# Advancing Community Policing Through Community Governance: A Framework Document

By
Drew Diamond
Deirdre Mead Weiss

POLICE EXECUTIVE
RESEARCH FORUM

COPS

COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

# Contents

# Acknowledgments

# Introduction

About 25 years ago, a number of progressive police departments began experimenting with a new approach to policing that focused on improving relations between police officers and the communities they serve. This approach to policing, called community policing, focused on developing partnerships between the police and the community, addressing community problems through systematic problem-solving efforts, and finding ways to ensure that officers' efforts in these areas receive support from the police department. Today, community policing is widely accepted in police departments across the county, and the vast majority of community members and local politicians want their police department to be a community policing agency.

As police departments implemented the community policing philosophy, they developed a deeper understanding of what it means to partner with the community. The community is not merely the people living or working within a city, but also the city's nonprofit and community-based organizations, local businesses, and, also important, government agencies. As police departments strengthen and advance their community policing efforts, they call on their colleagues in other departments of their own city government to assist with problem-solving efforts in the community. At this same time, many city administrators are seeking ways to increase community involvement in local government matters. These same managers are also trying to create a more transparent government structure that stresses accountability and responsiveness to the community.

Cities that pursue these efforts are beginning to adopt a new approach to local governance—one that is service-oriented. We refer to this philosophical approach to local governance as "community governance." At its most basic level, community governance takes the philosophy and elements of community policing to the citywide level. It stresses collaboration among city agencies and with the community, systematic problem-solving efforts, and organizational changes to support this new orientation.

## About the Document

*Advancing Community Policing through Community Governance: A Framework Document* serves as a basis for defining the community governance approach and what it looks like in practice by taking the first step of starting the discussion about community governance. We hope that additional projects and research in the future will expand the community governance knowledge base. This document will be of particular interest to police chiefs, city managers, mayors, and other municipal agency executives who are interested in developing a more collaborative approach to local governance in responding to community problems and issues.

## Document Development

This document reflects an extensive review of the existing literature about community policing and community governance. The research team also gathered data from interviews with city management teams (e.g., political leaders, city administrators, and municipal agency executives and supervisors) and observation of city operations in five municipalities: Anaheim, California; Irving, Texas; Longmont, Colorado; Prince William County, Virginia; and Wichita, Kansas. In 2005, prior to the start of the project, the Police Executive Research Forum, with support from the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (the COPS Office), held a focus group comprising police chiefs and city managers, to discuss community governance and community policing. The proceedings from that focus group added depth to the research, as did the proceedings of the session on community governance at the COPS Office's 2006 National Conference. Finally, we gathered information from a series of roundtable meetings with police leaders that were held in the spring of 2007 as part of another research project.[1] The roundtable meetings focused on the status, challenges to, and future of community policing. Throughout these meetings, police leaders emphasized that advancing community policing means taking the principles and elements of community policing across the city structure. Their comments and discussions added context to this framework document.

[1] For further information about this project, see its resulting COPS Office publication *Community Policing: Looking to Tomorrow* by Drew Diamond and Deirdre Mead Weiss.

[2] See, e.g., Chapman and Scheider, 2006; Diamond and Weiss,2009; Reiss, 2006; and Renaud and Batts, 2006.

[3] For a discussion of these issues from public administration scholars and practitioners, see, e.g., summary of Clarke and Stewart, 1998, in Joseph Rowntree Foundation 1999; Fischer-Stewart, 2007; Kettl, 2000, p. 488; National League of Cities, 2005, p.7; National League of Cities Institute for Youth, Education, and Families, 2006; and Thomas, 1999, p.83.

[4] For a further discussion see Bureau of Justice Assistance, 2001; Jarvi and Wegner, 2001; Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 1999; Marshall, Wray, Epstein, and Grifel, 2000; Mudd, 1976, p 114; and Ney and McGarry, 2006.

[5] See, e.g., British Council on Governance quoted in Marshall et al, 2000, p. 215; Clarke and Stewart, 1992, p. 29 quoted in Horrocks and Bellamy, 1997; Gates, 1999; and National League of Cities, 2005, p.7.

[6] See, e.g., Denhardt and Vinzant Denhardt, 2000; Epstein, Coates, Wray, and Swain, 2005; Jarvi and Wegner, 2001, p. 26; Nalbandian, 1999; National League of Cities, 2005; Potapchuk and Kennedy, 2004; and Simrell King, Feltey, and O'Neill Susel, 1998.

# Section I: The Emergence of Community Governance

Community governance is a philosophical approach to local governance in which municipal agencies, city leaders, and the community (e.g., nonprofit and community-based organizations, individuals, and businesses) view themselves as partners and collaborate to address community problems and improve the overall quality of life. Community governance, still a relatively new concept, is being adopted in many cities and towns across the United States. These cities believe that there is a need for a holistic, collaborative approach to providing municipal services and addressing community problems. They recognize that city departments need to work with each other and the communities they serve to effectively address the complex, multidisciplinary challenges that face cities and towns today. Additionally, these jurisdictions understand that their agencies and the community can contribute a part of the answer to seemingly intractable community problems and, therefore, they regularly use the resources and expertise of both groups.

Some of community governance's strongest advocates today include police chiefs, city managers and administrators, and mayors who have embraced the community governance concept for its ability to bring municipal agencies, community organizations, businesses, and individuals together and engage them to address local problems, improve community quality of life, and plan for the future. For many local leaders, especially police chiefs, community governance is the natural extension of community policing. It applies the community policing philosophy and its elements at the citywide level.[2] For other local leaders, community governance has emerged from their understanding that both municipal agencies and the community have roles and responsibilities to fill. They include working together to share the responsibility for public safety and community quality of life.[3] Municipal agency coordination and responsiveness are essential to these efforts but, unfortunately, generally have been lacking in matters requiring action across municipal agencies and with community organizations.[4] Still other municipal leaders have begun to shift their approach from government (an institution) to governance (a process).[5] These leaders often point to the need for civil servants to have new skill sets that allow them to act as facilitators, consensus builders, collaborators, and community builders who engage the public in decision-making processes.[6] These ideas are also embraced by proponents of community policing, who stress that the police and the community share the responsibility for community safety and often act as facilitators and collaborators when engaging the community in problem-solving efforts around crime and disorder issues.

# The Origins of Community Policing

In an effort to curb corruption early in the 20th century, police departments attempted to separate themselves from the public and the world of politics and began to adopt a more "professional" image—that of a military model of management, education, and uniformity through training.[7] Over time, the police became an insulated unit: they centralized authority to control precinct captains and stressed serious crime over problems of social disorder.[8] Neighborhood residents no longer knew their local police officer and technology moved beat officers into radio-equipped patrol cars.[9] The radios allowed officers to race from call to call and police had less time to concern themselves with the overall well-being of the neighborhood. In other words, police became response-driven. Artificial measures of efficiency became more important than true effectiveness and the police began to be measured by how many calls they responded to, not necessarily whether they solved the problems that resulted in the calls for service.[10]

The professionalism movement succeeded in separating the police from the public and political influences, but the reform era also brought with it some serious challenges for policing—namely that it contributed to disaffection and lack of trust, especially between the police and the poorest and least powerful people they serve. Community policing seeks to amend the shortcomings of this "professionalism" or "traditional policing" model, by bringing the officer and the community back into contact with each other. Community policing places a much stronger focus on developing and maintaining trust and positive relationships between the police and all people they serve.

Community policing's emphasis on developing partnerships to address community crime and disorder problems and supporting that effort through organizational change has transformed American policing. Today, a large majority of police chiefs support community policing to some degree, in step with mayors and city managers requiring community policing skills as a key competency for the city's police chief. Within only a generation, community policing has become the predominant approach to policing in American police departments.[11]

# What is Community Policing?

Community policing is a philosophical approach to policing; it is not a program or set of programs or tactics.[12] Police departments that embrace the community policing philosophy work in partnership with the community to address local public safety problems and make organizational changes to support these efforts. There are three elements to the community policing philosophy: community partnerships, problem solving, and organizational transformation (see Figure 1). These elements are expressed through principles, such as leadership, vision, equity, trust, empowerment, service, and accountability.[13]

[7] See Greene, 2000; and Trojanowicz, Kappeler, Gaines, and Bucqueroux, 1998.

[8] See Patterson, 1995.

[9] See Allender, 2004.

[10] See Allender, 2004 and Patterson, 1995.

[11] See, e.g., Mastrofski, Willis, and Kochel, 2007; and Fridell and Wycoff, 2004. Additionally, in recent years, the Department of Justice's Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics and Local Police Department reports have detailed a range of community policing activities in which local law enforcement agencies engage. Reports are available on the Bureau of Justice Statistics web,site, www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/.

[12] For a further discussion about the origins and foundations of community policing, see Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1994.

[13] For a further discussion of these principles see Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1998, p. 8–10.

Community Policing Definition
Community policing is a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies, which support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques, to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime. (U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2009)[14]

## Figure 1: Community Policing Definition Framework.

| Community Partnerships: | Organizational Transformation: | Problem Solving: |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Collaborative partnerships between the law enforcement agency and the individuals and organizations they serve to develop solutions to problems and increase trust in police.<br>• Other Government Agencies<br>• Community Members/Groups<br>• Nonprofits/Service Providers<br>• Private Businesses<br>• Media | The alignment of organizational management, structure, personnel, and information systems to support community partnerships and proactive problem-solving.<br>• Agency Management<br> – Climate and culture<br> – Leadership<br> – Labor relations<br> – Decision-making<br> – Strategic planning<br> – Policies<br> – Organizational evaluations<br> – Transparency<br>• Organizational Structure<br> – Geographic assignment of officers<br> – Despecialization<br> – Resources and finances<br>• Personnel<br> – Recruitment, hiring, and selection<br> – Personnel supervision/evaluations<br> – Training<br>• Information Systems (Technology)<br> – Communication/access to data<br> – Quality and accuracy of data | The process of engaging in the proactive and systematic examination of identified problems to develop effective responses that are evaluated rigorously.<br>• Scanning: Identifying and prioritizing problems<br>• Analysis: Analyzing<br>• Response: Responding to problems<br>• Assessment: Assessing problem-solving initiatives<br>• Using the crime triangle to focus on immediate conditions (victim/offender/location) |

Community partnerships are collaborative relationships that police department employees at all levels and ranks develop with individuals and organizations that have a stake in a variety of community issues. Police personnel are expected to have a broad range of partners in the community and to engage them in

problem-solving efforts. Both the police department and the community partners are expected to demonstrate their commitment to these efforts by applying their expertise and resources.

Problem solving is a systematic method of collaboratively identifying, analyzing, responding to, and evaluating the response to specific community problems. Police departments and communities across the country that have been trained in community policing and problem solving often utilize a specific problem-solving model called SARA.[15] The SARA model has four phases: scanning, analysis, response, and assessment. During scanning, stakeholders (i.e., police and a wide range of community partners) identify community problems and choose the problem or problems on which they will focus their efforts. Problems are defined as two or more incidents that are similar in nature and capable of causing harm. In addition, there must be a public expectation that something needs to be done to address the problem. Stakeholders then analyze the problem to identify why it is occurring, who is causing the problem, who is being affected by the problem, and what harms result from the problem. With the information gathered in the analysis phase, stakeholders respond by developing and implementing strategies or programs designed to eliminate or decrease the problem. Finally, during the assessment phase, stakeholders examine the effectiveness of their response. It is important to note that the problem-solving process is circular, allowing the users to go back to each step whenever necessary. Revisiting a step does not indicate failure (see Figure 2).[16]

## Figure 2: The SARA Model of Problem Solving.



A police department that utilizes community partnerships and problem-solving efforts as part of its efforts to reduce crime and citizen fear of crime has different organizational needs and challenges than a traditional police department that does not engage its community in such efforts. This is because community policing challenges the basic beliefs that were the foundation of traditional policing.[17] The changes that a community policing agency must make in its management, organizational structure, personnel practices, and technology and information systems in support of community policing are referred to as organizational transformation. Such organizational transformation efforts

[15] The SARA problem-solving model has its origins in the work of Herman Goldstein who conducted early research in problem-oriented policing (see, e.g., Goldstein, 1990) and also in the research of the Police Executive Research Forum (see Eck and Spelman, 1987).

[16] Training curricula for the SARA model of problem solving are available on the Police Executive Research Forum web site: www.policeforum.org. The U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (the COPS Office) has also sponsored a number of specific topical guides on problem-oriented policing. See www.cops.usdoj.gov for more information. Another important problem-solving resource is the Center for Problem Oriented Policing, www.popcenter.org/.

[17] For a further discussion see Trojanowicz, Kappeler, Gaines, and Bucqueroux, 1998; and Chapman and Scheider, 2006, p.2.

include promoting an agency climate and culture conducive to community policing; devolving power and decision-making authority to officers engaged in community policing activities; ensuring transparency and accountability; assigning officers to geographic districts; training officers to be "generalists" rather than "specialists"; recruiting, selecting, and hiring service-oriented officers; providing community policing training; evaluating officers on their community policing activities; and ensuring access to information and information systems that provide data about, and context to, community policing activities.

<u>What Does Community Policing Look Like?</u>
Community policing focuses on crime and social disorder through the delivery of police services that includes aspects of traditional law enforcement, as well as crime prevention, problem solving, community engagement, and partnerships. The community policing model balances reactive responses to calls for service with proactive problem solving centred on the causes of crime and disorder. Community policing requires police and citizens to join together as partners in the course of both identifying and effectively addressing these issues. (U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services 2003)

## The Transition from Community Policing to Community Governance

Many police departments engaged in community policing, as well as scholars who research it, have realized that police departments need a broad range of multidisciplinary partnerships with the community to address local public safety problems.  This means partnerships with community-based organizations (e.g., advocacy organizations, faith-based groups, Rotary clubs), community businesses, individual community members, and government agencies—especially at the municipal level.[18] Many police departments view partnerships with their fellow municipal agencies as an essential component of successful community policing. Police departments need the assistance of their municipal agency counterparts to address recurring crime, disorder, and other problem issues identified by the community.[19] The problem of burglaries in overcrowded apartments or break-ins in abandoned or unkempt buildings, for example, often touch on code enforcement or environmental health issues. Similarly, youth vandalism of community parks has implications for police as well as parks and recreation, schools, and youth officials.

