

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

University Microfilms International

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA
St. John's Road, Tyler's Green
High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

7824895

LOWERY, CLIFFORD BENJAMIN
AN EXAMINATION OF GATEWAYS: A CITIZEN
PARTICIPATION ORGANIZATION EMPHASIZING
CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT IN THE SETTING OF GOALS
IN GREENSBORO, NORTH CAROLINA.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT
GREENSBORO, ED.D., 1978

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

© 1978

CLIFFORD BENJAMIN LOWERY

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

AN EXAMINATION OF GATEWAYS: A CITIZEN PARTICIPATION
ORGANIZATION EMPHASIZING CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT
IN THE SETTING OF GOALS IN GREENSBORO,
NORTH CAROLINA

by

Clifford B. Lowery

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1978

Approved by


Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Adviser *Donald F. Hill*

Committee Members *Joseph E. Bryson*

Walter H. ...

J. E. ... (JOSEPH H. ...)

Robert ...

March 21, 1978
Date of Acceptance by Committee

March 29, 1978
Date of Final Oral Examination

ABSTRACT

LOWERY, CLIFFORD BENJAMIN. An Examination of Gateways: A Citizen Participation Organization Emphasizing Citizen Involvement in the Setting of Goals in Greensboro, North Carolina. (1978) Directed by: Dr. Dwight F. Clark. Pp. 148.

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine Gateways, a citizen participation organization in Greensboro, North Carolina, as it was developed and implemented by the citizens of the community. The primary emphasis in this citizen participation effort was that of community goal setting. The review of literature documented the emergence of citizen participation from the 1840's to the goal-setting organizations of the 1970's.

Other studies of citizen participation groups were reviewed: the study of five citizen participation groups by the Grassroots Research Program of the Environmental Clearing House, Incorporated of Washington, D. C.; and the "Goals for Dallas" program established in 1966 and continuing today.

In addition, a summary of fourteen local citizen participation organizations throughout America was included.

The review of the Gateways Program in Greensboro, North Carolina summarizes the early stages of development of the citizen participation organization and the later stages including a detailed review of the first Citizen's Day, the task force efforts, and plans for the second

Citizen's Day in 1977. The comparison of Gateways with other citizen participation groups was based on several factors including organization structure, history, source and amount of funding, objectives, methods of approach, and problems and accomplishments.

The study of Gateways was based upon a systematic review of the planning, participation, and the action that emanated from the citizen participation process. This study included the position papers, Gateways Day, the Goals, the Task Forces, the reorganization of Gateways, and plans for the second Gateways Day. The investigation concluded that twelve major accomplishments could be attributed to the Gateways process.

This study further concluded:

1. That citizen participation in community goal setting has a significant input on elected and appointed planners;
2. That citizens will become involved before a crisis situation develops; and
3. That citizen participation offers a potential for improved citizenship in American communities.

Several recommendations were made to improve citizen participation, to increase goal implementation and to solidify support for the Gateways process. Gateways provided a detailed analysis of community problems and offered opportunity for citizen participation in seeking solutions. It was further recommended that in addition to general participation a concerted effort should be counted to implement leadership development programs similar to those in Atlanta, Georgia;

Flint, Michigan; Columbus, Ohio; and Evansville, Indiana. These programs are designed to bring prospective leaders together to learn more about the leadership process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A special debt is owed to the many citizens who have contributed to the Gateways process and who made this study necessary. They are the co-founders of Gateways. Special thanks are in order to Robert O. Bussey, Executive Director of Gateways for his willingness to answer questions and to react to the approach presented here.

My Committee members have been supportive and helpful. Dr. Joseph Bryson provided the initial support for this study; Dr. Dale Brubaker offered assistance in learning to write from a personal base; Dr. Joseph Himes and his wife, Estelle, provided encouragement on numerous occasions; Dr. Richard Bardolph provided inspiration in his special way; and Dr. Dwight Clark, Chairman, offered a challenge to provide a quality paper.

The staff of the Harriet Elliott University Center at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro - Terry Weaver, Elizabeth Carriker, Phillip Myers-Reid, Jim Lancaster, and Rhe Markham - performed efficiently and graciously when this research and writing reached the final stages. Linda Hendricks was an excellent typist and offered many valuable suggestions.

Special thanks and apologies are reserved for Carolyn, Kathryn, Kevin and Kameran. This effort is dedicated to them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.	iii
CHAPTER	
I. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PAST AND PRESENT	1
Introduction.	1
Citizen Participation: The Past	3
Citizen Participation: The Present.	9
II. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION: THE FUTURE.	18
III. THE GENESIS AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF GATEWAYS - A LOCAL CITIZEN PARTICIPATION ORGANIZATION	26
IV. THE REORGANIZATION OF GATEWAYS AND THE SECOND CITIZENS' DAY	43
V. A COMPARISON OF GATEWAYS WITH OTHER CITIZEN PARTICIPATION GROUPS IN THE UNITED STATES.	64
VI. A REVIEW OF THE GATEWAYS PROGRAM COMPONENTS.	76
The Gateways Plan	76
The Position Papers	79
Gateways Day.	83
The Task Force Activities	87
Reorganization of Gateways.	106
Gateways Day.	111
Questionnaire	112
VII. SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION.	117
Summary	117
Recommendations	122
Conclusion.	126

	Page
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	130
APPENDIX A: STEERING COMMITTEE	133
APPENDIX B: POSITION PAPER WRITERS	134
APPENDIX C: GATEWAYS DAY DISCUSSION LEADERS.	135
APPENDIX D: REVIEW BOARD	136
APPENDIX E: COORDINATING COMMITTEE	137
APPENDIX F: TASK FORCE LEADERS 1974.	138
APPENDIX G: CITIZENS' DAY - EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE	139
APPENDIX H: AREAS OF DISCUSSION - CITIZENS' DAY 1977	142
APPENDIX I: GREENSBORO/GUILFORD COUNTY GATEWAYS, INC..	143

CHAPTER I
CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PAST AND PRESENT
INTRODUCTION

Citizen participation and citizen participation organizations such as Greensboro, North Carolina's Gateways are greatly misunderstood. That such organizations have become a national movement has disturbed many politicians and social leaders in communities across the country. The misunderstanding is prevalent in professional circles and among the general public as well. Heated rhetoric often surrounds any discussion of citizen participation in the national or local arena and misleading euphemisms are used to elevate the discussions to strident levels.

Since participation by citizens is thought to be a capstone of our democracy, it is imperative that further review of the Citizen Participation Movement be undertaken to determine its worth in our society. Citizen participation groups have the potential to improve the "quality of life" in local communities and may be able to foster greater responsiveness for public policy decisions. Government and business officials are now aware that citizens accept decisions more readily when they have participated in making those decisions.

Educators and administrators have not provided the effective leadership that has been required to translate educational theory into practical accomplishments. Theorists such as Seymour Sarason have

suggested ways to create improved climates for schools and hospitals,¹ but educators and administrators are seldom aware of new developments and even less often are they skilled at introducing new procedures. This is especially true in dealing with larger societal groups such as neighborhoods and cities. Effective networks are difficult to establish and the challenge to develop communication between and among citizens often goes unheard. Recently in American society a new interest in citizen participation has been awakened in the "quality of life" issues such as consumerism, environmental concerns and human rights.

The following chapters will assess the Citizen Participation Movement and will describe its development. Earlier citizen participation activities will be examined including the Progressive Movement, the labor movement, the civil rights movement, the student movement, the consumer movement, the environmental movement, the women's movement and finally the citizens' goals or future movement.

Following a historical review and a review of the literature, a local citizen participation organization will be analyzed. Gateways, the citizen participation organization in Greensboro, North Carolina, will be investigated. It will be compared with similar organizations elsewhere in the United States to determine similarities and differences in structure, funding, and operation. An effort will also be made to

¹Seymour B. Sarason, *The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies*, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976).

evaluate the Gateways program in a review of its goals and objectives. Finally, the implications of the Gateways organization will be discussed with accompanying conclusions and recommendations.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION: THE PAST

The origins of citizen participation are rooted in American history including the American Revolution. Since the founding of America, citizens have insisted on participation in community affairs. As the modern industrial society has developed, citizens have become more aware of social differences and have gained confidence in their ability to present their cases to governmental agencies and to businesses.

Current action in the citizen participation movement involves hundreds of environmental and community goal-setting groups. These organizations have developed from the earlier history of citizen participation that has laced the fabric of American society.

Long before the more recent movements, citizens were participating in attempts to effect matters in their own communities and in larger geographical areas.

According to Morison and Commager, America had experienced its first reform movement by the 1840's and 1850's following less than 100 years of independence. Numerous isolated community, regional, and national movements had been noted long before that time such as the Boston and Edenton Tea Parties, the Whiskey Rebellion, the Hartford Convention, Nullification Efforts, and the "Know Nothing" Movement.

The Progressive Movement of the 1890's and the first part of the 20th century highlights the continued development of citizen participation as it focused attention on the problems of the poor and disadvantaged: the Negro, the American Indian and immigrants. More generally the movement involved citizens in attempts to restore honesty in their government and in attempts to restore ethics in business. Numerous publications of the period draw attention to these citizen concerns and are aptly treated in the documents of the time.¹

By 1905 W. E. B. Dubois and many others were uniting in the Niagara Movement in an effort to upgrade civil rights for Negroes. Dubois and his followers were capable organizers of citizens --black and white-- and proceeded to agitate for voting rights for Negroes. In contrast Booker T. Washington had espoused a theory that Negroes must achieve economic involvement and independence before they could be allowed to assume political equality. In 1909 Dubois and his followers were winning the leadership of the Negro movement, as the Niagara Movement became the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.² As the NAACP was maturing as a national movement another effort, the Labor Movement, was becoming more visible as well. The Labor Movement had strengthened by the turn of the century and in its economic platform of 1918 the American Federation of Labor provided evidence that it had become a strong citizen participation organization. Under

¹Samuel Eliot Morison and Henry Steele Comager, The Growth of the American Republic, Vol. 1 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 440-475.

²Ibid., pp. 471-473.

Samuel Gompers, the AFL was proposing compulsory education, free schools, free textbooks, and an 8-hour day. While many labor activists worked specifically for higher wages, many labor leaders sought other benefits that were similar to citizen participation goals and benefits in other organizations.¹ It is notable that the labor union activities of more recent years have tended to support the status quo rather than to agitate for social causes. Kitzmiller and Ottinger contend that labor unions today have greater difficulty controlling their own members and suggest that the unions have actually become a part of the "establishment". They feel that often the labor unions have supported the business establishment as each has attempted to discourage citizen participation groups.² This is not unlike the experience of other movements: that when a need is satisfied it is more difficult to sustain interest.

As Maslow suggests it is necessary to provide sustenance before individuals and groups can be concerned with creativity and self-esteem. The Citizen Participation Movement observed this basic principle as initial activities were aimed primarily at meeting economic and social needs. It was not until the Civil Rights Movement, the Student Movement relative to Viet Nam, the Environmental Movement, and finally the "Quality of Life" Citizen Participation Movement that moral and ethical questions became paramount. While the foundation of such a

¹Ibid., pp. 224-255.

²William Michael Kitzmiller and Richard Ottinger, Citizen Action Vital Force for Change (Washington, D. C.: Center for a Voluntary Society, 1971), p. 2.

development may have been laid in the Progressive Movement it was not until the 1960's that the larger issues were clearly reflected.

The Report of the President's Commission on National Goals of 1960 clearly enumerates goals for Americans. The Commission attempted to provide a series of essays to "encourage informed discussion by the American Republic".¹ In many respects the Report of the President's Commission on National Goals was the forerunner of the current emphasis on citizen participation goals groups throughout the country--especially those that developed in response to the Bicentennial observance.

The Commission was established by President Dwight Eisenhower and was administered by the American Assembly which was associated with Columbia University. The national goals were divided into those for home and abroad. The goals at home included: 1) the individual, 2) equality, 3) the democratic process, 4) education, 5) arts and statements on sciences, 6) democratic economy, 7) economic growth, 8) technological change, 9) agriculture, 10) living conditions, and 11) health and welfare. The goals abroad included: 1) helping to build an open and peaceful world, 2) the defense of the free world, 3) disarmament, and 4) the United Nations.²

The publishing of the goals and the public discussions that followed were to some degree responsible for the Civil Rights Movement. The goal of equality had been clearly specified in the Report. It

¹Goals for Americans: The Report of the President's Commission on National Goals (Washington, D. C.: Prentice-Hall, A Spectrum Book, March 1962), p. vi.

²Ibid., pp. 1-23.

called Negro attention to the prospect of equality which in turn provided a grim reminder of life as it was for many Negroes. A portion of the important statement on equality follows:

Vestiges of religious prejudice, handicaps to women, and, most important, discrimination on the basis of race must be recognized as morally wrong, economically wasteful, and in many respects dangerous. In this decade we must sharply lower these last stubborn barriers.

Respect for the individual means respect for every individual. Every man and woman must have equal rights before the law, and an equal opportunity to vote and hold office, to be educated, to get a job and to be promoted when qualified, to buy a home, to participate fully in community affairs. These goals, which are at the core of our system, must be achieved by action at all levels.

By 1970 discrimination in higher education should be entirely overcome. Every state must make progress in good faith toward desegregation of publicly supported schools.¹

This observer was an eager follower of the events of the 1960's. As a student leader of a predominantly white liberal arts college in the South, it was possible to see and feel the changes that were occurring. The college in those years allowed the first black person in its history to attend the institution. And when the faculty rejected a \$2,000.00 request for funding a symposium on "The Emerging World of the American Negro" several students organized and raised nearly \$15,000.00 for the effort. As a representative to the 1964 National Student Association Convention in Minneapolis, Minnesota, the writer was able to feel the anger of young blacks and chicanos who sought greater equality for themselves and their friends. Later as a

¹Ibid., pp. 3-4.

teacher in an experimental predominantly black public school in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, it was possible to work with black professionals who understood the difficulties in their own lives and who were hesitant to impart new values to their students for fear of creating worse problems for the students by raising their expectations beyond reasonably attainable levels.

The Civil Rights Movement of Selma, Alabama, and the now famous sit-ins in Greensboro, North Carolina, spread throughout the nation and engendered a new recognition that much could be accomplished by citizen participation. The thousands who worked quietly and contributed time and money eventually were rewarded with the elimination of segregated facilities and programs and many gained the right to vote through the Voter Registration Programs.

By the late 1960's the Student Movement was overshadowing the Civil Rights Movement as college students protested vehemently against the Viet Nam War. It too was a single-issue movement, but it proved again the power of concerted effort against the "establishment".

The Student Movement was however destined to oblivion when the war began to wind down as again the need was satisfied. Many of the students involved in those efforts were able to apply practical knowledge from their experiences to other issues.¹

¹Kitzmiller and Ottinger, Growth of Republic, p. 5.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION: THE PRESENT

By 1970 the Consumer Movement drew in many of the veterans of the student strikes against the Viet Nam War. While they were busy on several fronts many students had become involved in particular consumer issues. Perhaps the best-known group in this area was the "Raiders" who worked for Ralph Nader. Nader and his young assistants helped to disseminate a different view of corporate giants such as General Motors. They were successful in focusing public energies on consumer issues to the extent that new legislation and government protection were demanded by the public.

The Consumer Movement was led also by the founder of Common Cause, John Gardner. The membership of Common Cause, now stabilized at approximately 250,000 in 1977, had reached a peak of 325,000 in 1973. Its first-year enrollment was over 100,000, a phenomenal influx of dues-paying members. The organization before 1970 was not involved in local issues; rather it focused attention on national questions. In the 1970's however, it was expressing greater interest in local citizen action and was supporting the Barnes-Mixner Colorado Project.¹

The Kitzmiller and Ottinger study, cited previously, provides a summary of the Citizen Action Movement and more importantly provides a detailed study of five Citizen Action Groups. The five-month study

¹Ibid., p. 6.

by the Grassroots Research Program of the Environmental Clearing House, Incorporated of Washington, D. C., has fostered additional study in the field and will be remembered for its efforts to record the growth of citizen participation and for its assessment of the achievements of such groups. The study was based essentially on primary sources as is the current study. Perhaps a key aspect of the Kitzmiller and Ottinger thrust was to suggest a new terminology for the Citizen Participation Movement. They suggested that "citizen action" would be a more appropriate term than "citizen participation". Recent review of numerous sources including Dissertation Abstracts, the Public Information Research Service, and the Social-Science Citation Index reveals that the term "citizen participation" is, however, still more widely used.

It was reported in 1971 that the movement "appears to be well on its way to becoming institutionalized".¹ In 1978 it can be affirmed here that the movement is indeed institutionalized. Several organizations now coordinate Citizen Participation efforts throughout the country, including the Citizen Involvement Network (CIN), Action, Center for Community Change, The Independent Foundation, and the National Center for Voluntary action. Such organizations have provided leadership, resources, information, and coordination. Much federal legislation of recent years has included additional efforts to involve citizens in community planning. A primary example of this legislation

¹Ibid., p. 7.

is that surrounding the Housing and Urban Development Programs (HUD). The Housing and Urban Development Offices have incorporated a staff person who serves as Chief Advisor on Citizen Participation. The legislation has sought to involve citizens in major urban development efforts.¹

The women's movement is yet another of the efforts that has been primarily a single-issue campaign. Its impact will be judged in the future, but it seems apparent that it has been beneficial to men as well. A human liberation has resulted from the women's movement in spite of much negative reaction by both males and females to the Equal Rights Amendment. Freeman postulates that four essential elements contributed to the development of the women's movement: (1) "the growth of a pre-existing communications network which was (2) co-optible to the ideas of the new movement; (3) a series of crises that galvanized into action people involved in this network, and/or (4) subsequent organizing effort to weld the spontaneous groups together into a movement."²

To pinpoint the emergence of the women's movement or any of these movements is difficult. It is generally suggested however that pre-conditions such as those cited by Freeman must exist. Sociologists are concerned with further research to specify such conditions.

¹Sherry R. Arnstein, "Ladder of Citizen Participation," Journal of the American Institute of Planners 35 (July 1969): 216-224; Edmund M. Burke, "Citizen Participation Strategies," Journal of the American Institute of Planners 34 (September 1968): 287-293.

²Jo Freeman, "The Origins of the Women's Liberation Movement," American Journal of Sociology 78 (January 1973): 30-49.

Certainly leadership, communication and personal attitudes are large elements in the formation of a social movement. Each of these necessary conditions is set in the citizen participation efforts cited.

It is apparent that the Citizen Participation Movement in the past has been a significant one. It has contributed significantly to single-issue campaigns in our country and has provided considerable leadership in defining national goals and values. An exciting aspect of the Citizen Participation Movement is that it now promises to amplify this potential and to be an even stronger voice in helping to assess local and regional goals and priorities to affect the quality of life in American communities. A review of the literature in this field since 1974 by the Public Information Research Service includes only fifteen (15) references in English, but over forty (40) in French and German. Evidently citizen participation is an international phenomenon. In a review of Dissertation Abstracts one can identify a surge of writing on citizen participation since 1973.

