



Citizen Engagement in Montgomery Celebrating Successes and Shaping the Future



MCLA Rain Garden Group

*"As a graduate of the Montgomery Citizens' Leadership Academy
I have another set of friends; I feel more connected
to my community and my government"*

Citizen Engagement in Montgomery Celebrating Successes and Shaping the Future

I.	Introduction and Methodology	2
II.	Articles and Current Research on Citizen Engagement	3
III.	Citizen Engagement Activities Compared to Other Communities	6
IV.	Significant Observations from Stakeholder Interviews.....	12
V.	Measuring Civic Engagement	17
VI.	Suggested Performance Measures	26
VII.	Suggested Improvements to Citizen Engagement Activities	41
VIII.	Conclusion	43
IX.	Documentation and support materials	
	a. Alphabetical listing of sources	44
	b. Stakeholder Interview Questions	46
	c. Key Stakeholder Comments by Question	48
	d. Endnotes and CD containing all referenced sources.....	62



Leaders at the Core of Better Communities

Leadership ICMA Team Members

Laura Allen
Phil Green
Gary Palmer
Amanda Thompson

I. Introduction and Methodology

The City of Montgomery, Ohio, has been systematically expanding and enhancing its efforts to build community engagement since 2005¹. Information received from the 2005 Resident Survey was used to develop goals and implementation steps in the 2006 Strategic Plan. This plan stated that the City's marketing and communication program would be used to "build upon the spirit of trust and cooperation that exists between the government and the community." One strategy listed for achieving this goal was to foster two-way communication between the City and the community.

Since 2005, thirteen new citizen engagement efforts² have been initiated and three existing efforts³ have been revised and enhanced to meet the goal of fostering two-way communication. Clearly, the City Council and staff are committed to engaging citizens in the work of the community through active involvement and support of civic organizations, service clubs, the neighborhood associations, schools, churches and the local government.

In March 2010, the City of Montgomery contracted with the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) to have a Leadership ICMA Team (LICMA Team) do the following evaluation of the City's citizen engagement initiatives:⁴

- Review publications produced by the City of Montgomery and current research on citizen engagement in order to compare Montgomery's activities with leading national practices. Copies of all of the sources referenced are contained on the attached CD disk.
- Compare Montgomery's 17 citizen engagement activities with citizen engagement activities of other jurisdictions in the United States and provide examples of other citizen engagement activities that would enhance Montgomery's current efforts. An extensive matrix of activities by jurisdiction is included in this report.
- Prepare a detailed description of the actual experiences and desires of those involved in citizen engagement programs in Montgomery. In order to compile these practical experiences, stakeholder interviews were held with members of the City Council, City staff and Montgomery residents involved in citizen engagement activities. Significant observations and specific comments from these interviews are detailed later in this report.
- Review literature on performance measurement and develop suggested performance measures that would quantify the impact of Montgomery's current efforts.

The LICMA Team held several meetings with City of Montgomery staff during the first site visit on April 29-30, 2010. Discussion focused on the City's implementation of the High Performance Organization (HPO) model, as well as the City's history of citizen engagement. Twenty-seven stakeholder interviews occurred during this visit.

During the second site visit on May 24-25, 2010, the LICMA Team presented the initial findings from the article review, the citizen engagement activities comparison with other jurisdictions, details from the April interviews, and initial concepts regarding performance measures. The final eleven interviews occurred during this visit. LICMA Team members also participated in a community conversation with approximately twenty Montgomery residents focused on how neighborhoods have changed, the distinctions between community and government, and the stories people would like to tell about Montgomery in 5-10 years.

The final presentation of this report and discussion with the City of Montgomery staff and the Montgomery City Council will be on June 23, 2010.

Key Findings

Each portion of the project had several key findings that are explained in detail throughout this report. In this summary, select findings from each section of the report are highlighted:

1. The City of Montgomery provides a wide range of citizen engagement activities; none of the 29 municipalities surveyed matched the City's efforts in this area. This approach is consistent with the best practices identified by the LICMA Team.
2. The City of Montgomery already collects a significant amount of performance data on citizen engagement through its Resident Survey, program reviews and participant feedback surveys.
3. In the stakeholder interviews, City staff and Council indicated they are supportive of citizen engagement efforts and dedicated to providing excellent customer service. Residents understand and appreciate the City's efforts to build community and unleash the passion and talent of citizens.

"Citizen engagement is getting citizens/residents involved in activities; not necessarily civic, but community activities (home owners assoc., parent-teachers group, school, church)."

II. Articles and Current Research on Citizen Engagement

The LICMA Team completed a thorough review of articles and current research on citizen engagement to compare how Montgomery ranks in terms of best practices in this area. Based on the review of more than 30 publications, the LICMA Team concludes the City of Montgomery:

A. Employs a broader definition of citizen engagement than most organizations:

"Citizen Engagement" typically refers to forums that bring together affected citizens into partnership with decision-makers through a dialog-based process at different points in the policy-development continuum: definition of the problem, policy design, and implementation. More recently the definition has expanded to include social media as a tool as well.⁵

Montgomery is using a broader definition of "getting citizens engaged in the work of the community through active involvement in neighborhood associations, schools, civic organizations, service organizations and local government." Some cities, most notably Carlsbad⁶ and Redwood City in California and Decatur, Georgia, are also focusing on the broader concept of using citizen engagement to build communities.

B. Utilizes a broader and more conceptual goal for citizen engagement than most organizations' goals:

The most commonly cited reasons⁷ for engaging the public are to:

1. Inform and educate the public.
2. Improve government decision-making.
3. Create opportunities for citizens to shape policy.
4. Legitimize government decisions.
5. Involve citizens in monitoring outcomes.
6. Enhance citizen trust in government.

Montgomery's goal is to stimulate the restoration of social fabric or social capital, which is quickly losing ground in America, by fostering interconnections, synergies and accountability among residents and groups without increasing the reliance on local government to build community.

C. Takes an approach to citizen engagement consistent with two key shifts affecting how citizens participate in government world-wide:

1. Shift from information exchange to information processing models of engagement.
2. Shift from citizens as consumers to active shapers of government policies and programs.⁸

Studies have shown that people want the government to involve them on an ongoing basis in setting priorities, defining outcomes and designing services that reflect their needs and preferences. Research indicates when citizens are directly engaged with government, policy and service-level decisions are seen as more legitimate and challenged less frequently, and policy and program initiatives have a greater success rate.⁹ In addition, by actively engaging citizens, research has shown that trust in government increases.¹⁰

D. Makes use of social media in a manner consistent with current trends in citizen engagement:

1. Government openness is central to digital democracy and openness is predicated on improving access to government information. That is well informed citizens are more capable of playing an active role in government. Citizens can make their voices more powerful with well-informed active participation in the policy-making process. Thus, citizens may be empowered via e-mails to elected officials, as well as by debating social issues in digital forums.¹¹
2. Digital democracy need not compete with traditional forums of public debate. Instead, it increases the breadth of citizen engagement and enriches the depth of citizen participation in the public policy process. Digital democracy is quickly providing a direct mechanism for citizens to interact with government and influence the public-policy process. It enriches the democratic process and builds public trust.¹²
3. Three out of four Americans are participating in social media.¹³
4. New information and communication technologies have the potential to shift citizen involvement in public issues away from the shrill, divisive tone that has increasingly dominated the political scene over the past decade to a more deliberative approach.¹⁴

5. Use of technology in civic engagement creates a new set of forums that allow citizen participation on a much larger scale.¹⁵
6. Social media is a cost effective communications tool.¹⁶
7. Social media is a communications challenge not a technology challenge.¹⁷

E. Uses various channels for communication which helps to avoid widening the gap between citizens who can effectively use new communication tools, such as the Internet, and those who cannot:

1. Citizens should be able to provide comments using a number of difference channels, such as websites, email, traditional mail, face to face, over the phone and through social networking sites.¹⁸
2. Citizens who are digitally excluded usually suffer from multiple forms of disadvantage and thus are most in need of personalized and flexible public services.¹⁹
3. Even though the online population is increasingly reflective of communities offline²⁰, there is a gap between citizens who can effectively use new communications tools, such as the Internet, and those who cannot. This means that certain segments of the population are effectively excluded from online deliberations and the excluded populations tend to consist of historically disenfranchised individuals. In addition, the Internet as a communications medium favors individuals with strong writing skills, and these individuals also tend to have greater access to financial resources and education.²¹
4. Gen X (ages 27 - 40) and Gen Y (ages 22 – 26) are more likely to be social media content creators, critics and spectators than Young Boomers (ages 41 – 50), Older Boomers (ages 51 – 61) and Seniors (ages 62 and older).²²

F. Follows many of the key practices identified in articles and research on citizen engagement:

1. Develop a citizen-centric vision of governance.²³
2. Create a strategy²⁴ – define goals.²⁵
3. Tailor services and communications to meet user needs and preferences.²⁶
4. Aim for success in terms of improved service quality and increased citizen trust in government.²⁷
5. Measure results²⁸ – treat feedback as a valuable strategic asset.²⁹

Based on the article review, the LICMA Team identified three additional key practices the City may want to ensure they are doing in their citizen engagement efforts:

1. Think of social media as a marketing campaign, select sites, plan resources and content accordingly³⁰ – be clear and concise when framing issues³¹ and sending messages.³² The City could expand its use of communications plans as a means of developing and tailoring the messages it wishes to send.

2. Strengthen and foster the capacity to innovate by creating a sense of ownership within the workforce.³³ Connecting the City’s adoption of the HPO model with citizen engagement should help address the workforce capacity issue. One example contained in this report is to use the City’s Efficiency and Effectiveness Team to evaluate Open City Hall.
3. Tell them what you did with what they said.³⁴ The Montgomery Bulletin could be used for letting residents know what the City did in response to comments, or the City may find using Twitter and Facebook to be a more effective means of delivering this information.

III. Citizen Engagement Activities Compared to Other Communities

The LICMA Team compared the City of Montgomery’s 17 citizen engagement activities with those of 29 other jurisdictions in the United States. These jurisdictions were selected because they were referenced in the research as actively involved in citizen engagement or they were recipients of grant funding from the Center for Civic Innovation. The data was collected through online searches of each City’s website and follow-up interviews and emails.

The table below summarizes the information from all 30 cities surveyed. The data indicates no other city is providing the same combination of programs.

Citizen Engagement Activities Summary

Montgomery’s Activities	Yes	No
Resident Surveys	96%	4%
Volunteer Program	96%	4%
Newsletter	93%	7%
E-Government Services	93%	7%
Citizens’ Academy	83%	17%
Use of Social Media	80%	20%
Open House on Key Issues	73%	27%
City Information Booths	63%	37%
Business District Association	60%	40%
Community Wellness Initiative	53%	47%
YouTube	50%	50%
Connect Montgomery (formerly Civic Collaborative)	43%	57%
Business Calling Program	40%	60%
Online Forum	36%	64%
New Resident Packets	26%	74%
Community Leadership Forums	17%	83%
Citizens’ Academy Alumni Group	3%	97%

Overall, resident surveys and volunteer programs are used by the vast majority of the cities surveyed (96%), followed closely by newsletters and e-government services, both at 93% and Citizens’ Academies at 83%. The least commonly used activities include mailing welcome

packets to new residents (26%), holding community leadership forums (17%) and maintaining an active Citizens' Academy alumni group (3%). In fact, Montgomery is the only city in this group with an active Citizens' Academy alumni group.

Use of social media is a relatively common citizen engagement activity among the cities surveyed. Twitter and Facebook were the most common social media tools used (80%) followed by YouTube (50%) and online forums (36%).

The following Civic Engagement Activities chart shows the individual jurisdictions and the various citizen engagement programs they currently provide.

Citizen Engagement Activities by City

	Population	Newsletter	Citizens' Academy	CA Alumni Group	Connect Montgomery	Business District Assoc.	Online Forums	Comm. Leadership Forums	E-Government Services	Use of Social Media	Resident Surveys	Open Houses on Key Issues	New Resident Packets	Business Calling Program	YouTube	City Information Booths	Volunteer Program	Comm. Wellness Initiative
Montgomery, OH	10,000	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Alachua County, FL ³⁵	218,000	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Alpharetta, GA ³⁶	50,000	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Amesbury, MA ³⁷	16,000	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Ankeny, IA ³⁸	42,000	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Austin, TX ³⁹	27,000	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Bellevue, WA ⁴⁰	120,000	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Carlsbad, CA	105,000	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Chattanooga, TN ⁴¹	170,000	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Decatur, GA ⁴²	18,000	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Derby, KS ⁴³	23,000	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Duluth, MN ⁴⁴	84,000	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Eugene, OR ⁴⁵	137,000	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Irving, TX ⁴⁶	201,000	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lauderhill, FL ⁴⁷	58,000	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Lynchburg, VA ⁴⁸	71,000	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N
N. Las Vegas, NV ⁴⁹	217,000	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
New Bedford, MA ⁵⁰	91,000	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Newport, RI ⁵¹	80,000	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Novi, MI ⁵²	20,000	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Palm Bay, FL ⁵³	101,000	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Redwood City, CA ⁵⁴	75,000	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Saco, ME ⁵⁵	18,000	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Salisbury, NC ⁵⁶	26,000	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Somerville, MA ⁵⁷	77,000	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Springfield, MA ⁵⁸	152,000	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
Stanly County, NC ⁵⁹	60,000	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
University Place, WA ⁶⁰	30,000	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Washington County, MN	201,000	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
West Hartford, CT ⁶¹	64,000	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y

The City of Montgomery asked the LICMA Team to provide examples of citizen engagement activities in other communities that would enhance their current efforts. The LICMA Team has identified the following types of programs and communities for the City’s consideration.

Program A. Speakers Bureau Programs

Example 1. Irving, Texas

Karen Ducote, Office Coordinator, Management Operations
(972) 721-2533 kducote@cityofirving.org
www.ci.irving.tx.us

This Speakers Bureau Program, “Irving Speaks,” was created in 2002 to help achieve the City’s goal to promote effective communication among all members of the community.

A shift in focus to other programs caused this activity to move down the priority list after it was established. The Speakers Bureau Program was revived in 2010 and the City is actively seeking out the civic groups. The City uses the program to get the word out to the community about hot topics such as a new redevelopment project or the expansion of a major highway in the area as well as to provide information on general areas of interest such as code enforcement, fire prevention, and library services. The City has a list of speakers from within the organization and their specific topics. Internally, the list of speakers is called the “Talent Pool,” which consists of department directors, deputy directors, rising stars and anyone who is considered a subject matter expert.

*“Citizen engagement is citizens taking ownership
and taking action
to enhance the community.”*

The City has built relationships with several community groups that frequently call to fill their guest speaker slots in their weekly and monthly meetings (e.g. Rotary). The program is seen as an effective way of getting the City’s message out and a great way to build relationships in the community. The City has a brochure that promotes the program and uses feedback from evaluation forms to modify presentations and to help develop presentations subjects that are requested by the group.

Example 2. Novi, Michigan

Sheryl Walsh, Director of Communications
(248) 735-5628 swalsh@cityofnovi.org
www.cityofnovi.org

The City of Novi Speakers Bureau is a community resource any Novi resident or business partner may pursue. The Speakers Bureau is made up of a variety of City staff and community

leaders who are able to educate on a variety of topics. Requests for speakers can be submitted electronically through the City's website.

Program B. Neighborhood Focus Programs

Two cities in the LICMA Team survey took a neighborhood focused approach to citizen engagement. The details of those programs are:

Example 1. Bellevue, Washington

Cheryl Kuhn, Neighborhood Outreach Manager
(425) 452-6836 ckuhn@bellevuewa.gov
www.ci.bellevue.wa.us

Neighborhood Liaisons

Designed as a way to build stronger neighborhood/City relationships, the Neighborhood Liaison Program operates through a 12-member team of City staff assigned to specific Bellevue neighborhoods. Liaisons are responsible for seeing that citizens in "their" neighborhoods receive the best possible customer service from the City of Bellevue.

Residents can contact their Neighborhood Liaison whenever they want:

- Information and don't know where to find it.
- A connection to City staff or resources.
- To get more involved with their City and neighborhood.
- Advice on influencing City decisions.
- Help resolving a neighborhood issue or concern.
- To form a neighborhood association or re-energize an existing one.

Neighborhood Enhancement Program

The Neighborhood Enhancement Program (NEP) is part of the City's Capital Investment Program (CIP) which includes a budget set aside for NEP projects. Bellevue is divided into 13 Neighborhood Enhancement Program Areas. The NEP funds are divided among the NEP areas according to number of households in each area. Every three years, each NEP area has an opportunity to request projects. When funding becomes available the City mails a newsletter to the NEP area residents, who submit ideas via the enclosed request card or online. The requests for projects are reviewed by City staff for compliance with NEP screening criteria. Project descriptions and cost estimates are presented to residents, and they vote for their top two or three projects. Votes are tallied according to a point system for first, second or third choices. Projects are funded based on the points received and funds available for the area. The City implements the funded projects.

