E-PARCC
COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE

Syracuse University
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs
Program for the Advancement of Research on Conflict and Collaboration

BUILDING A HEALTHY COMMUNITY
CASE

This case presents recurrent points of tension around resident representation in a community planning process, Santa Centro Community Change Initiative. Community engagement, participation and collaboration are fundamental features of public management, yet often residents and their intimate knowledge of the problems facing their community remain on the periphery of these processes. Measures of participation in the form of the number of events in the community and/or the number of residents who attend such events are often substituted for inclusion (Quick and Feldman, 2011). Research on collaborative public management and participatory governance demonstrates collaborative efforts to address social problems, like the one described in this case, do not experience success solely because of particular leadership or funder generosity, but instead as a result of collaborative and participatory planning (O'Leary, R., Gerard, C. and Bingham, L. B., 2006; O'Leary & Bingham, 2009). Recent research on inclusive management emphasizes the importance of *how* people participate and *how* the planning process and the actors within it engage with resident representation (Quick and Feldman, 2011). *Building a Healthy Community* illustrates the potential for dealing with emerging tensions (in this case around resident representation) as sites of learning and growth even when they may feel counterproductive.

As you read this case consider how points of tension are engaged in a productive or nonproductive way. Where do participants get stuck and how do they move forward? What are the practices that help them move forward?

Participants. The case has a number of participants. We provide the following descriptions for your convenience:

Ava: Attended Define and Discover planning event. She is a resident of central Santa Centro and a mother. She is a native Spanish speaker from Mexico.

Chris: Steering Committee member and member of Data and Evaluation Subcommittee. He is a professor at a local university. He is not a resident of Santa Centro. He is bilingual and is of Mexican descent.

David: Steering Committee member. He holds an upper level position in a Southern California County organization focused on community participation in development projects. He is not a resident of Central Santa Centro. He is not bilingual. He is white.

Eduardo: Not a Steering Committee member, but attends Steering Committee meetings regularly. He is a teacher in Santa Centro and also a resident of Santa Centro. He is bilingual and Mexican-American.

Emilio: Attends many meetings because he is an intern with the lead agency. He is college-age and thinking about going to medical school. He is bilingual and Mexican-American.

Flora: Attends steering committee meetings. She is an employee in the lead agency. She is bilingual and Mexican-American.

Gail: Member of Data and Evaluation Subcommittee; attended many meetings as a notetaker. She is a graduate student at a local university. She is not bilingual. She is white.

Irene: Member of Data and Evaluation Subcommittee brought on to partner with the lead agency to help them document the process. She is a graduate student at a local university and has a masters degree in public health. She is not bilingual. She is white.

Joe: Steering Committee member. He is an upper level manager in Santa Centro Police Department. He speaks some Spanish, but is not completely bilingual. He is white.

Jose: A member of the Steering Committee and an Outcome Subcommittee. He works for a Santa Centro based organization focused on improving youth development. He is bilingual and is Mexican-American.

Lenny: A member of the Steering Committee and the Outcome 8 Subcommittee. He holds an upper level position in a countywide poverty alleviation organization. He is not completely bilingual but understands some Spanish. He is Asian.

Lillian: Organized and led Steering Committee meetings in the beginning of the process and hired the facilitation and planning consultants. She works for the lead agency and is their primary representative for the Santa Centro Community Change Initiative process. She has been working in Santa Centro for many years. She speaks Spanish, but is not completely bilingual. She is of Mexican descent.

Luis: Attends Steering Committee meetings and meetings concerning resident engagement. He represents a countywide organization that promotes worker rights and voter participation. He is bilingual. He is Mexican-American.

Maria: Steering committee member and involved in meetings concerning resident engagement. She holds an upper level position at a Santa Centro based health-focused organization. She is bilingual and Latina.

May: Member of the Steering Committee and the Data and Evaluation Subcommittee. She works for a countywide health-focused organization. She does not speak Spanish, but understands a lot. She is white.

Nancy: Attends Steering Committee meetings and meetings concerning resident engagement. She works for a county organization focused on community participation in develop projects. She is bilingual and does a lot of informal and formal translation. She is Mexican-American.

Norman: Member of the Data and Evaluation Subcommittee and Community Engagement Subcommittee. He is a medical student at a local university. He has taken a year off to work with the Santa Centro Community Change Initiative. He has a masters degree in public health. He is bilingual. He is white.

Oliver: Member of the Steering Committee and attends meetings concerning resident engagement. He is a resident of central Santa Centro, bilingual and Mexican-American.

Richard: He is the Foundation Program Officer who works in Southern California and was assigned to Santa Centro for the Community Change Initiative. Each of the 14 cities was assigned a program officer. He does not live in Santa Centro, is not bilingual but understands some Spanish and is white.

Rosa: Attended Define and Discover planning event. She is a youth volunteer/intern with the lead agency, working with Santa Centro Community Change Initiative. She is a resident of central Santa Centro, bilingual and Mexican-American.

Samuel: Executive Director of the lead agency. He occasionally attends Steering Committee meetings. He is white.

Serena: Attended Define and Discover planning event. She is a resident of central Santa Centro and a mother. She is a native Spanish speaker from Mexico.

Sophia: Attended Define and Discover planning event. She is a resident of central Santa Centro and a mother. She is a native Spanish speaker from Mexico.

Tabitha: She attends steering committee meetings and strategic planning committee meetings and other meetings as needed. She is the planning consultant who lives in Southern California. She is bilingual and white.

Tim: Facilitation consultant from Southern California area. He does not speak Spanish. He is white.

Victoria: Attended Define and Discover planning event. She is a resident of central Santa Centro and a mother. She is a native Spanish speaker from Mexico.

Wendy: A Steering Committee member who also attends an Outcome Group Subcommittee. She holds an upper level position with a Santa Centro based organization focused on helping troubled youth. She is bilingual and is Mexican-American.

The Foundation for Healthy Places is a private, statewide health foundation. The Foundation for Healthy Places aims to create equitable access to quality health care for the most vulnerable individuals and communities, and to support systems and policy changes to improve the health status of all Californians.

PART A

Background

Santa Centro Community Change Initiative began in April 2009 when The Foundation for Healthy Places selected fourteen cities across California to receive 10 years of funding for place-based community-driven health strategies and interventions that prioritized policy and systems change to create sustainable changes that reduce health disparities.

Place-based community change initiatives like Santa Centro Community Change Initiative have a rich history in the United States dating back to the Kennedy Administration, with the Economic Recovery Act of 1964 that created Community Action Organizations in poor neighborhoods (Moynihan, 1969). In the 1990s, comprehensive community change initiatives emerged to address the needs of poor neighborhoods (Kubisch, A.C., et al., 2010). More recently, in 2008, the Obama Administration began its Promise and Choice Neighborhood Programs modeled after Harlem Children's Zone. Local efforts to do place-based worked also have sprung up across the country.

The Foundation for Healthy Places selected sites for their Community Change Initiative by requesting data on various social and health indicators from local organizations and agencies and then assessing and selecting the places of highest need.

Santa Centro is centrally located in Southern California. It ranks in the top 10 most densely populated cities in the U.S, in the 2000 and 2010 censuses. Santa Centro is a very young city with 30% of the population under the age of 18. Over 75% of its residents are of Hispanic or Latino origin with over 80% of household reporting speaking a language other than English at home (US Census, 2010). The population has low levels of higher education with 11% of households reporting having a bachelors degree or higher. Most residents work in the service industry, which are traditionally low-wage jobs that either do not offer health insurance or offer coverage that is not affordable for workers. The 12 neighborhoods that make up The Foundation for Healthy Places target area within central Santa Centro, suffer disproportionately across a range of social and health indicators having especially high rates of obesity and diabetes, asthma, heart disease, community violence and gang activity.

The Foundation for Healthy Places required each chosen site to write a plan as well as to develop a governance structure to guide the 10 years of funding. It allocated the first nine months to planning and expected the written plan and a plan for the governance structure at the end of those nine months. It provided 4 overarching goals and 10 outcomes that each site would address.

The **four overarching goals** were:
- Reductions in youth violence
- Reverse the childhood obesity epidemic
- Provide a health home for all children and
- Increase school attendance (The California Endowment, n.d.)

The **ten outcomes** were:
1. "All Children Have Health Coverage
2. "Families Have Improved Access to a Health Home That Supports Healthy Behaviors
3. "Health and Family-Focused Human Services Shift Resources Toward Prevention
4. "Residents Live in Communities with Health-Promoting Land-Use, Transportation and Community Development
5. "Children and their Families are Safe from Violence in their Homes and "Neighborhoods
6. "Communities Support Healthy Youth Development
7. "Neighborhood and School Environments Support Improved Health and Healthy Behaviors
8. "Community Health Improvements are Linked to Economic Development
9. "Health Gaps for Boys and Young Men of Color are Narrowed
10. "California has a Shared Vision of Community Health" (The California Endowment, n.d.).

