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The purpose of the study was to design and field test a model for collaborative long-range community planning. A model was designed on the basis of research found in the literature, tested in a community setting, and evaluated regarding its effectiveness.

The problem delineated for the study was the lack of collaborative long-range planning in our society, particularly at the community level. A review of the literature in this field indicated that although long-range planning is considered to be important, it is seldom practiced successfully. The study's response to the problem was to design and field test a model which could be used to assist leaders in putting planning theory into practice more effectively.

A model designed by Shahan (1979) for use in a theological school was adapted for use in a community setting. The adapted model was implemented in an actual planning project in the community of Three Rivers, Michigan, a community characterized by rapid growth. The model was evaluated through the use of a prepared questionnaire which was administered to those who participated in the planning effort.
The results of the testing of the adapted planning model were very positive. The majority of those who participated in the implementation of the model ranked every stage, step, and factor in the adapted model as being above average or higher in importance and/or effectiveness.

Especially noteworthy were the very high ratings given to the process components most emphasized in the research literature—namely the importance of involving an outside facilitator and the necessity of involving politicians in the actual planning process. High ratings were also given to the importance of preliminary planning, the use of an on-site coordinator, the collaborative style of leadership, and the use of the consensus method.

Optimum conditions for implementation of the adapted model were discussed and recommendations were made regarding the steps by which the model should be implemented, including suggestions for assimilation of additional components into the model if desired.

As a result of the implementation and evaluation of the adapted model, the author concluded that the model was effective in the setting in which it was tested and that it could be used with assurance by others in similar settings.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The last decade has been characterized by declining resources, double-digit inflation, and unbalanced budgets in our public institutions. The severity of these problems makes it necessary for those who lead such institutions to seek improved means to maintain them and assist them in reaching their desired goals.

The issues are serious enough to be considered by many a matter of survival. At the least, these are considered a threat to the quality of life in our nation and its communities. One solution which appears to hold much promise for dealing with the present problems and threats is collaborative long-range planning.

Cook (1979) has stated:

In order for any institution to survive this immediate period of retrenchment and to anticipate future deleterious impacts, institutions must recognize the centrality of the planning issue. (p. 90)

Moore (1981) suggests:

We must work together to assure that the eighties become one of those rare intervals of intellectual ferment. To see this happen will require our making a dedicated commitment to thoughtful planning together with a willingness to coalesce with individuals with whom we now have adversarial relationships. (p. 1)

Despite the potential and need for resolving our problems through collaborative long-range planning, little has been accomplished by
this means thus far. Gardner (1981) states, "The question at issue is whether private groups can work together to accomplish any significant purpose. They show little sign of any such capacity today" (p. 6). Is collaborative long-range planning a solution for the severe problems facing our public institutions? Can private groups with adversarial relationships coalesce to meet the challenge? This study seeks to answer these questions posed by Gardner and others.

Statement of the Problem

The problem that prompted this study was the lack of successful, comprehensive long-range planning being carried out in our society today—particularly at the community level. Despite the many advocates and theories of planning, there is an apparent need to develop a planning model which may be used to assist leaders in putting theory into practice more effectively.

The Background of the Problem

The potential for long-range planning as a means of solving problems is often traced back to Henri Fayol, who was successful as a manager of mining operations in France in the years 1888 to 1918, and who later propounded planning in his "Theory of Administration." It was not until 1958, however, when Ewing published a comprehensive text on the subject, that long-range planning theory began to be developed for practitioners.
In recent years, many authors have produced texts and articles which deal with planning theory and practice; among them are: Cunningham (1982), Faludi (1973), Getzels (1979), Gilbert (1977), Massie (1979), and Steiner (1979). Doctoral dissertations have also dealt with long-range planning in both general terms and specific settings. Stansbury (1970) dealt with a conceptual framework of planning. Bushong (1971) focused on the development of a planning information system. Edlefson (1978) and Fitzpatrick (1978) described citizen participation efforts. Jacobs (1979), Shahan (1979), Shariat (1980), and Tomlinson (1975) presented studies of long-range planning within specific organizations—especially schools. Some dissertations have dealt with community planning (Alicea, 1978 and Bolens, 1974), but only in a very general way.

Michael (1973) stated:

The normative planning literature is quite detached from the "real world" and the literature of social psychology is seriously incomplete in its understanding of the dynamics of people and organizations undergoing change. (p. 11)

Rue (1973) comments that:

Most of the literature on long-range planning is general and philosophical in nature. In addition, almost no empirical research has been conducted to support the advocated approaches to long-range planning. (p. 23)

After making studies of long-range planning in school districts, Colucciello (1978), Fischer (1969), and Marcy (1969) reported that, even though planning is generally recognized to be an important function for school administrators, little long-range planning takes
place in most districts.

Many reasons can be found for the lack of planning within and between institutions and groups; some of the most common are the following:

1. Lack of training and knowledge of the process.
2. Lack of interest or desire.
3. Resistance.
4. Realization of the risks involved.

Sayles (1979) notes that:

Managers seeking guidance from the academic world and the experts will discover that what first appears useful and relevant has a fatal shortcoming. The books and speeches emphasize what the good manager should be thinking and/or the results he or she should be achieving. They tend to omit the critical "how" to do this. (p. 5)

He goes on to state:

Few managers don't want to plan well. The problem is how. The principles of management neglect everything that's problematic in converting good intentions into good results. The middle ground, between motive and results, is both critical and the neglected area of training. (p. 6)

Files (1973) supports Sayle's thinking by pointing out that:

Part of this lack of planning may be credited to a scarcity of formalized management training. Long-range planning requires dedicated involvement and commitment. To have that involvement and commitment, we must understand the process. (p. 115)

Explaining "Why Can't Johnny Plan?", Levin (1976) lays much of the blame for that failure on those who are teaching about planning. He states, "They cannot teach planning because they have not spent enough time in the real world of planning. It's because they have
never been real planners themselves" (p. 21). This problem can be linked to the relatively new emphasis on long-range planning.

Dealing with the issue of lack of interest or desire to plan, Files (1973) states, "Most managers don't like to plan. It takes time, a limited resource" (p. 115).

Shepherd (1976) adds other reasons why managers don't plan. He concludes:

1. It is not very exciting. Putting out fires is more apt to make men heroes.

2. The results are distant, and therefore don't give immediate emotional satisfaction.

3. It is limiting. Managers can't easily vary from the adopted course.

4. It costs money, which is already in short supply. (p. 85)

Referring to the issue of not getting involved in collaborative planning, Gardner (1981) believes that:

The root of the problem is that the organized interest group today feels literally no responsibility beyond maximizing advantage to its own constituency. This doesn't mean the leaders are bad people; they are generally good people, but our fragmented society does not require that they exhibit responsibility to the larger good. No one really expects it of them. But we must begin to expect it of them. We must move forward to new patterns of shared responsibility. (p. 6)

Saunders (1977) responds to the question, "Why don't planners plan?" by stating:

Several reasons become obvious. The first is that they do not feel a competitive stress that forces them to optimize, but rather can satisfice at a more comfortable level. The second is a relatively low degree of environmental uncertainty, as perceived by management. (p. 21)
Michaels (1973) reinforces Saunders by stating:

Now or within the foreseeable future, long-range social planning does not seem possible unless there are radical changes in the structure of organizations and in the norms that guide and sustain the behavior of the people who work in them and who, in turn, sustain those structures. The radical changes seem most difficult to realize in governmental agencies. (p. 7)

There are some factors which produce resistance to planning. Kahn (1969) notes that:

Political realities limit planning. There are powers and interests which do not want planning, which contract for pseudo-planning, or which undercut established plans; and these powers are often in the ascendency. The stakes of competing community groups, geographic sections, program sections, occupational groups, or bureaucracies are often resolved through a bargaining and power process which would appear to allow little play for rationality. To recognize this, however, is not to hold that planning is impossible. (p. 58)

There are risks in planning. Kadivar (1978) cites Rondinelli (1978) who states:

Scholars have recently begun to examine the planning process from new perspectives and are reaching different kinds of conclusions. These researchers are now discovering that the decades of planning and implementation have not been a simple, straightforward, problem solving process. Many plans actually intensified former problems both inadvertently, through planning errors, and intentionally, due to aristocratic self interest. (p. 3)

Riedel (1972) notes that there are "some harsh realities" when involving others in planning. He states:

My reading of the current upsurge in participation interest is that many are not talking about representative participation at all. They are asking for a direct transfer or reallocation of political (governmental) power, and without having to achieve
it through the tedious requirements of the existing political system. (p. 218)

Sayles (1979) summarizes the cycle which can lead a potentially good manager and planner into a more traditional and limited role:

1. The organizational setting is more recalcitrant than one imagines or has been led to believe.

2. The manager is induced or seduced into trying out rather simplistic models which lead to failure.

3. When the manager seeks help, he finds it difficult to find.

4. Not knowing how to continue, the manager is shocked and dismayed by what he finds. The reality is far different from the expectations.

5. Not having time to sort out the differences between the academic rhetoric and the realities of the firing line, the manager retreats to a more simplistic, but appealing, model of the managerial role. (p. 3)

If the managers and leaders of our institutions are to be successful in planning and willing to take the risks involved, rather than retreating to safer, less-productive roles, they must be "able to think that large returns might well come their way and occasionally someone must hit a jackpot to keep the game credible" (Dailey, 1971, p. 186).

The Purpose and Objectives of the Study

The purpose of this study was to design, field test, and describe a model which could assist educators in assuming leadership roles in cooperative area planning efforts and which could assist them in effectively leading a planning group toward the accomplishment of mutual goals.
The objectives of the study were:

1. To design a model which could be easily followed by others in the planning process.
2. To describe methods, materials, and procedures which would facilitate the successful implementation of the model.
3. To test the model in a community planning setting.
4. To report the results of the use of the model as perceived by the writer and others taking part in the planning process.
5. To draw conclusions and make recommendations regarding revision in the model for use by others in similar situations.

The Significance of the Study

The rationale for this study was based upon the argument that the success of any planning effort is contingent upon the effective linking of sound theory and effective application.

For long-range planning to reach its potential as a means to assist leaders in maintaining their institutions and reaching their desired goals, those leaders must be more effectively trained for the task and more successful in their initial ventures into the real world of planning. To fail in these areas is to assure the cycle of failure described previously by Sayles (1979).

Benefits of the Study

A well-developed planning model, based upon the best available theory and research, and field tested to provide greater assurance of success for its use by others should contribute to knowledge and
insight into the planning process and be useful at both the training and practice levels.

The ultimate benefit of the study should be that the leaders of tomorrow "will knit together an unraveling social fabric moving diverse groups toward a workable consensus" (Gardner, 1981, p. 6) through collaborative long-range community planning.

Definition of Terms

The definitions of significant terms used in this study are presented to assist the reader in understanding the framework in which they are used.

**Collaboration:** is defined as "one or more persons working with other persons toward the attainment of a common or agreed-on goal" (Pareek, 1981, p. 165).

**Long-range community planning:** an effort to appraise the overall needs of a particular geographic area and to determine how these needs can be met in the most effective and economical manner by existing and future facilities and programs. The needs are normally projected ahead for the next 5 to 15 years (Burlage, 1967 in Alicea, 1978, p. 50).

**Model:** an outline to identify the major components of the planning process. The model attempts to isolate the various factors that exert a significant influence on the overall function for the purpose of analysis (Steiss, 1974, p. 10).
Policy: a general guide that sets up boundaries within which organizations will cooperate (Shepherd, 1976, p. 99).

Systems Approach: the viewing of an organization as part of a larger and more complex system (Shepherd, 1976, p. 40).

Limitations of the Study

This study has been limited in the following ways.

1. The model was designed specifically for use in collaborative planning between public governmental organizations and institutions in communities. It may not be applicable for other types of planning or other types of groups.

2. The planners involved in this study and field test were official representatives of their organizations and institutions. No attempt was made to involve other citizens in the planning effort or to gain their direct input.

3. The design of the study did not allow for the testing of a variety of possible methods and materials.

4. The time frame of the study did not allow for evaluation of the implementation of the alternative selected by the planning council.

The Design of the Study

In order to accomplish the objectives of this study, it was determined that the following steps should be undertaken:

1. A review of the general literature on long-range planning
and on the development of a planning model would be conducted.

2. A model which could easily be followed by others would be designed. It would include general concepts and specific steps as recommended in the literature.

3. A further review of the literature would be undertaken to determine what methods, materials, and procedures would best facilitate the successful implementation of the model.

4. The model would be tested in a community planning setting. The writer would serve as the facilitator of the model for an area planning council.

5. The results of the testing of the model would be gathered by interviewing each member of the area planning council--using an evaluation instrument.

6. Conclusions would be drawn and recommendations made regarding revisions in the model for use by others in similar situations.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A review of the literature was undertaken in the following areas: (a) the importance of long-range planning, (b) the benefits of long-range planning, (c) the city as a planning center, (d) the involvement of schools in the planning process, (e) the structure needed for independent planning, (f) models for planning, and (g) the process components of planning.

The Importance of Long-range Planning

Although the roots of long-range planning may be traced as far back in history as the beginning of civilization, it is generally conceded today that long-range planning as a well-developed practice of managers is still in its infancy (Filho, 1982, p. 4).

Steiner (1979) summarizes the present view of the importance of long-range planning by stating:

Years ago when my colleagues and I were selling what at that time was called long-range planning and what I now call strategic planning, we spoke of it as a valuable new tool for management, a major new technique to help managers. I no longer speak of it this way. Strategic planning is inextricably interwoven into the entire fabric of management. (p. 3)

He went on to say, "I believe that no manager is fully discharging his or her responsibility when strategic planning is neglected" (p.4).

Tomlinson (1975) cites Taylor (1971) who says:

The horizon was a long way off in the slow moving
world which we had for several hundred years. It was unimportant that we could not see into the long-range future; but in our present world, the horizon is moving toward us with increasing speed. We cannot be satisfied with restricted vision. What is today just over the horizon is tomorrow's reality; contingent as our world must be, we must find the vantage point that gives us the longer view. (p.25)

Rue (1973) supports Taylor in stating, "The increased rate of change in today's world almost dictates that we plan well into the future" (p. 23).

Tomlinson (1975) also quotes Gelina and Pytlik (1974) in suggesting that "man now has the technical capacity to control and direct the future; to realize that alternative futures are available for the choosing; and to be able to make the best choice of these potential futures" (p. 26).