Neighborhood Match

The Neighborhood Match Program offers grants up to \$5,000 for small neighborhood projects when matched by the community in cash, donated professional services, donated materials or volunteer labor. Examples of eligible projects include landscaping and signage for neighborhood entrances, landscaping traffic islands and City rights of way and public art.

From January 1 to March 1, residents anywhere in the City can apply for Neighborhood Match funding for a project. The program is funded at \$50,000 per year. If there are unexpended funds at the end of the application period, additional applications for Match Projects are accepted after March 1.

The City has a list of criteria proposed projects must meet. Each proposed project undergoes evaluation based on a set of guidelines. Projects approved for funding then move on to implementation. The City provides reimbursement up to the grant amount after the neighborhood pays costs upfront.

Little Match

To help boost neighborhood identity and vitality, the City of Bellevue offers Little Match grants, a new part of the Neighborhood Match program. This program has been used to:

- Establish a new neighborhood association.
- Reinvigorate an inactive neighborhood association.
- Increase participation in an established neighborhood association.



Little Match grants (up to \$250) can be used to help fund organizational expenses such as:

- Printing and mailing costs for an initial organizational flyer.
- Room rental and supplies for an organizational meeting.
- Construction of A-frame signs to be placed in strategic locations on meeting dates.

The City evaluates the grant requests based on the following criteria:

- Cooperation – Project brings people together to address issues or build community.
- Sustainable – Project is a one-time expenditure that makes a lasting impact.
- Inclusive – Applicant actively seeks to involve all affected residents in the activities.
- Supported – Project has community leadership and support.
- Feasible – Activity can be completed within budget and on time.
- Relevant – Activity benefits the entire neighborhood.

Little Match funds are available citywide on an annual basis. Neighborhoods may apply only once each calendar year. Applications are accepted until the \$2,500 yearly budget is depleted. Grant requests are reviewed and the results of staff’s analysis are communicated back to applicants within 30 days of receipt.

Example 2. Redwood City, CA

Magda A. González, Deputy City Manager
(650) 780-7302 mgonzalez@redwoodcity.org
www.redwoodcity.org

Neighborhood Liaisons

Neighborhood Liaisons are people who agree to simply meet and talk with a few of their neighbors, have them fill out voluntary contact sheets, and then help get some neighbors together to work on a neighborhood project that the neighbors come up with. A Neighborhood Liaison is also a conduit for periodic information to and from the City. The program provides a convenient and effective way for neighbors to organize around diverse neighborhood issues ranging from disaster preparedness to neighborhood beautification to block parties to whatever the neighbors feel is important for their community.

Through the Neighborhood Liaison program the City offers training – such as neighborhood organizing, leadership development, conflict resolution, emergency preparedness, and more. Using this approach the City hopes to effectively create something that will benefit individuals, families, neighbors, and the community.

The City’s website includes a “Neighborhood Toolbox” to help get the process started, which is reprinted below.

Neighborhood Toolbox

Some Great Ideas for Bringing your Neighbors Together!	Community Improvement Grant Program Application (for block parties, neighborhood gatherings, neighborhood projects, etc.)
Neighborhood Contact Form	Neighborhood Contact Letter (in English & Spanish)
Sample Meeting Agenda	Meeting Facilitation Handout
150 Things to Build Social Capital	Block Party Outline
Redwood City Neighborhood Watch Packet (Bring your neighbors together around Neighborhood Watch!) (Flyer Template & Contact List)	Cool Lifestyle Practices (the first 10 steps for you and your neighbors, excerpted from “Low Carbon Diet” by David Gershon)
Quick Ideas to Reduce Your Carbon Footprint	Redwood City Verde Page (Includes links to lots of other climate protection pages with great ways for you and your neighbors to save water & energy, reduce waste, and save money!)
Redwood City Water Conservation Page	“5 Steps to Resolving Conflict” Neighborhood Toolkit

Community Improvement Grant Program

Redwood City's Community Improvement Grant Program (CIGP) provides small grants for community engagement projects, beautification programs, neighborhood participation activities, or other projects that brings people together and builds community.

There are two levels of Community Improvement grants:

- Smaller neighborhood gathering (e.g. a block party or a pot-luck dinner) - up to \$100.
- More ambitious neighborhood event (e.g. a community clean-up project, large multi-street block party, or a neighborhood newsletter or website) is eligible for a grant of up to \$300.

Program C. Citizen-Centered Strategic Plans

Example 1. Decatur, Georgia

Lyn Menne, Assistant City Manager for Community and Economic Development
(404) 370-4102 lyn.menne@decaturga.com
www.decaturga.com
www.decaturnext.com (Strategic Plan website)

Example 2. Portsmouth, New Hampshire

<http://www.portsmouthlistens.com/>

Both of these example cities utilized the Study Circles process (www.everyday-democracy.org) to engage residents in small group conversations that ultimately resulted in ten-year strategic plans. The discussion guides for the small groups included broad questions like, "What do you hope your City will look like in ten years?" and more specific questions like "What community partners do we need to reduce crime in the community?" The conversations were recorded by facilitators who generated reports that captured the broad themes from the discussion. The community input was used to generate a vision statement for the community, goals and specific action steps to guide the operations of the City and the community over a ten-year time period.

IV. Significant Observations from Stakeholder Interviews

The staff project team selected the thirty-eight stakeholders who were interviewed by the LICMA Team. Interviews were held with four members of the City Council⁶², eighteen City of Montgomery staff members⁶³, and sixteen Montgomery residents⁶⁴ involved in citizen engagement activities. The LICMA Team developed a series of questions for each of the stakeholder groups⁶⁵ and performed the individual interviews. The questions were designed to learn about the experiences of each participant with the City's citizen engagement programs, to determine any trends among each group (Council, staff or resident), and to identify how each participant would define "successful" citizen engagement. The questions also explored the stakeholder's familiarity with the language used to describe the City's citizen engagement goals – phrases such as "social fabric" and "meaningful two-way communication."

The interview responses helped the LICMA Team develop performance measures for the City’s citizen engagement activities as well as provide feedback to City staff on stakeholders’ understanding of the City’s citizen engagement goals. The following is a synopsis of the significant observations made by the thirty-eight individuals interviewed for this study. These comments represent the opinions of the people interviewed. Direct quotes from stakeholders are indicated. More specific comments and quotes, as well as the interview questions, are listed in the documentation and support materials section at the end.

1. How do you define citizen engagement?

The stakeholders interviewed defined citizen engagement in a variety of ways including attending special events, volunteering in the community, being an informed citizen and simply building relationships between residents and City staff. Montgomery Citizens’ Leadership Academy (MCLA) participants had clearly heard the City’s message that community involvement meant more than just working with the City, but included schools, churches, businesses and other civic organizations.

City staff understood that engaging citizens meant listening and responding to concerns as well as partnering with residents to provide City services. In the stakeholders’ own words, citizen engagement is: “Having your voice heard and knowing that it’s understood”; “Citizens taking ownership and taking action to enhance the community”; “The residents being engaged within the City and actually participating in the City.”

2. What are the City’s most effective citizen engagement programs?

Almost everyone interviewed agreed that the most effective program is the Montgomery Citizens’ Leadership Academy (MCLA). Those who had participated in the program stated they learned a lot about the City and City staff through the MCLA program. One participant stated, “I really, really enjoyed MCLA. It’s one thing to be a citizen on the outside and criticize, which I have done. It’s another thing to see the inner workings and be able to hold your tongue before you criticize because you have a better feeling for things.”

Another participant said, “I’m proudest of MCLA, and it has been very successful. It started out as a source for volunteers, but what came from it is educated citizens who are engaged and who want to do more in the community. They may not serve on commissions, but they serve in other critical ways.” Other citizen engagement activities mentioned in the interviews were the Civic Collaborative (now called Connect Montgomery) and the Montgomery Bulletin. As one Council Member said, “The most recognized, and utilized, outreach is the Bulletin. I get feedback all the time about items mentioned in there.”

“Citizen engagement is finding your niche.”

3. What does “building upon the spirit of trust and cooperation that exists between the government and the community” look like to you?

While most of the stakeholders interviewed recognized the importance of trust between government and its community, there were a wide variety of responses regarding the degree to which people trust government. Complicating the issue of “trust in government” is the challenge many citizens have in separating their feelings regarding federal and state government from their feelings regarding local government.

The interviews showed that the important difference-maker for local government is the ability for residents to have a real relationship with local officials. In the interviews, some respondents expressed trust in government because they know the people in government, “I trust people who have been elected because I know them – they are human; if I trust them, I know I can ask them for help.”

Most MCLA alumni expressed their great appreciation and admiration for city council members who took the time to teach and attend sessions of the leadership academy. Knowing personally people at the City and on the Council was a source of comfort to people and enabled them to trust government more.

Several participants also indicated the importance of quality, reliable public services in order to build trust. One said, “It’s not trust in a person so much as trust in things you expect the government to do – if they do what you expect them to do, that builds trust.” The City must also trust its residents. One person said, “Demonstrating trust convinces people to trust.” Another said, “I think trust can be built up by listening to people. You can build trust if you are willing to hear people out, and *not* give people the idea that you are just jumping to a decision or that you already have the decision made and they are just wasting their time.”

Others indicated a lack of trust in government based upon a past experience, “The City has its own agenda; they don’t listen to everything.” When participants were questioned further about any lack of trust they may have, they generally indicated that they were upset about a lack of communication regarding a specific event, or that they were told “no” but were not told why the answer was no.

4. What does “meaningful two-way communication” mean to you?

The stakeholders interviewed understood the concept of meaningful two-way communication as a partnership which involves active participation (speaking) and receptivity (listening). Some participants indicated a connection between this concept and trust in government, with one stakeholder defining meaningful two-way communication as, “establishing trust between residents and their government.”

Stakeholders also indicated an expectation that the City would take the lead in creating opportunities for two-way communication: “The City needs to take the initiative,” and “Trying to find as many outlets as we can to create a feedback loop for getting public opinion, creating a

source for ideas, concerns – if there are those, stimulating conversation either by asking open-ended questions in the Bulletin, driving people to Open City Hall to get their feedback.”

Several residents, all very involved in community service, expressed the idea that the City should also be realistic regarding the desire of citizens for two-way communication with the City: “People are too busy and as long as they are okay with what’s happening they don’t participate.” One MCLA graduate said, “[Meaningful two-way communication] doesn’t mean a lot to me because I think that the citizens want to talk to the government when it’s important for them to talk to the government. On the most part, we’d rather not know they [government] exist. I really think an effective government is one where you don’t know they’re there because you’re happy with how things are. For the most part, I think the City of Montgomery operates that way. I think they do a wonderful job not stirring things up a lot.”

5. What would happen if we were successful?

*“It is
citizens
engaged in
building
community,
making
things
happen and
the
government
is not the
pivot point.”*

In order to help establish performance measures that truly measure the things that matter to Montgomery, participants were asked to describe what would happen in the future that wasn’t currently happening if their community engagement efforts were successful. Some answers were long-term and conceptual: “We would be developing City leaders sufficient for future needs. With all of our community engagement efforts, if we don’t generate enough future leaders, where are they going to come from? Are they going to come from those who have been more negative about our community engagement efforts and the things that create quality of life?”

Other comments were short and specific: “I would know the names of my neighbors.” “There would be an increasing number of people who understand their role as citizen.” “There would be a decrease in the number of people who see government as the answer.”

One participant effectively stated the desire to see citizens empowered and equipped to do significant work for the community: “Regarding the boards and commissions, instead of coming up with ideas and then expecting City staff to do the work, real success would be the boards and commissions not only coming up with ideas but actually doing the work and following through with their ideas, and the staff would be there just as a liaison or consultant to answer questions regarding what can and can’t be done.”

Finally, one MCLA graduate said, “I would like to see more [ethnic] diversity in the programs, as well as age and income diversity. Also, if it were my wildest dreams, every street would have someone who went through MCLA, because I think it’s an eye opener both for the participant and the City.”

6. What would be an appropriate level of resources to allocate towards evaluation?

“You can’t manage what you don’t measure” is an old management adage that is still true and relevant today. The only way to know if a program is getting better or worse is to measure it, and to adjust your management practices accordingly. The LICMA Team was pleased to discover that the City staff and Council Members interviewed understand this principal and are committed to providing sufficient resources to evaluate current and future programs. As one staff member said, “If I spend 1-2 hours writing an article, it would be nice to spend 1-2 hours to know if that [article] made any impact at all.”

Another participant expressed the commitment to evaluation this way, “If you’re going to do it [a program or activity], you have to build in some time to make sure it’s working. I don’t know if it’s a percentage of time or a percentage of dollars spent. As you put a project together, part of the project scope should be, ‘How are we going to evaluate the success of this? What is the feedback loop?’ Hopefully we’ve created a culture of evaluation.”

While specifics were hard to come by, a few made an initial effort. One Council Member suggested, “Maybe 6-10% of the cost of the program, or \$100,000. You have to check to see if what you are doing is effective. If you don’t, it’s a disservice to the money you are spending.”

A word of caution was also extended to not get carried away with hurting programs due to excessive measurement: “Anything worth doing is worth doing poorly, at least for a little while. Start simple [with evaluation], so we don’t get discouraged with data collection.”

7. Avoiding an increasing reliance upon local government to build community.

Based upon the materials provided to the LICMA Team, the City Council and City staff understand the potential danger of *creating* dependence upon local government by actively promoting community engagement. City staff wrote, “The overall challenge became increasingly clear, ‘to foster interconnections, synergies, and accountabilities among residents and groups, without increasing the reliance on local government to build community.’”⁶⁶ Therefore, stakeholders were asked, “How do you know that your community engagement efforts are not increasing the reliance on local government to build community?”

A few participants did not appear to understand the issue, or the caution. But those who did understand the concern were very clear that Montgomery has worked hard to avoid the danger. One MCLA graduate said, “The City is very clear. They will facilitate programs, but that’s it. The citizens run this government.” Another MCLA graduate said, “I don’t think that they’re creating reliance. Quite honestly, I think [they] have done a good job of lighting fires and then getting out of the way – getting things started, then backing away and letting them flourish.”

One Council Member said, “From my perspective, they’re just enabling it, they’re not overdoing it. A number of these [efforts] [the seventeen programs evaluated in the study] are not really pushing citizen engagement; some of it is just City communication, which you have to do. I don’t think, by any means, we’re overdoing it yet – we may be under-doing it.”

8. Memorable Quotes

The entire LICMA Team was impressed with the passion and energy expressed by all of the participants, especially from the MCLA graduates. These committed community servants truly love Montgomery and are excited for the future of the community, despite knowing more about how their local government truly works and the challenges the City faces than most residents understand.

Throughout the interviews several great comments were made and memorable quotes flowed. Here are a few of them:

1. “As a MCLA graduate I have another set of friends; I feel more connected to my community and my government.”
2. “Most people want *less government* on themselves and *more government* on their neighbors!”
3. “When MCLA started I had to fill out a questionnaire. One question was, ‘What’s the difference between a resident and a citizen?’ I really gave it a lot of thought, because I never contemplated if there was a difference. At the first MCLA session that question was raised and one answer was read. I thought, ‘Man, that’s a really good answer.’ And it ended up being mine!” [The answer: “You can find a resident in the phone book. You can find a citizen in the community.”]
4. “You know you have a really engaged community when people see an opportunity that isn’t a ‘crisis’ and they bring the right people to the table and move forward with a program or project.”

V. Measuring Civic Engagement

Introduction

Many communities, nonprofit organizations and academic researchers have tackled the issue of defining and measuring citizen engagement. Although some of Montgomery’s citizen engagement programs are in the early stages of implementation, the City is eager to determine the impact of these programs. The LICMA Team researched the role of performance measurement in citizen engagement, how Montgomery defines citizen engagement and the types of measures and reports other organizations are using to evaluate their citizen engagement efforts.

The LICMA Team was asked to evaluate 17 civic engagement programs that Montgomery is responsible for administering or serves as the convening organization. The team developed performance measures for 5 programs that exemplify the two-way communication desired by the City. These performance measures are designed to provide ongoing information about the efficiency and effectiveness of the City’s citizen engagement programs. Outcome performance measures were also developed that can be used to measure the long-term impact of citizen engagement programs on increasing public trust in government, a resident’s connection to the community and their likelihood to participate in civic activities. Continual emphasis on the

collection and reporting of performance data is consistent with the recommended key practices presented in Section II – F of this report and in the HPO operational model.