While the Citizen Participation Movement is clearly visible now in the consumer, environmental and women's areas, since 1964 a new citizen participation area has developed that focuses attention on the "quality of life" in communities. Dallas, Texas, and New Orleans, Louisiana were early leaders in this field, but by the mid 1970's and with the advent of the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration (ARBA), efforts to develop goals for communities had developed throughout the United States. The early leaders have been models for other communities but the approaches have been varied and there is no model

that appears to be most effective for all localities. Today these goals or futures organizations exist on regional, state and local bases. Regional affiliations include: Great Lakes Tomorrow, Commission on the Future of the South, Northwest Regional Foundation and the Federation of Rocky Mountain States. State organizations include: Idaho's Tomorrow, Commission on Minnesota's Future, and Alternatives for Washington. Locally based programs abound throughout the country and include: ACCESS-Santa Barbara, California; Austin Tomorrow; Seattle 2000; Atlanta Tomorrow and Citizens' Goals 2000 Commission-Nashville, Tennessee.¹ These organizations and numerous others like them represent a new concern of the Citizen Participation Movement to be involved in planning for a future rather than the earlier stages of the movement when the immediate concerns were the primary focus and when the movements were based on single issues.

These efforts verify that the Citizen Participation effort is indeed a social movement and that the movement has had an impact on the country. These movements are well researched and documented in the literature. The study of social movements is included in Sociology courses throughout the country where the developmental characteristics and social significance of the movement are analyzed. The more

¹U.S., Congressional Research Service: Library of Congress, Citizen Futures Organizations: Group Profiles, by Keith Alan Bea and Cynthia Elnur Huston, 76-260SP (Washington, D. C., 28 December 1976), p. 6.

recent organizations are now maturing. This study of citizen participation groups on a local level will be repeated many times in the years ahead.

After reflection on the development of the Citizen Participation Movement, it is important to discuss the reasons for the present activity. Hazel Henderson, who has been a leader in a number of public interest organizations, cites the "almost intuitive understanding of the persuasive power of the information"¹ as a key factor. Henderson feels that Citizen Movements offer an excellent social feedback mechanism and should be accepted as such. As the mass media have presented images conducive to our "mass consumption economy, the Citizen Movements, whether for peace, consumer, and environmental protection or social equality. . . have focused on. . . the diseconomies, disservices and diseminities. . ." ² While Henderson's argument that Citizen Movements serve as social feedback mechanisms is accepted, it is necessary to modify her suggestion that alienation has been a theme underlying most of the Citizen Movements. It must be modified to the extent that the present citizens and organizations in the Citizen Participation Movement are not so much alienated as they are committed to improving the quality of life in local and regional communities. That kind of commitment comes not from alienation but from a deep sense of responsibility.

¹Hazel Henderson, "Information and the New Movement for Citizen Participation," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 412, (March 1974): 34.

²Ibid., p. 35.

It offers a possibility for citizens to be involved in planning before a final vote is required, to offer assistance without giving up a career to run for public office, and to feel involved with important issues rather than feeling that others are making the decisions, and furthermore, it offers an opportunity for citizens to become sufficiently involved (as opposed to a one-time open hearing) to understand the complexity of an issue. This willingness of citizens to become involved and assume responsibilities is indicative of a strong commitment to America. The onslaught of technological change and social loneliness makes this new movement particularly refreshing. This commitment will affect the development of the movement and will be discussed further in the section on the future of the Citizen Participation Movement.

The exchange of information regarding many social problems referred to by Henderson is not complete and citizens have learned that the government may not always tell all the story. Consequently citizen leaders and the Citizen Movements have learned to develop information and have learned how to use information. Parenthetically, one must note that citizen participation groups have also learned to misuse information. Nationally, however, it is assumed that the more information the public has access to, the better informed it will be. Citizen participation groups seem to believe that more public information also forces government and business to render decisions that are more attuned to the public interest. It is debatable that more public information is necessarily better public information.

A symposium on "Public Information in a Democracy" featuring former Senator Wayne Morse, Ralph Nader and Sander Vanocur illustrated various approaches to public information. Senator Morse acknowledged that there was a need to keep highly classified military information from the public, but called for more information relative to the Viet Nam War. He believed more information as a general rule would provide better information. Ralph Nader asserted that more information in the consumer area was always better information; while Sander Vanocur agreed that more information properly presented by the media was better information.¹

In Henderson's reflection on the movement, she postulated that information is the key ingredient in the development of the participatory citizen movement. She contends that citizens have lacked the information with which to make effective judgments. Consequently the more atomistic Cartesian view of society has been dominant among citizens. The provision of greater information has provided a means whereby citizens may begin to see a more complete picture of society. It is possible that the performance of organizations themselves cannot be measured independently of their structure. Consequently most organizations deal with information in piecemeal fashion making it impossible to render decisions or judgments based on a holistic approach.² The approach of the new goal-setting groups and futures

¹Symposium with Senator Wayne Morse, Ralph Nader, and Sander Vanocur, "Public Information in a Democracy," North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina, Spring 1967.

²Henderson, "Information for Citizen Participation," pp. 35-36.

organizations promises to combat this problem.

CHAPTER II

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION: THE FUTURE

Future Citizen Participation will be enhanced by the information explosion and will be accelerated as the goals established in communities throughout the country are fulfilled. It is imperative also that the citizens learn as statesmen have had to learn that minorities must have rights also. The verdict on the Citizen Participation Movement also hinges on the ability of these organizations to follow the current trend and focus on identifying community needs as compared with more narrow needs of individual political groups.

If the Citizen Participation Movement is to survive, it must also counter the influential view that Citizen Participation hampers government leaders. One of the experiments to strengthen this idea of Citizen Participation is the CIN (Citizen Involvement Network). CIN contends that it does not encourage leaders to abdicate their ability to make decisions. To the contrary, it recognizes that elected leaders are accountable and suggests that "citizens do not want to change our structure of governance; they do, however, want considerably more opportunity to examine policy alternatives and to press for changes they feel are needed - and this is what Citizen Involvement is all about."¹ The Citizen Involvement Network is a non-profit corporation that has attempted to link twenty community citizen participation programs

¹"Citizen Involvement Network," (1211 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C. 1973), p. 7. (Mimeographed.)

together to demonstrate their effectiveness and to evaluate their techniques for citizen involvement. Numerous community groups across the nation applied for the program including Gateways, Incorporated of Greensboro, North Carolina. The city chosen in North Carolina, however, was Charlotte. Perhaps this was due to the fact that the University of North Carolina at Charlotte was deeply involved in the Charlotte program. The network provides funding, expertise, information and recognition in an effort to make citizen participation an integral part of the political process in these communities. The results on the CIN are not yet in, but it appears that the leadership it can offer will be an enormous asset in developing models for citizen participation that are more carefully and systematically constructed. The benefits of CIN research and learnings will be made available to other groups as well.

One of the critical issues in the Citizen Participation Movement is the conflict between participatory democracy and professional expertise. Edmund Burke notes how difficult it will be to maximize both values, but rightly suggests that accommodations must be made. Burke has developed a model to analyze citizen participation as a basis for strategies. While his report indicated assumptions, conditions, and organization requirements for each of five strategies, only a brief discussion of these strategies will be provided: education therapy, behaviorial change, staff supplement, co-optation, and community power.¹

¹Burke, "Citizen Participation Strategies," p. 287.

The education therapy strategy is primarily focused upon education. In this particular strategy there is an attempt to have the participants involved in the program so that their participation leads to individual improvement and understanding of the needs. In this respect it is considered to be citizenship training and encourages citizens to work together toward solutions of community problems.

The second strategy is that of behavior change wherein there is a deliberate orientation toward change, and attempts are made to modify individual behavior through their participation in the group effort. This strategy takes advantage of the consideration that citizens will support a decision more quickly if they have been involved in making the decision.

The third strategy is that of staff supplement. As Burke indicates this is perhaps one of the oldest rationales for citizen participation. It suggests quite simply that volunteers are to augment the services of the professional in the agency. This particular strategy argues that staff members need not be experts on substance or issues but supports the idea that they must be experts in involving citizens. It attempts to utilize the abilities and time as well as expertise of citizens in reaching an agency or staff goal.

A fourth strategy is one Burke identifies as co-optation. He postulates that this strategy is primarily a way to prevent citizens from obstructing a plan of action. Co-optation incorporates the

individual citizen into the group. It makes them partners in assisting in the goal.

The fifth strategy is that of community power which accepts the fact that "centers of power do exist outside the formal political structure of the community and such centers are influential in shaping community decisions".¹ The Community Power Strategy encourages groups to exert pressure in the process of reaching community decisions. Sometimes these decisions exploit the community power structure by the actual exertion of either power or large numbers. Demonstrations and boycotts would be an example of one such appeal. Saul Alinsky is one of the prime advocates of this conflict oriented strategy. Alinsky often sought to agitate for change to the point that a direct confrontation was necessary.²

While Burke's model will be cited further in Chapter 6 it is important to note for this overview that he feels the behavioral change and the staff supplement strategies to be the most important in community goal-setting groups.

Other writers have proposed typologies of citizen participation. Arnstein presents a continuum or ladder of citizen participation. The stages move progressively from the manipulation approach which is actually nonparticipation to citizen control which represents great

¹Ibid., p. 292.

²Ibid., pp. 287-294.

citizen power by the have-not citizens. The eight designations are: manipulation, therapy, informing, consultations, placation, partnership, delegated power, and citizen control.¹

Arnstein indicates that manipulation and therapy are nonparticipatory stages while information, consultation, and placation represent degrees of tokenism. While the latter is definitely an oversimplification, it challenges elected leaders and citizen participants alike to be more sympathetic to the other's concern in community planning. The citizens must recognize and work with a limited knowledge base among the have-nots and must recognize the difficulty of "organizing a representative and accountable citizens' group in the face of futility, alienation, and distrust".² Likewise, community leaders must be aware of potential difficulties such as racism, paternalism and a temptation to resist any attempt at power redistribution.³

These models can be used in analyzing any citizens' participation organization and will be utilized in evaluating the Gateways Program in Chapter 6.

In discussing and evaluating citizen participation it will be difficult to overlook the work of Alden Lind and Alvin Toffler. Each author has attempted to alert citizens to the need for participation.

¹Arnstein, "Ladder of Participation," p. 216.

²Ibid., p. 217.

³Ibid.

Each author documents the need to reverse the feelings of alienation and powerlessness that they feel pervade modern society.¹

It is apparent that with the advent of the new futures organizations and goal-setting community groups, a counter-force to alienation and powerlessness has developed. It will not reach all citizens in a participatory way, but its affects will be manifested in local movements in every state.

Toffler and Lind, while concerned with the feelings of alienation and powerlessness that have gripped the nation as well as the crises of confidence which has been experienced by our citizens in regard to the government; nevertheless have hopeful projections for the future. Lind acknowledges that our political institutions have acquired greater and greater responsibilities which have resulted in fewer opportunities for citizen involvement. At the same time, however, he acknowledges the growing demand of citizens to be involved and he suggests that the citizen input model must continue to acquire greater acceptance among our leaders. There is increasing evidence that society has fulfilled many of the basic needs suggested by Maslow so that individuals and groups may actually seek affection, esteem, and self-actualization. As this occurs it will be necessary to evaluate higher order needs such as desires for an improved quality of life. Lind further

¹Alden Lind, "The Future of Citizen Involvement," The Futurist, 9 (December 1975): 316-328; Alvin Toffler, "What is Anticipatory Democracy?" The Futurist, 9 (October 1975): 224-229.

believes that it will be more and more difficult to predict behavior. Consequently, he suggests that we must substitute trust for as he rightly observes "if we can't predict other people's behavior, we need to be able to trust them to do the right thing".¹ He cites Muzafer Sherif and his belief that intergroup conflict will not be lessened unless there is a preceding identification of higher order goals that require cooperation. He suggests that such a prospect might be called "projective (future oriented) social existentialism".² Projective social existentialism is very similar to Toffler's anticipatory democracy which invites a sharing in the social network of higher order values.³ They suggest that this greater social network will necessitate cooperation and involvement of citizens in both political and social processes. While these high order values demand participation and future orientation, they will also be difficult to maintain without constant reassessment. Such reassessment is a characteristic of the future which has also come to be a characteristic of the citizen participation goal-setting groups that have developed throughout the country. It is noted by Daniel Bell and Virginia Held as "there is more participation than ever before in American society. . . that every state of affairs leads to a paradox because it is the increase in participation which creates a sense of powerlessness

¹Lind, "Future Involvement," p. 327.

²Ibid.

³Toffler, "What is Anticipatory Democracy?" Pp. 224-229.

and consequent frustration."¹ The great increase in citizen participation programs is itself proof of the need for higher order values which Lind and Toffler have identified. They suggest that citizen involvement may increase trust in government but suggest that these activities will increase trust through, as Lind says, the "overlapping small scale network of which that large society is composed."²

That is the future of the Citizen Participation Movement and perhaps the future of contemporary society.

¹Daniel Bell and Virginia Held, "The Community Revolution," The Public Interest 16 (Summer 1969): 142.

²Toffler, "What is Anticipatory Democracy?" p. 224-229; Lind, "Future Involvement," p. 328; Sarason, "The Creation of Settings and The Future Societies," pp. 164-167.

CHAPTER III
THE GENESIS AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF GATEWAYS -
A LOCAL CITIZEN PARTICIPATION ORGANIZATION

So many characteristics of American society seem to be preconditions of its demise that in analyzing the American society of the early 1970's it is instructive to view the current manifestations and trends as preconditions for the society of the future. Only in studying these fetal heartbeats can social scientists begin to predict significant social changes. Perhaps Alvin Toffler's clear implication that permanence is dead will be true not only in the technical context but in the social milieu as well.

The social milieu of the early 1970's was imbued with numerous social movements. These movements were so pervasive and so potent that this fact alone may be considered a precondition for the future. Particularly relevant here is the recognition that these movements were able to demand sufficient exposure in the mass media that their impact was quite powerful. For the most part these movements conformed to the model of Borda in his book Social Change and Subversion. His suggestion that social change is an act of subversion is intriguing and sound. Borda's myth encompasses subversion as idea, subversion as change and subversion as conflict. It is interesting to note that Borda and others

speak of institutionalization of movements or their concerns. It is the perceived strength--though weakened--of American society that leads one to believe it can withstand and institutionalize much of its subversion.

Current American society is fraught with many conflicts. Most of them are expressed ideologically in the conflict between the establishment and the social movements of the day. Some of the specific conflicts are represented in the phrases which follow: cooperation vs. competition; truth by experience vs. truth by objectivity; community vs. individualism; technology vs. nature; and peace vs. war. If one can keep these issues in mind; then superimpose the specifics of individual movements, one can begin to see the complexity and the possible impact of movements for the future.

Examples of the black activists and environmentalists who stay outside of the bureaucracy while the bureaucracy attempts to respond to some of the movements' concerns is a fine illustration of the concept of the bureaucracy absorbing activists' values. It is a valid observation for this paper to suggest that this tactic of control has recently been further refined by the Federal Government and other elements of the establishment as in the use of regulations requiring citizen participation.

It must be pointed out that the Federal Government has the greatest potential for responding to social ills--financially, as well as through legislation. Presently the government has managed to respond in a manner to keep the "majority" satisfied. It must be

concluded that government and other institutions will continue to respond. The response is and will continue to be late, reactive and often ineffective. Nevertheless, the American democratic process will function to buffet the clamor for social change, and it will, as it presently does, ameliorate some of the social conflict. The difficulty may well be that the responses from the have-nots and other antagonists will continue to take the form of violence. Unfortunately the prognosis for American society at this time is critical also. However, there is sufficient stamina, character, expertise and commitment that both may be able to survive.

A more specific look at the current issues of movements will readily bring to mind the frustrations of the war in Viet Nam, the conflict of domestic crises and the ecological concerns for life on this planet. These issues and the various groups (social movements) that have thrust them before the public clearly illustrate operational principles about social movements; ideology, leadership, image, preconditions, organization, strategy, tactics, and demise. Consequently it is somewhat comforting to hope that this analysis and the analyses of social scientists will permit a more predictable future. For it is certain that just as movements have great impact today - that impact will be even more dramatic in 1980. It can safely be predicted also that social movements in one part of the world will come to have great importance in other parts. The social movement may even replace the "leader" as a topic for conversation and the strategy of American elections may be changed dramatically. The movement may

become much more important than the man, especially as the mass media polishes each leader to appear to be all things to all people.

It is pertinent to ask what other trends are moving across the social fabric that represent the impact of social movements. One such trend is the willingness of professionals to strike. Could it be that they have learned this technique from successful movements? As the professionals adopt the social movement model, the model itself will become more respected. A second trait to watch for in the near future is the attempt by various movements to find leaders that can best pull the diverse elements together. American society seeks such a leader every four years, but the near future and maybe even 1982 will be filled by efforts to revitalize the nation by producing a leader such as John F. Kennedy was to many people. As such leaders come and go the frustrations that lead to social movements will ebb and flow. This trend may operate simultaneously with the trend toward the importance of the movement.

These leaders must be charismatic and aware of Marshal McLuhan's premise that the "Medium is the Message." Perhaps an adult "Sesame Street" will be programmed by the communications experts for the public. Perhaps such media efforts will serve to enlighten the public. Unfortunately the evidence of 1978 suggests that the media and the public's filtering of information serves to heighten the anti-social rather than to heal wounds that are already seething with infection. Let it be said here that while a major operation may be needed, it will not come.

Rather the medical chart will be dotted with pills and injections but the operation will be too expensive for the Establishment. Perhaps the only cure will be a citizen participation effort that will allow citizens to revitalize the American democratic structure.

Gateways, the citizen participation organization in Greensboro, North Carolina, developed in the social context of the early 1970's. Dallas, Texas and other communities had earlier adopted major programs for goal-setting activities in their communities. Goals for Dallas became a model program for other communities. According to Frank J. Kendrick the theory of a program such as Gateways is this:

"if the people of a community can initially agree upon desirable and realistic goals to be achieved, planning can then proceed upon a more rational basis for the achievement of these goals. Also, by providing both for early recognition of specific group interests while the goals are being selected, and for consultation with citizens and their groups throughout the process of goals definition and implementation, the worst effects of pluralistic politics may be mitigated. In other words, a city should be able to select workable goals and then implement them later on if citizens and interest groups are involved directly in the process virtually from the beginning to the end. Ideally, we should see better planned cities emerge from the process, cities in which large numbers of interested citizens continually play active roles in community development."¹

Early in 1973 the Junior League of Greensboro through its leadership began to talk with the leadership of other organizations in an attempt to interest them in such a goal-seeking program for the citizens of Greensboro. When representatives of the Junior League

¹Frank J. Kendrick, "Citizen Participation In Urban Planning: The Goals Program," (Akron, Ohio, November 1977), p. 5. (Mimeographed.)

of Greensboro, the United Way of Greater Greensboro, and the Greensboro Chamber of Commerce met in early 1973 they were primarily concerned with the need to promote planned change for the community. Their conversations led them to the conclusion that there was a great amount of planning for the future that was being done.

However, each agency was making its own response to the demands of the future. It appeared to these citizens that community leadership seldom came together to unite their energies and activities for programmed change. Following these early discussions the City of Greensboro and Guilford County leadership became involved in their deliberations. After these initial discussions it was determined that local citizens would be invited to articulate the Gateways Plan in cooperation with the inaugurating organizations. Dr. James Watson was invited to prepare the initial plan and did so in the spring of 1973. During these discussions it became apparent also that a financial need existed in order to establish the Gateways program and to execute any sort of plan. To that end a steering committee was formed and local businesses and foundations were approached for funding.

Dr. Watson documented in the initial plan the fact that other communities were also experimenting in their attempts to provide better communities and to involve citizens in planning for those communities. His review indicated that one of the best ways to accomplish these ends was to involve citizens in the development

of goals and in achieving them. This became a basic theme of his Greensboro Plan as it had been in a number of other communities.