The *4 overarching goals* represent the indicators of long-term success for the program. The *10 outcomes* are elements of community health that help signify progress toward the goals.

The first step outlined by the Foundation's plan was to select a local organization that would administer the funds. This lead agency would also oversee the planning process by organizing meeting locations, sending reminders, drafting agendas and providing refreshments. The lead agency would also hire consultants for meeting facilitation and plan writing. Hiring consultants was strongly recommended by The Foundation for Healthy Places and all 14 selected cities did hire consultants. Facilitation of the process included convening stakeholders and guiding conversation on the 4 overarching goals and the 10 outcomes so that the community was able to prioritize the outcomes and make them locally relevant. The plan writing was a matter of pulling together the information from the facilitation process and outlining how the community would accomplish the policy and systems-change priorities that would impact the 4 overarching goals and 10 outcomes. This plan would guide the next ten years of funding. The Foundation for Healthy Places required this plan to contain a visual representation of the plan, a process model and a narrative description of plan and the planning process.

Planning Begins
Planning began in April 2009 with the lead agency organizing a community kick-off event to celebrate the selection of Santa Centro as a recipient of the Community Change Initiative funding and to introduce the initiative. Simultaneously the lead agency began recruiting representatives of local organizations to form a steering committee. The lead agency organized a retreat for the newly formed steering committee in June 2009. At the retreat, Lillian, the lead agency representative laid out the structure of the planning process that would begin immediately and would wrap up in December 2009 when they would submit their plan to The Foundation for Healthy Places. The lead agency decided that to meet this deadline they would organize 4 large events. The first event, Define and Discover, would be held in August. Its purpose would be to introduce the initiative to residents, discuss the outcomes and then cull the 10 outcomes down to 3-5 priority areas. It also aimed to

provide residents with skills to go out and talk to their neighbors to get their input on the plan and engage them in the process. The second event, Strategic Stakeholder Summit, would be in mid-October. Its purpose would be to bring into the process community institutions and actors identified as necessary to achieve the goals set out in Define and Discover. Third, in mid-November a "Designing Event" would take place in which a draft plan would be created. Key strategies, measures and policy changes would be identified for each outcome, and plugged into the plan. Finally, in mid-December the Finalizing Event would take place. At this event the plan would receive final approval from the organizations and residents and next steps in implementation would be identified and discussed.

This case begins by describing the first event, Define and Discover and the questions about resident participation and representation that emerged.

Define and Discover!

Define and Discover happened over two consecutive Fridays in central Santa Centro. As mentioned in the background, Define and Discover aimed to engage community residents in the process, to provide information about the Community Change Initiative and to discuss how to achieve the 10 outcomes in Santa Centro and how to make them locally relevant. The event was also training because it aimed to provide skills in "facilitating community engagement activities such as interviews, dialogues, focus groups and forums" (Santa Centro Community Change Initiative, 2009) so that residents could go out and engage more resident input into the planning process. The Steering Committee discussed recruiting residents to attend Define and Discover and decided that the recently formed Community Engagement Subcommittee should recruit residents with the help of the many local organizations that were involved in the process. Lillian created a flyer that called for participants who could reserve from 8am to 6pm for the event and asked if they needed childcare, translation and to RSVP (Lillian, personal communication, July 30, 2009).

Community Leaders Wanted!!!

Are you interested in Building a Better Santa Centro?
We need community leaders that are interested and committed to working on developing a ten-year plan for the next 7 months to develop a healthy Santa Centro.

FREE "Defining and Discovering" two-day training ·
· Free Facilitation and Recorder Training
· Learn professional skills and community research methods
· Learn how to lead participatory processes
· Be a part of defining community topics for discussions
· Be a part of a movement for change and unity in Santa Centro
· Build your leadership capacity and share your talents and skills
· Let's build our community power by connecting and building a base of local community leaders to move this initiative forward

Purpose:
This training is aimed at building the capacity of community leaders to be engaged and be owners in the planning process by being involved in facilitating community engagement activities such as interviews, dialogues, focus groups and forums.

Criteria for Participation:
· Prior leadership experience and training preferred
· Must already be actively involved in their community, school or neighborhood
· Must be committed to a long term vision of change for Santa Centro
· Desire to develop solutions and be part of the solution
· Must have good communication skills and not be afraid to speak in public
· Youth and Resident Leaders as well as organizational community outreach and community engagement staff are welcomed

Be a part of this exciting opportunity! Space is limited! Breakfast, lunch, snacks and on site childcare provided at no cost.

Location: Local School

Time: 8:00 a.m. (registration and refreshments) to 6:00 p.m.
(may end earlier, but please hold the time)
Please turn in RSVP Form by August 12, 2009 by 5:00 p.m.

Santa Centro Community Change Initiative
"Defining and Discovering" two-day training
RSVP FORM
Please specify if you are available the following days from 8 AM – 6 PM (Yes/No)
_____ **I am available August 14**th
_____ **I am available August 21**st

First and Last Name:

Organization/School/Neighborhood Association:

Address, City, Zip:

Phone Number (best # to reach you):

Email:

Do you need childcare? (Yes/No)
    If yes, Name of child/children and age:

Do you need translation from English to Spanish? (Yes/No)

Do you need translation for any other language? What language?

Please specify any special needs:

(A $50.00 stipend per day of training is available upon request for lost wages for residents not being compensated by employer and have to miss work to attend training. Verification of employment and satisfactory performance of at least one community engagement activity required.)

Who were you invited by? Indicate name of person:

Space is limited! Please reserve your space as soon as possible.
E-mail form back to: Dominique; Dominique@xxx.org
(555) 555- 5555

Define and Discover, Day 1

Define and Discover Day 1 begins with adults and their children filtering into the school courtyard where registration was set up. People mingle, excited to see one another, hugging and kissing, laughing, tending to their children, getting refreshments and looking around to try and piece together who was leading the event and if it was starting soon. About 100 people are gathered in the auditorium space. Tim, the facilitation consultant, comes to the front and says, "Welcome! We are so glad to have you here to be a part of this exciting opportunity!" Lillian joins him and explains that we are going to get started and says she "is so excited to introduce Tim, who we are *so* lucky to have. He is going to be the facilitator for our planning process." People in the audience listen but look confused. A woman whispers to her neighbor, "Our what?" Others are translating this into Spanish. There is a small group of 3 or 4 ladies leaning in around Nancy, an organizational representative, who is translating it for them. Tim claps his hand and says, "Great! I am excited to lead this process but really I am here to participate *with* you all." Lillian taps him on the shoulder and points to Laura standing to the side and he says, "Oh yes! Translation!" and smiles. A woman standing next to him is translating into an audio device. She smiles and nods her head. The Spanish-speaking participants are wearing headphones through which they hear the translation. They are pressing the headphones to their ears to hear her. Some remove one ear to listen to both Spanish and English and get translation from the friends around them.

The meeting proceeded with ground rules for the day, a summary of the schedule and the outcomes. The ground rules include things like *respect each other* and *let everyone have a chance to speak*. Tim explained, "Now we are going to break out into pairs so we can really get to know one another. I want you to focus on the positive, I want you not only to get to know what each other do but also what makes you feel good about being a part of this community, Santa Centro." Lillian corrects him, "specifically *central* Santa Centro, if you can." Tim responded, "Oh yes, we can focus on central Santa Centro, your neighborhood, that would be a good place to start." This activity took about an hour and ended at lunchtime. After lunch, the group came together and brainstormed about the assets of the Santa Centro community for another hour. The main activity of the afternoon, breaking into groups based on the 10 outcomes, followed the discussion of assets. People were supposed to break out according to which of the 10 outcomes they were most interested in. There were approximately 10 to 15 people in each group. They had about an hour for discussion. Lillian announced that at each group someone would be taking notes and reporting out at the end of the day.

"What group are you going to?" one resident asked another. "Safety. There is so much violence! *That* has got to change first." "Yes, yes, I agree, the other day my son was approached by a local gang member in Jackson Park, I will come with you." People moved to the round tables scattered throughout the auditorium. People were confused what the purpose of the activity was. One woman whispered to another, "So what are we doing?" There was someone assigned to lead the discussion, and someone taking notes on flipcharts at every table. The person leading the discussion at the safety table was Ralph, an organizational representative. He worked at a local non-profit. He said, " I think we are supposed to read the outcome and figure out what it means in Santa Centro." People

immediately launched into discussions about how no one trusts the police, how there are raids targeting undocumented immigrants, and how gangs threaten youth and try to make them join. Joe, a representative from law enforcement, brought up doing a gang injunction in the area whereby identified gang members can be incarcerated for activities on the street. Emilio, a bilingual resident interning with one of the organizations, took notes for this group; he had a pad of paper and was writing down furiously what people were saying. "Ultimately safety is everyone's responsibility!" Serena, a resident, said. The other residents around her nodded and Ava said, "Yeah, we cannot blame any one person but it is everyone who needs to help. We need to work together."