Educators are becoming increasingly aware of the need for planning. Stansbury (1970) states:

Education is affected by the social, political, economic, and environmental activities and changes in society that planners study and influence. If present trends and policies continue, these activities will exert even greater influence on educational plans and policies than ever before. The time has now come when the educational leaders of this and all states must become involved in comprehensive planning activities so that the educational needs and concerns will be adequately and fairly represented and met. (p. 2)

He goes on to suggest:

As our metropolitan areas continue to grow, many of their developmental problems will be solved only through joint governmental efforts. (p. 1)

The educational system must move toward intersystem cooperation with other social systems throughout the metropolitan area. There appears to be much room for educators to take the initiative in becoming associated with metropolitan-level, intersystem,
cooperative activities, to which they have much to contribute and from which they have much to gain. (p. 5)

The Benefits of Long-range Planning

Steiner (1979, p. 36) indicates that there are a number of "payoffs" for long-range planning. One is the stimulation to pursue key questions, such as "What is our basic line of business?" "What are our underlying philosophies and purposes?" Another benefit is that planning stimulates thinking about the future in a systematic way. It also involves individuals in setting objectives and serves as a motivator and morale builder, since those who have had a hand in setting objectives will strive harder to carry them out. Also:

By helping to formulate plans, managers should have a sense of satisfaction in at least partial creation of their own destiny. They know what is expected of them, which when achieved brings a sense of satisfaction. (p. 36)

Lastly, he notes:

People in organizations, at all levels, are interested in participating in the decision-making process, contributing their knowledge to the organization and finding opportunities to be creative. A strategic planning process is one in which these desires may be fulfilled. All of the above should make people more adaptable to change, a valuable attribute in organizations. (p. 36)

Other writers who support this philosophy include Newman and Summer (1961) who state, "The attention given to future changes and to possible company action stimulates creative thinking" (p. 432).

Dinges and Weigel (1971) indicate that a major strategy in having organizational members work in planning groups is to provide a setting "where the emphasis is upon personal growth through
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expanding awareness, exploration of interpersonal issues, and the release of dysfunctional inhibitors" (p. 342).

Bennis and Slater (1964) add:

The key to planning is then what happens to people. This means that we must eternally confront and test our own humanness and strive to become more fully human, for all planning processes involve the hopes, fears, conflicts, and other forms of human expression of people. (p. 93)

Cunningham (1982) states that:

By anticipating the future, administrators can prepare for needed changes and mitigate some outcomes that might be considered undesirable. Planning helps administrators to be better prepared to deal with both foreseen and unforeseen problems. Planning is a tool for adapting to an exciting new innovation, for resolving conflicts, improving old approaches, upgrading existing quality, improving communication, and achieving many other outcomes. The planning process allows both for the establishment of predetermined and agreed-upon outcomes or results and for the development of measures to determine the success of the organization in achieving those results. (p. 7)

The City as a Planning Center

A major area of our society affected by rapid changes and diminishing resources is that of our cities and metropolitan areas.

According to Senior (1966), strategic long-range planning for cities is a recent phenomenon. Community-wide planning in Britain began earlier than in the United States, but even there it was not considered to be effective until after 1944.

The major factors which led to development planning for cities and regional areas were:
1. Economic efficiency.
2. Social satisfaction.
3. Space shortage.
4. Urban design. (Senior, 1966, p. 38)

Cost benefit studies suggest that systematically planned urban growth can produce substantial economies, while meeting the needs and desires as well.

Havighurst (1968) suggests that:

The metropolitan area is taking the place of the city as the most useful geographical unit for thinking about the coordination and the organization of educational, governmental, and other social systems. Educators, government officials, and businessmen are developing a theory and practice of the physical environment to human satisfactions in the metropolitan area. (p. 4)

He defines "metropolitanism" as a process of action and planning.

It is the action of an increasing number of organizations which take the metropolitan area as their natural area of activity. It is also a process for future development of the metropolitan area as a unit. Related to this process is a growing amount of cooperation among local units and organizations in the provision of services to people. (p. 5)

He goes on to state:

As people and jobs were redistributed and concentrated increasingly in metropolitan areas, there were two general types of response to these developments. One was a protective response, by means of which local communities within and without the central city tried to isolate themselves through restrictive zoning, through restrictive covenants in deeds to houses to prevent the sale of homes to negroes, and generally through efforts to maintain local communities that were satisfied to remain unchanged within the larger area where change was the rule.

The other type of response was one of increasing recognition of the metropolitan area as an appropriate unit for planning and for community development. Commitment to the interests of the area as a whole
depends on the development of a sense of common
destiny. But people can hardly see themselves as
jointly participating in a geographic space unless
they visualize the geographics of the metropolitan
area in which they live. Such an image, if it exists,
serves as a symbolic representation which mediates
and thus facilitates communication and interchange
among the members of the social system. (p. 9)

Involvement of Schools

In earlier times, the separation of educational government from
other governmental structures has been thought either a trivial mat-
ter or a positive blessing. However, as society has grown more com-
plex, its parts have grown more interrelated. The pace of change has
also had an effect. For example, the speed with which an undeveloped
tract of cornfields or fruit orchards can be converted into a suburban
village or shopping center reveals the impact which such decisions
have on all kinds of local public services—education being by no
means the least. (Havighurst, 1968, p. 203)

Banghart and Trull (1973) suggest:

Many of the problems faced today are a result of man's
effort to improve one aspect of his life at the cost
of another. These seesaw manuevers and isolated improve-
ments are detrimental and, in the long run, become
part of the problem. Planners are recognizing the
need for inclusive planning that considers the social,
physical, and economic aspects of any given problem.
(p. 5)

In fact, education is affected by, and in turn affects
most activities within the community. Educational
planning, therefore, has by political action become
a part of the city's total comprehensive planning
process. (p. 17)
We do not need to forsake the tradition that all kinds of individuals and groups pursue purposes of their own choosing. But we must ask that every individual and every group, however vigorously they may pursue their special purposes, seek to reconcile those purposes with the larger needs of the society. (p. 7)

Structure Needed for Interdependent Planning

Faludi (1973) has proposed the formation of a separate agency or council to deal with planning when joint decisions are needed on issues involving interdependencies and common interests. The council would provide "positive coordination results in strategic planning on a level above that of the original agencies" (p. 211).

He further states:

Planning should be limited to only key areas. Other planning agencies are not completely subservient to the higher strategic agency, but share in the formulation of the framework. Each level has its own status, because each has an indispensable part to play in the overall process of planning. (p. 212)

The advantages of such councils is summarized by Hillman (1954) who stated:

Public spirit is not dead in rural-urban communities, but is apparently dormant in most of them. Rural-urban councils can awaken this spirit which can transform the community to new life, enthusiasm, and ambition. (p. 50)

Models for Planning

Models for planning found in the literature varied from those which described the process by listing from four to twelve steps with little description to those which presented comprehensive outlines and descriptions.
Examples of the former type of model were found in publications by Bower (1966), French (1979), Kahn (1969), and LeBreton and Henning (1961). The more comprehensive models were those by Alicia (1978), Bushong (1971), Grimes (1976), Shahan (1979), Shariat (1980), Stansbury (1970), and Tomlinson (1975).

Although the more recent and comprehensive models have become much more specific and practical, the concern expressed by Rue (1973) that "almost no empirical research has been conducted to support the advocated approaches to planning" (p. 61) remains.

Tomlinson (1975) was one of the first to design a model which was based on research and fieldtesting. However, his research was very limited and his model lacked detail. The evaluation of his model was done only with a panel of experts and not with those involved in the planning process.

Shahan (1979) designed a very detailed planning model, based on a planning effort in a theological school. The design of his model was apparently constructed on a step-by-step basis as the planning process proceeded. The evaluation of the model was done only by himself. His reporting in the study was an attempt "to tell the truth about what actually happens in such a process" (p. 1).

The Process Components of Planning

A study of the process components of planning was conducted in the review of the literature, using the redesigned model described by Shahan (1979, p. 183) as a general outline.
Development of a Rationale for Long-range Planning

Planning is commonly viewed as problem solving. Levinson (1972) states:

There are two reasons why one person comes to another for help: either he has some kind of pain (suffering, discomfort, problem) or he is causing someone else to have such pain, who is in turn compelling him to do something about that problem. (p. 10)

He further explains that there are six types of problems which have social or political importance:

1. Resource mobilization.
2. Distribution of benefits.
3. Allocation of costs.
4. Controls.
5. Adaptability and stabilization.
6. The division of labor and role allocation. (p. 9)

Sayles (1979) suggests that planning should be undertaken only when the people who are involved feel that they have a problem. He states:

For people to be interested in changing their behavior they must first be dissatisfied. Only when the people who have to change feel that they have a problem is there likely to be any movement. (p. 156)

Getzels and Thurow (1979) also believe that planning without a problem is not effective. They state, "People are project-oriented; they want results, not 'planning,' for their work" (p. 10).

The proposed general solutions to problems become the goals of planning. Hillman (1954) has noted that "before coordination of efforts can be achieved to any substantial effect, there must be
some agreement on the goals of community planning" (p. 136).

Grimes (1976) recommends that the rationale for planning be:

based on the assumption that a discrepancy exists between the state of "what is" and the state of "what is desired" and the discrepancy forms the basis for formulation of goals and objectives. (p. 84)

Securing the Necessary Approvals and Commitments

An important event in the planning process is "to create approval and commitment of the policy group or groups to begin planning" (Burke, 1979, p. 154).

The degree of permiability or openness which is to be allowed and encouraged must also be set by the leadership of the organizations. (Kahalas, 1977, p. 79)

Crochett (1970) suggests that planning is part of the:

so-called Theory Y style of management—management by participation. It is for those who believe that conflict can be handled best by confronting it openly and for those who understand that real commitment can be secured only by participation in making plans and setting objectives. (p. 306)

Johnson and Johnson (1975) provide a rationale for seeking approval and commitment to interdependent planning by stating:

Many of our goals can only be achieved with the cooperation and coordination of others. The pooling of resources to accomplish common objectives results in advantages for each group member which could never be enjoyed through individual action. The history of mankind is the history of organized groups created to obtain mutual benefits and to find ways of improving the quality of life and satisfying the needs of members. An efficient and effective group is the best friend you will ever have. (p.1)
Alicea (1978) presents a definition which may be useful in gaining approval and commitment from those who may be hesitant about yielding their authority or power to others. He defines interdependent planning as coalition planning. He describes a coalition as "an organization that blends two or more independent units without either one losing its identity or sovereignty" (p. 213).

Determining the Need for Outside Consultants

Many researchers and writers advocate the use of outside consultants or facilitators in interdependent planning efforts.

Shahan (1979) notes that:

Based upon the experience of an actual implementation of the planning model, the writer believes that it is absolutely essential that an outside consultant be used for the first meeting of the primary planning group. Such a person will likely have more credibility and greater success in the team building aspects of the design because of being a person who is definitionally "agenda free" in terms of particular outcomes of the planning process.

The outside consultant was recognized as "expert." His interventions were readily accepted by the group and enabled the process to continue. (p. 171)

Shahan also suggested the use of an on-site coordinator who acted as a consultant to the organization from within the organization (p. 173).

Filho (1982) cites Ackoff (1970) who suggests that "in the majority of organizations, the involvement of an external consultant, specialized in strategic planning is required" (p. 14).

Burke (1979) lists seven major roles for the planning facilitator
as follows:

1. Analyst
2. Organizer
3. Broker
4. Advocate
5. Enabler
6. Educator
7. Publicist (p. 269)

The roles and skills necessary to carry out these functions suggest the need for a trained specialist who is not part of any of the groups involved. An example of these requirements may be found in Burke's description of the planner as broker:

Coalitions may be formed, or there may be competition between organizations for the right to plan and organize a program. The planner, therefore, may be required to act as an intermediary between organizations and groups, or indeed even between groups within the same organization. The role is one of coordinating and integrating the varying desires of groups who have a stake in the outcomes of a plan.

The broker role requires an ability to mediate issues; to understand and use negotiating skills; to use techniques of persuasion and to bargain elements of a decision. (p. 271)

Maier and Hoffman (1960) conducted a study to determine the degree to which the training of discussion leaders furthers the quality of group decisions. They reported that the results of their study "provided striking evidence of the power of a trained developmental discussion leader to improve the quality of group decisions" (p. 249).

Duffey (1982) states that if facilitators are to be effective they must be group centered and must understand how groups work best:
To be a successful facilitator, an individual must... believe in and value both people and diversity... have an openness to new ideas and new ways of doing things... be able to cope with controversy and unpleasant situations... and be willing to subordinate his/her own expectations for the common good. (p. 32)

Rothman (1974) states that planning practitioners "have been found to have the capability to strongly influence community programs" (p. 71). He notes that:

Several studies indicate that their influence can be considerable: Weissman (1966) found that practitioners have much sway in federated or welfare council structures through the use of "exchange" modes of influence. Gilbert (1969) observed that practitioner interventions were decisive in a Community Action Program that had a new and divided policy board. Earlier writings by Banfield (1961) and Rossi (1960) have documented the impactful role of paid professionals on community issues through their critical location in and the capacity to manipulate bureaucratic institutions. (p. 72)

**Determination of the Planning Group**

The determination of the planning group includes the answering of two major questions: "Who?" and "How many?"

In answering the question of who should be involved, one recommendation is repeated many times in the literature. That recommendation is that politicians must be involved in the process.

Catanese (1974) reported that:

My professional experience has been such that I can no longer accept theories that hold that planning is distinct from the political actions needed for plan effectuation. Plans that are formulated and merely given to politicians or other professionals are doomed to dusty shelves. (p. 9)

Alicea (1978) echoed that:
Traditional planning theorists and practitioners alike have often functioned as if planning were a technical, intellectually pure, decision-making process separate from and devoid of political considerations. However, the countless master plans that clutter the dusty bins of planning offices everywhere prove the fallacy of that separation.

