



A Catalyst for Community Health

Getting Along: Tools and Tips for Forging Consensus

“The real act of discovery consists not in finding new lands, but seeing with new eyes.”

— Marcel Proust

Can your organization or community benefit from new ways of thinking and better methods for forging consensus? Most people wouldn't hesitate to say 'Yes!' But if you asked some consensus-building experts, they'd say most people underestimate how popular doing things “the same way we've always done it” really is.

Consensus is one of many terms used to describe voluntary techniques for reaching agreement, also known as alternative dispute resolution (ADR). Collectively, these techniques are “alternatives” to costly and time-consuming litigation. Along with consensus building, other ADR techniques include negotiation, mediation and arbitration.

Finding Common Ground

As anyone who has tried to forge consensus among groups or individuals with different opinions can attest, negotiation and leadership skills are key. Even people who have the same set of facts about a specific issue often disagree on how best to address the problem.

Leadership skills aside, insight, understanding and agreement take time. Unfortunately, time

is in short supply in an age of inflated expectations, short attention spans and a seemingly endless cycle of meetings that, to many participants, don't go anywhere. Although insight, understanding and agreement are necessary conditions, even when they are present they are not always sufficient to establish consensus.

Why? One of the chief reasons meetings aren't always constructive is that those around the table haven't established a “common ground” of shared values, experiences and expectations. In a culture dominated by debate, competition and endless talk of individualism and special interests, they talk past and through each other, but seldom *to* and *with* each other.

It doesn't have to be this way. In this issue of Community Connect, we explore the process of consensus-building: what it is, what it isn't, and some of the tools and techniques organizations can use to bridge divergent interests and establish a common set of values and agenda, even if they don't always agree on each and every point.

There's no magic bullet in any of these approaches. They create a space for conversation of a certain kind, but without skilled facilitators and participants who are open to new ways of talking and working with each other for the common good, they can degenerate into “just another meeting.” With the willing suspension of disbelief, all things become possible. ■

IN THIS ISSUE

- | | |
|-----|---|
| p2 | What is Consensus? |
| p3 | Developing Consensus Within Organizations |
| p4 | Consensus Building Techniques |
| p6 | Before You Begin |
| p7 | Debate to Dialogue |
| p8 | Consensus Building: It Works |
| p10 | Everything is Negotiable |

Some Definitions

Consensus:

general agreement about a course of action.

Negotiation:

agreement reached through structured discussion.

Mediation:

agreement negotiated with the assistance of a third party.

Arbitration:

agreement negotiated by a third party with authority to make a final and binding decision.

“We believe that the vision or the consensus that grows within an organization or a community is always there, but it’s latent. So the process of building consensus is the creation of a new context.”

“I can better describe consensus by what it’s not,” says Marilyn Oyler of the Institute for Cultural Affairs. “It’s not unanimous and it’s not the lowest common denominator. It’s not the same as compromise, but it has to do with all ideas and concerns being expressed, and then being able to discern our common will, our common intent in relation to that information.”

Consensus building, based on the tools and techniques derived from negotiation, can be used to address any issue.

Alternatively, failure to reach some type of agreement often leads groups into polarizing – and often contentious – debate, conflict and other nonproductive behaviors. Getting beyond self-interests to the discovery of *common interests* enables groups to reframe issues and see new opportunities.

In order to reach the common ground, groups most often need to reframe ‘rights’ issues as ‘interest’ issues. Rights are often resolved through litigation, but any good attorney will tell you that interests cannot be resolved that way because there is no ‘cause of action.’

So, while issues of rights can be – and often are – addressed through the courts, how much more beneficial would it be to those impacted, and to society in general, if they were successfully negotiated through the building of consensus on a course of action that draws on the expertise, active involvement and goodwill of all parties? ■

What Is Consensus?

The old way of examining a problem was to gather “experts” in a room and allow them to say their piece and perhaps attack others’ ideas. At the end of the meeting, participants would vote to ‘agree’ on a course of action. Those in the majority would leave the meeting secure in the knowledge that their perception and subsequent action was the correct one. Those in the minority would leave frustrated and discouraged.