"Ok, time is almost up. Are you guys almost done?" Tim said walking around to the groups. People at the table all said "no." Someone said "It is so loud in here it is hard to hear my group speak." "Ok 15 more minutes" Tim announced. There were moans from the audience that there was not enough time. "Ok come back to the middle of the room!" "Ok *that* group in the corner, time is up come back so we can debrief before the end of the day!" People eventually came back.

"Ok I would like one or two people from each group to come up to the front of the room and in one sentence explain what your outcome means and other things that came up in your group." The people in the safety group looked at each other, Joe said he would present. "Our group was safety," the audience laughed because of course it was, he was the law enforcement representative. "We discussed the gang problem in Santa Centro and the distrust between the police and community members. Safety is a major concern for everyone. It is not just the responsibility of the police but also of parents. I discussed the idea of a gang injunction. I feel like we were just getting into a good discussion and needed more time." Lillian was writing these comments up on flipcharts at the front of the room.

Tim said, "Thanks Joe." Joe nodded his head and sat down. Once all the groups reported out Tim said, "All right so it seems like there are a number of priorities set by the group. Lillian wrote these on flipcharts on the stage. They were synthesized by Tim to be:
- Safety is everyone's responsibility
- Land use, plan improvements, housing, community participation in planning
- Youth development: build organizational capacity and sustainability, respect & dignity for youth
- Demand that Santa Centro be a Sanctuary City. Long term: Comprehensive immigration reform.
- Open spaces for play and learning that are safe, more centers, parks, and trails
- Universal health coverage for children; quality health coverage; nutrition classes
- Job training for quality careers with benefits; reinvest to create opportunities; reduce income disparities
- Support programs that focus on prevention that are already working
- Combine all existing health services and clinics into one-stop-shop open 24/7
- Strengthen faith in the community
- Distribute information through schools, internet, newspaper, email
- Help youth before they get into trouble; help people with mental or physical illness.

Tim noted that "we could postpone addressing Outcome 10, California has a shared vision of community health, because we really didn't address that and it's kind of vague."

After going over the priorities, Tim explained that everyone was now going to vote for which ones they felt were most important. He said there would be two votes: (1) which topics would have 'the greatest positive impact' and (2) which ones had 'the most energy around them' (Santa Centro Community Change Initiative, August 14, 2009). People looked a little confused, there were murmurings of what does *energy* mean? The vote proceeded, people were given index cards and asked to write their priority for number one and then number two. Tim explained that he would then tally them up and report out the results to everyone the next week on Day 2 of Define and Discover. People again turned to their neighbors to clarify the instructions and see how they were deciding and voting. Sophia, a Santa Centro resident said to Victoria, another resident, "I think safety is the most important, but we are not safe because we are afraid that my husband is going to be deported. So how do I vote?" Victoria agreed saying that is tough, she wanted to vote for safety, but doesn't believe in a gang injunction, the cops are the ones she does not trust or feel safe from. Lillian asked everyone to pass their cards to the end of the row and she would collect them.

Tim then handed out another set of index cards and asked people to give him feedback on the day. He wanted to know if they could make any changes for Day 2, which would happen in a week. People again discussed with their neighbors what they thought about the day. One person said, they liked getting to know Joe, "he is much nicer than any other cop, I have met before." Victoria discussed with Sophia again, that she thought it was too loud. She told Sophia, that they should change the location so people can hear each other better. Sophia agreed. In the back of the room Luis, a resident and political organizer at a local organization stood with 4 other residents in a circle. "This voting was BS." "We barely got to get into deep discussion on these topics. Jobs are what are important to Santa Centro, but once again they don't want to hear that." Who *they* are was not clear but it was clear that participants, residents in particular, were not happy with how Day 1 was organized. At the same time, the participants did not seem surprised. "They don't care what we say, they will just do what they want to do in the end, and give the Foundation what they want," Luis said with conviction. "They don't even respect our time," another woman said and wrote something on her card. At this point it was past ending time and participants had been there since 8 am.

Debriefing from Day 1 and Planning for Day 2
On a conference call the following Day 1 a small group discussed plans for Day 2 and the feedback cards from Day 1. Norman a graduate student intern from a local university had taken the cards at the end of Day 1 and synthesized the feedback. He explained to the people on the call that there were concerns about the limitations of the voting process. Some one wrote on the feedback cards, "Some people were being told how to vote by others." The voting process confused participants and "We should not reduce to so few topics and vote; create themes from all of the conversations instead." One participant commented, "I hope the voting results and priorities reflect the detailed discussions and

are shared in writing." The voting had squeezed out the quality of their participation. "Participants did not want to have to choose between safety and open space was one comment" Norman shared. Irene, another graduate student intern, agreed; "Yes because these two issues are not mutually exclusive." The conversations had allowed topics to be connected but then they were parsed into separate issues when it came to voting. "We need another way to make decisions that reflects the work done in the breakout groups"(Norman, personal communication, August 19, 2009).

Other comments also showed that Day 2 needed to be different. The interview instructions steered participant conversations to be only positive, but to discuss the problem participants expressed that they need to talk about what is not working too. People liked the interviews in the beginning of the day because they got to know one another but it took too much time and not enough time was spent on the outcomes later. "The focus on assets did not permit us the flexibility to discuss what is *not* working." One resident commented that the afternoon session on the outcomes was not enough to understand the outcomes. "We need more education about what the outcomes mean. If we just say them out loud and tell people to choose immediately, it is hard to know where to go." Another participant wanted "less talking from facilitators and more by participants with each other." Another person said they did not feel "valued or listened to."

Logistics also caused problems. People said they could not hear each other in the room and suggested having break out groups in separate rooms. "It was extremely hard to hear what people had to say in groups." Another comment was that "Scheduling sessions on Fridays limits resident participation and favors most steering committee members who are paid by their organizations to attend." Finding a mutually agreeable time had been difficult because the organizations represented on the Steering Committee were involved in many community events during this time of year. Ultimately, the Steering Committee decided on the August dates in order to stay on schedule understanding that not everyone would be able to make it. Day 2 was also on a Friday so residents probably would still find it difficult to attend.

It was clear participants from Day 1 were unsatisfied with how Santa Centro Community Change Initiative was organized so far. Irene thought, "This cannot be another time that the community is not listened to! What are we going to do?" Tim was the one who was supposed to be the expert facilitator so how would he handle it? Tim said he would work with Lillian to take action on all the feedback and make changes for Day 2 and if anyone else wanted to help they were welcome.

Brainstorm (individually or in a small group) the answers to the following questions.
QUESTIONS:
1. Why would Ava, Serena, Sophia and Victoria want to participate in Define and Discover?

2. Why would organizations (like the ones represented by Joe, Luis, May and Nancy) want to have representatives at Define and Discover?

3. How would the various participants, Lillian, Ava, Serena, Sophia and Victoria describe

the Define and Discover event?

- What did they want from the event?

- Were they satisfied with the event?

- What were they happy or unhappy with?

4. What did residents say or do that indicated they were uneasy with parts of the process?

5. How did the goals of the organizers (Lillian and Tim) differ from the goals of the residents?

6. What priorities and/or assumptions are the organizers making? How are they different from the priorities and/or assumptions of residents?

7. How do the differences affect the ability to communicate and accomplish what is important to each group during the Define and Discover event?

8. Imagine you are on the conference call planning Day 2: How would you help Tim and Lillian understand what wasn't working?

   a. Should Tim and Lillian change plans or continue with what they had planned?

   b. If you suggest changes, what changes should they make?

Part B.
After Day 1 of Define and Discover, Tim and Lillian led a conference call to plan for Day 2. Irene, Norman, Tabitha, a Planning Consultant, Maria, an organizational representative, and Flora, an employee from the lead agency, were also on the call. The conference call was followed by a series of emails to discuss making some changes to Day 2 in response to participant feedback from Day 1 because feedback from residents indicated that they were upset. They were particularly dissatisfied with the voting process used on Day 1 to decide on community priorities.

In an email following the conference call, Norman said that what he thought was needed was "a methodology that is effective in eliciting and amplifying the voice of the residents, not squeezing it out" (Norman, personal communication, August 19, 2009). He suggested transcribing and coding the themes of the discussions to get a better idea of what people see as the key to a healthy community.

