MIDVALE CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP MEETING
AGENDA
September 11, 2018

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Midvale City Council will hold a workshop meeting on the 11th day of September 2018 at Midvale City Hall, 7505 South Holden Street, Midvale, Utah as follows:

6:30 p.m.

I. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Discuss Midvale/United Way Promise Partnership Program [Mayor Robert Hale]

B. Discuss Citizens Climate Lobby [Mayor Robert Hale]

C. Discuss Arts Council Facility Lease Agreement [Kane Loader, City Manager/Laurie Harvey, Assistant City Manager/Admin Services Director]

D. Discuss Jordan Bluffs Proposed Zoning [Brian Berndt, Assistant City Manager/Community Development Director]

E. Discuss Small Area Master Plan [Brian Berndt, Assistant City Manager/Community Development Director]

F. Discuss Proposed Amendments to the FY2019 Budgets for the General Fund and other funds as necessary [Laurie Harvey, Assistant City Manager/Admin Services Director]

II. ADJOURN

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, Midvale City will make reasonable accommodations for participation in the meeting. Request assistance by contacting the City Recorder at 801-567-7207, providing at least three working day notice of the meeting. TTY 711

A copy of the foregoing agenda was provided to the news media by email and/or fax. The agenda was also posted at the following locations on the date and time as posted above: City Hall Lobby, on the City’s website at www.midvalecity.org and the State Public Notice Website at http://pmn.utah.gov. Council Members may participate in the meeting via electronic communications. Council Members’ participation via electronic communication will be broadcast and amplified so other council Members and all other persons present in the Council Chambers will be able to hear or see the communication.

PLEASE MAKE SURE ALL CELL PHONES ARE TURNED OFF DURING THE MEETING

DATE POSTED: SEPTEMBER 7, 2018

RORI L. ANDREASON, MMC
H.R. DIRECTOR/CITY RECORDER
Chair Hale called the meeting to order at 10:14 p.m.

I. DISCUSSION ITEMS
   A. DISCUSS PROPOSAL FOR NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Patrick O’Brien discussed the proposed Neighborhood Housing Improvement Program. The program is intended to improve residential neighborhoods, contribute to the overall quality of Midvale’s housing stock, encourage home-ownership, and support long-term housing affordability. To achieve these goals, the program would be used to identify, acquire, and redevelop single-family homes that are currently closed to occupancy, attract crime, or otherwise negatively impact their surrounding neighborhood. The redeveloped properties would subsequently be sold to households that earn 60% or less of the area median income with restrictions that would run with the land to ensure the property remains affordable. If the Program is approved, it is anticipated that it would be funded through the RDA’s City-Wide Housing account.

It is the RDA staff’s intent to return to the RDA Board in a future meeting with a detailed program term sheet that will establish the policies and procedures that will be used to identify potential acquisitions, negotiate necessary agreements, design replacement housing, and establish the affordability requirements for end users.

Board Member Dustin Gettel asked what area they are planning on building.
Mr. O'Brien said he has been working with code enforcement on properties. He will put together a formal list and present it to the Board in a closed session.

Board Member Paul Glover asked how much funding was available and where it was coming from.

Matt Dahl said there is about $1 million available in the City-Wide Housing Fund.

Board Member Paul Glover asked how much control the city would have regarding the rentals.

Matt Dahl said Midvale will own the units.

Kane Loader asked if there was a way for the owner to own the land.

Mr. O'Brien said if the City owns the land, it ensures long term affordability.

Matt Dahl said with the program, they will negotiate the lease on the land.

II. **ADJOURN**

Chair Hale declared the meeting adjourned at approximately 10:27 p.m.

Rori L. Andreason, MMC  
City Recorder

Approved this 18th day of September 2018
Mayor Hale called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

I. DISCUSSION ITEMS
   A. DISCUSS MIDVALE/UNITED WAY PROMISE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

Bill Crim, United Way, said this presentation is about a partnership that has been working with the Canyon School District students. Self reliance is not universal. Kids who come from families that struggle from poverty, struggle in school. They have thousands of nonprofits and 10s of thousands of programs which equals “service delivery chaos”. He discussed collective impact as a way to develop these programs to work towards a common goal. With Canyon School District and dozens of nonprofits they have been trying to build that infrastructure that allows this to happen. Communities are where things happen, and problems get solved. Change can be made and measured for every child.

Karen Sterling, Canyons School District, said it is their commitment to provide an equitable education to the children in Midvale. Children deserve quality principals and teachers. She discussed her experience in teaching kids from all walks of life. The Community School model was developed and is now being followed. School is the heart of the community; it is open all year, and all day. The logic model being comprised of academic learning; youth development, parent/family engagement and support; health and social services; and community partnerships was discussed. It will maximize the academic learning time, promote climate and positive youth development; align all resources and services; develop community partnerships. She discussed statistics regarding how schools are doing with these goals.
Katherine Zachera said they have designed a rigorous approach to looking at data and wanted to introduce the Promise Midvale Partnership Structure. They would like to create a leadership committee including City Council, Mayor, Canyons School District, business leaders, police, some partners, UWSL, Community members, School Board, Salt Lake County, and parents. Community Schools have already been developed and are receiving strong support. They are developing all partner groups through senate bill 67. They will map resources and gather data to inform decisions, identify gaps and set priorities; and to develop strategies and interventions to address these gaps.

Council Member Bryant Brown discussed the large class sizes that need to be smaller.

B. DISCUSS CITIZENS CLIMATE LOBBY

Bill Barron, Regional Coordinator for Citizens Climate Lobby, said they are a volunteer-based organization out of San Diego, California. Their goal is to build a political will for a livable world. They are advocating for a specific policy at the federal level to put a fee on carbon emissions and return the all revenue to all the households. It is a legislative proposal called Carbon Fee Dividend. They need to reach out to all levels of congress addressing climate change. Their approach is building relationships and focused on the information they are providing. The Carbon Fee Dividend is the legislative proposal they are advocating. The way it works is to put a graduating increasing fee on carbon emissions at the source with $15-ton the first year and $10 each additional ton each year. The proposal is to accelerate away from using fossil fuels which are creating the change in the climate. The money would be collected and distributed equally with a dividend check to every citizen. They are proposing border trade adjustments. Products coming in from other countries would be assessed a fee for the embedded carbon cost of their products. There are other forms of governments who currently have carbon pricing.

A study was conducted called the REMI Study as follows:

- CO2 emissions declined by 33% in 10 years and 52% after 20 years.
- National Employment increases by 2.1 Million jobs after 10 years and 2.8 after 20 years.
- Reduced air pollution saves 13,000 lives annually after 10 years with cumulative 227,000 American lives saved after 20 years.
- GDP Cumulative increase of $1.375 trillion after 20 years.

Laser talks answers questions on carbon pricing.
Laser Talks link reference:  http://citizensclimatelobby.org/laser-talks

One of the highlights of the work they have done is the creation of a bipartisan climate solutions caucus that is in the house, which currently has 86 members. For every republican member there is a democrat member. They believe it should not be a partisan decision. He provided a link for resolutions from State, County and City Resolutions for support:  https://citizenscitizensclimatelobby.org/endorsements/municipal and link for influencer letter to Congress:  https://citizensclimatelobby.org/leaders/
Bill Barron asked for consideration to support action on a resolution for climate action. He also encourages and invites city leaders to join them in congress to share concerns.

C. DISCUSS ARTS COUNCIL FACILITY LEASE AGREEMENT
Stephanie Johnson and Melanie Beardall reviewed the plays and concerts for the past year. They discussed the grants and finances of the arts council. Stephanie Johnson said they would like to have some janitorial services to take out garbage, bathrooms cleaned, and vacuumed once a week. Someone from public works takes the garbage cans out to the street on Wednesday nights which is greatly appreciated. She said they don’t have an industrial vacuum, so they cannot get in-between the seats.

Council Member Paul Glover said the Arts Council needs to add to their agreement to least out the facility, a required cleaning deposit or clean it themselves.

Stephanie Johnson said they are very grateful to Andrea Andreason and Levi McNeill from Public Works and appreciate their help.

Lisa Garner said when the City gifts money to any organization, the organization must show the City is receiving services, etc. equaling fair market value for the money being donated. She said the contract needs some clarification on the funds being received and expended.

The Council discussed the agreement between Midvale City and the Arts Council, plans moving forward, and options.

D. DISCUSS JORDAN BLUFFS PROPOSED ZONING
Brian Berndt and Lesley Burns discussed the Jordan Bluffs Subarea Plan.

The proposed ordinance
- applicable to all development in subareas 1-3
  - Commercial
  - Retail
  - Office
  - Residential
  - All allowed uses – no conditional
- Subareas divided into 6 pods for large scale master plans.

Review Process
- Concept plan for workshop meeting with Planning Commission (prior to any formal application.)
- Large Scale Master Plan – Planning Commission
- Development Agreement – City Council
- Site Plan Approval – Staff
- Subdivision Plats – Planning Commission/City Council

Large Scale Master Plan
• Site plan showing general location and size of buildings, setbacks, streets, walkways, parking areas, general landscaping, plazas, recreational amenities.
• Preliminary master utility plan
• Transportation plan showing road, bicycle and pedestrian networks.
• Master parking plan
• Traffic analysis
• Illustrative architectural elevations
• Thematic design elements
• Signage master plan

Development Standards
• Uses
• Building height
• Landscape setbacks from roads
• Roads
• Parking (shared parking available)
• Landscape & irrigation
• Fencing & Screening
• Outdoor Lighting
• Residential Development
• Commercial Development
• Sign Standards
• Additional Standards for specific uses

Council Member Paul Glover asked what the council has control over and what they can change.

