building citizenship, and reinforcing a sense of community, and it cannot be equated with one-way exchanges between government and citizens.”3

The International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) offers the Public Participation Spectrum that further elaborates on the distinction between exchanges with citizens and citizen engagement, identifying five levels of interactions ranging from simply informing citizens to fully empowering them to make decisions. With each increasing type of interaction, the potential impact of the public participation on the actual decision increases.

The IAP2 spectrum advocates for local governments to identify the objec-
tive of the engagement activity and the promise it intends to make to its citizens. It further concludes that not all resident engagement is the same, and the design and format of the engagement needs to be matched to purpose and intended outcomes of the engagement activity.

**Bridging the “Engagement Gaps”**

For most local governments, an effective civic engagement strategy will likely incorporate multiple levels of interaction described in the IAP2 Spectrum (see Figure 1). Not all participants will choose to engage at the highest level chosen; some will engage at lower levels based on their interest and available time.

In a collaborative approach, for example, some citizens will participate directly as members of a working group, still more will attend workshops or meetings (likely the “Involve” level, Figure 1), others will share input online (“Consult”), and even more stay connected through media and websites but not provide input (“Inform”).

Thus, local governments are required to use a variety of approaches that will effectively engage a wide range of stakeholders where they wish to participate, while at the same time encouraging the interactions to shift from simple “exchanges with citizens” to more robust “citizen engagement.”

Regardless of the approaches taken, author Matt Leighninger of the Deliberative Democracy Consortium warns of typical gaps that can lessen the effectiveness or even derail engagement strategies. These gaps include:

- The lack of cross-sector plans or structures that embed and sustain engagement.
- The need for tracking, measuring, and assessing participation.
- The use of online engagement that supports and complements face-to-face opportunities.
- The need to bring a diversity of viewpoints and backgrounds to the table.

A local government manager should be aware of the potential presence of the gaps in their community’s civic engagement strategy. Addressing the potential for them begins with a commitment to planning and measuring various meaningful engagement opportunities (both online and face-to-face) for people across all sectors of their community.

Opportunities need to be created where community members can expect the chance to listen to one another, to compare values and experiences, and to make the decision to become engaged, ultimately feeling that their opinions and actions make a difference.

**Moving Forward With Engagement**

The Connected Communities report concludes that engagement is both the right and smart thing for local governments to do, and in the current environment of reduced resources and wicked problems, should be looked at as a mandatory skill for managers—and something they must learn to do well.

There is no single best way to achieve engagement or one technique or format that serves all engagement purposes. Recent public engagement research from a variety of sources, however, consistently suggests similar types of strategies for any engagement effort.

Building upon these research findings, here are 10 suggestions that managers should consider in building an effective engagement strategy for their communities:

1. Take stock of what you are already doing, distinguishing between exchange and engagement efforts.
2. Assess how receptive your organization is to initiatives from community groups and to what extent your organizational culture supports civic engagement.
3. Work with your elected officials to convene a community conversation on engagement to hear from residents how they wish to be involved in shaping community life and how local government could contribute to meeting their aspirations.

---

**THE ART OF THE PUBLIC-PRIVATE DEAL**

**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY**

A series of new programs that provide critical skills to ensure that the public interest is served in complex public-private ventures and investment transactions

For legislators, policymakers, business development officials, finance directors, general managers and others in state, county and municipal government

**TWO-DAY COURSES**

- Project Finance
- Optimizing Government Return on Assets
- Pension Fund Portfolio Management

Ronald Reagan Building
Washington, DC
October – December 2013

www.publicpolicy.umd.edu/public-private
**FIGURE 1. IAP2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SPECTRUM.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION</th>
<th>EXCHANGES WITH CITIZENS</th>
<th>CITIZEN ENGAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>Provide the public with balanced and objective information and assist them in understanding the problems, alternatives and/or solutions.</td>
<td>Obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives, and/or decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>We will keep you informed.</td>
<td>We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve</td>
<td>We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.</td>
<td>We will look to you for direct advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendation into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate</td>
<td>We will partner with the public in each aspect of the decision, including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.</td>
<td>We will implement what you decide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empower</td>
<td>To place final decision making in the hands of the public.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXAMPLE TOOLS**

- Fact sheets; Websites; Open houses.
- Public comment; Focus groups; Surveys; Public meetings.
- Workshops Deliberative polling.
- Citizen Advisory Committees; Consensus building; Participatory decision making.
- Citizen juries; Ballots; Delegated decisions.

**SOURCE:** International Association for Public Participation (IAP2), www.iap2.org. Used with permission.

---

**JOIN THE CMS DISCUSSION**

Be part of ICMA’s conversation on civic engagement by visiting these websites:

- Center for Management Strategies (CMS): icma.org/managementstrategies.
- CMS Knowledge Network Group featuring posted reports and documents: icma.org/cmsgroup.
- CMS blog, featuring commentary by technical assistance providers and specialists: icma.org/cmsblog.
- Civic engagement Knowledge Network group: icma.org/kn/citizenengagement.