But experts in group decision making say the old methods don’t fit today’s reality. As Dale Carnegie, the best-selling author of *How to Win Friends and Influence People* put it, “Nine times out of ten, an argument ends with each of the contestants more firmly convinced than ever that he is right.”

If you lose the argument, you lose. But even if you win, you lose, because solutions and actions to address complex issues can’t be successfully undertaken by one person acting alone however “right” that person’s point of view may be.

A New Context

“Consensus building is about creating new ground, new paradigms, new thoughts, and therefore new ways of being, seeing and doing. Consensus is about distinguishing things that weren’t there before,” says Linda Vogelsong, a co-founder of Tapestries International Communications, an organizational development and training firm.

Even Lawyers Get Tired

Advocates might reply that they've "been there and done that." They tried community engagement but ran up against a brick wall of bureaucratic obfuscation, recalcitrance and legislative backpedaling. They were "forced" to resort to the courts. It's the American way.

But even lawyers get tired of constant confrontation and feelings of frustration and ill will. In the case of the Jason K lawsuit, which focused on the provision of family-based community mental health services for children, lawyers from the Arizona Center for Disability Law, officials from the Arizona Department of Health Services, consumer advocates, providers and others got together and basically said, "What's it going to take to settle this? How can we come together on what we say we all want – community-based mental health services for children – and work together for the common good?"

The result: They settled the Jason K lawsuit and established a plan to work together to build more family involvement into the provision of community-based, public mental health services for children in need of them. It's ongoing, it's not perfect, but it's a start.

It's also another way than the "American way" of resorting to the courts. ■

Developing Consensus Within Organizations

The processes of alternative dispute resolution, from consensus building to arbitration, are tailor-made for diverse groups, entrenched constituencies – even warring factions – but what about the need for developing consensus within an organization?

Any organization worth its salt consists of individuals and groups with diverse points of view. Nonetheless, if an organization is to be successful, there must be consensus about who they are, where they're going and how they will get there.

Specific situations might include creating, updating or reconfirming the organization's mission and vision statements; creating and strengthening a climate of trust within the organization; or developing cooperative goals and roles for the implementation of a new project.

The Importance of Process

Building consensus means aligning interests to achieve a common goal – a definition strikingly similar to contemporary definitions of leadership. Both are more about *process* and less about *person*.

continued on page 4

The American Way

In 1981, Phoenix attorney Chick Arnold filed a class action suit against James Sarn, then director of the Arizona Department of Health Services, alleging the State and Maricopa County did not fund a comprehensive mental health system.

That far-reaching and lingering lawsuit, *Arnold vs. Sarn*, sought to enforce the creation of a community-based mental health system on behalf of persons with serious mental illnesses. The trial court ruled that Arizona had violated its statutory duty, a ruling that was later affirmed by the State Supreme Court.

When voluntary talk and engagement go nowhere, people resort to the courts. *Arnold vs. Sarn* got results, although not at the funding and support level intended. But the lawsuit also bred something else: a climate of mutual suspicion and occasional hostility among public officials, consumer advocates and mental health providers that still lingers today.

Instead of going through the courts to address rights, what if Arnold had gotten together with Sarn and other community stakeholders to convene a meeting around common interests, with a goal of figuring out how things could be done better? What if they had engaged in a facilitated and deliberative process focused on clearly identifying the problem, determining root causes and addressing the issues — both challenges and opportunities — surrounding Arizona's mental health system? What if those involved had united around a vision of community-based services such as counseling, job training and drop-in centers for those with serious mental illnesses? Would Arizona have a better system today? ■

continued from page 3

Martha Rozelle, a consultant in the field for 25 years, agrees. “People are trained to be bottom-line oriented; they’re path-oriented. They say, ‘Let’s jump to a solution.’”