Lesley Burns said they can change the development standards, parking, building height, and landscaping standards.

E. DISCUSS SMALL AREA MASTER PLAN
Christine Richman, GSBS Consulting, Buck Sweeney and Tim Sullivan were present to discuss the small area master plan process. Christine Richman said they started with an existing conditions analysis and market opportunities. They reviewed and gave feedback on options, identify preferences and recommendations, and now have a draft plan to review and hopefully adopt.

Christine Richman and Buck Sweeney reviewed the following:

7200 South area vision principles
• Transformative through urban design and land use.
• Increase human designed space (as opposed to automobile designed space) to 25-30 percent.
• Connect the area to the rest of the community
• Focus on hotels and hospitality
• Create a cohesive brand for the area as a regional entry point to the community and a gateway to recreation.

Projects and Implementation Area
• Work with existing business and property owners to identify a brand and theme consistent with the plan vision statements.
• Explore the appropriate mix of funding mechanisms for the public improvements within the station area.
• Work with UTA to implement the plan.
• Update the Zoning Code to require:
  o Dedication of open space associated with new developments to support the public space network incorporated in the plan,
  o Contribution to an open space fund in lieu of dedication if the development is not adjacent to the public space network,
  o Require a balanced mix of land use types within the station area to include:
    ▪ Medium and high density residential,
    ▪ Office,
    ▪ Hotel,
    ▪ Retail,
  o Require new development to comply with design guidelines implementing the station area’s brand and theme,
  o Focus the most intensive development along the 7200 South frontage.
  o Buffer existing single-family residential areas with less intensive development
  o Update parking requirements in accordance with parking analysis recommendations, and
• Develop street cross sections and streetscape requirements consistent with the station area brand and theme.

Vision Principles – Center Street Area
• Awaken and activate the area
• Design and improve for charm
• Encourage transformative development

Midvale City Station Area Plans:
• Existing Conditions & Market Opportunities
• Vision & Guiding Principals
• Review & Feedback on Options
• Identity Preferences & Recommendation
• Submit Draft Plan for Review

Vision Principles
• Transformative through urban design and land use
• Increase human designed space (as opposed to automobile designed space) to 25-30 percent
• Connect the area to the rest of the community
• Focus on hotels and hospitality
• Create a cohesive brand for the area as a regional entry point to the community and
  a gateway to recreation
• Midvale Small Area Plans

Preferred alternative land use intensity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>212,400</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>216,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td>124,500</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Designed</td>
<td></td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projects and Implementation
7200 South Station Area

- Work with existing business and property owners to identify a brand and theme consistent with the plan vision statements
- Explore the appropriate mix of funding mechanisms for the public improvements within the station area
- Work with UTA to implement plan
- Update the Zoning Code to require:
  - Dedication of open space associated with new developments to support the public space network incorporated in the plan
  - Contribution to an open space fund in lieu of dedication if the development is not adjacent to the public space network
  - Require a balanced mix of land use types within the station area to include:
    - Medium and high density residential
    - Office
    - Hotel
    - Retail
  - Require new development to comply with design guidelines implementing the station area's brand and theme
  - Focus the most intensive development along the 7200 South frontage
  - Buffer existing single-family residential areas with less intensive development
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- Update parking requirements in accordance with parking analysis recommendations, and
- Develop street cross sections and streetscape requirements consistent with the station area

Vision Principles
Awaken and activate the area
- Design and improve for charm
- Encourage transformative development.
- Concentrate the most intense uses near State Street and Center Street
- Create a cohesive brand for the area as a village center and activity hub in the community.

Center Street Station Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>642,600</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td>96,300</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Designed</td>
<td></td>
<td>177,500</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CENTER ST STATION PLAN

- 25 Mile Station Radius
- Near Term Catalytic Opportunity
- Mid Term Catalytic Opportunity
- Long Term Catalytic Opportunity
- Single Family Residential 2
Projects and Implementation

Center Street Station Area

- Work with existing business and property owners to identify a brand and theme consistent with the plan vision statements
- Explore the appropriate mix of funding mechanisms for the public improvements within the station area
- Work with UTA to implement plan
- Update the Zoning Code to require:
  - Dedication of open space associated with new developments to support the public space network incorporated in the plan
  - Contribution to an open space fund in lieu of dedication if the development is not adjacent to the public space network
  - Require a balanced mix of land use types within the station area to include:
    - Medium and high density residential
    - Office
    - Retail
  - Require new development to comply with design guidelines implementing the station area’s brand and theme
  - Focus the most intensive development from State Street to the station,
  - Buffer existing single-family residential areas with less intensive development,
  - Update parking requirements in accordance with parking analysis recommendations, and
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- Develop street cross sections and streetscape requirements consistent with the station area brand and theme
- Create pedestrian areas on all four corners of the State Street and 8000 South, State Street and Center Street and State Street and 7615 South intersections, and
- Reconfigure Center Street to improve the pedestrian environment and install streetscape improvements.

Christine Richman said the next step is to discuss the implementations and make sure the type of development the City wants is the key to putting the zone together and implementing the plan.

F. DISCUSS PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FY2019 BUDGETS FOR THE GENERAL FUND AND OTHER FUNDS AS NECESSARY

Laurie Harvey discussed the proposed budget amendments as follows:

**Amendments to General Fund**

- Allocation of reserve account for merit increases
  - $57,800 from “Employee Services” to various departments
  - JAG grant - UPD
  - $15,200 2018 grant
    - Speed trailer
    - Thermal imaging monoculars
    - GPS trackers
  - $15,400 2017 grant (carryover)
    - Wireless mics with earpieces for police radios
    - 55 chairs for precinct

- Recreation Director position
  - Salary and benefits - $27,000
  - Software and operations - $8,000
  - From Fund Balance - $35,000

- Dinners/snacks for Council meetings
  - From Fund Balance - $3,000

- Replace air conditioning unit at Police Station
  - From Fund Balance - $100,000

- Total from Fund Balance - $138,000

Leaves fund balance reserve at approximately $4.1 million - 20.5% of $20 million General Fund revenue.

**Amendments to General Fund and CIP**

- $5,250,000 Grant from Salt Lake County
• Pass through to CIP for Bingham Junction Blvd

• $470,000 from sale of Main Street basketball court and Museum
  • Increase of $70,000 from FY 2018 estimate
  • Pass through to CIP for Community Center/Bowery project

• $400,000 increase in budget for Community Center/Bowery project
  • $330,000 transfer from “Future Projects” CIP line item
  • Balance from increase in estimated revenue from sale of properties

Kane Loader proposed a new meeting schedule starting in January with only two meetings a month starting at 6:00 p.m., with no workshops. A quarterly workshop can be scheduled if needed. The Council agreed to proceed.

II.  ADJOURN
Mayor Hale adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:13 p.m.

Rori L. Andreasen, MMC
H.R. DIRECTORY/CITY RECORDER

Approved this 18th day of September 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (PLEASE PRINT)</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Sterling</td>
<td>Canyons School District 4150 S 5500 W</td>
<td>Sandy 84070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Barron</td>
<td>769 E Harris Ave</td>
<td>SLC UT 84105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathlene Zachara</td>
<td>257 E 30 S #1111</td>
<td>SLC UT 84111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Pickren</td>
<td>200 E 140 S Ave</td>
<td>SLC UT 84103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Grim</td>
<td>257 E 200 S #300</td>
<td>SLC UT 84101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danya Pastiszek</td>
<td>257 E 200 S</td>
<td>84111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott McLenn</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Citizens' Climate Lobby—Bill Barron 801-699-5705, bill.barron@citizensclimate.org

Citizens' Climate Lobby (https://citizensclimatelobby.org/)
CCL Supporters worldwide 109K, in the US 103K, Chapters worldwide 486, in the US 416
CCL Supporters in Utah-1762

Citizens' Climate Lobby values (https://citizensclimatelobby.org/about-ccl/values/)
Focus: Optimism-Relationships-Integrity-Personal Power-Being Nonpartisan

Carbon Fee and Dividend (https://citizensclimatelobby.org/basics-carbon-fee-dividend/).
Revenue-neutral market based solution.
  • Gradually increasing fee on carbon emissions
  • All revenue returned to households (% households do better or break even)
  • Border trade adjustments

As of January 2018-42 national and 25 subnational governments have instituted some form of carbon pricing (British Columbia)

The REMI Study
• CO2 emissions decline by 33% in 10 yrs and 52% after 20 years
• National Employment increases by 2.1 M jobs after 10 years and 2.8 M after 20 years
• Reduced air pollution saves 13,000 lives annually after 10 years with a cumulative 227,000 American lives saved after 20 years
• GDP Cumulative increase of $1.375 trillion after 20 years

Laser Talks (https://citizensclimatelobby.org/laser-talks/)

Building political will for action on climate:
State County and City Resolutions
(https://citizensclimatelobby.org/endorsements/municipal/)

Endorsements
Influencer Letter to Congress (https://citizensclimatelobby.org/leaders/)


Join CCL in meetings with MOC’s

Other actions are available.
SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION

Resolution 41 of 2015

JOINT RESOLUTION URGING CONGRESS TO LEVY REVENUE-NEUTRAL FEE ON CARBON IN FOSSIL FUELS

WHEREAS, climate scientists worldwide are in near-unanimous agreement that the planet is warming rapidly and this must be slowed to prevent the development of a climate that is perilous to human civilization, numerous species, and the global ecosystem we all share; and