Contemporary planning professionals know from experience that any plan not legitimized by the special interest groups who control community resources is doomed to fail. (p. 26)

Grimes (1976) quotes Mayer, Moroney, and Morris (1974) in concluding that:

Planning in a pluralistic society is dependent on the political process and while technology is useful in identifying alternatives and tracing their consequences, it cannot replace negotiation and bargaining. (p. 115)

Involving politicians, of course, can be expected to be accompanied by conflicts among individuals and collective values. This, in turn, has led to the recognition that the political process of dealing with these conflicts must be of concern to the planner if he is to have any hope of having his plans implemented. (Steiss, 1974, p. 222)

Bushong (1971) quotes Gross (1965) in stating that:

Planning is an exercise in conflict management rather than only the sober application of technical rationality. Any real life planning may be characterized as a stream of successive compromises punctuated by frequent occasions of deadlock or avoidance and occasional victories, defeats, and integrations. (p. 12)

Steiss encourages planners to see the value of involving politicians, but warns that the arena is no place for the fainthearted. He states:

The best thing that could happen to planning is that it be taken seriously instead of accepted as a kind of elegant drawing-room accomplishment which receives the
same lip service as the other unloved civic virtues. When the greasy, grimy hands of politics are laid on planning because it means votes, the subject and its practitioners have come of age. This means that planning has come to matter. The fearful would do well to join Ophelia in a nunnery. (p. 222)

A second aspect of the question of who should be involved in collaborative planning deals with which organizations should be represented.

Alicea (1978) helps to answer the above question by reporting the results of a planning effort in which:

The reasons behind group, agency, and individual involvement became obvious. All the groups and individuals that joined the planning effort did so because the resources in contention were particularly attractive and every participant could stand to gain financial, political, or social rewards from the effort. (p. 150)

The number of people to be involved in the planning group will also have an effect on which groups, agencies, and individuals will be involved.

Seaman (1981) notes group size is an important factor in group productivity. He cites research by Steiner (1972) which indicated that:

From eight to ten persons may be the optimum to be considered in a task oriented group. Above that size groups either tend to divide into subgroups or adopt a polarized pattern of interaction. Also, when the group is too small, members perceive the task as too large. On the other hand, when the group is too large, members may feel their efforts are not really needed.

It is only natural that as group size increases, the number of problems also increases at least proportionately. "The more, the merrier" may be true as far as how much fun a group may have. In regard to
productivity, the reverse is probably more accurate.
(p. 42)

Thomas and Fink (1963) cited ten experimental studies on group size. They reported that the quality of solutions was significantly greater for groups of 12 or 13, than for groups of 6, 7, or 8. They also noted that "it would appear that smaller groups inhibit expression of disagreements and dissatisfactions more than larger groups" (p. 375).

In meetings where discussions and consensus building are desired, Smith (1965) states that "groups of 12 or fewer persons" (p. 10) are appropriate.

Jay (1976) states that "up to 10 (or at the most 12) people" (p. 46) are desirable.

Scheduling Major Events of the Process

Gilbert and Specht (1977) emphasize that "an organizer and group ought to have a good idea of what they plan to do before they set out to do it. They need to anticipate as many of the moves as possible" (p. 233).

Smith (1965) suggests that the steps in planning ought to follow the pattern of constructive thinking. He states:

The pattern of constructive thinking has five steps:
1. Identification of the problem.
2. Analysis of the relationship between the goal and barriers to it.
3. Consideration of possible solutions to the difficulty.
4. Selection of the solution that appears to be most satisfactory.

5. Consideration of ways in which the solution might be put into effect. (p. 33)

To clarify the issues involved, Smith describes a problem as "any situation in which an individual or individuals seek a practical means by which to overcome a barrier or barriers to a worth-while goal" (p. 23). He defines a barrier as "any circumstance or force that prevents an individual or a group from obtaining a stated goal" (p. 25).

Colucciello (1978) came to the conclusion that planning models are needed which "could reduce the steps involved and the time that needs to be allocated" (p. 135).

Gilbert and Specht (1977) note that:

- The order and pace of any process shapes its outcome.
- Time is a tactical consideration of community workers and groups whatever the mode of intervention. It is in the interests of those engaged in community work to effectuate an action as early in a process as possible. (p. 235)

Betz (1974) stated that:

- Time should be structured firmly and adhered to tenaciously. If a no-nonsense attitude is developed towards the time dimension, it is more likely that the group will use it as productive time. The use of time in a task group is a dynamic variable of group process and the group leader must attend to that variable if it is to contribute to the success of the group. (p. 3)

Taylor (1975) cited an experience in an American company which prepared a 6-inch thick Corporate Strategic Plan and "the planning effort so exhausted the planning staff and so depleted its goodwill..."
with operating managers that no effort was made at subsequent revisions" (p. 28).

It appears clear that the number of major events in the process and the time involved should be as brief as meaningfully possible.

Convening the Planning Group

Shahan (1979) suggests that the following need to be accomplished early in the planning process:

1. Develop a statement of mission, goals, and objectives in view of input from the constituents.

2. Use organization development techniques to facilitate the process. (p. 184)

Gilbert and Specht (1977) indicate that the tactics that organizers and community groups use to effect community change depend upon how the goal is perceived. When the goal is perceived as mutually enhancing adjustments or involving rearrangement of resources, the mode of intervention is collaborative and the method is consensus (p. 227).

Pareek (1981) lists the major advantages of collaboration:

1. **BUILDING MUTUALITY.** Collaboration helps to build relationships based on mutuality—recognizing the strengths of others and the contributions that other people can make...It also helps them to encourage the strengths of other persons, to utilize them, and to contribute to the further development of others.

2. **GENERATING IDEAS AND ALTERNATIVES.** In a collaborative relationship, people stimulate each other in thinking about problems and alternatives and generating ideas, approaches, and solutions.

3. **BUILDING MUTUAL SUPPORT AND REINFORCEMENT.** The
collaborative relationship plays a significant emotional role by reinforcing members' efforts toward mutual support....In this continuous process of feedback and support, successes are reinforced and the team is strengthened.

4. DEVELOPING SYNERGY. A collaborative relationship produces synergy, the multiplication of talents and resources available in the group.

5. DEVELOPING COLLECTIVE ACTION. When people work together in a group or team, their commitment to the goal is likely to be high and their courage to stand by that goal and take necessary action is much higher.

6. SUPPLEMENTING EXPERTISE. The greatest advantage of collaboration is that individuals go beyond their own limitation and one person's lack of expertise in a particular area does not keep the group from achieving its goals. The group's pool of strengths and expertise supplements the various individual contributions; as a result the collaborative group is able to generate multidimensional solutions. (pp. 167-168)

Smith (1965) lists the advantages of discussion which leads to consensus over debate and parliamentary procedure as follows:

1. Discussion tends to unify rather than divide a group.

2. Participants gain deeper insights into the problem they are attempting to solve.

3. Form or rules do not tend to thwart the principle of equal opportunity for all. (p. 10)

He goes on to state:

Because complete agreement on solutions to problems results in higher group morale and more enthusiastic support for the chosen solution, consensus is considered to be the most desirable result of group problem-solving. (p. 12

Group development techniques which have been found to be helpful in acquainting members with the values involved include the use
of exercises and games. Edlefson (1978) noted that the facilitator for a group project in which she took part "was able to take us through some exercises a couple of times which were very helpful" (p. 60).

Hall (1971) has used the "Lost on the Moon Test" to support the theory that decisions arrived at by an effective, democratic group, using the consensus method, are superior to those arrived at by individuals (p. 51). This test could easily be used with planning groups to assist the group in the development of its ability to collaborate and arrive at decisions through consensus.

The Leadership Style Needed

The beliefs and behaviors of those who lead collaborative planning groups toward consensus and action are crucial to the success of the process.

Earley and Rutledge (1980) note that "the more democratic and collaborative the style of the leaders, the easier it will be for them to use the model" (p. 150).

Duffey (1982) states that five basic beliefs are common to individuals who assist planning efforts:

1. Each member has something to contribute.
2. Diversity is needed to adequately identify and address basic concerns.
3. Individuals involved must be committed to not only their own participation, but also the participation of others.
4. Planning activities must be open at all times.
5. Democratic efforts are more acceptable than other efforts. (p. 17)

To put these beliefs into action, Duffey says the leader must:

1. Establish a climate where everyone feels free to participate.
2. Be an active listener.
3. Play an active role when needed.
4. Encourage leadership to emerge.
5. Be a model for group behavior. (p. 18)

Group Maintenance

It is well established in the literature that maintaining the group and dealing with personality problems are very important components in leading a successful planning group.

Lenz and Lyles (1981) state that:

Some of the most perplexing problems encountered when using long-range planning are those concerned with human behavior. Problems arising from human behavior can easily undermine the effectiveness of even a well-designed planning process. (p. 72)

Cartwright and Zander (1953) gave examples of behaviors which serve functions of group maintenance: "keeps interpersonal relations pleasant, arbitrates disputes, provides encouragement, gives minority a chance to be heard, stimulates self-direction, and increases interdependence among members" (p. 541).

Dyer (1972) states that:

It is not a waste of time for groups to take time to ensure that misunderstandings are cleared, to relieve tension, visit and relax, tell jokes and exchange personal experiences. These are some of the maintenance functions going on which keep the
group in a state of health so it can accomplish its task. We live in a task-oriented society where the emphasis is on more and more production. We neglect the feelings and emotions of people at our own peril. (p. 58)

Preparing for the Meetings

Koneya (1981) notes that:

Much attention is routinely paid by group facilitators to leadership styles, functional roles of group members, and group problem-solving formats, but the potential significance of the arrangement of chairs and tables as a variable of a meeting's success or failure is often overlooked. The quality of citizen participation can be severely affected by seating arrangements and conference table shapes. (p. 4)

He contrasts table shapes and what they mean as follows:

1. The circular table symbolizes unity, cooperation, and equality.

2. Square tables...convey the image of sidedness, competition, and adversity.

3. The rectangular table typifies unity on one side with opposition on the other side...The head of the table may denote superior status. (p.4-5)

Jay (1976) notes that the objectives for the meeting must determine the agenda (p. 47). He also notes that the agenda, "properly drawn up, has a power of speeding and clarifying a meeting that very few people understand or harness" (p. 49). He suggests putting items which require mental energy and clear heads early on the agenda. Lastly, he notes that few meetings achieve anything of value after two hours.

Determining Goals and Selecting Alternatives

At the center of the planning process is the selection of the
alternative or alternatives which will best solve the problem or meet the goal which the group has identified.

Hillman (1954) states that:

Before coordination of efforts can be achieved to any substantial effect, there must be some agreement on the goals. Such consensus is never perfect, but may be achieved progressively through experiences which yield mutual confidence and understanding. (p. 136)

Hudson (1979) describes synoptic planning, or the rational comprehensive approach, as the dominant tradition. Synoptic planning has roughly four classical elements:

1. Goal setting.
2. Identification of policy alternatives.
4. Implementation of decisions. (p. 388)

The fact that interdependent long-range planning includes persons with a variety of background and perspectives helps to assure that a comprehensive approach is used. According to Bliss (1978), the comprehensive approach "takes the form of saying, 'look at all the parts of the system and all the mechanisms by which the parts interact'" (p. 7).

Smith (1978) notes that:

In a planning context, the creative decision-making ability of participants and their evaluation of data for relevance or obsolescence can relieve the burden that was formerly on centralized planning to adequately prepare and evaluate all possible alternatives. Participation simply provides a broader basis and potentially more comprehensive framework for analysis and evaluation. Community members can quickly identify certain kinds of consequences implicit in the adoption of different alternatives. More important, community members can contribute to the generation of relevant alternatives which may save the planning
process the energy devoted to the preparation and elimination of useless alternatives. (p. 25)

When it is necessary to generate alternatives, Smith notes that a technique such as Osborn's brainstorming may be used (p. 193).

Simon (1958) gives perspective to the reality of choosing an alternative by collaborative consensus. He states:

It has been assumed that a plan will come into being when there is perfect agreement among the group members as to which of all the possibilities available to the group they would like to see realized. As a matter of fact, this is not strictly necessary. Group coordination may be possible in many cases where different individuals have different notions of the "optimum." It is necessary only that they agree in finding one plan preferable to any alternative that would be open to them as individuals if there were no cooperation. (p. 107)

Futurism as a Factor in Planning

A factor which is coming to have an increased impact upon the planning process, particularly as a stimulant to action, is the projected future.

The people who have become seriously interested in the future emphasize that we can do relatively little to improve the present world, because basic changes require time, but we have greater power over the more distant future. A seed of change planted today can become a mighty force in the years ahead. (Cornish, 1977, p. vii)

One method for picturing the future is the scenario. It is a "picture" of the future which can be formed by projecting trends into the future. "A scenario begins when we ask, 'What would happen if such and such occurred?'"(Cornish, 1977, p. 90).

Hencley and Yates (1974) describe forecasting as "the window
through which possible futures become more transparent. Forecasting

tells us what to change—what to avoid and what to drive toward"  
(p. 7). They also note that "results are obtained by exploiting
opportunities, not by solving problems" (p. 14).

Submitting the Plan to the Individual Organizations

As Burke (1979) points out:

What determines the success of a plan is whether
it is carried out as designed—not whether it has
been accepted or not by a decision center. The
implementation of a plan, therefore, cannot be left
to chance. It requires the planning of methods and
procedures to ensure that the plan is carried out.  
(p. 156)

Sayles (1979) states:

A major shift in interaction pattern is required
to move from ideas, alternatives, to acceptance of
solution...While some decisions can be made unilat­
erally, many must be "sold" to those who implement
them...Conviction and acceptance are necessary for
reasonably enthusiastic implementation by those in
critical positions.

So at this point, the planner must shift from the
position of a moderator to that of serving as a
catalyst to generate agreement. The successful
managers we observed could "sell" new programs by
communicating their excitement, their convictions
about eventual enormous success and generous rewards
for all. (p. 231)

Summary

Based upon the review of the literature, it is obvious that
collaborative long-range planning has become increasingly important
throughout our society. The benefits derived from such planning are
many. If collaborative long-range planning is to be successful, however, close attention must be paid to the components of the process—particularly those which involve the maintenance of the group.
CHAPTER III

THE DESIGN AND FIELD TEST OF THE MODEL

The problem delineated in this study was the lack of successful, comprehensive long-range planning in our society today—particularly at the community level—and the apparent need to develop a comprehensive planning model which could be used to assist leaders in putting planning theory into practice more effectively.

The response to the problem was to design, describe, and field test a comprehensive model which educators could effectively use to lead a collaborative community planning group toward the accomplishment of its goals.

The major purposes of this chapter are to describe: (1) the design of the model, (2) the methods and arrangements used in the implementation of the model, and (3) the setting in which the model was tested.

The Design of the Model

Shahan's Model used as a Basis

After a thorough review of the literature, it was determined that the model designed by Shahan (1979) and tested in a theological school could best be adapted for use in a community setting. Shahan's model was far more comprehensive and detailed than other models found in the literature.