As noted earlier by Daniel Bell and Virginia Held there may actually be more participation in our society than has ever been the case before. They suggest that this increase in citizen participation actually is a causal factor in the increased sense of powerlessness and alienation that other authors such as Alvin Toffler and Alden Lind have documented. But Daniel Bell and Virginia Held go further in their analysis and suggest that the greatest number of participants in any process will inevitably increase the amount of time involved in consultation and litigation since each individual or each organization may desire contradictory goals and consequently a long process of decision making is involved. The result may be dissension and frustration.

It must be the goal of citizen participation groups such as Gateways to involve citizens in community planning but it must be careful to share with citizens this possible development so that they will be prepared for this element of participatory democracy. As Bell and Held suggest, new approaches must be developed that provide for this citizen involvement and the necessary compromises that invariably must come. Lind, Toffler, Bell and Held, each suggest that what must follow is a development of a sense of trust if we are to strengthen the relationship of individual citizens to one another and of citizens to the established governmental agencies

and business interests.¹

The early Gateways leadership was sensitive to these concerns and sought to allow citizens an opportunity to emerge into the political scene in a carefully planned way that would help to end the alienation and sense of frustration that many citizens experience. While Gateways was designed to do this it has learned very painfully that even when citizens are involved they may yet be frustrated by the slowness of activity and by the sheer difficulty of working toward a goal which is not shared by everyone in the community. Perhaps this is a lesson that statesmen learned long ago but which must be learned anew by citizens on the neighborhood level and in dealing with long-range community planning. The primary goals of Gateways accepted by the leadership and the Steering Committee were that Gateways should provide for involvement and that it would also attempt to unite citizen energies into a problem-solving task force. We shall note later the success of Gateways as a forum and suggest that as a problem-solving task force it is still maturing.

A larger group of citizens was nominated to give direction and support to Gateways. Subsequently the Gateways Steering Committee (Appendix A) was organized and was composed of twenty-four members from various agencies throughout the city and county including the

¹Ibid.; Toffler, "What is Anticipatory Democracy?" pp. 224-229; Bell and Held, "The Community Revolution," p. 177.

Junior League, the United Way, Chamber of Commerce, University of North Carolina at Greensboro Child Development and Family Relations Department and representatives from the City and County Government. It was the Steering Committee that suggested the need for position papers which would define the basic concerns in twelve major areas of research.

The twelve original position papers and another that was written later in the process provided one of the key benefits of the Gateways program. These papers became the focus of attention and gave professionals and other citizens a starting point for their discussions. While the position papers were not made available to the general public, they were available to the leadership of community organizations and were available to those who were beginning to be involved in the Gateways process. Many hours were devoted by local citizens to analyzing the local situation in the basic citizen concern areas of government, criminal justice, transportation, community development, housing, economy, services to the family and individual, health services, secondary and elementary education, continuing education, higher education, leisure culture, and leisure recreation (Appendix B).

During the fall of 1973, twelve resource and agenda-planning committees were formed that included lay and professional citizens throughout the community. The position papers were being completed and were being printed for general distribution to the 400 citizens who would later discuss them on Resource and Agenda Day. As more and

more was being done the need for financial support became more critical. It was at this point that the North Carolina Committee for Continuing Education in the Humanities contributed \$10,000.00 in operating funds for the continued development of the Gateways process and Gateways Day was announced for February 23, 1974. The Resource and Agenda Day, which had been planned and organized by Betty Cone and Victor Nussbaum, Jr., was a success in the eyes of the Gateways Leadership who had hoped that this day would provide a more detailed review and discussion of community problems. There was a dream that this early discussion would involve a broad cross section of citizens. It was hosted on the N.C. A&T State University Campus in a hope to involve citizens from the black community. This goal was only partially achieved but at least represented an effort on the part of the Gateways leadership to involve minority citizens in the Gateways process. At the December 1 meeting of the Resource and Agenda Day, it was determined that a thirteenth area of concern should be added and that a position paper on Housing should be commissioned.

A great deal more work on the part of Junior League members and others was necessary before the final Gateways Day. The Gateways Day Arrangement Committee headed by Lou Freeman and Anne Wagg and the Public Relations Committee of Robert Clark and Diane Stone, the Implementation Planning Committee of Carol Leslie and Ann Redhead and the Evaluation Committee of Margie Furr and Ann Inman were busy finalizing mailings, posters, questionnaires, and other arrangements

for the Gateways Day to be hosted at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro Campus.

February 23rd was a crisp but clear winter day. As citizens began to flow into the registration area it was obvious that, measured by the number of citizens involved, the day was to be a success. Those citizens who completed registration forms, enjoyed coffee and doughnuts and proceeded to the opening session had been spared the difficulties of the planning and organizing that is necessary to an effort of this nature. Lou Freeman and Ann Wagg and their assistants handled the special details of hosting over 1100 guests. The 1100 citizens who eventually assembled for the day were also unaware of the last minute negotiations with Mayor Kevin White's office. His advance men attempted a short-lived effort to have his appearance overshadow the other elements of Gateways. This observer applauded the businesslike approach of the sponsors and watched carefully as they reminded Mr. White's staff of his obligations to the Gateways program. The Gateways discussion leaders were prepared to follow the keynote address of Mayor Kevin White with discussion, evaluation surrounding the position papers and the development of goals for Greensboro and Guilford County. By the conclusion of the day, over one hundred and thirty (130) goals had been developed by the group discussion areas that would be presented to the citizens.

There was a considerable delay in moving the goals that were developed on Gateways Day to the printer but the goals were finally available in September of 1974. Prior to the publication of the

Gateways 1974 Report to the People, however, over 350 citizens continued to work on evaluation and implementation of the goals by the task forces and through the Gateways Review Board. Perhaps it was at this point that the Gateways process alienated many of its citizens including its own task force leadership. After goals were set, the Gateways plan included a continued review and study by its own task forces and the Review Board (Appendix D). At the Review Board task force leaders were asked to present their plans for implementation, and defend them and gain approval for these plans. Many task force leaders began to feel that the Gateways process was nearly as bureaucratic as they felt government agencies to be. Many did not understand basic principles of compromise and only later came to see that goals must be generally accepted by large elements of the citizenry to be effective. Some task force chairmen were frustrated and did resign but others continued their commitment far beyond those first difficult months.

Perhaps the lessons learned through citizen involvement can basically be defined as participation in civic activity and understanding local problems. It is in these two areas that those citizens who became involved learned to accept the fact that each citizen's involvement is important and to accept the idea that each citizen is needed in the process even if one disagrees with the other's objectives. A second key element to the basic citizenship lesson which was being

taught anew in the Gateways process was the idea that social conflict among individuals and groups is inevitable, but that does not lessen the need to achieve harmony and to continue working toward the solution of social problems for the greater good of all the citizens. One of the spokesmen for Gateways from the Junior League who continued to take a major leadership role in the Gateways process was Judy McAdoo who prepared a series of questions and answers for the Junior League Publication of February, 1974. Mrs. McAdoo asked "What should setting goals mean to you as an individual?" and she suggested the following answer:

As a citizen of this community you will be exercising a very precious right - to be a part of a democratic process you will be helping bridge the gap between government and agencies and the People. You will be actively a part of Greensboro and Guilford County, more than just a taxpayer and a news watcher. You will be the news.

Her second question was: "From the league members point of view how can you profit?" She answered:

Many of you are concerned with personal targets - learning disabilities, criminal justice, arts, education, to name only a few. By participating in discussions in related areas, human needs, health, leisure culture, etc., you are better preparing yourselves to take an active role or to get involved in action programs along these lines and remember, it's a learning process - for all of us - from beginning to end.

By the end of 1974 Gateways leadership was calling for annual reports from each of the task forces. While thirteen areas of concern had been

¹McAdoo, Judy, "Gateways Means You," Greensboro Junior League News 34 (February 1974): 11.

investigated and had established goals at the February 23 Gateways Day, only twelve were active that first year. The task force on criminal justice was not formed and operating until January 1975.

The Annual Report of 1974 provided a clear indication from the task force chairman and their secretaries of the efforts of the citizen task forces during the early months following the Gateways Day. The Gateways Leisure Culture Task Force was acknowledged to have been both active and effective during those months. Its initial meeting was a luncheon session in July at the Elliott University Center at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro. That early meeting was devoted to a discussion of the Gateways process. Over 40 citizens participated at that time and the goals were generally reviewed in preparation for subcommittees that would be formed. The second meeting was held on August 22, 1974 at the United Arts Center. At that time additional subcommittees were appointed to assist in accomplishing the goals that had been identified. Eight goal-oriented committees were formed to involve additional citizens and to accomplish the specific goals that had been identified. By the September 25th meeting the Committee was preparing to submit goals and solutions to the Coordinating Committee and the Review Board and it became necessary to explain to the entire task force the Gateways process again. It was at this meeting that the Task Force engaged in a lengthy discussion on the need for a viable and accessible art center in the community which would provide facilities for teaching, developing and displaying

the arts. The consensus of the Task Force was that the art center was a primary need for the community and the group unanimously approved the plans of the Junior League Arts Committee to conduct a survey on art needs in Greensboro.

By the October meeting a resolution on the cultural center for Greensboro was discussed and a formal resolution was prepared for the next meeting. In addition the Task Force indicated its desire for a regularly scheduled radio show to accentuate the arts. Following letters and visits with local area radio stations, a format was developed that allowed Ellisa Josephsohn, an employee of the United Arts Council and secretary of the Leisure-Culture Task Force, the opportunity to develop a five-minute radio program on the arts each week which was aired on six area radio stations. As a later development in 1977, WFMY-TV began a weekly program "Two for the Show" produced by James Eldridge, which also accented activity in the arts. By the December 5th meeting of the Leisure-Culture Task Force, the group was completing its efforts to accentuate the arts in the community by meeting at the Cablevision Studios at 1813 Spring Garden Street and by taping a 15-minute television show which was identified as a Report to the People on the Leisure-Culture Task Force in Gateways. The program was shown on Channel 6 on Monday night, December 9th as the first program on community access television in Greensboro. Representatives of the task force appeared on local radio and television stations to discuss the efforts of the task force and to give the task

force high visibility during the early stages of its work.¹ A review of this task force and others will be undertaken in Chapter 6.

A second task force which was active in those first months was the Community Development Task Force led by Ian MacBryde. The annual report prepared by MacBryde and Bettie Dixon, Assistant Chairman, indicated that "one of the problems inherent in Gateways is that some people expect instant success for the program. A little thought will destroy that hope; unfortunately, many people cannot apply that kind of thought to the problem."² The task force was gripped by heated discussions regarding citizen participation in the professional view of community development. The task force leadership found it necessary in its annual statement to suggest that those who expect instant success will become deeply frustrated. They rightly pointed out what other authors have suggested that one of the major goals of any citizen participation activity must be to deal with the phenomenon of unmet expectations. The report further acknowledged that the Task Force has met with only limited success although it applauded the interest of citizens in attempting to solve their problems. It concluded that substantial progress had not been made. The Task Force had hoped for greater representation from rural areas of the county but discovered that this was a very difficult goal

¹Gateways, "Annual Report" (Greensboro, N. C., 1974), p. 1.

²Ibid., p. 2.

to achieve. The Task Force studied nine primary goals from Gateways Day. It discovered that a number of these goals were in areas served by other task forces. Therefore, it was determined that only two of the goals were primary goals that would be faced by the Community Development Task Force alone. All of the other goals were goals that needed to be coordinated with other task forces. The annual report indicated that the goal involving the establishment of a land use plan "is being timed so as to evaluate the preparation of the land use plan of the Guilford County Planning Department".¹ The results of that evaluation by the subtask force were expected in the early part of 1975. Another indication of the problems of the Community Development Task Force is evident from this statement:

"It is clear by the end of 1974 that any dreams of massive community involvement in planning processes must be put aside at least for the time being. The average man in the street is still not convinced that citizen participation can produce any meaningful result. . . The involvement of gifted and dedicated amateurs is still a goal worth pursuing. . ." ²

¹Ibid., p. 3.

²Ibid.

CHAPTER IV
THE REORGANIZATION OF GATEWAYS
AND THE SECOND CITIZEN'S DAY

Following the busy year of 1974 the Gateways process continued its efforts at citizen involvement and goal implementation. Those initial goals which had been relatively easy to accomplish had been approved by the Coordinating Committee and the Review Board. The more difficult goal areas continued to demand attention: attention that Gateways volunteers were sometimes unable to deliver. Nevertheless the process continued as the thirteen task forces attempted to accomplish more of the goals and in 1975 it was determined that Gateways would apply to the Citizen Involvement Network, which was being established nationally, as a means for rejuvenating the process and for receiving the financial help being offered by the Citizen Involvement Network. The proposal to the CIN was completed in September of 1975 and offers the best source of information regarding the Gateways Program during that year. The material which follows is primarily gleaned from that report and personal observations during the course of the year.

As the report was being prepared, the authors determined that the new phase would be Phase II or the Implementation Phase of Gateways. Funding for Gateways had always been precarious but thanks to local corporations and foundations, sufficient funds had been raised to at

least operate on a modest basis. An earlier budget established in 1974 was based on income of \$28,175.00. By September of 1975 only 25% of that amount had actually been received. These funds were contributed by area banks, two insurance companies, five textile companies, a utility company and miscellaneous businesses.

The United Way continued to supply in-kind services including professional staff assistance, secretarial services, and office space. It was during the '75-76 time period also that the City and County Governments began to contribute \$5,000.00 each for the Gateways program. Without that \$10,000.00 it is doubtful that the Gateways program as it has been run would have survived. That same \$10,000.00 amount was allocated also for 1977 and there was anticipation on the part of the Gateways leadership that additional funds would be forthcoming from the City and County following the Citizens Day on November 12, 1977.

The Proposal to the Citizens Involvement Network analyzed the economic climate and determined that it was strong. The study, which had been prepared by faculty members of the School of Business and Economics at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, indicated that in general there were no urgent political or social issues around which the citizens were likely to rally. Instead the report suggested that capable leadership of local government and institutions had provided an atmosphere in which citizens could expect fair and just programs from their government. The report noted that the "sociodynamics of the situation appear to be that citizens are content to leave most

of the planning and implementation of plans for the future of Greensboro in the hands of its institutions or leaders. While this could be due to a perception of not being heard this does not seem to be the case."¹ It is interesting that this group recognized the possibility that citizen efforts might continue to play a part in developing the "quality of life" proposals for the community's future. The Gateways Leadership volunteered that it would be able to assist citizens in this effort and that it would be able to continue to work on some of the issues that had been discussed at the Citizens' Day 1974. The six issues cited in the proposal included:

1. The quality of education in our public school system and the need for greater discipline in the classrooms.
2. The accessibility of health care services, especially for new citizens, those who have limited transportation, and those who need emergency medical care.
3. Public transportation systems.
4. Downtown Greensboro survival - whether it will continue to survive as a retail center or should be transformed into some other role in community life.
5. Coordination of social service agencies.
6. The need for encouragement of young leaders in community service by industry, institutions to complement the degree coming from financial corporations.²

¹Greensboro/Guilford County Gateways, "Community Self-Assessment for Citizen Involvement Network" (Greensboro, N.C., 1 September 1975), Chapter I, p. 5. (mimeographed.)

²Ibid., p. 6.

The CIN Proposal suggested that citizens felt confidence in their local institutions and in their leaders and while most of these institutions provided for citizen involvement, it was suggested that this general climate provided a superior arrangement for the development of greater citizen participation in developing goals for the future instead of waiting for immediate crises to develop. The proposal recorded the citizen involvement on Gateways Day and included information about the task forces as they were involved in approaching the goals. As the report continued, it acknowledged some shortcomings and suggested there was a tremendous lag between Gateways Day of February and the date of the distribution of the Report to the People in October. It was suggested that if an executive director had been employed as a facilitator, he could have prevented such a loss of time and perhaps a loss of enthusiasm on the part of the community.¹

By the completion of the CIN Proposal in September of 1975, nine major proposals had been passed by both the Coordinating Committee and the Review Board. Others were in various stages of preparation by the task forces. One proposal had been rejected and one was still pending at the Review Board level. The CIN Proposal pointed out that many of the action-oriented citizens who had joined Gateways earlier had by this time dropped out. Many of them were dissatisfied with Gateways since it was not as strong a lobbying group as they had assumed it would be. Gateways clearly acknowledged that it needed to

¹Ibid., Chapter III, p. 2.

have a broad cross section of citizens at work on the task forces and acknowledged that this had been a very difficult problem. It was suggested in the proposal that there had been "reasonable cooperation" with City and County offices but there was concern that some public officials were only giving lip service to the process. Most were not really involved in the program and did not fully appreciate the Gateways effort.¹ This was in contrast to other communities where the City and County leadership had provided a strong base of support for such citizen efforts. Strong leadership and support were given by institutions such as the universities and local colleges, churches and synagogues, health and welfare agencies; but the private economic sector had been less involved and its own leadership in the Chamber of Commerce had been less than enthusiastic from the very beginning in its support of the Gateways program.

Another major concern that the leadership expressed in the CIN Proposal was the feeling that local media reporting was not providing a sufficiently positive force in helping the citizens to understand the Gateways concept. The media, in general, had been supportive of the process but on occasion had been openly skeptical. Other citizen participation groups such as the service clubs, League of Women Voters, and PTA's had also been utilized to help inform and involve citizens in the Gateways process. The CIN Proposal however suggested that the

¹Ibid., Chapter II, p. 4.

Gateways program "encouraged citizens to participate as individuals rather than groups. There is a definite need at this point to recontact groups to give progress reports and develop additional volunteer support."¹ The Proposal built a strong case for Gateways in suggesting that a broad base of citizens was involved in leadership positions. The more the program attempted to involve leading citizens however, the more it became evident that its leadership would be from one quadrant of the community. This criticism leveled at Gateways by its own leadership in the Proposal and others has never been sufficiently overcome; the involvement of a wide cross section of citizens remains one of Gateways' overall goals at the current time.

One of the basic difficulties of organizing such a distinguished list of supporters and members of coordinating committees and steering committees was that so many of them were extremely busy serving as public officials and business people in their own private lives. They were not willing to take the time to become involved in the Gateways program. Many of them suggested that they would be happy to continue providing support for the program and attend meetings but sincerely felt everyone should be doing more to involve citizens in the process as well.

A section of the Proposal was devoted to strengths, weaknesses and corrective actions. The Gateways personnel interviewed individuals in the various socio-economic community sectors and provided this information in its proposal submitted to the Citizen Involvement

¹Ibid., Chapter II, p. 5.

Network. It must be noted here that many of the citizens who were supposedly involved in the process were actually uninformed and were not able to articulate positive impressions of the process. It is not known whether these reactions discouraged the acceptance of Gateways by the Citizen Involvement Network. But it is now generally accepted that the recent Gateways activity has been considerably reduced from what it would have been had the Citizen Involvement Network proposal been approved. The summary that follows represents the citizen view of Gateways as it was presented to the Citizen Involvement Network. This information was gleaned from citizen interviews and recaptured to illustrate citizen response and some of the problems involved but also to demonstrate the material that was submitted on behalf of the proposal.

The interviews included citizens in the ad hoc sector, hidden sector, media sector, institutional sector, and the private economic sector. Two citizens were interviewed from the ad hoc sector. One was generally positive although he identified some problems associated with the process while the other indicated that he was comfortable with the concept and felt that Gateways had potential. Both citizens from this category suggested that the concept of citizen involvement was a positive one and both felt that local government had actually sought citizen participation. They acknowledged that citizen response to these attempts was low. One suggested this was a generalized

apathy since the problems were too complex and others were not able to educate themselves sufficiently to be involved. The other citizen suggested that there was a credibility gap between organized programs such as Gateways and the lower socio-economic groups who were typically not interested in much beyond their own neighborhood. Both individuals agreed the productivity of Gateways had been low. One of the respondents felt that too much concern was being shown about the question of broad representation in Gateways while the other felt that Gateways was definitely not representative of minorities. Both felt that Gateways was attempting to accomplish more than it could reasonably expect to accomplish and felt that it should confine itself to fewer problems and attempt to give greater promise of results.