WHEREAS, Salt Lake City is already feeling the local effects of climate change through increased temperatures, changes in water systems, extreme weather events and other disruptions that threaten our economy, residents and overall quality of life; and

WHEREAS, the primary cause of that warming globally is human activity, especially the combustion of fossil fuels that create greenhouse gases and alter the chemical composition of the Earth’s atmosphere and oceans.; and

WHEREAS, Salt Lake City Corporation has demonstrated its commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through the transformation of City facilities to "net zero" energy use, increased use of clean or alternative fuel vehicles in the City fleet, reduction of barriers to installing renewable energy such as solar panels and ongoing regulatory, programmatic and policy support for clean energy and clean vehicle deployment on a community-scale and regionally throughout Utah; and

WHEREAS, the urgent need to transition from fossil fuels can be accelerated through a market-based program, namely a revenue-neutral carbon fee on producers and corresponding rebate to consumers, and

WHEREAS, a market-driven mechanism such as a carbon fee and dividend would encourage and empower residents to reduce and replace their consumption of carbon-based energy with renewable and other innovative energy sources, whether through conservation, being more efficient or by choosing less carbon-intensive energy sources; and

WHEREAS, the transition to low-carbon, renewable energy resources will provide a range of additional co-benefits including enhanced public health, increased national and energy security, local green jobs, reduced reliance on finite resources and myriad other positive outcomes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED

that that the Salt Lake City Council and Mayor of Salt Lake City strongly urge the United States Congress to pass legislation that levies an annually increasing revenue-neutral fee on the carbon in fossil fuels at the point of production and importation, sufficient to:
1. Encourage individuals and corporations to produce and use less fossil fuels;
2. Make the transition from fossil fuels less onerous to consumers and to the economy by returning to American households on an equitable basis all of the revenues gained from the fee;
3. Reduce United States’ CO2-equivalent emissions to 10% of 1990 levels by 2050;
4. Encourage similar actions by other nations trading with the United States, by suitable carbon content-based fees for imports and rebates for exports to nations that have not taken such actions.

Ralph Becker
Salt Lake City Mayor

Council Chair
Salt Lake City Council Member, District Four
SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION

Resolution

James Rogers, Vice Chair
Salt Lake City Council Member, District One

Kyle LeMaile
Salt Lake City Council Member, District Two

Stan Penfold
Salt Lake City Council Member, District Three

Erin Mendenhall
Salt Lake City Council Member, District Five

Charles Luke
Salt Lake City Council Member, District Six

Lisa Adams
Salt Lake City Council Member, District Seven

Passed by the City Council of Salt Lake City, Utah, this 10th day of November, 2015.
Midvale Arts Council Expenditures related to Midvale City's Grant Money
July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Money Restrictions</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productions, Musical and Arts Events</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Midvale Arts Council's Spending</th>
<th>Net Payroll</th>
<th>Payroll Taxes</th>
<th>Accounting Fees</th>
<th>Productions/Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final check for Suzanne Walker</td>
<td>812.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>11,190.00 Contract Labor/Bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. check for Daniel Daniels</td>
<td>1,060.72</td>
<td>476.20</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>10,000.00 Midvale Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. ck for Daniel Daniels</td>
<td>1,060.73</td>
<td>341.54</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. ck for Daniel Daniels</td>
<td>1,060.73</td>
<td>341.56</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>4,200.00 Theater contract labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah withholding for qtr</td>
<td></td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,990.00 Concert performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. ck for Daniel Daniels</td>
<td>1,167.25</td>
<td>386.48</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. cks for Daniel Daniels</td>
<td>2,217.19</td>
<td>336.12</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. check for Daniel Daniels</td>
<td>1,167.25</td>
<td>386.50</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah withholding for qtr</td>
<td></td>
<td>223.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee for preparing and filing W2s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. ck for Daniel Daniels</td>
<td>1,197.25</td>
<td>356.50</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March ck for Daniel Daniels</td>
<td>1,197.25</td>
<td>356.50</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April ck for Daniel Daniels</td>
<td>1,197.25</td>
<td>356.50</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah withholding for qtr</td>
<td></td>
<td>183.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May ck for Daniel Daniels</td>
<td>1,197.25</td>
<td>356.50</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June ck for Daniel Daniels</td>
<td>1,197.25</td>
<td>356.50</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditures for payroll</strong></td>
<td>14,532.80</td>
<td>4,558.90</td>
<td><strong>396.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,487.70</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference from $20,000 Midvale grant</strong></td>
<td><strong>-512.30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not all $20,000 was spent of the grant money because of the change from one Exec Director to another--there was a small gap in payroll. Daniel Daniels pay was increased after the first few months to bring him up to what Suzanne had been paid.**

Change Leader Conference: $-139.00
Grantwatch program: $-199.00
Rotary Fees: $-255.00
Net Payroll: $-80.70
Agenda

Welcome and Introductions
Mayor Hale

Strengthening Midvale through Collective Action
Bill Crim, CEO, UWSL

Current Community Initiatives
Karen Sterling, Director of Student Advocacy and Access, Canyons School District

Promise Midvale Partnership
Katherine Zachara, Director of Civic Partnerships, UWSL

Q&A

Complex Problems Require Community Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL POVERTY BY AGE GROUP FOR MIDVALE</th>
<th>HILLCREST FEEDER PATTERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 62% of students in the feeder are living in poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Intergenerational Poverty Rate (IGP) at the four elementary schools is approximately 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 20% of students are homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 30% mobility rate among students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 43% of students report moving 2+ times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>Under Federal Poverty Line</th>
<th>1-2 times the Federal Poverty Line</th>
<th>More than 2x the Federal Poverty Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 6</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11 YEARS</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-17 YEARS</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 YEARS</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 YEARS</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 YEARS</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 YEARS</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 YEARS</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 YEARS</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ YEARS</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thousands of Nonprofits &
10s of Thousands of Programs

“Service Delivery Chaos”

Collective Impact

“...long-term commitments by a group of important actors from different sectors to a common agenda for solving a specific social problem.”

- John Kania and Mark Kramer
PREPARING OUR CHILDREN TO BE SUCCESSFUL & SELF-RELIANT

STUDENTS WHO ARE PROFICIENT IN READING IN 3RD GRADE are more likely to graduate from high school.10

STUDENTS WHO ARE PROFICIENT IN MATH IN 8TH GRADE are more likely to complete college and be prepared for the workforce.11

CHILDREN WHO ARE KINDERGARTEN READY are more likely to have a foundation that supports future learning and health.12

STUDENTS WHO ARE COLLEGE AND CAREER READY are more likely to have better employment and earnings opportunities.13

FINANCIALLY STABLE FAMILIES

HEALTH

ADULTS WHO EARN CERTIFICATES OR DEGREES are more likely to be financially stable, live longer, healthier lives, and be more civically engaged.14

Strengthening Entire Communities

"Successful coalitions:

- are mostly started and inspired by civic leaders with no formal authority, and not by politicians, and are driven not by party ideology or affiliation but by a relentless 'what-works attitude.'

- ...all begin with a vision, strategy and benchmarks for rebuilding their community, which enable them 'to harness each element of the community and mobilize their unique resources...’"

Build on the Strength of Midvale

Attracting new and expanding businesses
Strong values: family, education, and community
Rich history
Talented residents
Strong leadership
Public Private Partnerships
Diversity

Holistic Approach to Serving the Citizens of Midvale

Integration of proven community services and academic practices in the places where families are already connected to improve education, health, and financial stability outcomes.

Engagement of all the community service relationships and resources to achieve specific results for the entire community.

Cross-sector partners work together to improve a specific, measurable outcome at a large geographic scale.

Identify bright spots and scale what works. Elevate systemic barriers to be addressed by systems leaders. Pilot change ideas in communities and schools.
Mont Millerberg  
Canyons School District  
Board Member – District 1

I am disappointed that I won’t be able to attend City Council meeting Tuesday due to the prior commitment with the District APEX Awards. Please extend my gratitude to the United Way and the Midvale City Council for the work they are doing as we partner with them to better serve the people of the Midvale area.

It is exciting to me that the first new school constructed in the Canyons School District was Midvale Elementary. This was no accident. It was by design. We now have a new Midvale Middle School that opened a little over a year ago. Hillcrest High School is currently under construction and Midvalley Elementary is scheduled to break ground in late March of 2019. A new Union Middle School is also included as a part of the bond passed by voters last November.

The Canyons Board of Education is committed to providing not only quality buildings, but also quality teachers and administrators to our Midvale Schools. There are challenges, but with our growing partnerships with Midvale City, United Way, the other community agencies, non-profit organizations, and businesses all working together, we CAN move the dial on achievement for all students. We are committed to providing equity in educational opportunities to one of our most challenging communities.

Get the Conditions Right  
FOR ALL KIDS

- Parents Did Not Do Well in School
- Limited English Proficiency
- Hungry
- Poor Health
- Depressed
- Smart & Bored
- Abused
- Isolated
What is a Community School?

Canyons School District's Community Collaboration Model for School Improvement

Assessment/Action

Immediate/Intermediate Outcomes

Long-term Outcomes

Effective Academic and Instructional Leadership and Climate

Student Outcomes

Community Outcomes
Collaborating For Student Success in College, Career and Citizenship

1. Maximize academic learning
2. Promote school climate and positive youth development;
3. Address non-academic barriers to learning;
4. Align resources and services;
5. Develop community partnerships to support academic achievement of all students

Title I Schools

School & Community Support for Parents/Caregivers increased across all schools, including items across all schools, including items

- The school helps families get the services we need in the community like childcare, housing, and health care.
- The school helps families get to know other adults in the school community.
- In our school and community, there are opportunities for all parents/caregivers to work.
- There are opportunities in our school and community for parents/caregivers to improve their education.