Role of Performance Measurement

Performance measures, in this context, are designed to measure the quantity, quality, efficiency and overall impact of the work of the City’s citizen engagement efforts. They provide a platform for evidence-based decision making and help the City know if it is achieving the intended policy goals. The City of Montgomery already operates in a performance management system through the High Performance Organization (HPO) model, which includes strategic planning, data collection, 360 degree evaluations, Resident Surveys and institutionalized feedback loops. It is seeking to extend this same rigor to its citizen engagement programs.

It is helpful to remember that there is not one “perfect” measure that can determine if the city has reached its goal. The true impact of the city’s programs is a summation of multiple measures and perspectives. This concept is best illustrated by the ancient Indian tale of a group of blind men who were asked to report on the nature of an elephant. The man who touched the trunk reported the elephant was thin and flexible. The man who touched the tail reported the elephant was covered in long hair etc. It is only by combining all of their perspectives that the full nature of the elephant is revealed.

The National Performance Management Advisory Commission Framework, the Center for Civic Innovation and the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) have completed a significant amount of study and work into determining what makes a performance measure useful. They are credible, relevant and meaningful to the identified audience, timely and affordable to measure. The measures recommended in this report are consistent with these national standards.

Several types of performance measures are recommended in this report. The ICMA Center for Performance Measurement has provided a concise breakdown of the different types of performance measures. The examples given below for each type of measure are fictional and simply intended to illustrate how each measure could be used.

- Montgomery’s Citizen Engagement Programs**
- Montgomery Citizens’ Leadership Academy (MCLA)
- MCLA Alumni Program
- The Montgomery Civic Collaborative
- Community Leadership Forum
- Volunteer Program/Resident Boards and Commissions
- Open City Hall
- Open House Format
- City Information Booth at Events
- Community Wellness Initiative
- The District Business Association
- Montgomery Bulletin
- E-Gov Services
- Resident Survey
- New Resident Packets
- Business Calling Program
- Montgomery Video and Television Segment
- Social Media

Outcome (Effectiveness) Measures – These measures tell how well a program or service is accomplishing its mission and goals – including effectiveness, quality, cycle time, and citizen satisfaction measures. Outcome measures are:

- Tied to mission and program targets.
- Can be short term, intermediate, long term or end outcomes (ultimate program impact/effect).
- Citizen perceptions – often captured by citizen surveys – often are the ultimate set of outcome measures

Example: Eight-five percent (85%) of residents reported that Montgomery does an excellent job at welcoming citizen involvement.

Outcome measures are influenced by (and determined in part by):

Output Measures – These measures reflect the amount of a service or program provided (which represents completed work activity or effort) expressed in units of service delivered.

Example: The City hosted three (3) information booths at special events advertising volunteer opportunities in 2010.

Efficiency Measures – These measures indicate how well the organization is using or leveraging its resources, expressed as a ratio between the amount of input and the amount of output or outcome.

Example: The cost of one (1) information booth at a special event is \$50. This is determined by the cost of staff/volunteer labor multiplied by the number of hours the information booth was open and the cost printed materials.

Which, in turn, are influenced by (and determined in part by):

Input Measures – These measures include the amount of resources used to produce a program or provide a service, generally expressed in expenditure or labor units. Other types of inputs include the civic support of citizens groups as well as those of business, faith community businesses and other organization in addition to that of the elected leadership.

Example: Inputs for the information booth at special events include: staff time (\$15 per hour), volunteer time (\$10 per hour, in-kind service), printed handouts with volunteer activities (.25 cents per copy), Montgomery logo give away items (\$1 per item).

All of which need to be analyzed in the overall context of:

Descriptors – These provide information about the jurisdiction (e.g. population, median household income, square miles of service area) or the ways services are provided (e.g. volunteer or professional fire department, curb side recycling).

Data Collection Tools

Surveys

- online, in-person, phone, mail
- self-selected or random sample

Examples: the Resident Survey, feedback cards and program evaluation forms.

Focus Groups

- self-selected or random sample

Example: Bring together a group of past MCLA participants to discuss how they learned about the program and why they decided to participate.

Observations

Example: Attending a public meeting and recording the number of civil and uncivil public comments.

Records Review

Example: Budget documents, volunteer service records, E-gov service requests.

Interviews

- scheduled, intercept

Example: Asking attendees about their experience or future desires as they leave a special event or a public meeting.

Example: The City provides an information booth that is staffed by one volunteer and one City staff person three times a year at the largest special events (Bastille Day, the Arts Festival and the Winter Solstice celebration). At the booth, visitors can learn about volunteer opportunities in the community, sign up for an email listserv and pick up a Montgomery logo keychain.

Data Collection & Reporting

There are a variety of data collection tools that can be used to generate performance measures, including surveys, focus groups, interviews, observations, case studies and data gathering. These tools can be used to collect qualitative (descriptions) or quantitative (numbers) data. The City already utilizes a number of these tools through feedback cards, the Resident Survey, eGov statistics and records reviews. It then shares the information that has been collected through articles for the Bulletin, webpages and Annual Reports.

Citizen engagement efforts are commonly evaluated using a combination of surveys and focus groups. Surveys allow the researcher to determine how many people have participated and what perceptions people have about particular organizations or programs. Focus Groups explain the details of why and what happened with institutions and programs.

For each citizen engagement program, the City must consider the appropriate data collection tool to evaluate the intended outcomes. There are advantages and disadvantages to each tool. Staff time and costs vary widely with each tool. The cost of two random sample focus groups facilitated by a marketing professional is approximately \$6,000. This includes the

development of a discussion guide and a report of the discussion results. In comparison, the cost of the National Research Center's random sample survey, the Community Satisfaction Survey, done via mail, is about \$9,900 for a City of 18,000 residents. A good guide on how to conduct focus groups and surveys is available from the Center for Civic Innovation and included in the reference section of this report.

Data collection does not have to be time consuming or expensive. Most of Montgomery's front line employees are ideally suited to administer short surveys or record observations. Volunteers can also be trained to collect data. Most residents will not come to City Hall, but City Hall can come to them.

Montgomery currently has a number of staff involved in collecting data, but staff from all departments could be involved. Examples of City staff that can collect data include:

- Permitting, Inspections and Certificates of Occupancy Staff
- Police Officers
- Recreation Staff

Examples of volunteers who can collect data include:

- Neighborhood Associations
- Members of Connect Montgomery
- Resident Boards and Commissions
- Religious Institutions

Once the data has been collected, it is important to share the results or the story of the work that is happening in the community. The National Performance Management Advisory Commission Framework, the Center for Civic Innovation and the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) have published guidelines on the elements that make a performance report useful. They suggest that performance reports be targeted to a specific audience, produced regularly, accessible through multiple methods/channels, and provide clear, unbiased information.

Sharing the story of the information is essential. As Seth Godin, the author of Tribes, explains:

“People don't believe what you tell them. They rarely believe what you show them. They often believe what their friends tell them. They always believe what they tell themselves. What leaders do: they give people stories they can tell themselves. Stories about the future and about change.”

Montgomery has an opportunity to share its story about citizen engagement. There are a variety of mediums for reporting information, including video, Annual Reports and other written materials, presentations and even signage (think of the United Way's thermometer signs). Reporting is an excellent topic to engage staff and residents through focus groups to determine what type of reporting medium they would be most interested in viewing and creating.

National Definitions and Measures of Citizen Engagement

Many communities, nonprofit organizations and academic researchers have tackled the issue of defining and measuring citizen engagement over the past fifty years. Citizen engagement programs and how they are evaluated include a mixture of nationally recognized indicators, e.g. the percentage of population that voted in the last municipal election; to community based indicators, e.g. how many projects were completed by the neighborhood association. The article “Citizen-Centered Collaborative Public Management” published in the *Public Administration Review* in December 2006 summarizes the types of citizen engagement with government over

the past fifty years and identifies six variables that have been shown to influence a resident's decision to be part of a citizen-centered form of government.

The author(s) Cooper, et al, provide the following definition, "Civic engagement means people participating together for deliberation and collection action within an array of interests, institutions and networks, developing civic identity and involving people in governance processes." They note that over the past fifty years civic engagement efforts have ranged from Adversarial (MoveOn.Org) to Electoral (participation in the electoral process through voting, campaigns, etc.) to Information Exchange (public hearings) to Civil Society (associations, volunteer organizations) to Deliberative (issue-based public forums) to Citizen-Centered Collaborative Public Management.

They identified six variables necessary for citizen engagement:

1. Government trust in citizens – Do the City staff and elected officials trust their citizens to coproduce public goods?
2. Citizen efficacy – I feel I understand government. I think I can influence government.
3. Citizen trust in government – The government is responsive to me. They look out for my interests.
4. Citizen competence – Do citizens understand how the government functions and have skills to contribute to the community?
5. Government responsiveness – Did the government do what it said it was going to do in a timely manner?
6. Government legitimacy – Is the government telling the truth?

Citizen engagement programs should be designed with these variables in mind. For example, the Montgomery Citizens' Leadership Academy increases citizen competence, government trust in citizens and citizens' trust in government. Performance measures are developed to capture public perception around these variables as well.

The LICMA Team found seven organizations that were collecting and reporting data on citizen engagement programs that will be useful for Montgomery's purposes. They include three nonprofit organizations: the National Conference on Citizenship (NCoC), Truckee Meadows Tomorrow, and the Chattanooga Neighborhood Association Council; a state department, Oregon Benchmarks; and three cities, Charlotte, North Carolina, Chattanooga, Tennessee, and Redwood City, California. The organizations are described briefly below and examples of their reports can be found in the appendix. All of the organizations are collecting measures that show changes to the six variables of citizen engagement listed previously.

National Conference on Citizenship

The National Conference on Citizenship (www.ncoc.net) measures, tracks and promotes civic participation across the United States. It publishes the annual Civic Health Index, a quantitative means for building program consensus and measuring success with the goal of strengthening citizenship in America. It also hosts the Annual Conference on Citizenship that brings together leaders in the civic engagement field to set concrete and ambitious goals to promote a more active and involved citizenry.

In the NCoC report “America’s Civic Health Index 2009: Civic Health in Hard Times” they found that:

Millennials lead the way in volunteering with a 43% service rate, compared to only 35% for Baby Boomers. Even within a generation, there are significant differences as 45% of Baby Boomers who are still in the work force volunteer versus only 23% of those who are retired. Additionally, Baby Boomers are engaging in other ways – 38% of Baby Boomers (49% of those in retirement and 33% of those still working) gave food, money or shelter while only 28% of Millennials did the same.

Millennials who use social networking sites for civic causes are also more civically engaged in their communities. Although we cannot conclude that belonging to social networking sites alone causes an increase in civic engagement, those who engage online come from diverse economic and educational backgrounds, illustrating the potential of how technology can bridge traditional civic gaps. Online platforms provide engagement opportunities for many Americans who may not belong to a formal volunteering organization.

Montgomery can use this national survey data to benchmark against their survey data and to inform the design of their engagement programs. The NCoC also provides well researched measures for concepts like “participation” and “trusting other people.”

Truckee Meadows Tomorrow

Truckee Meadows Tomorrow (www.TruckeeMeadowsTomorrow.org) is a non-profit organization that collects regional indicator measures to ensure that the region is maintaining its quality of life. In 1989, the Nevada State Legislature created Regional Planning to ensure that Reno and Sparks were coordinating efforts to manage growth in the Truckee Meadows. A stipulation of Regional Planning was that the residents and organizations in Truckee Meadows must define and monitor the area’s quality of life. The logic was that if they could maintain or improve the area’s quality of life, growth was fine. If they could not maintain it, then regional planners would have to revise their projections until they achieved a sustainable quality of life.

At about the same time, the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN) realized that quality of life mattered to businesses moving into our area. Truckee Meadows Tomorrow (TMT) grew out of an EDAWN committee. Founding members included: EDAWN (initial start-up subcommittee prior to incorporation), Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (initial staff support for start-up and original indicator research), Washoe Education Association (annual contributions consistently above the highest membership levels), and Renown Health/Washoe Medical Center (initial grant funding).

In 1993, TMT incorporated as an independent, nonprofit organization and helped select the area’s quality of life indicators, asking “*What matters most?*” to nearly 4,000 stakeholders. In the fall of 1994, TMT issued a prototype of the Indicators Report, which became the benchmark for our future efforts, reporting on the original 66 indicators. Civic Engagement is one of the

indicators. How TMT defines it is outlined below and the full report is contained in the appendix. The full report shows the results of data collection and the phone survey for each of these areas. The following is an excerpt from the TMT report:

“Civic Engagement Indicator: It’s the essence of democracy, social responsibility / investment in community, stewardship for the future of the community. Our community exhibits a high quality of design that reflects our unique sense of place and culture. Residents are engaged civic participants. We welcome diversity of perspectives, age, gender and orientation, cultures, races and ethnicities in governance that guides our community. Indicators include:

Emergency preparedness: Households with emergency kits and businesses with disaster recovery plans denote stewardship for the future of our families and our community.

Civility and neighborhood pride: Giving your best here and now indicates civic and social connectivity, strengthens inclusion, and provides a sense of pride and community.

Voter turnout: The percentage of eligible citizens registered and casting votes indicates they are invested in our community and see the value in working to make it even better.

Effective government engagement: Civic responsibility includes having the ability to effectively participate in the governing process; while the diversity of elected or appointed members of community boards, councils, commissions, as well as government staff, demonstrate that government is representative of and responsive to our citizens.”

Montgomery can use this example to utilize residents and/or non-profits in the creation and collection of performance measurement data, to benchmark results and as a sample report format.

The Oregon Benchmarks

The Oregon Progress Board (benchmarks.oregon.gov) is an independent board created by the Oregon Legislature in 1990 to monitor the state’s 20-year strategic vision, *Oregon Shines*. The 12 member panel, chaired by the Governor and made up of citizen leaders, reflects the state’s social, ethnic and political diversity. The Progress Board focuses Oregon’s citizens and institutions on a set of quality-of-life measures that gauge progress towards the overall goals of *Oregon Shines*:

- Quality jobs for all Oregonians
- Safe, caring and engaged communities
- Healthy, sustainable surroundings

The measures are called Oregon Benchmarks. The benchmarks include a broad array of up to 100 social, economic and environmental indicators, including K-12 student achievement, per capita income, air quality, crime rates, employment, and community engagement. The Oregon Progress Board collects data through random sample phone surveys conducted state wide to measure shifts in residents’ perceptions and knowledge in different topic areas. In the area of

civic engagement, the indicators include feelings of community, voter turnout, knowledge about the tax system and participation in the arts.

They have an excellent website that allows users to generate reports for specific indicators, explains clearly how data is collected and why certain performance measures are chosen and even shares case studies on how different governments and non-profit organization are using the indicators.

Montgomery can use this example to utilize residents and/or non-profits in the creation of performance measurement data, to benchmark results, to connect citizen engagement to strategic planning efforts and as a sample report format.

Charlotte, North Carolina

The City of Charlotte, North Carolina (www.charmeck.org/charlotte) has three departments (Community Relations, Corporate Communications and Neighborhood and Business Services) that produce annual reports with performance measures and activities related to citizen engagement. Each report does a good job of linking the measures to the City's strategic plan and departmental business plan. To view these reports go to Charlotte's website, to "City Departments", click on the "Budget & Evaluation - City" link, then click on "Performance Measures."

Montgomery can use this example to connect citizen engagement and performance measures to strategic planning and report performance data in a variety of formats.

Chattanooga, Tennessee

The City of Chattanooga, Tennessee has established a Neighborhood Relations department (www.chattanooga.gov/86_NeighborhoodServicesandCommunityDevelopment.htm). The department supports the belief that the real strength of neighborhoods lies in the efforts of residents and community organizations. The staff serves as "Neighborhood Relations Specialists" whose roles are to coordinate interdepartmental efforts to address neighborhood problems, assist neighborhood organizations in addressing community priorities and needs by helping set attainable goals and to promote involvement and foster leadership among concerned citizens through training and development.

They produce a monthly newsletter that is written by the department and by residents. They host an annual neighborhood conference, weekly radio show, directory of neighborhood associations and a neighborhood grant program to implement small improvements, like street sign toppers.

Montgomery can use this example to learn how to use community-wide visioning processes and localized planning processes to establish new policies and partnerships to address problems identified by the community, institutionalize citizen engagement practices through community liaisons and report performance data in a variety of formats.

Chattanooga Neighborhood Association Council

The Chattanooga Neighborhood Association Council (CNAC) (www.cnacouncil.org) was formed in 2001 to represent every neighborhood in Chattanooga as a unified body. The Mayor of Chattanooga at the time, Jon Kinsey, gave \$10,000 seed money to initiate the process of neighborhood leaders coming together to form an organization that dealt with common issues and problems that plague every neighborhood. CNAC has hosted many successful forums, receptions and retreats. They have built a CNAC Kiosk and Website.