Two citizens from the so-called hidden sector of the community were identified for interviews but contact was established with only one. This particular person according to the proposal is a highly influential citizen and a leader behind the scenes in the community. "His support and influence with other key community leaders is an asset to many community efforts."¹

This individual felt that citizen involvement was an important outlet for citizens although he did express concern about the duplication of efforts among the organizations in the community. He felt that Gateways had not and would not receive attention in the media unless the Gateways program was modeled to more nearly parallel media thought. He perceived the media as having their own beliefs and

¹Ibid., Chapter V, p. 3.

suggested that until the Gateways program was more in line with media thought and philosophy it would continue to receive poor coverage.

Three interviews were conducted with personnel in the media area and represented a television station, local newspaper and one major radio outlet. All three professed interest in citizen involvement programs but one suggested no additional outlet was needed beyond the current one of representative government. This individual declared that any organized effort such as Gateways would become an adversary of local government. The other two citizens felt that Gateways possessed potential for the community and suggested that it would be advantageous to government as well as a channel for citizen participation. They were concerned that steps be taken to prevent small vocal minorities from dominating the goals and achievement of goals. Generally the interviewees felt that the media had reported on the Gateways process to the extent that it had been newsworthy. For the most part they did not perceive a community service role in helping to make the process work. They suggested that the citizens were not particularly concerned at this time since there was no real crisis in the general community. They suggested that citizens needed key issues if they were to get excited and get involved. One of the interviewees did not become involved in the Gateways process because he considered it a "fabricated" citizen involvement movement outside normal representative government. In addition, all three of the

media respondents expressed concern that the Gateways process had not involved a broad enough cross section of the community. These representatives also felt that foundation funds should be sought in continuing Gateways since the public, they felt, was insecure in the use of public funds which might be quickly cut off and which they perceived as often having strings attached.

Six interviews were arranged among the institutional sector which included local colleges and universities, religious institutions and health and welfare institutions. As a general summation it may be said that two were highly supportive, two were optimistic, and two were skeptical of any success that the Gateways program might have. All the respondents indicated they believed in the citizen participation concept but several of them felt there were some significant barriers to citizen involvement at this time. They felt that large meetings were of little value and they suggested that the average citizen was satisfied to utilize elected representatives. Another response was that citizens desired to become involved but were not sufficiently self-confident to represent themselves. It was also suggested that these average citizens are not informed sufficiently to be effective in community planning and that there is a need for citizenship training in this area. Half of this group talked of the misconception that Gateways had become a bureaucratic structure. They were not willing to have Gateways become a new agency or institution if

it were to attempt "to do it all" or if its approach should be to bring in "outside specialists". Most of these interviewees felt that the media could have done a better job in supporting Gateways and the media should be responsible for "the good of the community". They suggested that more detailed coverage of issues be given.¹

In the public sector ten interviews were conducted. These interviews included the City and County School Superintendent, the Executive Director of the regional Council of Governments and other key leaders. All of these respondents felt that citizen participation was essential and that it could benefit future planning in the community. All of them felt that Gateways had been an asset. About half of them felt that Gateways had already been worthwhile in the development of community goals and felt that Gateways had served as a catalyst in encouraging communication among various leaders and organizations. Each of the respondents felt that their own organizations were also beneficial in this respect in that they all sought citizen participation. Most seemed to feel that Gateways would be a good channel for providing citizen input but felt that these channels existed already through their own efforts in many cases. They were hopeful that Gateways might continue to strive to reach elements of the population that the other public agencies had been unable to reach.

¹Ibid., pp. 7-8.

To this end they felt that it was advantageous to continue to budget public funds in order to secure this citizen involvement. Seven of these public leaders had participated in Gateways Day and had found the day to be beneficial by including the public in goal-setting.

These leaders expressed concern that initially a coordination problem had developed with their own government agencies and individual task forces. They suggested that task forces should have consulted these institutions regarding what had been done or was being planned in a given area. They acknowledged that these deliberations had begun to improve and they felt that future cooperation would be the norm between the agencies and the task forces. These leaders also suggested that the Gateways leadership should define its own goals in a more precise fashion. They felt that the large number of interests of Gateways made it very difficult to produce results and likewise quite difficult to measure them.

It was this group of leaders however that came closest to understanding the total concept of Gateways. For the most part they accepted the fact that citizen participation was an educational process that would require additional work until this value became one that was highly placed in the local society. They felt that much could be learned through constructive and meaningful participation if citizens would give themselves the opportunity. Like the earlier interviewees they felt that many citizens had not participated in the Gateways process or other citizen efforts since there appeared to be no real crisis that demanded their attention. They were confident

that citizens would respond if there were a crisis but doubted that most citizens could be sufficiently challenged to become involved without such an issue. They concurred with most other citizens in suggesting that the media ought to play a more effective role in community development in a number of areas including governmental concern, and Gateways. The typical negative approach by the news media was pointed to again as being a major factor in the disillusionment that citizens might have about their institutions. This group was evenly divided on their feelings about funding of Gateways. Half of them thought that it should receive public dollars since citizens were working to develop information for governmental institutions. However, other leaders felt that government funds might mean that Gateways would be co-opted by local government.

Two interviews were conducted with individuals in the private economic sector, although attempts were made to interview two others. The first felt that citizen participation was valuable if it was not monopolized too often by small minorities. The other felt strongly that this sort of citizen participation would not benefit local government because "a mob cannot rule". One felt that Gateways was nothing more than a political organization which had already spread itself too thin. While one individual had been involved in Gateways and suggested that he had acquired a better understanding in the needs of the transportation area as a result, the other indicated that he had deliberately refrained from involvement and would not encourage his employees to become involved. Both interviewees agreed that the

newspaper coverage had not been sufficient to provide appropriate support and they expressed the thought that most newspaper coverage of things was not good. Newspaper coverage was seen as being incomplete or inaccurate. One of the interviewees in this sector felt that funds should not be allocated from government sources and saw any reliance on federal funds as a danger. The other individual felt that appropriations should come from those citizens involved in Gateways and who hoped to get something out of it.¹

These citizen interviews are helpful in providing a perspective on Gateways. It is unfortunate that they were not better informed, but Gateways personnel accepted the fact that these interviews reflected the opinions of most of the citizens in the community. They indicated clearly the public relations problem that had to be faced by the volunteers in efforts to mount support for a second Citizens' Day.

In January of 1975, Gateways issued a Guide for Task Force Members. Most of the material in the Guide was drawn from the Dimensions program of Charlotte/Mecklenburg, North Carolina, and was altered to fit the needs of the local situation. The primary intent of the brief publication was to acquaint task force leaders and task force members with information about Gateways and with information regarding proposed activity. The first elements included a repetition of essential

¹Ibid., p. 15.

principles: 1) Every citizen has a chance to help plan the community's future. 2) Gateways is a long-term broad-scale endeavor. 3) The program is independent, non-partisan, and non-political. 4) Citizen groups prepare proposals. 5) Conclusions are reached by consensus. 6) The Gateways program is a facilitating but not an implementing program.

The next section provided comments about the purpose, organization, general procedure, and scheduling of reports of the task forces. Additional sections suggested specific steps in the preparation of solution proposals and called for interpretation of the goals, a review of related goals and a series of interviews to identify people who might be involved in implementing that particular goal. In addition, the results of work in all these areas was to be recorded and reviewed by the individual task force before submission to the Review Board. It was suggested that experts were to be consulted for additional interviews if necessary and a subcommittee would finally develop a proposal that would include a time schedule of actions and estimated costs. The proposal was then to be reviewed again with administrative leaders who had been consulted earlier in the process. The plan was to be reviewed again by the task force and a final solution proposal was to be submitted to the Coordinating Committee and the Review Board for approval. It was finally suggested that the task force would act as an achievement group to insure that the solution proposals were implemented even though Gateways itself had no power of implement. It should be noted that very few proposals followed the specified

route of the fourteen (14) steps. It was at this point that many of the task force members and chairmen became quite frustrated with the Gateways bureaucracy. Nevertheless proposals were studied and reviewed and finally approved by the appropriate Gateways bodies and many goals were actually achieved as will be noted in Chapter 5.

The task force guide included a series of five questions about task force activities with Gateways answers supplied. A couple of the questions can be noted here. For example: "Can a new goal be added or can the wording of a specific goal be changed?" The Gateways response was no. "The task forces are to prepare proposals based on the goals as written by the citizens on Citizens' Day." A second question was: "Must the task force follow the proposed time table included in the task force guide?" The answer: "The time table is a suggestion. Modification of the goals ought not to be made unless there are good reasons."¹

The Task Force Guides were provided as a result of questions of many task force leaders who did not have the executive ability to plan sufficiently to provide an overview of the work of their task forces. In many cases they were not sufficiently fluent with Gateways objectives to be able to articulate them effectively to task force members. In some cases task force members had biases which prevented a smooth working relationship with all members of the task force. These and other problems kept the task forces of 1975-76 from being as effective

¹Gateways, "Guide for Task Force Members" (Greensboro, N. C., January 1975), p. 10. (Mimeographed.)

as was planned. Nevertheless a large amount of work and hundreds of hours were spent in discussing goals and possible implementation. While there were many disagreements and frustrations in the process there was a required interface between the citizen and the Gateways program and the elected and appointed City and County officials. Such interaction would not have occurred without the Gateways process.

During much of 1975 and early 1976 Gateways was not highly visible to the citizens. A few task forces continued to work but for the most part citizens were unaware of the efforts of Gateways personnel. What publicity was available often developed in a negative manner with the local newspapers and the difficulty of talking about citizen involvement to a skeptical media and to a skeptical citizenry was nearly impossible to overcome. The group continued however to develop plans for the ongoing operation of the task forces. It had been observed in late 1975 that an executive director must be hired. Initial interviews were held in October but a final decision was not made until December when Robert Bussey was hired as the first Executive Director to begin his work in January of 1976. The addition of a full-time executive provided visibility to the organization and made it possible to have a representative at a number of meetings for citizens. With the addition of a full-time staff person more conversations led to a continued reappraisal of the process. By mid-1976 it was determined that a reorganization would be necessary. A special group of sixty citizens was invited to meet at the Center for Creative Leadership for a full day to discuss Gateways and its future. The results of that meeting

have been captured by Jim Scherer, a long time proponent of the Gateways process. His comments follow:

"Today was a great experience! Watching individual citizens and the groups at work was inspiring. I hope we can share this day with the citizens so that they can regain confidence in their own ability to assist in community decision-making."¹

Out of that December reorganization and the work that followed in the early part of 1977, Gateways was reorganized to capture the flavor of the comments at the December session and a new constitution and supporting document were developed. New officers for 1977 were elected and installed. A time table was established for the work of the new organization including the Executive Committee, the Administrative Committee, the Citizen Advisory Council and Citizen Involvement Committee. Reverend William Bigham was named Chairman of the Citizen Advisory Council, Cliff Lowery was named Chairman of the Administrative Committee and Rose Marie Ponton was named Chairman of the Citizen Involvement Committee. A Mediating Committee was to be established that would include three members of local community who were highly respected. The nominating committee was careful in its deliberations to include representatives from the black community and at least one black was nominated to an executive position in each of the Gateways components. After much discussion it was determined that a second community Citizens' Day would be held. Following consultation with local civic groups and after reviewing

¹James Scherer, quoted at meeting for Gateways Reorganization, Greensboro, North Carolina, 9 December 1976.

other activities planned for the community in the fall of 1977, it was determined that the second Citizens' Day would be held on November 12th at N.C. A&T State University. The group leaders were established and given the task to explore the status of previous goals and to work with lay personnel and professional leaders to establish a framework for discussion on Citizens' Day.

In a two-week period in October each of the discussion area leaders held a meeting which was open to the general public. The author attended the arts meeting which included considerable review of previous goals and the establishment of primary areas for the larger group of citizens to respond to in November. Great care was taken to insure that if the citizens wanted to deal with other objectives, they could suggest a change in the agenda. Under the leadership of the group leaders (Appendix G) great care was taken to establish objectives for the Citizens' Day 1977 as compared to the goals which had been set for 1974. There was great concern expressed by numerous leaders that one of the failings of the earlier Gateways experience was that citizens were not able to measure results.

One of the major modifications in the plans for Citizens' Day 1977 was that measurable objectives were to be established. At the update meetings great care was taken to include old task force members, representatives of governmental agencies, representatives of community organizations, professionals in the field, and a cross section of interested citizens. It was anticipated that 10 to 20 persons would be a reasonable number to expect for such a meeting. The group leaders

were also expected to prepare a brief report that might be used as a handout for Citizens' Day. It was anticipated that this material might also provide a framework for publicity efforts. Special invitations were issued to numerous citizens with whom Gateways had established contact. Other promotion was planned through the mailing of 15,000 brochures and through public relations efforts with the local media which was handled efficiently by Mary Stella Jones.

During the course of the deliberations surrounding the planning of Citizens' Day a number of issues developed: Should the day be a full day or shorter one? Would goals or objectives be approached? Who would provide the keynote address if there was to be one? Would lunch be a major expense and time element for the day?

It was suggested that the Governor should provide the keynote address if he would be available to do so and he was invited. After considerable delay it was agreed that other approaches should be made and the Executive Committee and the Chairperson of Citizens' Day, Barbara Walser, determined that Howard Lee should be invited. Mr. Lee accepted the invitation of the group and also agreed to participate in the public relations effort which was being made to involve a broad cross section of the community. Since Mr. Lee was a black, a former mayor of Chapel Hill, a prospective candidate for other offices as well as the current Secretary of Natural and Economic Resources of North Carolina; it was anticipated that his involvement would be of considerable value in promoting a cross section of attendance.

In establishing a plan for Gateways during the summer of 1977, it was suggested in a report written by Judy McAdoo that criteria for evaluating Gateways be established jointly with the City and County since they had agreed to provide \$10,000.00 in funding for the Citizens' Day and administrative expenses.¹ Such an evaluation was circulated to members of the City and County Administrative and elected offices during the third week of October. Essentially the proposal was the continuation of the first Gateways questionnaire at the Congress Day in 1974 and it was suggested that the same questionnaire with slight modification would be the best instrument to provide a comparison of the two Citizens' Days and to establish whether a cross sectional involvement of the citizens had been accomplished. A sample of the questionnaire appears as Appendix I. The first questionnaire resulted in useful information and will be discussed more fully in Chapter 5. During the summer of 1977 numerous individuals became active in the Gateways process including many of the previous supporters such as George Norman, Judy McAdoo, William Bigham, Francis Logan, Jane Brabham, Louis Fields and others. They were assisted by newly interested citizens such as Tony Witkege, Rose Marie Ponton, Abe Abramovitz, George Campbell, Charles Thompson, Mary Montgomery, Art Davis, Margaret Kirkman, and Barbara Hughes.

¹Gateways, "Planning Outline 1977-78," Greensboro, North Carolina. (Mimeographed.)

CHAPTER V
A COMPARISON OF GATEWAYS WITH OTHER CITIZEN
PARTICIPATION GROUPS IN THE UNITED STATES

Gateways is similar to many programs that have been established throughout the country. It has a very special sister relationship with the Dallas, Texas program but likewise, has much in common with the program established in New Orleans, Louisiana as well. An attempt will be made here to establish the basic approaches that citizen goal setting and futures organization groups are using with special emphasis on the ways in which Gateways can be compared and contrasted to these other programs.

It must be noted that organizations of this type exist as indicated earlier on the local level, state level, and regional level. A brief review of some of those organizations on a regional level will suggest that most of them were proposed by the Governors or their aides in the states which have adopted such programs. In most cases the Governors provided leadership to organize staff and citizens to provide a framework for the work of the organization. Most of these organizations have likewise been established in the last five to ten years and many of them within the last three or four years. In the discussion that follows regarding regional, state, and local groups; the basic format utilized will be to discuss the following characteristics: history,

source and amount of funding, structure, objectives, method, programs, and accomplishments. This is the pattern suggested by review of twenty-nine such organizations in a recent study, December 28, 1976, by the Congressional Research Service. The report has attempted to relate basic information regarding these aspects of the goals and futures groups reviewed. No attempt was made to contact every organization but the author has contacted several of them to verify the accuracy of the information included in the CRS Review.

The material was developed from printed material and from conversations held with individuals connected with each of the organizations. Certainly any value judgment about the organization's programs and accomplishments might be biased by such sources, but in the main these contacts appear to be careful not to accept too much credit for any accomplishments, choosing rather to discuss accomplishments as the benefit of endeavors of several organizations. In reviewing these groups it is critical to note that while the organizations are individually unique they do share many common elements in their structure, techniques, funding, and other facets. These groups have been established in communities ranging in size from 5,500 in Clarinda, Iowa, to cities of approximately 500,000 such as Atlanta, Georgia. These organizations are found in every state of the union and oftentimes in numerous communities within a state. An element which appears to vary from one organization to the other is the process used to develop goals and alternatives. Some of the organizations have established

local committees to formulate their recommendations. Others have included work in the public schools including the primary grades such as the Commission on the Year 2000 in Hawaii. Another process is that used by ACCESS in Santa Barbara, California, where aspects of policy analysis are used. The ACCESS program relies heavily on visual aids and communication devices. It has attempted to achieve the old New England Town Meeting concept in an effort to have citizens analyze information in order to make the best judgments possible. Another difference between the groups reviewed is the degree to which they analyze the various costs of seeking alternatives among goals. The various groups have taken different approaches to determine the trade-offs that are necessary to accomplish goals. Some of the questions that are asked in making these judgments include:

1. What will these goals cost us in tax dollars if they are implemented?
2. Will we have to sacrifice our standard of living, personal time, or social prominence if this particular future comes about?
3. Do these goals and considerations abort any of the personal goals we have established for ourselves or our family?
4. Whose future is more crucial, my community's or my own?
If anyone has to lose on any of these goals whose preference has priority?¹

¹Congressional Research Service: Citizen Profiles, p. 6.

There are two major clearing houses for information regarding local, state, regional organizations. The Citizen Involvement Network was discussed earlier; the other is the Committee for Anticipatory Democracy. The Committee for Anticipatory Democracy is a recent newcomer to the field established in 1975. It is primarily a result of the emphasis in the 94th Congress on futures research. Alvin Toffler and 50 other persons interested in forecasting and futures research supported the establishment of the Committee for Anticipatory Democracy. A number of Congressmen expressed interest in goal setting and futures groups and sponsored a seminar for Congressional staff in September, 1975. These two organizations have continued to encourage local citizen participation groups and should be further studied to assess the impact of their work. In addition, there have been other acts of the federal government that include the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, and the House Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, which demonstrate great interest on the part of Congress in the use of techniques and foresights for analyzing the future. If the federal government continues to show such a great interest in goal setting and futures organizations as it has in these legislative acts and in the earlier establishment of the citizen participation goals of the Housing and Urban Development program, the interest in such groups will continue to grow at a very fast rate. As Senators and Congressmen have continued to need information regarding the procedures of citizen

involvement, the 94th Congress established a Congressional Clearing House on the Future. Its goals include:

1. To assist Members as they become aware of the way in which the Future is affected by today's decisions.
2. To help committee members implement the foresight provision by holding foresight hearings as well as oversight hearings by identifying witnesses, suggesting questions, helping to organize meetings.
3. Help members foresee the impact of legislation on state and local governments so that legislation will have foresight.
4. Let members know that citizens groups are eager to work in the planning process of government and to give members new methods of citizen involvement to use with their constituents.¹

The CRS Report was prepared for the members of Congress and has been extremely helpful in identifying specific organizations and trends in the Citizen Participation Movement. It is anticipated that such service will be particularly helpful as more studies of this sort are done to discover the impact of the Citizen Participation Movement on national and local affairs. Earlier notice was taken of the state and regional groups that are endeavoring to provide future planning. It is the local organization, however, which provides the focus for this report and which will provide the comparison for the Greensboro, North Carolina Gateways Program.

