

---

**REPORT TO THE USDA FOREST SERVICE  
ON PHASE I OF THE PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

**CONTRACT #: 43-9138-2-3120**

---

**SUBMITTED BY:**

PINCHOT INSTITUTE FOR CONSERVATION  
(J. SIRMON, N. RANA, P. KOSTISHACK)  
1616 P STREET, NW  
SUITE 100  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

**DATE:**

SEPTEMBER 30, 2002

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

---

### *Background*

In response to the need for greater competency in the arena of natural resource management partnerships, the Forest Service's Partnership Task Force is taking the lead in designing a Partnership Development Program. The Task Force envisions this program as one that will be useful and available to agency personnel as well as outside parties that have an interest in partnering with the Forest Service. The overall scope of work for the development of this program has been divided into two phases. For both phases, the Forest Service requested the support of the Pinchot Institute for Conservation. This report covers the work completed by the Pinchot Institute for Phase I.

### *Phase I Scope of Work*

In Phase I, the Pinchot Institute aimed to: define the core skill-set required of program managers and partnership specialists who are responsible for advancing solutions to natural resource management using collaboration and partnerships; catalogue existing training opportunities related to the development of core skills; explore the cultural, procedural, and skill-related barriers to the advancement collaborative solutions; and identify some of the more promising, and perhaps necessary, approaches to developing competency in partnerships and collaborative stewardship.

### *Methods*

In order to carry out this scope of work, the Pinchot Institute developed a set of questions that were used in interviews with noted practitioners, trainers, and academics to obtain their ideas regarding partnership skill needs and training opportunities (the interview questions are attached). To date, the Institute has conducted 24 interviews, all by telephone except for two in-person interviews (two additional interviews are pending due to scheduling conflicts). A list of interviewees is attached.

### *Product*

This report summarizes the information that was gathered through the interviews and presents the Pinchot Institute's recommendations regarding approaches the agency may wish to pursue in the effort to enhance its capacity to foster and engage in partnerships more effectively. It also outlines three models, which represent our initial thoughts on components of the design of a Partnership Development Program. Further articulation of these and other models will be undertaken as part of Phase II of the Partnership Development Program effort.

---

## II. IDENTIFYING CORE SKILLS AND COMPETENCIES

---

Interviewees were asked to identify those skills they feel are essential for an individual's effective participation in partnerships (especially Forest Service partnerships). We were able to categorize the skills identified as being related to:

- ✍ relationship building;
- ✍ understanding communities;
- ✍ facilitation/mediation;
- ✍ the business side of partnerships; or
- ✍ monitoring.

Interviewees were *not* asked to identify skills falling under these categories specifically; rather, the categories emerged organically, indicating a certain importance placed upon these types of skills.

In addition, some interviewees cited certain personality traits that have proven to be a benefit to the partnership process. These traits may have emerged as helpful in relationship building, facilitation/mediation, and/or implementation. Those interviewed were also asked to name individuals who they believe to be "master performers" in the area of partnerships and collaboration. The list of master performers is attached and will be useful in the identification of potential mentors and resource people to help in the creation of a partnership development program.

### ***Relationship Building***

The skills listed below relate to one's ability to lay the foundation for effective partnerships by forging meaningful relationships with key partners and valuing these relationships, however informal they may be.

*Skills needed in:*

- ✍ Communication
- ✍ Dropping ideologies and replacing them with a commitment to community
- ✍ Fostering trust
- ✍ Utilizing or calling upon someone with multilingual skills when necessary
- ✍ Outreach and networking
- ✍ Understanding the theory and meaning behind public participation and collaboration
- ✍ Engaging the people who pose the most difficulty in a particular situation
- ✍ Addressing past problems to forge new collaborations
- ✍ Knowing who to engage, as well as how and when engage them
- ✍ Identifying local expertise in the region and tapping into their knowledge

### ***Understanding Communities***

The skills listed below relate to one's ability to recognize, acknowledge, and respect the perspectives of potential and actual partners. "Community" is described broadly here to include communities of interest (those interested in or affected by an issue) and communities of place.

*Skills needed in:*

- ✍ Understanding that natural resource problems are complex and involve multiple actors
- ✍ Understanding other organizations and how they view partnerships

- 
- ✂ Identifying the values of all effected parties
  - ✂ Identifying and nurturing the strengths of a community
  - ✂ Identifying and dissolving the weaknesses of a community through capacity building
  - ✂ Understanding small communities – how they work and how to respect local traditions
  - ✂ Understanding informal networks and how to access them

### ***Facilitation/Mediation***

The skills listed below relate to one’s ability to develop, lead, and work through a collaborative process effectively, especially when diverse interests are represented.