In some communities, police officials and their municipal agency counterparts have been able to collaborate and work together easily to address these issues and resolve or reduce identified problems. In other communities, however, police officials have not been as successful in developing and maintaining

[18] For a discussion from the perspective of policing scholars see Wood, Rouse, and Davis, 1999; and Scott and Goldstein, 2005. For a discussion from the perspective of community planners, see Rohe, Adams, and Arcury, 2001. For a popular press discussion of this topic, see Stephens, 2001.

[19] For a further discussion of police practitioners' perspective see Diamond and Weiss, 2009.

collaborative relationships with their municipal agency counterparts and have attributed these difficulties to various organizational philosophies and approaches to service and collaboration. Still other communities have seen short-term successes in interdepartmental and community collaborations, but have used these methods merely as short-term responses to specific community problems rather than as an ongoing, citywide operating philosophy.[20]

For these reasons, there has been a growing interest, especially among policing leaders and city administrators, in seeing the elements of community policing and its service orientation adopted throughout of local government.[21] These officials believe that such efforts will make their community policing efforts more successful and will contribute to a thriving community in which people want to live and work.

[20] For a further discussion see Stewart-Brown, 2001, p.9.

[21] See, e.g., Diamond and Weiss, 2009; Fischer-Stewart, 2007, p. 7; National League of Cities Institute for Youth, Education, and Families, 2006; Reiss, 2006; and Renaud and Batts, 2006.

Why Should I be Interested in Community Governance?
Community governance can help city administrators, police chiefs, and other city department leaders use their expertise and limited resources (e.g., human, financial, technological, and logistical) effectively. Community governance does the following:
- Recognizes that the activities of one city department affect other departments.
- Provides a holistic approach to local government service delivery that breaks down organizational barriers.
- Encourages community and municipal stakeholders to pool expertise and limited resources to address community problems.
- Provides a voice for the full range of community stakeholders and input into decision-making processes.
- Engages community members in their own well-being and in improving the community s quality of life.
- Adheres to the democratic principles of equality and responsiveness.
- Increases the transparency and accountability of local government.
- Shares the responsibility for community safety and quality of life between local government and the community.
- Stresses community well-being outcomes (e.g., health and safety), rather than mere outputs (e.g., number of persons vaccinated, number of tickets written).

The rest of this document is dedicated to exploring community governance in greater detail. In Section II, the four community governance elements are discussed separately regarding what they mean for municipalities and the community. This section also discusses the important role of leadership in initially adopting and then institutionalizing and advancing community governance; highlights some of the key challenges to implementation and sustainability; and provides some tips from the field. Section III describes community governance efforts in five American communities: Anaheim, California; Irving, Texas; Longmont, Colorado; Prince William County, Virginia; and Wichita, Kansas.

# Section II: Defining Community Governance and Its Elements

Community governance, like community policing, is not a set of programs. Rather, community governance is a philosophical approach to local governance. At its core, community governance seeks to help cities better coordinate their service delivery and collaboratively solve community problems. Community governance focuses on "governance" as a process rather than on "government" as an institution. Community governance relies on municipal agencies to engage each other and work together and with their community to address community problems, improve the quality of life, and plan for the future. Agencies engaged in community governance, just like those engaged in community policing, need to make organizational changes to support this approach to local government. Four elements comprise the community governance philosophy:

1.  Partnerships among municipal agencies.

2.  Partnerships with the community.

3.  Collaborative problem-solving efforts.

4.  Organizational change.

What is Community Governance?
Mutual responsibility coupled with interdepartmental and community engagement form the basis of community governance—bringing city and county agencies, schools, religious and nonprofit organizations, businesses, and residential communities together to communicate openly on how to improve the quality of life of citizens. This requires all stakeholders to meet regularly to discuss ongoing problems in the neighborhood, develop strategic plans to repair deteriorated neighborhoods, and establish goals for their future. (Reis, 2006, p. 11)

The police are only one of the many local government agencies responsible for responding to community problems as varied as traffic, litter, street lighting, or problem parks. Under a community governance model based on community policing principles, other government agencies are called on and recognized for their abilities to respond to citywide issues. Community-based organizations are also brought in to address issues of common concern. The support and leadership of elected officials, as well as the coordination of the police department and other municipal agencies at all levels, are vital to the success of these efforts. Organizational and cultural changes can take place in all of these agencies to promote proactive public service models based on the basic principles of partnerships and problem solving. (Chapman and Scheider, 2006, p.3)

# Element 1: Partnerships Among Municipal Agencies

In community governance, municipalities take a collaborative, holistic approach to delivering services to the community. Municipal department staff members at all ranks and levels should not only be knowledgeable about the services provided by their colleagues in other city agencies, but also should work with each other and with the community to coordinate their responses to problems and to provide services. Municipal agency executives and their staff members may act as facilitators, consensus builders, and partnership builders in problem-solving efforts and decision-making processes. These efforts should focus on fostering inclusive processes that bring together diverse opinions and interests in the community and local government to concentrate on getting things done collectively. Municipal civil servants and elected officials—from city administrators to agency executives and their supervisory staffs—must be willing to provide resources, expertise, and time for their employees to develop strong collaborative relationships with other persons working in city government. The leaders in municipal agencies should encourage the employees they supervise to proactively address community concerns and they should hold employees accountable for their efforts.

## Operationalizing Partnerships Among Municipal Agencies

In practice, municipal agencies should work together to achieve the common good for the community. This concept, however, is often easier to express in theory than in practice. The reality is that often a city's leaders develop a vision for the community and its future, but each municipal agency has its own distinct mission and goals based on its competencies and role in local government. This can pose some challenges to providing a holistic approach to services because city agencies will clearly want to focus on the specific services they provide. Each agency's mission and goals, therefore, should support the city's overall vision.

While each agency should focus on delivering the services in which it specializes, agency leaders and their staff members must realize that agency activities, decisions, policies, and procedures do not exist in isolation, but rather affect the rest of local government. This is one of many reasons why there needs to be timely and substantive communication across city agencies. Another reason is that each agency has specific strengths and can provide specific services. Coordinating the services can prove to be an efficient and effective use of resources.

Communication among city agencies and coordination of activities are some of the first and easiest steps that municipal agencies can undertake in community governance. These efforts describe a relationship among city agencies; the next step is to move toward a partnership characterized by shared decision-making processes, the contribution of resources to address specific problems, and joint ownership of the results. Partnership activities require collaboration between municipal agency leaders and city administrators; both must view themselves and their colleagues as part of a city management team. These activities also require strong leadership and communication within municipal agencies— from executives to supervisors and their staff members and vice versa. Hence, partnerships require strong communication both horizontally and vertically within the city and its agencies' structures.

Within each agency, line-level staff members play an important role in fostering relationships and partnerships between municipal departments. For these reasons, municipal agency staff members should have an understanding of the services, expertise, and resources provided by others within the city and should be encouraged to collaborate with their colleagues from other agencies when working on broad issues. It is in these areas that the expertise of multiple departments will prove useful.

A rash of graffiti by teenagers in neighborhood parks, for example, should be an impetus for parks and recreation officials to work with other city departments to respond to the problem. Law enforcement, sanitation, and code enforcement officials, as well as youth authorities can bring their own insights, experiences, and expertise to the situation.

## Role of Leadership

City administrators' leadership is critical to getting municipal agencies to work in partnership with each other. The idea of collaboration in government must be stressed at the highest levels of leadership within the city, as well as encouraged among all city employees. The administrator should stress that the city's agencies and their staff members comprise a team that seeks to provide a comprehensive approach to local government services. He or she also must stress that there are no organizational "silos" within the city; departments must work together to address the needs of the community.

Within each municipal agency, the executive must also clearly stress the need for partnerships among municipal agencies and model that through his or her behavior. Within each organization, midlevel managers will be critical to the success of the department's and the city's efforts. These managers should be brought into the process early and engaged in these activities so they will be more likely to buy into the transition to community governance. Finally, the line-level officers are the ambassadors for this work because they are encouraged to work with other city agency employees and community stakeholders to address community issues and problems. These efforts clearly require the daily support of agency leaders.

Tips for Leaders Wanting to Strengthen Municipal Agency Partnerships
• Continually emphasize collaboration and model desired behaviors.
• Stress the importance of municipal agency partnerships with city staff members at all levels.
• Obtain buy-in and enlist support from midlevel managers.
• Make any needed organizational changes to support staff members partnership efforts.

## Challenges to Implementation and Sustainability

Municipalities that want to develop stronger partnerships between municipal agencies can expect challenges as they make the transition to community governance. Some of the most pressing issues cities may face include poor relations between municipal agencies, unsuccessful past attempts at collaboration, and a lack of interest in developing partnerships. Cities should identify where these challenges are present and take steps to address these issues.

**Poor relations between municipal agencies.** In some cities, a few municipal agencies have a history of tense relations with other city departments. This may come from a perceived view that one agency and its employees have more resources at their disposal than other agencies or that an agency does not view itself as part of city government. These poor relations can also emerge from friction between municipal department heads that over time become a part of agency culture. Regardless of why these poor relations exist, they pose challenges to adopting the community governance philosophy. Here, the role of leadership is once again paramount. The city administrators set the tone for how municipal agencies do or do not work together. By stressing partnerships, modelling the behaviors, and rewarding partnerships, cities can begin to take steps to build and strengthen collaborative efforts.

**Unsuccessful past attempts at collaboration.** Some city leaders and staff members may view the move toward community governance with scepticism and they may approach these ideas with a "been there, done that" outlook. They may believe that they have undertaken some of these efforts in the past but for any number of reasons—such as political will or lack of funding—they did not continue down that path in the long term. For these individuals, it is particularly important to explain why the city is adopting the community governance philosophy and what efforts it is undertaking to ensure sustainability over time.

**Lack of interest in developing partnerships.** For some municipal agency staff members and their leadership, the idea of working in partnership to address community issues is new. For many, partnerships may be viewed as yet another task added to their workload. They may not see the purpose of these efforts or why they should engage in them. Furthermore, they may view building relationships and partnerships with their other city colleagues as taking them away from their other work responsibilities. This may particularly be the case with midlevel supervisors concerned about allocating resources to partnership activities, especially if it is not part of the city's scheme for evaluating employees. Without midlevel managers' support of their staff members' partnership activities, these efforts face significant challenges. To address some of these challenges, city leaders should explain how community governance efforts can actually help city employees and the community they serve. (For a brief

listing of talking points, see the sidebar entitled "Why Should I Be Interested in Community Governance?" in Section I.) City leaders should also address the organizational barriers to developing partnerships. These may range from including "creating partnerships" as an objective in employee work plans to taking steps to hire and promote persons with a service orientation.

Tips from the Field: Building and Sustaining Partnerships among Municipal Agencies

- Avoid compartmentalizing city departments for policy development. When dealing with environmental matters or economic vitality, for example, make sure that everyone is at the table even the least likely department—because these issues go well beyond one department s focus. No initiative exists in a vacuum.
- Ensure that city administrators and department heads meet regularly. This provides opportunities for interconnectivity and a team approach to problem solving.
- Build relationships and sustain them over time. Ensure that all city departments have a place at the table.
- Stress with all city employees the importance of having conversations with fellow city employees from other agencies. Bring agencies together and let staff members get to know each other to help build trust.
- Market the municipal government team and its efforts to address community issues collaboratively.
- Maintain long-term support, share leadership, identify role models to bring other city employees along, and hire persons with a service orientation.

## Element 2: Partnerships with the Community

Community members are essential partners of municipalities that are committed to community governance. Along with individuals, other stakeholders include community-based and nonprofit organizations (e.g., faith-based organizations, issue advocacy groups, fraternal organizations, and service providers, and local elementary and secondary schools), community businesses, and individuals. They also include other municipal government agencies and agencies at the state and federal levels (e.g., state department of corrections, Federal Bureau of Investigation). Community stakeholders help municipal agencies determine priorities, and they contribute time and resources to addressing identified problems. When confronting neighborhood issues, local schools in particular can convey trust and credibility in the municipal government to residents while encouraging their involvement. By devoting their own resources, the community stakeholders show their commitment to working with their municipal agency partners. The community should be recognized for its efforts and also should also be held accountable, as should city government. This notion of dual accountability stresses that community safety and quality of life are the shared responsibility of the community and its local government.

## Operationalizing Partnerships with the Community

Municipalities engaged in community governance efforts develop partnerships with community stakeholders to address problems and enhance overall quality of life in the community.

Examples of Community Partners
- Community-based and nonprofit organizations
    Faith-based organizations, e.g., Salvation Army, churches, synagogues, and mosques
    Issue advocacy groups, e.g., Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) and domestic violence awareness groups
    Fraternal organizations, e.g., Elks, college fraternities and sororities
    Schools, e.g., elementary and secondary public and private schools, community colleges, vocational schools, and universities
    Nonprofit organizations, e.g., Red Cross and Habitat for Humanity
- Community businesses
    Companies of all sizes
    News media
- Individuals
    Persons who live in the community
    Persons who work in the community
    Community leaders
- Other government agencies
    Other municipal agencies in the region
    State government agencies
    Federal government agencies

These partnerships with the community are similar in many ways to the partnerships previously described among municipal agencies. The move toward partnerships is characterized first by creating (where needed) and strengthening communication between community stakeholders and municipal government. As with partnerships among municipal agencies, partnerships with the community are characterized by joint identification of problem areas, collaboratively developing and implementing a plan to address the problems, and jointly owning the results of the efforts.