This is not directly tied to performance measurement, but it is a similar concept as the Civic Collaborative. Montgomery can use this example to use community wide visioning processes and localized planning processes to establish new policies and partnerships to address problems identified by the community and institutionalize citizen engagement practices through community liaisons.

Redwood City, California

In the 2006-2008 budget, the City Manager's department of Redwood City, California (www.redwoodcity.org) contained a performance measure report on their citizen engagement efforts. The report contains the program goals, objectives and all types of performance measures from inputs to effectiveness measures. It details the results of the Partnership Academy for Community Teamwork (PACT) program, which is similar to the MCLA program.

Montgomery can use this example to benchmark results, to connect citizen engagement to strategic planning efforts and as a sample report format.

VI. Suggested Performance Measures

How Montgomery Defines Citizen Engagement

In this section of the report we will move from national standards and definitions to describe the work Montgomery has completed in defining citizen engagement for its community. The City has chosen to use the Knight Foundation's definition of citizen engagement, which is:

Community Citizen Engagement = Attitudinal Loyalty + Passion

Attitudinal Loyalty is defined as the resident's:

- overall contentment with community
- likelihood to stay in the community
- willingness to recommend the community to others

Passion is defined as the:

- pride and enthusiasm residents have toward their community
- what their outlook for the future is
- how they feel about their place in the community

These six elements are the outcomes the City would hope to achieve through its citizen engagement programs. For example, seeing an increase in resident's willingness to recommend the community to others would be an indicator that the community engagement programs were working as intended. As mentioned earlier, there is not one performance measure that can capture all six of these outcomes. In addition to defining citizen engagement, the City also has a 2006 Strategic Plan goal that asks the government to "...build upon spirit of trust and cooperation that exists between the government and the community." The strategies for achieving this goal include implementing a communications plan, focusing on two-way communication efforts and providing excellent customer service.

Montgomery's Citizen Engagement Performance Measures

Two types of performance measures have been developed for this project: outcome measures and program-specific measures. The LICMA team created measures based upon information obtained in the stakeholder interviews and nationally used and validated performance measures, like those used by the National Conference on Citizenship. The majority of the outcome measures have been developed by the National Research Center (www.n-r-c.com) for their Community Satisfaction Survey. This report also includes measures already developed and collected by the City.

Outcome Measures

These measures tell how well a program or service is accomplishing its mission and goals, including effectiveness and citizen satisfaction measures. The stakeholder interviews revealed that residents and staff in Montgomery evaluate citizen engagement much the same way as the rest of the country. They are concerned about the six variables necessary for citizen engagement.

Six variables necessary for citizen engagement:

1. Government trust in citizens
2. Citizen efficacy
3. Citizen trust in government
4. Citizen competence
5. Government responsiveness
6. Government legitimacy

The measures in this section are outcome measures designed to determine if Montgomery is increasing the feeling of Attitudinal Loyalty and Passion among its residents and business owners. They also indicate collective change caused by the City's entire engagement program versus a specific program. The questions are meant to be used in surveys, interviews or focus groups.

1. Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Montgomery: (Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor)

- Montgomery as a place to live.
- Your neighborhood as a place to live.
- The overall quality of life in Montgomery.

2. **Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Montgomery as a whole: (Excellent, Good, Fair or Poor)**
 - Sense of community.
 - Opportunities to volunteer.
 - Opportunities to participate in community issues.
 - Overall image or reputation of Montgomery.

3. **In the last 12 months, about how many times, if ever, have you or other household members participated in the following activities in Montgomery? (Never, Once or twice, 3 to 12 times, 13 to 26 times, More than 26 times)**
 - Attended a meeting of local elected officials or other local public meeting.
 - Watched a meeting of local elected officials or other local public meeting on cable TV.
 - Read the Montgomery Bulletin.
 - Visited the Montgomery website (montgomeryohio.org).
 - Volunteered your time to some group or activity in Montgomery.
 - Participated in a club or civic group in Montgomery.
 - Provided help to a friend or neighbor.
 - Visited the Open City Hall online forum.

4. **About how often, if at all, do you talk to or visit with your immediate neighbors (people who live in the 10 or 20 households that are closest to you)? (Every day, Several times a week, Several times a month, Once a month, Several times a year, Once a year or less, Never)**

5. **Please rate the following categories of Montgomery government performance: (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor)**
 - The job Montgomery does at welcoming citizen involvement.
 - The job Montgomery does at listening to citizens.
 - The job Montgomery does at providing residents with the information they need to be involved in the community.
 - The job the City Council does at representing the interests of residents.
 - The job the City Commissions do at representing the interests of residents.

6. **Please indicate how likely or unlikely you are to do each of the following: (Very likely, Somewhat likely, Somewhat unlikely, Very unlikely)**
 - Recommend living in Montgomery to someone who asks.
 - Continue to be a Montgomery resident for the next five years.

Customer Service Outcome Measures

1. **Have you had any in-person or phone contact with an employee of the City of Montgomery within the last 12 months (including police, receptionists, planners or any others)?**
 - Yes
 - No

2. **What was your impression of the employee(s) of the City of Montgomery in your most recent contact? (Excellent, Good, Fair Poor)**
 - Knowledge
 - Responsiveness
 - Courtesy
 - Overall Impression

Suggested Outcome Measures from the Stakeholder Interviews

1. **What percentage of residents were engaged in the community last year?**
2. **How would you rate your level of engagement in the community?**

Both of the questions above would require a definition of “engagement” and “level of engagement.” The example organizations/communities in this report provide definitions for engagement.

3. **What is the total annual purchase amount of Montgomery logo items (including Christmas ornament and e-store purchases) by non-employees?**
4. **How many complaints were filed by residents last year? What percentage of those could have been addressed without involvement from the City?**
5. **What is the total number of qualified applicants for open City Council positions?**
The word “qualified” would need to have a common definition.
6. **What was the total number of positive quotes about Montgomery in the local news this year?**

Program-Specific Measures

In addition to outcome measures (broad picture), the City also needs program-specific measures to determine if the engagement activities are achieving the desired goals. In developing program specific measures (e.g. for the Montgomery Citizens’ Leadership Academy), it is important to clearly identify the goals and objectives first. The LICMA Team and City staff chose to focus on five programs that are the strongest forms of two-way communication and build citizen’s capacity for leadership.

The performance measurement plan for each program should include the following details:

- **Description of the Program** - Describe the activities and services the program provides. Identify who staffs and funds the program.
- **Goal for the Program** – Define the goal for the program. A *goal* is a statement of direction, purpose or intent that describes the future state of a condition or result to achieve. What would happen in the future if this program achieved success?
- **Specific Objectives** – An *objective* is a specific result or action that helps indicate if you are reaching your goal.

- Evaluation Tool – Qualitative and Quantitative – The *evaluation tool* is the way you collect information. For example, a survey is an evaluation tool.
- Responsibility and Frequency of the Evaluation – The *responsibility* and *frequency* section outline who will collect and/or report the performance results and how often they will collect/report the results.
- Information Source – The *information sources* identifies the data sources (e.g. class participants, volunteer records).
- Reporting Format – The *reporting format* identifies the type of report that will be generated, keeping in mind the needs and desires of the audience.
- Performance Measures – Measures which look at Outcomes, Outputs, Efficiency Measures, Inputs, and Descriptors to determine if the goal is being met. Efficiency measures can be obtained by dividing the total cost of the service or program by the number of units (hours, items, etc.)

Every program is different and will require a tailored approach based on the goal and the resources the City is willing to spend evaluating their efforts. The City is already capturing a lot of information about its programs and in many cases simply needs to pull it together in one reporting format. Qualitative data (stories and descriptions) are equally important as quantitative data (the numbers) in providing a comprehensive picture of the impact of the City’s programs.

Suggested Performance Measures for Programs that Exemplify Two-Way Communication

Montgomery Citizens’ Leadership Academy

Goal: To increase the willingness and capacity of residents to serve as leaders in the community.

Objective 1: The majority of participants will show an increase in knowledge in the service opportunities available in the community.

Objective 2: Able to fill 100% of the open resident board and commission vacancies within 3 months.

Objective 3: Able to fill 100% of the volunteer requests for support of City services.

Evaluation Tool: Records review, Pre and Post Knowledge tests.

Responsibility and Frequency: Obj. 1 – Communication Coordinator, yearly.
Obj. 2 – Volunteer Coordinator, bi-annually.
Obj. 3 – Volunteer Coordinator, monthly.

Information Source: Class rosters, Commission and Board rosters, volunteer request records.



MCLA rain garden digging

Reporting Format: Written report shared with all participating staff of MCLA, shared with council through Friday update.

Performance Measures:

- The number of participants in MCLA.
- The number of MCLA graduates serving on City boards and commissions.
- The number of MCLA graduates serving on City boards and commissions as a percentage of total residents serving on City boards and commissions.
- The number of MCLA graduates in other leadership roles in the community.
- The number of MCLA class projects completed.
- The percentage of MCLA recruits who are unknown to City staff.
- The number of streets in City that have an MCLA graduate.
- The percentage of streets in the City that have an MCLA graduate.
- The number of staff hours spent on the MCLA program.
- The cost of the staff hours.
- Capacity/Knowledge Test for graduates.
- Narrative description of class projects.

Previously Measured Results

Since its launch in 2008, the MCLA has experienced a variety of successful outcomes, some intended, some not. After the 2010 class has graduated, seventy-seven residents will have completed the Academy. Six new MCLA graduates have filled seats on the City's Boards, Commissions and committees. Five business owners were instrumental in creating a business association, Prosper Montgomery, in downtown Montgomery. One MCLA graduate was elected to City Council.

MCLA Alumni

Goal: Sustain connection between MCLA alumni to City government and each other.

Objective 1: Monthly email sent to MCLA alumni from City including information about special events, activities and issues in the community.

Objective 2: 60% of MCLA alumni attend the annual reunion summit.

Objective 3: MCLA alumni lead a project annually that allows the City to enhance community services and activities (e.g. new resident welcome letters, farmer's market, H1N1 vaccinations).

Evaluation Tool: Records review, observation.

Responsibility and Frequency: Obj. 1 – Communication Coordinator, monthly.
Obj. 2 – Communication Coordinator, annually.
Obj. 3 – Communication Coordinator, annually.

Information Source: E-mail records, meeting rosters (Saturday meetings, farmer's market staffing, service on City teams, volunteers at info booths, welcome team), reunion summit roster, class applications, MCLA roster, annual reunion summit.

Reporting Format: Written report shared at Big Picture meeting.

Performance Measures:

- The number of City staff meetings with alumni.
- The percentage of annual reunion summit attendees as compared to total number of MCLA graduates.
- The number of emails sent by the City to the group.
- The number of staff hours spent on program.
- The cost of those staff hours.
- The number of MCLA alumni led projects completed.
- The number of comments posted by MCLA alumni on Open City Hall.
- The percentage of MCLA alumni comments as compared to the total number of comments posted on Open City Hall.
- Narrative description of projects.

Previously Measured Results

A solid relationship, level of trust and two-way dialogue has been created with the alumni group, and they can be relied upon to volunteer, serve as ambassadors, dispel rumors, and provide valuable input on issues facing the City. Since 2008, MCLA Alumni have filled thirty various vacancies on the City's Boards, Commissions and committees and have volunteered countless hours at events.

Connect Montgomery (formerly Civic Collaborative)

Goal: Increased coordination and use of shared resources by citizen-based service groups that serve the community of Montgomery.

Objective 1: All member organizations are using the Connect Montgomery web site.

Objective 2: Host quarterly meetings with at least 75% of collaborative representatives in attendance at each meeting.

Objective 3: At least three collaborative members will complete one collective project to benefit the community of Montgomery annually.

Evaluation Tool: Records review, observation, surveys, interviews.

Responsibility and Frequency: Obj. 1 – Communication Coordinator, quarterly.
Obj. 2 – Communication Coordinator, quarterly.
Obj. 3 – Communication Coordinator, annually.

Information Source: Collaborative members, Connect Montgomery website, meeting records.

Reporting Format: Verbal report at staff meetings.

Performance Measures:

- The number of staff hours spent on program.
- The cost of those staff hours.
- The number of civic associations involved in collaborative.
- The number of Connect Montgomery meetings annually.
- The percentage of members attending each meeting as compared to the total number of members.
- The number of projects completed by the collaborative (e.g. connectmontgomery.com).
- The number of organizations partnering on the project.
- The length of participation for individual organizations.
- The number of active neighborhood associations. “Active” needs to be defined.
- Narrative description of projects.

Previously Measured Results

It was a huge “aha” moment for these twenty groups to acknowledge that they are facing common problems and challenges. After four meetings, an eight organization beta group has been formed to develop, with a local firm Pop Design Works, ConnectMontgomery.com. With ConnectMontgomery.com, each group will have their own individual page. As groups post information, it will populate a CM homepage. Residents and others will be encouraged to go to the homepage and sign up for an automated monthly newsletter that will be emailed to them. A draft of the site’s form and function has now been completed with the help of a grant from the City to Connect Montgomery.



Community Leadership Forum

Community Leadership Forum (CLF)

Goal: To create informed community leaders who share their knowledge of City issues with other residents and businesses in Montgomery.

Objective 1: The majority of CLF attendees will show an accurate understanding of the program presented by the City at the forum.

Objective 2: The City will email all CLF invitees quarterly with topical events/issues in a format that can be forwarded to others.

Objective 3: 50% of CLF attendees will submit comments on Open City Hall at least once per year.

Objective 4: 75% of CLF attendees will respond that they are “likely” to share the information they have learned from the City with others.

Evaluation Tool: Records review, knowledge test, surveys, interviews.

Responsibility and Frequency: Obj. 1 – Communication Coordinator, quarterly.
Obj. 2 – Communication Coordinator, quarterly.
Obj. 3 – Communication Coordinator, as needed.
Obj. 4 – Citizen Engagement Director, annually.

Information Source: CLF participants, Open City Hall records, email records.

Reporting Format: Verbal at staff meetings.

Performance Measures:

- The number of staff hours spent on program.
- The cost of those staff hours.
- The number of CLF attendees.
- The percentage of attendees as compared to the total number invited.
- The number of comments on Open City Hall by CLF attendees.
- The number of emails send to CLF invitees.
- Knowledge & Willingness survey given at the annual forum.

Previously Measured Results

Since civic engagement has become a focus, the Community Leadership Forum has grown considerably and the topics and agenda shifted to be more about dialogue. Its growth has necessitated a larger location. At the 2007 Community Leadership Forum, the concept of the Civic Collaborative was conceived.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Topics</u>
2001 fall	24	Community Survey, Tree Ordinance, City Zoning Code
2002 spring	14	New Strategic Plan, Open Q and A
2002 fall	29	City Charter Revisions
2003 spring	18	Open Q and A
2003 fall	21	Zoning on Montgomery Road, Traffic Safety, Volunteerism
2004 spring	27	Triangle Property Development, Utility Projects, New Trash Collection, Open Q and A
2004 fall	11	Open Q and A
		➤ <i>Feedback from a survey resulted in a once-a-year spring format for the forum.</i>
2005	29	Update from Boards\Commissions, Major Projects update, Open Q and A
2006	20	Input on new Strategic Plan, Open Q and A

<u>Year</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Topics</u>
2007	46	2007 Strategic Plan Overview, Parks Master Plan input, Input on City's Communication Program
2008	37	Montgomery Citizen Engagement Efforts, Where do we go from here? Standing at the Crossroads
2009	54	What's on the Radar? New developments, economy and City Hall, RecycleBank, How do we Engage the Unengaged? Open City Hall, Citizen Engagement Efforts, Dialogue on topics of Interest
2010	56	City's Financial Condition, Economic Development, Water Main Project, Open Q and A

Citizens in Daily Work \ Service Provision \ Volunteer Program

Goal: Regular involvement of citizens in making positive contributions to the community.

Objective 1: Involve citizens in at least one service area per department annually.

Objective 2: Create a volunteer data base of emails and contact information for ease of communication.

Objective 3: Advertise the need for volunteers on behalf of Connect Montgomery members.

Objective 4: Facilitate a minimum of 40 volunteer hours per month for City or community services.

Evaluation Tool: Records review, surveys, interviews.

Responsibility and Frequency: Obj. 1 – Volunteer Coordinator, annually.
 Obj. 2 – Volunteer Coordinator, daily.
 Obj. 3 – Volunteer Coordinator, monthly.
 Obj. 4 – Volunteer Coordinator, monthly.

Information Source: Volunteer records, Connect Montgomery participants, department records.

Reporting Format: Verbal at staff meetings, annual report, electronic database.

Performance Measures:

- The number of staff hours spent on program.
- The cost of those staff hours.
- The total number of volunteer hours for the City, the community (monthly, annually).
- The number of community volunteer opportunities advertised.
- The number of volunteer hours provided to each department annually.
- The number of volunteers and hours provided by project.