“Instead,” Rozelle says, “we really want to emphasize the importance of a process, which is different than what I think people are used to doing and are more comfortable doing. They don’t have the patience for the process to really build the underlying foundation that would then lead to good decisions that are more likely to be implemented.”

“In a lot of organizations, somebody is pushing change,” says David Wayne, co-founder of Tapestries International Communications, an organizational development firm.

“When someone decides to reexamine who we are and how we’re going to do things, other people may not buy in, so no matter what happens, there is going to be some pulling and struggling, whatever’s being done.”

Wayne prefers to focus individuals on *positive* aspects of the organization. “We focus on what’s going well,” says Wayne. “If you can figure out what’s going well and what people value, you can shine a light on where the organization needs to go.” ■

CONSENSUS BUILDING TECHNIQUES

Theory and Reality

There are as many tools and techniques for building consensus as there are types of situations in which to use them. Some of these techniques are best suited to identifying and defining an issue, while others are better used for forging a common vision for the future that creates an action plan for resolving the issue. Done successfully, each of them creates a renewed sense of commitment and energy.

Knowing which consensus building technique is best for your situation can be tricky. Much depends on the type of organization or public you are dealing with, the size and scope of the issue you are addressing and the nature of the issue itself.

While each of the techniques described below has some unique characteristics, there are more similarities than differences in their underlying premise of open communication, respect for the opinions of others and openness to innovative and divergent ways of thinking. All but one of the techniques utilize a facilitator, often a person from outside of the group being convened. Given their similarities, a key consideration may be the selection of an outside consultant to act as a facilitator.

Here are just a few of the many techniques for building consensus:

Samoan Circles

This technique is most often used with external groups, particularly when there is a need to stimulate active participation while also building trust and balancing the power of more dominant interests. Unlike some of the other techniques, it can be adapted for large groups of people and also works well with controversial issues.

The process of Samoan Circles is perhaps the most unique among the various consensus building techniques. Participants gather in two concentric circles – an inner circle and an outer circle. Everyone begins in the outer circle. The issue is presented, and discussion begins. Those most interested take positions in the inner circle. Those less interested stay in the outer circle. All are able to move in or out of the center as the discussion flows or topics change.

Each speaker makes a comment or asks a question. Speakers are not restricted in what they say, but they must sit in the inner circle. Someone wishing to speak stands behind someone in the inner circle; this signals those already in the circle to relinquish their position. While outside conversations are not allowed, the opinions of nonspeakers are often collected along with the recorded comments.

ChoiceWork Dialogue

Designed to expedite the process of working through the values that underlie public judgment, this process encourages people’s values and feelings to come into play as well as their intellect, so that as a group they can move beyond their initial impulse to avoid hard choices and disagreeable realities. ChoiceWork Dialogues are structured to build social capital by providing greater insight into how – and why – public views on an issue are likely to evolve, and the opportunities for leadership that knowledge creates.

This technique is particularly valuable for addressing emerging public policy issues, or when changed circumstances dictate the need to address existing policy decisions. Based on the work of Daniel Yankelovich, the process was designed specifically to work through the stages by which public opinion develops from initial raw opinion to more considered public judgment. The consulting firm, Viewpoint Learning uses the ChoiceWork method with randomly selected, demographically representative groups of about 40 people to work through the pros and cons presented in a set of pre-constructed scenarios representing different policy choices.

Dialogue

Based on the work of Peter Senge, Dialogue focuses on the exploration of complex or difficult issues from many different perspectives in an effort to move beyond debate and away from determining who is “right” or who has the most compelling argument. When practiced successfully, Dialogue allows groups to move beyond individual points of view, to gain new insights and foster creative problem identification and problem solving.

Because of its focus on “engaging the heart and the head,” Dialogue may be most useful when trying to reconcile a significant gap between the shared vision of the group and the current reality of their situation. With this technique, a question that captures the paradox of the situation is presented to a small group, which then reflects on what is said in the group, as well as their own thoughts and feelings about it.