38

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Shahan had field tested his model by implementing it in a long-range planning effort at Seabury-Western Seminary in Evanston, Illinois. Seabury-Western Seminary is a small, private, nonprofit organization sponsored by the Episcopal Church and supported by donations. It is governed by a board of trustees and it has ten regular faculty members and approximately 80 students (pp. 3-4).

After field testing his model, Shahan stated:

The resulting model is one of proven utility and is based upon sound management principles. With the assistance of a skilled consultant from within or outside the organization, the model is ready for implementation in other settings. (p. 190)

He further stated:

A most important piece of research could be done in testing the model in nonprofit organizations which are not church-related. There is nothing in the model which is uniquely church-oriented, but a test in another type of organization would demonstrate its utility in other settings. If a researcher hypothesized that some new insight or theory might improve the model, it should be tested. (p. 192)

The major weaknesses which the writer perceived in Shahan's model and the reasons why revisions were necessary for use by leaders in a collaborative community setting are as follows:

1. Although Shahan claimed that his model was "based upon sound management principles" (p. 190), he seldom documented his hypothesis for the methods and arrangements which he used.

2. No formal evaluation was made of the model or of the plan which was arrived at through the use of the model. The only evaluation of the model's utility was Shahan's report of his own perception.
3. Reports of planning group involvement at the various steps in the process focused more on the behaviors of group members than on leadership behavior—thus limiting the value to prospective leaders of long-range planning efforts.

4. Because his model was implemented in a private organization, little attention was paid to the political aspects of long-range planning.

Despite its limitations, Shahan's model served as a very helpful starting point in the design of a model for collaborative long-range community planning. His model is presented to help the reader understand the adaptations made by the writer when designing an adapted model.

**Shahan's model.** Shahan's model is a plan to plan with the following elements:

1. Develop a local rationale for long-range planning.
2. Secure the necessary approvals.
3. Determine the need for outside consultants.
4. Set a projected timetable.
5. Select a coordinator to oversee the process.
6. Determine composition of the primary planning group.
7. Schedule major events of the process.

The 12 stages of element 7 would now be described as follows:

1. Board approval of the plan to plan.
2. Identification of constituencies and the information desired from each of them.
   a. Use a systems approach.
   b. Coordinator and administrative team are responsible.

3. Solicit inputs from all relevant constituencies.
   a. Design instruments and test them prior to mailing.
   b. Set timetable.
   c. Provide for feedback.
   d. Develop system for collating information.
   e. Coordinator and administrative team are responsible.

   a. Give this group basic training in systems analysis and organization development.
   b. Develop a statement of mission, goals, and objectives in view of inputs from constituents.
   c. Use organization development techniques to facilitate the process.
   d. Use an outside process consultant.
   e. Coordinator and outside consultant are responsible.

5. Administrative staffing of programs.
   a. Use a systems approach or the systems analysis paradigm on each goal to select alternative means of meeting the goals.
   b. Develop action plans to meet proposed goals and objectives.
   c. Cost each action plan.
   d. Note action plans which require additional funding.
   e. Do necessary future forecasting.
   f. Write a draft preliminary long-range plan.
   g. Coordinator, administrative team, and necessary outside resource persons are responsible.

   a. Review administrative staffing.
   b. Review priorities among action plans.
   c. Review the draft preliminary long-range plan and redraft or refine as necessary.
   d. Coordinator is responsible.
7. Submit draft preliminary long-range plan to trustee committees.
   a. Note particular implications for each committee.
   b. Committees to approve or suggest revision of mission statement.
   c. Committees to approve or disapprove principles underlying the draft preliminary long-range plan.
   d. Committees to list their concerns with the plan.
   e. Committees to set a time for a special meeting to consider the plan.
   f. Coordinator, administrative team, and the chairpersons of each committee are responsible.

8. Refine the draft plan based upon trustee committee input.
   a. Prepare final long-range plan.
   b. Coordinator and administrative team are responsible.

   a. Review and approve the final long-range plan.
   b. Coordinator is responsible.

10. Submit final long-range plan to Board of Trustees for approval.
    a. Board approves plan and appoints a continuing long-range planning and evaluation committee composed of trustees, faculty, administration, and students.
    b. Coordinator is responsible.

11. Implementation.
    a. Begin implementation according to a schedule contained in the long-range plan.
    b. Administrative team and designated parties are responsible.

12. Evaluation and continued update of the long-range plan.
    a. Monitor progress of the plan according to the schedule contained therein.
    b. Evaluate action plans according to criteria contained in the plan.
c. Check proposed new programs, not included in the plan, against the mission statement and refer to appropriate decision-makers.

d. Call for a new major planning effort using this model every five years.

e. Continuing long-range planning and evaluation committee is responsible. (pp. 183-186)

Shahan noted that the components of his plan to plan were described as elements because "they are all parts of a single entity, they are not stages to be followed in a particular sequence" (p. 95).

The Writer's Adapted Model for Collaborative Long-range Community Planning

In designing a model for use in a community setting, the writer attempted to determine the best possible sequence of steps to be followed, using the research found in the literature as a basis for the design.

Although not entirely disagreeing with Shahan's belief that the elements of a model need not be followed in a particular sequence, the writer supported the advice of Smith (1965) who stated that "the steps in planning ought to follow the pattern of constructive thinking" (p. 33). The writer therefore designed the model in steps based upon a recommended sequential order.

The model, which has been entitled "A Model for Collaborative Long-range Community Planning," is presented in its entirety, to be followed by a discussion of each step in the planning process as the writer perceived its applicability. The discussion will also include descriptions of methods and materials used in the implementation of the model.
A model for collaborative long-range community planning.

1. Develop a local rationale for long-range planning.

2. Determine the composition of a preliminary planning group.
   a. Groups to be involved.
   b. Individuals to be involved.
   c. Number of people desired.

3. Meet with the preliminary planning group.
   a. Secure approval of the local rationale for long-range planning.
   b. Determine composition of the planning group.
   c. Determine the mode of operation to be followed.
   d. Determine the need for outside consultants.
   e. Select a coordinator to oversee the process.
   f. Determine a projected timetable.
   g. Plan for the first meeting of the primary planning group.

4. Convene the primary planning group.
   a. Orient the group to the preliminary plans and seek approval of them.
   b. Provide training and experience in the use of the selected mode of operation.
   c. Determine the problems which the group wishes to address.
   d. Develop a statement of mission and goals.
   e. Seek the official endorsement of the statement of
mission and goals by the representative Boards.

f. Discuss and study problem areas and the background of each.

g. Discuss and study possible alternative solutions to the problems.

h. Determine the preferred solutions to the problems.

i. Determine responsibilities for the implementation of the preferred solutions.

j. Determine whether on-going planning and/or evaluation is desired.

5. Submit the proposed long-range plan to each represented Board for approval.

6. If desired, reconvene the planning group for adjustments in the proposed long-range plan.

7. Communicate the plan to the total community.

Discussion of the Steps in the Model

Develop a local rationale for long-range planning. The need for the development of a local rationale is well established in the literature. Getzels and Thurow (1979), Grimes (1976), Hillman (1954), Levinson (1972), and Sayles (1979) all indicated that planning is only meaningful when a problem or need is clearly recognized and a discrepancy exists between the state of "what is" and the state of "what is desired."

The concept of a council which would assist independent units
of government to accomplish common goals, as described by Faludi (1973) and Hillman (1954), should be interwoven into the rationale for long-range community planning.

Shahan did not elaborate at length about the local rationale in his model. His statement, "The Board of Trustees called for the institution of a long-range planning process" (P. 6), and his a priori assumption that "building commitment may be more important than the actual plan" (p. 52), may reasonably be assumed to be a sufficient rationale in a private institution dependent upon donations for support.

The writer, however, perceived the development of a local rationale to be critical to the success of an interdependent planning effort where separate units of government are involved.

**Determine the composition of a preliminary planning group.**

Shahan noted that:

> The description of the primary planning group is an important part of the methodology. This group must be representative of various constituencies and yet not be too large to make the accomplishment of their tasks difficult. (p. 89)

Research in the literature provided support for Shahan's recommendations, but also strongly urged that politicians be actively involved in the community planning process.

**Groups to be involved.** Because of the sparsity of community planning, the literature regarding which groups should be involved is limited. Alicea (1978) indicated that "any plan not legitimized by the special interest groups who control community resources is doomed
to fail" (p. 26).

In a representative democracy such as is found in our American communities, the control of resources rests with the representatives of the people in governmental units and in the organizations which represent the interests of private businesses and industries. For this reason, the writer believed that the groups to be involved in community planning should be the major governmental units, such as the city, the surrounding townships, and the schools, and an organization which would represent the business and industrial interests, such as a chamber of commerce.

The writer believed that the responsibility for making the group determination should be undertaken by the preliminary planning group. Alicea (1978) noted that "groups which stand to gain financial, political, or social rewards from the effort will want to be involved" (p. 150).

Individuals to be involved. As noted in the review of the literature, many writers, including Alicea, Catanese (1974), Grimes (1976), and Steiss (1974), were emphatic in suggesting that politicians must be actively involved in community planning efforts, or as Catanese noted, "Plans that are formulated and merely given to politicians or other professionals are doomed to dusty shelves" (p. 9).

If the planning effort is to be effective, the writer believes it is essential that every effort be made to involve politicians in the process as early as possible.
Number of people to be involved. Although Shahan stated, "It may be hypothesized that a group of up to twenty people would provide adequate representation and still be a workable size" (p. 89), he gives no basis for his hypothesis and would find little support in the literature.

The opinions of such writers as Jay (1976), Seaman (1981), Smith (1965), and Steiner (1979), and the experimental studies cited by Thomas and Fink (1963) suggest that the optimum size for task-oriented groups where discussion and consensus building are desired is from 8 to 12 people.

The writer believed that the determination of an appropriate number of people to be involved in the planning group should be an essential task for the preliminary planning group.

Meet with preliminary planning group. Shahan's model provided that all preliminary planning would be carried out by the administrative team (p. 9). His chronology indicated that the period from the time that the dean of the seminary called for the establishment of a long-range planning effort to the first meeting of the primary planning group was slightly over one year in duration (p. 13). The total planning process described by Shahan, therefore, was accomplished in two years, rather than the one year period which he stated his model would "demonstrate that it was possible" (p. 12).

The writer believed that preliminary planning would be more efficient and effective if representatives of the groups to be involved in the planning effort were included early in the process.
Failure to initiate such early involvement limits opportunities to take advantage of the systems approach and the organizational development which Shahan so strongly advocated (p. 9).

Possible breakdowns in the planning process at the later stages may be avoided by involving members of the planning group in preliminary planning. Shahan could have experienced such a breakdown when a non-teaching member of the group reacted strongly to the attempt of faculty members—all 10 of whom were on the primary planning group—to dominate the determination of goals for the curriculum (p. 128).

Secure approval of the local rationale. Burke (1979) suggests that an important step in the planning process is to "create approval and commitment of the policy group or groups to begin planning" (p. 154). This event is perceived by the writer to be more crucial in interdependent community planning than in a private institution because of the different "power dynamics" Shahan involved (p. 52).

Alicea (1978) indicated that interdependent planning must assure that independent units can blend together without any losing their identity or sovereignty (p. 213). Failure to establish this assurance early in the planning process could reasonably hinder the approval and commitment needed for effective long-range planning.

Securing approval of the local rationale was perceived by the writer to be the first step which should be taken by the preliminary planning group. Failure to accomplish agreement at this stage would make the remainder of the planning process meaningless, if not
impossible.

The local rationale for long-range community planning approved at this preliminary stage is subject to later approval by the final planning group and the boards of the groups represented.

Determine composition of the primary planning group. As noted earlier in the discussion regarding determination of the composition of a preliminary group, the description of the planning group is an important part of the methodology. The factors discussed in that step of the planning process are the same as those at this step and therefore are not repeated here.

The leader should strongly encourage the preliminary planning group to follow the guidelines found in the research regarding the groups to be represented, the individuals to be involved, and the number of people to be included in the primary planning group.

An essential point at this stage of the process is that the determination of the primary planning group should be made with the involvement of the representatives of the groups involved in the process, and not entirely by the administrative team. Failure to provide for this involvement at an early stage of the planning process could seriously diminish the agreement and commitment so crucial to any long-range planning effort.

Determine the mode of operation to be followed. An important step in the preliminary planning process is the determination of the mode of operation to be followed. As in other determinations to be made by the preliminary planning group, involvement by the group
in the decision as to the mode of operation to be followed at an early stage can be very beneficial in increasing agreement and commitment among those involved in planning.

Shahan suggested that systems analysis and organizational development are two essentials in the planning process. Gilbert and Specht (1977) indicated that:

The tactics that organizers and community groups use to effect community change depend upon how the goal is achieved. When the goal is perceived as mutually enhancing adjustments or involving rearrangement of resources, the mode of intervention is collaborative and the method is consensus. (p. 227)

Hall (1971), Pareek (1981), and Smith (1965) support the use of collaboration and consensus as the best way to build relationships, generate support, and arrive at superior decisions. The leader of the preliminary planning group should emphasize the input of these writers in helping the group determine the best possible mode of operation.

The writer used collaboration and the consensus method in the implementation of the model with the approval of the planning group.

Determine the need for outside consultant. The determination of the need for an outside consultant should be made during the preliminary planning stage to make it possible to procure a consultant and to deal with the issue of the costs involved.

Shahan noted that based upon his experience in implementing his planning model:

It is absolutely essential that an outside consultant be used for the first meeting of
the primary planning group. Such a person will likely have more credibility and greater success in the team building aspects of the design because of being a person who is definitionally "agenda free" in terms of particular content outcomes of the planning process. (p. 17)

It should be noted that the first meeting of the primary planning group at Seabury-Western Theological Seminary lasted for three days.

Shahan further noted:

The outside consultant to the process functioned in three important ways: he assisted in the design of the particular events which occurred during the first meeting of the primary planning group, he provided training in the systems approach and organization development, and he made interpersonal interventions in the process as he deemed necessary. His contribution in each of these aspects was very important. His input into the design helped to ensure an orderly progression of events; his opening lecture placed him in a position of "expert" with the group; and his interventions, although few in number, were appropriate in that they were readily accepted by the group and enabled the process to continue. (p. 172)

Shahan also recommended that "if there were any serious reservations, they should retain an outside consultant for their other meetings as well" (p. 173). Shahan, who served as coordinator of the planning process, had previous experience as a participant and as a consultant and was able to function as the facilitator-moderator for the later meetings.