- Demographic breakdown of volunteers (age, gender, neighborhood).
- The number of open slots for boards/commissions.
- The number of projects/event organized by volunteers, including board and commission projects.

Previously Measured Results

- Nearly 40 volunteers share approximately 144 hours to help make six recreation department events a success.
- 123 volunteers contribute approximately 400 hours to help produce a festively decorated Heritage District for the holidays.
- About 28 volunteers share 76 hours to “dig in” and plant 260 hanging baskets to enhance the Heritage District’s streetscape each spring.
- 13 organizations (civic, school, church, neighborhood, City Commissions, City Council and City Employees) help plant thousands of flowers in the Montgomery Road medians.
- 29 teens share their summer vacation time to work as Teacher Assistants at Safety Village and 601 hours helping to make it fun and safe for the children in the community.
- Over 20 volunteers, coordinated by a MCLA graduate, alongside City staff helped check-in 3,000 citizens, talked them through the process and answered questions at a recent Community Point of Distribution opened by the Hamilton County Health Department to inoculate citizens against H1N1 in December, 2009.
- And more than 100 volunteers help with the annual Photography Competition and Exhibit, Arbor Day Tree Seedling Project, Plant Swaps, and Beautification Awards.

Citizen engagement is getting a variety of people to participate in events and fundraisers.

The Remaining Citizen Engagement Programs

Performance measures for the remaining 12 of the City’s engagement programs are contained in this section. They primarily represent 1-way communication efforts. The City is currently collecting some measures for these programs and additional measures were identified through the stakeholder interviews and best practices research.

As time is available, staff or a resident/business committee should go through the process of defining the program and measuring the results. Each program should include:

- Description of the Program
- Goal of the Program
- Specific Objectives
- Evaluation Tool – Qualitative and Quantitative
- Responsibility and Frequency of the Evaluation
- Information Source
- Reporting Format

Every program is different and will require a tailored approach based on the goal and the resources the City is willing to spend evaluating their efforts. Qualitative data (stories and

descriptions) are equally important as quantitative data (the numbers) in providing a comprehensive picture of the impact of the City's programs.

With a program like The District Business Association, the City may be most interested in ensuring that their efforts to support the organization do not increase reliance on the City. Therefore, the most important measures will be the staff time spent on The District activities. At the same time you will want to capture the new partnerships and projects The District has completed which can be told in a story format.

For a program like Open City Hall, the most comprehensive way to capture the broad impact of this program is through community surveys, which can be expensive. However, it can be thought of as a policy question. Does the City want to provide residents multiple ways of commenting on important issues?

At all times, the policy goal should drive the data collection. The key is to be transparent about the purposes and goals of the specific program. For example, it is difficult to measure the impact of the Montgomery YouTube Video post production. The number of views can be collected, but it would require focus groups or surveys of those viewers to determine if their pride in Montgomery increased. However, if the goal of that program was to involve residents in creating a product that showcased their pride in Montgomery then the City has effectively captured qualitative (stories from participants) and quantitative (the number of residents involved) data that shows the goal has been met.

The District Business Association Performance Measures:

- The number of staff hours spent on program.
- The cost of those staff hours.
- The number of businesses subscribed/members.
- The number of visitors to website and page views.
- The percentage of businesses approached to join organization out of the total number of businesses in City.
- The number of downtown improvement projects identified and implemented by The District (Ex. New parking signage or targeted retail marketing campaign).

Previously Measured Results

At a local business meet and greet, Prosper Montgomery launched www.thedistrictonline.com. Over 50 businesses have purchased space. The launch was marked with a booth at the City's Bastille Day celebration. Some joint marketing and a Susan B. Koman event has also been sponsored. In 2009, the City provided \$10,000 "seed money" to help sustain the group through the first year of getting organized and to develop their website. The City has a page on The District web site and the site has over 17,000 views to date. The City also promotes the site by driving people to the City page through monthly articles in the Montgomery Bulletin.

Open City Hall Performance Measures:

- The number of staff hours spent on program.

- The cost of those staff hours.
- The number of questions developed.
- Newsletter article on Open City Hall question (yes/no).
- Email publicity message (yes/no).
- The number of participants, unique visitors and responses per issue.
- Breakdown of membership by groups.
- Breakdown of membership by residents.

Previously Measured Results

Response rates to each question are listed in the chart above.

Breakdown by membership in Council/Boards/Commissions and/or MCLA

	Participants	Subscribers
Council/Boards/Commissions – 65 total	18	16
MCLA, excluding those on C/B/Cs – 64 total	24	23
Non-members	162	106
Total	204	145

Breakdown by residence

	Participants	Subscribers
Inside Montgomery	162	122
Outside Montgomery	42	23
Total	204	145

Montgomery Bulletin Performance Measures:

- The number of staff hours spent on program.
- The cost of those staff hours.
- The number of website hits.
- The cost of production per newsletter.
- Communication measures from the Resident Survey.

Previously Measured Results

- With few exceptions, the Bulletin is delivered on time each month.
- Website hits have increased from 165,455 in 2007 to 181,978 in 2008 and 204,887 in 2009 (a 20% increase).
- Costs have been managed effectively with an average of \$1.18 per publication in 2007, \$1.53 in 2008 (added in issue management) and \$1.50 in 2009 (controlled number of pages starting in fall). Estimate for 2010 is \$1.32 per publication keeping length at 12 pages per issue.



E-Gov Services Performance Measures:

- The number of staff hours spent on program.
- The cost of those staff hours.
- The cost of software contracts.
- The number of monthly visits to City website.
- The number of online registrations.
- The number and percentage of people registering for recreation services in person vs. online.
- The percentage of satisfaction surveys completed.
- Staff hours saved from residents processing their own registration.
- The number of online service requests.
- Average time to resolve an online request.
- The number of email subscriptions.

Previously Measured Results

- 80% of recreation program registrations take place online.
- In 2009, pool membership online registration expanded to returning non-residents decreasing staff time on opening day of registration from 2 people for 3 hours to 1 person for 1 hour.
- The percent of surveys completed for an average program went from less than 10% in 2006 to 40% in 2009.
- Online lodge reservations saved 70 hours of staff time since implementation in 2006 (est. \$1,875.00).
- The number of online service requests increased from 535 in 2007 to 1,015 in 2009. The average time to take initial action on a request is 1 business day and the average time to resolve a request is 2 business days.
- The number of email subscriptions is currently at 863, an increase of 400% since 2006.
- The number of monthly visits on the City website increased from 13,787 per month in 2007 to 17,073 per month in 2009 (a 20% increase in use).

Social Media Performance Measures:

- The number of staff hours spent on program.
- The cost of those staff hours.
- The number of views\fans\followers.
- The number of comments posted.
- The quality of comments posted (Quality will have to be defined).

Previously Measured Results

- Current views \fans\ followers of YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter can be tracked to show the value and interest in each type of social media tool. Because these outlets are so new, the numbers change daily. As of the end of February, 2010: over 985 views on YouTube, 95 fans on Facebook and 15 followers on Twitter.

Open House Format Performance Measures:

- The number of staff hours spent on program.
- The cost of those staff hours.
- The number of comments submitted.
- Quality of comments (Quality will have to be defined).

Previously Measured Results

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| • <u>Dog Park without Open House</u> | <u>Park Study with Open House format</u> |
| • Uncivil \ personal attacks | Civil \ on topic |
| • Meetings: Sept 2005 to Oct 2006 | Meetings: July 2007 to April 2008 |
| • Polarized groups at meetings | Public forums for one-on-one discussions |
| • Decision meetings: 5 | Decision meetings: 2 |
| • Developed into Initiative Petition | Unanimously passed with no public debate |

New Resident Packets Performance Measures:

- The number of staff hours spent on program.
- The cost of those staff hours.
- The number of packets mailed out.
- The number of returned feedback surveys.
- The production cost of a packet.

Previously Measured Results

More than 140 new residents were welcomed to the community in 2009 with this packet of informative resource materials. 129 new resident packets were mailed in 2008 starting in May of that year when the City began the use of the new materials. Only 2 surveys have been received to date and both indicated an interest in the addition of coupons to local businesses which were passed along to the business association to consider as a project to create a discount card for new residents.

Business Calling Program Performance Measures:

- The number of staff hours spent on program.
- The cost of those staff hours.
- The percentage of businesses welcomed by City as compared to the total number of businesses.
- The number of returned feedback surveys.

Previously Measured Results

A team of City staff, including representatives from Fire, Police, Administration and the Tax Department, met to discuss how best to utilize the business calling materials, how to begin making business visits and how to handle follow up when necessary. A database containing businesses, contact names and numbers was created to track information obtained from business visits. Those making business calls will update the database with the date of the call, what business materials were distributed, and if any follow up is needed. The goal is to increase

awareness among business owners and managers about unique City services available to them and to leave a message of appreciation for our business community.

Montgomery Video & Television Segment Performance Measures:

- The number of staff hours spent on program.
- The cost of those staff hours.
- The number of participants and hours spent creating video.
- The number of views on YouTube.

Previously Measured Results

Over 30 residents and business owners were engaged in the production of these videos, expressing why they love living in Montgomery in both. To date, the Gt. Lifestyles Video has been viewed by over 700 people on the City’s YouTube channel, and a sense of community pride has been generated.

City Information Booth at Events Performance Measures:

- The number of staff hours spent on the program.
- The cost of those staff hours.
- The number of events staffed.
- The number of people welcomed.
- The number of feedback surveys collected.
- The number of people who gave correct contact information.
- The percentage of those contacted who participated in the community* within the next year.

* The City will need to define what “participated in the community” means e.g. volunteered at a special event.



MCLA Alums work the City Booth

Previously Measured Results

Hundreds have been engaged and welcomed by City staff and MCLA Alumni (residents) at the City’s booth, and hundreds of surveys have been completed with valuable data collected on the quality of the event they attended, with the purpose of using that data to improve future events. The City’s booth has become a place where residents stop in to say hello, more interested in having a conversation with those staffing the booth than the actual information contained in it.

VII. Suggested Improvements to Citizen Engagement Activities

A variety of suggested improvements are contained in each section of this report, based on the article reviews, comparisons with other communities and stakeholder interviews. The recommendations listed below are those the LICMA Team has identified as most critical to

meeting the goal of encouraging “two-way communication” and decreasing the reliance on City government to build community.

Before implementing a specific recommendation, the City should consider examining both staffing levels and the internal structure of employees to maximize the opportunity to build an engaged community in Montgomery. The City’s engagement efforts would be strengthened by grouping services based on function so that existing staff members can communicate and use resources more efficiently. For example, the Volunteer Coordinator position should be included in the same Recreation/Community Engagement department since her work is a critical part of the engagement program. Current staff is at capacity in terms managing the existing engagement projects. If the City decides to implement any new practices or expand existing efforts, additional levels of staffing will be required.

1. Defining Citizen Engagement

Montgomery should more narrowly define its citizen engagement goals and programs to increase the impact of these efforts on the community.

- A. Use commonly understood terms and phrases to describe what the City is trying to accomplish with community engagement (e.g. community connections). The City’s publication “Taking Responsibility Together to Provide Superior Services” is an excellent example of this approach.
- B. Citizen engagement programs focus on building relationships and connecting different parts of the community to each other to solve problems or enhance services. Spend more time on these programs and reduce the time spent on other efforts that are one-way communication methods. For example, MCLA is a true engagement program and a YouTube video is not.
- C. Keep shifting the language in official publications from “customer” to “citizen.”
- D. Define a goal for each citizen engagement program that is tied to one of the six measures of Attitudinal Loyalty and/or Passion.

2. Evaluating Citizen Engagement Programs

Montgomery should continue to evaluate its citizen engagement efforts.

- A. Use the City’s Efficiency and Effectiveness Team to monitor citizen engagement performance measures and generate ideas (e.g. have them evaluate the best use for Open City Hall). Explore using residents to collect data and generate reports under the direction of this team.
- B. Survey program participants and community organizations annually to see what activities the community has worked on over the past year.
- C. Integrate the Volunteer Coordinator into current citizen engagement efforts and expand the volunteer opportunity listing services to community organizations. The volunteer contact database should be electronic and accessible to all City staff.

- D. Utilize the existing resident boards and commissions to manage community led projects and vet resident requests. For example, any new MCLA class project should have to be completed in partnership with the appropriate board or commission.
- E. Consider expanding the City’s engagement efforts directly into neighborhoods. Several citizens mentioned the critical role of neighborhood associations and neighborhood representatives during the interviews. Excellent models are the previously mentioned programs in Bellevue, Washington, and Redwood City, California.

3. Increasing Participation in Citizen Engagement Programs

Montgomery should take the lead on initiating the conversation with the community by inviting them to dialogue about the future of the City, how they would like to be involved and allowing for shared creation of policy recommendations on important issues.

- A. Evaluate the time commitment for the MCLA program - it may be a barrier to getting a diversity of ages participating.
- B. Continue to use various methods of communication to reach out to residents, which helps to avoid widening the gap between citizens who can effectively use new information and communication tools, such as the Internet, and those who cannot. Consider the benefits of a speakers bureau program as mentioned in program example A.
- C. Ask the community how they would like to be involved and what they need to be successful in their efforts. Include the City, churches, businesses and non-profits in the conversation as part of the City’s strategic planning process. Consider utilizing the Study Circles process mentioned in program example C.
- D. Utilize the Volunteer Coordinator position to provide volunteer services for the entire community, not just the City’s volunteer needs. Examples of communities who structure their volunteer programs this way include Decatur, Georgia and Derby, Kansas.

VIII. Conclusion

The City of Montgomery can feel confident that it is making progress in achieving Goal 5 of the 2006 Strategic Plan to “build upon the spirit of trust and cooperation that exists between the government and the community.” The Resident Surveys indicate a majority of residents are highly satisfied with their life in Montgomery. The stakeholder interviews revealed that the program participants appreciate and enjoy the City’s citizen engagement programs, especially the Montgomery Citizens’ Leadership Academy. A national review of citizen engagement programs has shown that Montgomery is providing a variety of opportunities for two-way communication and staff/resident partnerships, sometimes more than the efforts of much larger cities.

Moving forward, the City can use the research and recommendations from this report to continue to meet established goals and to shape the 2010 Strategic Plan. This report can also be used to provide ongoing evaluations for specific citizen engagement programs, to provide a framework for vetting engagement requests from staff, residents and civic groups and to garner input from the community on new engagement programs.

Montgomery has issued an invitation to the community to redefine themselves as citizens. They have accepted and the City has begun to change its story from simply a customer service organization to a community of citizens that co-create a vibrant, livable City.