Focused Conversation

Similar to Dialogue, Focused Conversation utilizes a structured set of questions to move a group from a superficial understanding of an issue to a degree of resolve about that issue. Focused Conversations are more about creating shared awareness than consensus, although consensus might be revealed in the course of conversation as common points of view are revealed.

Through a process that moves from objective questions to reflective and then interpretive questions to arrive at consideration of decisional questions, Focused Conversation is well-suited to address situations in which the group is starting with little factual information, or in which factual data is unknown to many members of the group.

Creative Problem Solving

CPS is a technique, parts of which are similar to brainstorming, designed to help participants understand challenges and opportunities, generate ideas and develop effective plans for solving problems and managing change. In this approach, the process begins with the divergent, nonjudgmental generation of as many ideas and possibilities as possible, and moves to a convergent process that defines a set of operations, tools and techniques to narrow, refine and evaluate ideas.

Through a linear process comparable to the process utilized in Focused Conversation, CPS participants engage in exploration of the challenge before them, followed by the generation of ideas and preparation for action. The structured process may make it one of the most useful techniques for convening individuals within organizations who are working to establish a common vision.

Appreciative Inquiry

Appreciative Inquiry may be described as the “anti-problem solving” methodology. Instead of focusing on defining a problem and how to fix what’s broken, Appreciative Inquiry searches for past and current best practices that already exist in the organization. Members of the group are both informed and inspired to amplify processes that are working. In the words of its primary originator, Dr. David L. Cooperrider of Case Western Reserve University, Appreciative Inquiry asks groups to pay special attention to “the best of the past and present [in order to] ignite the collective imagination of what might be.”

This technique may be especially useful within organizations, when there has been significant turnover or additions to the staff. As with many of the other techniques, Appreciative Inquiry only works if decisions and outcomes are not predetermined. In another parallel to leadership science – don’t ask people to provide ideas and invest in the process and the outcome if those ideas and plans aren’t going to be part of the final product. ■

The Consensus Critique

Is consensus always the best thing? Not necessarily. While the goal for all consensus building techniques is to find common understanding, sometimes the push for agreement can paralyze any attempts at action. Consensus itself becomes the goal.

Even with the same set of facts, it’s possible – and even probable – that people will disagree. Agreement may simply mask an underlying conflict that remains unresolved. Whether or not the group reaches consensus, active listening and learning will lead to increased understanding and the resolution of conflict. ■

A Common Theme

If these techniques sound similar, it's because they are. All of them have at least one common underlying theme – finding shared values. This illustrates the goal of consensus not as simply garnering agreement, but moving beyond who is “right” and moving beyond predictions and critique (which is unproductive at best and divisive in most cases).

We engage in the process of consensus building in order to understand the choices we face in addressing an issue, and then answer the question: how can this be done better?

True consensus also means inviting all stakeholders, not just “experts” or highly motivated parties, says consultant Marilyn Oyler. “It’s really important to have diversity on perspectives. I just don’t see any way around it. If we’re able to have more perspectives, that means we’re hearing more of the truth, more of the reality surrounding the issue. You won’t get to the real issue unless you have those perspectives.” ■

Advising a Prince

Based on Machiavelli’s *Prince*, one way of thinking about consensus building is to answer the question: What advice would you give a prince?

According to Roger Fisher, author of *Getting to Yes and Beyond Machiavelli: Tools for Coping with Conflict*, “Generating advice – even if it is only hypothetical – is the best way to think rigorously about difficult problems.” By clarifying objectives, different disciplines can be presented with a common question, which in turn, makes it easier to reconcile the different approaches and move beyond what we could reasonably predict to what we can positively affect. ■

Before you Begin: Questions to Ask

Before tackling any consensus building exercise, ask yourself the following questions:

1. What people or groups have an interest in this issue?
2. How much information are they likely to have about the issue?
3. Is the information they have likely to be accurate?
4. How salient is the issue to the various groups/people?
5. Which groups/people are likely to support or oppose possible actions on this issue?
6. What underlying values might be shared by all of the groups/people with regard to this issue?
7. Are there likely to be hidden agendas or concerns that groups/people won't be willing to discuss openly?
8. Is my (my organization's) role that of convener? Stakeholder? Decision-maker?
9. Do I (does my organization) have a preferred outcome? If so, what is it?
10. Is the goal for this meeting awareness? Consensus? Action? What about for the overall process?
11. What are the options if we don't reach consensus? ■

MOVING FROM Debate to Dialogue

Too often, the failure to distinguish between dialogue and debate – and to engage in the former without resorting to the latter – is the downfall of the consensus building process. This is especially true with issues that prick at deeply held beliefs and values. Here are some of the differences:

Debate

Assumes there is one right answer (and you have it)

Combative: attempts to prove the other side wrong

About winning

Listening to find flaws

Defending your assumptions

Criticizing other points of view

Defending your views against the views of others

Searching for weaknesses and flaws in others' positions

Seeking an outcome that agrees with your position

Dialogue

Assumes that others have pieces of the answer

Collaborative: attempts to find common understanding

About finding common ground

Listening to understand

Bringing up your assumptions for inspection and discussion

Reexamining all points of view

Admitting that others' thinking can improve your own

Searching for strengths and value in others' positions

Discovering new possibilities and opportunities

Consensus Building: It Works

Here are a few illustrative examples of successful real-life consensus building processes and outcomes.

HIV/AIDS Community Planning Council

In 1994, Maricopa and Pinal counties were designated an Eligible Metropolitan Area (EMA) and received approximately \$4 million through Title I of the federal Ryan White C.A.R.E. Act to address the HIV/AIDS epidemic. The funding allocation process was governed by a Community Planning Council, and the need to get the funds out into the community quickly precipitated intense competition amongst would-be service providers.

Because of the quick start-up, service providers dominated the Planning Council for the next several years until, in 1996, the federal government required that in order to continue receiving funds, the Planning Council must be reestablished in compliance with federal guidelines.

Despite the upheaval, this scenario offered an opportunity to overcome the self-interests of the dominant members of the Council. More importantly,

it offered an opportunity for stakeholders to develop a common vision for the comprehensive and collaborative provision of services

– a vision based on the interests of persons living with HIV/AIDS.

As the grantee of record and fiscal agent for the funds, Maricopa County conducted an outreach campaign to identify stakeholders.

With the help of a neutral consultant and consensus building techniques, new bylaws were drafted and a method to facilitate broad participation and diverse membership on the Council was developed.

Today, the Planning Council oversees \$7 million in direct federal funds and serves informally as a broad resource for the coordination of other HIV-related services. According to David Paquette, Director of the Division of HIV/HCV Services for Maricopa County, in the last two years Phoenix received more Title I funding per person living with HIV than any other EMA nationwide, based on the success of its planning and service programs. Clearly, they moved from being driven by self-interests and rights to a common and shared interest based on the needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS. ■

YWCA

Like many nonprofit organizations, the YWCA of Maricopa County elects members to its Board of Directors for three-year terms, within which most officers serve one-year terms. While this creates a constant infusion of fresh new ideas, the downside is loss of continuity for long-term planning.

With a new President in place, the organization took the opportunity to explore their strategic direction and to clarify individual responsibilities of the Board and senior staff. The process was initiated by careful assessment and review of their current situation – similar to the process of *focused conversation* – in order to establish a common understanding. However, the real key of the consensus building process for the YWCA was based on their values of peace, justice, freedom and dignity. For them, as for others, building consensus meant seeking – and respecting – the opinions of their clients, staff at all levels and their Board members, and to answer the question: “How does this forward our mission?”

As executive director, Barbara Lewkowitz put it, “There are times when every organization must make difficult decisions, decisions that make everyone uncomfortable. But you go through the process and even though it’s difficult, you know you’ve reached the right decision because you’ve considered everyone’s opinion and multiple options before reaching that decision.”