---

4. Identify potential issues that need resident engagement and involvement, including new ways staff could interact with residents in the day-to-day delivery of services.

5. Plan an engagement event by matching the purpose and intended outcomes with the appropriate technique and activity.

6. Actively recruit diverse stakeholder groups beyond the “usual suspects” who always participate.

7. Provide participants multiple opportunities to compare values and interests and articulate self-interests, and include opportunities in both large forums and small-group discussions.

8. Seek to combine both online and face-to-face engagement opportunities and venues.

9. Design engagement initiatives to move from talk to action by identifying tangible goals and desired outcomes; then, measure your success.

10. Develop an ongoing program in partnership with residents and community organizations to build meaningful engagement and facilitate resident problem solving in the work of local government.

**A Call to Action**

While there are a variety of resources available that can assist managers in developing an engagement strategy for their communities, getting started can be difficult. In fact, when local elected officials were asked in a 2006 National League of Cities survey about the main obstacles to pursuing engagement activities, the most common response was the “lack of training.” Many felt that both they and staff needed more background in how to recruit participants, facilitate meetings, frame issues, and move from talk to action in engagement settings.
Toward this end, ICMA’s Center for Management Strategies (CMS) and its partners, the Alliance for Innovation and Arizona State University, have completed research into the field of civic engagement, identifying both best and leading practices as well as key experts and practitioners to assist managers in implementing effective strategies for engagement in their communities.

Key findings of this research,⁷ suggest:

1. When done well, citizen engagement has been shown to be both the right thing to do in terms of promoting democracy and community building, but also to be the smart thing to do in terms of creating better decisions and policies, improving civility and trust in government, and fostering an educated and engaged citizenry.

2. There is a need for a more comprehensive, intentional, and holistic approach to citizen engagement that brings together actors and agencies throughout a municipality, instead of one-shot activities that occur in isolation.

One way to begin is by conducting a comprehensive assessment of existing capacities and past strategies and experiences. It may be necessary to examine and possibly revise current legal mandates and existing policies and procedures related to engaging with the public.

3. Beyond integrated plans within the formal governmental body, it is also important to develop cross-sector plans that embed and sustain engagement throughout communities.

4. There is a wide range of activities and techniques that can be used to engage with citizens. Before focusing on a particular tool or technique, it is important to first establish the purpose of the particular initiative (why engage?) and be clear upfront about the “promise to the public” in regard to ways that residents can engage and what they can reasonably expect in terms of how their participation will be used (to what end?).

At the end of the day, effective civic action and problem solving depends on ordinary individuals thinking of themselves as productive people who hold themselves accountable—people who can build things, do things, come up with ideas and resources, and be bold in their approach. Communities need places and spaces where people can develop their civic capacities and their public lives.

Local governments need to recognize the importance of engagement work as well as the need for effective plans for engagement and ways to measure the results of their efforts. The local government manager will play a key leadership role in achieving these goals.

MIKE HUGGINS, ICMA-CM, a former city manager, is principal, Public Collaboration Strategies, Madison, Wisconsin (hugginsmw@gmail.com). CHERYL HILVERT, ICMA-CM, a former city manager, is director, ICMA Center for Management Strategies (CMS), Washington, D.C. (chilver@icma.org). CMS delivers educational programming, as well as technical assistance and information sharing, and can be a resource for a local government pursuing civic engagement.

ENDNOTES
2 “Connected Communities: Local Government as a Partner in Citizen Engagement and Community Building,” James Svara and Janet Denhardt, eds. Alliance for Innovation, 2010.
3 “Connected Communities: Local Government as a Partner in Citizen Engagement and Community Building,” James Svara and Janet Denhardt, eds. Alliance for Innovation, 2010.
7 Summary of key findings of AFI/ASU/ICMA research courtesy of Kelly Campbell Rawlings, Ph.D; Assistant Research Professor; School of Public Affairs, Arizona State University.

KEY RESOURCES


Model Municipal Public Participation Ordinance

Whereas, public participation and collaboration may enhance local government's effectiveness, expand its range of options, improve the quality of its decisions, and enlist the problem-solving capacities of the general public and organizations outside local government, and

Whereas, knowledge and talent are widely dispersed in society, and all benefit when those skills and abilities are directed toward common goals, and

Whereas, public agencies and municipal authorities may collaborate with the general public and state, regional, and local government agencies, tribes, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and other nongovernmental stakeholders to accomplish public work and deliver public services more efficiently and effectively,

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF __________:

Section 1: Definitions

a) "Public participation," is defined to include "public comment", "public hearing", "public engagement," or "community engagement," includes, but is not limited to, any form of in-person, technology-aided, or online communication that provides for discussion, dialogue, or deliberation among participants, allowing residents to engage meaningfully in the policy process.

b) “Policy process” means any action developing, implementing, or enforcing public policy, including but not limited to identifying and defining a public policy issue, defining the options for a new policy framework, expanding the range of options, identifying approaches for addressing an issue, setting priorities among approaches, selecting from among the priorities, implementing solutions, project management, and assessing the impacts of decisions.