Partnership efforts with the community provide a vehicle through which local government can listen to the community and identify what community members think are their most pressing issues. To be successful, local government officials need to be open and honest, rather than defensive about the challenges facing the city and its neighborhoods. City leaders also need to engage a range of stakeholders that represent various interests in the community. This provides government officials with a balanced perspective of community views. Too often, cities rely on a small but active group of individuals to provide input. Community governance seeks to broaden these efforts

and include comprehensive interests in problem-solving efforts. Community governance recognizes that local people want to be involved in what affects their daily lives and neighborhood—and it take steps to encourage their involvement.

Community members are not passive actors in community governance; rather, they are expected to contribute resources to address problems and improve quality of life. Clearly, individual community members and even community organizations are not expected to bear the entire cost of working to resolve the problem. Instead, by investing some of their own resources to address a problem, the community, and not just the local government, has a stake in the outcome. Community members can bring a wide variety of resources, such as time, knowledge, skills, and money, to the table. These efforts need to be nurtured and sustained over time.

The process of developing and sustaining partnerships with community stakeholders helps local government officials in many ways: It helps them identify problem areas; it assists departments in identifying their strengths and weaknesses in providing services; and it provides local government employees with direct feedback from the public they serve. There are other benefits to partnerships, as well. Partnership efforts not only encourage the public to become more engaged with their local government, but also provide a vehicle for community education. Community members who partner with local government learn about their city and how municipal government functions. They learn who to go to when they experience various problems, and they become aware of the limited resources and the restrictions on activities that the municipal agencies face. Additionally, community members learn about activities that violate local ordinances, and they are more likely to report those violations when they see them, or to let their neighbors know about the ordinances. Partnership activities also stress that municipal departments are part of a city team that provide services. This can enhance the public's trust in various city agencies. Another by-product of partnerships with the community is an increased community capacity to deal with problems. Neighborhoods learn the skills they need to work together to take on important neighborhood issues. They understand what resources exist in the community and how they can be put to use (along with government resources). This knowledge gives the community the confidence and wherewithal to take actions independently where they can best address a problem and to work with local government to address other challenges.

## Role of Leadership

In many aspects, the role of city leadership in developing and strengthening partnerships with the community is similar to the role it should play in building and sustaining those partnerships among municipal agencies. City administrators and municipal department executives must continually emphasize and model the behaviors they want to see from staff members of all municipal government agencies. They also need to cultivate and ensure that they have the support of midlevel managers. Their support and guidance of line-level staff members are at the core of developing partnerships. To get support from midlevel mangers, some organizational changes may be needed, such as criteria for promotion and evaluation of employees.

There are also some distinct aspects to the role of leadership in building partnerships with the community. City leaders must use some of their own personal "capital" to get members of the community involved in community governance. Often, personally contacting community members will gain their participation. City administrators, the executives of municipal agencies, and many senior managers in the agencies have a wide variety of community contacts on which to draw.

Another area in which city administrators and their department heads need to assert leadership is in marketing the city team to the community. At community events, some members of city agencies are much easier to spot than others. Police officers, for example, are easily recognized by their uniform, and many citizens view them as a symbol of security for the neighborhood. Other city agency staff members may be present at these events but are not recognized as such.  Even if they are recognized, some community members will still approach a police officer to discuss a problem, even one that is not traditionally in the officer's purview (e.g., a complaint about a broken stove in front of a neighbor's house for three weeks). For these reasons, city managers need to market the entire city team and build knowledge with the public about what each department does. These efforts reinforce the idea that the city departments comprise a team and that all have important contributions to make in

addressing community problems and maintaining and improving quality of life. These efforts also have the potential to motivate staff members to engage in community governance activities.

## Challenges to Implementation and Sustainability

Municipalities that want to develop stronger partnerships with community stakeholders can also expect challenges as they make the transition to community governance. Some of the most pressing issues cities may face include committing to the hard work of building partnerships, a lack of interest in partnerships among members of the community, and community concerns about the transition to community governance. Cities should take steps to identify and address these challenges.

**Building partnerships is hard work.** Developing partnerships and sustaining them over the long run is challenging. It is not an effort that municipalities can engage in periodically over time or only when they face crises and expect to succeed. Rather, this is an effort that must be continuous among municipal agencies. Developing partnerships requires time and effort from agency staff—time that some supervisors and staff members may feel would be better spent on other work. Similarly, it takes a lot of time and energy to educate the public about local government and to gather input into future efforts. These efforts, however, are essential to any agency wanting to adopt the community governance philosophy.

**Lack of interest among the community.** Community engagement in local issues tends to wax and wane. Community members tend to be more active during times of crisis and often are less active when they are satisfied with the current situation. This challenge can be quite difficult to overcome. Cities, therefore, should undertake a wide variety of activities to engage people from different backgrounds and interests. When cities always rely on a small group of persons, sustaining their efforts will be difficult because people get tired and burned out. Additionally, cities should look at how technology can help them engage the public while recognizing the limitations of this approach,

namely, that it excludes a segment of the population that is not technologically savvy. City leaders should also take steps to continually reach out to the neighborhoods and people who generally avoid participating in government.

**Community concerns.** Community members often become highly engaged when NIMBY (not in my backyard) issues come to their attention. For example, in some communities, transitional housing for persons returning to the community from prison is a highly controversial issue and often neighborhoods express concern that they are not getting a fair share of city resources compared to other neighbourhoods.  Education efforts can help to counter both types of community concerns. These education efforts, however, may require cities to devote a significant amount of time to building a knowledge base on the issue. For these reasons, it is also important to engage community members from the outset when these decisions are being made. Community members can then better understand how and why decisions are made, and cities can build community support for their efforts.

**Another community concern focuses on personnel matters.** For some cities engaged in community governance, city employees become well-known in various neighborhoods. Community members feel that they work well with these individuals and would like to see them stay in the neighborhood. When these staff members are promoted, some community members may become upset that "their" city employee will no longer be working with them, and the neighborhood residents may be a bit apprehensive about working with someone new.  City leaders sometimes need to step in and reassure community members that a personnel change does not indicate that they have abandoned community governance, but rather gives the staff member the chance to expand his or her skills.

Tips from the Field: Building and Sustaining Partnerships with the Community
- Build the expectation of developing partnerships into citywide practices, particularly in personnel decisions such as hiring and promotion.
- Get all  knees under the table  and build in inclusion from every group you can think of from the outset. This is time  consuming and requires the use of personal relationships to get people engaged, but it is worth the effort.
- Before making a significant change or taking on a large project, solicit the community s input—including the naysayers—at the very beginning of planning efforts. Keep them informed throughout the process, including final results. Even if this slows things at the beginning, the implementation process can move faster because the city has gained buy-in from the community.
- Invest in relationships with the community. Although it takes a lot of time, it pays big dividends in the future.
- If voices are missing on an issue, personally seek out and invite stakeholders.
- Use personal connections and capital to encourage participation. Personal invitations from city administrators and department heads get better responses.
- Reach out and engage in meaningful conversations with the community. Understand why they are or are not engaged and determine their interests, needs, and resources.
- Continually cultivate community partners. Find new partners and strengthen existing partnerships.
- Broaden collaboration efforts beyond one or two partners, otherwise the efforts cannot succeed.
- Promote the concept that community members also have a responsibility to take steps to address community problems and enhance quality of life.
- Identify the values of the community, challenge the community members to play their role, and have them challenge the government to improve its role and be a better partner.
- Share information with the community. Give community members access and a voice, as well as a way to contribute their resources
- If community participation is not strong, do not blame the citizens. Take another look at the city s efforts and try to modify them. For example, consider  bring your child  activities in order to facilitate participation by parents of young children.
- Pay attention to the people who show up and actively engage in partnership and problem-solving activities. They have put in the sweat equity and deserve recognition for their efforts.
- Market the city team and educate the community about the roles and responsibilities of various departments. This builds the credibility of city agencies and increases community knowledge.

# Element 3: Collaborative Problem-Solving Efforts

Municipal agencies engaged in community governance develop collaborative relationships with each other and with the community they serve. These relationships and partnerships can be leveraged for problem-solving activities that focus on specific community problems that run the gamut of local government responsibilities, such as public safety, public health, environmental protection, business development, and housing issues. Collaborative problem-solving efforts provide a vehicle by which local municipal agencies can identify existing and emerging community concerns and develop collaborative efforts to address them. Collaborative problem-solving efforts bring the community into local government decision-making, and, in doing so, educate community

members about how government operates and the issues facing the city as viewed by a broad range of community stakeholders. Collaborative problem solving also shares the responsibility of community quality of life and public safety between municipal government and the community. Each entity has its own roles and responsibilities, as well as specific competencies and resources that can be brought to bear on complex community problems.

## Operationalizing Collaborative Problem-Solving Efforts

Collaborative problem solving is an analytic process for identifying and analyzing specific problems and then, developing and evaluating responses to the problems. The SARA model (scanning, analysis, response and assessment) is one example of a problem-solving process. An analytical process is essential to problem-solving efforts because it helps stakeholders distinguish between symptoms of a problem and root causes, thereby understanding the problem. Through problem solving, stakeholders try to identify and work on root causes of problems. These activities should not be limited to those who hold management positions in municipal government. Cities engaged in collaborative problem solving encourage staff members at all levels of municipal agencies to engage in this process.

Collaborative problem-solving efforts give city employees a broad vision of their job so they can view and understand problems as they are experienced by community members who live and work in the area. Municipal agency staff members engaged in collaborative problem-solving efforts have the benefit of working closely with the community and developing a better understanding of what various community stakeholders see as existing and emerging issues that need to be addressed, and what they want their city to be like in the future. The problems identified in this process often may not always be the same as the problems that city officials have noted. Community members may bring new issues and problems to the attention of city officials. By working collaboratively with the community, city officials can also begin to identify priorities in various neighborhoods. These priorities may or may not be what city officials expect to hear from community stakeholders.

Once problems have been identified jointly by municipal agencies and community stakeholders, they need to choose the problems they want to work on first. This decision can be quite challenging in communities where there are a number of issues that persons are highly interested in addressing. It is particularly important, therefore, to enumerate the reasons for working on a specific problem first. Additionally, it is critical for all stakeholders to note that complex community problems are not one-dimensional, but rather touch on many areas, a number of which were likely already identified by stakeholders. For example, many communities experience high rates of recidivism of persons returning to the community after release from jail. If this is an issue a community

wants to address, a number of related problems will be touched on, such as mental health services, substance abuse services, education, employment, housing, and family matters.

It is also important that all stakeholders know that collaborative problem solving is not a single, one-time effort and that other problems will be tackled over time. Agencies can also work on multiple issues at a certain point, given agency and community interest and resources. When communities identify emerging issues, they may want to take steps to address them before they reach a crisis level. Additionally, cities planning various activities, such as major street improvements, will want to engage the community in identifying and making plans to mitigate potential problems resulting from the work. Efforts to engage citizens and seek their input can help projects move forward.

After municipal agency and community stakeholders decide which issues they will work on first, they conduct a thorough analysis of each problem. For this process, information and data from both municipal agencies and the community will be important. Community data may take the form of anecdotes, personal experiences, or more systemized data. City agencies collect a wide variety of data that can prove useful to the process of analyzing a local problem. Police agencies that utilize geographic information systems, such as mapping or CompStat, may find those resources and technologies helpful. Agencies that have begun to take steps to bring their various citywide technologies and resources together will find that those efforts prove exceptionally useful in collaborative problem solving.[23]

Critical to any analysis effort is information-sharing. For collaborative problem solving to be successful, municipal agencies must be willing to share their data with their city partners and with the community and vice versa. Clearly, all data-sharing should be conducted in accordance with local, state, and federal statutes; some of these may place restrictions on the type of information and with whom data can be shared. Municipal legal departments can clarify these regulations and convey the restrictions to community stakeholders. This transparency can help community members understand why specific, personalized information cannot be shared, for example.

Once stakeholders have utilized available data and information to develop a broad understanding of the problem, they develop and later implement specific plans to eliminate or reduce the problem. These implementation plans may call on both community stakeholders and the local government, to commit time and resources to address the problem.

Problem-solving activities should be evaluated to determine their success and whether stakeholders should continue or end specific efforts. When results of

[23] For further information about how to bring together various municipal data for a comprehensive approach to analyzing problems, see the discussion of Baltimore, Maryland's CitiStat program in Perez and Rushing, 2007.

an effort are not as successful as hoped, problem-solving models encourage stakeholders to reconsider their analyses and conduct further studies or implement new activities to address the problem.

## Role of Leadership

Characteristics of Collaborative Problem-Solving Efforts
- Using a systematic process to collaboratively:
    Identify community problems
    Analyze the causes of those problems
    Develop and implement plans to solve or reduce the problems
    Evaluate the outcomes of those efforts
- Leveraging the resources, knowledge, and expertise of municipal agencies and community stakeholders
- Focusing on improving outcomes and problem resolution.

City administrators and municipal department executives should encourage agency staff at all levels to use problem-solving processes with the community and also within their own agencies to address specific problems. The more municipal agency staff members use these tools and skills, the more they will become a part of everyday activities and, hence, become institutionalized in the agency culture.

City and agency leaders also should cultivate, and ensure that they have the support of, midlevel managers. Their support and guidance of line-level staff members are at the core of developing and sustaining collaborative problem solving. As discussed in the other elements, to gain support from midlevel mangers, some organizational changes may be needed in the criteria for promotion and evaluation of employees. These changes would stress the importance of problem solving.