IX. Documentation and support materials

Alphabetical listing of sources: (included in the attached CD)

1. Add to Wish List, Jonathan Walters. *Governing*. April 2008 pg. 58-60
2. Beyond the Usuals: Ideas To Encourage Broader Public Involvement In Your Community, Institute for Local Government
3. Citizen-Centered Collaborative Public Management, Cooper, Bryer and Meek. *Public Administration Review*, December 2006.
4. Citizen Involvement Efforts and Bureaucratic Responsiveness: Participatory Values, Stakeholder Pressures, and Administrative Practicality, Yang & Callahan. *Public Administration Review*, March/April 2007.
5. Community Building How to Do It, Why It Matters, ICMA IQ Report
6. Crafting a message that sticks: An interview with Chip Heath, *The McKinsey Quarterly*, November 2007
7. eGovernment Social Media Platform Deployments and Future Opportunities, Angela Fultz Nordstrom, Director of Portal Development NIC Inc.
8. E-government Strategies Planning: Reap the Benefits of an Online Presence, ICMA IQ Report
9. From e-Government to e-Governance: Using new technologies to strengthen relationships with citizens, Accenture Institute for Health and Public Service Value
10. Government 2.0 Building Communities with Web 2.0 and Social Networking, *Digital Communities*
11. How businesses are using Web 2.0, A McKinsey Global Survey, *The McKinsey Quarterly*, 2007
12. How companies are benefitting from Web 2.0, A McKinsey Global Survey, *The McKinsey Quarterly*, 2009
13. Managing beyond Web 2.0, *McKinsey Quarterly* July 2009
14. Managing More Effectively With a Strategic Communications Plan, *Western City Magazine* September 2009
15. Selected Articles. *National Civic Review* Winter 2004 Volume 93, Number 4
16. Selected Articles. *National Civic Review* Summer 2007 Volume 96, Number 2

17. Selected Articles. National Civic Review Spring 2008 Volume 97, Number 1
18. A Performance Management Framework for State and Local Government., National Performance Management Advisory Commission July 2009 www.gasb.org
19. Pew Research Center, “Millennials: A Portrait of Generation Next,” February 2010
20. Planning Public Engagement: Key Questions for Local Officials, Institute for Local Government
21. Presentation on Latest Technologies for Local Governments, Cal-ICMA Coaching Program September 19, 2007
22. Presentation on Stanford University’s use of social media by Ian Hsu, Director of Internet Media Outreach
23. Principles for Public Engagement Practice for Local Government Officials, Institute for Local Government
24. Public Deliberation: A Manager’s Guide to Citizen Engagement, IBM Center for The Business of Government, 2006
25. Public Engagement in Budgeting, a Local Official’s Guide, Institute for Local Government, 2010
26. Putting citizens on-line, not in line, McKinsey Quarterly 2001
27. Restoring Trust in Government: The Potential of Digital Citizen Participation, IBM Center for The Business of Government, August 2004
28. Six Trends Transforming Government, IBM Center for The Business of Government
29. Smart Democracy: How To Engage Citizens, ICMA IQ Report
30. Social Media and Public Agencies: Legal Issues to Be Aware of (1/10 draft), Institute for Local Government
31. Standards of Excellence in Civic Engagement (Appendix B), Imagine and Act for the Public Good, The Harwood Institute for Public Innovation, 2005
32. The Future of GIS-Enabled Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Challenges and Opportunities, IBM Center for The Business of Government
33. The Internet and Civic Engagement, Pew Interest and American Life Project, September 2009
34. The Power of Dialogue, ICMA IQ Report
35. Using Social Media for Citizen Engagement, Alliance for Innovation various blogs from Digital Communities
36. Web 2.0 and the Next Generation of Public Service, Accenture

Alphabetical Listing of Book Resources: (not included in the attached CD)

1. Better Together: Restoring the American Community, Robert D. Putnam and Lewis M. Feldstein
2. Citizen Surveys, ICMA Publications
3. Collaborative Leadership, David D. Chrislip and Carl E. Larson
4. Community: The Structure of Belonging, Peter Block

5. Creating Community Anywhere, Carolyn R. Shaffer and Kristin Anundsen
6. Informing Digital Futures: Strategies for Citizen Engagement, Leela Damodaran and Wendy Olphert
7. A New Engagement: Political Participation, Civic Life and the Changing American Citizen, Cliff Zukin, Scott Keeter, Molly Andolina, Krista Jenkins and Michael X. Delli Carpini
8. Evaluation, Carol H. Weiss
9. Investing in Democracy: Engaging Citizens in Collaborative Governance, Carmen Sirianni
10. The Practice of Social Research, Earl Babbie
11. Tribes, Seth Godin

Stakeholder Interview Questions

Staff

1. How do you define community engagement in your own words?
2. What does it mean to “foster meaningful two-way communications between City government and the community”?
3. Which of these programs (list of CE activities) do you participate in/administer? (Depending on staff person we will drill down into details of program)

For each CE activity they participate in:

- a. How does this CE activity “foster meaningful two-way communications between City government and the community”?
 - i. What could be changed to enhance this outcome?
 - b. How does this CE activity help build or restore social capital?
 - i. What could be changed to enhance this outcome?
4. What isn't happening today that would happen if you were successful in your CE activities?
For example, fully staffed boards and commissions
 5. How do you know if you are successful in your CE efforts?
 6. Are there any measures for success that you have heard of, but are not using now?
 7. How much resources (staff time, funding) are you willing to put towards evaluating your efforts?
 8. Tell me a story about a direct experience you had with one of your CE efforts that helped build social capital.
 9. How do you measure the quality of the City's customer service?
 10. Your stated goal is to “build upon the spirit of trust and cooperation that exists between the government and the community.” Can you give me an example of what that looks like?

11. How do you know that your CE efforts are not increasing the reliance on local government to build community?

Council

1. How do you define community engagement in your own words?
2. Which of the CE programs are you most proud of? Tell me a story about a direct experience you had with one of your CE efforts that helped build social capital.
3. What isn't happening today that would happen if the City was successful in its CE activities?
For example, fully staffed boards and commissions
4. How do you know if you are successful in your CE efforts?
5. What does it mean to "foster meaningful two-way communications between City government and the community"?
6. The City's stated goal is to "build upon the spirit of trust and cooperation that exists between the government and the community." Can you give me an example of what that looks like?
7. What do you think is the appropriate amount of resources to allocate towards evaluating CE efforts?
8. How do you know that your CE efforts are not increasing the reliance on local government to build community?
9. We are considering hosting a larger community conversation about civic engagement in late May. Would you be willing to extend a personal invitation to someone you know has not been involved with community activities in the past?

Residents

1. How do you define community engagement in your own words?
2. Which of these programs (list of CE activities) have you or do you participate in? Tell me about that experience.
3. Did participating in that program/these programs change your view of the City? Did it change your willingness to volunteer for the City or community organizations?
4. How, or in what ways, do you think that program/these programs help "stimulate the restoration of 'social fabric or social capital'"?
5. For that program/these programs, is the City playing the role of convener and facilitator or are they "increasing reliance on local government to build community"?
 - a. Why do you believe that?
6. The City's strategic plan states that it wants to "foster meaningful two-way communications between City government and the community." What does that mean to you?
7. The City's stated goal is to "build upon the spirit of trust and cooperation that exists between the government and the community." What does that mean to you?

8. We are considering hosting a larger community conversation about civic engagement in late May. Would you be willing to extend a personal invitation to someone you know has not been involved with community activities in the past?

Key Stakeholder Comments by Question

Following is a detailed list of the key themes and comments made by the thirty-eight individuals interviewed for this study, organized by question. The majority of what is listed here are direct quotes, with only minor alterations to consolidate ideas and flow of thought.

What is Citizen/Community Engagement?

1. Partnership with the City to increase the quality of life in Montgomery.
2. Getting citizens/residents involved in activities; not necessarily civic, but community activities (home owners assoc., parent-teachers group, school, church).
3. Involvement in all aspects of community – church, synagogue, voting – knowing what’s going on.
4. An involved City – residents & businesses are aware of what’s going on – community doesn’t have to call City Hall.
5. Citizens engaged in building community, making things happen and the government is not the pivot point.
6. Citizens comfortable communicating issues to the government with the understanding of what can and cannot be done because they understand how local government works.
7. Residents and business owners working together to enhance the community.
8. Citizens taking ownership and taking action to enhance the community.
9. When a person has a stake in what is happening in the community.
10. Having your voice heard and knowing that it’s understood.
11. Finding your niche.
12. Getting a variety of people to participate in events and fundraisers.
13. Being purposefully involved in the community, not just attending events.
14. The citizens pick up where the City leaves off. If we want the community to be something more than just a City, it falls upon the citizens to pick that up and make it what they want.
15. Citizens of all levels helping to make this community a better place to live, work, and investing in the value they have in their households. It can be anything from picking up litter along the streets to serving on City Council – whatever you are doing to be involved in the place you live in to make it a better place for us and the future generations.
16. Developing connections between residents and citizens for the greater good.
17. Some feel it is any kind of communication with the residents or business community. I don’t believe that is community engagement. Communication is one thing, and is very necessary. But for community engagement, you not only have to have some type of communication but the people have to actually participate in some way. Ideally, they

would be presenting their own ideas, they would be discussing things among themselves, they would be coming up with new initiatives.

18. Being an informed citizen, feeling welcomed and being invited to join in the process. Then, when a person gets into it, not just dropped into it and told to swim but helped through the process. The City looking at you as a partner, not just selling you a service. They told you going in, “We’re going to provide this [MCLA training] to you, at a cost, and we expect *you* to give back. It may not be to the City government; it may not be to whatever. We expect you to do something in the community. We want you to active and involved.” Then they don’t let it drop – they come looking for you.
19. Trying to make sure you are actively collecting the thoughts and opinions of the citizens. Community consists of various sub-groups (elderly, families with children, new people moving in, etc.). Community engagement is reaching out to all those different segments and finding what it is that would get them more excited, what brings them together, what service amenities and opportunities they would like to see.
20. You get a partnership between local government and the community so that they [the community] take a little bit more responsibility in what their community should be and what they want it to be, as opposed to residents who always turn to City Hall and make demands or complain. An engaged community is one that sees an issue or problem, and it’s a true partnership, were the citizens work with the local government, faith-based organizations, PTA or whomever the interested partners are at the table, to take on the issue, challenge or opportunity it faces.
21. The residents being engaged within the City and actually participating in the City. Not sitting in their houses and sending us nasty e-mails about what we didn’t do right. If they don’t think we did something right, then come up here and help us fix it.
22. Residents or businesses being involved in the community, either through the government itself, a neighborhood association, a church – doing something that contributes back to the community.
23. Involvement in the community, participation, a commitment. It doesn’t have to be strictly with the City itself. It could be through the schools, county associations, church, and neighborhoods. It’s also not sitting back, but getting involved and getting the word out. Another important aspect is relationships – building relationships with people.

Effective Citizen Engagement Programs

1. I enjoy serving on the Parks and Rec Commission and check on the parks every month.
2. Wrote an article for the Montgomery Bulletin.
3. Open City Hall is not that exciting to use.
4. My parents fill out the residential survey.
5. Attend special events.
6. Feel like I have input on special projects by serving on the commission.
7. It’s interesting to hear the inner workings of the City staff and interact with Council members.

8. Most high school students want to “be a body, rather than a mind” so they like to do fundraiser type races or clean up days, soup kitchens and Big Sister programs. Kids like to see immediate results of their work.
9. Serving on the Parks Commission has increased my willingness to volunteer and move back to Montgomery after college.
10. City does a good job with e-government and meetings.
11. People that care about an issue have easy ways to provide feedback.
12. MCLA, New Resident packet, Resident survey, Montgomery Bulletin are all effective programs.
13. Only checked out Facebook page one time.
14. Special events and MCLA build social fabric.
15. I really, really enjoyed MCLA. It’s one thing to be a citizen on the outside and criticize, which I have done. It’s another thing to see the inner workings and be able to hold your tongue before you criticize because you have a better feeling for things.
16. I’m involved in the City a lot more than I ever have been because I was involved in MCLA, and I recognize other people who are doing the exact same things.
17. The Civic Collaborative (Connect Montgomery) allows people who are already doing things in the community to communicate what they are doing. When you start to communicate and share information, people begin to see dovetail opportunities, which minimizes cost, increases impact, and plants seeds for the future for how people can work together.
18. MCLA, by far, number one. I’ve tried to recruit as many friends as I can for future sessions. I want [these people] to see how really positive our government is, how well the City’s run, and how it *is* run. They have no idea, and until I got involved, I had no idea either. MCLA is a big time commitment, but it gives the best understanding of how spoiled we really are in the City.
19. We’ve had some vacancies on some of the commissions, but with MCLA grads stepping up to the table, we have more than we need, which is what you ask for. And the quality of the people who are coming to the table is better.
20. MCLA is the project that is the best example of community engagement because once we get the classes started it is not a matter of just feeding these people information, it’s not all lecture. A lot of it is having these folks do projects, exercises, they get heavy involved with each other, they get involved with the City personnel who are putting this on, and there is a real engagement of ideas. That is the exciting thing for me.
21. MCLA is the keystone to a lot of [the activity in the community]. The members of MCLA , when you need someone to help you on a project, you go to your book that lists everyone from the MCLA classes and you call for help. It’s hard for them to say “no” because they know who you are!
22. The most recognized, and utilized, outreach is the Bulletin. I get feedback all the time about items mentioned in there.
23. MCLA is one of the things we’re proudest of because it was progressive, bringing people in, show them behind the scenes, what it takes to run a City. We were having difficulty

recruiting volunteers because they didn't really know what the City does, they didn't know the opportunities, and just having [volunteer] job listings in the Bulletin wasn't getting it done. We wanted to figure out a way to be constantly prospecting and bringing people in, and MCLA was the best idea. It's really been pretty exciting to see the energy that it's plugged in, in terms of getting 25 people a year engaged with the City, understanding what goes on. It's created a lot of enthusiasm, and the graduates are very proud of their work.

24. The survey's very helpful. That's our level of benchmarking now on services and amenities. You always get the "whisper responses" [casual verbal comments] out there in the community, but to know what's working and what's not working. But by formally surveying, people know you're serious too, so they believe that their feedback is being listened to, compared to, "Well, I told them I didn't like that when I saw them at Kroger."
25. I'm proudest of MCLA, and it has been very successful. It started out as a source for volunteers, but what came from it is educated citizens who are engaged and who want to do more in the community. They may not serve on commissions, but they serve in other critical ways. We've gotten a really good base of people who are really involved, really engaged and really want to do things for the City.
26. MCLA definitely is the best program for developing community engagement. Graduates have gotten involved more, and some were or now are commission and board members. They understand now more about how things work and what happens in local government. I've seen them go a little beyond their board or commission and to get more involved than what they might have been before. Unfortunately, I think some MCLA alumni have done very little, they do their class project but I don't see them stepping forward for boards or commissions.

Building Trust in Government

1. City can't stay at arms length – needs to stand up and be counted with us
2. City doesn't trust.
3. The concept of "building upon" assumes there is an existing level of trust to begin with.
4. I trust people who have been elected because I know them – they are human; if I trust them I know I can ask them for help.
5. Bastille Day is where you see everything come together and peoples' voices are heard
6. Social capital is built when citizens understand their role
7. Public trust is the key
8. Helping to educate; to get people on the same page
9. Trust = responsiveness (when we are slow we create a perception of secrecy)
10. City has its own agenda; they don't listen to everything
11. I know the City caters to the older crowd because those are the people in the room
12. The phrase "build upon the spirit of trust and cooperation that exists between the government and the community" doesn't really mean anything to me
13. I'm not sure the civic engagement activities build social capital; I'm doing it but I'm not sure others are doing it. I hope you can get to it.

14. Demonstrating trust convinces people to trust
15. It's not trust in a person so much as trust in things you expect the government to do – if they do what you expect them to do, that builds trust.
16. City staff is cooperative and responsive.
17. City is built out so we don't have to trust them to finish a building or a project. Think the downtown looks gorgeous.
18. Feel comfortable with the City because they are responsive and I know who to talk too.
19. City does a good job of making sure the zoning regulations are enforced.
20. Trust [in government] is built up over time. They [citizens] have to know the people who run the government, and that takes time. The initial thought is, "I don't trust government."
21. People who are involved day to day trust this community, and they're involved in the community, and respect the community. The people who aren't involved, you really don't know what they think except that they are taking things for granted. To me, the only way you are going to get [their trust] is by getting more people involved so they *do* trust, so they *do* understand.
22. There may always be a certain element of your population that are going to decide that government is evil, they are trying every way possible to work us over, and they just not going to accept anything. But, even though you might have some of those people, I think trust can be built up by listening to people. You can build trust if you are willing to hear people out, and *not* give people the idea that you are just jumping to a decision or that you already have the decision made and they are just wasting their time. Listening, and making an effort to try and look at the other side, is the only thing you can do to build up trust.
23. Nationally there is an increasing distrust in government, be it budgetary or philosophy. The key thing we must present is, it's not us vs. them. This really is a service organization for the benefit of everyone. Yes, we have to keep the parks clean and the infrastructure working, but then what can we do to enhance the opportunities of the citizens? We want to be a partner in building solutions instead of being a wall that people have to climb over. It's more about how City Hall interfaces with its constituents, largely business but also residents. Regarding the business community, we are changing from "no" to "how can we work together?" We've not had a service problem, but HPO has been a big catalyst for these improvements.
24. [Regarding the City and MCLA grads working together to plan and organize the H1N1 vaccination program] The MCLA grads demonstrated trust in us [City staff] because they knew us from teaching the courses. We trusted them because we had a relationship with them and we know they were interested citizens because they spent 10 weeks coming to the MCLA courses in the dead of winter. And most of the people in line, as you saw them come through, were pleased with how well run the program was and how quickly they moved through. So the feedback from the community was that the program worked very well. That was a huge success. We remind our employees constantly that trust takes a long time to build and foster and it can be gone in one event.

25. I think we've come a long way in this area. When we had all the disruptiveness and bickering on the council, some were feeding into the media mistrustful statements about the other council members and about staff members and department heads. There was a lot of mistrust and people didn't know what to believe. Regarding the park issue, I called and spoke with many people to see what others were saying. What I heard was people trusted the City. They trusted the council, they trusted the staff to make the right decisions. Yes, they were hearing the negative rhetoric, but they believed that we were going to make the right decision. And when that issue went to a vote, it was overwhelming, 2 to 1, on the council's side regarding that issue. I thought that showed a *huge* improvement regarding the trust people have in what the council and administration are doing.
26. I think trust in government is built when the MCLA participants, especially those who have not been involved with the City previously, both long-term and short-term residents, when they see us [mayor, council and staff] interact with each other the way that we do – we get along, we don't bicker, we laugh, we have a good time, we pick on each other like you do within a family. We genuinely get along, and that shows.
27. People have a general mistrust of government. Knowing that this stereotype exists, we need to take every opportunity to combat that or challenge that through all of our programs and work (MCLA, information booth, articles in the Bulletin). When we write articles, we need to remember that some people will not believe anything we say because we are “government”, and our challenge is to change that perspective, however we can.
28. Trust in government is based upon transparency. It requires government to be proactive with information, ahead of the rumor mill. It is also contingent upon government being willing to admit that we [government] might have made a mistake and might have to modify what we do. Building trust requires government to sit down at the table, like occurs with the Civic Collaborate, as equal partners who share a problem. Like with HPO, when you sit down with residents you take your “government” hat off and everyone is just a resident.