As noted in the review of the literature, many writers favor the use of trained consultants in planning efforts. Ackhoff (1970) suggested that "in the majority of organizations, the involvement of an external consultant, specialized in strategic planning is required"
Burke (1979), Duffey (1982), Maier and Hoffman (1960), and Rothman (1974) all emphasized the importance of skilled leadership in improving group interaction and the quality of group decisions.

The writer agreed that a skilled consultant who was able to serve as the facilitator-moderator of the group is essential. It would undoubtedly be best if this person was external to the group. In the event that this arrangement is not feasible, however, the writer proposes that an internal consultant with the necessary skills could serve as facilitator-moderator of an interdependent planning group. Such an arrangement would require the agreement of all of the parties involved.

In the implementation of the adapted model for community planning, the writer served as the outside consultant, with the title of moderator-facilitator.

Select a coordinator to oversee the process. An on-site coordinator should be selected by the preliminary planning group at an early stage in the process.

Shahan noted, "It became apparent that the long-range planning process would need to be coordinated by some person" (p. 42). He also noted:

The on-site coordinator is, by definition, a consultant from within the organization. This person manages the entire planning effort, and provided with proper role definition and clearly defined authority, can do so effectively. (p. 173)

Although no research was found, other than Shahan, to support
the need for a coordinator, the writer agreed with the apparent need for a coordinator as a key person in the long-range planning process.

In the implementation of the model in a community setting, there will usually be at least one person whose job description includes the responsibility for long-range planning. This person is generally the best equipped in terms of training and available time to coordinate the planning project.

In the setting in which the writer implemented the adapted model, the city planner was the most logical choice for this role and was approved by the planning group.

Determine a projected timetable. Research in the literature indicated that the time factor in planning is an important element. Betz (1974), Colucciello (1978), and Gilbert and Specht (1977) all noted that time is a dynamic variable, that it is a tactical consideration in working with voluntary community workers, and that since the order and pace of any planning process shapes its outcome, actions should be effectuated as early as possible in the planning process.

Shahan set out to "demonstrate that it was possible to accomplish the planning process in a period of one year" (p. 12). His chronology of events indicated that, with the exception of preliminary planning, he was able to complete the process within the desired time frame (p. 13).

Based upon the research in the literature and Shahan's experience, the writer believed it was essential to set a projected timetable which would make it possible to accomplish reasonable goals.
without spending excessive time or losing the goodwill of those involved in the process.

In implementing the adapted model, the writer sought and gained the approval of the planning group to project a timetable which would not exceed one year in duration.

Plan for the first meeting of the primary planning group. Having secured the approval of the local rationale for long-range planning and having determined the other needs listed in the model for preliminary planning, the last step to be taken by the preliminary planning group is to plan for the first meeting of the primary planning group. Included in the plans must be such considerations as where and when the meeting would be held and what preparations were needed.

Shahan was able to use a retreat center owned by the Episcopal Church and away from the seminary for planning meetings. The planning group was able to meet in three-day sessions, making it possible to complete the planning process in two sessions of the group (p. 128).

It is important to meet in a location which is not considered to be advantageous to any group involved in the planning effort. It also is important to meet at times considered convenient for all groups and individuals involved.

The writer perceived that the first meeting of the primary planning group would be a key to its long-term success. In the implementation of the adapted model, the first meeting was scheduled to be held at the community library, a facility shared and supported.
by all groups involved in the planning effort. The meeting was scheduled for an evening when all groups could be represented.

The preliminary planning group suggested that each group represented bring three issues of concern or problems to be addressed to the first meeting of the planning group.

Convening the primary planning group. After the completion of preliminary planning, the next major step in the planning process is to convene the primary planning group. Shahan says that this is the first step in involving the group in "the process of doing long-range planning and accomplishing the results desired" (p. 11). As in the preliminary planning stage, a number of steps are necessary to reach the desired results.

As noted by Shahan, the facilitator has the prime responsibility for designing the events which are to occur during the first meeting (p. 172). Gilbert and Specht (1977) support the concept of careful planning prior to the meeting. They suggest the "need to anticipate as many of the moves as possible (p. 233).

The agenda must be carefully prepared, as an essential tool for "speeding and clarifying a meeting" (Jay, 1976, p. 49). The arrangement of tables and chairs is also an important variable in the success or failure of a meeting. Koneya (1981) suggests that "the circular table symbolizes unity, cooperation, and equality" (p. 4).

The writer believed that the designing of the agenda for the meetings and the arrangement of tables and chairs were essential elements of a successful planning process. Special attention was
paid to these details in the implementation of the model.

Orient the group to the preliminary plans and seek approval of them. Based upon the belief that agreement and commitment are essential at each and every step of any successful model for collaborative long-range planning—especially when the cooperation of independent groups is needed—the primary planning group should be aware of and in agreement with the preliminary plans for the planning project.

Shahan did not provide for an orientation of the primary planning group (p. 184). This omission could lead to some of the "traps to be avoided" cited by Naylor (1981), namely failure to allow for the necessary involvement of those taking part in the planning process and failure to create a climate which is congenial to planning (p. 57).

The writer believed that the orientation of the primary planning group to the preliminary plans—with an opportunity to amend them as desired—was an essential step in the planning process. In the implementation of the model, this step was carried out as the first item on the agenda at the first meeting of the primary planning group.

Provide training and experience in the use of the selected mode of operation. Shahan noted that "the primary planning group must have or have access to the skills necessary to do their work" (p. 81), and that in the implementation of his model, "the outside consultant to the process provided training in the systems approach and organization development" (p. 172).
As Hall (1971) pointed out:

Group decisions often are frustrating and inadequate. All members want agreement, but they also want to make their own points heard. So they bargain, they compromise, and the final product is often a potpourri that no group member really believes in. (p. 51)

He found, however, that groups trained in the consensus method "did significantly better than untrained groups" (p. 53).

The writer believed that providing training and experience in the selected mode of operation was an essential step in the planning process. In the implementation of this step, he used the guidelines for achieving consensus and the "Lost on the Moon" exercise designed by Hall (pp. 86-88). (See Appendix C).

Determine the problems which the group wishes to address. As discussed earlier under the topic of developing a local rationale for long-range planning, planning is only meaningful when problems or needs are clearly recognized. Therefore, to make the planning process meaningful to the primary planning group at an early stage, the determination of problems it wishes to address is essential.

Shahan stated that:

A clearly formulated problem is one which suggests that there is a way to know when the problem has been solved and that there is some expectation of being able to solve it. (p. 44)

This definition could be helpful to the planning group in arriving at well-defined problems.

Using a technique such as asking each independent group involved in the planning process to bring three problems to the meeting
may be expected to generate a list of potential problems. The consensus method is then useful in helping the group to arrive at a prioritized, consolidated list of problems.

The writer believed that this is a basic step in the planning process and should be dealt with early in the planning process.

**Develop a statement of mission and goals.** Shahan noted that:

> Although one common perception in the literature is that an organization must have some understanding of its mission or purpose, the literature does not describe how an organization arrives at that understanding. (p. 93)

The writer arrived at the same conclusion after reviewing the literature.

The local rationale for long-range planning may be sufficient as a mission statement for an interdependent council involved in long-range community planning. It may also be easily amended for that purpose through the consensus method.

Shahan stated that "one of the purposes in writing a mission statement is to provide input into the goal setting process" (p. 125). He described goals as "realizable desired outcomes" (p. 127).

In developing a statement of goals, the writer believed that the problems identified by the group could be restated in the form of goals with the involvement of the primary planning group, using the consensus method.

**Seek the official endorsement of the statement of mission and goals by the represented Boards.** The writer believed that it is essential that the Boards represented in the collaborative long-range
planning process have a continuing involvement in and commitment to the planning effort. Therefore, at specific steps in the planning process, opportunity must be provided for their involvement. The endorsement of the statement of mission and goals was considered to be one such step.

The continuous involvement of politicians in the planning process was endorsed and encouraged by Alicea (1978), Catanese (1974), Grimes (1976), and Steiss (1974).

In implementing the model, the writer used a prepared resolution which was presented to the individual boards by their representatives to the primary planning group. The signing of this resolution facilitated the official endorsement of the statement of mission and goals of the primary planning group. (See Appendix A).

Discuss and study problem areas and the background of each. Shahan suggested that there are two modes of intervention to promote organizational development in the planning process: (a) confrontation—the bringing together of units of the organization which have previously been in poor communication, and (b) data feedback—the systematic collection, reporting, and diagnosis of data in problem solving and planning (p. 91).

In regard to the confrontation mode, Duffey (1982) noted that "planning activities must be conducted in an atmosphere of openness using democratic efforts" (p. 17). Gross (1965) stated: "Planning is an exercise in conflict management rather than only the sober
application of technical rationality" (p. 12).

Sayles (1979) recommended that data feedback be used as a "catalyst to the people who will have to change, emphasizing the discrepancy between what they believed and the reality of the situation" (p. 157). Smith (1978) supports data analysis to "dispose of obsolete information and the acceptance of new information by participants in planning" (p. 25).

Smith also stated:

Where the purposes of a planning experience are not necessarily to further the particular interests of any participant, there exists the requirement of full and equal access to information. Without open information, dialogue and learning cannot occur, the degree of uncertainty and risk increases and there is less willingness to act. (p. 67)

The writer believed that, on the basis of research found in the literature, open discussion and study of the problem areas was a vital step in the problem solving necessary for effective long-range planning. He echoes Early and Rutledge (1980) who note, "The more democratic and collaborative the style of the leader, the easier it will be for them to implement the model" (p. 150). In implementing the model, the writer used the democratic and collaborative style.

Discuss and study possible alternative solutions to the problems. Basic to the planning process is the generating of possible alternative solutions to the problems addressed.

Writers such as Cornish (1977) emphasize that "we can do little to improve the present world, because basic changes take time, but we
have greater power over the more distant future. A seed of change planted today can become a mighty force in the years ahead" (p. vii). He recommends the use of the scenario to assist planners to imagine "what would happen if such and such occurred?" (p. 90).

Hencley and Yates (1974) recommend forecasting as a means to determine what to change and what to avoid (p. 7). They emphasize that "results are attained by exploiting opportunities, not by solving problems" (p. 14).

Hall (1971), Pareek (1981), and Smith (1978) all note that the collaborative group goes far beyond the potential of where the individuals involved could go on their own. Hall calls this happy event "synergy" (p. 53).

When a special method is needed to generate alternatives, a technique such as Osborn's brainstorming may be helpful (Smith, p. 193).

The writer believed that the composition of the interdependent planning group would be conducive to the generation of a variety of alternative solutions to the problems defined. No special method was necessary to generate alternatives when implementing the model.

Determine the preferred solutions to the problems. The determination of preferred solutions to the problems is another essential step in the planning process.

Simon (1978) stated that although:

It has been assumed that a plan will only come into being when there is perfect agreement among the group members as to which of all the possibilities available to the group they would like to see
realized...it is only necessary that they agree in finding one plan preferable to any alternative that would be open to them as individuals if there were no cooperation. (p. 107)

Litchfield (1960) notes:

Cost-benefit analysis must be made in choosing from among community planning proposals to compare benefits that would accrue to the community with the costs at which they would be bought. (p. 273)

Shahan suggested that choosing a preferred solution should be based on "how the organization wants to spend the next five years" (p. 181). Related to this issue is his definition of "intentional planning" which asks the question, "What should we be doing?" (p. 127).

As in the generating of possible solutions, the fact that interdependent long-range planning includes persons with a variety of backgrounds and experiences, the preferred solutions tend to take into account "all the parts of the system and all the mechanisms by which the parts interact" (Bliss, 1978, p. 7).

The writer believed that the determination of the preferred solutions would best be achieved through group discussion using the consensus method. This method was therefore used at this stage, as well as in all other stages of the implementation of the model.

Determine responsibilities for the implementation of the preferred solutions. As Burke (1979) pointed out:

What determines the success of a plan is whether it is carried out as designed—not whether it has been accepted or not by a decision center. The implementation of a plan, therefore, cannot be left to chance. It requires the planning of methods and procedures to ensure that the plan is carried out. (p. 156)
Sayles (1979) stated:

The facilitator must shift from the position of a moderator to that of serving as a catalyst to generate agreement and then "help sell" the chosen alternatives by communicating their excitement, their convictions about eventual enormous success and generous rewards for all.

(p. 231)

Shahan outlined the implementation step in his model, but did not discuss it in his commentary. His implementation plan included the setting of a schedule and the responsibility of the administrative team and other designated parties (p. 186).

The writer believed that the "designated parties" who would have to carry most of the responsibility for implementing the preferred solutions were the representatives of each unit in the planning council. This arrangement was carried out in the implementation of the adapted model.

Determine whether on-going planning and/or evaluation is desired and make appropriate plans. Shahan noted that his model was designed to be used every five years to plan for the next five years. He stated:

It would not be meaningful and could be counter-productive to go through the process of writing a mission statement and establishing new goals each year. If the plan is seen to be a five year plan, then the annual task becomes one of evaluation. The committee responsible for continuing long-range planning should see its task as the monitoring of the current long-range plan and evaluate each of its goals.

(p. 182)

The writer agreed with Shahan's rationale and included this
step in the adapted model. The major difference in this step in the adapted model, designed for use with an interdependent planning group, would be that the council would have to reconvene periodically to conduct meaningful on-going planning or evaluation.

In implementing the adapted model, the writer left the option open to the council as to whether or not on-going planning or evaluation would be continued. The planning council decided to resume for another year of planning after a summer recess. On-going planning and evaluation were scheduled to take place during the next year.

Submit the proposed long-range plan to each represented unit board for approval. Shahan included an equivalent to this step in his model by submitting the long-range plan first to trustee committees and then to the Board of Trustees for approval. He noted that the committees were to approve the plan as presented or suggest revisions to various parts of the plan (pp. 185-186).

The writer perceived a similarity between the role of the trustee committees at Seabury-Western Theological Seminary and that of the individual boards represented on the primary planning council. Therefore, the adapted model included provision for each represented unit board to approve the long-range plan as an essential step in the interdependent planning process.

In the implementation of this step of the model, unit representatives were asked to discuss the plan with their boards prior to the last meeting of the primary planning group so that any suggested
revisions could be made before the group was adjourned or recessed and before announcement of the plan was made to the total community.

If desired, reconvene the primary planning group for adjustments in the proposed long-range plan. Shahan's model provided for the reconvening of the primary planning group after the plan was refined--based upon trustee committee input. The primary planning group reviewed and approved the final long-range plan prior to submitting it to the Board of Trustees for approval (pp. 185-186).