Tips for Leaders Wanting to Strengthen Collaborative Problem-Solving Efforts
- Continually emphasize collaboration and model desired behaviors within the city and its agencies, as well as with the community
- Obtain buy-in and enlist support from midlevel managers
- Make any needed organizational changes to support staff members collaborative problem-solving efforts
- Stress to the community its responsibility in addressing community problems and enhancing quality of life.

## Challenges to Implementation and Sustainability

Municipalities that want to have strong collaborative problem-solving efforts between municipal agencies and the community can expect challenges as they make the transition to community governance. Some of the most pressing issues cities may face include a lack of interest by the community and technological challenges.

**Lack of interest in the community.** A lack of interest within the community poses challenges to collaborative problem solving, just as it does to developing partnerships within the community. Interest in problem solving may vary over time depending on the issues that are being addressed.

Just as when the city develops partnerships, it also should take steps to engage a wide variety of stakeholders in collaborative problem-solving efforts. City officials should also stress to the community that these efforts are not simply processes to gain input. Rather, collaborative problem solving implies that municipal agencies and the community collaborate through the entire process of problem solving. This idea will be new for some members of the community and it may take some time for them to get used to the fact that they are not only expected to voice their opinions, but also to contribute to improving a situation or solving a problem. This transition from passive to active participation is a benefit that cities can stress to show that the city is engaged in a collaborative effort to be responsive to community needs.

**Technological challenges.** Collaborative problem-solving activities require that municipal agencies contribute their relevant information to analysis activities. This allows for a an understanding of a much broader picture of the problem. The tools used by various municipal agencies are not always interoperable, nor are there mechanisms through which information can be shared or combined. These technological problems can affect the efficiency and sometimes even the quality of information that can be analyzed for problem-solving purposes. For these reasons, cities engaged in collaborative problem solving need to develop processes through which municipal agencies can share information with each other. Cities should work through any technological challenges that make these activities difficult to undertake.

# Element 4: Organizational Change

Any city or town that actively seeks to implement community governance will need to adapt its organizational structure, personnel practices, and approach to management and information technology to this new philosophy. Organizational changes tend to be slow and incremental and occasionally face setbacks because of a lack of institutionalization. When organizational changes are made in support of community governance and sustained over time, however, municipal agency executives and their staff members can succeed. Essential to this success is consistent, steady leadership by the city executives and their municipal department heads. Through their guidance, leadership, and modelling of community governance over time, as well as their steps to remove organizational barriers to creating partnerships and engaging in problem-solving efforts, community governance can become the municipality's way of doing business.

## Operationalizing Organizational Change

Changing government organization is essential for agencies adopting the community governance philosophy. In community governance, organizational change focuses on agency policies, procedures, structures, and cultures that inhibit the development of partnerships among municipal agencies and the community and hamper the ability to engage in collaborative problem solving. Agencies adopting community governance should pay particular attention to organizational change needed in the organizational management, organizational structure, personnel practices, and technology and information systems of the city and its departments.

**Organizational management.** Cities engaged in community governance must look at a number of aspects of organizational management to see if they support or hinder agency staff members' ability to engage in partnership and problem-solving activities. At a minimum, cities should consider the mission and vision, agency evaluations, resources, accountability, transparency, and devolution of authority of their organizational management.

Cities engaged in community governance activities should have a shared vision for the city that supports the philosophy and its focus on partnerships and problem solving. This common vision is the basis for all city activities. Furthermore, each city agency's mission should support the city's shared vision and should highlight how that agency's expertise contributes to reaching that goal. All city agencies should strive to improve quality of life through the provision of services. Some communities take this one step further and view themselves as community builders. They strive to provide the best services they can through an effective use of time and money. They examine their efforts according to whether they have met the changing dynamics of the community they serve. Community governance agencies also should be sure that evaluations of agency efforts are consistent with what is being asked of them under this philosophy.

Community governance requires municipal agencies to think about their activities and resources in a new light. Community governance requires a willingness to share resources among municipal agencies. It necessitates the view that through a give-and-take process the city can direct resources to those parts of the city and those topical areas that need to be addressed. It encourages agencies to be flexible and agile in their approach to providing services and using resources such as financial, logistical, human, and technological assets. Community governance requires a commitment to these resources to sustain efforts over time. In many cities, community governance may also precipitate a new examination and approach to planning and resource allocation.

Community governance seeks to make municipal agencies and the community accountable for their activities. This involves a shift in perspective in municipal agencies who must be concerned not only about specific services that they deliver to the community, but also about the whole product—the community's overall well-being. Additionally, municipal leaders must stress that the government alone cannot address complex social problems successfully. Rather, the community's help and expertise is needed through problem-solving and partnership efforts. The community, along with the municipal government, should be held accountable for addressing community problems and improving the quality of life.

Cities adopting community governance should also take steps to make the city and its agencies more transparent to the public. Characteristics of transparency include a willingness to share relevant information with the public, to explain decision-making processes and agency policies and procedures to the public, and to engage the community in developing these processes. Transparency helps to build trust between parties. Transparent efforts, therefore, will help build trust both among municipal departments and between municipal agencies and the community. Another measure of transparency is in sharing evaluations and findings with the public, regardless of how positive or negative they are toward municipal agencies.

In some cities, organizational structures may have to adapt to meet the needs of community governance which, in many aspects, is characterized by devolution of authority, responsibility, and decision-making capabilities. Line-level employees are asked to take on more responsibilities and work with other city agencies and community stakeholders to address community problems. This gives line-level employees ownership of various community problems. Cities also may need to examine how information is shared and communicated both horizontally and vertically within the organization.

**Organizational structure.** A number of cities engaged in community governance efforts see the need to focus on delivering services through various districts or neighborhoods. This geographic division of the city and the delivery of city services have allowed cities to focus their efforts more directly in specific neighborhoods, as staff members are assigned to those areas and develop an in-depth knowledge of the neighborhood and its concerns over time.

**Personnel practices.** A number of personnel practices can enhance or inhibit a city's ability to implement and institutionalize community governance efforts over time: recruitment, selection, hiring, and promotions; personnel evaluations; supervision; and training. Municipal agencies may need to take a number of steps in these areas to make their personnel practices more congruent with the community governance philosophy.

To the extent possible, agencies should look to "select-in" persons with a service orientation who support the community governance philosophy, rather than merely "selecting out" the so-called bad apples. Agencies should look for persons who have conflict-resolution skills, are compassionate, and are proficient at multitasking. These efforts at attracting service-oriented candidates may involve developing new recruitment techniques and taking steps to brand the city and its agencies as a community governance entity.[24] Those individuals who are role models in their agency and successfully espouse the community governance philosophy should be promoted within the agency. Community members also can play important roles on hiring and promotional boards.

[24] For further discussion and examples of creative ways to recruit service-oriented police officers and agency branding efforts, see Scrivner, 2006.

Personnel evaluations and supervision are also critical to institutionalizing community governance. Staff members' annual work plans and evaluations should support the transition from traditional work to community governance. Their problem-solving and partnership efforts should be among the areas evaluated and persons who have done exceptional work should receive formal recognition. This can help to ensure that midlevel managers support staff members who are engaging in community governance efforts. Supervisors' encouragement and support of problem-solving activities and partnerships will have an effect on how the staff members view community governance. The goal is to convince employees that community governance is the city's new operating philosophy—not a short-term program.

Training is often overlooked in personnel practices. City administrators and municipal department heads should recognize that the transition to community governance requires employees to engage in new activities and that some staff members may be unsure of, or uncomfortable with, these new expectations. All current staff will not have the skills for community governance activities. Training, therefore, is an essential aspect of the transition to community governance. Clearly, for new hires, community governance training should begin with the initial training they receive when they join a municipal agency, and it should continue over time with in-service and continuing education training. For existing hires, community governance training ideally should start before the agency begins to adopt the philosophy.

Community governance training should involve problem solving, conflict resolution, consensus-building, public speaking, partnership-building, and specific training about the services offered by all municipal agencies. Pilot projects and small learning groups can be helpful to staff members who are being introduced to these concepts and small successes can help them build their confidence to undertake these activities with the community. Joint training or cross-training among municipal agencies in these topical areas can help reinforce the goal that municipal agencies comprise a city team that provides services to the community. It also helps city employees develop relationships with staff members from other city departments. Finally, cities should support the professional development of their employees and help them developed the advanced skills essential for community governance.

**Technology and information systems.** Municipal agencies use a range of data systems that may or may not allow for data to be shared easily or co-located for problem analysis purposes. Agencies engaged in community governance should take steps to ensure that technology and information systems can be used to share relevant information between departments. City administrators and municipal agency leaders should also stress that information-sharing is an essential aspect of collaboration and community governance. Agencies,

therefore, may need to develop new mechanisms for information-sharing or may have to invest in new technology. Agency leaders should understand the strengths and limitations of their data systems and work together to try to bring data together in a timely, accurate fashion.

Characteristics of Organizational Change
- Identifying city and agency policies, procedures, structures, and culture that are not congruent with the community governance philosophy
- Removing or minimizing these obstacles
- Establishing city and agency policies, procedures, structures, and culture that support building and sustaining partnerships and collaborative problem-solving activities
- Ensuring that city agencies are flexible and agile and therefore capable of responding to community problems and planning for the future

## Role of Leadership

As discussed throughout this document, leadership is essential to implementing and sustaining community governance efforts, and leadership in bringing about organizational change is no different. Both city administrators and agency executives should foster support of problem solving and partnerships within municipal agencies and the community. The most important of these activities is recognizing and addressing obstacles to community governance across the city and within its departments. City and agency policies, procedures, structures, and culture should support, not contradict, the community governance philosophy. These efforts also require city leaders to work with collective bargaining units to address their concerns and questions and obtain their support for this approach to local government. The same steps should also be taken with political leaders, who will come and go over time. Leadership in the area of organizational change, as with the other elements, should be continuous and clear.

Tips for Leaders Wanting to Strengthen Organizational Change
- Recognize and take timely steps to address obstacles to developing and sustaining partnerships and problem-solving efforts among city staffers at all levels. Where challenges persist, clarify the reason for their continued existence.
- Engage collective bargaining units in discussions about community governance and seek their support for problem-solving and partnership activities.
- Seek support for community governance efforts among elected leaders, where applicable.

## Challenges to Implementation and Sustainability

As discussed previously, municipalities that want to adopt and sustain community governance are faced with the challenge of making needed organizational changes within the city and its departments to support partnership and collaborative problem-solving activities. Specific challenges may also include the allocation of resources and political support.

**Allocation of resources.** As staffing and money decrease in many cities, partnering among municipal agencies becomes more difficult. Departments become more territorial and look to protect and improve their agencies' resources. These challenges pose a serious problem to long-term cooperation; therefore, it is important for all agencies to consider how to share resources in a way that is most beneficial for the community.

**Political support.** Political support can help municipal agencies sustain community governance efforts. This support may be in the form of dedicated resources or simply a clear statement of support. Community governance may not be popular among some city officials because community members who have problems may seek out municipal agency staffers, rather than their elected representatives. Elected officials may view city employees as overstepping their boundaries by working directly with community members. For these reasons, it is important to educate elected leaders about how community governance works and why it should be sustained and advanced.

**Lack of consistent leadership.** In many cities, the tenure of municipal agency executives is not long enough to make significant, long-term changes to their agencies. Leadership changes are often accompanied by a change in priorities, as well, dictated from new political leadership or a change in political priorities. Regardless, when consistent, clear, reinforcing messages about the importance of collaboration and problem solving are lacking, it becomes more difficult to institutionalize a philosophy. The more time an executive has to work with staff members and stress the philosophical change through words and actions, the more likely the community governance philosophy will withstand changes in leadership.

Tips from the Field: Building and Sustaining Organizational Change
- Recognize that everyone will not embrace community governance. Slowly weed those people out of the department and replace them with new recruits who espouse the community governance philosophy.
- Pick the right top leaders. They need to drive the philosophy down into the organization. Make sure that supervisors fully support the philosophy.
- The transition to community governance is like a long-distance marathon. It takes longer than any one leader s tenure to institutionalize the philosophy. City administrators and agency executives need to develop long-term outlooks.
- Make as many decisions as possible based on research: hire a research analyst who looks for best practices, conduct community surveys and strategic planning, and identify and take steps to minimize obstacles.
- Community governance requires an accountability mechanism because a lack of geographic assignments across city agencies makes accountability difficult.
- Determine what information about service availability needs to be provided to all new employees and provide it in a well-organized orientation or in trainings.
- Elected officials need to support this method of delivering services for it to become institutionalized. Community governance cannot be sustained without political support, which must be cultivated continually as officials retire from public service and new candidates are elected to positions in city government.
- Stress the benefits of crime-and-disorder-prevention activities.

# Section III: Examples from the Field

This section describes how five communities—Anaheim, California; Irving, Texas; Longmont, Colorado; Prince William County, Virginia; and Wichita, Kansas—have taken steps to adopt the community governance philosophy. It demonstrates how the elements discussed in Section II have been applied in these municipalities. This section also shows the variety of activities that cities can undertake when they make the transition to community governance.

## Anaheim, California

Anaheim, with a population of about 340,000, is California's 10th largest city. It is located in Orange County in Southern California, and is well-known for being the home of Disneyland. Anaheim operates under a council-manager form of government. The city is governed by a mayor and four city council members, who are elected at large to 4-year terms. They serve as the city's policymaking body. A city manager, the chief administrative officer of the city, is appointed by the Anaheim City Council and serves as its pleasure. The city manager's responsibilities include overseeing and hiring Anaheim's municipal agency directors and preparing and overseeing the city budget.