Parent & Caregiver Perceptions

School & Community Support

- Copperview: 3.50, 3.65, 3.80, 3.65, 3.79
- East Midvale: 3.65, 3.46, 3.62, 3.67, 3.53
- Midvale: 3.40, 3.53, 3.57, 3.72

Bar charts showing support from 2012 to 2018.
Title I Schools
Community Services & Supports Scale includes items:
- Has accessible services and supports available for families.
- Has quality services and supports available for families.
- Has services and supports in place to meet the needs of families.
- Have enough services and supports for families.*

Teacher & Staff Perceptions

Community Services & Supports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copperview</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midvale</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midvale</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Midvale Schools
Community Support for Positive Youth Development Scale includes:
- Provides opportunities for youth to be involved in pro-social activities.
- Reinforces youth involvement in pro-social activities.
- Views youth as valuable assets.
- Has high expectations for youth.*
- Celebrates cultural diversity.*

Teacher & Staff Perceptions

Community Support for Positive Youth Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copperview</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midvale</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midvale</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Supports for Positive Youth Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midvale Middle</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest High</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1298 English Learners in Hillcrest Network (23%)

In 2014, Refugee resettlement agencies identified several apartment areas in Canyons boundaries for new Refugees coming to the United States from all over the world. In 2017-2018, Canyons served 122 children from countries such as Syria, Iraq, Iran, Sudan, Congo, Somalia, Rwanda, Burundi, Equatorial Guinea and Afghanistan.

Refugee Language Total
Arabic 51
Swahili 28
Kinyarwanda 16
Farsi 11
Other* 50

*Includes 14 languages such as Dinka, French, Kurdish, Somali and Thai
SB67 Partnerships for Student Success

United Way of Salt Lake
United Way

Boys and Girls Club
Canyons Education Foundation
Canyons School District
Community Building Community
Family Support Center
iCHAMPS
International Rescue Committee
Larry H. Miller Foundation
Latinos in Action
Midvale City
Midvale Road Home
Promise Partnership Regional Council
PLAYWorks
Sandy Chamber of Commerce
Salt Lake County Government
Savage Services
U of U - Dept. of Education, Culture and Society
U of U - College of Social Work
United Way of Salt Lake
Utah Afterschool Network
Utah Community Action
Utah Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health
Utah Food Bank
Utah Health Policy Project
Utah Partners for Health
Valley Behavioral Health

Leadership provides direction and accountability for community building

Identify challenges
- Crime
- Poverty
- Transportation
- Equity in services
- Health
- Financial Stability
- Self-sufficiency

Review data
- Education outcomes
- Crime statistics
- Poverty (Intergenerational Poverty)
- Health

Develop a common plan
- Outcomes
- Indicators
- Strategic plan (one year)
- 3 month action plans
- Build on resources and initiatives that already exist

Continuous quality improvement
- Rigorous continuous improvement
- Identify bright spots
- Scale/replicate bright spots
Promise Midvale Partnership Structure

**Leadership Committee**
- Members: City Council, Mayor, Canyons School District, Business Leaders, Police, Some partners, UWSL, Community Members, School Board, Salt Lake County, Parents
- Roles:
  1. Oversight/advice
  2. Make decisions based on data
  3. Identify community and city-level issues
  4. Develop strategies and interventions
  5. Address policy and governance challenges that impede systems change

**All Partner Group**
- Members: Non-profit orgs, businesses, education providers, civic groups, parents, and community members
- Roles:
  1. Track progress using the 9 indicators defined in Senate Bill 67
  2. Map Resources and gather data to inform decisions
  3. Identify gaps and set priorities
  4. Develop strategies and interventions to address these gaps

**Community Schools**
- Members: School staff, partner organizations, parents, students
- Roles:
  1. Provide equitable and excellent instruction to all students
  2. Implement evidence-based practices
  3. Align, coordinate and develop sustainable resources
  4. Provide support at the school level
  5. Coordinate service delivery
  6. Gather Data and monitor progress

Key principles:
- Common vision; communication; data-driven decisions; continuous improvement; collaboration across sectors; align resources; address systemic challenges.

Questions?

**Contact**

**United Way of Salt Lake**
Bill Crim
Bill@uw.org
O: 801-736-7701
C: 801-455-8138

Katherine Zachara
KatherineZ@uw.org
O: 801-746-2557
C: 773-655-8800

**Canyons School District**
Karen Sterling
Karen.Sterling@canyonsdistrict.org
O: 801-826-5111
Senate Bill 67: Partnerships for Student Success Grant

**Purpose:** To improve educational outcomes for low income students through the formation of cross-sector partnerships that use data to align and improve efforts focused on student success.

**Collective Impact:** The practice of bringing people from different organizations together, in a structured way, to achieve social change: Essential components of the partnership:

1. Common agenda
2. Shared measurement for continuous improvement
3. Mutually reinforcing activities
4. Continuous communication
5. Strong backbone organization

**Grant Priorities:** 1) Includes a low-performing school as determined by the Board; 2) Addresses parent and community engagement

**Eligible Partnership:** A partnership that includes at least 1 in each of the following categories:

1. A local education agency that has designated an eligible school feeder pattern
2. A local nonprofit organization
3. A private business
4. A municipality or county in which the eligible school feeder pattern is located
5. A institution of higher education within the state
6. A state or local government agency that provides services to students attending schools within the eligible feeder pattern
7. A local philanthropic organization
8. A local health care organization

**Eligible School Feeder Pattern:** The succession of schools that a student enrolls as the student progresses from kindergarten through grade 12 that includes:

1. A high school
2. An eligible junior high that is a district schools within the geographic boundaries of the high school
3. An eligible elementary school that is a district school within the geographic boundary of the high school

**Partnership Memorandum of Understanding** (must address the following):

1. Shared goals, outcomes, and measurement practices based on community needs and interests that are aligned with the 5 and 10 year plan to address intergenerational poverty
2. Address the following for students attending a school within an eligible school feeder pattern:
   • Kindergarten readiness
   • Grade 3 mathematics and reading proficiency
   • Grade 8 mathematics and reading proficiency
   • High school graduation
   • Postsecondary education attainment
   • Physical and mental health
   • Development of career skills and readiness

3. Coordinate and align services to:
   • Students attending schools within an eligible school feeder pattern
   • The families and communities of the students within an eligible LEA school feeder pattern

4. Implement a System for:
   • Sharing data to monitor and evaluate shared goals and outcomes in accordance with state and federal law
   • Accountability for shared goals and outcomes

5. Funding
   • Commitment to provide matching funds equal to two times the amount of the grant
   • At least half of the matching funds provided must come from the LEA
   • Matching funds may include cash or in-kind donations

**Eligible Expenses**: The partnership that receives the grant may use funds only for the following purposes:
1. Contract with a technical assistance provider
2. Project management
3. Planning and adaptation of services and strategies
4. Coordination of services
5. Establishment and implementation of shared measurement practices
6. Production of communication materials and outreach activities to build public support
7. Establishment of data privacy and sharing agreements in accordance with state and federal law
8. Purchasing infrastructure, hardware, and software to collect and store data
9. Analyzing data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health and Mental</th>
<th>Readiness</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Literacy Indicators</th>
<th>Math Indicators</th>
<th>Science Indicators</th>
<th>Physical Indicators</th>
<th>Education Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Mental</td>
<td>Readiness</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>Literacy Indicators</td>
<td>Math Indicators</td>
<td>Science Indicators</td>
<td>Physical Indicators</td>
<td>Education Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Primary</td>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome Indicators Aligned to 5 and 10 Year Plan to Address Intergenerational Poverty**

Hillcrest Feeder - Baseline Data July 2017/2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary and Career Skills and College Readiness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postsecondary Readiness</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Dropout Rate</th>
<th>Readiness Indicators</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>% of Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Readiness</th>
<th>Physical Activity</th>
<th>Readiness</th>
<th>% of Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental Readiness</th>
<th>% of Graduates</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical and Mental Health Readiness Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Graduates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental Health Readiness Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Mental Health Readiness Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Graduates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental Health Readiness Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table represents the various levels of knowledge and their corresponding academic and non-academic indicators. Higher levels indicate a more comprehensive understanding and broader range of achievements.
Collective Impact
By John Kania & Mark Kramer
Collective Impact

LARGE-SCALE SOCIAL CHANGE REQUIRES BROAD CROSS-SECTOR COORDINATION, YET THE SOCIAL SECTOR REMAINS FOCUSED ON THE ISOLATED INTERVENTION OF INDIVIDUAL ORGANIZATIONS.

BY JOHN KANIA & MARK KRAMER

Illustration by Martin Jarrie

The scale and complexity of the U.S. public education system has thwarted attempts at reforms for decades. Major funders, such as the Annenberg Foundation, Ford Foundation, and Pew Charitable Trusts have abandoned many of their efforts in frustration after acknowledging their lack of progress. Once the global leader—after World War II the United States had the highest high school graduation rate in the world—the country now ranks 18th among the top 24 industrialized nations, with more than 1 million secondary school students dropping out every year. The heroic efforts of countless teachers, administrators, and nonprofits, together with billions of dollars in charitable contributions, may have led to important improvements in individual schools and classrooms, yet system-wide progress has seemed virtually unattainable.