Tim was concerned that the process Norman proposed required too many resources. Norman pointed out that they could use notes from the meetings and flip charts to get "a good idea of what was going on in the discussions and this will serve as a good proxy for full transcription" (Norman, personal communication August 19, 2009). "This analysis could supplement the consensus that came from the vote" and "it would be replicable in future community gatherings and meeting in the process and beyond" and through this "we will not only give the community ownership of the project but lay down the foundations of communication that will lead to sustained resident involvement for the life of the project and beyond" (Norman, personal communication August 19, 2009). He also assured Tim that this type of work is what he had imagined doing as a member of the Data and Evaluation Subcommittee, one of the subcommittees that had begun meeting early in the process.

Norman spent the next couple of days reading through all the notes from Day 1 and doing a thematic analysis to present back to the participants on Day 2.

In a final planning email before Day 2, Tim suggested having people break out by outcome instead of the "affirmative topics" that had resulted from the voting on Day 1 because of the dissatisfaction with the voting process. The top six affirmative topics were Community development, Health and Prevention, Safety, Economic Justice, Youth Development and Community Advocacy and Immigration Reform, "but we can't be sure this represents what people want if they feel the voting process did not represent their conversations."

Day 2 of Define and Discover took place on the Friday following Day 1 at a different site in Central Santa Centro from Day 1. It started out in the same fashion as Day 1 with everyone gathering in a large auditorium. About 50 people attended and about half of those attending were residents. The other attendees were representatives of organizations. There were many fewer residents than the previous week. Tim and Lillian passed out handouts that had the results of the Day 1 vote in a table format. Irene mentioned to Gail, another graduate student helping for the day, that this document had so much text on it, she could not even understand it.

Tim announced "we are going to start the day by reviewing the agenda which you all should have and discussing how it addresses concerns expressed in feedback we got from you all at the end of Day 1. One of the key points we learned from your feedback was that people were not happy with the voting process." He explained that Norman had synthesized the notes and flipcharts where people's words were written down to complement the voting process and that Norman would present this information later. Tim then said, "Remember the work we are doing here is like creating a blueprint for a very large building that will take 10 years to build – it needs lots of input, careful thought, discussion, planning, design, review, feedback, collaboration, to meet the complex needs."

At this point, Lillian asked Irene to circulate index cards to everyone. Tim said that he wanted everyone to write on the index cards what they needed for the day to go well. He acknowledged that these cards had not been discussed in the plans for Day 2, but he felt that it was important for motivating the group and getting everyone on the same page for the day.

People looked confused, he gave the example of "allowing everyone, even quiet people, to talk more." People began writing and at the same time having side conversations with their neighbors sharing their thoughts on the activity. Irene collected these cards. She asked, Rosa, who was volunteering at the sign-in table and who spoke Spanish if she would help her read through the cards. Irene separated the cards between Spanish and English and gave the Spanish cards to Rosa. Rosa asked Irene "Do we pick those that are the most radical or are we just looking for general themes?" Irene, did not really know but responded, "I am not sure, so I would say both." Irene and Rosa read through the responses outside the auditorium. They took notes on some of the common themes and some of the most extreme statements.

While Irene and Rosa were compiling the information on the cards, Norman was presenting his synthesis. Norman pulled up a PowerPoint on the projector and photos from Day 1 appeared on the screen. Norman's next slide was titled, "What themes emerged last Friday?" There was a picture of Maria, the director of a health nonprofit, talking on the microphone. Overlaid on this picture were the words: family, immigration reform, safety, education, housing and jobs. "But what were people saying about these issues?" Norman asked. The next slides had photos of Day 1 participants with the following quotes:

> *Social change happens in circles like these.*
>
> *Central Santa Centro may be poor, but there is a wealth of people dedicated to improving their community and the lives of their neighbors.*
>
> *Our community is organized, energized and has been doing "community change" for decades.*
>
> *Family is the Heart of Santa Centro. Family is the Heart of Change.*

Norman was linking people's words to the themes. For example he highlighted safety with resident words on safety like "We want to be safe from Gangs, Drugs, Crime, Mistreatment and Neglect by police, Harassment and Deportation by ICE." "Safety is everyone's responsibility" was at the bottom of that slide. Audience members were nodding their heads as he went through each of the themes. Serena whispered to the resident next to her and pointed to herself indicating those were her words up there. Norman then said, "There *are* barriers to achieving these things" and people nodded. Then he clicked to his last slide and said, "But, success will come from sustained involvement and residents put it best last Friday when they said 'Getting our friends, family and neighbors to talk about these issues is the first step we must all take.'"

Irene and Rosa were outside the auditorium reading and synthesizing the input from the index cards. Lillian came out a few times to ask if they were done yet. Irene read what themes she was seeing to Rosa to see if she was seeing the same things or if Rosa had anything to add. They compiled their syntheses onto a piece of paper, and Irene ran the synthesis in to Lillian. Norman was still up front explaining what he did to summarize the resident voices. Lillian gave the synthesis to Tim who was standing off to the side of where Norman was presenting his slideshow.

Tim thanked Norman for his presentation and all his work and announced that he was going to go over what people said they needed for the day to be as productive as possible. Tim reported the following:
- Actively listen
- Be respectful and open to others' views as everyone is informed by their own unique life experience
- Be patient and take all concerns seriously
- Challenge self to participate and speak up more
- Think critically and ask question – feel comfortable doing this
- Be less critical of process
- Be mindful of the time that you take and time group spends on ideas
- Ask for clarification not assuming what speaker may mean
- Try to relate own experience to those conveyed by others
- Be a voice for the experience of the community
- Be more involved in the process, trust the process
- Work as a group and support group
- Commit to speak up for those who are being over run

Tim said, "Some people said they are still too shy to speak, and they would like people who have experience to speak in public to teach us to speak the right way to our community. We need to really listen to what the community is saying, so community stories are not overlooked."

Lillian explained that next they were going to go over the 10 outcomes and if there are any questions about The Foundation or The Community Change Initiative in general. After that she would review the voting and the affirmative topics discussed in Day 1, "then depending

on where we get with the affirmative topics, we will then move into the training portion of the day." She said, "We want to prepare people to talk about the outcomes and The Community Change Initiative with their neighbors in interviews, focus groups or using other methods like world café. And it was mentioned in the feedback that people were expecting training in being able to talk about The Foundation's Community Change Initiative with their neighbors. This is a part of our group effort to engage more residents too, so it is very important."

Then Eduardo, a resident, raised his hand. He had just been discussing something with the residents sitting near him. Lillian said, "Yes do you have a question? Go ahead." He responded, "I still don't understand where we are supposed to be going with this? It is not clear what you want from us? Or what we are creating. I am a teacher and when I assign my kids homework or a paper I give them a template, do you have a template we are working towards?"

Lillian and Tim looked at each other. Tim responded, "We want this to be a process that is not constrained by preconceived notions of what it should look like." Eduardo responded, "but it is really hard to know what to talk about when we don't know why." Lillian chimed in, "We will be doing some trainings on how we need to write the plan, but the Foundation is still developing those materials and trainings. Tabitha, our plan writing consultant, is an expert in strategic planning with projects like this." Tabitha stood up and waved. Lillian assured the group, "we will get there but right now we are more in a discovery phase."

Tim said, "Now we are going to break into groups based on the outcomes, everyone needs to choose one group to work with." A resident asked, "What are the groups?" Tim responded "we are not going to break out by the topics you voted on but go back to the outcome groups to work on those more. If a group is too large we can make two groups so everyone gets a chance to participate." Tim continued to explain the instructions. "Each participant needs to choose a group and then choose roles like who is going to be the timekeeper, reporter and meaning maker or facilitator." Tabitha and Lillian had created handouts that explained how-to do these tasks. She pointed to the table in the back where the handouts were in stacks. Tim continued, "So what you need to do in your groups is brainstorm ideas and discuss how the 10 outcomes relate to one another." Participants got up deciding and sharing which group they were going to, picking up the handouts and then headed outside the auditorium to find the table and group they wanted to discuss.

The tables were more spread out than on Day 1 because some of the feedback had indicated that people could not hear each other because the groups were too close together. The economic justice (Outcome 8) group was the largest. The conversation began with Lenny saying, "you know what really irks me and what my organization is concerned about is how there are no good jobs that provide living wages in Santa Centro."

After forty-five minutes Tim and Lillian came round to say time was up. After they walked away, a resident youth who was not there on Day 1 commented, "I can't believe they expect us to have these deep, important conversations in such a short amount of time." Another person said, "yeah this happened last time too, we are talking about people's livelihood

here, we have to get to the root causes." The groups reconvened in the auditorium and reported out. It was already lunchtime, so Lillian announced they would do the second outcome breakout group after lunch.