Views from the Front Lines: Community Governance in Anaheim
Our transition to community governance was really an awakening to the fact that the collective we of the city departments and the community were all in the soup bowl together. Each party has an equal place at the table, which requires full participation.
    Craig Hunter, Deputy Chief, Police Department

Community governance breaks down organizational and communal barriers by enlisting everyone to work together as a team in solving problems in neighborhoods.
    Joe Reiss, Captain, Special Operations, Police Department

City departments have traditionally been organized by function with departments viewing their roles as single-purpose. A more effective, coordinated interdepartmental response occurs when missions and resources are shared. This moves the organization towards community governance.
    Steve Swaim, Superintendent of Community Services

The role of government, when it comes to neighborhoods, is really to bring stakeholders together.
    Tom Wood, Assistant City Manager

## Origins of Community Governance in Anaheim

Anaheim's transition to community governance has been described in a number of Department of Justice articles and conferences.[25] The city is a well-known leader in the adoption of community governance. Its community governance efforts emerged from a hybrid of neighborhood services and community

[25] See Reiss, 2006 and Swaim et al, 2006.

policing activities spearheaded by the city manager's office and the police department. The community governance philosophy also results from city departments that recognize and participate in the practices of municipal government as a convener, consensus-builder, and joint problem-solver.

**Community policing and community governance.** In the mid-1990s, community policing in Anaheim was only the responsibility of persons assigned to a specialized section of the agency. During the same time, the city experienced significant gang, drug, and vandalism activities in a densely populated apartment neighborhood. A sergeant and six community policing officers, tasked with addressing these problems, focused on traditional enforcement tactics to decrease crime. Although they met with some successes—arresting between 30 and 40 persons per month within the neighborhood—crime did not decrease. A year into these efforts, the department acknowledged that the situation in the neighborhood had not improved, prompting the department to recognize that it needed the help of its colleagues in other city agencies to alleviate crime problems. Thus, a team of city agencies—including the city manager's office, police, code enforcement, public works, utilities, and the city attorney—was formed to work collectively with the neighborhood to address crime. Through a variety of efforts, such as prohibiting street parking, strictly enforcing code regulations, and increasing street lighting, the neighborhood saw crime decrease by almost 80 percent.[26]

[26] For a further discussion, see Reiss, 2006.

The success of that effort resulted in more changes in the Anaheim Police Department. There was recognition that placing community policing in a specialized section of the agency contributed to a duplication of efforts and lack of communication within the department. For this reason, the department began to implement and stress the community policing philosophy across the agency. Community policing no longer remained the responsibility of a few officers within the department.

**City commitment community problem solving.** Anaheim has become a facilitator of community dialog by connecting residents and other community stakeholders, including schools, businesses, and faith-based and nonprofit organizations. Consistent with the city council's desire to improve the quality of life in neighborhoods, early facilitation efforts were pioneered through the city manager's office in 1992 by implementing the city's "Anti Gang-Drug Strategy," which called for the city to coordinate the community's response to gang and drug issues. Although the city was committed to carrying out numerous activities as a partner (including gang prevention, diversion and suppression, code enforcement, etc.), its major role was to provide guidance to the other stakeholders in contributing their ideas and services in a collaborative effort to address gangs and drugs. During this process, Anaheim's role changed from that of a lone problem solver to that of a convener and consensus-builder. The

city also realized that the attack on gang and drug problems was best made neighborhood by neighborhood, through organizing and enabling the creative and innovative problem-solving abilities of residents, apartment owners, local school principals, and faith organizations. In 1995, the city reorganized its antigang/drug facilitation efforts and created a new Neighborhood Services Division in its Community Services Department.

**Transformation to a coordinated community governance organization.**
The transformation to an organization that was truly coordinated using a community governance approach occurred early in 2001. The police department's shift over the years in community policing—utilizing a multidepartment process and engaging community members—was yielding results, as was the city's neighborhood services operation. Through the guidance of the city manager and department heads, a 1-day retreat generated ideas on more effective ways departments could work together, avoid duplication, and engage the talents of city staffers and community stakeholders in community problem solving. Charged with implementing these ideas, city division heads crafted and implemented a "Neighborhood Improvement Plan" to utilize the community problem-solving experience gained from community policing and neighborhood services activities during the past decade. Using a community governance approach was the foundation of this plan.

## Key Aspects of Community Governance in Anaheim

Important components of the newly-crafted Neighborhood Improvement Program plan were the adoption of a decentralized community policing model and the division of the city into four policing districts. Each district was assigned a team anchored by a police lieutenant serving as district commander (DC). The DC could marshal police resources as a department priority and serve as the key police manager for interaction with district residents and other community stakeholders. Also, a sergeant and four community policing officers were assigned to each district team. Other city department administrative and mid-managers, including representatives from code enforcement, the city attorney's office, planning, public works, utilities, fire, community development, and community services were assigned to serve on the four teams. In addition, local school principals were seen as vital members of each team. The orientation of the team evolved from a "policing district" team to that of a "neighborhood services district" team.

To provide ongoing community stakeholder input, permanent neighborhood councils were created in each district. The neighborhood councils consist of community stakeholders. In Anaheim, stakeholders (other than the government) are identified as representing six groups: residents, apartment owners, community nonprofit organizations, the faith community, schools, and the business community.[27] The efforts of these councils are reported in

[27] See Swaim et al, 2006.

[28] For further information see www.anaheim. net/comm_svc/ neighborhood/about. htm and click "District Neighborhood Council Newsletter."

[29] For an example of a Neighborhood Improvement Project Action Plan, see City of Anaheim, 2003.

[30]Reiss, 2006, p. 10.

quarterly newsletters posted on the Anaheim Neighborhood Services Division web site.[28] Other city activities include planning efforts coordinated by the Neighborhood Services Division for specific neighborhoods where community stakeholders and members of the district teams meet to identify ways to improve their neighborhood. This process helps residents create a vision of what they would like their neighborhood to be and identifies actions that will achieve the vision, responsible parties to be involved (i.e., city government, the community, or both), and ongoing updates of actions.[29] The police department's DCs also meet quarterly with community stakeholders to gather feedback and input about the department's services. The four neighborhood services district teams have become part of a decentralized government structure and part of the service delivery system. This decentralization allows district teams to work collaboratively with the community to address problems and take proactive efforts to enhance the community's quality of life. The collaborative nature of government has been institutionalized through the neighborhood council monthly meetings in which the district team discusses issues with its respective neighborhood council. As a district team, city staff members and their school colleagues brainstorm ideas and discuss resources, skills, and knowledge that they use to address community issues. They also develop strategic plans for improving quality of life in neighborhoods that are identified as severely "challenged," that is, neighborhoods plagued by extensive socioeconomic problems that affect basic neighborhood livability. Long-term improvement action plans have been developed by the district team with input by the neighborhood's stakeholders. Within these neighborhoods, yearly surveys gather ongoing information about how effective efforts have been and how residents view the quality of life in their neighborhoods. Combined with police and code enforcement statistics, these surveys are critical in measuring the progress of important outcomes.

In addition, the teams discuss and work on other issues identified as problematic across the district. The district teams use the following principles to guide their work:

- "Use the expertise of all city departments in a coordinated effort to improve the liveability of Anaheim's neighborhoods.

- Assist severely deteriorated neighborhoods, as well as those beginning to show signs of decline, by developing a strategic plan to improve the quality of life in these areas.

- Ensure active participation by all neighborhood stakeholders, including single-family home residents, property and apartment owners, tenants, school and church officials, business owners, and city employees.

- Work with neighborhood stakeholders to create a vision of what the neighborhood can achieve in becoming a high-quality place to live."[30]

**Fostering neighborhood leadership and sustainability.** Another example of the city's community governance efforts is its Neighborhood Leadership Academy, held every 2 years. The academy's goal is to provide community members with the knowledge, skills, and tools needed to exert leadership and facilitate efforts to improve life in the neighborhood. Topics covered in the leadership academy include why the participants' leadership is needed, interpersonal skills and goal-setting, conflict resolution, cultural sensitivity, managing meetings, decision-making and consensus building, public speaking, presentation skills, understanding local government, and community resources. The academy also includes project assignments and presentations on actual hands-on issues encountered by neighborhood leaders. These project assignments utilize the skills and competencies learned by participants. Following a graduation ceremony, participants are recognized by the city council.

## Irving, Texas

Irving is a city of approximately 210,000 people located in the Metroplex (Dallas/Fort Worth area) in North Texas. The city operates under a council-manager form of government, with eight council members and a mayor serving as the policy-making body. The council members and the mayor are elected to 3-year terms. Five city councillors are required to live within specific geographic boundaries within the city, while the other three members can live anywhere within the city. A city manager, appointed by the Irving City Council, serves at its discretion. The city manager is responsible for overseeing and hiring municipal agency directors.

Views from the Front Lines: Community Governance in Irving
Everyone solves problems together. The stakeholders are city agencies and the community. We, as city employees, facilitate this process.
Teresa Adrian, Environmental Services Manager, Inspections Department

In community governance everyone—the local government and the community—is accountable to the whole product rather than a portion of it.
Larry Boyd, Chief, Police Department

Community governance is government in its simplest form. It is incorporating and identifying needs and mirroring those to resources. It is government defined from the bottom up—from the citizens up to the government.
Gilbert Perales, Assistant City Manager

## Origins of Community Governance in Irving

The City of Irving recently began to take steps to transition to the community governance philosophy. The impetus comes from several areas. First, it comes from persons working in city administration and from municipal agency heads who believe that agencies should be working together to address city issues. Community governance is also emerging from the police department's commitment to advancing its community policing efforts. Finally, the fundamentals of community governance have been expressed in the city's 2006 strategic plan, which was developed through a collaborative process.

**Community policing and community governance.** In recent years, the Irving Police Department took a numbers of steps to enhance its community policing efforts. Some of these efforts were taken with assistance from the Community Policing Consortium.[31] In 2005, the Irving Police Department hosted a "community engagement" and later had officers participate in a train-the-trainer session on community engagements. Community engagements are problem-solving sessions in which the police and a range of community stakeholders (e.g., residents, community organizations, other municipal agencies, and businesses) within a specific geographical area learn about and apply the SARA model of problem solving (scanning, analysis, response and assessment) to specific areas' community problems. The train-the-trainer sessions educated officers about how to facilitate community engagements effectively and provided the agency with a trained cadre of officers who are comfortable conducting community-police problem-solving sessions and are able to coach other members of the department in becoming more effective community policing officers. This training is now conducted internally by trained officers. Also during 2005, the department held a working session about how command staff can better support and advance the community policing philosophy.

As the police department took steps to enhance its community policing practices, other city officials saw that community policing has far-reaching implications not only for the police department and its community partners, but also for all of city government. They increasingly viewed the community policing model as a catalyst for changing the way the city governs. Hence, in late 2005, city departments participated in a 1-day training/workshop conducted by the Community Policing Consortium to guide them through planning community policing and community governance efforts and to identify organizational issues that can thwart these efforts.[32] This helped to set the stage for the city's community governance initiative.

**Strategic planning and community governance.** Some of the impetus for adopting community governance in Irving has also emerged from the city's strategic planning process. The city's 2006 strategic plan was developed with the

[31] The Community Policing Consortium was a partnership of five of the nation's leading law enforcement organizations: the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, the National Sheriffs' Association, the Police Executive Research Forum, and the Police Foundation. From 1994 until 2006, the Consortium was administered and funded by the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. The Consortium provided community policing training and technical assistance to local law enforcement agencies and their communities.

[32] This process, called the Executive Blueprint Process, encourages participants to examine the planning and implementation of policies by focusing on the following areas: assessment, political support, community outreach, resource considerations, training needs, agency directives, and employee and labor relations.

input of elected leaders, city staff, and community members. The plan sets forth the course for Irving's future by identifying the 10 goals for the city:

1. Promote excellence in land use and the image of Irving's built and natural environment.

2. Nurture and promote vital, vibrant neighborhoods.

3. Cultivate an environment conducive to strong, successful economic development to enhance and diversify Irving's economic base.

4. Set the standard for a safe and secure city.

5. Promote and support diversity in the community.

6. Promote effective communication among all members of the community.

7. Promote excellence in Irving's cultural, recreational, and educational environments.

8. Set the standard for sound governance, fiscal management and sustainability.

9. Enhance and sustain Irving's infrastructure network.

10. Become a successful, environmentally sustainable community.[33]

Many of these goals involve strategies that require collaboration across municipal agencies and with the community as well as problem-solving activities. These efforts also sometimes require organizational changes, or reorientations, within local government. Such strategies from Irving's 2006 strategic plan include the following:

•   Initiate neighborhood revitalization

•   Develop a brand strategy for the city

•   Decrease crime throughout the city by providing community, problem-oriented policing targeting specific areas of concern

•   Build problem-solving partnerships in the community that result in the positive perception of police services and resident perception of safety in their neighborhoods

•   Develop and implement a Public Safety Plan, blending its objectives with overall city strategies

•   Enhance communications with city employees

•   Use team-oriented interdisciplinary groups to address city priorities

•   Improve communication between the city and educational institutions, faith-based organizations, and the business community

•   Develop government curricula/programs for all students to promote learning and interest in Irving's city government

- Institute a holistic customer-service philosophy throughout the organization
- Develop an outcome-oriented budget approach
- Increase employee training in targeted areas such as ethics, supervision, customer service, and leadership development
- Develop partnerships/relationships with other cities and governmental entities

## From Planning to Implementation: First Steps

With the city's clear commitment to community policing and the adoption of the strategic plans, city employees had clear expectations not only about what they needed to work on during the next 3 to 5 years, but also how they should work on those issues. The city's management team felt that the focus should be on taking small steps and earning successes with them, rather than trying to adopt overly ambitious plans hastily that could not be accomplished realistically and could turn department staff members off to community governance. City leaders recognized that the transition to a more collaborative government that focuses on partnerships and problem solving requires an emphasis on skills that previously were not so highly stressed. These skills include collaboration, conflict resolution, and problem solving; therefore, they decided the best way to transition employees to community governance is to provide them with practice and guidance.