Beyond that, Lewkowitz says that it’s not just the final decision,

“but also the process itself, because the consensus building process is what gives our goals and dreams legitimacy. The process encourages broad input, considers all opinions and sets realistic timeframes. In that way, everyone - even those with secondary opinions - is invested in the decision and its final outcome.”

The YWCA also uses consensus building techniques to develop their programs. That wasn’t always the case. When they were developing a motivational reward system as part of their teen program, the staff envisioned a series of field trips that teens could earn by attending various self-improvement programs. When they took the plan to the Teen Advisory Council, they were surprised (at least at first) with the Council’s feedback. “They didn’t like it at all!” says Lewkowitz. “Not only were the field trips to places they didn’t necessarily want to go, but the whole idea felt like a bribe to some of the teens.” In retrospect, the program staff realized the importance of involving, and respecting, the input of program participants from the beginning. With a consensus building process, they were able to involve the teens in developing the buy-in and support of the self-improvement programs by identifying and sharing a common interest with the teens.

The next time around, with the review of programs for seniors, the YWCA worked with the Senior Site Council to get input about activities, meal menus, etc. to identify upfront the things that were working well and opportunities for improvement.

Having developed and refined a consensus building process for activities at every level of the organization, Lewkowitz says she can step back and see how the process has established a standard for communication throughout the organization. As she puts it, “The consensus building process isn’t a one-time activity. It may start with strategic planning or program planning, but the communication process it establishes continues throughout the organization.” ■

“The consensus building process isn’t a one-time activity. It may start with strategic planning or program planning, but the communication process it establishes continues throughout the organization.”

EVERYTHING IS NEGOTIABLE

Inherent in the consensus building process, but often overlooked, is the role of negotiation. While the process enables a group to deal with differences effectively, efficiently and peacefully, there remains a purpose of achieving some end result – and that often requires negotiation.

Negotiation begins with knowing and understanding what you want – and what others want. While we can't assume that we all have the same goal with regard to a particular problem, neither should we assume that our interests and those of other parties are incompatible. When groups seem far apart, it is helpful to look behind the statements for the underlying interests where it's possible to find at least one area of mutual interest. Thinking back and analyzing past events in terms of the messages you have been sending and how they have been received provides the first clues to what the other party may see themselves as facing. Think of how the other party sees the choices you are offering for reaching consensus – if they see other choices, is it because of the content of the question being asked or the process by which it is being presented, or both?

When it seems you're at an impasse, the problem may be in the definition of the issue. Resolving the issue may be as easy as reframing it. Roger Fisher illustrates the impact of reframing – and finding common goals – in an old Italian folk story of three stonecutters. When asked what they were doing, the first replied that he was chipping stones to be just the right size; the second man responded that he was earning his wages; but the third replied that he was building a cathedral. It is the third man's answer that inspires a shared vision between the stonecutters – and any other worker – and enables them to achieve a greater goal.

In thinking of a new paradigm, it may be helpful to think systematically by answering the following questions:

- 1 What is wrong – what are the symptoms, the preferred situation and the gap between them?
- 2 What are the possible reasons that the problem hasn't been solved before, or that consensus hasn't been reached – what's changed?
- 3 What strategies and possible interventions have been presented – are they sufficient to address the problem? Are they realistic? Are they operational?
- 4 What choices can others make to resolve the problem? Why would – or wouldn't – they make those choices?

With most efforts to change the status quo, consensus at first seems like a far away goal. Looking at the choices from the others' point of view - or from a completely new perspective - may move the group to see new solutions while building trust and respect along the way. ■

Tool Box

Organizations/Associations

There is no shortage of training options to learn how to improve your facilitation and consensus building skills. For starters:

- The Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA) offers training in Phoenix and in 24 cities nationally and internationally, focused on problem solving, planning and decision making. www.ica-usa.org
- The International Association of Facilitators offers training through their local chapter. www.iaf-world.org. Information on local opportunities is available from nancyvanpelt@cox.net.
- The International Association for Public Participation offers a series of courses ranging from small group discussions to large scale public participation. www.iap2.org
- The Nonprofit Management Institute at Arizona State University provides a range of organizational development resources, including strategic planning and group facilitation training at <http://www.asu.edu/xed/npmi>.