After lunch and the second outcome-group breakout session, Lillian announced that, "we want to make sure that we also give you some skills to take home to have these conversations and engage more residents. So we are going to try and squeeze in two sessions in the afternoon so people can learn two skills. Tabitha will be doing the session on focus groups and recording, I will be doing sessions on dialoguing and conversation leader training and Tim will be doing training on working with large groups." At the end of the two sessions, Tabitha, Lillian and Tim asked participants to write on their group's flipchart "their commitment" whether this was discussing it with neighbors, hosting an event for their child's PTA or for organizations to do larger events with their clients. Participants wrote commitments up on the flipcharts and Tim asked everyone to reconvene in the auditorium it was almost time to leave. He asked people to fill out evaluations again and mentioned that there would be future trainings on the initiative and these skills in upcoming weeks at night for those who could not attend. Tim asked everyone to come together and stand in a circle and hold hands. He told everyone to say something or do something that expressed how he or she was feeling. Many people made comments of gratitude, and inspiration; many people said, "Si se puede" or "Yes we can!"

In the next Steering Committee meeting participants reflected on Define and Discover. At that point, they decided not to continue with Tim as a facilitator. Many people mentioned how much they appreciated and liked Norman's presentation of their conversations. Their words constituted the themes. A resident expressed that the Steering Committee needs to make a decision and come out and meet the community, get to know the community "we are not a statistic. Norman's presentation shows that, but we need to keep that up." Residents expressed frustration that at every meeting there is a lot of repetition, and it is a waste of time. They reported that the community is creating their own discussion group because they were not included in the Steering Committee discussion. At the same time residents were frustrated by the rigidity of the agenda, Eduardo said, "stop being so strict with an agenda, we are talking about our lives and OUR community. The power should rest with the community residents."

Norman, Chris and Irene met independently to discuss the importance of continuing to capture the stories so resident voices could have direct influence on the plan. They discussed how they could make this happen beyond Define and Discover, collecting resident stories at every meeting big and small that would be happening over the next few months of planning. Irene felt that the frustration of repetitive conversations could also be helped through creating a more rigorous note taking system. She and Norman discussed setting this up with Lillian before Define and Discover and their were notetakers at the meetings, but Norman, Chris and Irene were thinking this needed to be more organized to cover the array of meetings, big and small, that were going to happen over the next few months. This note taking system could trace what had been said before and hold the process accountable to resident voices and at the same time help the process move forward. This process was called "Visions and Voices."

The Data and Evaluation Committee met a week after Day 2 of Define and Discover and Chris, Norman and Irene presented a formalized version of what Norman did in Day 2 calling it "the recorder process" or "Visions and Voices." Standing in front of a screen where his PowerPoint presentation was projecting, Chris proposed the process. "We have the potential to do something *different* and *very* important. By having note takers at every meeting we can create a qualitative database for our planning process. Through this we can ensure that resident voices are incorporated *and* drive the plan." He proposed that Irene would convene a group of graduate students from the local university, where she was in graduate school, to attend and take notes at each meeting. Norman and Irene would put the notes into Atlas.ti qualitative software and code the transcripts for key themes based on the words of the residents. The committee members were all impressed by the presentation and eager for Visions and Voices to be a part of the data in Santa Centro Community Change Initiative. (Data and Evaluation Subcommittee, 2009).

Visions and Voices would be publicly available through the Santa Centro Community Change Initiative website. Lillian explained that "these notes will be shared with people who missed meetings and also stored by us (the lead agency) for archival purposes. Flora will also post them on the website so we are being as transparent as possible." Norman pointed out that Visions and Voices would also help provide summaries of the work done in previous meetings at the beginning of each meeting. In this way, "we are building off previous conversations and privileging resident voices."

Having a recorder at every meeting, getting the notes typed up, translated and posted was a time and resource intensive task. Lillian and Irene met one morning at a local coffee shop to discuss more of the details of the recorders and
agreed to pay students a small stipend. Lillian told Irene she was "still working on the training materials for the recorders with our planning consultant, but have finalized the call for recorders and will email it to you so you can start recruiting." Irene sent out the
"Call for Recorders" (see Figure 1) via email and listserves. She also posted the flyer around the university campus. Norman reached out to his fellow students. He was in a medical training program that focused on primary care in the Latino Community, so this work fit very well with its mission. Irene heard back from a number of students. Chris, Norman and Irene planned a meeting on campus to bring all interested students to tell them about Santa Centro Community Change Initiative and what they were trying to achieve by doing the recording process. "Your role as a recorder is to make sure *everyone's* voice is captured in the meetings, the residents as well as the organizational representative. This is particularly important because, at this point, there are more organizational representatives than residents." One graduate student asked,

"so should I participate in the meeting or am I *allowed to*?" "Good question," Irene said. "Well, what I have been doing is taking more of a backseat at first and just taking notes. This is not a hard and fast rule as you may be asked for your opinion or have something to offer to the conversation but hopefully this does not detract from your recording task or does not skew the conversation toward technical expertise. We want the residents to feel comfortable participating and not be excluded, so even if you don't intend to, feeding into an organization-only conversation may perpetuate that exclusion. Your actions matter so we need to reflect on ourselves as researchers." The students nodded. Some students were more excited by the description of the project, nodding their heads. Irene asked, "are there any outcomes that are particularly interesting for you, for your research? We may be able match you up as the recorder for that outcome-group." Students raised their hand and said which ones they were interested in. From this meeting a core group of about 10 graduate students committed to being involved. Irene felt like this recording process was going to make a difference to help integrate resident voices into the plan.

Implementing Note Taking

From this point on Irene aimed to have a recorder at each meeting. Lillian or a steering committee member would let her know about a meeting and she would email her list of students to see if someone could attend. It was a first-come first serve basis. Some students committed to standing meetings of outcome-groups. Note takers would email Irene the notes after the meeting, and she would email them to Norman, Lillian and Flora.

One day, a member of an outcome-group asked Irene in an email, "Can you see if the university representative could give us a good cultural mix of the students?" Irene felt her stomach sink. She thought, "Oh no, *they* don't want *us* involved." She emailed Gail the recorder from the group to ask about this and Gail expressed that she felt that "a white-female notetaker like herself was not wanted" (Gail, personal communication, September 14, 2009). Irene *had* only outreached to the university students. Moreover, she knew about community based participatory research and knew her outreach hadn't been good enough. Recorders should be community residents too, but she did not yet have the connections to set that up.

Irene was not sure how to handle this situation. She worried that she might have offended someone. She realized that *how* the recorders were organized had not been explained to everyone who was now seeing recorders at their meetings, and she emailed the member of outcome 8 with that information. He responded that it was not a personal attack on the current note taker but he would be interested in "getting more Latino/Mexicano students participating" (Jose, personal communication, September 15, 2009). Irene was relieved and she emailed back, "This is important to me as well. Let's be in touch about how we can work together to see if we can make the recorder pool more diverse and representative of the community it is working in. Let me know if you have any ideas as I am relatively new to Santa Centro" (Irene, personal communication, September 15, 2009).

Irene had recently learned through conversations with other members of this outcome-

group that it was going through a leadership struggle as to who was the chair of the group. This group had three people vying to lead the group because each one did not trust their voice would be heard nor would the other two best represent the community. One of the three said "I am concerned that the current tension and power struggle that exists in the group is impeding our work together. At the very least it has created a working environment that lacks trust. My fear is that if we don't name it and resolve this now, it will ultimately make our work together impossible. I'm not sure that simply reassigning the communication duties is enough" (Wendy, email September 14, 2009). In a later conversation, Chris pointed out that this struggle as well as the concern over recorder representation "reflected the overall tension about representation in the process" (Chris, personal communication, September 15, 2009).

Over the next couple of weeks, Irene attended meetings, met people and discussed the recording. She learned of interns, employees and made connections with the participating organizations for potential local and Latino recorders. Sometimes she would learn after the fact that someone had been a recorder for a meeting and then she would add him or her to her list of people to call when there was a meeting that needed a recorder. Some recorders did not have email so she would communicate with them by phone or through personal contacts to see if they could record.

More challenges and opportunities for resident inclusion

Lillian realized that the schedule of events initially planned would have to be pushed back. Even after implementing the note taking, tension over how to represent the community continued to be an issue that required a lot of time and effort. It was mid-September and people were still figuring out how to meet in their outcome-groups. The Strategic Stakeholder Summit did not seem like a possibility in less than a month. The Foundation moved back the initial deadline to submit the plan from December to January. Santa Centro was not the only city that was having a hard time meeting the Foundation's initial schedule.