In 2006, the city management team decided to develop a pilot effort that would bring together city departments in a holistic fashion and provide services and enhance quality of life and community engagement within a 1-square mile neighborhood. City leaders saw this pilot effort as a way to provide city staff members with a chance to test their skills and gain a win. The identified neighborhood scheduled for long-term infrastructure improvements does not have a neighborhood association. It has low-level disorder issues, such as code violations and noise complaints, but no serious crime. The city hoped to strengthen community engagement and revitalize this neighborhood and form a neighborhood association in the area.

The city management team tasked senior managers from their departments with the responsibility of working together as a team on this project and to spearhead the effort within their own agencies. One of the first things that the city operations team did was meet to discuss what each knew about the specific neighborhood and learn how the collaborative problem-solving process works. As part of this project, in 2006, the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) was able to facilitate the discussions of the operations team members as they prepared to engage the citizens in the pilot neighborhood effort. The

departments brought together information about what they knew about the community and culled and shared the following:

- Neighborhood boundaries
- Number and types of residential and commercial properties
- Demographic information about neighborhood residents, such as age distribution, languages spoken
- Plans for upcoming infrastructure improvements
- Public safety issues
- Traffic issues
- Code enforcement issues
- Fire and fire safety issues.

This effort gave city staff members a broad background and an understanding of the neighborhood that prepared them for a community engagement in the late winter of 2007. With groundwork from the city staff, who not only mailed invitations to neighborhood residents but also personally called them and went door-to-door asking residents to come to the engagement, about 30 neighborhood residents showed up and worked with city employees to identify and begin to work on community problems. For some community members, the focus on jointly solving community problems was a new idea that took some time to adjust to. Prior to this event, they viewed their role as identifying problems for the government to address. This effort gave them not only a voice, but a responsibility.

## Longmont, Colorado

Longmont, Colorado, is a city of almost 85,000 people located in Boulder County at the foothills of the Rocky Mountains. Like Anaheim and Irving, Longmont operates under a council-manager form of government. Longmont's seven-member city council is presided over by the mayor. Together they make up the city's policymaking body. Council members are elected to 4-year terms, while the mayor is elected to a 2-year term. Three city council members are elected by and represent specific wards within the city. The remaining four council members and the mayor are elected at-large. The Longmont City Council appoints a city manager who is responsible for the administration of municipal departments.

Views from the Front Lines: What Does Community Governance Mean to Me?
Customer service is not the key because it promotes more of a sense of being helped. Governance is really about enabling the citizen to be a proactive, empowered partner to getting the job done.
    Julia Pirnack, Mayor

## Origins of Community Governance in Longmont

In the 1990s, the Longmont Police Department—like many other police departments and sheriffs' offices across the country—began to implement the community policing philosophy, and since then it has been widely recognized as a premiere community policing agency.[34] At the same time, the city manager's office throughout the 1990s was internally stressing the need to involve the community in more aspects of local governance. It was also emphasizing the need for municipal agencies to work together to enhance community quality of life. These efforts gained support from city departments and were put into practice, although some questions remained about roles and responsibilities.

**Development of a resource manual on community involvement.** In 2001, the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board requested that the Longmont City Council clarify the roles of the city's various boards and commissions. In the council's annual retreat that year, members focused on the topic of governance: ways to further involve the community in service delivery and problem-solving efforts and on how to share responsibility for quality-of-life issues with the community. The council tasked a committee of city staff members representing all city departments with developing an approach to achieving greater community involvement. With input from the council, community members, and city employees, the working group developed a community involvement resource manual[35] that provides a framework for determining the appropriate level of community involvement because community involvement "is not a canned program that the City has simply adopted and implemented."[36] Rather, community involvement strategies should be particular to "an issue and the people concerned about that issue."[37] The resource manual describes four levels of community involvement and provides examples of principles and strategies that are used at each level. The levels in ascending order of involvement are as follows:

- Inform: Providing balanced and objective information to assist in understanding the problem, alternatives, and/or solutions.

- Consult: Obtaining feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.

- Involve: Collaborating directly with the community throughout the process to ensure that issues and concerns are consistently understood and considered.

- Partner: Partnering with the public in each aspect of the decision, including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution. All participants' input is equally valued.[38]

The "inform" level of involvement includes activities such as advertisements, utilizing the media, public meetings, electronic bulletin boards, fliers, brochures, and door hangers. "Consulting" activities include brainstorming sessions,

[34] For a further discussion about Longmont's implementation of community policing see Schneider, Kimerer, Seaman, and Sweeney, 2003.

[35] City of Longmont Community Involvement Committee, 2002. See also City of Longmont, n.d., for a further discussion.

[36] City of Longmont Community Involvement Committee, 2002, p. 1.

[37] City of Longmont Community Involvement Committee, 2002, p. 1.

[38] City of Longmont Community Involvement Committee, 2002, p. 2.

advisory boards and commissions, focus groups, questionnaires, and hot lines and 800 numbers. The "involve" level includes citizen juries, mediation, task forces, community-oriented policing, and community-oriented governance. The "partner" level includes activities such as community partnership and working groups. The city also stresses that different phases or aspects of a project may call for different levels of involvement (e.g., during planning, implementation, and evaluation).[39] The City of Longmont has used this resource as a framework on which to continue to build and improve its efforts at engaging the community around public policy matters and problem-solving efforts.

**Community policing and community governance.** The police department's efforts to implement and sustain community governance support problem-solving efforts. The Longmont Police Department views community policing as its way of doing business, and it works to engage and partner with other municipal agencies on community crime and disorder issues. It recognizes that other city departments have expertise, knowledge, and resources that can help resolve or minimize crime problems, and it partners with them. The department also strives to involve the community in problem-solving issues and works to increase its transparency and demonstrate its service orientation. For example, engaging the community is one of the areas in which officer performance is evaluated. Further, community members, including high school seniors identified by the department's school resource officers and graduates of the citizens' academy, as well as representatives from the criminal justice system (e.g., judges, probation officials), serve on the department's hiring and promotion boards.

## Key Aspects of Community Governance in Longmont

Longmont continues to build on its community engagement efforts and is a nationally-recognized leader in community collaboration and problem solving.[40] Longmont has reiterated its commitment to collaborative problem-solving efforts among municipal agencies and with the community in its most recent comprehensive plan, which was adopted in 2003. The plan stresses the service orientation of Longmont's municipal agencies and it builds on the city's mission statement: "Our mission is to enhance the quality of life for those who live in, work in, or visit our community."[41] This comprehensive plan serves as a guide for the future, detailing the city's policies, goals, and strategies in all areas (e.g., growth of the city, role of government, economic development, transportation, human services, culture, and education) during the following 10 years.

[39] City of, Longmont Community Involvement Committee, 2002.

[40] In 2006, the City of Longmont received the "All-America City" award from the National Civic League. Each year, 10 communities in the country are selected for this award that recognizes governments that collaborate with the community to address challenges. For further details see: www.ci.longmont.co.us/news/pr/2006/All-AmericaCity.htm and http://ncl.org/aac/AACindex.htm.

[41] City of Longmont 2003, p. 1-1.

Sample Goal, Policies, and Strategies Concerning the Role of Government

Goal: Work cooperatively to achieve the goals and policies of the Longmont Area Comprehensive Plan through the efficient, equitable, and fair operation of municipal government and the private sector.

- Policy: Promote a service delivery philosophy among City employees that encourages them to seek creative and flexible solutions to problems, to provide responsive, sensitive service to residents, to be efficient and result oriented, and to establish partnerships with the community in making Longmont a better place to live, work, and visit.

  Strategy: Continue to integrate the principles and techniques of quality customer service into employees hiring, orientation, training, and evaluation, and assist employees in providing quality service to the public.

- Policy: Make City government open and accessible to residents.

  Strategy: Develop programs to improve the City s capability to communicate with residents who speak languages other than English.

  Strategy: Get information to the public about issues the City is facing, and explore opportunities to supplement public information methods the City is currently using.

- Policy: Encourage community leadership and participation in City government.

  Strategy: Encourage residents to serve on boards and commissions that advise City Council on matters important to the City, and periodically review the purposes and roles of these boards and commissions to ensure that they continue to benefit the City and effectively use residents time and energies.

  Strategy: Develop cooperative programs with educational providers to teach people of all age levels about City functions and operations and the City decision-making process.

- Policy: Create partnerships with other entities, as appropriate, to serve Longmont s residents.

  Strategy: Explore opportunities to serve Longmont s residents better by creating partnerships, and structure these partnerships as formal or informal, continuous or time-specific, comprehensive or project-specific as appropriate.

(Source: City of Longmont Community Involvement Committee 2002, p.13-2–13-4.)

In 2005, the City of Longmont conducted further visioning and strategic planning efforts with extensive community involvement. The resulting policy directions serve as broad, overarching courses for the city to pursue as it plans for the future. The policy directions focused on five areas:

1. Promote a healthy business climate.

2. Support education as a community-wide value.

3. Enhance the natural environment.

4. Focus on downtown.

5. Promote community identity and cultural inclusion.[42]

[42] Catalyst Consulting, 2006, p. 17.

The fifth area discussed a number of aspects of collaboration with the community. The consulting team developing the report of the strategic planning process highlighted a number of policy areas for consideration:

- "Engaged Neighborhoods: Place a continued and enhanced emphasis on neighborhoods as the primary building block of the city.

- Renewed Emphasis on Youth Activities: Involve youth in planning and conducting new and revitalized programs and activities, and create an environment where youth feel valued in the community.

- Meaningful Citizen Involvement: Continue to promote meaningful, purposeful citizen involvement and engagement opportunities to hear many voices in City programs and initiatives.

- Culturally Inclusive Gatherings and Events: Support and encourage culturally inclusive community gatherings and events."[43]

The consulting team also recommended specific activities that support these policies, such as strengthening neighborhood groups, working with the Longmont Youth Council, and annual reviews of the city's progress.[44]

The goals, policies, strategies, and plans for enhancing community involvement and shared responsibility for quality-of-life issues continue to be expressed through a number of avenues in Longmont. One such avenue was to set a vision and priorities for education in the community at a forum attended by 700 community members, including many local high school students. The city used a process by which background information and data were provided to community members. As part of this effort, local experts shared information about best practices in the field. Using the shared data, the community worked in small groups to develop input for the school system and city management. Seven action groups were also established to ensure continued input, and a steering committee of city employees provided the staff work to sustain the effort.

Another example of community governance activities in Longmont is the leadership training program offered by the Community and Neighborhood Resources Department. The program teaches people who live or work in Longmont about the city's history and government, effective methods of communication, meeting facilitation, cultural diversity, and community policing. The mayor and other city officials participate in the program's graduation ceremonies.[45] The city has also used problem-solving processes to address myriad issues, such as traffic mitigation. In one instance, engineers contacted community members who had made complaints and worked through a problem-solving process with them and jointly developed a plan, which was taken to the Longmont City Council. While the plan varied little from what the engineers originally thought it would be, they had clear support from members

[43] Catalyst Consulting, 2006, p. 24.

[44] Catalyst Consulting, 2006, p. 24.

[45] further details, see: www.ci.longmont.co.us/ cnr/neighborhood/ leadership_training.htm.

of the public who probably would not have been as supportive had they not been involved in the decision-making process.

# Prince William County, Virginia

Prince William County, Virginia, is a growing community of approximately 380,000 people located about 35 miles southwest of Washington, D.C. Since 2000, the county has grown by 100,000 persons—or 37 percent. Prince William County operates under a county executive form of government. The county's governing body is composed of an eight-member board of county supervisors who make policy decisions. Seven of the board members are elected to serve districts within the county, and the eighth member is elected at-large to serve as the board's chairman. All members of the Prince William Board of County Supervisors are elected to 4-year terms. The board appoints a county executive who is responsible for implementing policies, addressing administrative issues, and recommending department heads for appointment.

As a county government, Prince William County has some unique features that are different from the city governments discussed in this section. Within Prince William County, there are two independent cities that have their own government structure and operate independently of the county government. There are also four incorporated towns within the county boundaries. Those cities provide services in cooperation with the county.

Views from the Front Lines: Community Governance in Prince William County
The value of community government is keeping focused on achieving the vision, values, and leadership philosophy of the government and the citizens it serves. This is achieved by a community strategic planning process, performance measurement, service efforts benchmarking, performance based budgeting, and continuous process improvement. Further, the value of community governance involves creating an organizational culture that focuses on government agencies working together as well as with community residents in addressing community priorities and concerns.
    Tom Pulaski, Director of Planning and Budget, Police Department

## Origins of Community Governance in Prince William County

In Prince William County, administrators and agency executives stress that community governance is their philosophy and not a set of county programs. The community governance approach sets the foundation for how county agencies work together and provide services. These efforts trace back to the early 1990s, when the county adopted a new performance measurement system. They also have roots in efforts to advance community policing within the Prince William County Police Department.

**Performance measurement and community governance.** In the early 1990s, Prince William County developed a new, multifaceted performance measurement system for its agencies. This award-winning system follows a cyclical process that includes the following:

- A strategic planning process

- Identification of performance measures

- The county budget process

- Delivery of efficient and effective services

- Explicit linkage of employee evaluations with agency/county goals

- An evaluation of the county's progress toward meeting its intended goals.