#### *Skills needed in:*

- ✂ Leadership
- ✂ Issue identification (including identifying what is non-negotiable)
- ✂ Framing issues (in a way that engages the audience and promotes participation)
- ✂ Assessing and analyzing power/influence dynamics between groups and individuals
- ✂ Listening to what people say and determining what is really bothering them
- ✂ Asking the right questions
- ✂ Breaking a problem apart
- ✂ Problem solving (involves investigation)
- ✂ Understanding ecosystems (and setting appropriate project-level boundaries)
- ✂ The collaborative learning process
- ✂ Systems thinking
- ✂ Thinking outside the box
- ✂ Visioning
- ✂ Negotiation
- ✂ Interest-based bargaining (separating issues and interests from positions)
- ✂ Understanding areas of compromise for developing mutually acceptable solutions (mutual gains development)
- ✂ Dispute management
- ✂ Designing meeting agendas
- ✂ Writing mission statements
- ✂ Developing joint problem statements that incorporate the multiple interests
- ✂ “Giving up power”
- ✂ Getting to the bottom line
- ✂ Keeping everyone at the table
- ✂ Documenting others’ comments (includes capturing information and summarizing it)

### ***Business Side of Partnerships***

The skills identified below relate to the ability of agency personnel to utilize the proper mechanisms and procedures for formalizing partnerships.

#### *Skills needed in:*

- ✂ Using and crafting the right grants and agreements (especially challenge cost-share agreements and participatory agreements)
- ✂ Understanding the agency’s basic authorities and the restrictions on activities associated with them
- ✂ Tracking money
- ✂ Making sure terms of agreement are being met (holding people accountable)

- 
- ✍ Extending/modifying contracts when necessary
  - ✍ Developing a process to deliver money to the ground and filtering it through the community
  - ✍ Implementation (execution as opposed to planning)

### ***Monitoring***

The skills listed below relate to one's ability to capture useful information from a partnership process and applying it toward adaptive change.

#### *Skills needed in:*

- ✍ Measurement
- ✍ Documentation
- ✍ Qualitative analysis
- ✍ Understanding photographs
- ✍ Multi-party monitoring processes
- ✍ Building monitoring into the work plan
- ✍ Evaluation of outcomes (thoughtful consideration of goals, making sure they are measurable)

### ***Personality Traits***

- ✍ Willingness to try something new
- ✍ Personal wisdom
- ✍ Humility
- ✍ Openness
- ✍ Leadership
- ✍ Diplomacy
- ✍ Willingness to identify own biases and address them upfront
- ✍ Innovativeness
- ✍ Ability to work as part of a team
- ✍ Ability to see the larger picture

---

### III. SIGNIFICANT BARRIERS TO PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

---

It is impossible to address training needs in partnerships without considering the many types of barriers that Forest Service managers face in forming them. For this reason, we asked the experts interviewed to comment on what they considered the most significant barriers to partnerships and collaboration. While the answers were diverse, common themes emerged, with several experts agreeing that Forest Service managers face a combination of barriers that stem from a mix of agency culture, required procedures, their own lack of skills, and a system that offers little support for risk taking. These categories are examined in greater detail below along with specific comments from the interviews.

#### *Agency Culture*

Organizational culture, while slow to change, was consistently identified as an impediment to working with others. Often considered to be a prime barrier to the critical activity of relationship building, the agency culture was described as bureaucratic and self-serving. Many experts in the field of partnerships see a need for the agency to relinquish some of its perceived control over decision-making and find effective ways to engage the public and outside organizations in its land management efforts. Specific comments about the agency's culture included:

- ✂ Agency has difficulty devolving power.
- ✂ The agency culture breeds the notion that working collaboratively means letting go of all control in decision-making. The agency needs to stop thinking that it must do everything alone. Agency personnel need to invest more time in developing relationships with outside partners.
- ✂ Agency is rigid in its approach to reading and interpreting the law.
- ✂ The culture of the Forest Service used to be one of strong local commitment. Over the last 20 years, however, there has been inconsistent political direction regarding collaborative stewardship.
- ✂ The agency has tended to use partnerships as a way to get its work done by someone else; this is not what real partnerships are about.
- ✂ Forest Service personnel don't do anything unless they are told to do it; BLM personnel act in almost the opposite way (doing whatever they think is best unless they're told they can't).
- ✂ The agency is often "organating," creating organizational work (shuffling people around) and not making a difference on the ground. The constant moving in and out of Forest Service managers is discouraging to communities.
- ✂ Collaboration is conveyed as a policy decision ("you shall collaborate") instead of promoted as a way of conducting business more effectively.
- ✂ Consensus for change within the agency needs to be built. These efforts need to be funded and assisted. All of these barriers are present, but the cultural barrier is the broadest and most difficult to overcome.
- ✂ Bureaucracies get caught up in planning, which builds mistrust and makes people angry when nothing is getting done on the ground.
- ✂ Institutional culture can be overcome through training, technical assistance, and informal networking.