Against these daunting odds, a remarkable exception seems to be emerging in Cincinnati. Strive, a nonprofit subsidiary of KnowledgeWorks, has brought together local leaders to tackle the student achievement crisis and improve education throughout greater Cincinnati and northern Kentucky. In the four years since the group was launched, Strive partners have improved student success in dozens of key areas across three large public school districts. Despite the recession and budget cuts, 34 of the 53 success indicators that Strive tracks have shown positive trends, including high school graduation rates, fourth-grade reading and math scores, and the number of preschool children prepared for kindergarten.

Why has Strive made progress when so many other efforts have failed? It is because a core group of community leaders decided to abandon their individual agendas in favor of a collective approach to improving student achievement. More than 300 leaders of local organizations agreed to participate, including the heads of influential private and corporate foundations, city government officials, school district representatives, the presidents of eight universities and community colleges, and the executive directors of hundreds of education-related nonprofit and advocacy groups.

These leaders realized that fixing one point on the educational continuum—such as after-school programs—wouldn’t make much difference unless all parts of the continuum improved at the same time. No single organization, however innovative or powerful, could accomplish this alone. Instead, their ambitious mission became to coordinate improvements at every stage of a young person’s life, from “cradle to career.”

Strive didn’t try to create a new educational program or attempt to convince donors to spend more money. Instead, through a carefully structured process, Strive focused the entire educational community on a single set of goals, measured in the same way. Participating organizations are grouped into 15 different Student Success Networks (SSNs) by type of activity, such as early childhood education or tutoring. Each SSN has been meeting with coaches and facilitators for two hours every two weeks, for the past three years, developing shared performance indicators, discussing their progress, and most important, learning from each other and aligning their efforts to support each other.

Strive, both the organization and the process it helps facilitate, is an example of collective impact, the commitment of a group of important actors from different sectors to a common agenda for solving a specific social problem. Collaboration is nothing new. The social sector is filled with examples of partnerships, networks, and other types of joint efforts. But collective impact initiatives are distinctly different. Unlike most
collaborations, collective impact initiatives involve a centralized infrastructure, a dedicated staff, and a structured process that leads to a common agenda, shared measurement, continuous communication, and mutually reinforcing activities among all participants. (See “Types of Collaborations” on page 39.)

Although rare, other successful examples of collective impact are addressing social issues that, like education, require many different players to change their behavior in order to solve a complex problem. In 1993, Marjorie Mayfield Jackson helped found the Elizabeth River Project with a mission of cleaning up the Elizabeth River in southeastern Virginia, which for decades had been a dumping ground for industrial waste. They engaged more than 100 stakeholders, including the city governments of Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth, and Virginia Beach, Va., the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the U.S. Navy, and dozens of local businesses, schools, community groups, environmental organizations, and universities, in developing an 18-point plan to restore the watershed. Fifteen years later, more than 1,000 acres of a watershed land have been conserved or restored, pollution has been reduced by more than 245 million pounds, concentrations of the most severe carcinogen have been cut sixfold, and water quality has significantly improved. Much remains to be done before the river is fully restored, but already 27 species of fish and oysters are thriving in the restored wetlands, and bald eagles have returned to nest on the shores.

Or consider Shape up Somerville, a citywide effort to reduce and prevent childhood obesity in elementary school children in Somerville, Mass. Led by Christina Economos, an associate professor at Tufts University’s Gerald J. and Dorothy R. Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy, and funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Massachusetts, and United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley, the program engaged government officials, educators, businesses, nonprofits, and citizens in collectively defining wellness and weight gain prevention practices. Schools agreed to offer healthier foods, teach nutrition, and promote physical activity. Local restaurants received a certification if they served low-fat, high nutritional food. The city organized a farmers’ market and provided healthy lifestyle incentives such as reduced-price gym memberships for city employees. Even sidewalks were modified and crosswalks repainted to encourage more children to walk to school. The result was a statistically significant decrease in body mass index among the community’s young children between 2002 and 2005.

Even companies are beginning to explore collective impact to tackle social problems. Mars, a manufacturer of chocolate brands such as M&M’s, Snickers, and Dove, is working with NGOs, local governments, and even direct competitors to improve the lives of more than 500,000 impoverished cocoa farmers in Cote d’Ivoire, where Mars sources a large portion of its cocoa. Research suggests that better farming practices and improved plant stocks could triple the yield per hectare, dramatically increasing farmer incomes and improving the sustainability of Mars’s supply chain. To accomplish this, Mars must enlist the coordinated efforts of multiple organizations: the Cote d’Ivoire government needs to provide more agricultural extension workers, the World Bank needs to finance new roads, and bilateral donors need to support NGOs in improving health care, nutrition, and education in cocoa growing communities. And Mars must find ways to work with its direct competitors on pre-competitive issues to reach farmers outside its supply chain.

These varied examples all have a common theme: that large-scale social change comes from better cross-sector coordination rather than from the isolated intervention of individual organizations. Evidence of the effectiveness of this approach is still limited, but these examples suggest that substantially greater progress could be made in alleviating many of our most serious and complex social problems if nonprofits, governments, businesses, and the public were brought together around a common agenda to create collective impact. It doesn’t happen often, not because it is impossible, but because it is so rarely attempted. Funders and nonprofits alike overlook the potential for collective impact because they are used to focusing on independent action as the primary vehicle for social change.

**ISOLATED IMPACT**

Most funders, faced with the task of choosing a few grantees from many applicants, try to ascertain which organizations make the greatest contribution toward solving a social problem. Grantees, in turn, compete to be chosen by emphasizing how their individual activities produce the greatest effect. Each organization is judged on its own potential to achieve impact, independent of the numerous other organizations that may also influence the issue. And when a grantee is asked to evaluate the impact of its work, every attempt is made to isolate that grantee’s individual influence from all other variables.

In short, the nonprofit sector most frequently operates using an approach that we call isolated impact. It is an approach oriented toward finding and funding a solution embodied within a single organization, combined with the hope that the most effective organizations will grow or replicate to extend their impact more widely. Funders search for more effective interventions as if there were a cure for failing schools that only needs to be discovered, in the way that medical cures are discovered in laboratories. As a result of this process, nearly 1.4 million nonprofits try to invent independent solutions to major social problems, often working at odds with each other and exponentially increasing the perceived resources required to make meaningful progress. Recent trends have only reinforced this perspective. The growing interest in venture philanthropy and social entrepreneurship, for example, has greatly benefited the social sector by identifying and accelerating the growth of many high-performing nonprofits, yet it has also accentuated an emphasis on scaling up a few select organizations as the key to social progress.

Despite the dominance of this approach, there is scant evidence that isolated initiatives are the best way to solve many social problems in today’s complex and interdependent world. No single organization is responsible for any major social problem, nor can any single
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TYPES OF COLLABORATIONS

Organizations have attempted to solve social problems by collaboration for decades without producing many results. The vast majority of these efforts lack the elements of success that enable collective impact initiatives to achieve a sustained alignment of efforts.

Funder Collaboratives are groups of funders interested in supporting the same issue who pool their resources. Generally, participants do not adopt an overarching evidence-based plan of action or a shared measurement system, nor do they engage in differentiated activities beyond check writing or engage stakeholders from other sectors. Public-Private Partnerships are partnerships formed between government and private sector organizations to deliver specific services or benefits. They are often targeted narrowly, such as developing a particular drug to fight a single disease, and usually don’t engage the full set of stakeholders that affect the issue, such as the potential drug’s distribution system.

Multi-Stakeholder Initiatives are voluntary activities by stakeholders from different sectors around a common theme. Typically, these initiatives lack any shared measurement of impact and the supporting infrastructure to forge any true alignment of efforts or accountability for results.

Social Sector Networks are groups of individuals or organizations fluidly connected through purposeful relationships, whether formal or informal. Collaboration is generally ad hoc, and most often the emphasis is placed on information sharing and targeted short-term actions, rather than a sustained and structured initiative.

Collective Impact Initiatives are long-term commitments by a group of important actors from different sectors to a common agenda for solving a specific social problem. Their actions are supported by a shared measurement system, mutually reinforcing activities, continuous communication, and ongoing communication, and are staffed by an independent backbone organization.

Shifting from isolated impact to collective impact is not merely a matter of encouraging more collaboration or public-private partnerships. It requires a systemic approach to social impact that focuses on the relationships between organizations and the progress toward shared objectives. And it requires the creation of a new set of nonprofit management organizations that have the skills and resources to assemble and coordinate the specific elements necessary for collective action to succeed.

THE FIVE CONDITIONS OF COLLECTIVE SUCCESS

Our research shows that successful collective impact initiatives typically have five conditions that together produce true alignment and lead to powerful results: a common agenda, shared measurement systems, mutually reinforcing activities, continuous communication, and backbone support organizations.

Common Agenda | Collective impact requires all participants to have a shared vision for change, one that includes a common understanding of the problem and a joint approach to solving it through agreed upon actions. Take a close look at any group of funders and nonprofits that believe they are working on the same social issue, and you quickly find that it is often not the same issue at all. Each organization often has a slightly different definition of the problem and the ultimate goal. These differences are easily ignored when organizations work independently on isolated initiatives, yet these differences splinter the efforts and undermine the impact of the field as a whole. Collective impact requires that these differences be discussed and resolved. Every participant need not agree with every other participant on all dimensions of the problem. In fact, disagreements continue to divide participants in all of our examples of collective impact. All participants must agree, however, on the primary goals for the collective impact initiative as a whole. The Elizabeth River Project, for example, had to find common ground among the different objectives of corporations, governments, community groups, and local citizens in order to establish workable cross-sector initiatives.