Prince William County residents are involved throughout the performance measurement process. The county's citizen survey creates the basis for data used to make decisions, and it also helps agencies to evaluate their progress toward meeting their goals. A survey of county staff members also assists in the evaluation process. This performance measurement system stresses collaboration and problem solving and supports organizational changes that are needed for these efforts to succeed. This evaluation process and the public dissemination of the results highlight the transparency of county government.[46] The county's report on service efforts and accomplishments serves not only as a accountability mechanism but also as way by which county staff members can "review results, raise questions, and when appropriate, initiate change."[47] County officials believe that this commitment to transparency must be agency-wide, and that it is a critical component of their community governance efforts.

**Community policing and community governance.** Community policing helped pave the way to community governance in Prince William County. The department's commitment to partnerships, problem solving, and organizational transformation helped connect it with other county agencies and the community. These positive relationships and the department's reputation for ethical decision-making helped to facilitate getting other agencies within the government to also adopt a community-oriented approach.

## Key Aspects of Community Governance in Prince William County

Prince William County has taken steps to encourage county staffers to work with each other and the community to address local problems. The county has taken a number of steps to support and institutionalize these efforts through organizational changes within agencies and the overall county structure. Prince William County executives believe that there are three main keys to their success, and that these keys are essential for any municipality adopting the community governance philosophy:

[46] Prince William County posts its annual Service Efforts and Accomplishments Report and other accountability reports, such as citizen surveys and strategic plans, and capital improvement plans, on its web site: www.pwcgov.org/accountability.

[47] See Prince William County, Virginia, 2006, p. a.

1. There needs to be conduits for exchange. The community has an avenue to express its concerns, for example, through community surveys, and the agency executives communicate formally through the strategic planning process.

2. The government has to be willing to give up some ownership of the problems to the community. By doing so, the government can engage in true dialogue and collaboration with the community. The community should participate in defining goals, problems, and solutions.

3. The government has to report on results. The government needs to be transparent in its approach and give feedback about the successes or failures of its approach.

In Prince William County, the development of relationships over time has encouraged information-sharing and problem-solving efforts across agencies and with the community. For example, the Prince William County Police Department connects with other agencies through the use of a tracker system, which follows the resolution of common problems to be addressed across county agencies. The Community Services Board, which assists persons suffering from or at risk of developing mental disabilities or substance abuse problems, collaborates with other city agencies and the community on its prevention and proactive problem-solving efforts. It has found that in some cases colocating its staff with other agencies assists with collaboration. The Neighborhood Services Division of the county's Public Works Department has also embraced the community-oriented approach to its work. The division is responsible for educating and engaging with residents in cooperative efforts to deal with code issues such as zoning, overcrowding in housing, litter, and landscaping. Staff members engage the community in two main ways: a community maintenance task force that brings together a variety of stakeholders, and a community volunteer group. The division has developed process action teams to work on community problems, using the SARA model of problem solving. For all county agencies, these relationships with their local government colleagues and with the community have proven critical to dealing with crises or hot-button issues, such as illegal immigration. They have helped agencies continue their dialogue with the community and clarify and respond to community concerns.

Prince William County agencies have adopted the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) model, which calls for problem solving, the use of data to inform decision-making (e.g., community surveys), and working with neighborhood residents to define and prioritize problems. CQI is used throughout county agencies, and related training is offered to all county staff. These efforts are data-driven with links carried through to employee evaluations and agency-wide goals (i.e., outcome of the "cleanest, best-looking county"). Through these evaluations, county employees are held responsible for their

actions and productivity. Prince William County's approach to recruitment, hiring, and retention supports the commitment to CQI; it looks to recruit and hire persons with a collaborative spirit and leaderships capabilities.

Additionally, agencies are asked to give up some of their autonomy to embrace the county mission and its goals. The city's mission and vision statements reiterate its commitment to working together with residents to address problems and improve the quality of life in the county. Individual agency mission statements support the county's overall mission statement and stress the specific competencies of the agency.

Prince William County Employee Vision Statement
Prince William County Government is an organization where elected leaders, staff, and citizens work together to make our community the best. We, as employees, pledge to do the right thing for the customer and the community every time. We, as a learning organization, commit to provide the necessary support and opportunities for each employee to honor this pledge.  (Prince William County, Virginia, 2007, p.6)

Other key ways in which the Prince William County government has taken steps to support its move toward community governance and institutionalize these efforts is by making changes in the budgeting process to enhance collaboration between agencies. The budgeting process now stresses consensus building and voting by agency heads and draws on what has been learned through community surveys. This approach to budgeting is one way in which the agency leadership consistently and persistently stresses, facilitates, and models the adoption of a community-oriented approach to local government. Another way these efforts are being institutionalized is through a continuity of leadership that reiterates the commitment to a community-oriented approach to local governance.

Selected Prince William County Mission Statements

Prince William County Government
The mission of Prince William County Government is to provide the necessary services to protect the health, welfare, safety, and environment of citizens consistent with the community s values and priorities. This mission is accomplished by: encouraging citizen input and involvement; preserving the County s fiscal stability; producing effective and efficient government programs; managing the County s resources; planning for the future; and representing citizens needs and desires to other levels of government. (Prince William County, Virginia, 2007, p.121)

Prince William County Police Department
To enhance the quality of life by providing police service through shared responsibility with the public. (p. 519)

Prince William County Office of Planning
The mission of the Office of Planning is to assist the community in developing the county to its best potential. We evaluate and implement policies to support the goals of the community as it prospers and matures. (p. 337)

Prince William County Sheriff s Office
The Sheriff 's Office, in partnership with elected leaders, staff, and citizens as part of public safety will provide security at the Judicial Center, serve all court process, provide timely transport for prisoners and patients, and continue to develop and enhance collaboration with all of our partners. (p. 553)

Prince William County Community Services Board
We are committed to improving the quality of life for people with or at risk of developing mental disabilities and substance abuse problems and to preventing the occurrences of these conditions. We do this through a system of caring that respects and promotes the dignity, rights, and full participation of individuals and their families. To the maximum extent possible, these services are provided within the community. (p. 607)

Prince William County Office on Youth
To promote and encourage positive youth development by offering youth, youth-serving professionals, interested citizens, and community groups information, activities, resources, and programs on issues important to and relevant to youth. To enhance the economic stability of county families by offering both affordable and accessible, high-quality, developmentally appropriate child care at County Elementary Schools before/after school, during school breaks, and throughout the summer. (p. 659)

# Wichita, Kansas

Wichita, with a population of about 360,000 people, is the largest city in Kansas. Wichita operates under a council-manager form of government. The city has a seven-member council that serves as its policymaking body. Six of its members are elected by districts. The seventh member, the mayor, is elected at-large. All members of the council are elected to 4-year terms. The city manager is appointed by the city council to carry out policies. The city manager's responsibilities include submitting the annual budget, administering and overseeing operations, and appointing and removing city personnel.

Views from the Front Lines: Community Governance in Wichita

City managers as a profession now talk about engaging citizens. It s widely accepted that we need citizens engaged to move projects forward.
    Kathy Holdeman, Assistant City Manager

It s not just about department heads collaborating. The community needs to be empowered and given the tools to be successful. The police aren t there every day, and neither are we in housing.
    Mary Vaughn, Director, Housing Department

The more we can do community governance, the more the community will benefit—through increased trust in government and enhanced, proactive service delivery.
    Norman Williams, Chief, Police Department

## Origins of community governance in Wichita

Community governance in Wichita emerged as the agency took steps to adopt the community policing philosophy. It was also strongly promoted within the city structure by the leaders, who stressed the need for agencies to work together on community issues.

**Community policing and community governance.** In Wichita, the origins of community governance emerged along with community policing in the early 1990s. Following a widely publicized shooting at a Wichita State University community event, the city developed the "Neighborhood Initiative," which brought together community stakeholders to gather input on the challenges facing Wichita. As part of this process, the city developed a document with 78 action steps detailing activities that the community and city could undertake to combat crime and improve quality of life. Key to this document and the success of the community was the implementation of community policing. Closely tied to the police department's efforts was the work of the Office of Central Inspections and the Environmental Services Department; both offices deal with code violations in the city. Their work and cooperation were seen as essential to the success of community policing and the improvement of life in Wichita neighborhoods.

**City leaders and community governance.** For Wichita's mayor and the city manager, the Neighborhood Initiative was a critically important city effort, and both stressed and supported the implementation of community policing. The mayor and city manager saw the implications of community policing on the rest of the city's departments and took steps to pull them into a transition to a more community-oriented approach to local government. They brought other departments into problem-solving efforts and established four neighborhood city halls staffed by members of the police, code enforcement, and environmental services departments, as well as neighborhood assistants from the city manager's office. The neighborhood city halls, which corresponded with the districts the police department developed as part of its community policing implementation efforts, provided a venue for the community and city staff to address neighborhood issues collaboratively. Over time, the courts became a part of the neighborhood city halls, and they now hold court proceedings for persons residing in the area. Through these efforts, the city administration stressed that city departments need to collaborate and gave them a venue through which they could engage in such efforts.

## Key Aspects of Community Governance in Wichita

In Wichita, as in many communities, city officials have seen community engagement ebb and flow. The city faces the challenge of maintaining community interest and activity in collaborative efforts, especially when there are no crises to rally community members to action. Likewise, the city and its departments have also seen interest in collaboration vary over time as priorities and political leaders change. Currently, the city is undertaking a number of efforts to maintain community involvement in local issues and to strengthen and institutionalize collaboration and integration between municipal agencies. These include a commitment to changing how city government operates, the implementation of specific programs, and community education and training.

Wichita is taking steps to institutionalize a more collaborative, service-oriented municipal government. Throughout the city, this change in the approach to governance is referred to as "Transforming Wichita," which sets a vision:

- "For Wichita to be a premiere Midwestern city where people want to visit, live, and play (as envisioned in Visioneering Wichita).

- For Wichita City government to be a model of world class city governance— where citizens are getting the best possible value for their dollars and the City has the public's confidence and trust. For this vision to be attained, we have to adapt to change!"[48]

[48] See City of Wichita, n.d.b. Visioneering Wichita was the final product of regional dialogues and meetings to collectively identify and express a common vision and goals for the Wichita metropolitan area. For further details see Visioneering Wichita Task Force, 2004.

Along with the vision for the city, Transforming Wichita also sets goals for how city government should operate in the future. Citizens will have a municipal government that is a "high-performing organization" that does the following:

- Focuses on results

- Understands what results matter most to their customers

- Makes performance matter

- Moves decision-making to the front-line, closest to customers

- Fosters an environment of excellence, inclusiveness, accountability, learning, and innovation.[49]

Through Transforming Wichita, the city manager is stressing transparency in city government, efficient and effective delivery of services, positive outcomes, problem solving, collaboration between government agencies and the community, and continuous improvement in city government.[50] City leaders also stress that this approach to governance is fiscally responsible and that it is a way to continuously seek improvement in city operations.[51] Through a number of citywide initiatives and programs, the city is putting these ideas into action.

One such program is "Stop Blight." The Stop Blight effort grew out of concern among community residents about the condition of properties in various neighborhoods. The city also had concerns of its own, namely, that neglected and abandoned properties were contributing to a sense of disorder in neighborhoods and that this blight slowed property appreciation and inhibited economic development. The Stop Blight effort encourages community involvement and municipal agency collaboration in identifying blighted properties and seeks to bring them up to code. As part of this effort, the city adopted a new ordinance targeting neglected buildings. It also developed a StopBlight Action Response Team (START) that is to provide "a comprehensive, proactive, interdepartmental approach to eliminating blight and other neighborhood nuisances."[52] The START Team is composed of staff members representing the following city agencies: Office of Central Inspection, Environmental Services, Police, Law, Neighborhood Services, Municipal Court Administrator, and Housing and Community Services. The team is responsible for collaborating with the community to identify and seeks solutions to blighted properties. These efforts help reenergize communication and collaboration between city departments and their staff members and provides them with up-to-date information about the services their department can provide to help alleviate blight.

Wichita is also working with the Kansas Department of Correction on a reentry initiative that seeks to increase the likelihood that persons returning to Wichita from state prison make a successful transition back into society and

[49] See City of Wichita, n.d.b.

[50] For further information see Kolb, n.d.

[51] See Kolb, n.d.

[52] See City of Wichita, n.d.a., p. 24.

do not commit new crimes or return to prison for technical violations of their conditions of release. In Wichita, offender reentry is a crucial public safety issue facing the community because about 70 percent of persons released from corrections will return to Wichita. This effort recognizes that no single agency can effectively address the reentry problem alone and, therefore, it seeks to bring in other government and community stakeholders, such as social services, health, mental health, substance abuse, education, housing, and employment providers.

Another example of a collaborative, multiagency effort focuses on education of new homeowners. The city helped form a Home Owner's Alumni Club for Section 8 renters who have graduated into home ownership. The housing department and other city agencies realize that new homeowners can face a number of challenges after they move into their home, and they want to provide community members with the tools to be successful. The housing department, therefore, organizes monthly meetings for new homeowners. Other city departments come to these meetings to discuss homeowner responsibilities and to share their knowledge and expertise. These meetings have covered topics such as domestic abuse, code enforcement, and gardening and lawn care, and have brought housing, police, parks and recreation, environmental services, and central inspection officials together with the community. The city also facilitates a neighborhood clean-up program in which community members come out to beautify the area and work on problems. In some neighborhoods, these clean-up efforts have been the genesis of greater community engagement and the formation of neighborhood associations. As community residents have become more engaged, their expectations and norms have changed, making it less likely for government to slip and become less responsive. Should this happen, city officials are confident the community would demand a return to a service-oriented government.

# Conclusion

The transition to community governance, like the transition from traditional policing to community policing, will not occur overnight or, for that matter, in a few short years. The organizational changes required for community governance are significant. They require clear and consistent leadership from municipal administrators, elected municipal leaders, and municipal agency executives. Together as a team, these leaders can stress, model, encourage, and reward municipal agency staff members for their collaborative problem-solving efforts within local government and with the community.