#### *Procedures (rules, regulations, legislation)*

Respondents were slightly more divided on the significance of procedural barriers to partnering. While some recognized that laws could be restrictive in collaborative situations, many felt that

---

the way the agency interprets those laws, through its bureaucracy and internal processes, exacerbates the problem. While we have separated procedural and cultural barriers in the layout of this report, it is also important to see the relationships between the two. Procedures play a critical role in shaping the agency's culture, and once they have been shaped by agency culture, those procedures then become very difficult to change. The following are specific comments related to procedural barriers:

- ✂ Individuals can break through the culture, but it is harder to break through the rules.
- ✂ Regulations can provide limitations.
- ✂ FACA and the Recission Bill with Salvage Rider have provided problems. There is still a fear of FACA, although it is diminishing. Many people invoke FACA as an excuse for doing nothing.
- ✂ The agency budgeting process doesn't make sense.
- ✂ Agency personnel see partnerships as being too caught up in red tape; once agreements are finally negotiated, people often do not have the time, energy or resources to implement them.
- ✂ Procedural issues are vital, as they are part of the process of putting things together.
- ✂ The Forest Service decision-making process has bred a certain culture through its procedures.
- ✂ Procedures aren't the real barrier - FACA hasn't prevented anyone from engaging in partnerships, and a whole-scale revision of laws may not be necessary. Regulations prevent the worst but don't bring out the best. There need to be incentives for people to engage in partnerships.
- ✂ Look for policies and processes that enhance collaboration rather than divide the community. Restricting access to decision-making will cause more harm than good.
- ✂ The Forest Service "public input" process often includes meetings which don't always have the right decision-makers at the table. Often, the agency ignores certain levels of government or certain partners (e.g. consulting only with effected counties and not with municipalities).
- ✂ Agency personnel tend to take old MOU's and improperly recast them as "partnerships."

### ***Lack of Skills***

High levels of personal skills and comfort operating in partnerships are attributes that set aside many of the "Master Performers" discussed in the interviews. Insufficient skills were considered to be a limitation in many components of the partnership process, including building relationships, working through conflicting perspectives, and implementing collaborative efforts. Some of the experts consulted feel that the Forest Service is extremely good at planning and analysis, but that it lacks people with the ability to actually carry out the projects that mean the most to partners and communities. Some specific comments included:

- ✂ Agency people need to be comfortable attending local meetings and need to understand local politics.
- ✂ Agency personnel lack the skills to effectively assist communities in implementing various phases of the partnering process.
- ✂ Agency personnel lack effective interest-based and consensus-based problem-solving skills.
- ✂ The lack of skills is the biggest barrier.
- ✂ Agency personnel working in land management are only trained in how to collect and work with technical information. Large, landscape scale management ("ecosystem management") has been the "death throw" of the technical paradigm – taking on too much to really be effective.
- ✂ Agency personnel need more environmental dispute resolution skills.

---

✍ Agency personnel need more skills in how to effectively connect with partners. Public meetings often end up being a forum for people to take positions rather than express interests. People may be more open in private. Agency personnel need to be strategic about when they connect with partners, where they connect, and how they go about it.

### ***Lack of Internal Agency Support***

Many of those interviewed for this project suggested that the Forest Service find ways to provide more support for forming partnerships and collaboration. The kinds of support required include: leadership direction and encouragement to collaborate with communities and outside organizations; upfront funds to build relationships and curtail potential conflicts; rewards and personal incentives; and stronger backing for collaboratively derived decisions. Below are some specific comments pertaining to the barriers posed by lack of agency support:

- ✍ Agency personnel are struggling with the lack of clarity coming from the leadership. Edicts are coming down from the top that imply that people should be “doing collaboration,” instead of striving to work collaboratively. The agency hasn’t been clear about its intent: Phil Janik’s letter (stating, “you shall do collaboration on everything”) is one example of this.
- ✍ Currently, there are no incentives or rewards for developing partnerships.
- ✍ There has been a lot of talk (e.g. Gale Norton’s” 4 C’s”), but the agencies haven’t provided incentives for employees to engage in partnerships.
- ✍ There has not been an institutional (financial) commitment to partnerships.
- ✍ Agency personnel need to see a commitment to collaboration and partnerships on a number of different levels. The leadership should not be telling people to “go down a new path to get to the same old place.” There need to be resources to support a new way of working.
- ✍ People need encouragement to engage in partnerships.
- ✍ The agency has always tried to maintain its autonomy; therefore, people are penalized for working collaboratively.
- ✍ People need to be rewarded through the annual review process for working collaboratively and in partnerships.
- ✍ Resource professionals within the agency are being asked to facilitate learning and dialogue among partners; however, they are not being trained in these areas and are not being rewarded for this type of work. Lengthening tenure and promoting people would help keep partnerships in place.
- ✍ Collaboration and partnering are being loaded on to the backs of people without creating public policy to support them. In the long term, that is not sustainable. It doesn’t matter how many skills you have.
- ✍ Hierarchical “good cop/bad cop:” someone higher up in the agency will make decisions that reject or modify collaborative decisions, leaving the agency employee working with the community in an awkward situation.
- ✍ As it is currently structured, the agency is unable to allocate money upfront to support capacity building, empowerment, and civic entrepreneurship.
- ✍ Show department and agency support by dedicating some funds for innovation and change agents for collaboration and partnerships.

### ***Other***

Finally, there were a few barriers suggested by interviewees that are important but do not fall into any of the categories discussed above. They are as follows:

- 
- ✍ The “Old West versus the New West” creates a divisiveness that is a huge challenge for land managers and community members to overcome. It is not at all a level playing field. National and regional interests that want to destroy partnerships can do so and never pay any penalty. The biggest barrier is a lack of real connection between agency field managers and communities.
  - ✍ The promotion of *formal* partnerships across the board may actually kill things in certain situations; some partnerships are more intangible in spirit and are more about forming relationships than signing contracts.
  - ✍ Many Forest Service managers feel demoralized or downtrodden when it comes to working with partnerships. This stems from the agency having its image battered by citizens and adversaries, as well as from the stresses of internal downsizing and the inability to move ahead with deadlocked projects.

---

#### IV. TRAINING TO DEVELOP AND/OR ENHANCE CORE PARTNERSHIP SKILL SETS

---

##### *Existing Training Opportunities*

The following sources of existing training were discussed or recommended during the interviews. They are grouped according to the skill sets described above. They represent only a subset of available training options. Except for those reviewed in previous work, these sources are listed without evaluation by the Pinchot Institute. However, they have been suggested by sources who have a history of employing and teaching these skills. At the time of this report, the Pinchot Institute is in the process of inventorying training already used by the Forest Service by reviewing the internal agency training database.

##### **Relationship Building/Understanding Communities**

- ✍ *BLM National Training Center, Phoenix, AZ.* Offers training on community collaboration in a geographically rotating 5-day course that builds on local issues. Some Forest Service personnel have participated in this course.
- ✍ *Bolle Center for People and Forests, Missoula, MT.* Jim Burchfield, Director, has worked with others to conduct training sessions that draw together community representatives and agencies to talk about values regarding land management. (e.g. workshop for National Grassland in North Dakota).
- ✍ *Steve Daniels and Greg Walker, Utah State Univ. and Oregon State Univ.* Provide problem-specific training/coaching in collaborative learning, including “situation assessment” to help people look at issues more broadly.
- ✍ *The Heartland Center, Lincoln, NE.* Offers a basic training course in community development.
- ✍ *Integrations, Eugene, OR.* Provides workshops for diverse participants to help them through real life collaborative projects or challenges.
- ✍ *James Kent Associates, Ashland, OR.* Offers training in the social and cultural aspects of collaborative natural resource management, including methods for understanding the networks and functioning of communities.
- ✍ *Mike Lunn and Bob Chadwick, OR.* Offer custom designed courses, generally consisting of modules that bring agency personnel, community leaders, landowners, and activists together to work on collaborative approaches to solving watershed-level problems.
- ✍ *Steve McCool, University of Montana.* Teaches about standard setting and understanding the “Limits to Acceptable Change.”
- ✍ *Pinchot Institute for Conservation, Washington, D.C.* Jeff Sirmon, Institute Senior Fellow, has led leadership workshops called “Mobilizing People to Act.” “All leadership should have this training.”
- ✍ *Shipleigh Associates, Woods Cross, UT.* Provide training on NEPA that focuses on the intent of regulatory components. The methods are successful at getting issues defined.
- ✍ *The Sonoran Institute, Tucson, AZ.* Conducts a “Building Partnerships” program that involves public land managers and adjacent communities. One component, “Balancing Nature and Commerce,” conducted in conjunction with The Conservation Fund and the USFWS National Conservation Training Center, involves community visioning and teaches methods for tracking economic trends and promoting recreation and tourism.