¹Ibid., pp. 12-13.

HISTORY

In the area of history it can be said that nearly all of the groups have been established since 1970. Only Fort Worth, Texas, 1964, and Dallas, Texas, 1965, were established prior to 1970. Three of the organizations were established in 1972. Four each in 1973 and 1974 and one was established in 1976.¹

It is apparent that the Citizen Participation Movement grew rapidly through the mid-1970's and it will be interesting to see if such growth continues.

SOURCE AND AMOUNT OF FUNDING

A review of the source of funding of the fourteen communities' programs indicates that most received a combination of funding including federal and local tax monies along with grants from foundations and businesses. The budgets range from a modest five thousand dollars in dues and contributions for Norwich, New York to four hundred thousand dollars from private corporate sources for Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The other communities however received funding in varying degrees from the combined efforts of government and private sources. Federal or local funds are received in ten of the fourteen cities. Those not receiving governmental support operate on a shoe string. There is one obvious exception in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania where the program is securely funded and operates on a budget of \$400,000.00.

¹Ibid., pp. 39-78 passim.

ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE

It is very difficult to analyze the organizational structure of groups that were designed in individual communities to serve different needs. Of the fourteen cities involved in this survey however it can be said that nearly all include some sort of advisory council or board of directors. Only Santa Barbara, California and Charlotte, North Carolina have moved in other directions with a strong relationship to the local university. However, in each of these cases there is also a citizen's group to provide access to the local organization. The sizes of the boards vary from relatively small boards in most communities such as Austin, Texas with twenty members to the larger board of Philadelphia which includes seventy-five local citizens and Clarinda, Iowa which includes ninety on its advisory council. Nearly all of the communities have used the task force or study group as the primary tool for developing goal statements and for instituting achievement committees. Each community has indicated its attempt to diversify their boards by including representatives of minorities. Nearly all of the organizations have an executive director either paid or volunteer. In the case of Philadelphia there are an additional ten paid staff workers. No other community has the budget to utilize such a strong staff complement.

ORGANIZATION OBJECTIVES

In a review of the fourteen communities every organization cited its primary emphasis to be in the area of citizen participation. In

most instances concern was also articulated that the citizens be involved in planning responses to current and future problems. In most cases this took the form of goals or objectives to be accomplished by various groups in the community. In addition other objectives were apparent such as the mandate in Austin, Texas to develop a master plan for the city; the dream in Clarinda, Iowa to involve 50% of the citizens; the motivation in Norwich, New York to teach citizens to have an impact on their government; and the specific goal in Raleigh, North Carolina to teach citizens the history of the city. While the goals appear to be quite similar a number of approaches are being used to meet these goals, for as stated in Goals for Dallas "goals are ends to be achieved; plans are the means to achieve them".¹ In all the cities there seems to be a concern that there be goals and that there be plans established to achieve those goals, for without the achievement of the goals there would be little need to establish the goals in the first place.

METHOD OF APPROACH

Nearly all of the organizations have included some form of task force or study group as the core element to provide research, to assemble information and to draft responses. To augment this approach several of the communities such as Akron, Charlotte, and Clarinda as well as Dallas have used neighborhood groups including meetings in

¹Dallas Citizens, Goals for Dallas (Dallas, Texas: Goals for Dallas, August 1969), p. iii.

private homes to study the goals and to devise ways of providing information to the community. Other communities such as Akron, Raleigh, and Lynchburg have provided various conferences or Citizens' Day to elicit citizen response. Other communities such as Raleigh, Seattle, and Santa Barbara have offered various forms of citizen balloting to improve the number and quality of citizen response. Santa Barbara's ACCESS is perhaps the most highly sophisticated in that it includes an electronic polling arrangement for gaining citizen input. In those cities where the method of approach included heavy use of the media, newspaper and television were the primary avenues for reaching citizens. These attempts were included in Atlanta, Charlotte, Nashville, and Seattle.

PROBLEMS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Several organizations and organizational leaders mentioned the overall problem of credibility and talked about the difficulties of reaching citizens in trying to elicit their responses. The organizations have experienced suspicions of citizens especially in those areas such as Seattle where the program was initiated by the city government. Some of the major problems experienced by the local community organizations have included: the suspicions of citizens who did not understand the process, the lack of media support in attempting to communicate with citizens, the difficulty of maintaining continuity in a volunteer organization and the impossibility of finding sufficient funding to

maintain visibility and expertise. The difficulties of maintaining funding sources were primary obstacles and problems noted by the organizations. Several organizations mentioned the difficulty of maintaining volunteer effort when the payoffs were either nonexistent or very slow in materializing. Fort Worth is perhaps exemplary in its problem statement and is included here as a typical one in analyzing the problems of these organizations:

"In an effort which is this complex and comprehensive, some of the administrative problems which were encountered were probably unavoidable. It proved to be difficult to mobilize citizens to maintain consistent interest in the program as the process was lengthy and demanding in terms of commitments. The lack of media coverage of the program proved to inhibit public awareness of the process. Some elements of the process were seen as being too ambitious. The lack of funding and personnel hampered the operations of the program. The program has proved to require more manpower and has increased the cost of developing a city plan as compared to the cost of those previously attempted without citizen participation. However, these additional costs were anticipated at the beginning of the program by those who designed it".¹

Such a statement seems to capture the essence of the problem experienced by most of the goal setting and futures organizations now surviving in this country. Another specific problem which has been experienced widely is that of gaining citizen involvement. The difficulty in establishing rapport with minorities - especially poor minorities, has been perplexing to the leadership of citizen goal-setting groups. Maslow's hierarchy of needs explains the lack of involvement. This difficulty has been pointed out in the literature and in the survey of these organizations. If an answer can be found to this particular

¹Congressional Research Service: Citizen Profiles, p. 59.

problem, at least one of the continuing problems for all of the organizations could be solved.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

It is much more difficult to assess the accomplishments of these groups, and the only resources are the materials of the individual communities and the responses of staff and volunteers who are already involved in the process. Nevertheless, their responses seem to have been objective in their evaluation of accomplishments. In nearly all cases the responses from volunteers or staff, as one might expect, included the statement that a far greater number of citizens have been involved since the inception of these groups in their communities than ever before. In many instances goals of involving over 100,000 citizens were set and met. In others, lesser goals of citizen involvement were attempted and in some cases these too were highly successful. Other accomplishments have included the sheer process of goal setting which has assisted city and county planning units to know the desires of citizens and to work with that information. Citizens have had the opportunity to indicate goal choices for the future and this process has provided many new goals for some cities and changed goals for city planning departments in others. In reviewing the accomplishments of the cities it is evident also that numerous specific goals have been accomplished. This is demonstrated in Charlotte where approximately 20% of the goals had been accomplished by the end of 1976.

Other accomplishments have included the new experimentation including the electronic polling which has been attempted in Santa Barbara, California. In addition the process has been successful in providing alternatives from which citizens and elected officials might make appropriate choices. In some communities additional cooperation of volunteers and between numerous agencies has been observed. This has occurred in nearly all the communities, especially those in which the governmental support was already a part of the arrangement. In other cities such as Norwich, Citizens Unlimited has appreciated its role of providing objective, factual information on all sides of an issue and indicates that this has been recognized as a positive force by community leaders and elected officials alike. Other citizens' groups, including Nashville, Tennessee, have suggested that its work "has strengthened and encouraged public policy and has caused people to look beyond the crisis of now and deal with the consequences of having taken action or not having taken action". Such comments reflect the possibility that citizen groups may be able to assist in policy and decision making for the future rather than to assume a posture of alienation and frustration. Other accomplishments are relatively simple such as the success of Clarinda, Iowa in developing meetings in the homes of participants.

CHAPTER VI

A REVIEW OF THE GATEWAYS PROGRAM COMPONENTS

The Gateways program includes several factors that offer opportunities for evaluation. This study will provide a review of several Gateways' activities including:

1. The plan established by Gateways.
2. The position papers which were written by citizens in Greensboro.
3. Gateways Day, February 23, 1974, and the goals that emanated from the Day.
4. The task force activities.
5. The reorganization of Gateways.
6. Planning for the second Citizens' Day.
7. Citizens' Day, November 12, 1977.

An attempt will be made to assess the quality of these activities, the planning involved in these activities and finally the action that has followed from the Gateways process.

THE GATEWAYS PLAN

Following the initial discussion regarding an implementation of Gateways, Dr. Jim Watson served as consultant and produced a brief document entitled "The Greensboro Plan". Watson's paper included

sixteen pages of discussion regarding the last twenty-five years of the twentieth century and the response that Greensboro might make. He included brief comments relative to the changes that were occurring in the late 1970's and he documented the changes that were occurring:

"(1) bigness, (2) complexity, (3) an ever increasing rate of change, (4) a staggering accumulation of scientific and technical knowledge, (5) increasing affluence and leisure, (6) rapid population growth, (7) rapid development of urbanization, urban sprawl and megalopoli, (8) increasing literacy and education, (9) increasing industrialization and super industrialization, (10) increasingly complex technological revolutions, (11) staggering rates of mobility, and finally, (12) an accelerated growth toward a mosaic society with many and varied beliefs, values, ideals, subgroupings, and goals".¹

While the problems seem to be staggering, Dr. Watson took the cue from Mayor Erik Jonsson and the citizens from Dallas, Texas, who in June of 1966 had established Goals for Dallas. Watson reviewed the Goals for Dallas Program and postulated that Greensboro would do well to incorporate much of the Dallas plan in trying to respond to the future. Watson was careful to delineate "people problems" and indicated that a holistic approach to system planning was necessary if Greensboro was to escape the problems associated with other major cities. He proposed that Greensboro in developing its Gateways program exclude hardware planning and concentrate on software or people problem planning. Watson's approach of (1) identifying goals, (2) prioritizing goals,

¹J. Allen Watson, "The Greensboro Plan," (Consultant Report to the Greensboro Junior League, Greensboro, N.C., 9 April 1973), pp. 2-3. (Mimeographed.)

(3) identifying requirements for solutions, (4) choosing solutions from alternatives, (5) implementation and feedback, (6) evaluation and (7) eliminating needs were the primary elements of the people problems solving plan.¹ The plan became a basis for the Gateways Plan which was written by the Steering Committee of Gateways. The Steering Committee included twenty citizens from the community but in actuality a much smaller core did the writing for the Gateways plan. Of those on the Steering Committee who might be identified in the writing it is necessary to mention here, Judy McAdoo, Ann Lineweaver, Betty Cone, Ann Wagg, George Norman, Jim Scherer, Rex Todd, Vincent Rue, and John Parramore, Jr. These citizens adapted Watson's eighteen steps to their own plan, which included thirty-nine steps; but they both concluded with a second community congress day which Dr. Watson had suggested would occur in 1977. In evaluating this plan it is important to note that the Gateways leadership and its volunteers have followed the Greensboro Plan and the Gateways Plan earnestly. The difficulties of 1975 and 1976 aside, the Gateways program has been active in following its plan and successful in incorporating the best features of Watson's proposal. The final postscript of the Gateways plan acknowledged:

"This Gateways plan is readily adaptable to the specific needs, interests and resources of Greater Greensboro. It appeals to the common sense of the citizenry in that Greater Greensboro is after all their region, and it is their right and responsibility to become actively involved

¹Ibid., p. 9.

in the vital decision making processes that affect their urban-rural environment. The Gateways Plan is ambitious and summons intensive concern for the development and management of our resources in a planned manner. It would be unrealistic to say that all of those who begin here with us will end with us but the important thing is that this plan offers a beginning which we can no longer afford to postpone."¹

THE POSITION PAPERS

Following the presentation and adoption of the Gateways Plan a series of position papers were developed on the areas specified. These thirteen papers prepared by individual citizens represent a considerable effort in assessing the situation in regards to a number of service areas and proved to be of tremendous value to the community in determining needs and in providing discussion opportunities for the future. These position papers were extremely well written and captured the critical elements for consideration by citizens in improving such areas as criminal justice, government, community development, transportation, secondary and elementary education. In the assessment of the quality of these reports, two will be selected for particular review. The first is the "Essay on Secondary and Elementary Education" prepared by Dr. Joseph Bryson of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dr. Bryson's review of the Greensboro, Guilford County School System included review of the following areas:

1. Enrollment - Elementary and Secondary students including kindergarten.

¹Ibid., p. 23.

2. School facilities - school value, design, present use and future projections.
3. Faculty and administration certification - degree indication and continued professional personnel growth and development.
4. Curriculum and instruction - administrative and organizational structure; description of curriculum and instruction; special instruction design; future curriculum and instructional plans; and student response to instructional program.
5. Studies, analysis, long-range planning and future directions.¹

Dr. Bryson's review of the Greensboro Public Schools and the Guilford County School System provided for citizens a most detailed look at their school system. The paper provided a rare opportunity to analyze the local public school system on its own merit but Dr. Bryson also wisely included comparisons with other school systems throughout the country. This information was new for many citizens and provided a first-hand opportunity to know that other possible approaches to education were available. These suggestions and this very detailed study have been significant in giving citizens a better grasp of their school systems.

¹Joseph Bryson, "Gateways presents an essay on the current position of Greensboro and Guilford County in the area of Secondary and Elementary Education," report for the Gateways Committee, Greensboro, North Carolina, (Mimeographed.)

A second paper was the "Essay on Health" prepared by Richard J. Jones. The paper is itself a compilation of fourteen position papers relative to the health care system available to residents of Greensboro and Guilford County. These reports were prepared by numerous professionals with the health and service agencies in the county and provided the best coordinated statement on health care services in the county to that date. The vast array of services was compiled in a systematic fashion and citizens learned in this paper what they could expect to experience in the field of health were they to need the services of any of the health agencies. The report stressed the need for organization throughout the county which would provide services and enable professionals to always have the best possible knowledge and resources to assist them in working with their patients. The report suggested that excellence of care could not be achieved by the family doctor providing services from birth to death but rather the family physician and others must be appropriately coordinated with all other personnel facilities and resources to meet the requirements for individuals and families regarding health care needs. The paper served to stimulate discussion among professionals and laymen, and the health discussion on Gateways Day was lively and animated. The report further challenged the community to seek "optimal health for all people in our society" and while it suggested that such a goal was beyond the ability of the community to achieve at that time, it was not and should not be beyond the ability of community citizens to seek that goal. The paper presented a myriad

of facts and ideas regarding health care in the region.¹

Like the other Gateways position papers it provided an effective document for citizens to analyze various services and opportunities within the community. The thirteen papers provided the most detailed study of problems in the community that had been generated to that time. The papers are consistently of high quality and reflect keen insights into the problem areas discussed. While much of the material in these thirteen papers dealt with then current situations there was also a striking concern for the future. The authors of the individual papers have provided an outstanding service to the citizens of Greensboro and Guilford County through their work. Hopefully additional presentations of this type perhaps every five to ten years will be an effective way to again acquaint citizens with some of the problems in the areas cited for study.

Other communities such as Dallas and New Orleans chose to publish their position papers. New Orleans, Louisiana published its position papers in a document entitled "Framework for the Future" which was printed in April, 1971. Many of the areas treated in the Gateways position papers are the same as those suggested in the New Orleans study. Like those of the Gateways program those papers seem to be well conceived and written. This format provides a context and a

¹Richard J. Jones, "Gateways presents a report on the current position of Greensboro and Guilford County in the area of Health," a report for the Gateways Committee, Greensboro, North Carolina. (Mimeographed.)

guide for further discussions and as suggested earlier often a challenge for those who are to evaluate current situations. All of the papers were developed on a volunteer basis and reflect concerns of professionals and lay citizens alike in attempting to improve the local environment.

The position papers provided a vehicle and a visible activity for citizens as they moved toward the first Citizens' Day which was still a new concept in the community. The process of citizen participation had been utilized numerous times before in the public election process, but seldom in a full-scale approach to analyzing community needs and in looking toward the future for the community.

GATEWAYS DAY

A third major element of the Gateways process was the Gateways Day. Over 1100 citizens participated in that day-long conference which was keynoted by Mayor Kevin White of Boston. Kevin White's remarks were appropriate for the day. In addition the 1100 attendees were more than the facility of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro at its Elliott University Center could accommodate. Only 800 people were anticipated; but as the crowds began to arrive, more chairs were provided and many had to stand during the initial ceremony and the keynote address. Several handicapped persons were escorted in wheelchairs to sites in the auditorium and they were later transported from one floor to another to accommodate their participation in the

various discussion areas. The discussion areas were lively and interesting and developed one hundred and thirty (130) goals which would be reported to the people of Greensboro. One of the most often heard complaints of the day was that citizens could realistically participate in only one discussion at a time. Many citizens wanted to be involved in two or more of the discussion areas.

An evaluation questionnaire was administered that generated 546 returns. The questionnaire had been designed primarily to give immediate feedback to planners and also to document some of the concerns regarding Gateways. The questions were very general and the questionnaire as a whole was an informal one but it pointed out: (1) that the majority of citizens, 58%, had learned about Gateways Day from a friend or personal contact; (2) that nearly all the participants had felt enthusiastic or optimistic and interested about the day before coming; (Only one person suggested opposition to the idea while 29 expressed doubts about coming and 107 suggested that they were curious.); (3) that sixty-three percent (63%) of the respondents suggested that Gateways had been a good beginning while only .7% suggested that the day had been unproductive and 2.6% suggested that the day had been confusing; (4) that eighty-four percent (84%) of the participants in Gateways Day indicated that they understood the major task of the day was to set goals while 36.6% had suggested that the purpose of the day was to identify problems and 8.8% had suggested that the basic purpose of the day was to discover solutions.

The planners discovered from the questionnaire that the position papers referred to earlier had been the best preparation for the group discussions. In addition, the respondents cited the registration material (26%), discussions with friends (22%), newspapers (21%), speakers (9.5%), and radio and television (8.6%) as the additional means that provided preparation for the day.

One of the concerns of the Gateways' planners for the Citizens' Day or Gateways Day had been to insure a good cross section of the community to be represented in the day. However, this representation did not occur and many of the citizens themselves were aware that this did not occur. Forty-three percent (43%) of the citizens felt that a good cross section had been represented while 45.6% said no. Four people were unsure.

Other information on the questionnaire however had asked the citizens about their residence in the city or county. From that question it was discovered that 35% represented the northwest quadrant of the city, 6% the northeast, 19% the southeast, and 5% the southwest. Twenty percent (20%) had represented the northern portion of the county lying outside the city limits and 7% had represented the southern portion of the county lying outside the city limits. It was clear that a broad cross section had not participated.

Other questions provided the following information: (1) 94% of the respondents felt that they had been able to express their ideas while only 1.6% disagreed. Nearly ninety-two percent (91.9%) felt

they had been listened to while only 3.2% disagreed. (3) Nearly eighty-five percent (84.6%) of the respondents as opposed to 9.7% felt that their group had discussed problems that they thought were most important.

Other questions asked citizens if they would come to another Gateways Day; 90% said yes, 1.5% said no and 8.5% were unsure.