Funders can play an important role in getting organizations to act in concert. In the case of Strive, rather than fueling hundreds of strategies and nonprofits, many funders have aligned to support Strive’s central goals. The Greater Cincinnati Foundation realigned its education goals to be more compatible with Strive, adopting Strive’s annual report card as the foundation’s own measures for progress in education. Every time an organization applied to Duke Energy for a grant, Duke asked, “Are you part of the [Strive] network?” And when a new funder, the Carol Ann and Ralph V. Haile Jr./U.S. Bank Foundation, expressed interest in education, they were encouraged by virtually every major education leader in Cincinnati to join Strive if they wanted to have an impact in local education.
Shared Measurement Systems | Developing a shared measurement system is essential to collective impact. Agreement on a common agenda is illusory without agreement on the ways success will be measured and reported. Collecting data and measuring results consistently on a short list of indicators at the community level and across all participating organizations not only ensures that all efforts remain aligned, it also enables the participants to hold each other accountable and learn from each other’s successes and failures.

It may seem impossible to evaluate hundreds of different organizations on the same set of measures. Yet recent advances in Web-based technologies have enabled common systems for reporting performance and measuring outcomes. These systems increase efficiency and reduce cost. They can also improve the quality and credibility of the data collected, increase effectiveness by enabling grantees to learn from each other’s performance, and document the progress of the field as a whole.2

All of the preschool programs in Strive, for example, have agreed to measure their results on the same criteria and use only evidence-based decision making. Each type of activity requires a different set of measures, but all organizations engaged in the same type of activity report on the same measures. Looking at results across multiple organizations enables the participants to spot patterns, find solutions, and implement them rapidly. The preschool programs discovered that children regress during the summer break before kindergarten. By launching an innovative “summer bridge” session, a technique more often used in middle school, and implementing it simultaneously in all preschool programs, they increased the average kindergarten readiness scores throughout the region by an average of 10 percent in a single year.3

Mutually Reinforcing Activities | Collective impact initiatives depend on a diverse group of stakeholders working together, not by requiring that all participants do the same thing, but by encouraging each participant to undertake the specific set of activities at which it excels in a way that supports and is coordinated with the actions of others.

The power of collective action comes not from the sheer number of participants or the uniformity of their efforts, but from the coordination of their differentiated activities through a mutually reinforcing plan of action. Each stakeholder’s efforts must fit into an overarching plan if their combined efforts are to succeed. The multiple causes of social problems, and the components of their solutions, are interdependent. They cannot be addressed by uncoordinated actions among isolated organizations.

All participants in the Elizabeth River Project, for example, agreed on the 18-point watershed restoration plan, but each is playing a different role based on its particular capabilities. One group of organizations works on creating grassroots support and engagement among citizens, a second provides peer review and recruitment for industrial participants who voluntarily reduce pollution, and a third coordinates and reviews scientific research.

The 15 SSNs in Strive each undertake different types of activities at different stages of the educational continuum. Strive does not prescribe what practices each of the 300 participating organizations should pursue. Each organization and network is free to chart its own course consistent with the common agenda, and informed by the shared measurement of results.

Continuous Communication | Developing trust among nonprofits, corporations, and government agencies is a monumental challenge. Participants need several years of regular meetings to build up enough experience with each other to recognize and appreciate the common motivation behind their different efforts. They need time to see that their own interests will be treated fairly, and that decisions will be made on the basis of objective evidence and the best possible solution to the problem, not to favor the priorities of one organization over another.

Even the process of creating a common vocabulary takes time, and it is an essential prerequisite to developing shared measurement systems. All the collective impact initiatives we have studied held monthly or even biweekly in-person meetings among the organizations’ CEO-level leaders. Skipping meetings or sending lower-level delegates was not acceptable. Most of the meetings were supported by external facilitators and followed a structured agenda.

The Strive networks, for example, have been meeting regularly for more than three years. Communication happens between meetings too: Strive uses Web-based tools, such as Google Groups, to keep communication flowing among and within the networks. At first, many of the leaders showed up because they hoped that their participation would bring their organizations additional funding, but they soon learned that was not the meetings’ purpose. What they discovered instead were the rewards of learning and solving problems together with others who shared their same deep knowledge and passion about the issue.

Backbone Support Organizations | Creating and managing collective impact requires a separate organization and staff with a very specific set of skills to serve as the backbone for the entire initiative. Coordination takes time, and none of the participating organizations has any to spare. The expectation that collaboration can occur without a supporting infrastructure is one of the most frequent reasons why it fails.

The backbone organization requires a dedicated staff separate from the participating organizations who can plan, manage, and support the initiative through ongoing facilitation, technology and communications support, data collection and reporting, and handling the myriad logistical and administrative details needed for the initiative to function smoothly. Strive has simplified the initial staffing requirements for a backbone organization to three roles: project manager, data manager, and facilitator.

Collective impact also requires a highly structured process that leads to effective decision making. In the case of Strive, staff worked with General Electric (GE) to adopt for the social sector the Six Sigma process that GE uses for its own continuous quality improvement. The Strive Six Sigma process includes training, tools, and resources that each SSN uses to define its common agenda, shared measures, and plan of action, supported by Strive facilitators to guide the process.

In the best of circumstances, these backbone organizations embody the principles of adaptive leadership: the ability to focus people’s attention and create a sense of urgency, the skill to apply pressure to stakeholders without overwhelming them, the competence to frame issues in a way that presents opportunities as well as difficulties, and the strength to mediate conflict among stakeholders.
CREATING A SUCCESSFUL COLLECTIVE IMPACT INITIATIVE

Creating a successful collective impact initiative requires a significant financial investment: the time participating organizations must dedicate to the work, the development and monitoring of shared measurement systems, and the staff of the backbone organization needed to lead and support the initiative's ongoing work.

As successful as Strive has been, it has struggled to raise money, confronting funders' reluctance to pay for infrastructure and preference for short-term solutions. Collective impact requires instead that funders support a long-term process of social change without identifying any particular solution in advance. They must be willing to let grantees steer the work and have the patience to stay with an initiative for years, recognizing that social change can come from the gradual improvement of an entire system over time, not just from a single breakthrough by an individual organization.

This requires a fundamental change in how funders see their role, from funding organizations to leading a long-term process of social change. It is no longer enough to fund an innovative solution created by a single nonprofit or to build that organization's capacity. Instead, funders must help create and sustain the collective processes, measurement reporting systems, and community leadership that enable cross-sector coalitions to arise and thrive.

This is a shift that we foreshadowed in both "Leading Boldly" and our more recent article, "Catalytic Philanthropy," in the fall 2009 issue of the Stanford Social Innovation Review. In the former, we suggested that the most powerful role for funders to play in addressing adaptive problems is to focus attention on the issue and help to create a process that mobilizes the organizations involved to find a solution themselves. In "Catalytic Philanthropy," we wrote: "Mobilizing and coordinating stakeholders is far messier and slower work than funding a compelling grant request from a single organization. Systemic change, however, ultimately depends on a sustained campaign to increase the capacity and coordination of an entire field." We recommended that funders who want to create large-scale change follow four practices: take responsibility for assembling the elements of a solution; create a movement for change; include solutions from outside the nonprofit sector; and use actionable knowledge to influence behavior and improve performance.

These same four principles are embodied in collective impact initiatives. The organizers of Strive abandoned the conventional approach of funding specific programs at education nonprofits and took responsibility for advancing education reform themselves. They built a movement, engaging hundreds of organizations in a drive toward shared goals. They used tools outside the nonprofit sector, adapting GE's Six Sigma planning process for the social sector. And through the community report card and the biweekly meetings of the SSNs they created actionable knowledge that motivated the community and improved performance among the participants.

Funding collective impact initiatives costs money, but it can be a highly leveraged investment. A backbone organization with a modest annual budget can support a collective impact initiative of several hundred organizations, magnifying the impact of millions or even billions of dollars in existing funding. Strive, for example, has a $1.5 million annual budget but is coordinating the efforts and increasing the effectiveness of organizations with combined budgets of $7 billion. The social sector, however, has not yet changed its funding practices to enable the shift to collective impact. Until funders are willing to embrace this new approach and invest sufficient resources in the necessary facilitation, coordination, and measurement that enable organizations to work in concert, the requisite infrastructure will not evolve.

FUTURE SHOCK

What might social change look like if funders, nonprofits, government officials, civic leaders, and business executives embraced collective impact? Recent events at Strive provide an exciting indication of what might be possible.

Strive has begun to codify what it has learned so that other communities can achieve collective impact more rapidly. The organization is working with nine other communities to establish similar cradle to career initiatives. Importantly, although Strive is broadening its impact to a national level, the organization is not scaling up its own operations by opening branches in other cities. Instead, Strive is proactively building a flexible process for change, offering each community a set of tools for collective impact, drawn from Strive's experience but adaptable to the community's own needs and resources. As a result, the new communities take true ownership of their own collective impact initiatives, but they don't need to start the process from scratch. Activities such as developing a collective educational reform mission and vision or creating specific community-level educational indicators are expedited through the use of Strive materials and assistance from Strive staff. Processes that took Strive several years to develop are being adapted and modified by other communities in significantly less time.