---

## Facilitation/Mediation

- ✂ *Todd Bryan and Barbara Gray, Univ. of Michigan and Penn State Univ.* Conducted a pre-conference training called “Frame This” at the May 2002 U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution Conference.
- ✂ *CDR Associates, Boulder, CO.* Offer a variety of off-the-shelf and custom training courses on collaborative natural resource management, environmental conflict/alternative dispute resolution, and mediation.
- ✂ *Ecosystem Management Initiative (EMI), University of Michigan.* Provides general training in collaborative resource management, as well as training that can be tailored to address a specific partnership situation or need.
- ✂ *Interaction Associates, Boston, MA.* Offer training in facilitation.
- ✂ *Resolve, Inc. Washington, D.C.* Provides standard and custom courses in negotiation, environmental dispute resolution, and collaborative leadership.
- ✂ *USDA Forest Service.* Offers training in nominal group technique.
- ✂ *Various providers.* Offer training on how to take good notes and effectively convey information.

## Business Side of Partnerships

- ✂ *Danny Ebert, Boise National Forest.* Conducts good internal training sessions on grants, agreements, and partnership enhancement.
- ✂ *Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University.* Organizes and delivers customized, short-term, non-degree executive development programs that address various management challenges. Programs are tailored to the particular needs of an agency or institution and may address a very specific management problem or deal with a more global view of management and leadership.
- ✂ *Forest Service Internal Grants and Agreements (G&A) Staff.* Provide one-day trainings on basics, including an overview of the laws that allow partnerships. The Forest Service is currently setting up a certification system for G&A employees based upon education and experience.
- ✂ *International Institute of Municipal Clerks (IIMC), Rancho Cucamonga, CA.* Offers training related to grants and agreements.
- ✂ *School of Administrative Leadership, University of Montana.* Previously offered courses to line officers of any land management agency. Current availability unknown.
- ✂ *George Washington University/ ESI, Arlington, VA.* Provides training in project and contract management.
- ✂ *U.S. Department of Agriculture Graduate School.* Offers a web-based course called “The Federal Appropriations Law (FAL) Fundamentals,” which covers changes in appropriations law as documented in the Government Accounting Office's (GAO) FAL Handbook and provides examples of court decisions related to application of these laws.
- ✂ *The Woods Institute, Washington, D.C.* Offers seminars for businesses and organizations that need to understand both the legislative operations of the U.S. Congress and the state, local and national government relations within the federal system. Programs are tailored to the interests of the participants. Most of their effort through seminars, lectures and research travel has been directed toward policy and budget understanding for maintaining sustainable natural resources

---

## Other

✂ *Firewise Program.* Trains people in the nitty-gritty of planning for fire protection and aids them in the analysis of fiscal and economic impacts.

### ***Recommendations for Filling the Voids in Existing Training***

While training exists to address almost all of the core skills needed to be successful in partnering, our interviews uncovered certain areas where experts believed that training was lacking or could be improved to be more effective to Forest Service managers and their key partners. By far, the most frequent comments focused on making training more hands-on and contextual. Related suggestions referred to energizing practitioners to take risks and to apply, on the ground, what they have learned in training courses. Finally, there were some specific recommendations for how to use mentors and others with implementation experience to teach key concepts to managers. Below is a list of comments from the interviewees on improving and supplementing existing training:

- ✂ Training in grants and agreements might be more effective coming from someone other than the G&A people; maybe have a District Ranger or someone who has used these mechanisms successfully deliver such training.
- ✂ The agency's laws, regulations, and policies are laid out in the Forest Service manual and handbook, but there needs to be more explicit training regarding grants and agreements.
- ✂ Training courses should incorporate fieldtrips to get people out on the land to discover their common values.
- ✂ A training course should be developed to focus on the distinct subject matter of collaboration (in a Forest Service context); that is: forest planning, restoration, stewardship, strengthening rural communities, etc. Participants would have homework to do before they came to the training and would be asked to bring case materials from their current work setting.
- ✂ Training needs to be more hands-on and project-oriented.
- ✂ One-on-one mentoring should be used to work through issues.
- ✂ Formal training is not the answer, unless it is case-oriented.
- ✂ Training needs to include specific, real world examples.
- ✂ Training needs to talk about seizing opportunities and being energetic and creative. It should also convey how partnerships can help the agency do its job better.
- ✂ An internal mentoring program needs to be developed that uses proven performers as coaches.
- ✂ Training in the area of problem solving needs to be more widely implemented.
- ✂ There is a need to develop transformational leaders (inside and outside the agency).
- ✂ Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) training should not be the only type of collaborative training promoted. ADR is not the same as collaboration, which is more positive and proactive. Collaboration is more functional and long-term, while ADR is just short of going to court (one side loses, one side gains).
- ✂ There is need for training in the ability to translate concepts into a form that can facilitate the achievement of the tasks at hand.