Consultants

In addition to providing training, these and other organizations are useful resources for finding consultants who can guide your organization through the process. Like most things, the best information on consultants skilled in facilitation techniques is found through word of mouth. Selecting a consultant to assist with the process is like selecting the approach itself, it's a matter of fit – with the situation, with the group and with the goals.

- Marilyn Oyler, The Institute for Cultural Affairs, 1.800.742.4032 or 602.955.4811
moyler@ica-usa.org or <http://www.ica-usa.org>.
- BJ Peters, 602.279.4805
bjp1@cox.net.
- Innovate Group for Advancing Possibilities, 602.788.3003
thereids@earthlink.net.
- The Rozelle Group, Ltd., 602.224.0847
mar@rozellegroup.com.
- Gloria Sandvik, 480.425.0890 or 858.792.6469
gsandvik@infinet-is.com.
- BJ Tatro Consulting, 480.596.3560
bjtatro@msn.com.

- Viewpoint Learning, Inc., 858.551.2317
www.ViewpointLearning.com.
- WinWin Creations, 602.840.6813
winwin1@cox.net.
- BJ Communications, 602.277.9530
www.bjc.com.
- Dolores Casillas, 480.491.5634
DRetana@aol.com.

Books

For the self-help crowd, there are a number of excellent books that cover the techniques discussed previously, as well as other facilitation, consensus building and conflict resolution techniques. A brief list includes:

- Appreciative Inquiry: Rethinking Human Organization. David Cooperrider, et al., editors. Stipes Publishing, 2000. Champaign, IL.
- Beyond Machiavelli: Tools for Coping with Conflict. Roger Fisher, et al. Penguin Books, 1994. NY.
- The Thin Book of Appreciative Inquiry. Sue Annis Hammond and Cathy Royal. Practical Press. Plano, TX.
- The Keys to Conflict Resolution: Proven Methods for Resolving Disputes Voluntarily. Theodore W. Kheel. Four Walls Eight Windows, 2001. NY.
- The Fifth Discipline. Peter Senge. Doubleday, 1990. NY.
- Winning Through Participation. Laura J. Spencer. Kendall Hunt Publishing Company, 1999. Iowa.
- The Art of Focused Conversation: 100 Ways to Access Group Wisdom in the Workplace. Brian R. Stanfield. New Society Publishers, 2000. Canada.
- Appreciative Consultation: A Constructive Approach to Organization Development and Social Change. The Taos Institute. Taos, NM.
- The Magic of Dialogue: Transforming Conflict into Cooperation. Daniel Yankelevich. Simon and Schuster, 1999. NY. ■

Community Connect is published three times a year as a resource for nonprofits to use in increasing organizational capacity and community development. This publication offers general information only. Professional advice should be sought to address individual situations.

Community Connect seeks to provide information, perspectives, tools and techniques on issues that all nonprofits face in becoming better at what they do. Whether it's board development, strategic planning, fund raising, program evaluation or a host of other topics, all of us profit from sharing ideas about what works and what doesn't, and where we can go to find relevant information and improve our skills. Community Connect is one forum in which this learning can take place. ■

Community Connect is published three times a year by St. Luke's Health Initiatives as a resource for nonprofits. Material may be reproduced without permission when proper acknowledgement is made. Writers: Jill Rissi, Brady Chatfield ■ Graphic Design: DesignKit, Inc.



St. Luke's Health Initiatives

2375 East Camelback Road
Suite 200
Phoenix, Arizona 85016

www.slhi.org
info@slhi.org
tel. 602 / 385 6500
fax 602 / 385 6510

NONPROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Phoenix, Arizona
Permit No. 4288