At the mid-September Steering committee meeting Richard, the new Foundation Program Officer for Santa Centro, officially started working with Santa Centro. The program officer acted as a liaison between the local city and the Foundation. At this meeting, the Community Engagement Subcommittee reported a recommended outreach strategy to engage more residents. They suggested doing a door-to-door campaign to talk with 9,000 residents (about 10% of the target population) about what they wanted for their community. The questions designed in collaboration with the Data and Evaluation Subcommittee were two open-ended questions that aimed at starting a conversation:

1. What does a healthy community look like for you?
2. How can we achieve it?

This information would be folded into the "Visions and Voices" (the qualitative database) by Norman so that more residents' voices made it into the plan.

Chris and Norman also presented "Visions and Voices" to the Steering Committee at this meeting. They described it as a data collection process that "aims to accurately record, represent and interpret the ideas and visions of Santa Centro residents and stakeholders in order to inform the Community Plan." They emphasized how community engagement activities such as large events in schools or churches, the door-to-door campaign and smaller living room conversations will result in qualitative data and noted that to ensure adequate representation, each type of community engagement activity must have a recorder. They described Irene's process for recruiting recorders and making sure each meeting has a recorder, and noted that if Irene has not provided a recorder, then the lead or facilitator should ask someone to document discussion in writing and forward information the information to Chris or Norman. "We will be working with the Community Engagement Subcommittee so hopefully that will be easy." He pointed out that outcome-groups will also be recording their discussions. "The Goal is that qualitative data from all community engagement activities and outcome-group discussions will inform the strategic plan."

Norman explained that the data analysis process would be simultaneous with community engagement activities. Then, he put an example of "tag cloud" up on the screen, it was a compilation of the words he synthesized from Define and Discover (see example below). He explained that this "tag cloud" was just one way that the software they were using enabled them to present the information.

A resident commented on Visions of Voices saying, "Data should show what is already happening and what is needed." Another participant said, "At the beginning of each Steering Committee meeting, we should receive a report on data collection." Norman agreed. Other residents said, "But everything must be translated into Spanish and we need to have Spanish language meetings for residents."

Concern about how the plan would reflect conversations reemerged at the next Steering Committee meeting. This meeting focused on who was going to write the plan. A committee member said, "the language of the plan needs to be simplified for residents to be able to participate and hold the plan accountable down the road." It was suggested that the Community Engagement Subcommittee nominate resident representatives so that the group writing the plan included the consultant, organizational representatives and residents. A participant also recommended that this group report back regularly to the

Steering Committee. The Steering Committee voted and agreed by consensus that residents needed to be a part of the plan writing committee and that the plan writing committee would report regularly to the Steering Committee.

Increased community inclusion and a plan for the plan.

At the Steering Committee meeting in the beginning of November, the room was laid out so that in the front of the room tables were set up in a "U-shape" for steering committee members. In the back, tables were clustered together for people who were not on the Steering Committee but who attended these meetings. David, a director of a local organization, was chairing the meeting because Lillian had decided that it was a good idea to rotate this responsibility after Tim left. Lillian was standing in front to the side near the sign-in sheets. People who were not on the steering committee chatted in the back of the room. David welcomed people and announced that the strategic planning and strategic stakeholder summit would be postponed.

Then, Oliver raised his hand, stood up and said, "We need to pause and not move forward with, we need to focus on the fact that residents especially youth are still not meaningfully engaged in the process!" Lillian's face went blank. She said "ok." Samuel, Lillian's boss, came up to the front of the room to try and help her answer questions and assuage the crowd. Then other people started speaking out describing how they agreed with Oliver. One organizational representative suggested requiring more residents on the steering committee. Another organizational representative said, "Yes they should be running it." Another organizational leader said, "Because it is their process, not ours!" The conversation continued along these lines and came to a general conclusion that more changes needed to be made to increase resident representation in the process.

The Steering Committee decided that they would ask the Foundation to extend the deadline to mid May. The discussion continued to focus on resident engagement and some important decisions were made including:
- Residents would serve as co-chairs of each outcome-group, with the Community Engagement Subcommittee providing assistance as needed in identifying and engaging residents for this role.
- The Community Engagement Subcommittee would meet with outcome-group leaders to consider additional strategies to involve residents and youth in a meaningful way. Outcome groups selected one organizational representative and one resident representative to lead the group. Their responsibilities consisted of communicating with group members, scheduling meetings, preparing agendas and communicating to the Steering Committee and reporting out at Steering Committee meetings as needed.
- The Steering Committee meetings will take place at a time that is more accessible to residents. It was decided meetings would be on the first Tuesday of the month from 6 pm to 8 pm, and the third Saturday of the month from 9:30 am to 11:30 am and that childcare would be provided.
- Steering Committee members will visit the Target Area so that organizations get to know the neighborhood and the residents.

- Simultaneous English/Spanish translation will be provided at Steering Committee meetings by two of the organizations, one providing the volunteer interpreters and the other the equipment.
- Public comments at Steering Committee meetings will take place at the beginning of the meeting and before decisions are made.

Following this meeting Richard, the Foundation Program Officer for Santa Centro, sent the Steering Committee an email. He suggested that, in light of the request for an extension, it is important to assess the collaborative effort. He said that the universal commitment to improving the health and wellbeing of Central Santa Centro's children and families was clear at the meetings he attended, but that it was *not yet* clear how the group was going to act on that commitment (Richard, personal communication, November 10, 2009). He suggested creating a "plan for the plan." "It is a hard task but Santa Centro has residents with deep understanding and insights into their community, nonprofit, school, and government agency leaders with experience working on tough problems, and several consultants with particular expertise in planning and facilitation. Everyone has good ideas on a range of solutions and changes that will help improve central Santa Centro. What we need now is the roadmap for how the process all fits together." He also "noted during last week's Steering Committee meeting, there also is a need for more deliberate engagement of community residents (especially youth) in the Community Change Initiative planning in central Santa Centro" (Richard, personal communication, November 10, 2009).

Richard suggested that the lead agency change their budget to accommodate for this short-term project of "planning for the plan." He proposed establishing an 8-member workgroup comprised of Steering Committee members to draft the "plan for the plan." The plan for the plan" would specify, "the timeline, activities, sequencing, staffing, and budget needed to deliver the plan to the Foundation by May 15." This group of 8 would report their recommendations back to the Steering Committee. Richard said that he would "make myself available to the workgroup for information and support." He proposed that people nominate themselves via e-mail to Lillian and then all nominees could be voted on using an on-line voting system. The 8 members receiving the highest number of votes would constitute the workgroup. Richard specified that at least 3 of the 8 members must be central Santa Centro residents. He acknowledged that this compressed approach was not ideal but was necessary in part to keep pace with the 13 other cities that are writing plans and because the budget changes needed to be in before the end of the Foundation's fiscal year.

The nominating and voting process proceeded as Richard proposed. At the Steering Committee meeting a few days later, the "plan for the plan" was reviewed and the elected group was announced. Two people had tied, so 9 names were announced. May raised her hand and told the steering committee that she and other county employees were not able to vote because their computer firewall blocked the voting software. Lillian asked if there should be another vote right now? Then Chris asked, "Are you happy with the group as it stands?" May did not respond, but appeared to want to vote. Lillian's boss, Samuel, was facilitating that meeting, but Lillian came up to the front at this time. She suggested that we

allow the individuals that were left out to vote now "so that we can be inclusive." The county employees wrote their votes on pieces of paper and then handed them to Lillian. Before this vote there was tie between two people, resulting in a 9-member committee. The vote broke the tie and 8 members were selected, 3 residents and 5 organizational representatives.

The 8 members of the Plan for the Plan Committee met intensely for the next few weeks and over the Thanksgiving Holiday. In the December 1st Steering Committee meeting the recommendations for the "plan to the plan" were presented. First was a reorganization of the Steering Committee so that two-thirds of the Steering Committee was residents. Second, a new lead agency would be selected through a voting process. A call for applicants would go out and applying organizations would do a presentation at the next Steering Committee meeting. The decision would be made by a vote of the Steering Committee members. The third recommendation was to hire Norman to oversee the data portion of the planning process. He was available full time, taking a year off from medical school and there was support to continue the recording process and subsequent building of the Visions and Voices.

All of these suggestions were accepted by the Steering Committee. Oliver stood up and said, "It is more than having residents at meetings." An organizational representative said, "we have to figure out how to make the plan accountable to residents." John, one of the organizational representatives in the "Plan for the Plan", agreed, he said, "you are right and we need to keep coming back to this, we are all figuring this out as we go and the eight of us have just starting the ball rolling. Accountability needs to be a part of our plan." A new lead agency would be selected. Data management for Visions and Voices became a funded position and Norman was hired. The steering committee would be reconstituted and most of the members were adult and youth residents.