With respect to their expectations as to what would happen after Gateways Day; 15% said that many goals would be reached, 46.9% said that citizens would get involved in working toward the goals, 40.8% said that community plans will reflect more clearly the needs of the citizens, 50% felt that some goals may be reached, 27% felt that some goals would be disregarded, 11% said that citizens would leave it up to the community leaders to work on the goals and 2.6% felt that nothing would really happen. (Citizens were encouraged to respond to as many categories as interested them).

It was discovered that 6.95% of the participants on Gateways Day were under 21 while 48.5% were 22-40 years of age, 34.7% were in the 41 to 65 age bracket and 5.5% were over 65. In addition it was discovered that 49% of the participants had been male and 51% had been female. The questionnaire provided clear evidence that citizens felt Citizens' Day to be successful and over 76% suggested that they would be willing to become involved with the group to help carry out goals set by the Gateways Day participants.

Perhaps the most telling criticism of Gateways Day would be the lack of the cross section of the community represented on that day.

The planners worked diligently to meet this need but were simply unable to involve minorities and the poor in this sort of activity. Parenthetically it may be said that no other similar body in the community has been able to do so either. It remains a continued need and a very difficult one to achieve.

THE TASK FORCE ACTIVITIES

Following Gateways Day thirteen task forces were constituted to develop more specific details regarding goal implementation. The leaders of these task forces are included in Appendix F and deserve considerable credit for citizen involvement, planning, goal implementation, and final action relative to the goals. In regards to planning it can be said that most of the task forces met regularly and involved numbers of citizens in developing proposals. A number of the task forces met monthly and others met approximately every six weeks to continue their work. Many subcommittees represented citizens and many visitations and consultations with professionals were held to try to develop alternative solutions under proposed implementation that would be accepted by the entire task force and the review board. Of the 130 goals developed from Gateways Day many were implemented as a direct result of the enthusiasm from the Citizens' Day. Not all of the actions taken were caused directly by Gateways but the entire process of calling attention to needs and suggesting goals and reviewing goals with agencies provided an impetus for participation and goal implementation. In reviewing some of the goals it is imperative to recognize both those

that were implemented and those which received no action on the part of the Gateways task forces.

Government

In the governmental area a number of goals were discussed in the course of the deliberations by the task force. The group explored a wide range of topics in small group discussions and continued to work on the seven goals. These goals continued to represent a majority view but not a unanimous view of those in the task force or those who were involved in the Gateways discussion. The first goal was to develop a plan for increased communications with and participation in city and county governments. The conclusion rendered here from review of Citizen participation and city and county responsiveness to Gateways is that goal number one was effectively addressed and was successfully implemented. The task force and the Gateways leadership has continued to interact with city and county officials in an effort to involve citizens in the fullest way possible in discussions. Gateways communicated with the government task force and others to encourage them to participate in neighborhood meetings sponsored by the city government and encouraged participation in the neighborhood councils in the county. It has also encouraged citizen participation and input in discussions regarding major proposals such as road plans and water treatment problems. Following the presentation of the goals from Gateways Day, city and county leadership provided additional

assistance through their own programs and departments to encourage citizen participation in the election process and the campaign process. They also reviewed efforts to provide clear information about the services and responsibilities of each governmental body. The city and county leadership deserve much credit for the implementation of the goals that were developed on Gateways Day.

Goal number six of the government discussion group was to initiate a study to determine whether the city would be better served by some form of representative government other than the current form. The vote of the group on Gateways Day was divided equally on the questions of recommending a modified ward system for the City of Greensboro. Following those discussions this proposal was included as a referendum in the municipal election of 1975 and such a move was defeated by the voters. It is apparent from the defeat that sufficient enthusiasm and concurrence had not developed within the task force or Gateways to provide the leadership toward this particular goal.

A seventh goal was listed: to encourage increased cooperation between the city and the county in dealing with problems common to both. The observation of this writer concurs with the observation of other members of Gateways leadership and it must be realistically and objectively stated that while members of the task force and other task forces did speak out on this subject the implementation of such increased cooperation has been only partially successful.

Criminal Justice System

A second task force was that entitled Criminal Justice System. Eleven goals were enumerated on Gateways Day but the least amount of activity has occurred in this particular area. The death of Zoe Barbee, leader of the criminal justice system discussion, and the difficulty of working through the fragmentation and inconsistency in the administration of justice in this growing community has made it difficult to accomplish the goals. One of the difficulties in accomplishing the goals of the criminal justice system was that many of the goals required not only local support but changes in state and federal procedures as well. Specifically, goal seven: "to meet the needs of persons in prison and Guilford County jail. . .and by preventing neglect leading to deaths in our jails" and goal eight: "to establish more community based programs both residential and nonresidential such as emergency shelter homes, group homes and counseling services. . ." were encouraged and endorsed by Gateways but were not goals that Gateways personnel themselves could achieve. These goals have however been approached by the Greensboro Urban Ministry which has created an ex-offenders program. The Youth Services Bureau has also responded to the need of providing community-based programs for youths aged 15 to 18. Local agencies such the Greensboro Urban Ministry, the Greensboro Council on Children and Youth, and the Youth Services Bureau have utilized the Gateways goals to push for action within their own programs. They have cited these needs as developed by the citizens of Greensboro-Guilford County as a vehicle in receiving

funds. Personnel involved in the Criminal Justice System task forces can take solace in the fact that much has been accomplished to improve the criminal justice system though so much more yet remains to be done.

Transportation

The Transportation Task Force included more than 60 people who developed 20 goals. In most of these goal areas it was impossible for Gateways alone to provide action but it has encouraged increased participation on the part of citizens. Several goals including the goal to improve the present bus system of cross town busing, better scheduling, and rerouting of existing routes, have been accomplished due in part to the political and community pressure provided by the focus of the Gateways process. Goal number five has engendered considerable public debate and the question of financing public transportation through fares, commercial business and government subsidy, government revenue sharing or highway trust fund money has been a heated one. On goal number seven: "to study the feasibility of a flexible transportation system such as dial-a-ride which has facilities for the handicapped," a new program has been structured entitled "GATE" which is now providing transportation for the elderly and the handicapped.

One of the transportation goals sought to require that elected officials justify to the public their reasons for decisions involving transportation. It can be reported that through the Pollard Report on transportation the Gateways Community Development Task Force worked to improve this goal. The public has also provided additional assistance in this area. Action has been taken on bikeways, the construction of additional sidewalks, and while a new system proposing the closing of certain streets on Sunday afternoons has not developed, city streets are closed for special events such as the Fun Fourth Holiday, and the Greensboro County Park is now closed to all vehicle traffic.

Community Development Task Force

The Community Development Task Force started with 90 citizens who met to establish goals for their area. The concerns of community development naturally overlapped matters that were discussed in other groups but there was general agreement that a long-term regional plan was necessary to provide for future growth. It is this area perhaps more than any other that speaks to the overall quality of life relative to the environment. The goals of the Community Development Task Force provided the impetus for a great deal of discussion among city and county planners and among citizens in general. Their first goal was to accomplish further community and regional development according to an enforceable and comprehensive land use plan for the region. This plan

was to be coordinated with regional planning to include population density control and was to guarantee citizen participation in adoption and modification. The goals also suggested that there might be a limited moratorium on growth until the plan was drawn up and approved. Since that goal was established in the winter of 1974, much discussion has ensued relative to land use. There has been a good deal achieved in this area; however, it is debatable as to how much citizen participation was considered and how much citizen suggestions were accepted in the preparation of plans. One of the community development goals was: to allow citizens better access to elected officials on questions of community development. It is widely believed that Gateways had a positive effect here. The City and County have held frequent public hearings and mailed hundreds of letters to interested persons. About three-fifths of the Gateways community development recommendations to the city were accepted and the others are being reviewed by city planners.

One of the community development goals had been to urge that 50% of all public meetings for Greensboro and Guilford County concerning planning and zoning be held in convenient locations and at times other than 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday. Following the presentation of this goal to city and county officials there appears to be a decided move in the direction of scheduling public meetings and hearings at various times. The Mayor's neighborhood meetings and other public hearings are held at night but other meetings do occur during the day.

Another of the community development goals was to establish incentives for renters, landlords and homeowners to rehabilitate deteriorating housing to a minimum standard. While Gateways was not able to provide specific action, initiative was provided which energized the city through its own departments to continue working through the community development block grant program. Loans and grants have been utilized to facilitate this goal. During 1977 City Council members and others exhibited renewed interest in this goal and have stimulated landlord and public concern regarding deteriorating housing.

Housing

The Housing Task Force led by Dave Wright provided seven goals that proved very difficult for action on the part of Gateways. Nevertheless action was taken by other agencies on three of the goals. The four major items in goal number one were to take immediate action to increase availability of moderate and low income cost housing through the following: new methods of financing, rehabilitation, available subsidization and development of incentives. Considerable discussion of the goal occurred during the housing meeting on Gateways Day. The four major items in this goal were achieved in part by the city through the community development block grant. There remains a problem in securing areas for scattered subsidized site housing; but the city and others are actively involved in this process. In achieving goal number two which was to rehabilitate deteriorating housing by establishing a mechanism to provide rehabilitation funds for an owner

or rehabilitator, the city was able to utilize surplus community development funds.

Economy

The Economy Task Force led by Charles Powell, Jr. provided a set of goals to encourage and support sound business initiative and to examine the opportunities present in the areas of labor, education and the business community to reach this goal. One of the primary goals of the Economy Task Force was to examine the purposes, functions, and goals of Greensboro's central business district to prevent future deterioration of the area and to reinforce it as a center of influence and to encourage the protection of surrounding residential areas. Gateways, along with many others, encouraged the revitalization of downtown; and while there is not a direct reflection of the Gateways effort, it can be reported that while downtown has a number of vacant storefronts the offices have been rented to a surprisingly high degree. In addition the city has contributed considerably to the development of the Carolina Theatre and the new visual arts facility which will be opened in 1978. The Chamber of Commerce and others are still working with this problem area and there is promise that downtown revitalization will continue to develop as it has in the last couple of years.

Goal number four sought to urge a conservation of energy to develop a means of keeping Greensboro, the government and its citizens, informed as to the impact of energy shortages as they affected planning,

adoption of building codes, construction designs, transport systems and patterns of urban and economic development. Much was accomplished in this area by the city. Much of the work was done utilizing staff of the Greensboro Fire Department. A commission was formed by the city which received high praise for its efforts in this area.

Services to the Family and Individual

In the area of Services to the Family and Individual sixteen goals were specified which provided a considerable framework for discussion and implementation. A number of goals were seized upon by various agencies including the development of the Child Advocacy System which was adopted by the Junior League. This later led to the establishment of the Greensboro Council for Children and Youth. Goal number thirteen in this area sought to establish a group to study the rights of senior citizens and to advocate protection of those rights. In response to this goal statement a blue ribbon panel was convened by the United Way of Greater Greensboro which subsequently involved the city, county, and the regional council of governments to study the concerns of senior citizens. The new organization called United Services for Older Adults has recruited a full-time coordinator and is now providing protection for the rights of senior citizens. The goal "to establish a central system to identify needs of and services available to senior citizens. . ." led Gateways to urge additional support to senior citizens. Discount tickets were provided by several art organizations through the Leisure-Culture Task

Force in conjunction with the Services to the Family and Individual Task Force and transportation was provided to the Eastern Music Festival (a summer music festival housed on the Guilford College Campus).

In responding to other goals Gateways urged the city and county to consider using revenue sharing funds for the development of adequate, cheap, mass transportation; half-way houses for both sexes-- especially for ex-offenders, drug abusers, undisciplined youth; and an effective job placement system for those new to the job market and those who are hard to employ. Requests have been made for the use of revenue sharing funds in these areas and this goal remains one of the challenges to Gateways' personnel. It was anticipated that these and many other goals would be reviewed, further discussed and refined at the second Citizens' Day.

Health Services

In the area of health services five goals were established through the discussion group working with Richard Jones. It was determined that the community needed to improve its health care resources and the quality of care available at its health facilities, and that it needed to ensure that all citizens have access to adequate care for their health needs. While the goals provided opportunity again for community discussion, it must be said that basically no action was taken by Gateways except

to encourage discussions and to stimulate action in so far as possible. Perhaps the only real achievement was proposal number three which was to establish a Comprehensive Health Planning Council supported by public and private funds with the ability to:

- a) provide an information referral service
- b) collect and distribute statistical data
- c) stimulate joint efforts between providers of health services and recipients of those services.

Such a proposal was presented to the Review Board on March 18, 1975 and approved. The proposal was then presented to six area agencies for study and action during March, 1975.

Secondary and Elementary Education

The largest discussion group on Gateways Day was the group responsible for development of goals in the area of secondary and elementary education. The discussion group sought to provide every young person in the community with the best education possible to insure their development as capable and responsible citizens. John Red provided leadership for this large group as it effectively discussed the education program in the area. The six goals included a proposal for an alternative school for Greensboro. The proposal for the alternative school, which prompted many hours of discussion for numerous citizens, was eventually presented to the Review Board and approved on

February 13, 1975. The proposal was presented to the Board of Education for the City Schools on February 18, 1975. It was finally rejected by the School Board. However, it is widely felt that better communications have been established between the citizens and the administrators of the schools. This was accomplished primarily through the Parents' Council and through the hiring of additional staff whose goal was to improve communications. This was also one of the Gateways goals. It is also the opinion of leaders of the task force and independent observers that money was primarily the rationale for the rejection of the alternative school. However, two years later it is seen by most that many of the concepts, ideas, and thoughts regarding the alternative school have been accepted in various ways by the school system which has provided a comprehensive new facility that is under construction.

Continuing Education

The Continuing Education Group led by Jean Eason sought to increase the awareness of continuing education on the part of those who participate in such activities and the agencies and institutions which are responsible for these educational programs. Action was taken on six of the seven goals in the Continuing Education area and included a proposal for a Continuing Education Clearing House which was formulated in detail in March of 1975 and presented to the Review Board on June 19, 1975 which then approved the concept of the Continuing

Education Clearing House. The proposal for an education information center for Guilford County was sent to the Assessment Committee of Gateways on March 22, 1975. Additions were made and the proposal was resubmitted to the Assessments Committee on April 26, 1976. The proposal was then submitted to the Review Board on May 19, 1976. These actions represented the incorporation of six of the Continuing Education Goals. One other goal was to develop a plan of financial support which would be on parity with other educational systems and which would not require Continuing Education to be self-supporting. No action was taken by Gateways and this goal remains one that has eluded Continuing Education enthusiasts and Gateways as well.

Higher Education

The Higher Education group under the leadership of Bob Shennum was perhaps the least representative of the discussion groups but was perhaps one of the better informed groups of citizens. The majority of participants were developing a familiar theme since most of the participants were involved intimately in the higher education programs of the region. One of the primary goals was that local industries and local universities strive to provide each other with better information regarding their needs and abilities. The Higher Education Task Force was inoperative for a period of time. However, when leadership was provided and when directions toward the goals were obtained a healthy

forum was created. Several meetings were held following the Gateways Day, comprised primarily of staff and faculty from the schools. There was great disagreement between private and public institutions and this provided considerable differences of opinion in the discussions. Many of the goals have been used by individual institutions but Gateways per se has not been in a position to provide the leadership for the level of dedication necessary in dealing with the problem of higher education.

Leisure:Culture Task Force

The Leisure:Culture discussion group led by William Snider on Gateways Day consisted of many citizens who were keenly interested in the level of arts activities in the public schools and in the level of activity in the community at large. Seven goals were established and to some degree all of the goals were implemented. The first goal was to provide a broadened base for the arts through community exposure and by instituting a continuous arts education program in the elementary and secondary schools in Greensboro. Gateways and other arts groups such as the Arts Council and its Arts and Crafts Association provided the emphasis for continued development of an educational program in the arts. The task force and various arts groups continued to work together in the months following the Gateways Day to establish greater cooperation within the groups and to broaden the base for

art support through community exposure. In addition the task force, local arts organizations, and the United Arts Council provided a concerted effort to seek additional support from city and county government for the arts.

Each of the governmental agencies has continued to improve its contribution to the arts with a final manifestation of this support being the opening of the Carolina Theatre in 1977. Projected for 1978 is the opening of the Visual Arts Center which has been contributed by the City of Greensboro. In addition The University of North Carolina at Greensboro and other institutions have attempted to expose the community to various art forms and have provided transportation and reduced tickets for senior citizens and disadvantaged groups. Other goals achieved included the constant communication and support among the arts groups with each other and the eventual production on a monthly basis of a useful arts calendar published by the United Arts Council with information from all other arts groups included. One of the exciting possibilities suggested in the original goals was the encouragement of greater regional cooperation among all large groups. While a regional symphony and other possibilities have not developed, the regional cooperation between The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Guilford College, Wake Forest University and the High Point Theatre is an outstanding feature of regional cooperation.

Numerous other examples are available but perhaps the most exciting was the advent in 1977 of the North Carolina Shakespeare

Festival which was presented for the first time at the High Point Theatre. This festival approach is a regional one that provides the only classical repertory theatre in North Carolina. The Shakespeare Festival became the Cinderella arts development during 1977 and while most credit must be given to its producer, Mark Woods, and artistic director, Stuart Brooks, the support of countless arts-minded citizens to a regional concept over the past four years certainly must be cited as an important advantage in the success of the Shakespeare Festival.

Leisure:Recreation

The leisure:recreation goals developed with the assistance of Dr. Roy Moore called for six improvements in order that every individual in the community might have adequate recreational opportunities suited to his needs and interests. Specifically, the group had suggested that a comprehensive city-county recreation plan should be adopted. To that end the Guilford County Board of Commissioners received a proposal which had been approved by the Review Board on April 27, 1976 that was presented to the Commissioners on May 3, 1976. With the help of Commissioner Richard Maxwell and the help of the Rural-Surburban Community Council the commission was established and a director hired. This program is currently functioning throughout the county and has been extremely well received by citizens. It appears to enjoy the continued support of the County Commissioners. Most of the other

goals pertained to the city's park programs and the consensus of the group was that the program was already an adequate one. Other citizens proposed that changes might be made to improve it and the City has responded favorably regarding many of these proposals.

In this review of the efforts of the discussions groups and the task forces one must of necessity rely on both the actual implementation of the goal and the larger concerns regarding participation, planning, and action. Perhaps twelve primary accomplishments can be cited for the task forces over the past couple of years:

1. Gateways helped to develop the earlier concept of an arts center which was later delegated to the United Arts Council for implementation.
2. It made suggestions and provided continued pressure to have the City and County Community Development Programs and Transportation Programs implemented or improved.
3. Gateways urged and received the City's and the County's assistance in developing a land use program.
4. Gateways can take considerable credit in developing a program to facilitate the development of citizenship through its own programs and through its reliance on ongoing government communications and dialogue.
5. Gateways was instrumental in gaining approval for a County Recreation Commission and the hiring of a Director for that program.
6. Gateways and its attendant task force meetings and discussions can take great credit for the encouragement of communications among the various arts organizations.

7. Gateways was instrumental in facilitating the development of the ex-offender program which is now administered by the Urban Ministry.
8. With the assistance of the Junior League and others Gateways facilitated the development of the Greensboro Council on Children and Youth.
9. Gateways provided considerable information and direction in the development of the thoroughfare plan of Guilford County.
10. Gateways in its Leisure:Recreation Task Force provided considerable assistance in developing initiatives for the proposed Piedmont Triad Park.
11. Gateways has served as a facilitator in making local citizens aware of the need to conserve energy and facilitated the early establishment of a City Energy Commission.
12. Gateways can take considerable credit for the hours of study and review involved in the proposal for the alternative school plan which was later implemented in various stages by the City School Board.