### ***Training Opportunities Summary***

By in large, the core training needs identified by the interviewees could be developed through the rich array of training courses already offered by industry, universities and colleges, and government agencies. Many of these sources of training are able to provide customized training

---

in addition to their off-the-shelf courses. While there may be a few gaps in available training programs, such as adequate explanation of grants and agreements, such deficiencies can likely be remedied without excessive difficulty. The Pinchot Institute's October 26, 2001 report to the Forest Service, "Collaborative Stewardship Training Opportunities," provides a more in-depth review of several notable sources of training. Additionally, there are a number of other sources of available training geared toward natural resource and public lands management that are not addressed in that report.

With so many resources available, the major challenge is providing training and coaching in a timely manner and in a way that is integrated with real, collaborative problem solving activities. Training, coaching, and mentoring should be available to those in need when the time is ripe for outside intervention. The fact that this is not occurring is more an issue of administrative process and procurement than it is a lack of training sources.

---

## V. THREE PRELIMINARY MODELS FOR A PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

---

Based upon the written and spoken comments from experts in the field of partnerships and collaboration, the Pinchot Institute has described three models for developing partnership capacity among Forest Service managers. These models are described in brief below. For Phase II of the Partnership Development Program project, the Pinchot Institute will refine these models as well as explore others to come up with a detailed set of recommendations for a comprehensive Partnership Development Program.

### **Model 1: Learning While Doing**

Many experts in the field of partnerships and collaboration contend that the competencies needed to excel in this field are best learned in the process of working on real projects. In the development of this model, the Pinchot Institute will ask the Forest Service to identify several hands-on projects, with pre-existing funding, that are directed to be carried out in a collaborative manner through the use of partnerships. Examples include fuels reduction projects under the National Fire Plan and projects associated with the President's Healthy Forest Plan. The agency will then be asked to identify several volunteer communities and corresponding Forest Service units that need to work together to accomplish projects and that are ready to work collaboratively and in partnerships.

The agency will then pair these groups with Master Performers from their regions to serve as coaches or mentors, and to help group members walk through the following components of a collaborative approach as they apply to the project at hand:

- ✍ Public and policy support
- ✍ Building relationships and trust
- ✍ Preparing the communities of interests
- ✍ Select the hands-on challenge to be confronted

Funding for the involved Forest Service units will be set aside up front to cover the expenses of the coaches or mentors, outside training sources, outside experts, meetings/workshops, evaluations, and reports. The project will be evaluated and reported with recommendations to improve competencies, processes, and approaches to collaboration and partnership development.

### **Model 2: Learning From Master Performers**

A number of Forest Service personnel have already amassed an enormous amount of wisdom pertaining to collaboration and partnership development. This model would bring in experienced professionals who have been successful in their approach to collaboration (Master Performers) to share their success stories with participants who are about to embark on or who are currently working through similar activities. The format of such a training program would be a two to three day show-and-tell conference or workshop that would pair consultants/teachers/coaches with Forest Service managers, associated support staff, and key public partners. The course would be planned, organized, and facilitated by an outside consultant.

The key elements covered would include:

- ✍ Trust building
- ✍ Preparing your organization and community
- ✍ Framing
- ✍ Orchestrating

- 
- ✍ Reaching action steps
  - ✍ Forming partnerships
  - ✍ Designing actions and administration of partnerships
  - ✍ Monitoring and evaluation

As part of the session, participants would prepare strategic plans for how they are going to proceed with their project or challenge and set goals and measures of success. Coaching by the master performers would continue on an as-needed basis as the project progresses.

Some seed money would be needed to set up the initial meetings and help pay the expenses of non-government participants as well as to compensate the team of Master Performers.

### **Model 3: Top-Down Direction**

Another approach that may be necessary to assert the importance of building capacity in partnerships and collaboration involves strong encouragement and direction from the agency leadership. In this vein, the Forest Service may choose to design a comprehensive training and development model. A good start may be the implementation of the model workshops suggested in Part III of the 2001 Pinchot Institute Report, "Collaborative Stewardship Training Opportunities." In addition, this model would identify partnership skills required of Forest Service managers and recommend sources of appropriate training for developing those skills.