At the next meeting in December, the "plan for the plan" was fleshed out more. Three organizations made presentations to be the new lead agency. The Steering Committee members placed their votes by writing them down on a ballot. These were collected and counted at the meeting.

As the votes were being counted, the meeting continued. Two organizational representatives, Joe and David discussed the other recommendations by the "plan for the plan." David said, "The plan for the plan working group sought to create a structure that included more residents. We agreed that the recommendation should be for a larger steering committee that created a space for resident leaders to meet separately, youth leaders to meet separately and organizational leaders to meet separately. Then, all three groups could come together as the Steering Committee to talk about the plan as a unified group." The reasoning behind this suggestion was that that the Steering Committee had become so large that it was difficult for everyone to participate and hard to get work done during the meetings, but it was still important for them to meet all together to report on what they had done in their smaller groups and also to vote.

Joe said "we realized that the Steering Committee has already invested a great deal of time and effort into this initiative and it would be difficult at this late stage to bring in outsiders to facilitate the completion of the plan. As the Steering Committee members have gotten to know each other, we've been able to identify skill sets and leverage this process. The idea is to reallocate some of the resources to invest in those folks who were taking on heavy loads on a volunteer basis. As paid contractors, there is accountability." The group of 8 recommended having paid facilitators for the resident, youth and organization parts of the Steering Committees. These facilitators would also be part of a facilitation team and meet regularly to discuss what is going on in each group and make sure each group is moving forward together. Finally, they suggested that outcome-groups would continue to meet.

At the end of the meeting the new lead agency was announced. It was an organization that was already involved in the process. The choice felt like an acknowledgement of the work this organization had already put into the process and of the process that the group was developing together.

Later that year the data team created a series of presentations summarizing the Visions and Voices around 6 themes relevant to discussions around the outcomes: Health, Education, Safety, Economic Justice, Immigration and Community Engagement. The Data Team worked with the various facilitators to plan the presentations with each steering committee (resident, youth and organization). The aim of the presentation was to facilitate discussion of strategies, priorities and what is already working in the community by the facilitators. These discussions were recorded and then fed back at the next respective Steering Committee meeting. These discussions provided information on strategies, assets and goals needed for the plan. Over the next few months the participants continued to discuss and refine how they worked with one another and how the plan would be completed. In June 2010 the plan was presented at a large community event. Over 200 residents attended to show their support of the plan.

Questions:
I. **This case shows many examples of tough choices between attending to the feedback from the community or sticking to the guidelines and timeframe.**
a. What did participants or organizers do that demonstrated that the community is more important than sticking to the plan?
b. What was gained by saying community is more important than sticking to the plan?
c. What was at risk by asking for an extension in submitting the plan?
d. What are the pros and cons of making sure residents and organizations are included?

II. By saying community is more important, tense situations and frustrations around resident representation are engaged with and not dismissed in order to meet deadlines.
a. What were the frustrations and tensions in this case?
b. What were some ways of dealing with the frustrations and tensions?
c. Brainstorm some other ways not seen in the case and explain how you came up with those methods.
d. Do you think what they did in this case is appropriate?

III. As a public manager or organizer it can be difficult to hear complaints. For Irene, her stomach sank when she was told her notetakers were not representative enough of the community. For the group on the conference call after Define and Discover day one, they faced a lot of feedback from residents.
a.   How were these complaints engaged with?
b.   What lessons can you draw from the actions taken to address complaints?
c.   How did the actions develop relationships among the people working on the initiative?

IV. In this case people chose to change the process.
   a.   What are the possible alternatives to changing the process?
   b.   What are the possible consequences (good and bad) to these alternatives?
   c.   Do you think what they did in this case is appropriate?

TEACHING NOTE

This teaching note presents a case summary, major points and strategies for using the case in the classroom. This case is relevant to current public policy, as outside funders ranging from private foundations to the national government increasingly focus their funding on community-based projects and these funders often have clear ideas of how the process should unfold. Thus, students of public management, planning, policy and public health will be working in collaborations and facing situations described in this case. This case pairs well with coursework focused on collaborative governance and management, inclusive management, and community based research methods. Consistent with collaborative management there is no primary protagonist in this case (Crosby, 2010; O'Leary and Bingham 2006). Instead different people played major roles in different parts of this case.

Case Summary:
This teaching case presents resident engagement efforts within a community planning process, Santa Centro Community Change Initiative. The case highlights important junctures in the planning process where barriers to resident inclusion are confronted and presents information about how organizers responded to these junctures. Case participants were torn between sticking to the plan and focusing on community engagement. Ultimately, they embraced organizing and planning not as a linear fixed process but as a live process that is complex, flexible, adaptive and dynamic. This case provides students with the opportunity for thinking critically about engagement in a real life setting.

Major Points:
- Drawing residents into the process involves being open to learning and willing to change.
- Resident engagement is an ongoing process of creating community.
- Differences between organization representatives and residents could be reinforced or redefined by the way the process is managed.
- Not sticking to the plan can be constructively managed and worthwhile.
- Developing a participatory and inclusive community involves a different kind of work than sticking to the plan.

Learning Objectives:
By the end of reading this case students will be able to:
- Understand the value and complexity of resident engagement.
- Recognize that tensions around resident representation are opportunities for learning and change.
- Express the connection between community engagement and community creation.
- Articulate the difference between organizational representatives and residents and how this difference can be reinforced or redefined by the way the process is managed.
- Communicate how not sticking to the plan can be constructively managed and worthwhile.

Teaching This Case:
Ideally, students should have an opportunity to read the case and the recommended readings before class and come prepared with preliminary thoughts.

Part A confronts students with a specific problem, dissatisfaction about resident representation, and helps them identify points of tension. Part A could be taught by itself. The first seven questions at the end of Part A situate the students in the case and ask them to think critically about what unfolded and why the tension and miscommunication occurred. The final question asks students to brainstorm solutions. Part B presents the solutions to these problems found by the participants in our case. These could be summarized for the class if only part A was being taught.

Part B provides much more detail about the ongoing nature of the tensions and the process of developing community through ways of engaging those tensions. It too can stand alone with many examples of tension between community engagement and sticking to the plan.

An effective way to teach Parts A and B together over one class period would be to direct students to read Part A, to answer the questions at the end of Part A on their own, and to read Part B after they have answered the questions. In this way, students have a chance to get background on the case and to try and problem solve on their own. In class students would work in groups to discuss their answer to part A and to develop together answers to the questions in Part B. In addition to brainstorming in a group, the case could be used to role-play, with students taking the parts of organizers and participants. In setting up the role-play it would be important to assign students to be organizers, organizational representatives and residents.

If you have time in the class session before you teach the case, the following exercise works well to provide the students an experience similar to the situation of the participants in the case. The instructor would present the class with the following or similar scenario:

The University has given the Undergraduate Student Government money to improve student health/life. The University has a set amount of money and some outcomes they want to focus on. These include:
1. Increasing recycling
2. Increasing sustainable transportation
3. Reducing drunk driving
4. Reducing smoking
5. Increasing school spirit

They have asked the Undergraduate Student Government to include students in how to achieve these outcomes using the given amount of money. The Undergraduate Student Government is going around classrooms to have discussions with students to do this.

First, present the scenario to the students.

Second, ask students to discuss the outcomes. In large lecture style classrooms have students talk to their neighbors to discuss which is most important to them, why and how

they would achieve the outcome at their university. In smaller classes, have students break into groups based on the outcomes and discuss what achieving the outcome would take at their university.

Third, reconvene the class together and have the class report back their thoughts or each group report out. In the large classroom, you want to get a wide variety of opinions to show that different people prioritize different outcomes. Keep discussion going to demonstrate how hard it is to decide on one outcome. Students will often want to do multiple outcomes not just one. Other concerns about the process or outcomes are also likely to emerge, such as not being able to hear or not having enough time. This reflects what happened in the case and gives the students an opportunity to empathize with the participants.

Fourth, thank the students for their participation, and tell them that, due to time constraints, they need to vote to provide a way to gauge interest and decide which priority to focus on. Explain that the voting will be brought back to the Student Government for their review. Have students vote by raising hands or using clickers if you have them. Tally the votes and announce the top priority. For dramatic purposes, tell the students that this top pick will be relayed to the Student Government.

Finally, discuss with students how they felt the process went. Did it include their ideas? Ask what would have happened if the discussion was not fixed to the outcomes but instead they were asked to discuss *what a healthy student meant to them? Or what quality student life at their university looks like?* When you teach the case, you can then draw parallels between their experience and the case.