Many critics of the Gateways Program have insisted that agencies would have provided these improvements for the quality of life in the region without Gateways. It is apparent however that such movement would not have been as effective or as efficiently arranged without the assistance of the Gateways process. Over 380 citizens contributed hundreds of hours to the development of the task force proposals and to the work of various agencies to which they were volunteers and in some cases with agencies to which they were bound by career employment. These task forces have provided an immeasurable service to the citizens of the region by their dedication and perseverance..

Critics of the program must also remember that the Gateways proposal never assumed that Gateways as a body would provide the implementation for the goals. The earliest plans included proposals that would encourage Gateways to administer task force proposals through various agencies which were established to facilitate these community needs. It also provided the most coordinated review of citizen effort and government effort thus far provided for the city and county.

REORGANIZATION OF GATEWAYS

As mentioned earlier the work of the Gateways process through its task forces was not highly visible during 1975 and 1976 even though a number of proposals were making their way through the task forces to the Review Board and to various agencies throughout the community. By the fall of 1976 it was evident to the Gateways Executive Director and many of its volunteers that a reappraisal of the process was necessary in light of community reaction, in view of the citizen involvement proposal which had been submitted and in recognition of the need to review the goals as suggested in the Gateways Plan. Consequently a group of community participants was invited to the Center for Creative Leadership of the Smith-Richardson Foundation for a day-long evaluation of Gateways. That 60 citizens would commit several hours to this endeavor is a monument to their commitment and also an indication of the potential that they believed remained for the Gateways process. Five groups were established and while an analysis

of the intergroup reaction might be an interesting facet of the day the discussion here will deal only with the suggestions and concerns that evolved from the discussion groups.

One of the groups, chaired by Barbara Walser, suggested that Gateways should revise the structure, function, and makeup of its Review Board to formulate a coordinating governing body or board that would include the task force committee chairmen and an advisory representative assigned to each task force. This concern developed primarily from task force chairmen who felt abused by the Gateways process in that often Gateways proposals were rejected or modified at the Review Board or Assessments Committee level. Many times this occurred without the opportunity for an appearance by the task force chairmen, or so it was perceived. The proposal would alter that situation to include the involvement of the task force chairmen.

Margie Furr and her group discussed the structure of Gateways and determined that it should include the board of directors which would be made up of a broad cross section of citizens constituted on racial, geographical and sexual characteristics. The addition of an administrative policy-making body and a new board of directors would carry the responsibilities of prioritizing goals and assuming responsibility for reporting to the people. They suggested that the process would continue to need a paid coordinator and that more stress be placed on a third component of the structure: a

resource bank of carefully chosen individuals who were identified by their expertise and area of concern. The group also suggested that the process should include a goal-setting day, the prioritizing of goals on the Congress Day, the submission of prioritized goals to an appropriate agency for responses, the administrative board to monitor the goals through the coordinator, the return of the goals to the administrative board to be reprioritized in light of agency response, the resubmission of prioritized goals to agencies or institutions for action or implementation, periodic reports to the community and additional task forces appointed by the board of directors as needed using the resource bank as a starting point.

Group three led by Dr. Lois Edinger suggested that Gateways should reduce its number of concerns and encourage a broader and fuller participation of citizens in the discussions. It further suggested a special orientation to greater citizen participation every two years as on a Congress Day. It suggested a less complex structure that would reduce the number of levels of review. It supported greater coordination of communication and advocacy and suggested that the Review Board become a full board of directors as a policy-making board with a broad constituency in the community.

The fourth group led by Dr. Will Parker suggested that the Gateways concept should be restructured to include a board of directors instead of a review board. The board of directors would retain all previous responsibilities of the review board except the review function. The

assessments committee according to Dr. Parker's group should be discontinued. The group believed that a Congress Day should be held every one or two years or as necessary and they believed that the board of directors should be responsible for contacting the agencies to determine if an agency would review a recommendation and respond to it.

The fifth discussion group on that day was led by Peggy Lambeth.

The proposals issuing from that group suggested that:

1. There be no approving administrative authority - only a simple evaluation of the procedure used in development of proposals to ensure that citizen involvement had been encouraged and that it had occurred.
2. It proposed that a thorough study of present task forces be undertaken with a possibility of making them into three or four major study groups rather than the thirteen individual task forces.

The group also suggested that a town meeting be held to demonstrate that Gateways was involved in developing new directions and that it was seeking input from citizens. It was further suggested that an attempt be made to bring various community agencies together on a given occasion to seek input from citizens. Citizens and agencies would then formulate short range goals through ad hoc groups to work toward the implementation of such goals.

Much of what occurred on December 9, 1976 was utilized in the final reorganization which occurred in early 1977. The reorganization was hammered out by a small group of citizens who had participated in the Gateways Day and eventually led to a new structure that included a

Citizens Advisory Council led by Rev. William Bigham, an Administrative Committee led by Cliff Lowery, and a Citizen Involvement Committee led by Rose Marie Ponton. By February 9, 1977 a printed document detailing the new structure was prepared for distribution. Appendix I will provide the basic elements of that revised plan including a reaffirmation of the purpose of Gateways. The only element of the structure which was not identified by the summer of 1977 was the Mediating Committee. The Nominating Committee and the Citizen Advisory Council had agreed to take additional time to formulate the Mediating Committee since it was felt that this committee should be very carefully chosen and should be constituted with three highly respected individuals in the community.

At first glance many of the former participants in Gateways were impressed with the new structure, and in the fall of 1977 just prior to the second Citizens' Day, it appeared that the new structure was working well. The Citizen Involvement Committee had been the most difficult manpower pool to develop but most of the slots had been filled. It is clearly evident from the appendix and from observations of the Gateways process that the new process is responsive to the suggestions of the Citizens who met on December 9, 1976. The proposal to reduce review levels has been incorporated into the new structure. Citizen participation is now guaranteed for at least one more occasion. There is no approving administrative authority that will reject proposals and there is a new emphasis in involving citizens at the neighborhood level.

Perhaps this is the major change that has been adopted by the Gateways program in attempting to develop citizen input. It should be noted however that overall more than forty-five individuals will be involved in the actual oversight of the Gateways process and that citizens will be invited to participate in numerous ways throughout the process.

GATEWAYS DAY

During September, 1977 the Citizen Advisory Committee approved the finalized plans for Gateways Day which were presented by Barbara Walser and Rose Marie Ponton. Countless people were busy making final arrangements for Citizens' Day which would include numerous discussions as it had before. Even before November 12th however each of the previous task forces was asked to hold an update meeting. These update meetings were held in various facilities at various times and places throughout the community. Approximately twenty people were identified to come together to review the current state of goals and needs in the discussion areas. Meetings were held with the group discussion leaders in an attempt to acquaint them with the Gateways process, to provide information relative to their own discussion group and to give them a refresher course in the workings of groups. The second Citizens' Day had been extremely well planned and it must be said that one of the largest publicity campaigns in the history of the county was planned by the public relations committee headed by Mary Stella Jones. The questionnaire for the evaluation of the second Gateways Day was to be

essentially the same as the first questionnaire in order to give an additional signpost as to the effectiveness and the involvement of the Gateways process. The questionnaire again sought to assess whether or not a broad cross section of the community had been involved in the day and attempted to provide feedback relative to the feelings of participants regarding the second Citizens' Day. In a local program concentrating on goals for the future, it is evident that citizen participation was critical in the development of the 130 goal statements, and it is equally evident that citizen participation provided tremendous emphasis to the agencies responsible for fulfilling many of the goals established on Gateways Day. The reorganizational plan for Gateways offered much hope for continuing citizen involvement and indeed for improving the quality of that participation. The plans for the second Citizens' Day included elaborate activities to manage the events and the personnel for the day. These committees like so many committees throughout the citizen participation effort gave citizens an opportunity to be involved in conducting a major activity.

QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire for the second Citizens' Day was returned by 191 respondents from among the 400 attending. Results recorded here are similar to those found in the first questionnaire.

On the question of a cross section of the community being represented, the citizens felt 2 to 1 that a cross section had been attained. By 121 to 64 they felt that all elements of the community were involved. In the first questionnaire only 43% had felt a cross section had attended.

Only a handful of participants in the two days felt the Citizens' Day to be unproductive. Less than 17 in both surveys responded in this manner.

Citizens often reported that information regarding the Citizens' Day had been acquired from friends or from the Gateways' brochure. A limited number (less than 25%) in either survey listed radio, television or newspaper as the primary resource for learning about or preparing for the Day.

Perhaps that statistic alone demonstrates a major difficulty of the Gateways program. The media perhaps understandably find it difficult to treat as hard news anything so calm as a group of citizens sitting down to talk. Picket signs and demonstrations were more likely to be considered news in the present atmosphere.

March 1 - 4, 1978, Red Skelton was in Greensboro for a residency at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro. In the course of that residency he told students of his move to leave the national network because of their insistence on violence and crude jokes. He also ventured the notion that national media report the more grotesque news items as a way to keep citizens at home. He offered the explanation

that if citizens stay at home they most likely will watch more television which allows the network to raise the advertising rates if more people are watching.

During the same week, Eric Sevareid of CBS was in Greensboro to deliver a lecture at the University and he talked about the public interest in wanting to be heard. He acknowledged that outpouring of citizen response when he would talk about citizen participation in his commentaries. He is particularly aware of the moral fibre of American citizens and challenges politicians and leaders to allow greater citizen involvement.

In the other questions of interest in the survey, it is noteworthy that 184 respondents felt that they were listened to, while only 7 disagreed. One hundred and seventy-nine indicated they had an opportunity to express their ideas and opinions while only 8 felt they did not have such an opportunity.

The other questions provided almost identical responses as found in the first questionnaire. The only new question that was included asked citizens if they felt the City and County funds were being well spent in co-sponsoring the Citizens' Day. Overwhelmingly, (95%) the citizens felt the Citizens' Day to be an appropriate expenditure of public funds.

Following the second Citizens' Day on November 12, 1977, Gateways experienced a funding crisis as the City and County had both indicated they would reconsider the Gateways budget request in January, 1978 for

the second half of the fiscal year. The Guilford County Commissioners were particularly hesitant and on February 6 announced their decision not to fund Gateways with the \$5,000 requested. The following week, on February 16, the City of Greensboro Council voted unanimously to fund the program at \$2,500.

The Citizen Advisory Council voted to dissolve the position of Executive Director and asked Robert Bussey and Sidney Morton to have everything in order by March 15, 1978 with as much work on the proposals to agencies to be accomplished as possible.

Other actions were planned to regain funding and to maintain the office. As March 15 neared the Executive Committee invited the Citizen Advisory Council and other friends of Gateways to a luncheon on that date to honor Bob Bussey for his efforts over the past two years on behalf of Gateways.

Evaluation was to continue through the efforts of the Citizen Involvement Committee to solicit responses to the sixty-four (64) objectives that were prepared on November 12, 1977. By the end of March, over one hundred and sixty-seven referrals had been made to area agencies and one hundred responses had been returned. The CIC must continue to monitor this process and to report the results to citizens. Craig Distelhorst was named to chair the CIC.

Reverend William Bigham continued to provide leadership for the Gateways program. He issued the following statement in the winter of 1978 to share with the Gateways team and area citizens the challenges

that still confronted them:

It now becomes the responsibility of the quadrant representatives who compose the Citizens' Involvement Committee to review the reports on the referrals, to monitor the progress of the implementation of the "objectives", to form ad hoc task forces to refine "objectives" that were considered unclear, or inadequately developed, and to design a mechanism for identifying neighborhood leadership and conducting a survey of concerns that need to be addressed in the future.

We are alive and well! But we do not have any illusions about the process of citizen participation being easy. Long-range plans call for another Citizens' Day - perhaps in the spring of 1979. During 1978, then, the "experiment" continues. As we monitor the process of implementation of the suggestions of citizens by community agencies, or even looking for new "vehicles" for solving problems that cannot be handled by existing agencies, we believe that we can renew the faith of people in their ability to affect the quality of life in our community.

In many places, around the country, communities gave up on citizen participation processes, like GATEWAYS. Many communities quit before the process had been adequately tested. We have already gone further than many sister communities. And we have the possibility of carrying our "experiment" to a fruitful conclusion. We believe that it can¹ be done in Greensboro if it can be done anywhere in America!¹

¹Bill Bigham, letter sent to Friends of Gateways, Greensboro, North Carolina, January 1978.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

SUMMARY

The history of the Gateways Program is similar to that of other citizen participation organizations. It has been an important study with significant contributions to the concept of citizen participation in this community; in addition, a number of specific accomplishments can be claimed from its efforts. The initial planners for Gateways including primarily the Junior League, United Way, and the Chamber of Commerce with the addition of the city and county government at a later time were leaders of courage and vision in the face of citizen inaction. These citizens prepared a very sophisticated plan for Gateways and have attempted to implement that plan over the past four and a half years. The Gateways personnel have been effective in implementing the plan and following it. In addition perhaps the keynote effort of the Gateways Program was the Gateways Day of 1974 with over eleven hundred participants. The three hundred and eighty individuals who worked on the task forces and their efforts must also be commended in any summary of Gateways activities. The citing of the following twelve accomplishments of Gateways is merely a recognition of the tremendous potential that such a program might have.

1. Gateways helped to develop the earlier concept of an art center which was later delegated to the United Arts Council for implementation.

2. It made suggestions and provided continued pressure to have the City and County Community Development Programs and Transportation Programs implemented or improved.
3. Gateways urged and received the City and County's assistance in developing a land use program.
4. Gateways can take considerable credit for its efforts in the development of a program to facilitate the development of citizenship through its own programs and through its reliance on ongoing government communications and dialogue.
5. Gateways was instrumental in gaining approval for a County Recreation Commission and the hiring of a Director for that program.
6. Gateways and its attendant task force meetings and discussions can take great credit for the encouragement of communications among the various arts organizations.
7. Gateways was instrumental in facilitating the development of the ex-offender program which is now administered by the Urban Ministry.
8. With the assistance of the Junior League and others Gateways facilitated the development of the Greensboro Council on Children and Youth.
9. Gateways provided considerable information and direction in the development of the thoroughfare plan of Guilford County.
10. Gateways in its leisure:recreation task force provided considerable assistance in developing initiatives for the proposed Piedmont Triad Park.
11. Gateways has served as a facilitator in making local citizens aware of the need to conserve energy and facilitated the early establishment of a City Energy Commission.
12. Gateways can take considerable credit for the hours of study and review involved in the proposal for the alternative school plan which has now been implemented in various stages by the City School Board.

Additional accomplishments include a renewed awareness of the potential of citizen participation and a keen appreciation on the part of many that such participation is difficult to maintain.

The two most apparent shortcomings of the Gateways process are the lack of a cross section of citizens in the effort (much improved in the second Citizens' Day), and the problem of losing volunteers who become overpowered by the difficulty of working within a program that has no authority in and of itself. As Daniel Bell suggests:

"Participation, however, is not the end of politics, as it seems to be in some of the rhetoric. . . It is the beginning, for politics arises in the first instance when one realizes that there is no such thing as the people. . . There are only peoples. . ." ¹

The respondents to the questionnaire administered on Gateways Day were enthusiastic in their responses. Sixty-three percent indicated that it had provided a good beginning. Ninety-four percent felt they had an opportunity to express their own ideas and opinions. Over ninety percent of the respondents indicated that they would be willing to attend such a Gateways Day in the future.

In Kendrick's article on goal-setting community groups, he reiterates the same problems identified by Leahy and Robotham and in this review of Gateways: 1) divisions of opinion among numerous local groups; 2) conflict and contradiction among goals proposals; and 3) lack

¹Bell and Held, "The Community Revolution," p. 177.

of interest on the part of citizens.¹

In addition Gateways experienced many of the other difficulties encountered by other citizen-based groups: 1) a lack of clear definition of the citizen participation expected--i.e. leaders vs. general public; 2) a difficulty in defining goals or objectives; 3) the lack of "sustained commitment" on the part of volunteer citizens and officials.²

The tremendous efforts of the organization and the planning for the second Congress Day are clear examples of the commitment, courage, and patience of some citizens in becoming more involved and in seeking to improve the quality of life in the community. Whether that commitment can be continued in Greensboro remains a mystery. Such a summary of the program ignores however the tremendous advantages of citizen involvement in the development of stronger citizenship characteristics among citizens. It has been evident from conversations and interviews with community leaders and citizens at large that the involvement in Gateways has been instrumental in providing a better understanding of community life. In addition Gateways has provided an opportunity for citizens to participate in defining goals for the future in a manner not afforded them before the Gateways process became a reality.

¹Kendrick, "Citizen Participation Goals Program," p. 24.

²Ibid., pp. 26-27.

It is clear that the citizen participation process is fraught with many problems which have been suggested throughout this study. Perhaps one of the most difficult is determining what citizen participation strategy will be adopted. A closer study of the Arnstein and Burke models may provide guidance for leaders of citizen participation organizations. Gateways would appear to conform to steps five and six of the Arnstein Model: Placation and Partnership. Gateways has accepted this posture to achieve the greatest response from agencies and to satisfy its own members who are divided on the question of advocacy. Consequently, it often assumes its role as Step Five which Arnstein suggests is "simply a higher level tokenism because the ground rules allow have-nots to advise, but retain for powerholders the continued right to decide."¹ This is just as most Gateways participants want it to be. On other occasions Gateways would appear to offer a partnership that enables participants to "negotiate and engage in trade-offs with traditional powerholders."² As suggested in Chapter IV, Gateways would appear to conform to Burke's Staff Complement and Behavior Change Strategies. Perhaps other approaches will be taken in the future, but for now it would appear that this is an appropriate characterization of Gateways.

¹Arnstein, "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," p. 217.

²Ibid., p. 217.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations are difficult to make for a program as complex as Gateways and the most difficult aspect of all is that Gateways is a volunteer organization. The volunteer literature is filled with numerous hints and suggestions for work with volunteers. For the purposes of this paper, however, it is more important to make specific suggestions dealing with the program and not with the administration of the program. Consequently, the following ten recommendations are made based on information available to the author and the reader in the material presented and available to the author through interviews with local citizens regarding Gateways:

1. It appears certain that the Gateways' impact was diluted by the length of time between the first and second Citizens' Day. Consequently it would seem appropriate for the Gateways leadership to consider the possibility of a Citizens' Day every other year. This would allow ample time for the planning of one major activity and for sufficient time to follow through on suggestions that are developed at such a conference. This would allow volunteers to become involved and would give them sufficient activity to feel a part of the enterprise. It would also allow for the continued review of citizen proposals on a regular basis that would more likely follow the interest of the average citizen.

2. A second recommendation is that Gateways organize a local leadership program for prospective leaders similar to the program offered by the Greensboro Chamber of Commerce and the program suggested by

Darrel Bigham in his article on Community Leadership. Bigham points out that Orlando, Atlanta, Columbus, Fort Worth, Flint and Evansville are six entirely different cities, but they share a common characteristic in that they have become concerned for the quality of public leadership in their communities. According to Bigham nearly thirty communities in the United States have attempted to "prevent future leadership from becoming exclusive, apathetic and ill-informed by establishing community leadership programs."¹ Such a leadership program could be developed through the Gateways mechanism since it already includes numerous community officials, blacks and whites, professionals and volunteers, and educators on its board. Such a board might utilize the results of community leadership training programs and alter them to suit the needs of Greensboro. This would be a natural outgrowth for the Gateways program and could be effectively utilized in Greensboro in the next five years.