These nine communities plus Cincinnati have formed a community of practice in which representatives from each effort connect regularly to share what they are learning. Because of the number and diversity of the communities, Strive and its partners can quickly determine what processes are universal and which require adaptation to a local context. As learning accumulates, Strive staff will incorporate new findings into an Internet-based knowledge portal that will be available to any community wishing to create a collective impact initiative based on Strive's model.

This exciting evolution of the Strive collective impact initiative is far removed from the isolated impact approach that now dominates the social sector and that inhibits any major effort at comprehensive, large-scale change. If successful, it presages the spread of a new approach that will enable us to solve today's most serious social problems with the resources we already have at our disposal. It would be a shock to the system. But it's a form of shock therapy that's badly needed.

Notes
1 Interview with Kathy Merchant, CEO of the Greater Cincinnati Foundation, April 10, 2010.
4 Indianapolis, Houston, Richmond, Va., and Hayward, Calif., are the first four communities to implement Strive's process for educational reform. Portland, Ore., Fresno, Calif., Mesa, Ariz., Albuquerque, and Memphis are just beginning their efforts.
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Where American Politics Can Still Work: From the Bottom Up

Civic coalitions are succeeding at revitalizing old towns where governmental efforts have failed.

By Thomas L. Friedman
Opinion Columnist

July 3, 2018

LANCASTER, Pa. — Last week I wrote about why political parties across the industrial world are fracturing from the top down. Today I’m writing about the political units that are working. On this Fourth of July, if you want to be an optimist about America, stand on your head. The country looks so much better from the bottom up.

I know — the current cliché is that we’re a country divided by two coasts, two coasts that are supposedly diversifying, pluralizing, modernizing and globalizing, while in flyover America everyone is high on opioids, cheering for President Trump and waiting for 1950 to return. That’s totally wrong.

Our country is actually a checkerboard of cities and communities — some that are forming what I call “complex adaptive coalitions” and are thriving from the bottom up, and others that can’t build such adaptive coalitions and are rapidly deteriorating. You can find both on the coasts and both in the interior — and you can find both in just one little corner of south-central Pennsylvania.

I was invited in April to give a paid book talk here in Lancaster, and I was so blown away by the societal innovation the town’s leaders had employed to rebuild their once-struggling city and county that I decided to return with my reporter’s notebook and interview them.

My original host was the Hourglass, a foundation founded by community leaders in Lancaster County in 1997, when the city of Lancaster was a crime-ridden ghost town at night where people were afraid to venture and when the county’s dominant industrial employer, Armstrong World Industries, was withering.

Some of the leading citizens decided that “time was running out” — hence “Hourglass” — and that no cavalry was coming to save them — not from the state’s capital or the nation’s capital. They realized that the only way they could replace Armstrong and re-energize the downtown was not with another dominant company, but by throwing partisan politics out the window and forming a complex adaptive coalition in which business leaders, educators, philanthropists, social innovators and the local government would work together to unleash entrepreneurship and forge whatever compromises were necessary to fix the city.
Pretty much the exact opposite of what’s happening in Washington, D.C., today.

For my 2016, “Thank You for Being Late,” I profiled the complex adaptive coalition — called the Itasca Project — that had emerged to re-energize my hometown, Minneapolis. I’ve since seen such coalitions popping up all over the world — from Knoxville, Tenn., to Sheridan, Wyo.; from Broward County, Fla., to Birmingham, Ala.; and from Mexicali, Mexico, to the Western Galilee in Israel.

One of the most successful is Hourglass, which defined its mission as being a “trusted source for information, innovative ideas and insights that will help stakeholders, elected officials and voters make more informed and enlightened decisions” to advance the community. In these dark days of our national politics, these emerging coalitions are a real source of optimism for me.

At 7:30 Friday morning in early June, the Hourglass leaders in Lancaster were all sitting around the kitchen table at Art Mann Sr.’s house, as they do every Friday. The seven men and women representing different Lancaster societal and business interests were discussing the region’s shortage of clean water, because of farm runoff, fertilizer and salt on the streets.

None is in city government or an elected politician; they’re just respected volunteer community activists who will make a recommendation, based on research, to the city or county to get a problem fixed and help galvanize resources to do it. They all know one another’s party affiliation, but they’ve checked them at Mann’s front door.

“The key to it all is trust,” Mann explained to me. “Politically we are all different, and our experiences are different. You can only get progress where there is trust. People trust that we are not in it for personal agendas and not partisan agendas. We will often host elected officials, and they will throw out ideas and we will give them feedback. And they are not worried it will go out of this room.”

As the breakfast wore on, I was reminded of the business philosopher Dov Seidman’s dictum that “trust is the only legal performance-enhancing drug.” And I recalled Israeli societal innovator Gidi Grinstein’s dictum that what is saving so many communities today is “leadership without authority — so many people stepping up to lead beyond their formal authority.”

Mann, a Republican local metals manufacturer who began his civic life running for the school board, was one of the original conveners of Hourglass — after looking around Lancaster in the early 1990s and seeing a county that was hemorrhaging jobs and a city that was dying and wholly unprepared for the 21st century.

“My family has been here since 1740 and was always interested in public service,” Mann told me. “We could see that in the late ’90s that the county was going to hell if we didn’t do something. People thought the city was unsafe. If we let the city die, it would affect the whole county.”

Greater Lancaster is a microcosm of America. The city has a population of 60,000, about 40 percent of whom are white, 40 percent Latino — mostly Puerto Ricans whose parents came decades ago to process chickens. About 15 percent are African-Americans, and the rest are a rainbow of Asians and immigrants and refugees from as far afield as Afghanistan, Nepal, Iraq and Syria. The city, though, is ringed by largely white suburbs — and beyond them a countryside dominated by Amish and Mennonite farmers and crafts people. The county’s total population is about 600,000.
Unwilling to let their hometown die a slow death, and fed up with weak municipal politicians, Mann and other civic leaders “got together in my living room” to become catalysts for change. “Our first insight was that leadership matters” — and if it wasn’t going to come from the politicians, then it would come from them — and it would be devoid of party politics.

The Lancaster ethic was best described to me by Ray D’Agostino, president of the Lancaster Housing & Opportunity Partnership, one of myriad young societal entrepreneurs I met here. His nonprofit mobilizes citizens to contribute time and resources to build and repair affordable housing.

“There is big P politics — party politics — and small P politics,” said D’Agostino. “We check the big P at the door and just worry about solving the issues — not worrying about what Republicans or Democrats think about it. It [became] ingrained in us. We still look at things in a conservative or liberal way, but I can work with my liberal friends because we agree on what needs to be done — and it has to get done. I won’t vote for them, but I will work with them. And you are talking to a guy who is the chairman of the Republican Party for our local school district!”

When visitors from nearby York, Reading or Harrisburg — communities not doing all that well — see what’s happening in Lancaster, “this is all foreign to them,” added D’Agostino. “I tell them: ‘You don’t know how to collaborate. You’re still working in silos.’” When a leader from York told him: “Ray, you know, we take care of our own. We’re doing things our way,” D’Agostino responded, “Maybe that’s part of the problem.”

That’s also how it used to be in Lancaster. Back around 2000, “nobody was talking to each other,” recalled Mann, which is why the convention center and other projects were stalled. So in December 2005 Hourglass started the “First Friday Noontime Forum” to get community leaders, business owners and elected officials into one room — with no press — to discuss all the components of fixing the city.

“We found that people who were responsible for key parts of the city, business and government had never met each other,” said Mann. “They were all in their own silos, and we — Hourglass — were neutral, so we could get them together.”

Many locals say the turnaround began in the early 2000s, when Lancaster got the chance to have a minor-league baseball team and stadium. The ballpark was originally planned for the suburbs — no one would come downtown at night — but a public-private coalition emerged to locate the stadium in the city’s northwest corridor in 2005. Recalled Mann: “I went to opening night and sat next to people from suburbia and they said, ‘Wow, I can’t believe I’m in Lancaster.’”

At the same time, Hourglass, and other groups provided the funds so public officials and the private sector could learn from the best experts in the world on how to lift their city and businesses. These included bringing in the mayor of Charleston, S.C., Joseph Riley, to explain how to build a thriving downtown; Edward Deming to teach quality improvement strategies; and an urban development expert from Brookings, Christopher Leinberger, to help create a long-term growth vision for the city and county. They’ve even looked to Denmark for insights.

I found the hunger for best practices profound. “There is an awareness that all good ideas don’t start here,” said Susan Eckert, president of the Lancaster Partnership for Health. “Who is the best small-city mayor? Let’s call ’em. Who is the best urban planner? Call ’em. Who are the education transformers? Call ’em. Who is doing the most interesting stuff in public health? Call ’em. No one is bowling alone here. The civic life and engagement are as rich and dense as anything I have ever seen.”
The momentum for change really picked up, though, around 2006 when a dynamic new mayor was elected, J. Richard Gray, who worked with the Hourglass team, local business leaders and societal innovators to take Lancaster to a new level. Gray, with the help of Leinberger, started by drawing up a long-term revitalization plan, which he carried around on a small note card every day to make sure every decision aligned with it.

Gray describes himself as a “Democratic capitalist,” which, he said, means: support businesses to invest in town — because there are no employees without employers — make sure they pay people a living wage and don’t damage the environment. It was a balance a lot of locals of all political stripes found appealing.

“On the local level I don’t know how many people would come up to me and say: ‘I am a Republican but I really like what you do,’” said Gray. “We have gotten over the partisan divide.”

Also in the early 2000s, farsighted community leaders at Franklin & Marshall, the dominant local university, and Lancaster General Hospital, the town’s biggest employer, decided to get together to redevelop the street that connected them, creating a new urban hub of restaurants, entertainment and housing called the “James Street Improvement District” (which later grew into the Lancaster City Alliance to work on improvements all across the city).