With tighter municipal budgets and increased community demands for involvement in decision-making, a more transparent government, and accountability for outcomes, community governance will not be a passing fad. Rather, because of these higher expectations from residents and the continued desire of police departments to advance community policing efforts to new levels, an increasing number of cities will look for ways to enhance their community collaboration and further bring the community into problem-solving efforts and decision-making processes. Once cities undertake these efforts seriously, expectations and norms both within municipal government and the community will change, making it unlikely that a community will accept any slippage to less-collaborative and less-responsive approaches to government.

This document, we hope, will encourage cities and their leaders to begin to adopt the community governance philosophy by providing them with information, guidance, and cautions about the road ahead and practical examples of this philosophy from the field. Clearly, further research is needed to develop a broader and more sophisticated understanding of community governance as more cities develop and implement the elements of partnerships within municipal agencies, partnerships with the community, problem-solving efforts, and organizational change. We believe this report is an important first step to learning about and encouraging the implementation of community governance. The future of community governance certainly looks bright and promising.

# References

Allender, David M., "Community Policing: Exploring the Philosophy." FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin (March 2004): 18–23.

Bureau of Justice Assistance. Understanding Community Policing: A Framework for Action. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1994.

Bureau of Justice Assistance. The Role of Local Government in Community Safety. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, 2001.

Caliber, an ICF International Company, Police Executive Research Forum, and U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. Community Policing Self-Assessment Tool User's Guide: Documenting Today and Planning for Tomorrow. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Police Services, 2009.

Catalyst Consulting Group. Final Report of the Focus on Longmont: Share Your Vision, Create Our Legacy Strategic Plan. Lexington, Massachusetts, 2006. www.ci.longmont.co.us/focus/pdfs/fol_Report_20906.pdf.

Chapman, Robert and Matthew Scheider. Community Policing for Mayors: A Municipal Service Model for Policing and Beyond. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Police Services, 2006.

City of Anaheim. Rancho La Palma: Neighborhood Improvement Project Action Plan. 2003. www.anaheim.net/comm_svc/neighborhood/docs/RANCHO.pdf.

City of Irving, Texas. Strategic Plan 2006. 2006. http://cityofirving.org/city-manager/pdfs/strategic-plan-2006.pdf.

City of Longmont. "Governance." n.d. www.ci.longmont.co.us/city_council/retreat/2003/pdfs/governance.pdf.

City of Longmont. Longmont Area Comprehensive Plan. 2003 (revised July 2007). www.ci.longmont.co.us/planning/lacp/documents/LACP_2007_update.pdf.

City of Longmont Community Involvement Committee. City of Longmont Community Involvement Resource Manual. 2002. www.ci.longmont.co.us/city_gov/ci/pdfs/CI_manual.pdf.

City of Wichita. "Stop Blight—Ready to Go! New Ordinances and Proposed Programs." PowerPoint Presentation. n.d. www.wichitagov.org/NR/rdonlyres/F27E7A74-EA25-452F-B371-5D819F0C9623/0/StopBlight.pdf.

City of Wichita. "Transforming Wichita." n.d. www.wichitagov.org/NR/rdonlyres/E9B0CC95-0AC5-46F6-B7F8-7F32A09EAFAD/0/TW_explained.pdf

Clarke, Michael and John Stewart. Shaping the Organization and Management of Local Authorities: Challenges and Issues for the Nineties. Luton, United Kingdom: Local Government Management Board, 1992.

Clarke, Michael and John Stewart. Community Governance, Community Leadership and the New Local Government. York, United Kingdom: Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 1998.

Denhardt, Robert B. and Janet Vinzant Denhardt, "The New Public Service: Serving Rather than Steering." Public Administration Review 60, No. 6 (2000): 549–559.

Diamond, Drew and Deirdre Mead Weiss. Community Policing: Looking to Tomorrow. U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Police Services, 2009.

Eck, John E. and William Spelman. Problem Solving: Problem Oriented Policing in Newport News. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum, 1987.

Epstein, Paul D., Paul M. Coates, Lyle D. Wray, and David Swain. Results that Matter: Improving Communities By Engaging Citizens, Measuring Performance, and Getting Things Done. San Francisco, California: Jossey Bass, 2005.

Fischer-Stewart, Gayle. Community Policing Explained: A Guide for Local Governments. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2007.

Fridell, Lorie and Mary Ann Wycoff, eds. Community Policing: The Past, Present, and Future. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum, 2004.

Gates, Christopher. "Community Governance." Futures, 31, no. 5 (1999).

Goldstein, Herman. Problem-Oriented Policing. New York: McGraw Hill, 1990.

Greene, Jack R., "Community Policing in America: Changing the Nature, Structure, and Function of the Police." Policies, Processes, and Decisions of the Criminal Justice System 3 (2000): 299–370.

Horrocks, Ivan and Christine Bellamy, "Telematics and Community Governance: Issues for Policy and Practice." International Journal of Public Sector Managemen, 10, No. 5 (1997).

Jarvi, Christopher K. and Daniel E. Wegner, "Parks and Recreation Professionals as Community Change Agents." Parks and Recreation, January 2001, 22–31.

Joseph Rowntree Foundation. "Community Governance, Community Leadership and the New Local Government: Findings." January 1999. http://www.jrf.org.uk/knowledge/findings/government/pdf/lgr119.pdf.

Kettl, Donald F., "The Transformation of Governance: Globalization, Devolution, and the Role of Government." Public Administration Review 60, no. 6 (2000): 488–497.

Kolb, George. "Transforming Wichita" PowerPoint Presentation. n.d. www.wichitagov.org/TW/TWPowerPoint.htm.

Marshall, Martha, Lyle Wray, Paul Epstein, and Stuart Grifel, "21st Century Community Governance: Better Results by Linking Citizens, Government, and Performance Measurement." ASQ's Annual Quality Congress Proceedings, (2000): 214–223.

Mastrofski, Stephen D., James J. Willis, and Tammy Rinehart Kochel. The Challenges of Implementing Community Policing in the United States. Report for the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2007.

Mudd, John, "Beyond Community Control: A Neighborhood Strategy for City Government." Publius 6, No. 4 (1976): 113–135.

Nalbandian, John, "Facilitating Community, Enabling Democracy: New Roles for Local Government Managers." Public Administration Review 59, No. 3 (2007): 187–197.

National League of Cities. Building Democratic Governance: Tools and Structures for Engaging Citizens. Washington, D.C.: National League of Cities Center for Research and Municipal Programs, 2005.

National League of Cities Institute for Youth, Education, and Families. Vital Partners: Mayors and Police Chiefs Working Together for America's Children and Youth. Washington, D.C.: National League of Cities, 2006.

Ney, Becki and Peggy McGarry. Getting It Right: Collaborative Problem Solving for Criminal Justice. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections, 2006.

Patterson, Jeffrey, "Community Policing: Learning the Lessons of History." FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, November 1995, 5–11.

Perez, Teresita and Reece Rushing. The CitiStat Model: How Data-Driven Government Can Increase Efficiency and Effectiveness. Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress, 2007.

Potapchuk, Bill and Joan Kennedy, "Sustaining Active Civic Participation Requires Diligence." Nation's Cities Weekly. February 16, 2004.

Prince William County, Virginia. 2006 Service Efforts and Accomplishments Report. Prince William County, Virginia: Prince William County, 2006. www.co.prince-william.va.us/default.aspx?topic=030011001170004170.

Prince William County, Virginia. FY 2007 Fiscal Plan. Prince William County, Virgnia: Prince William County, 2007. www.pwcgov.org/default.aspx?topic=010010000930003722.

Reiss, Joe, "Community Governance: An Organized Approach to Fighting Crime." FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, May 2006, 8–11.

Renaud, Cynthia and Anthony Batts, "Community Oriented Public Safety: The Long Beach Experience." FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, January 2006, 6–8.

Rohe, William M., Richard E. Adams, and Thomas A. Arcury, "Community Policing and Planning." Journal of the American Planning Association 67, No. 1 (2001): 78–90.

Schneider, Andrea, Clark Kimerer, Scott Seaman, and Joan Sweeney. Community Policing in Action! A Practitioner's Eye View of Organizational Change. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Police Services, 2003.

Scott, Michael S. and Herman Goldstein. Shifting and Sharing Responsibility for Public Safety Problems. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Police Services, 2005.

Scrivner, Ellen. Innovations in Police Recruitment and Hiring: Hiring in the Spirit of Service. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2006.

Simrell King, Cheryl, Kathryn M. Feltey, and Bridget O'Neill Susel, "The Question of Participation: Toward Authentic Public Participation in Public Administration." Public Administration Review 58, No. 4 (1998): 317–326.

Stephens, Gene, "Proactive Policing: The Key to Successful Crime Prevention and Control." USA Today Magazine, May 2001, 32–-34.

Stewart-Brown, Recheal, "Community Mobilization: The Foundation for Community Policing." FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, June 2001, 9–17.

Swaim, Steve, Joe Reiss, and Craig Hunter. "Community Governance: A Public Safety Response" PowerPoint Presentation at the 2006 National COPS Conference. Washington, D.C., July 2006. www.cops.usdoj.gov/files/ric/Publications/swaimhunterdiamondreisv2.pdf.

Thomas, John Clayton, "Bringing the Public into Public Administration: The Struggle Continues." Public Administration Review 59, No. 1 (1999): 83–88.

Trojanowicz, Robert C. and Bonnie Bucqueroux. Community Policing: How to Get Started, 2nd ed. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing Company, 1998.

Trojanowicz, Robert C., Victor E. Kappeler, Larry K. Gaines, and Bonnie Bucqueroux. Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective, 2nd ed. Cincinnati, Ohio Anderson Publishing Company, 1998.

U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. Community Policing. 2002. www.cops.usdoj.gov/Default.asp?Item=171.

U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. What Is Community Policing? 2003. www.cops.usdoj.gov/default.asp?Item=36.

Visioneering Wichita Task Force. "Visioneering Wichita: Creating the Future For Our Regional Community." 2004. www.visioneeringwichita.com/downloads/VISION%20DOCUMENT.pdf.

Wood, Richard L., Amelia Rouse, and Mariah C. Davis. Policing in Transition: Creating a Culture of Community Policing. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, 1999.

## About PERF

The Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) is a national organization of progressive law enforcement chief executives from city, county, and state agencies who collectively serve more than half of the country's population. Established in 1976 by 10 prominent police chiefs, PERF has evolved into one of the leading police think tanks. With membership from many of the largest police departments in the country and around the globe, PERF has pioneered studies in such fields as community and problem-oriented policing, racially biased policing, multijurisdictional investigations, domestic violence, the police response to people with mental illnesses, homeland security, management concerns, use of force, and crime-reduction approaches. To learn more about PERF visit www.policeforum.org.

# About COPS

The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (the COPS Office) is an innovative agency that has been the driving force in advancing community policing throughout the nation. The COPS Office has a unique mission to directly serve the needs of local law enforcement, and COPS Office grant programs and products respond specifically to those needs.

The COPS Office was created through the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. As a component of the Justice Department, the mission of the COPS Office is to advance the practice of community policing as an effective strategy to improve public safety. Moving from a reactive to proactive role, community policing represents a shift from more traditional law enforcement practices. By addressing the root causes of criminal and disorderly behavior, rather than simply responding to crimes once they have been committed, community policing concentrates on preventing both crime and the atmosphere of fear it creates. Additionally, community policing encourages the use of crime-fighting technology and operational strategies and the development of mutually beneficial relationships between law enforcement and the community. By earning the trust of the members of their communities and making those individuals stakeholders in their own safety, law enforcement can better understand and address the community's needs, and the factors that contribute to crime.

The COPS Office awards grants to state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies to hire and train community policing professionals, acquire and deploy cutting-edge crime-fighting technologies, and develop and test innovative policing strategies. COPS Office funding provides training and technical assistance to advance community policing at all levels of law enforcement, from line officers to law enforcement executives, as well as others in public safety. Because community policing is inclusive, COPS training also reaches state and local government leaders and the citizens they serve. The COPS Office has compiled an unprecedented array of knowledge and training resources on community policing. This includes topic-specific publications, training curricula, and resource CDs.  All COPS Office-developed materials are available as resources to law enforcement and their partners.

- Since 1994, the COPS Office has invested more than $12 billion to add community policing officers to the nation's streets, enhance crime fighting technology, support crime prevention initiatives, and provide training and technical assistance to help advance community policing.

- Nearly 500,000 law enforcement personnel, community members, and government leaders have been trained through COPS Office-funded training organizations.

- The COPS Office has distributed more than 1.2 million knowledge resource products (i.e., publications, training curricula, white papers, etc.) dealing with a wide range of community policing topics and issues.

- At present, approximately 81 percent of the nation's population is served by law enforcement agencies practicing community policing.

- By the end of FY 2008, the COPS Office had funded approximately 117,000 additional officers to more than 13,000 of the nation's 18,000 law enforcement agencies across the country in small and large jurisdictions alike. The most recent survey of COPS Office grantees indicated that approximately 109,581 of these officers have been hired.

As law enforcement agencies strengthen and advance their community policing efforts they often call on their colleagues in other departments of their own city government to assist with problem-solving efforts in the community. Many city administrators and elected officials are also seeking ways to increase community involvement in local government matters in a more systematic way that results in a more transparent government structure that stresses accountability and responsiveness to the community. Cities that pursue these collective efforts are beginning to adopt a philosophical approach to local governance referred to as "community governance", which is collaborative across agencies and service oriented. Advancing Community Policing Through Community Governance details the community governance philosophy and describes its implementation in five communities across the country.