The writer believed that this step would not ordinarily be necessary in a model for collaborative community planning, since communication with each board represented was continuous throughout the progressive steps of the model. Nevertheless, it was believed that provision should be made for the reconvening of the primary planning group in the event of needed adjustments in the projected long-range plan.

To fail to provide for this step could result in failure of the implementation of the plan due to lack of commitment on the part of one or more of the units represented.

In the implementation of this step of the adapted model, the reconvening of the primary planning group was scheduled to take place in the fall, after a summer recess, as part of a continuing effort to carry out collaborative long-range community planning.

Communicate the plan to the total community. Shahan noted:

Although major donors and potential donors were also considered to be an important part of the
constituency, it was decided by the administra-
tive team not to involve them until there was
a product in the form of a plan to show them.
(p. 105)

The writer arrived at a similar conclusion in deciding that
the total community should be involved with the long-range plan only
after a plan was available in its final form.

This decision was also influenced by the input of writers such
as Fitzpatrick (1978) who noted that citizens have a reasonable oppor-
tunity to "influence the distribution of benefits or losses which may
be visited upon them" through their elected representatives (p. 1),
and Riedel (1972) who stated that there are some "harsh realities"
involved in dealing with some members of the general public "who may
be seeking power and who haven't achieved a position as a representa-
tive through the tedious requirements of our political system" (p.218).

In the implementation of the model, plans were made by the pri-
mary planning group to have the coordinator communicate the final plans
to the total community through the area newspaper and radio station.

The Testing of the Model

The Setting

The model was tested in the southwestern Michigan community of
Three Rivers, in the years 1981 and 1982. The city and its three
surrounding townships had a combined population of approximately
16,000 people.

For some time, the mayor and council of the city of Three
Rivers had discussed the possibility of establishing a cooperative planning council which would involve representatives of the city, townships, schools, and other groups interested in area development.

The city and the surrounding townships had experienced some growth problems and conflicts in recent years. The establishment of a new General Motors transmission plant in the community had necessitated boundary changes through annexation and stimulated growth in the area. New stores, motels, and restaurants began to spring up—making the demand for water, sewer; and other services normally provided by the city more pressing.

Some of the requests for annexation to the city by the new businesses were opposed by one of the townships. The disputed cases were appealed to the State Boundary Commission. The Commission ruled in favor of annexation to the city in all cases, resolving the issue for the property owners, but resulting in some hard feelings between the township and the city.

Representatives of the township which opposed annexation to the city wanted the city to sell utilities to them, making it possible for the township to retain jurisdiction over all present properties and new businesses. They pointed out that this arrangement was being carried on in other metropolitan areas and that it had been discussed between the city and another township in recent years.

The city had established an unwritten policy that utilities would not be sold to anyone outside of the city boundaries. All recent requests for the purchase of utilities were denied on the
basis of this policy.

Other recent developments in the area included the establishment of an area hospital authority which provided a broader tax base for the hospital, and the construction of a new library which was built with broad community support. Operation of the hospital and library had previously been solely the responsibility of the city. The townships, however, had made yearly contributions for the support of the library on a voluntary basis.

The author's proposal to help establish an area planning council which could hopefully help resolve some of the current problems and provide for positive area development was accepted by the mayor and city council. Included in the proposal was the plan to use the model designed by the writer, to have the writer serve as facilitator of the model, and to evaluate the model's effectiveness at the end of the planning project.

The length of the planning period was tentatively set at one year, as that was the amount of time which the author was able to give to the project.

Establishment of the Area Planning Council

The mayor of the city invited representatives of the city, of three of its most closely surrounding townships, and of the public schools to meet together on August 12, 1981 to discuss the possible formation of a cooperative area planning council to deal with issues of mutual concern.
Those who attended the meeting were enthusiastic about the potential for such a council and readily entered into the preliminary planning steps in the writer's adapted model for collaborative long-range planning.

Decisions made by the preliminary planning group included:
(a) the acceptance of the proposed rationale for long-range planning;
(b) the addition of the Three Rivers Area Chamber of Commerce as a unit to be represented on the primary planning group; (c) the provision that each unit should be represented by two members; (d) the acceptance of the author as moderator-facilitator and the adoption of the use of his adapted model; (e) the approval of City Planner Barry Visel as coordinator of the planning project; and (f) the scheduling of the first regular meeting of the planning council on September 14, 1981, at 7:00 P.M. in the Three Rivers Library.

A total of nine meetings was held by the primary planning group, which determined that it should be known as the Area Planning Council (A.P.C.). Two-hour meetings were held on a monthly basis.

All representatives on the council were members of their unit's board, with the exception of those who represented the city. The city named two members of its appointed planning commission. One planning commissioner later yielded his seat on the A.P.C. to the newly-elected mayor who desired personal representation on the council.

Because two of the townships involved named one--rather than the suggested two-representatives to the A.P.C., the official
membership of the Council, excluding the moderator-facilitator and the coordinator, totaled ten persons. The average attendance at regular meetings was seven.

A summary of all meetings held in the implementation of the adapted model, excluding administrative planning meetings, is found in Appendix D.

**Methods Used in Testing the Adapted Model**

The methods used in testing the adapted model included the implementation of the model in an actual community setting to determine its utility, and the use of a formal evaluation instrument (See Appendix E) to determine their perceptions of the implementation of the model.

The implementation of the adapted model has been described in the discussion of each stage and step of the model, with details being provided in Appendix D.

A formal evaluation instrument was prepared by the writer to gather the perceptions of those representatives of boards who took part in the planning process. The instrument included questions related to each stage and step in the adapted model which had been implemented. Since the evaluation had to be conducted soon after the conclusion of the A.P.C. meetings, stages six and seven—reconvening of the group to consider possible changes and communicating the plan to the total community—were not included in the evaluation.

The evaluation instrument was administered by the writer by
interviewing each member of the A.P.C. individually at the conclusion of the planning process. Each person interviewed was asked to rate the importance of the issue or item question on a scale of 1 to 5 and to add comments where they might be helpful in clarifying or adding to a response.

The results of the testing of the implementation of the adapted model will be reported in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

REPORT AND DISCUSSION OF TESTING RESULTS

The study's response to the problem of the lack of successful comprehensive long-range planning at the community level was to design and field test a model which could be used to assist leaders in putting planning theory into practice more effectively.

This chapter will report and discuss the results of testing the model in a community setting and the evaluation of its effectiveness through the use of a prepared questionnaire. (See Appendix E). As stated in Chapter Three, the evaluation instrument was prepared and administered by the writer. Each of the ten participants in the primary planning group was interviewed and asked to respond to items on the questionnaire. Each interviewee was asked to rate the importance or effectiveness of each item on a scale of 1 to 5 and to comment wherever he/she believed it might be helpful in clarifying or adding to a response.

The numbers on the scale were matched with the following descriptions: 5 - Very high or great, 4 - Above average, 3 - Average, 2 - Below average, and 1 - Insignificant. In reporting the results on tables, the scale of numbers will be used for brevity. For the purpose of discussion, the descriptions which are matched with the numbers will be used for clarity.

The results of the testing of the model will be reported and
discussed under the specific heading which describes the stage, step, or factor being evaluated. The relationship between the various items on the questionnaire and the stages and factors in the model being evaluated will be discussed. Also, the writer will discuss any circumstances which may have affected the response of the participants.

Preliminary Planning

Item 1 on the evaluation instrument related to the importance and effectiveness of the preliminary planning stage of the model as implemented. As noted in Table 1, 50% of those responding to this item rated its importance and effectiveness as being very high or great, 40% rated it as being above average, and 10% rated it as being average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1. How important do you believe preliminary planning was to the success of the total planning process?</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the fact that only about one-half of those participating in the planning project took part in the preliminary planning stage,
90% of those responding to this item considered it to be of above average or very high importance.

The testing results indicate that the preliminary planning stage was an important and effective part of the planning model and its implementation.

Mission Statement

Item 2 on the evaluation instrument related to the importance and effectiveness of the mission statement as a factor in the adapted model. The mission statement originated with the development of a local rationale for long-range planning and was further developed during preliminary planning before being approved by the preliminary planning group.

The mission statement was published as part of the resolution prepared for official endorsement by the representative boards. (See Appendix A). The writer presented a copy of the resolution to each participant for review during the evaluation interview.

As noted in Table 2, 50% of the participants rated the importance of the mission statement as being very high or great, 30% rated it as being above average in importance, and 20% rated it as being of average importance.

Participant responses indicated that the mission statement was considered to be of above average or very high or great importance by the majority of those taking part in the planning process.
Table 2
Summary of Participant Responses to Items Relating to the Importance of the Mission Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 2. How important do you believe that the mission statement was to the success of the total planning process?</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of an Outside Facilitator

Item 3 on the evaluation instrument related to the importance of having an outside facilitator who would lead the planning process. The writer served as the outside facilitator, with the title of moderator.

As noted in Table 3, 80% of the participants considered this factor to be of very high or great importance, and 100% perceived it as having above average or very great importance to the effectiveness of the planning effort.

Comments made by participants during the evaluation interview supported the very high or great importance which the majority of participants perceived this factor to have in the success of the planning effort. They noted that "It helped that he wasn't a member of any of the organizations represented on the primary planning group."

Having served as a moderator for other planning projects where
he was a member of one of the organizations involved, the writer perceived a comparatively much more positive response to his leadership in this project where he was considered to be an outside expert.

Table 3

Summary of Participant Responses to Items Relating to the Importance of Having an Outside Facilitator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 3. How important to the success of the planning effort was the fact that an outside facilitator was used?</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Facilitator's Style of Leadership

Items 4, 5, 6, and 7 on the evaluation instrument related to the style of leadership which the facilitator used in leading the planning group. As stated earlier, the style of leadership and mode of intervention were collaborative, supportive, and involved.

As reported in Table 4, responses to items relating to the facilitator's style of leadership indicated that the majority of the participants perceived the importance of this factor to be above average or very great.
Table 4

Summary of Participant Responses to Items Relating to the Importance and Effectiveness of the Facilitator's Style of Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important was the facilitator in helping individuals within the group to grow as individuals and as effective group members?</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important were the other group members in helping you to experience personal growth?</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you believe that the facilitator's style of leadership was helpful and important in the planning process?</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you believe that the personal interest of the facilitator in the success of the planning process was important to the effectiveness of the total planning group?</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments relating to the growth of individuals within the group suggested that the fact that the group was made up of adults and that the amount of contact which they had with one another in the planning
process limited the amount of growth which could be expected.

Participants indicated that the facilitator's style of leadership and personal interest in the planning project were an encouragement to the group and instrumental to its success in planning.

The writer found the collaborative, supportive and involved style of leadership to be very comfortable and profitable. He also perceived growth in participants as individuals and in the relationships between group members as the planning project progressed.

The Use of a Coordinator

Items 8 and 9 on the evaluation instrument were related to the use of an on-site coordinator for the planning project. As stated earlier, the coordinator was a member of the city staff.

As noted in Table 5, the responses to Item 8 indicated that the majority of the participants considered the importance of the coordinator to the success of the planning group to be very high or great. Responses to Item 9 indicated that the majority considered the fact that the coordinator was a staff member for one of the governmental units involved in the planning to be of above average or very great importance.

Comments made by participants during the evaluation interview indicated that the coordinator provided a great deal of needed information and he completed tasks which no one else would have had time to do for the planning group.
Table 5
Summary of Participant Responses to Items Relating to the Importance and Effectiveness of Using an On-site Coordinator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 8. How important was the coordinator to the success of the planning group?</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9. How important to his effectiveness was the fact that the coordinator was a staff member for one of the governmental units involved in the planning?</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The writer agreed with the planning group's response regarding the importance of the coordinator. The facts, figures, maps, and other materials which he made available to the group were instrumental to its success. His arrangements for a visitation to another community also helped the group to arrive at a workable preferred solution.

It became apparent to the writer, as it had to Shahan (1979, p. 173), that the planning process needed to be coordinated by an on-site coordinator from within the represented organizations. The coordinator was a key person in helping the planning group to reach its goals.
The Timetable

Item 10 on the evaluation instrument related the importance of the timetable to the success of the planning effort. As noted in Table 6, 70% of the participants rated the importance of the timetable to be above average or very high or great.

Table 6

Summary of Participant Responses to Items Relating to the Importance of the Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 10. How important was the timetable to the success of the planning effort?</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments relating to this item noted that the nine-month planning calendar was "just about right." Related to comments for this item are those under Item 20, where participants indicated that they were willing to continue to be involved in further planning efforts if time factors were workable.

The writer agreed with the participants' perception that the timetable for a collaborative planning project should be for one year or less. The summer months were not used for primary planning group meetings in this project. The writer believed that it was wise to avoid meeting during the months of June, July, and August. Staff and preliminary planning meetings, however, were held during the implementation of the adapted model.
The Size of the Planning Group

Item 11 on the evaluation instrument related to the participants' perceptions of the importance of the size of the primary planning group as a factor in its effectiveness.

As noted in Table 7, 80% of the participants indicated that they believed that the size of the group was of above average or very high or great importance as a factor in the group's effectiveness.

Table 7
Summary of Participant Responses to Items Relating to the Importance of the Size of the Primary Planning Group to its Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 11. How important do you believe the size of the planning group was to the success of the group's planning efforts?</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments by participants indicated that they believed that an absolute minimum number of participants necessary for effective planning would be five or six. Most participants noted that the size of the primary planning group used in the implementation of the adapted model was "about right."

As noted earlier, the planning group had a membership of 10,
with an average of 7 members being present at each meeting. The writer perceived that the number of members involved in the planning effort was a contributing factor to its success.

The Composition of the Planning Group

As noted earlier, the primary planning group was made up of both planners and politicians. Item 12 on the evaluation instrument was designed to measure the importance of this factor as perceived by the participants in the planning project.

Table 8

Summary of Participant Responses to Items Relating to the Importance of the Makeup of the Planning Group to its Success in Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 12. How important was the makeup of the planning group to its success in planning?</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted in Table 8, 60% of the participants rated this factor as being of very high or great importance and all participants considered it to be of above average or higher importance. Comments included the following: "We had a good cross section," "We got to a decision better with politicians being involved," and "We didn't want all to agree."
The writer perceived that the involvement of politicians in the planning process was a key to its success. As Steiss (1974) noted, planning was perceived as "mattering" when politicians became increasingly involved (p. 222). The entrance of the newly-elected mayor into the planning process was perceived by the writer as being one of the most significant events in the success of the planning project.