F&M and the hospital each committed $250,000 a year for three years to improve the whole northwest quadrant of the city, offering financial incentives for people to buy homes along James Street and fix them up. That led to more attractive homes, park benches, trash cans and lighting, and to F&M eventually tearing down some of the hedges that separated it from the city and making it better neighbor. F&M also built a beautiful new sports complex on the grounds of the demolished Armstrong World Industries plant. The whole corridor has since been reborn as the “Eds and Meds” district.

All successful complex adaptive coalitions have some kind of college or university in their town. Gray told me he once remarked to F&M’s president, “You want to make Lancaster a place where students want to come and I want to make it a place where graduates want to stay.”

Word got around. Restaurants, bars, coffee houses and businesses began moving in across Lancaster, bringing many young people and start-ups with them.

But it was the partnership among Hourglass, the mayor and local business and community leaders and politicians to get the stalled convention center built and a Marriott Hotel next to it — in the heart of the city — that made downtown Lancaster not just somewhere people drove through on their way to boutique hotels in Amish country, but a destination of its own.

It wasn’t only the First Friday Forum’s getting people together that broke the deadlock over the convention center. It was Gray’s willingness to work with any Republican who would work with him. In particular, he forged a quiet partnership with Lloyd Smucker, a Republican who was then a state senator, to establish a community reinvestment zone that created the income stream to pay off the bonds needed to fund the convention center. “That was because Smucker and I could work together,” said Gray. “You get an awful lot done if you don’t worry who gets credit.”

Part of Gray’s strategic plan was also to bring public art into the city. “Art makes people feel better about themselves and their communities,” he told me, “so we made a huge push for public art, and we included the neighborhoods in deciding what kind of public art — and we now have a full-time director of public art for every development in the city.”
By February 2018, a month after Gray stepped down after three terms as mayor, Lancaster was named by Forbes as one of the “10 Coolest U.S. Cities to Visit,” saying this “newly hip Victorian city — just three hours from New York City — is still one of the U.S.’s best kept secrets.” It “boasts a bustling food scene and is quickly becoming a cultural hotbed. The architecture is the real star, so explore the alleys and cobblestone streets by foot, checking out the many repurposed old warehouses that house thriving businesses.”

But for all its progress digging itself out of a deep hole — by bridging political divides — racial divides and policing issues are alive in Lancaster, just like in other cities.

Last Thursday a white Lancaster police officer used a Taser on a 27-year-old black man who was sitting on a curb during an arrest — which he did not appear to be resisting. A bystander’s video of the tasing has amassed more than two million views on Facebook. It’s quite disturbing. The new mayor, Danene Sorace, who has ordered an investigation, told me, “The progress Lancaster has made in recent years is too precious a thing for us not to respond to this incident in a meaningful way … and with systemic changes that we were already working on.”

The unemployment rate in Lancaster County is 3.3 percent while in the city it’s over 10 percent. And while some 30 percent of the city lives below the poverty line, it reaches 50 percent in some of the poorest neighborhoods.

In other words, this is not nirvana. What differentiates Lancaster from its neighbors is the degree to which it built a complex adaptive coalition to save the city from terminal decline, the resources this has created to try to bridge its still tough economic and racial divides — and the sheer number of people here who want to get caught trying.

You name a challenge and someone here has started a nonprofit — the Lancaster Coalition for XYZ — to fix it. For instance, it was the Lancaster County Lead Coalition that brought the City Council’s attention to the horrors of lead poisoning in impoverished neighborhood rental properties, which led to a new set of safety ordinances. How many counties have a lead coalition?

Randy Patterson is director of economic development and neighborhood revitalization for the city and past president of the county United Way board. The United Way used to raise dollars through workplace campaigns and then distribute them to 30-some local agencies and partners, each going its own way.

“There were no community-oriented goals,” explained Patterson. “So the board moved to a collective-impact model — four bold goals over 10 years — aimed at reducing poverty by 50 percent; making sure that every child is kindergarten-ready in terms of basic learning skills; ensuring that every adult has access to postsecondary education and credentials; and ensuring that every citizen has access to some kind of health care.

So now, he said, “we raise money through the United Way, but we will only fund collaborative efforts to achieve those four goals. Grants are also for three years, not just one. We’re funding elements of 100 different agencies now, working collaboratively toward these four goals,” and “we partnered with F&M to measure our success.”

To succeed in today’s world, concluded Patterson, a community has to decide “what it wants to be” — no one is stopping you, but no one will do it for you. Lancaster got that. A lot of its neighboring towns haven’t.
The Amish and Mennonites are not just a tourist attraction around here. These faith communities, with their strong family values, work ethic and openness to refugees — they came to this region to flee religious persecution themselves — are one of the unique attributes and competitive advantages of Lancaster.

“We have a refugee inflow 20 times the national average,” said Gray, “and we say, ‘I don’t care where you’re from, you are welcome here.’” Local churches, synagogues and mosques have all been active in resettlement, as has business.

At the same time, there are roughly 13,000 job openings in Lancaster County, said Tom Baldridge, president of the Chamber of Commerce. Everyone is looking for workers. “The broader business community here is pro-immigration and wanting to make sure we can assimilate [immigrants] into the community as quickly as we can,” Baldridge said. “The average education level of immigrants is higher than ours, and [while] the language barrier is real, they have a work ethic beyond belief — and they love America. We just had dinner with a family from Syria, and afterward we were saying to ourselves, ‘Why are we scared of this?’”

Sam Bressi, C.E.O. of the Lancaster County Community Foundation, a private trust set up decades ago that now boasts $100 million in assets, put it to me this way: “We are not an extraordinary community unless we are an extraordinary community for everyone here. We started the country’s first refugee-oriented community center — located at a middle school.” It brings together in one neighborhood school all the different nonprofit services the community has to offer for immigrants, a one-stop shop for kids and parents.

To be certain that they were in tune with the direction the community wanted to go, Bressi’s foundation also started a “community champion quiz. We set up pop-up booths all over town — in the central market, local coffee shops, a bilingual training center — and had a film crew with each one. We asked people: ‘What is the most important thing for a successful community?’

“The answers that came up over and over again,” Bressi said, “were a community that creates respect and unity, respect and unity. People want to be heard and want to be respected. And they want unity, no divides. They see the national trends, they feel the division and they don’t want it.”

Damaris Rau, superintendent of the Lancaster School District, presides over 11,500 students — mostly poor, black and brown — who speak 37 languages. “My biggest challenge is that 90 percent of our students are eligible for free and reduced lunch,” she told me. To attract more affluent students, the district long ago instituted an international baccalaureate program. To help more needy students, Rau developed a program by which high school seniors who have completed all of their graduation requirements can take college courses in areas of their interest or needed technical skills, like nursing, and the city will pay their tuition. “It gives them a leg up when they start college.”

Rau told me about how one church noticed that there were a lot of children waiting for their public school to open each morning, because parents dropped them off and had to get to work. So for the last three years the church has opened early to provide breakfast for the kids.

Another thing I’ve seen in all complex adaptive coalitions is the business community getting involved in both K-12 and college courses, translating in real time the skills demanded by global businesses today — not waiting for the schools to figure it out.
For instance, Pete Slaugh Jr., managing director of Berkshire Hathaway HomeServices, decided to fund a program in entrepreneurship — with classroom, mentoring and hands-on experiences — at Millersville University, near Lancaster, to teach students how to turn ideas into products or services. “We need to make sure employers have workers with the actual skills they need,” said Slaugh.

Can Lancaster’s successes be replicated?

Yes. Its problems are global and the strategies Lancaster has employed to resurrect itself are shared by complex adaptive coalitions I’ve visited all over. The organization Grinstein, the societal innovator, created, called Reut, is helping to catalyze some in Israel. I took him with me to Lancaster, and afterward he noted common features that all of these successful coalitions share:

1. They are mostly started and inspired by civic leaders with no formal authority, and not by politicians, and are driven not by party ideology or affiliation but by a relentless “what-works attitude.”

2. They all begin with a vision, strategy and benchmarks for rebuilding their community, which enable them “to harness each element of the community and mobilize their unique resources, and societal innovations, behind this vision. … We call this ‘extending the yoke.’ The longer yoke you have, the more horses you can have pulling the wagon — and in a community, the ‘yoke’ is the inspiring vision and the ‘horses’ are the business leaders, social entrepreneurs, local colleges, philanthropies, nonprofits and faith-based institutions.”

3. They understand that there are no quick fixes for regenerating a community, which is why civic leadership is so crucial — “because civic leaders can adopt a long-term view that transcends political tenures.”

And I would add one more: Not a single community leader I spoke to in Lancaster said the progress was due to technology — to microchips. They all said it was due to relationships — relationships born not of tribal solidarity but of putting aside tribal differences to do big hard things together in their collective interest. It’s a beautiful thing to see.

So, on this Fourth of July, it’s worth remembering that it was our ability to do big hard things together as Americans that also got us this far as a country. And if you want to be reminded of what that looks like — because it is so easy to forget these days — Art Mann is serving breakfast for the Hourglass folks in his kitchen this Friday. It starts at 7:30 a.m. — and I’m sure he’d invite you in.

Thomas L. Friedman is the foreign affairs Op-Ed columnist. He joined the paper in 1981, and has won three Pulitzer Prizes. He is the author of seven books, including “From Beirut to Jerusalem,” which won the National Book Award.