Collaboration and Inclusion:
This teaching case would fit well in a management or public policy course that focuses on collaboration and inclusion because the principles of collaborative and inclusive management are evident through this case. The case's critical look at resident representation in community planning processes would be paired well with Quick and Feldman (2011) and Arnstein (1969). Quick and Feldman (2011) distinguish between inclusion and participation emphasizing *how* people participate and focus on inclusive practices. This is in contrast to a large body of the literature on community participation in community planning processes that focuses on who or how many are present (Larson & Lach, 2010) and that recreates and perpetuates fixed and adversarial relationships (Arnstein, 1969).

Collaborative and inclusive management emphasize coproduction of processes and goals and building relationships across boundaries (O'Leary and Bingham, 2006; Quick and Feldman, 2011). In particular, Quick and Feldman (2011) argue that coproduction of the process and content of decision-making, engaging multiple ways of knowing and sustaining temporal openness are important practices for transforming participation into inclusion. This case illustrates these three practices.

Coproducing the process and content of decision making is a central struggle in this case.

The identification of the 4 overarching goals and the 10 outcomes by the funding agency sets the stage for a struggle between organizational representatives, including the facilitators, who take these as a legitimate starting point and the residents who find them at odds with their experience. Should the process move forward with a set agenda based on the 4 overarching goals and the 10 outcomes so that the initiative meets the deadlines imposed by the funding agency or should the discussion be opened so that the community can define what it means to be a "health community?" In contrast to a rational or bureaucratic model of engagement, the inclusive management approach suggests there is no set way to "accomplish" participation and that practices enable the creation of community in the process of addressing significant community problems (Feldman & Khademian, 2000; Feldman & Khademian, 2007). Because there will also be a next problem, it is important not only to solve problems but also to develop practices that create a community that can solve problems together (Feldman, 2010). Ultimately, the case illustrates that building community and creating a plan are not distinct and opposing but are entwined such that the process of planning is a resource for building community and building community provides a strong foundation for the plan (Feldman and Quick, 2009).

Engaging multiple ways of knowing is another principle of collaborative and inclusive management this case demonstrates. Understandings of knowledge and power undergird the discussions of resident participation. The tension between the overlapping and interconnected form of the residents' experiential knowledge and the knowledge of the facilitators and organizational representatives about how to move the process forward and submit a plan are highlighted. Both kinds of expertise are important for the ultimate success of the initiative, but they are not easy to combine and it can appear that one is trying to drive out the other. The case illustrates the potential for coproduction to create opportunities for combining these kinds of expertise. Readings on practice and networked views of power and knowledge would be a good complement to help students see how power and knowledge are created in practice (see Innes & Booher, 2001; Fox, S., 2002; Orlikowski, W., 2002; Nicolini, D., Gherardi, S. & Yanow, D., 2003 for a practice view of knowledge and networked view of power).

Sustaining temporal openness is the final principle of inclusive management illustrated by this case. One of the primary tensions in the case is between sticking to the plan and taking the time to develop community engagement that enhances resident representation over time. Community engagement in the case is an ongoing process and resident representation as neither periodic nor fixed on a particular group of residents. Community of practice scholars, Lave and Wenger (1991) demonstrate that a community does not have a designated place that is the core or periphery, but is always being created and recreated. This view of community contrasts with views of becoming a part of a community as a process of assimilation and re-envisions boundaries and the tensions associated with them as dynamic sites of learning that are open to change as they are engaged with and moved through (Abbott, 1995; Feldman, 2010; Quick and Feldman 2011; Osterlund and Carlile, 2005).

Community Based Research:
This case could also be used in a community based research course or class found in a variety of disciplines including planning, policy and public health. This case demonstrates the creation of a data process that emerges from community needs. Reading articles that demonstrate other projects that use community based research methods (Amy J. Schulz et al., 2001) and well as literature that critiques it (Montoya, M. & Kent, E, 2011) would help students compare what was done in Santa Centro Community Change Initiative with other cases of community-based research.

Community based research methodology is rooted in Freirian (1970) ideas of power and knowledge, and over time has operationalized its practice to be about having community residents driving all aspects of the research endeavor, shifting power from the researchers to the researched. In this teaching case the tension between residents and organizations and the development of "Visions and Voices" is also about knowledge and power. Readings on practice and networked views of power and knowledge would also be helpful in this course or class to help students question assumptions of power and knowledge in community planning process and research approaches (see Innes & Booher, 2001; Fox, S., 2002; Orlikowski, W., 2002; Nicolini, D., Gherardi, S. & Yanow, D., 2003 for a practice view of knowledge and network view of power).

CASE AND TEACHING NOTE REFERENCES

Abbott, Andrew. (1995) Things of Boundaries. Social Research, 62:4 (1995:Winter) p.857 – 882.

Arnstein, S. 1969. A ladder of citizen participation. Journal of the American Institution of Planners 35:216-24.

The California Endowment. (n.d.) The California Endowment: Building Healthy Communities. General format. Retrieved January 21, 2012 from http://www.calendow.org/healthycommunities/pdfs/Ten%20Outcomes.pdf.

Crosby, B. C. (2010). Leading in the Shared-Power World of 2020. Public Administration Review. 70. S1. S69-S77.

Data and Evaluation Subcommittee. (2009, August 28). Santa Centro Community Change Initiative Data and Evaluation Subcommittee. Meeting Minutes.

Fox, S. (2002) Communities of Practice, Foucault and Actor-Network Theory. Journal of Management Studies. 37(6) 853-868.

Feldman, M. S. 2010. Managing the organization of the future. Public Administration Review 70 (S1): S159-63.

Feldman, M. S. and A. M. Khademian. 2000. Managing for inclusion: Balancing control and participation. International Journal of Public Management, 3(2): 149-168.

Feldman, M. S., and A. M. Khademian. 2007. The role of the public manager in inclusion: Creating communities of participation. Governance 20: 305-24.

Feldman, M. S. and K. S. Quick, 2009. Generating resources and energizing frameworks through inclusive public management. *International Public Management Journal* 12(2): 137-71.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Continuum.

Innes, J. E. and Booher, D. E. (2001) Network power in collaborative planning Journal of planning education and research.

Kubisch, A. C., Auspos, P., Brown, P., and Dewar, T. (2010) Voices from the Field III: Lessons and Challenges from Two Decades of Community Change Initiatives. Washington, D.C.: The Aspen Institute.

Larson, Kelli L., and Denise Lach (2010). Equity in Urban Water Governance Through Participatory, Place-Based Approaches. Natural Resources Journal (50) 407-430.

Lave, J., and E. Wenger. (1991) Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Montoya, M. and Kent, E. (2011) Dialogical Action: Moving From Community-Based to Community Driven Participatory Research. Qualitative Health Research. 21 (7) 1000-1111.

Moynihan, D. P. (1969) Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding: Community Action in the War on Poverty. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Nicolini, D., Gherardi, S. and Yanow, D. (2003) Introduction: Toward a Practice-Based View of Knowing and Learning in Organizations In Knowing in Organizations. New York, NY: ME Sharpe Inc. Pp. 3 – 31.

O'Leary, R., and L. B. Bingham, eds. 2009. The collaborative public manager: New ideas for the twenty-first century. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

O'Leary, R., Gerard, C. and Bingham, L. B. (2006). Introduction to the Symposium on Collaborative Public Management. Public Administration Review. Special Issue. 6-8.

Orlikowski, W. (2002) Knowing in Practice: Enacting a Collective Capability in Distributed Organizing. Organization Science. 13(3). 249 – 273.

Osterlund and Carlile (2005) Relations in Practice: Sorting Through Practice Theories on Knowledge Sharing in Complex Organizations. Information Society. 21. 91-107.

Quick, K. S. and Feldman, M. S. (2011) Distinguishing Participation and Inclusion. Journal of Planning Education and Research. 31. 272 – 290.

Santa Centro Community Change Initiative. (2009, July) *Define and Discover.* [Flyer]. Santa Centro, CA: Santa Centro Community Change Initiative.

Santa Centro Community Change Initiative. (2009, August) Define and Discover: Summary of Vote for Topics. Santa Centro, CA: Santa Centro Community Change Initiative.

Schulz, A. J. et al. (2001). The East Side Village Health Worker Partnership: Integrating Research with Action to Reduce Health Disparities. Public Health Reports (116) 548 – 557.

Steering Committee. (2009, December 1). Santa Centro Community Change Initiative Steering Committee Meeting. Meeting Minutes.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). State & county Quickfacts: Santa Centro, CA. Retrieved January 25, 2012, from http://quickfacts.census.gov.

Wang, C. & Burris, M. A. (1994) Empowerment through Photo Novella: Portraits of Participation. *Health Education and Behavior* (21), 171 – 186.

The White House. (2009). Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies: Developing Effective Place-Based Policies for the FY2011 Budget (White House Memorandum August 11, 2009 No. M-09-28). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.