The Appropriateness of the Priority Problems

Item 13 on the evaluation instrument was related to the appropriateness of the selected priority problems as a factor in the success of the group planning effort.

As indicated in Table 9, 90% of the participants indicated that the choice of priority problems was of above average or of very high or great importance.

Table 9

Summary of Participant Responses to Items Relating to the Importance of the Appropriateness of the Priority Problems to the Group's Planning Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 13. How important was the appropriateness of the selected priority problems to the success of the planning efforts?</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments by participants indicated that they were highly supportive of the priority problems selected by the group for study and planning.

The writer believed that the problems selected by the group were important to the total community and served as an important factor in the success of the planning effort.

Endorsement by Constituent Groups

Item 14 on the evaluation instrument was related to the endorsement by each constituent group as a factor in the effectiveness of the planning effort.

Table 10

Summary of Participant Responses to Items Relating to the Importance of the Endorsement of Constituent Groups to the Effectiveness of the Planning Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 14. How important was the endorsement of each constituent group to the effectiveness of the planning effort?</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 8, 60% of the participants believed that this factor was of above average importance or of very high or great importance; 30% considered it to be of average importance, and 10%
considered it to be below average in importance.

Some group members indicated that the endorsement may have been just a formality for some of the groups represented. Others noted that they were afraid that there might be possible "reneging" by at least one of the groups represented.

The writer perceived that the concern of some of the group members regarding the possible lack of commitment to the endorsement by constituent groups was the result of comments reportedly made by one of the group members just prior to the evaluation interview. At this time, he indicated that he did not favor the alternative selected by the planning group.

In the evaluation interview, the person involved expressed the concern that the chosen alternative "benefited the city more than the townships." He acknowledged to the writer that the alternative selected was clearly the first choice of other group members.

Had the concern described above not surfaced late in the planning process, the writer believed that the group would have rated this factor as being of higher importance. The relatively high rating given to this factor under the circumstances is believed to be evidence of its importance in a collaborative planning effort.

Training and Experience in the Mode of Operation

Item 15 on the evaluation instrument was related to the provision for training and experience in the use of the selected mode of operation. The facilitator used the "Lost on the Moon" exercise designed
by Hall (1971) for this purpose. (See Appendix C).

Because of the change in group membership noted earlier, and because of absenteeism on the night of the training, only six of the participants were able to evaluate this item.

As noted in Table 11, 16 2/3% of those responding rated the training and experience as very high or great, 66 2/3% rated it as above average, and 16 2/3% rated it as average. Participants commented that it was also a good get-acquainted tool.

Table 11
Summary of Participant Responses to Items Relating to Group Training and Experience in the Use of the Selected Mode of Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 15.</td>
<td>How effective do you believe the &quot;Lost on the Moon&quot; exercise was in helping the group members to see the value of a group effort over individual efforts?</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>14100</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The writer found the exercise helpful as a training and experience tool. However, although its author did not specify a recommended period of time for the use of the exercise, the hour allotted for its use by the writer was inadequate to complete the entire exercise. The writer believed that this factor may have kept the rating of the
exercise at a lower level than if a longer period had been allotted.

Use and Effectiveness of the Selected Mode of Operation

As noted earlier, the selected mode of operation included the use of the consensus method of decision making, the systems approach, and organizational development.

Table 12
Summary of Participant Responses to Items Related to the Use and Effectiveness of the Selected Mode of Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 16. How effective was the consensus method used by the facilitator and the group?</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 17. How successful was the group in improving relationships between community leaders?</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18. How committed are you to the implementation of the selected solutions?</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items 16, 17, and 18 on the evaluation instrument were all related to the selected mode of operation and its effect upon group effectiveness and commitment. As noted in Table 12, 90% of the
participants rated the effectiveness of the selected mode of operation as above average or higher on each of the items involved.

Comments by participants relating to the consensus method included the following: "We took the time to discuss thoroughly" and "Voting would have hardened the sides."

Some group members indicated that it was difficult to determine how successful the group was in improving relationships, but that "time would tell."

In regard to how committed participants were to the implementation of the selected solution, the majority stated that they were highly committed to the selected solution. Two township officials, however, had reservations—stating that they believed that the city would gain more from the selected solution than would the townships.

The writer believed that the selected mode of operation was a very important factor in the overall success of the planning effort. Although total harmony and commitment did not result, the planning process opened up communications, improved relationships, and developed a relatively high level of commitment to the implementation of the selected alternative solution to the problems under study.

The Total Adapted Model

Items 19 and 20 of the evaluation instrument were related to the perceptions of the participants regarding the accomplishments of the planning group and their willingness to become involved in other or...
further planning efforts as a result of their experiences in this group using the adapted model.

As noted in Table 13, the majority of the participants (60%) rated their satisfaction with the accomplishments of the planning group and their willingness to become involved in further planning as a result of their experiences in this group as above average.

Table 13

Summary of Participant Responses to Items Relating to Group Satisfaction with its Accomplishments and Willingness to become involved in Further Planning Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 19. How satisfied are you with the accomplishments of the planning group?</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20. How willing are you to become involved in other or further planning efforts as a result of your experience in this group?</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments relating to participant satisfaction with the accomplishments of the planning group were as follows: "I will be satisfied if all groups endorse the recommended solution," "Not everyone took the planning seriously enough," and "We lacked real authority."

The only reservation voiced regarding willingness to become further
involved in other or further planning efforts was that "time factors would determine any availability."

The writer believed that the positive responses to these items were the best indicators of the success of the adapted model and its implementation. Particularly important was the high rating given to willingness to become involved in other or further planning as a result of their experiences in this group (80% of the participants indicated above average willingness to become involved in future planning efforts).

Summary of Results

The overall results of the testing of the adapted planning model were very positive. The majority of those who participated in the implementation of the model in an actual collaborative, community, long-range planning project ranked every stage, step, and factor in the adapted model as being above average or very high or great in importance and effectiveness.

Especially noteworthy were the very high ratings given to process components most emphasized in the research literature, such as the importance of involving an outside facilitator and the necessity of involving politicians in the process.

The writer believed that the high ratings given to the various components of the adapted model and to the planning effort as a whole were evidence that the adapted model was very effective in the community setting in which it was tested.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions and recommendations in this chapter will be presented in the following sequence:

1. The problem and the study's response will be reviewed.
2. The results of the testing of the adapted model will be summarized.
3. Conclusions regarding the utility of the model will be presented.
4. Recommendations for further research and development of the adapted model will be made.

Review of the Problem and the Study's Response

The problem delineated in this study was the lack of comprehensive long-range planning in our society today, particularly at the community level. In Chapter I, it was established that most research in the area of long-range planning only deals with the issue in a very general way. Also, even though long-range planning is generally recognized to be important, little comprehensive long-range planning actually takes place in our society, particularly at the community level.

The study's response to the problem was to design, describe, and field test a model which would effectively link theory and research
with implementation and which would encourage leaders to become involved in comprehensive long-range planning at the community level.

Specifically, the objectives of the study were:

1. To design a model which could be easily followed by others in the planning process.

2. To describe methods, materials, and procedures which would facilitate the successful implementation of the model.

3. To test the model in a community setting.

4. To report the results of the use of the model as perceived by the writer and others taking part in the planning process.

5. To draw conclusions and make recommendations regarding revisions in the model for use by others in similar situations.

Summary of the Results of the Field Test of the Adapted Model

After a thorough review of the literature, as described in Chapter II, it was determined that a model designed by Shahan (1979) for use in a theological school could be adapted for use in a community setting. Weaknesses which the writer perceived in Shahan's model were corrected in the model adapted for use in a community setting.

The adapted model was described and discussed in detail in Chapter III. Also described in that chapter were the community setting in which the adapted model was tested and the methods used in testing the adapted model.

The results of the field test were presented and discussed in
Chapter IV. Feedback from the prepared instrument used to evaluate the implementation of the model indicated that those who took part in the field test considered the implementation of the planning model to be very successful. The majority of the responses to items on the evaluation instrument which related to the various stages, steps, and factors in the implementation of the model were above average in every area evaluated.

Conclusions Regarding the Utility of the Model

Based upon the results of the field test and evaluation of the adapted model, the writer concluded that the model was one of proven utility, having been based upon sound theory and successful practice. With the assistance of a skilled facilitator from within or without the planning group, the model is ready for implementation in other settings.

Although the model was designed specifically for use in collaborative planning between public governmental organizations and institutions in communities, it may be hypothesized that any organization which would attempt to implement the model would have a reasonable expectation of success. Also, the fact that no attempt was made to involve or gain input from persons other than official representatives of organizations and institutions, does not prohibit others from adding an input component into the model and its implementation.

Since the formal evaluation indicated greatest effectiveness
in the early and middle stages of the planning process, it may be concluded that there is a need for greater involvement by the facilitator and coordinator at the implementation stage of the model.

It is recommended that the model be implemented in the order of stages and steps as presented. Methods and materials used may vary by the preference of the facilitator or the planning group. They should, however, be based upon sound theory and research whenever possible.

Recommendations for Further Research and Development

The problem identified for this study was the lack of comprehensive long-range planning in our society, particularly at the community level. The response of the study was to design, describe, and field test a model which effectively linked theory and research with implementation. It has been concluded that the adapted model successfully accomplished this linkage.

The optimum conditions for implementation of the adapted model were discussed earlier in this chapter. Additionally, recommendations were made regarding the order and steps in which the model should be implemented and how other components could be added to the model as presented.

Further recommendations pertaining to the implementation and improvement of the adapted model are presented as follows:

1. To encourage greater involvement in collaborative long-range planning by organizations, research should be conducted
which would focus on the costs and benefits of such planning. Such research would provide tangible evidence of the advantages of involvement in long-range planning projects.

2. Alternative approaches which reflect greater community involvement and shared decision making in the process should be developed and tested. Development of this nature would provide planning leaders with an array of methodologies from which to select an approach compatible with the setting and expectations of the planning group.

3. Research should be conducted to determine the most appropriate means for implementing policies recommended by planning groups. As indicated earlier, planning without implementation is not really planning.

In summary, the adapted model was developed in response to the problem of a lack of comprehensive long-range planning in society today. If communities and their organizations are to meet the challenge of tomorrow, they must learn and practice effective collaborative long-range planning. Researchers and practitioners are encouraged to work together to bring increased understanding of the dynamics of people and organizations undergoing change so that communities may prosper in an era of reductions in resources.
APPENDIX A

RESOLUTION
ENDORSEMENT OF AREA PLANNING CONCEPT
RESOLUTION
ENDORSEMENT OF AREA PLANNING CONCEPT

WHEREAS, ____________________________ concurs
(Name of Organization)
with the need for an area-wide planning concept to address problems
of mutual concern;

AND, WHEREAS, members from the following organizations have
expressed interest in organizing an area planning committee to be
known as the Area Planning Council:
City of Three Rivers               Fabius Township
Three Rivers Area Chamber of Commerce  Lockport Township
Three Rivers Community Schools       Park Township

AND, WHEREAS, the Area Planning Council shall consider issues
and problems of area-wide concern and develop recommendations and
plans for addressing such issues and problems,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that _______________________
(Name of Organization)
agrees to consider all recommendations
made by the Area Planning Council.

Resolution adopted this _________ day of __________, 1981.

Signed: ________________________________

ATTEST:

_____________________________________
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GUIDELINES FOR ARRIVING AT A CONSENSUS GROUP DECISION
GUIDELINES FOR ARRIVING AT A CONSENSUS GROUP DECISION

Consensus is a decision process for making full use of available resources, resolving conflicts, and arriving at a group decision which all, or nearly all, group members can support.

Here are some guidelines for use in achieving consensus:

1. Avoid arguing for your position. Present your position as clearly and logically as possible. Then, listen to other members' reactions and consider them carefully before pressing the point.

2. Do not assume that someone must win and someone must lose when discussion reaches a stalemate. Instead, look for the most acceptable alternative for all parties.

3. Do not change your mind simply to avoid conflict and to reach agreement and harmony. Explore reasons for positions and be sure everyone accepts the solution for basically the same reasons. Yield only to positions that have objective and logically sound foundations.

4. Avoid conflict-reducing techniques such as majority votes, averages, coin-flips, and bargaining. When a dissenting member finally agrees, don't feel that he/she must be rewarded by having his/her own way on a later point.

5. Differences of opinion are natural and expected. Seek them out and try to involve everyone in the decision-making process. Disagreements can help the group's decision because with a wide range of information and opinion, there is a greater chance that the group will hit upon more adequate solutions.
APPENDIX C

LOST ON THE MOON EXERCISE
Your spaceship has just crash-landed on the moon. You were scheduled to rendezvous with a mother ship 200 miles away on the lighted surface of the moon, but the rough landing has ruined your ship and destroyed all the equipment on board, except for the 15 items listed below.

Your crew's survival depends on reaching the mother ship, so you must choose the most critical items available for the 200-mile trip. Your task is to rank the 15 items in terms of their importance for survival. Place number one by the most important item, number two by the second most important, and so on through number 15, the least important. NASA experts have determined the best solution to this task. (Hall, 1971, pp. 51-54, 86-88)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>NASA's Ranks</th>
<th>Your Ranks</th>
<th>Error Points</th>
<th>Group Ranks</th>
<th>Error Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Box of matches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food concentrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifty feet of nylon rope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parachute silk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar-powered portable heating unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two .45 caliber pistols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One case of dehydrated milk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two 100 pound tanks of oxygen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellar map (of the moon's constellation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-inflating life raft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetic compass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five gallons of water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal flares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-aid kit containing injection needles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar-powered FM receiver-transmitter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 102  Total 102
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SUMMARY OF PLANNING COUNCIL MEETINGS

The Formation of the Area Planning Council

Representatives of the city, its surrounding townships, and local schools met on August 12, 1981, to discuss the possible formation of a cooperative planning council.

The mayor gave an overview of the concept of a cooperative planning council. He then introduced the author and recommended that he be the facilitator-moderator of the planning effort. The author explained his interest in the proposed project and in the use of the model. The mayor also introduced the city planner, Barry Visel, and recommended that he be selected to serve as group coordinator. Group members agreed with both recommendations.

The group showed enthusiasm for the planning project. Members were also helpful in making suggestions for future meetings. It was determined that representatives of the Three Rivers Area Chamber of Commerce would be invited to join the council.