Meaningful Two-Way Communication

1. I told them what I liked about Montgomery but I'm not sure they got it.
2. Create the forum
3. We are pushing a lot of information out and not getting much back
4. Meaningful is the key piece to finding solutions together
5. It's the City's job to plan for the future
6. The City needs to take the initiative – people are too busy and as long as they are ok with what's happening they don't participate
7. At the end of the leadership academy the participants have an understanding of their role and responsibilities
8. Becomes a one on one personal relationship – mass emails don't do it
9. Establishes trust between residents and their government
10. Encourages dialogue, requires active participation and receptivity

11. Open City Hall isn't generating the two-way dialogue we hoped it would – hearing from the same group of engaged people and the answers don't tell us much.
12. I didn't know the City had a Facebook page (teen interview).
13. Keep mailing the Bulletin.
14. People have other reasons to be online besides looking at Montgomery's website.
15. Having citizens more involved in budget discussions or capital improvement discussions. But when things are going well, people have no reason to be involved.
16. From an MCLA graduate: “[Meaningful two-way communication] doesn't mean a lot to me because I think that the citizens want to talk to the government when it's important for them to talk to the government. On the most part, we'd rather not know they exist. I really think an effective government is one where you don't know they're there because you're happy with how things are. For the most part, I think the City of Montgomery operates that way. I think they do a wonderful job not stirring things up a lot.”
17. Right now there is a lot of one-way communication going out from the City. Meaningful communication is when somebody has an issue or problem, or sees something great going on, they relay it back to where the information is coming from, to the City or someone on one of the commissions, and not fester inside themselves; and then help do something about it, help create a solution to something they see instead of being part of the problem and just complaining about it.
18. If no one shows up [to a council meeting], it's unsuccessful, because you're not getting positive or negative feedback. And most of the time, nobody shows up. [When people do come], most of the time it's for a problem – they're not there to complement you, it's for an issue. I'm glad when I see people show up – they're passionate about their particular issue.
19. The standard in government is one-way communication. City's have “information officers” – that sounds to me like “spin doctor”. Two-way dialog is to truly listen, putting a face on government, and creating relationships with citizens. It's the difference between “customer” and “partner”. Do residents feel that they are a partner with the City or simply a customer? But how do you give citizens the “freedom” to assemble and dialog and at what risk do we bring to ourselves [government] in encouraging that? It's probably a lot of risk, but democracy is kind of a risk.
20. There are times when a lot of people are really motivated to engage with the City. When there's a problem, a controversy, people come flying in and want to have their say. But you can't live by controversies alone. We have to find ways to really be in touch with people on a regular basis exclusive of controversies. A difficulty exists that most people claim they are really busy and they don't have time to come to City Hall and Council meetings. However, if a controversy erupts, they suddenly find some time. We need to engage with people on a regular basis even though they claim they don't have time to do so.
21. The City does a lot to reach out to people and get feedback. Some people only relate well using electronic media – there's a path for them. The City [also] sends out paper and pencil stuff – that's great for other people.

22. Trying to find as many outlets as we can to create a feedback loop for getting public opinion, creating a source for ideas, concerns – if there are those, stimulating conversation either by asking open-ended questions in the Bulletin, driving people to Open City Hall to get their feedback. As an example, the session format for MCLA is lot of “learn, learn, learn – then feedback – what do you think about this, how could we improve that opportunity.”
23. You get “one offs” all the time in the editorial pages. By having 25 knowledgeable people in the room who you’ve educated about what the process is, who come from multiple disciplines and are generally professionals, you get a diverse but very opportunistic review by an outside group of people about what you are doing.
24. When you “foster” meaningful communication you strive to make sure that one group isn’t speaking down or up to the other. It’s an adult-to-adult conversation where you’re talking about the issue or opportunity in a way where you address the pros *and* the cons. Sometimes in that conversation there might be some uncomfortable areas, but if we’re truly in an adult-to-adult relationship everyone realizes that these are controversial issues but we’re not going to “take it out” on each other and let it become personal.
25. Creating some level of dialogue and interaction to create a relationship, even if to just remember their name so the next time I see them I can call them by name. We developed our social media programs to help create two-way dialogue.
26. Examples would be having council members available during open houses on specific issues; building relationships with homeowner associations so that you can get them the information they need for their purposes (newsletters, meetings, etc.); being proactive with issues and information, staying out in front of issues instead of reacting to issues.

What would Happen if We were Successful? (These Can Lead to Performance Measures)

1. Names – I know the names of my neighbors; the people who works at the City.
2. Do you know more of your neighbors by name this year?
3. Voter turnout.
4. Crime rate
5. Number of neighbor to neighbor connections; helping one another
6. Number of champions for the City
7. Cost per communication by category
8. Value of the communication
9. Increased participation on boards and commissions (number of vacancies, number days to fill vacancies, number of applicants)
10. Number of volunteers.
11. Because of MCLA I applied to serve on the Board of Zoning Appeals and on the Sycamore School Planning Commission.
12. Level of MCLA graduate involvement in boards and commissions, on council or volunteering
13. Number of people who say they are engaged
14. Number of people who understand their role as citizens

15. Increase in the level of pride in the community (more residents wanting to be involved)
16. Number of people who see government as the answer
17. Number of people who take initiative to find a solution rather than expecting the government to be a vending machine (e.g. are you more inclined this year to initiate a solution to a neighborhood issue rather than calling the City? Or do you feel more empowered to resolve a neighborhood issue?)
18. Number of people who say the City made a difference/ helped them
19. Number of complaints
20. Level of appreciation of the City's work
21. Exponential growth – ripple effect – impact of MCLA spread beyond
22. Number of people running for office
23. Number of hostile encounters with the public (e.g. council meetings, other forums)
24. Less reliance on government (would you say you are less reliant on government than you were last year?)
25. Move from building and connecting (motivating) to working with motivated citizens
26. Number of parade participants
27. Number of staff recruited MCLA participants (success would be zero)
28. Absence of strangers
29. Number of people who indicate they know what's going on in their community
30. More citizens would understand how lucky we are to live in this community!
31. We would have more of the unknowns [residents] coming forward. The more we drill down, and the more we get people to understand that we want to create a relationship, more of these folks are going to come out of the woodwork and help create the conversation.
32. I would like to see more [ethnic] diversity in the programs, as well as age and income diversity. Also, if it were my wildest dreams, every street would have someone who went through MCLA, because I think it's an eye opener both for the participant *and* the City.
33. The Business District and the Chamber should combine together to strengthen each other. Success would be the majority of the business community working towards the same ends and working with the City as a partner toward those ends, to bring in new businesses and to make the current businesses more successful, to get people to realize that there are a lot of places to shop and do business here.
34. I think we're being fairly successful, in light of the interest in and success of MCLA. In an ideal world you would have a little more activity, not necessarily always stimulated by the City. If you really had an ultimately engaged citizenry, it [ideas or activities] would come up on its own rather than being stimulated by the City. The reality is, between kid's schools, PTOs, coaching sports, volunteering at the library or the lunchroom, church groups, etc., there's a lot of competition for volunteer hours and there's only so much time that people can commit to one thing or another.
35. I would like to see more of the neighborhood organizations increasing their level of activity and importance; in that sense, their engagement. One of the things we've tried to

create is some leaders that might go back to their neighborhood and say, “Why aren’t we a little more active?” Then we could go to those [neighborhood] leaders to see what’s going on and interact with them.

36. We would be developing City leaders sufficient for future needs. With all of our community engagement efforts, if we don’t generate enough future leaders, where are they going to come from? Are they going to come from those who have been more negative about our community engagement efforts and the things that create quality of life?
37. Regarding the boards and commissions, instead of coming up with ideas and then expecting City staff to do the work, real success would be the boards and commissions not only coming up with ideas but actually doing the work and following through with their ideas, and the staff would be there just as a liaison or consultant to answer questions regarding what can and can’t be done. I think the boards and commissions have the resources available to do the work, but sometimes we enable them by doing it for them.
38. People would be more informed regarding what is truly happening in town. More citizens would take responsibility for things and not have the attitude, “Why isn’t the City doing this?” You would also have more people willing to learn, and wanting to learn how the City works.

Suggestions for Improvement of Current Programs

1. Open City Hall – use for selected hot topics
2. Feedback mechanism “we heard you and here’s what we are doing”
3. Give the history book for the leadership academy in advance of the classes
4. Create an informal personal connection between staff and the community
5. Use commonly understood terms and phrases to describe what the City is trying to accomplish with community engagement – community connections??
6. Use efficiency and effectiveness team to monitor civic engagement performance measures and generate ideas (e.g. have them evaluate the best use for Open City Hall)
7. Set up a system to track organic one on one civic engagement encounters between staff and community.
8. Use Facebook more for two-way communication.
9. Survey MCLA alumni to see what activities they are engaged in after graduation
10. Use Montgomery moms to staff information booths (Kathy said they’d love to do it)
11. Evaluate MCLA time commitment - it may be a barrier to getting a diversity of ages participating
12. More of the MCLA alumni need to actively recruit and draw new people into these activities.

New Engagement Ideas

1. Ivy Gate neighborhood hosts a summer “deck crawl”.

Comments from Staff and Council Members

1. Those not involved fulltime in citizen engagement efforts would like more feedback regarding their individual projects. Are their efforts serving any purpose?
2. It seems that people are only interested when an issue arises that might have a negative effect on them or the way the City does business. It seems like the only time people come out to express interest in what is going on is when it impacts them directly.
3. A small segment of the population is regularly involved in these activities – does that justify the expenses made? I think it makes a difference, but how do I know?
4. Regarding Open City Hall, I log on 2-3 times per month to see what’s going on and the conversation back and forth. I’m not sure when we have 8 replies that it’s worth the time and energy the City puts into it, but hopefully it will grow and be something better. Perhaps it represents 8 opportunities [voices] we would not have heard from, because not many people come to our council meetings. I’m still on the fence of how well this is working. You sometimes question the wisdom of the comments, but people say things I would not have thought of. Compared to a conversation with someone at Kroger’s, since a lot of people can view the Open City Hall comments, people can make assumptions off of what someone writes, whether it’s right or wrong. It’s a little more prone to spreading messages, whether good or bad, more so than a discussion at Kroger’s.
5. Concerning the Resident Survey, those are always interesting to see how they come back. When you get good marks back, we usually say, “Good for us.” But then we turn it around and say, “Even though we had a 97% satisfaction rating [from those who replied back], there are still 3% of the people who are not satisfied.” Another staff member reminds us, “Would you fly on an airline that has a 97% landing success rate?” So 97% is great, but there is always room for improvement.
6. When we did the TV thing, my perception is that it took a tremendous amount of staff time to get it done, to get all the people lined up, to get everything in place that needed to be done. It was great to have it, and we have been able to keep using it because it’s generic enough to keep using, but whether that was worth all of the time that went into it (not so much the money, but the time that went into that one effort) and what we got out of it – at the time it was great but looking back I don’t know if it was an appropriate use of staff’s time.

Resource Levels for Evaluation Efforts of CE Efforts

1. I think there are ways of doing it without spending a lot – a smart way of doing it.
2. If I spend 1-2 hours writing an article, it would be nice to spend 1-2 hours to know if that [article] made any impact at all.
3. 6-10% of the cost of the program, or \$100,000. You have to check to see if what you are doing is effective. If you don’t, it’s a disservice to the money you are spending.
4. Anything worth doing is worth doing poorly, at least for a little while. Start simple, so we don’t get discouraged with data collection. With so many programs, we first need to prioritize which programs to evaluate. Second, I would say if each [program] had three or four measures, I’d say that’s plenty, and make them really simple.
5. The strategic plan says that community engagement is one of the main things the City wants to work on because it is highly important. Money needs to be put into evaluation,

and you have to devote some resources to this, because if you don't make an effort to engage with your residents and business people, and actually get some engagement going on, it's going to be hard to operate a City successfully. You have to apply a certain amount of resources to do [community engagement], and then evaluate it.

6. If you're going to do it, you have to build in some time to make sure it's working. I don't know if it's a percentage of time or a percentage of dollars spent. As you put a project together, part of the project scope should be, "How are we going to evaluate the success of this? What is the feedback loop?" Hopefully we've created a culture of evaluation.
7. Our City staff does so much, internally and externally, so we need to be very cognizant, and somewhat conservative, in how much time is allotted to certain activities. As far as evaluating our programs, probably 5% of the total cost should be used that way. Cheryl is always trying to make every program better, and because of their evaluation efforts every program is better each year. So evaluation is important, but it needs to be balanced with doing all of the work, internally and externally, the staff is involved in.
8. If you want a program to be successful, you have to be willing to invest a lot of staff time and resources to do it. I have told other communities that wish to do community programs like we do, if you want a program to be successful you have to devote a lot of staff time, a lot of face time to get out there and build your relationships. Evaluation efforts are continually ongoing – the program is always going to change; social media will constantly change; demands on the program constantly change.

Are the City's CE Efforts Increasing Reliance on Local Government?

1. I don't think that they're creating reliance. Quite honestly, I think [they] have done a good job of lighting fires and then getting out of the way. You start things, and if you're really good, you pass them off to other people, let them finish them, and go on to the next project. I think [they] have done a good job of getting things started, then backing away and letting them flourish.
2. From my perspective, they're just enabling it, they're not overdoing it. A number of these [efforts] are not really pushing citizen engagement; some of it is just City communication, which you have to do. I don't think, by any means, we're overdoing it yet – we may be under-doing it.
3. I always come back to "What gifts are you willing to give?" and "What promises are you willing to make?" City staff has always been clear – it's not about the government, it's about building community.
4. We tell people, "You have to change your thinking. This building [City Hall] is not the City – you are the City!" That is the main challenge, because people get dependent, they also get very demanding, and very reliant on somebody else to do everything, solve everything. It's very easy for people to say, "Well, the City should be doing that." And "How come the City isn't doing this?" And "How can the City be so stupid." We have to get people to realize that *you* are the City. There has to be some ownership, and in our culture it's very easy to blame someone else. We have to try and get people to think differently.

5. The City is very clear. They will facilitate programs, but that's it. The citizens run this government. That feedback loop is there. [The City] is not going to do anything the citizens don't want to happen. They may make the citizens aware of it.
6. That is a valid concern. If the City stepped away from all of these initiatives, would they have the leadership and means to keep going? Clearly MCLA is "no" – it's designed to be run and sponsored by the City. If we can get further in creating more leaders, and sharing with them opportunities to take it outside of the government programs, I'll feel really good about our progress.
7. We are not creating reliance upon the government because we are trying to push these activities back into the community. You have the MCLA alumni who get together without any staff being there. You have the Civic Collaborative (Connect Montgomery) also starting to do the same. The business district association, they take on a lot with the staff only being there to monitor what is happening. I'm seeing these groups start to take ownership on their own and move forward with projects or events without us [City government] having to always "turn the wheel" to get them going.
8. We are not hearing "the City" as much from residents expressing their demands. People are working more together on problems and not calling the City for little things. Nuisance complaints are going down because businesses and residents are taking care of these issues themselves. People are not coming to us saying, "Here's my problem, you fix it!" Instead, people come to us saying, "Here's what I got, here's my problem. We've come together to help, is there a way we can do this?"