Section 2: Public Participation Policy

a) It is hereby declared a matter of public policy that the active public participation of community members to come together to deliberate and take action on public problems or issues that they themselves have defined as important is a public necessity and is required in the interest of the health, prosperity, safety, and welfare of the community.

b) The city and its municipal departments may use any process that meets the principles for public participation set forth in Section 3 in addition to notice and comment or public hearings required by law.

c) The city shall adopt and make publicly available a Public Participation Policy to guide the city’s use of participation strategies satisfying the principles for public participation set forth in Section 3.

Section 3. Principles for Public Participation

a) The following principles govern the design of public participation:
1. **Inclusive Design:** The design of a public participation process includes input from appropriate local officials as well as from members of intended participant communities. Public participation is an early and integral part of issue and opportunity identification, concept development, design, and implementation of city policies, programs, and projects.

2. **Authentic Intent:** A primary purpose of the public participation process is to generate public views and ideas to help shape local government action or policy.

3. **Transparency:** Public participation processes are open, honest, and understandable. There is clarity and transparency about public participation process sponsorship, purpose, design, and how decision makers will use the process results.

4. **Inclusiveness and Equity:** Public participation processes identify, reach out to, and encourage participation of the community in its full diversity. Processes respect a range of values and interests and the knowledge of those involved. Historically excluded individuals and groups are included authentically in processes, activities, and decision and policymaking. Impacts, including costs and benefits, are identified and distributed fairly.

5. **Informed Participation:** Participants in the process have information and/or access to expertise consistent with the work that sponsors and conveners ask them to do. Members of the public receive the information they need, and with enough lead time, to participate effectively.

6. **Accessible Participation:** Public participation processes are broadly accessible in terms of location, time, and language, and support the engagement of community members with disabilities.

7. **Appropriate Process:** The public participation process uses one or more engagement formats that are responsive to the needs of identified participant groups; and encourage full, authentic, effective and equitable participation consistent with process purposes. Participation processes and techniques are well-designed to appropriately fit the scope, character, and impact of a policy or project. Processes adapt to changing needs and issues as they move forward.

8. **Use of Information:** The ideas, preferences, and/or recommendations contributed by community members are documented and given consideration by decision-makers. Local officials communicate decisions back to process participants and the broader public, with a description of how the public input was considered and used.

9. **Building Relationships and Community Capacity:** Public participation processes invest in and develop long-term, collaborative working relationships and learning opportunities with community partners and stakeholders. This may include relationships with other temporary or ongoing community participation venues.

10. **Evaluation:** Sponsors and participants evaluate each public participation process with the collected feedback and learning shared broadly and applied to future public participation efforts.

**Section 4. Public Participation Specialist**

The mayor/city manager shall designate a staff member to be the public participation specialist. The city shall provide for training on a regular basis for the public participation specialist and other employees involved in implementing the public participation policy.

**Section 5. Public Participation Advisory Board**

a) **Establishment.** A public participation advisory board for the City of ______ is hereby created.

b) **Purpose and Intent.** The purpose of this board is to advise the city council on the design, implementation, and evaluation of public participation processes for determining community goals.
and policies and delivering services.

c) **Duties and Responsibilities.** The board shall have the following duties and responsibilities:

1. Develop and propose to the city council a multi-year plan for public participation to guide the public participation policies, protocols, practices, and assessment of the City of ________;
2. Develop guidelines and recommendations to the city council that support inclusive participation and a diversity of viewpoints in public engagement processes;
3. Provide advice and recommendations to the city council regarding the implementation of public participation guidelines and practices;
4. Review public participation process evaluation results to provide advice and recommendations to the city council regarding continuous improvement of public participation policies and practices; and
5. Provide an annual report to the city council regarding the status of public participation activities.

d) **Composition.** The public participation advisory board shall consist of numbers of members and terms consistent with the practices of the appointing authority. The appointing authority shall give due consideration to recognized qualifications and experiences in the field of public participation and shall designate representatives reflecting the diversity of interests of the broader community.

e) **Procedure.** A majority of the board shall constitute a quorum. The commission shall adopt such rules and bylaws as appropriate to further govern its proceedings.

f) **Meetings.** The board shall hold regular meetings as may be provided by its bylaws, and may hold special meetings on the call of the chairperson or at the request of the city council.


http://www.ncl.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=213&Itemid=228