The skills and expectations outlined in this model would then: be tied into the employee development plan; become a criterion in employee performance standards; and be integrated with working agreements between an employee and his/her supervisor. Employees would be evaluated for advancement based in part upon their ability to master the skills required to form partnerships, thus providing the incentive to try new approaches.

## **APPENDICES**

---

- ✍ List of master performers
- ✍ List of experts interviewed
- ✍ Survey questions given to experts

---

## MASTER PERFORMERS

---

Interviewees cited the following individuals, both inside and outside the agency, as “master performers” -- those who are exceptionally skilled in certain aspects of partnerships or are generally proficient in the overall process of collaborative stewardship.  
[Note: This does not necessarily include all of the experts listed in Wondolleck and Yaffee’s book, *Making Collaboration Work*.]

### *Forest Service Master Performers*

- ✂ *Debbie Austin: Forest Supervisor, Lolo NF*  
(good understanding of the theory and meaning behind public participation and collaboration)
- ✂ *Bernie Bornong: Forester, Bighorn NF*
- ✂ *Art Carroll: Area Director, Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area*  
(working with diverse set of people)
- ✂ *Bob Dettman: Branch Chief, Region 2*
- ✂ *Jim Golden: Forest Supervisor, Coconino NF*  
(good understanding of the theory and meaning behind public participation and collaboration)
- ✂ *Maribeth Gustafson: Forest Supervisor, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit*  
(natural mediator)
- ✂ *Becky Heath: Forest Supervisor, Gallatin NF*
- ✂ *Marcia Hogan: Public Affairs Officer, Northern Rockies Lynx Team, Region 1*  
(good at understanding the process of building and working through partnerships)
- ✂ *Cal Joyner: Director of Natural Resources, Deputy Regional Forester, Region 6*  
(good at understanding the process of building and working through partnerships)
- ✂ *Tom Kovalicky: former Forest Supervisor, Nez Perce NF*
- ✂ *Carmine Lockwood: Planning Staff Officer, GMUG NFs*
- ✂ *Meg Mitchell: District Ranger, Wallowa Valley Ranger District, Wallowa-Whitman NF*
- ✂ *Ron Ochs: Jobs in the Woods Coordinator, Regional Office, Region 6*  
(good at “barrier busting”)
- ✂ *Paul Peck: former EAP coordinator, San Juan-Rio Grande NF*
- ✂ *Michael Rains: Director, Research and Development, Northeastern Research Station*  
(especially good at framing the issues)
- ✂ *Terry Reid: Realty Specialist, Chugach NF*  
(participated in the Forest Plan revision for Chugach NF)
- ✂ *Terry Seyden: Public Affairs Officer, NFs in North Carolina*  
(especially good at conflict negotiation and adaptive change)
- ✂ *Chip Weber: District Ranger, Wrangle Ranger District, Tongass NF*  
(spiritually committed to collaboration and has good skills)
- ✂ *Thurman Wilson: Forester, Supervisor’s Office, San Juan-Rio Grande NF*
- ✂ *Mike Znerold: District Ranger, Mancos-Dolores District, San Juan-Rio Grande NF*

### *Non-Forest Service Master Performers*

- ✂ *Tony Cheng: Assistant Professor, Colorado State University*  
(implementing collaborative learning approach)
- ✂ *David Chrislip: author*  
(wrote good book on collaboration models and techniques – The Collaborative Leadership Fieldbook)
- ✂ *Bryan Cottam: Executive Director, Flagstaff Sustainable Forest Partnership.*

- 
- ✂ Steve Fitzgerald: Oregon State Extension Service*  
(looks at conflict as an opportunity for learning)
  - ✂ Gary Lindstrom: Summit County Commissioner, Colorado*
  - ✂ Chris Mazer: BLM*
  - ✂ Matt McKinney: Executive Director, Montana Consensus Council*  
(good at facilitation and resolving difficult situations)
  - ✂ Mike Preston: Federal Lands Program, Montezuma County, Colorado*
  - ✂ Chuck Sperry: Director, Rocky Mountain Center for Economic Democracy, Montana*