Each unit of government, the schools, and the Chamber of Commerce were asked to send two representatives to the first meeting of the planning council. The total number of representatives would therefore be 12, which is considered a maximum number for an effective discussion group whose purpose is interdependent collaborative planning.

It was agreed that the group would function on a somewhat informal basis, and that all actions taken or decisions made would be by the consensus of the group. It was also agreed that a resolution
would be prepared for consideration by the group which would be submitted to each governing body represented, seeking: (a) endorsement of the concept of area planning, (b) the establishment of an area planning council, and (c) agreement to consider all recommendations made by such a council. (See Appendix A.)

Each organization represented was asked to bring three subjects or issues to present to the council at its first regular meeting.

Meetings were scheduled for the second Monday of each month, starting in September. The first meeting would be held at the library. A determination of the location of future meetings would be made by the council at its first meeting.

Regular Meetings of the Planning Council

The first regular meeting of the planning council was held on September 14, 1981, at 7:00 P.M., in the library. A summary of the organizational meeting held on August 12, 1981 was read and approved. Seven representatives were in attendance, plus the facilitator-moderator and the coordinator.

Since no round tables were available, four small tables with rounded corners were blocked together to form a somewhat rounded table.

The group made suggestions as to what the name of the group should be. By consensus, the name Area Planning Council (A.P.C.) was selected.

Discussion was held on the role of the council. It was decided the major function would be to serve as a forum for discussion and
problem solving, and to make policy recommendations. Resolution forms endorsing the council concept were approved and circulated. A copy of the resolution form may be found in Appendix A.

The next order of business was to consider which subjects or issues the A.P.C. should concentrate on this year. After listing the suggestions made by group members and discussing them at length, it was agreed that the water and sewer issues, plus consolidation of area planning and zoning would be the two areas considered first by the group. The planning and zoning subject included local government boundaries.

After some discussion, it was decided to invite the city engineer and the wastewater plant superintendent to the next meeting for informational purposes. A request was also made that a consolidated area zoning map be constructed, showing existing zoning. The coordinator volunteered to prepare such a map for the next meeting.

The moderator asked the group to be prepared to take part in an exercise designed to demonstrate the value of using the consensus method and group decision-making. This exercise would take place at the next meeting.

It was decided that the library would be an appropriate place to hold future meetings. The meeting time would be from 7:00 P.M. to 9:00 P.M..

The Second Regular Meeting of the Area Planning Council

The second regular meeting of the A.P.C. was held on October
12, 1981. Eight regular members were present.

The first half of the meeting was designed to orient group members to the ground rules for arriving at a consensus and to demonstrate the superiority of group decision-making over the decisions made by individuals.

Guidelines for arriving at a consensus group decision were distributed and explained. (See Appendix B.) The group was then asked to take part in the "Lost on the Moon" exercise. (See Appendix C.) The exercise was taken first individually and then by the total group, using the consensus method.

The group appeared to enjoy the exercise, both as individuals and as a group. Group members followed the guidelines given to them earlier very well. Some individuals had very high scores on the exercise.

After using the exercise for nearly an hour, the moderator determined that attention needed to be switched to the resource person in attendance. The group score after one hour was higher than the average score, individually, but did not exceed some of the individual scores. This result may have been due to the time limit placed on the exercise. Hall (1971), the creator of the "Lost on the Moon" exercise stated:

I have found that when a group's final decision is compared to the independent points of view that the members held before entering the group, the group's effort is almost always an improvement over its average individual resource, and often is better than even the best individual contribution. (p. 51)
Although no specific time was recommended for the exercise by its designer, it was apparent that one hour was not sufficient time for both the individual and group exercise. Based upon this experience, a one and one-half to two-hour time period would be recommended for the use of this exercise.

The city engineer presented a report on the current status of the city's water and sewer systems. He reported that the sewer system was in need of rehabilitation and that some lines would need to be replaced. He stated that the water system was in relatively good condition.

Plans to improve the sewer system include expanding capacity enough to serve areas outside the city limits. The water system already has excess service capacity.

The engineer pointed out that it would be helpful for future planning purposes to know township needs and desires in terms of 5, 10, or 20 years into the future. Township representatives agreed that they would consult with their governing boards regarding possible future service needs.

The Third Regular Meeting of the Area Planning Council

The third regular meeting of the A.P.C. was held on November 9, 1981. Only five of the representatives were present at this meeting.

Resolutions of endorsement from each organization involved had been received by the coordinator.
Coordinator Visel provided council members with information regarding the various master plans which had been prepared in past years. He displayed colored zoning and topographical maps which he had prepared at the request of the group.

He pointed out that what were often referred to as "natural boundaries" were not natural at all. An example of such a boundary is the U.S. highway which bounds the city on its west side. Natural boundaries, such as hills and rivers, were pointed out on the topographical maps.

Townships had not been able to accurately project their water and sewer needs prior to this meeting.

Discussion was held on the proposed rehabilitation of the wastewater system which belongs to the city. It was noted that city residents were being asked to fund a project which would potentially serve township areas.

Meeting with Mayoral Candidate

The author met with city commissioner Norman Rivers on October 29, 1981. Mr. Rivers was the leading candidate for election to the position of mayor in the November elections.

Mr. Rivers had been regarded as an opponent of the area planning concept—having been the only commissioner to vote against the proposal at the time the A.P.C. was formed.

Mr. Rivers expressed two major concerns about the council. One was that he did not want to see another layer of "planning machinery"
on top of what already existed. The other was that he did not want to be faced with a confrontation with township proposals which the city commission would have to reject.

In responding to Mr. Rivers' concerns, the author assured him that the A.P.C. was not intended to be a permanent part of any planning machinery or another layer of government. The author also explained that the consensus method was designed to deal with possible confrontation issues at the A.P.C. level so that they could be avoided at the city commission level. Also, because no votes were taken at the council, issues could be dealt with at the influence level, rather than at the power level.

Mr. Rivers then stated that he was satisfied that the A.P.C. would not cause problems in the areas of his concern. He also stated that he would like to be actively involved on the council. The author encouraged him to play an active role for the benefit of all concerned.

The Fourth Meeting of the Area Planning Council

The fourth regular meeting of the A.P.C. was held on December 14, 1981. Eight representatives were present.

Newly-elected mayor Norman Rivers was welcomed as a new member of the council, replacing another representative who had been a member of the city planning commission. Up until this time, all units of government had been represented by elected officials who served as board members except the city of Three Rivers, which had
been represented by two members of their appointed planning commission. The addition of the mayor to the council provided a more practical—although sometimes more heated—atmosphere.

An evaluation of the progress of the council to date was conducted, using a questionnaire which had been sent out to each member after the last regular meeting.

The composite evaluation concerning how well the group was functioning was a good one. Six of the eight members indicated that the council was accomplishing its goals effectively and efficiently. Seven of the eight indicated that they favored the use of study committees to help reach goals more effectively.

The question of whether or not to use committees was discussed by the group. The consensus was that the A.P.C. wanted to work primarily as a committee of the whole, rather than in smaller specialized committees.

Each governmental unit described its present and projected needs for utilities. Discussion was held regarding the history of the present situation for each unit of government and its relationship with other governmental units.

One township expressed an immediate need for water along the U.S. highway at the western side of the city, but had no immediate need for sewer service. Another township noted that it had its own water system, but might need a supplemental source, particularly if there was any industrial development in the township. Sewer service may be needed in its lake area. The third township stated that it
had no immediate needs for water or sewer utilities.

A discussion of possible ways in which the townships could be provided with water was held. Mayor Rivers indicated that any proposed solution resulting in an advantage being given to a business outside of the city in the form of lesser costs would not be fair to business within the city.

One of the A.P.C. members raised the question, "What would happen if we did nothing about the water supply to the townships?" It was decided that the possible answer or answers to this question would be discussed at the next meeting.

The A.P.C. meeting scheduled for the month of January was cancelled because of inclement weather.

The Fifth Meeting of the Area Planning Council

The fifth regular meeting of the A.P.C. was held on February 8, 1982. Eight representatives were in attendance.

The first item considered by the council was the continuation of the utilities discussion. The coordinator presented a possible growth scenario based on a no-action alternative regarding provision of water and sewer services to the townships. The portions of the townships closest to the city and showing the most growth were used in the projection.

Discussion was held on Health Department requirements for on-site water and septic systems and the current zoning ordinance governing growth in the areas under study.
It was the consensus of the A.P.C. that a no-action alternative would be a major deterrent to the development of the community. Problems involved in the provision of water and sewer services and possible solutions to the problems were presented and discussed. Individual members of the A.P.C. agreed to study and prepare brief summaries of possible solutions which could be presented at the next regular meeting.

The Sixth Meeting of the Area Planning Council

The sixth regular meeting of the A.P.C. was held on March 8, 1982. Six representatives were in attendance.

The main item on the agenda was the presentation of individual reports regarding possible solutions to the problem of meeting the water and sewer needs of the townships while assuring fairness to the city and to the development of the total area.

The first report was a presentation of a concept known as the Urban Growth Area (U.G.A.). This concept involves redrawing the boundary lines around the city to provide for growth, and extending utility services to residences outside of the city. This plan has been used in other parts of the state.

A representative of the city presented the advantages of annexation by the city. A township representative then presented some disadvantages.

The city manager presented a report on the provision of services through a utility authority. A township representative
then reported on the costs of having independent water systems in each governmental unit.

The last presentation at the meeting involved a plan which would use a shared tax base.

It was the consensus of the A.P.C. that of the plans presented, the Urban Growth Area plan had more advantages and less disadvantages. Members agreed to study the issues involved and the materials presented and to discuss the issues in more detail at the next regular meeting.

A Visit to Saline, Michigan

In an attempt to learn more about the U.G.A. plan, the city manager made calls to other managers around the state to find out if U.G.A. had been implemented and if so, how successfully. It was determined that the plan had successfully been implemented recently in the city of Saline, Michigan.

The coordinator and moderator decided that a visit to Saline would be beneficial and that other A.P.C. members should be invited and encouraged to take part in the visitation.

Three members of the A.P.C., the coordinator, and the moderator made the trip to Saline on April 7, 1982. The council members met with the Saline city manager, who presented a history of the need for the implementation of the U.G.A. concept. He also answered questions which group members asked.

The consensus of the A.P.C. members taking part in the visit
was that the concept could work well in the Three Rivers area. A summary of the visitation and the U.G.A. concept were mailed to all A.P.C. members for discussion at the next meeting.

The Seventh Meeting of the Area Planning Council

The seventh regular meeting of the A.P.C. was held on April 12, 1982. Seven representatives were present at the meeting.

Continued discussion was held on the proposed alternative solutions to utility and growth problems. The concepts of shared tax base and the Urban Growth Area plan were discussed in detail and comparisons were made between the two plans.

Mutual agreements which had been worked out in the Saline area were presented and discussed.

The consensus of the A.P.C. members was that the U.G.A. plan had the best potential as a solution for the provision of utilities to the area and for the continued growth of the city. One representative proposed that, prior to making a final recommendation, members take more time to review the documents presented and also consult with other members of the groups which they represent.

The council agreed that an attempt to arrive at a final consensus would be made at the next meeting. It was also agreed that the May meeting would be the last meeting for work on current topics. The group would not meet during the summer months, but would reconvene in the fall to discuss new topics.
The Final Meeting of the Area Planning Council

The eighth and final regular meeting of the A.P.C. was held on May 10, 1982. Seven representatives were in attendance.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the A.P.C. that the U.G.A. plan was the most acceptable and workable alternative for meeting the goal of area development.

The focus of the A.P.C. was then turned to how best to implement the recommended alternative. The consensus of the group was that a letter should be sent to all organizations and units of government represented in the council, describing the plan and suggesting how they might proceed with implementation of the plan. A news release would also be drawn up by the coordinator and facilitator, subject to review by A.P.C. members before it would be published in the news media.

It was the consensus of the A.P.C. that its efforts should be continued after a summer break. The group would reconvene in September.

The facilitator explained procedures to be used in evaluation of the planning process and received input as to the best times to meet with individual A.P.C. members for evaluation interviews.

The facilitator thanked all A.P.C. members for their cooperation in making the planning effort both enjoyable and profitable. The A.P.C. was then declared recessed for the summer.
EVALUATION OF THE PLANNING PROCESS

In responding to evaluation questions which relate to importance, effectiveness, etc., please select from the following possible responses by writing in the corresponding number:

5 Very high or great
4 Above average
3 Average
2 Below average
1 Insignificant

Please give comments which may clarify or add to the understanding of your response where it may be helpful.

1. How important do you believe preliminary planning was to the success of the total planning process? ____

 Comments: ________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

2. How important do you believe that the mission statement was to the success of the total planning process? ____

 Comments: ________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

3. How important to the success of the planning effort was the fact that an outside facilitator was used? ____

 Comments: ________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

4. How important was the facilitator in helping individuals within the group to grow as individuals and as effective group members? ____

 Comments: ________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
5. How important were the other group members in helping you to experience personal growth? ____

Comments: ____________________________________________________________

6. To what extent do you believe that the facilitator's style of leadership was helpful and important in the planning process? ____

Comments: ____________________________________________________________

7. To what extent do you believe that the personal interest of the facilitator in the success of the planning process was important to the effectiveness of the total planning group? ____

Comments: ____________________________________________________________

8. How important was the coordinator to the success of the planning group? ____

Comments: ____________________________________________________________

9. How important to his effectiveness was the fact that the coordinator was a staff member for one of the governmental units involved in the planning? ____

Comments: ____________________________________________________________

10. How important was the timetable to the success of the planning effort? ____

Comments: ____________________________________________________________

11. How important do you believe the size of the planning group was to the success of the group's planning efforts? ____
12. How important was the make-up of the planning group to its success in planning? ___

Comments:_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

13. How important was the appropriateness of the selected priority problems to the success of the planning efforts? ___

Comments:_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

14. How important was the endorsement of each constituent group to the effectiveness of the planning effort? ___

Comments:_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

15. How effective do you believe the "Man on the Moon" exercise was in helping the group members to see the value of a group effort over individual efforts? ___

Comments:_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

16. How effective was the consensus method used by the facilitator and the group? ___

Comments:_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

17. How successful was the group in improving relationships between community leaders? ___

Comments:_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
18. How committed are you to the implementation of the selected solutions? ____
   Comments:________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

19. How satisfied are you with the accomplishments of the planning group? ____
   Comments:________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

20. How willing are you to become involved in other or further planning efforts as a result of your experience in this group? ____
   Comments:________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
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