Memorable Quotes:

1. The City has so much to offer – that's how we decided to become active
2. I would not have had the confidence to talk to people in the community without the leadership academy
3. After the academy I have a different feeling about how I can participate in my community and be a friend to my neighbors
4. The more comfortable you are with people the more willing you are to help
5. What a model! I'm in awe of Montgomery and appreciate their interest in community participation
6. We are resources to each other.
7. The leadership academy is a great opportunity to break bread
8. It's easier to complain when you don't know the people involved
9. Most people want less government on themselves and more government on their neighbors
10. Civic engagement – it's the right direction
11. Relationships weave the community together
12. People move here for the school district and then they see the downtown and stay
13. We like being able to walk to parks and downtown, and bike to the pool
14. You have to change attitudes to get people involved
15. The City tapped into a personal interest that got me going

16. The challenge is getting people to show up; making it appealing
17. The long-term building of social fabric matters over time – it means when I have something to say people will listen
18. People are busy – reach out to them in a variety of ways – the more the City does the better.
19. Montgomery is family friendly and well taken care of. It's a close knit community.
20. You start at home.
21. As a MCLA graduate I have another set of friends; I feel more connected to my community and my government
22. MCLA humanized government for me
23. When MCLA started I had to fill out a questionnaire. One question was, "What's the difference between a resident and a citizen?" I really gave it a lot of thought, because I never contemplated if there was a difference. At the first MCLA session that question was raised and one answer was read. I thought, "Man, that's a really good answer." And it ended up being mine!
 - a. The really good answer was "You can find a resident in the phone book. You can find a citizen in the community."
24. It is true we are trying to educate folks about how the City operates, but what we get back is more than what we present.
25. [Concerning getting involved] You don't have to crack the wall to get in – there is a big gaping hole in the wall and people are reaching out and pulling you in, saying "We want you!"
26. MCLA is a social engine.
27. One thing that blows me away about Montgomery, and we notice it when we were moving into the City, is that when you drive through the community people wave to you. They don't have to know you. When you walk down the street, people say, "Hello." They don't have to know you, but you're there and that's good enough. It's a delightful feeling. It's a warm-kind of a feeling.
28. Right after we moved into our house, which was 16-17 years old, I knew this community was different. I was concerned about the lifespan of the hard-wired smoke detectors. I walked over to the fire department, was greeted warmly by the receptionist, and said, "We are new in the community and I need to be changing some smoke detectors. Is there someone here who can give me a short course on it and tell me what I should be looking for?" About two minutes later the Fire Chief shows up and spends about half an hour with me telling me about smoke and carbon monoxide detectors. The Fire Chief? – come on! And I have seen that kind of personal involvement [from everyone]. He didn't know me from a whole in the wall. I was just a resident of the community. But it's that kind of a response you get around here. It makes you feel like, "These people are so nice to me, how can I not appreciate what I've got." And if I appreciate it I'm going to take care of it, and try to make it a little better maybe!
29. In theory, you could say, "If people aren't complaining, they must be happy." Happy, although, probably only leads to status quo. "Don't change anything because nobody's

upset about anything.” That’s good, in a way, but that doesn’t really look very forward, it just keeps us right here, where we are.

30. The result may be the same, but the way you got there makes everybody feel a little better!
31. If you’re going to do it, you have to build in some time to make sure it’s working.
32. Hopefully we’ve created a culture of evaluation.
33. You know you have a really engaged community when people see an opportunity that isn’t a “crisis” and they bring the right people to the table and move forward with a program or project.

Endnotes

¹ Montgomery Citizen Engagement Initiatives.doc and Montgomery Citizen Engagement Time Line.doc: City of Montgomery Staff

² E-Gov services, City Information Booth at Events, New Resident Outreach Packet, The Montgomery Citizens’ Leadership Academy (MCLA), MCLA Reunion Summit, The District (formerly Prosper Montgomery), New Resident Mailing, Open House Format, Open City Hall, Montgomery Civic Collaborative, Montgomery Television Segment, Social Media (Facebook, Twitter and YouTube), Community Wellness Initiative

³ Montgomery Bulletin, Community Leadership Forum, Business Calling Team

⁴ ICMA Montgomery Capstone Agreement.pdf

⁵ Public Deliberation: A Manager’s Guide to Citizen Engagement, IBM Center for The Business of Government, 2006; Six Trends Transforming Government, IBM Center for The Business of Government; Smart Democracy: How To Engage Citizens, ICMA IQ Report.

⁶ Interview with Ray Patchett, former City Manager, Carlsbad, CA.

⁷ Public Deliberation: A Manager’s Guide to Citizen Engagement, IBM Center for The Business of Government, 2006.

⁸ Ibid; The Power of Dialogue, ICMA IQ Report; Six Trends Transforming Government, IBM Center for The Business of Government.

⁹ Community Building How to Do It, Why It Matters, ICMA IQ Report; Six Trends Transforming Government, IBM Center for The Business of Government.

¹⁰ Ibid; Community Building How to Do It, Why It Matters, ICMA IQ Report; Smart Democracy: How To Engage Citizens, ICMA IQ Report.

¹¹ Restoring Trust in Government: The Potential of Digital Citizen Participation, IBM Center for The Business of Government, August 2004; Six Trends Transforming Government, IBM Center for The Business of Government; Government 2.0 Building Communities with Web 2.0 and Social Networking, Digital Communities.

¹² Ibid; Six Trends Transforming Government, IBM Center for The Business of Government; Government 2.0 Building Communities with Web 2.0 and Social Networking, Digital Communities; Smart Democracy: How To Engage Citizens, ICMA IQ Report.

¹³ Presentation on Stanford University’s use of social media by Ian Hsu, Director of Internet Media Outreach, April 17, 2010 Progress Seminar, Monterey, California.

¹⁴ Public Deliberation: A Manager’s Guide to Citizen Engagement, IBM Center for The Business of Government, 2006; The Power of Dialogue, ICMA IQ Report; Government 2.0 Building Communities with Web 2.0 and Social Networking, Digital Communities.

¹⁵ Using Social Media for Citizen Engagement, Alliance for Innovation various blogs from Digital Communities; The Future of GIS-Enabled Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Challenges and Opportunities, IBM Center

for The Business of Government; Social Media and Public Agencies: Legal Issues to Be Aware of (1/10 draft), Institute for Local Government.

- ¹⁶ eGovernment Social Media Platform Deployments and Future Opportunities, Angela Fultz Nordstrom, Director of Portal Development NIC Inc.; Web 2.0 and the Next Generation of Public Service, Accenture; How companies are benefitting from Web 2.0, A McKinsey Global Survey, The McKinsey Quarterly, 2009; Putting citizens online, not in line, McKinsey Quarterly 2001.
- ¹⁷ Presentation on Latest Technologies for Local Governments, Cal-ICMA Coaching Program September 19, 2007; Web 2.0 and the Next Generation of Public Service, Accenture; Managing More Effectively With a Strategic Communications Plan, Western City Magazine September 2009.
- ¹⁸ eGovernment Social Media Platform Deployments and Future Opportunities, Angela Fultz Nordstrom, Director of Portal Development NIC Inc.; Using Social Media for Citizen Engagement, Alliance for Innovation various blogs from Digital Communities; The Future of GIS-Enabled Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Challenges and Opportunities, IBM Center for The Business of Government; Managing More Effectively With a Strategic Communications Plan, Western City Magazine September 2009; Government 2.0 Building Communities with Web 2.0 and Social Networking, Digital Communities; Smart Democracy: How To Engage Citizens, ICMA IQ Report.
- ¹⁹ From e-Government to e-Governance: Using new technologies to strengthen relationships with citizens, Accenture Institute for Health and Public Service Value; Managing More Effectively With a Strategic Communications Plan, Western City Magazine September 2009; Government 2.0 Building Communities with Web 2.0 and Social Networking, Digital Communities.
- ²⁰ Public Deliberation: A Manager's Guide to Citizen Engagement, IBM Center for The Business of Government, 2006
- ²¹ Restoring Trust in Government: The Potential of Digital Citizen Participation, IBM Center for The Business of Government, August 2004; The Future of GIS-Enabled Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Challenges and Opportunities, IBM Center for The Business of Government; The Internet and Civic Engagement, Pew Interest and American Life Project, September 2009.
- ²² Presentation on Latest Technologies for Local Governments, Cal-ICMA Coaching Program September 19, 2007; Pew Research Center, "Millennials: A Portrait of Generation Next," February 2010; Government 2.0 Building Communities with Web 2.0 and Social Networking, Digital Communities; The Internet and Civic Engagement, Pew Interest and American Life Project, September 2009.
- ²³ From e-Government to e-Governance: Using new technologies to strengthen relationships with citizens, Accenture Institute for Health and Public Service Value.
- ²⁴ Planning Public Engagement: Key Questions for Local Officials, Institute for Local Government; E-government Strategies Planning: Reap the Benefits of an Online Presence, ICMA IQ Report; From e-Government to e-Governance: Using new technologies to strengthen relationships with citizens, Accenture Institute for Health and Public Service Value; Public Engagement in Budgeting, a Local Official's Guide, Institute for Local Government, 2010; Managing More Effectively With a Strategic Communications Plan, Western City Magazine September 2009.
- ²⁵ Beyond the Usuals: Ideas To Encourage Broader Public Involvement In Your Community, Institute for Local Government; Web 2.0 and the Next Generation of Public Service, Accenture; Managing More Effectively With a Strategic Communications Plan, Western City Magazine September 2009.
- ²⁶ Beyond the Usuals: Ideas To Encourage Broader Public Involvement In Your Community, Institute for Local Government; From e-Government to e-Governance: Using new technologies to strengthen relationships with citizens, Accenture Institute for Health and Public Service Value; Public Engagement in Budgeting, a Local Official's Guide, Institute for Local Government, 2010.
- ²⁷ Community Building How to Do It, Why It Matters, ICMA IQ Report; From e-Government to e-Governance: Using new technologies to strengthen relationships with citizens, Accenture Institute for Health and Public Service Value

-
- ²⁸ Public Deliberation: A Manager's Guide to Citizen Engagement, IBM Center for The Business of Government, 2006; From e-Government to e-Governance: Using new technologies to strengthen relationships with citizens, Accenture Institute for Health and Public Service Value.
- ²⁹ Ibid; How Businesses are using Web 2.0 A McKinsey Global Survey, The McKinsey Quarterly, 2007.
- ³⁰ Presentation on Stanford University's use of social media by Ian Hsu, Director of Internet Media Outreach, April 17, 2010 Progress Seminar, Monterey, California; The Power of Dialogue, ICMA IQ Report; Managing More Effectively With a Strategic Communications Plan, Western City Magazine September 2009; Smart Democracy: How To Engage Citizens, ICMA IQ Report.
- ³¹ Restoring Trust in Government: The Potential of Digital Citizen Participation, IBM Center for The Business of Government, August 2004; Community Building How to Do It, Why It Matters, ICMA IQ Report; From e-Government to e-Governance: Using new technologies to strengthen relationships with citizens, Accenture Institute for Health and Public Service Value; Public Engagement in Budgeting, a Local Official's Guide, Institute for Local Government, 2010.
- ³² Crafting a message that sticks: An interview with Chip Heath, The McKinsey Quarterly, November 2007.
- ³³ Standards of Excellence in Civic Engagement (Appendix B), Imagine and Act for the Public Good, The Harwood Institute for Public Innovation, 2005; Beyond the Usuals: Ideas To Encourage Broader Public Involvement In Your Community, Institute for Local Government; E-government Strategies Planning: Reap the Benefits of an Online Presence, ICMA IQ Report; Public Deliberation: A Manager's Guide to Citizen Engagement, IBM Center for The Business of Government, 2006; eGovernment Social Media Platform Deployments and Future Opportunities, Angela Fultz Nordstrom, Director of Portal Development NIC Inc.; Web 2.0 and the Next Generation of Public Service, Accenture.
- ³⁴ Principles for Public Engagement Practice for Local Government Officials, Institute for Local Government; Standards of Excellence in Civic Engagement (Appendix B), Imagine and Act for the Public Good, The Harwood Institute for Public Innovation, 2005; Public Engagement in Budgeting, a Local Official's Guide, Institute for Local Government, 2010; Social Media and Public Agencies: Legal Issues to Be Aware of (1/10 draft), Institute for Local Government.
- ³⁵ "Stay Engaged" page on website; Civic collaborative are topics specific: Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness Committee, Hunger Abatement Plan, Plan East Gainesville, and Healthy Communities; waste watcher interactive website created by Department of Public Works to raise public awareness of the need to recycle.
- ³⁶ Civic collaborative are topic specific e.g. Safe Neighborhoods 2003; Youth and Prevention 2010.
- ³⁷ Website has Google language conversion feature with 30 language options; City surveys on PD services only.
- ³⁸ Website has interesting interactive road construction map; citizen service guide; on-line new resident guide (Ankeny indicates it has been very successful); Citizens' Police Academy only; information booth at community events is staffed by Police Officers only.
- ³⁹ First academy graduated December 2009; several e newsletters; collaborative task forces e.g. arts, public spaces, communication.
- ⁴⁰ Website available in five languages; very neighborhood focused (similar approach to Redwood City, CA).
- ⁴¹ Neighborhood focused; Citizens' Police Academy only; strong Mayor form of government.
- ⁴² Civic collaborative is called the Green Umbrella for environmental groups, also has a neighborhoods alliance which meets twice per year; business association manages business calling program.
- ⁴³ Citizens' Police Academy only; annual health and wellness fair.
- ⁴⁴ Citizens' Police Academy; newsletter for Parks and Recreation and Seniors
- ⁴⁵ Citizens' Police Academy; wide variety of volunteer programs; webcasts of Council meetings, and committee work sessions.
- ⁴⁶ Citizens' Police Academy and Citizens' Fire Academy - developing a Resident Academy to develop more informed residents (currently has quarterly roundtable meetings with neighborhood associations; award winning monthly newsletter; website offers new resident guide; excellent E-government report/plan; new program "Speaking of Irving" assists civic organizations by providing speakers on topics that interest them.

-
- ⁴⁷ City has its own radio station; partners with Broward University for You-niversity program classes; quarterly newsletter.
- ⁴⁸ Civic collaborative are topic specific: Safe neighborhoods 2003, Youth and Prevention 2010.
- ⁴⁹ Citizens' Police Academy.
- ⁵⁰ Citizens' Police Academy; launched social media effort in 2009
- ⁵¹ Citizens' Police Academy; annual health and wellness fair.
- ⁵² Citizens' Police Academy; translatable website; neighborhood associations brought in twice a year to discuss issues with the city; has speakers bureau; no longer has active academy alumni group; City collaborates with private "welcome wagon" group for new resident packet and goodies.
- ⁵³ Citizens' Police Academy called U-COPS; new resident page on website.
- ⁵⁴ Neighborhood focused - provides liaison and grants for block parties; City does not use social media citing limited resources for managing blogs ("not a gap we thought we could address") - social media not conducive to two-way dialogue; loosely formed alumni for Citizens' Academy (PACT) no plans to formalize - focusing on neighborhoods; interactive GIS mapping.
- ⁵⁵ Citizens' Police Academy
- ⁵⁶ EBay link on website; created a Cultural Action Plan to enhance social capital in 2003; civic collaborative formed to discuss how to attract and retain young professionals in the community - also Police Department partners with United Way on an on-going basis.
- ⁵⁷ Resistat Program - meet with neighborhoods twice a year to discuss issues and on-line blog to consolidate and distribute answers to questions - active mailing list of over 5,000 participants; Citizens' Police Academy; civic collaborative takes regional approach on topics such as teenage substance abuse (looking at using Twitter and Facebook for this); mystery customer survey of city services; strong Mayor form of government.
- ⁵⁸ Citizens' Police Academy.
- ⁵⁹ Entered into a three year agreement with CGI Communications to produce a series of online videos highlighting the community.
- ⁶⁰ Extensive volunteer opportunities; Citizens' Academy run by sheriff's office (contract police services).
- ⁶¹ Citizens' Police Academy; annual health and wellness fair.
- ⁶² Gerri Harbison, Mayor; Chris Dobroszi, MCLA Graduate; Todd Steinbrink; Ken Suer
- ⁶³ Cheryl Hilvert, City Manager; Wayne Davis, Asst. City Manager; Ray Kingsbury, Director of Citizen Engagement; Frank Davis, Community/Property Dev. Director; Jim Hanson, Finance Director; Amber Morris, Recreation/Comm. Relations Dir.; Bob Nikula, Public Works Director; Don Simpson, Police Chief; Matthew Vanderhorst, IT / Customer Service Dir.; Paul Wright, Fire Chief; Evelyn Dumont, City Hall Front Desk; Susan Hamm, Clerk of Council; Ellen Hall, Communications Coordinator; Tina Heintzman, Fire Clerk; Don Jasper, Police Detective; Justin Liming, Public Works; Dan Miller, Public Works; Joyce Yock, Volunteer Coordinator
- ⁶⁴ Pakeeza Asghar, MCLA Graduate; Betsy Dolan, MCLA Graduate; Cherie Estill, MCLA Graduate Emily Kaes, High School Park Commissioner; Jodi Keith, MCLA Graduate; Matt Mangano, MCLA Graduate; Lynn McNay, Montgomery Kiwanis; Kathy Mecurio, Montgomery Moms; Ray Miller, MCLA Graduate/Arts Commission; Thom Monahan, President, District Business Association; Paul Myers, Exec. Dir., Chamber of Commerce; Chad Planner, District Business Association; Jim Ryerson, MCLA Graduate; Karen Schwartz, MCLA Graduate; Phil Schwartz, MCLA Graduate; Kathy Takenen, Montgomery Women's Club
- ⁶⁵ Stakeholder Interview Questions.pdf
- ⁶⁶ Montgomery Citizen Engagement Initiatives.doc: City of Montgomery Staff