---

**LIST OF EXPERTS CONSULTED**

---

<b><u>Name</u></b>	<b><u>Organization</u></b>
1. Ken Anderson	USDA Forest Service, Arizona
2. Gail Bingham	RESOLVE
3. Jim Burchfield	University of Montana
4. Sam Burns	Fort Lewis State College
5. Tony Cheng	Colorado State University
6. Zane & Elaine Cornett	Integrations
7. Steve Daniels	Utah State University
8. Crockett Dumas	USDA Forest Service, Utah
9. Todd Jones	U.S. FWS National Conservation Training Center
10. James Kent	James Kent Associates
11. Brad Leavitt	USDA Forest Service Retired, Oregon
12. Lars Lind	USDA Forest Service, Utah
13. Mike Lunn	Consensus Institute, Washington State University
14. Chris Moore	CDR Associates
15. Charles Pregler	BLM National Training Center
16. Lynn Scarlett	U.S. Department of the Interior
17. John Shepard	The Sonoran Institute
18. Craig Shinn	Portland State University
19. Gary Severson	Northwest Colorado Council of Governments
20. Maggie Shannon	Maxwell School, Syracuse University
21. Vicky Sturtevant	Southern Oregon University
22. Terry Tipple	private consultant
23. LuAnn Waida	USDA Forest Service, Colorado
24. Rebecca Watson	U.S. Department of the Interior
25. Brad Webb	Institute for Conservation Leadership
26. Julia Wondolleck/Steve Yaffee	University of Michigan

---

## **PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM INTERVIEW QUESTIONS**

---

**Gathering Background Information.** Please describe your experience with partnerships in natural resources management -- particularly in the area of teaching/training but also as it relates to research and/or actual participation in such partnerships.

**Identifying Core Skills.** In order to identify the range of skills demanded of the various participants in partnerships, we have broken down our questions according to the following three phases:<sup>1</sup>

?? ***Phase I: Issue Identification and Problem Framing***

This phase is the beginning of the partnership process in which organizations, individuals, and communities prepare themselves for collaboration through discussion and learning. Issues and roles are identified and the problem is framed.

?? ***Phase II: Conflict Resolution and Adaptive Change***

This phase requires partnership participants to work through conflicting perspectives to arrive at a mutually acceptable solution. Often, participants will have to modify their original positions in order to accommodate an outcome with which all parties can live.

?? ***Phase III: Implementation***

This phase is the execution of the steps that partnership participants agreed to in the problem-solving process (Phase II).

### **PHASE I: Issue Identification and Problem Framing**

1. How important is this phase to forming a partnership?
2. How well prepared have you found Forest Service managers to participate in this phase?
3. What are the most pressing training needs for Forest Service managers to effectively participate in this phase?
4. How well prepared have you found members of the communities of interests to participate in this phase?
5. What are the most pressing training needs for members of the communities of interests to effectively participate in this phase?
6. Are you aware of sources of training/mentoring/coaching available to meet the needs you recognize? If so, what are they?
7. Have you found any “master performers” (practitioners) for this phase? If so, who?
8. Which of the following is the most significant barrier that partnership participants encounter in identifying the issues and framing the problem?
  - ~~///~~ Cultural (related to agency culture/standard operating procedures)
  - ~~///~~ Procedural (related to legislative rules and regulations – “analysis paralysis”)
  - ~~///~~ Lack of skills

---

<sup>1</sup> See the Pinchot Institute’s report: “Collaborative Stewardship Training Opportunities: A Report to the USDA Forest Service,” October 26, 2001, pages 3, 4, & 30. [Available from the Pinchot Institute.]

---

## **PHASE II: Conflict Resolution and Adaptive Change**

1. Have you observed partnerships in this phase?
2. What were the strategies that participants used to resolve conflict? What skills were drawn upon?
3. What skills were lacking that could be better developed through training?
4. What specific training/mentoring/coaching would you recommend to develop or enhance the necessary skills?
5. Have you observed any “master performers” in this area? Who?
6. Which of the following is the most significant barrier that partnership participants encounter when attempting to resolve conflict and adapt to change?
  - ~~///~~ Cultural (related to agency culture/standard operating procedures)
  - ~~///~~ Procedural (related to legislative rules and regulations – “analysis paralysis”)
  - ~~///~~ Lack of skills

## **PHASE III: Implementation**

1. Have you observed partnerships in this phase? If so, which ones?
2. What skill deficiencies did you observe that could be remedied through training?
3. What type of training would you recommend?
4. Have you observed any “master performers” in this phase? Who?
5. Which of the following is the most significant barrier that partnership participants encounter in implementation?
  - ~~///~~ Cultural (related to agency culture/standard operating procedures)
  - ~~///~~ Procedural (related to legislative rules and regulations – “analysis paralysis”)
  - ~~///~~ Lack of skills
6. Are you aware of partnerships that were sustained after their initial tasks were implemented?
7. Do any of the partnerships that you are familiar with build monitoring into their work plans? If so, how essential is monitoring to the success of the partnership?