3. Many of the Gateways leaders have recently come to feel that the many difficulties of large public meetings suggest a move toward neighborhood meetings through the citizen involvement committee. Such a recommendation is a sound one and will go far in providing local citizen input from citizens who are not inclined to attend open public meetings. Such an effort would not only provide citizens with an opportunity for input but would provide a vehicle for the development of citizen leadership that is necessary if Gateways is to maintain a strong and favorable public image. Efforts to invigorate the citizen involvement committee must receive continued attention from the executive committee and the planning committee of Gateways.

¹ Darrel Bigham, "Community Leadership", Center for Creative Leadership 4 (October 1977): 8-9.

4. It is critical that Gateways continue the excellent planning that it has enjoyed since its inception. One of the most outstanding aspects of the Gateways Program has been the detailed planning and the persistent attempts made by Gateways leadership to follow the plan of consultants and citizens at large in developing a working format for the organization. This planning is most certainly responsible for the accomplishments and any continued success that Gateways may enjoy.

5. In the next few months, it will be necessary for Gateways to plan a series of workshops to involve all elements of the Gateways process and to gain a renewed commitment from the citizens for the difficult planning and implementation of proposals that lies ahead. Such a series of workshops must include an opportunity for individual citizens to come to understand themselves and their relation to the Gateways program. It will be helpful for some discussion of race and socio-economic differences to be undertaken.

6. It is imperative that meetings be arranged with elected and appointed community leaders to continue the education of these officials to the concept that any time "lost" to citizen involvement is not sacrificed. Rather such commitments must be encouraged and leaders must be willing to accept the delay in decisions in order to provide ample opportunities for citizen input. Such input must not be for the sake of open discussion but must be undertaken with an open and sincere desire that the very best decisions will be forthcoming. To prepare open hearings and other actions after decisions are effectively made will only serve to infuriate local citizens.

7. Gateways must continue to build a Resource File of local citizens who are willing to serve as consultants in developing and evaluating any proposals for future action. Community resource experts will provide an excellent way to develop the very best proposals and to secure community support for them.

8. It is strongly recommended that funding be continued from government, foundations, and businesses. Based on this review of Gateways and similar programs it appears that such a funding pattern provides the greatest stability. A combined effort from various funding sources will necessitate a careful use of these resources. Local government must be reminded again of the need for such organizations and for the potential benefit to be gained if public support from the leadership is forthcoming. The public is very much aware that verbal support is supported with resources to accomplish the task. Area businesses and foundations must be informed anew of the Gateways potential and urged to participate in this vital process.

9. Gateways has experimented with various methods of communicating with the public. It appears that well prepared and attractive booklets are too expensive and insufficiently read by the average citizen. Other communities have had even less success with the publication of books. The Gateways program and others have utilized public service announcements and general news categories for reaching the public. These are not dependable sources for communication and are often overshadowed by the personal biases of journalists. The Gateways process seems to have utilized successfully the newspaper advertising format as a convenient and economical vehicle for reaching many citizens. This approach is

worthy of continuation and insofar as funds can be made available this effort should be continued on a periodic basis to inform citizens of Gateways efforts.

10. One of the primary shortcomings of most citizen participation groups would appear to be the inability of such organizations to present their case to the citizenry in a forthright manner on a regular basis. It is suggested here that such organizations should seek additional support from the media and that they should be receptive to ideas from media personnel. Specifically, weekly citizen participation segments of the news might be included just as many stations across the country include news, weather, sports and arts. It is imperative in this regard that Gateways and similar programs enlist and solicit the aid of local media in educating the public regarding such processes. It has been apparent in recent interviews and in those interviews prepared by Gateways for the Citizen Involvement Network proposal that local citizens' perception of Gateways was formed in large part by the local media. The excellent resources within the Gateways structure must be utilized to develop the most positive public relations effort possible if Gateways is to survive beyond its present stage.

CONCLUSION

The author was privileged to meet Dr. Peter C. Goldmark a few years ago when Dr. Goldmark was attending a conference in Houston. Goldmark's address was stimulating as he quoted Aldous Huxley: "As I peek into the

future, it doesn't work."¹

Goldmark's creative genius and technological know-how have won him world-wide respect. Perhaps his greatest achievement, however has been in forcing social planners to recognize the tremendous impact that the rapid development in technology has produced. Long before Toffler and Lind and others, Goldmark was dramatically charting the exponential growth of our population, technology and change itself. His paper "The New Rural Society", pointed out that "time is short and we cannot invent, we must innovate."²

Goldmark concluded that even though "we have learned to communicate across space and under water, on records and on type. . . we must still perfect that most important form of communication--from man to man."³

The goal-setting groups we have discussed in this paper and Gateways in particular offer opportunities for community planners, educators and administrators to view a model of citizen participation. In this paper the primary aspects of the Gateways development have been presented with some attempt to place the process in social and historical perspective.

The challenge to professionals and lay citizens alike is to help in creating a better environment for the future. Such a future must be rationally considered before it is already a reality. To this end citizens are eager to offer their help. Whether Citizens' Days or television hook-ups or neighborhood meetings are used is not so important as the fact that citizens must be involved.

¹Peter C. Goldmark, "The New Rural Society" (lecture presented to Seminars in Modern Journalism at Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, 1972), p. 1.

²Ibid., p. 15.

³Ibid.

The involvement of citizens may not necessarily ensure an improvement in the quality of decisions made. An argument can be made that representative government offers the best approach to decision making. However, programs such as Gateways offer encouraging possibilities to develop more effective communication with citizens. Most citizens do not appear interested in taking decisions into their own hands. In fact, many citizens oppose citizen participation groups since they believe it undermines the elective process. Local programs appear to be more concerned with providing responsible forums. Gateways type programs offer an opportunity for conflict resolution such as a student-faculty advisory committee might provide in a university setting. Many communities have used similar groups to alleviate problems in the areas of race relations and school attendance zones.

Additional study is necessary as the citizen goal-setting movement matures. This paper has merely presented a brief narrative and has attempted to demonstrate the extent to which some citizens in one community were willing to sacrifice to communicate with each other and with governmental and social agencies.

Gateways is symbolic to administrators and educators who are sensitive to citizen and student concern that programs do not necessarily have to be handed down as the final word. Rather, citizens and students appreciate being involved in the effort to define their own future.

In educational circles the challenge is to create settings that recognize "that many issues are dilemmas to be reconciled rather than

problems to be solved. . ." ¹

Such efforts must be continuous for as long as our citizens and students have the courage to persevere.

¹Dale Brubaker, "Social Studies and the Creation of Settings", Part II (Publication #7 of The University of North Carolina at Greensboro Humanistic Education Project, 1 December 1976), p. 7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arnstein, Sherry R. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation." Journal of the American Institute of Planners 35 (July 1969): 216-224.
- Bell, Daniel, and Held, Virginia. "The Community Revolution." The Public Interest 16 (Summer 1969): 142.
- Bigham, William O. Letter sent to Friends of Gateways, Greensboro, North Carolina, January 1978.
- Bigham, Darrel. "Community Leadership." Center for Creative Leadership 4 (October 1977): 8-9.
- Brubaker, Dale. "Social Studies and the Creation of Settings" Part II. Publication #7 of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro Humanistic Education Project, 1 December 1976.
- Bryson, Joseph. "Gateways presents an essay on the current position of Greensboro and Guilford County in the area of Secondary and Elementary Education." Report for the Gateways Committee, Greensboro, North Carolina. (Mimeographed.)
- Burgess, Phillip and Richard Hofstadter. "The 'Student Movement': Ideology and Reality." Midwest Journal of Political Science 15 (November 1971): 687-702.
- Burke, Edmund M. "Citizen Participation Strategies." Journal of the American Institute of Planners 34 (September 1968): 287-293.
- "Citizen Involvement Network." 1211 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., 1973. (Mimeographed.)
- Cole, Richard L. Citizen Participation and the Urban Policy Process. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, D.C. Health and Company, 1974.
- Dallas Citizens. Goals for Dallas. Dallas: Goals for Dallas, August 1969.
- Fals-Borda, Orlando. Subversion and Social Change in Columbia. Translated by Jacqueline D. Skiles. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969
- Freeman, Jo. "The Origins of the Women's Liberation Movement." American Journal of Sociology 78 (January 1973): 30-49.

- Friedman, Samuel R. "Perspectives on the American Student Movement." Social Problems 20 (Winter 1973): 283-299.
- Gateways. "Annual Report." Greensboro, North Carolina, 1974. (Mimeographed.)
- Gateways. "Guide for Task Force Members." Greensboro, North Carolina, January 1975. (Mimeographed.)
- Gateways. "Planning Outline 1977-78." Greensboro, North Carolina. (Mimeographed.)
- Goals for Americans: The Report of the President's Commission on National Goals. Washington, D.C.: Prentice-Hall, A Spectrum Book, March 1962.
- Goals Foundation Council. Framework for the Future. Vol. 1: Position Papers By Professionals in Ten Areas of Concern. New Orleans, Louisiana: Goals Foundation Council, 1971.
- Goals Foundation Council. Framework for the Future. Vol. 11: Reports on Ten Areas of Concern by Citizen Task Forces. New Orleans, Louisiana: Goals Foundation Council, 1971.
- Goldmark, Peter C. "The New Rural Society." Lecture presented to Seminars in Modern Journalism at Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut. 1972.
- Greensboro/Guilford County Gateways. "Community Self-Assessment for Citizen Involvement Network." Greensboro, North Carolina, 1 September 1975. (Mimeographed.)
- Henderson, Hazel. "Information and the New Movement for Citizen Participation." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 412 (March 1974): 34-43.
- Jones, Richard J. "Gateways presents a report on the current position of Greensboro and Guilford County in the area of Health." A report for the Gateways Committee, Greensboro, North Carolina. (Mimeographed.)
- Kendrick, Frank et al. Strategies for Political Participation. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Winthrop Publishers, Inc. 1974.
- Kendrick, Frank J. "Citizen Participation in Urban Planning: The Goals Program." Akron, Ohio, November 1977. (Mimeographed.)

- Kitzmilller, William Michael and Ottinger, Richard. Citizen Action Vital Force for Change. Washington, D.C.: Center for A Voluntary Society, 1971.
- Lind, Alden. "The Future of Citizen Involvement." The Futurist 9 (December 1975): 316-328.
- McAdoo, Judy. "Gateways Means You." Greensboro Junior League News 34 (February 1974): 11.
- Morison, Samuel Eliot and Commanger, Henry Steele. The Growth of the American Republic. Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Morse, Senator Wayne, and Nader, Ralph, and Vanocur, Sander. "Public Information in a Democracy." North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina. Symposium, Spring 1967.
- Newman, Fred. Education for Citizen Action; Challenge for Secondary Curriculum. Berkeley, California: McCulchan Publishing Co., 1975.
- Reynolds, Cedric, and Cone, Elizabeth W., eds. Gateways 1974 Report to the People. Greensboro, North Carolina: September 1974.
- Sarason, Seymour B. The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publisher, 1976.
- Scherer, James. Meeting for Gateways Reorganization, Greensboro, North Carolina. Quote, 9 December 1976.
- Stewart, William H. Citizen Participation in Public Administration. Birmingham, Alabama: Birmingham Publishing Company, 1976.
- Toffler, Alvin. "What is Anticipatory Democracy?" The Futurist 9 (October 1975): 224-229.
- U.S. Congressional Research Service. Library of Congress. Citizen Futures Organization: Group Profiles, by Keith Alan Bea and Cynthia Elnur Huston. 76-260SP (Washington, D.C., 28 December 1976).
- Watson, J. Allen. "The Greensboro Plan." Consultant Report to the Greensboro Junior League, Greensboro, N.C., 9 April 1973. (Mimeographed.)

APPENDIX A

STEERING COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN

Judy McAdoo (Mrs. J. Brantley, Jr.) (JL)

David A. Atwood (UW)

Jane Brabham (Mrs. Vance W., III) (JL)

Rose Chamblee (Mrs. H. Milton, III) (JL)

Louis S. Fields (City)

Stanley Frank (CC)

Dr. Richard M. Furr (Consultant)

Peggy Lambeth (Mrs. David T.) (JL)

Ann Lineweaver (Mrs. Sidney) (UW)

Clifford B. Lowery (UNC-G)

Holly Lucas (Mrs. John S.) (UW)

Dr. James Noel (NCCEH)

John B. Parramore, Jr. (CC)

Charles F. Price (County)

Richard C. Routh (CC)

Thomas Routh (CC)

Vincent Rue (Consultant)

James F. Scherer (UW)

Rex H. Todd (County)

Dr. James Allen Watson (Consultant)

Donald G. Weaver (City)

APPENDIX B

POSITION PAPER WRITERS

GOVERNMENT

Dr. James Svara

CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Shirley T. Frye (Mrs. Henry)

TRANSPORTATION

Dr. Arthur Saltzman

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Charles R. Hayes

HOUSING

George E. Carr, Jr.

ECONOMY

Dr. David Shelton

SERVICES TO THE FAMILY AND THE INDIVIDUAL

James F. Scherer

HEALTH SERVICES

Richard J. Jones (Coordinator)

SECONDARY AND ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

Dr. Joseph Bryson

CONTINUING EDUCATION

Richard Benton

HIGHER EDUCATION

David Alexander

LEISURE: CULTURE

James C. Newlin

LEISURE: RECREATION

Grant Britt

APPENDIX C

GATEWAYS DAY DISCUSSION LEADERS

Cynthia Doyle (Mrs. Owen)

Zoe Barbee (Mrs. Lewis)

Dr. Alice Kidder (Mrs. David E.)

Dr. Ernest Lumsden, Jr.

Ian C. MacBryde (Planning Day)

Dave C. Wright, Jr.

Charles G. Powell, Jr.

The Reverend Richard Rhyne

Richard J. Jones

John W. Red, Jr.

Jean Eason (Mrs. Robert G.)

Dr. Robert H. Shennum

William D. Snider

Dr. Roy D. Moore

APPENDIX D

REVIEW BOARD

CHAIRMAN

George E. Norman, Jr.

Steve Abee
Michael Atkinson
The Reverend W. O. Bigham
Perry J. Brown
Kenneth V. Brugh, Jr.
W. L. Buchanan
The Reverend Howard Chubbs
Robert A. Clendenin
R. Cameron Cooke
Lemuel H. Cox
John A. Crawford
Katie Dorsett (Mrs. Warren G.)
Joe L. Dudley
Dr. Lois V. Edinger
Harper Jack Elam, III
W. G. Goldsborough
Albert S. Lineberry, Jr.
R. N. Linville
Ann Lineweaver (Mrs. F.B.)
Dr. Frances W. Logan
Dr. Theodore Mahaffey
Nan McCann (Mrs. Jerry C.)
Carolyn McGee (Mrs. William)
E. S. (Jim) Melvin
Dr. Sarah T. Morrow
Dr. Isaac H. Miller, Jr.
Thomas Z. Osborne
William C. Parket, Jr.
Herbert Reese
Dr. Martha Sharpless
Mrs. Jo Ann Scoggin

Robert G. Shaw
William D. Snider
Irvin R. Squires
Louis C. Stephens, Jr.
Kay Stern (Mrs. Sidney J.)
Mrs. Evelyn S. Tyler
John T. Warmath, Jr.
Kenneth C. Wible
Rufus White
Dr. Howard C. Wilkinson

APPENDIX E

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN

Anne Wagg (Mrs. Thomas E., III)

Kate Cloninger (Mrs. Charles W., Jr.)

T. Clyde Collins, Jr.

Betty Cone (Mrs. Benjamin, Jr.)

Louis S. Fields

Dr. Richard M. Furr

J. Orville Garrett

Anne Jones (Mrs. H. Eckess, Jr.)

Walter W. King, Jr.

Peggy Lambeth (Mrs. David T.)

Clifford B. Lowery

Holly Lucas (Mrs. John S.)

Ian C. MacBryde

Judy McAdoo (Mrs. J. Brantley, Jr.)

Charles E. Melvin, Jr.

Victory M. Nussbaum, Jr.

John B. Parramore, Jr.

Charles F. Price

Thomas S. Routh

Dr. Edward Rudow

Vince Rue

James F. Scherer

Tommy Lou Smith (Mrs. Herman)

John R. Taylor, Jr.

Rex H. Todd

Dr. James Walker

Joe Walker, Jr.

Dr. James A. Watson

Donald G. Weaver

Albert S. Webb

John V. Witherspoon

Dean Naomi Wynn

APPENDIX F

TASK FORCE LEADERS 1974

CHAIRMEN

GOVERNMENT

Charles E. Melvin, Jr.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

TRANSPORTATION

Kate B. Cloninger (Mrs. Charles W. Jr.)

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Ian C. MacBryde

HOUSING

John R. Taylor, Jr.

ECONOMY

Dr. James Walker

SERVICES TO THE FAMILY AND THE INDIVIDUAL

T. Clyde Collins, Jr.

HEALTH SERVICES

Dean Naomi Wynn

SECONDARY AND ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

Anne Jones (Mrs. H. Eckess, Jr.)

CONTINUING EDUCATION

J. Orville Garrett

HIGHER EDUCATION

Tommy Lou Smith (Mrs. Herman)

LEISURE: CULTURE

Clifford B. Lowery

LEISURE: RECREATION

Joe Walker, Jr.

ASSISTANT CHAIRMEN

Musette Steck (Mrs. Fred)

Dixie Tennille (Mrs. Ben F.)

Bettie Dixon (Mrs. Sewell H., Jr.)

Lynda Clifford (Mrs. Locke T.)

Mrs. Delores D. Page

Judy Murphy (Mrs. George R.)

Barbara Retenback (Mrs. T.M.)

Carroll Sitton (Mrs. Larry B.)

Margie Furr (Mrs. Richard M.)

Syvie Cloninger (Mrs. Kenneth L.)

Ramona Presson (Mrs. Thomas R.)

APPENDIX G

CITIZENS' DAY - EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Thank you for attending Citizens' Day. Your reactions are needed to help evaluate this Citizens' Day and to provide guidelines for future events of this type. We ask you to take the time now to complete this questionnaire. Your frank comments will be appreciated. Please feel free to check as many answers as you think apply.

1. How did you learn about Citizens' Day?
 Radio & TV _____
 Newspapers _____
 Friend or Personal Contact _____
 Citizens' Day Brochure _____
 Other _____
2. How did you feel about Citizens' Day before coming today?
 Enthusiastic _____
 Optimistic _____
 Interested _____
 Hopeful of solving a particular problem _____
 Other _____
 Curious _____
 Doubtful _____
 Opposed to the idea _____
3. What do you now think about Citizens' Day?
 It was:
 A good beginning _____
 Productive _____
 Educational _____
 Depends on what comes later _____
 Other _____
 Confusing _____
 Unproductive _____
 Too large a task for one day _____
4. What do you understand was the purpose of the day?
 Identify problems _____
 Set goals _____
 Find solutions _____
 Other _____
5. What helped prepare you best for your group discussion?
 Radio & TV _____
 Newspapers _____
 Registration material _____
 Speakers _____
 Position papers _____
 Discussions with friends _____
 Citizens' Day Brochure _____
 Other _____
6. Was a good cross section of the community represented in your group?
 Yes _____ No _____ If no, what group was missing? _____
7. Did you have an opportunity to express your ideas and opinions?
 Yes _____ No _____ If no, why not? _____
8. Do you feel you were listened to? Yes _____ No _____
 If no, why not? _____

9. Did your group discuss problems you thought were most important?
 Yes _____ No _____ If no, why not? Ran out of time _____
 Problem wasn't covered on list of problems _____
 Discussion was stopped by chairman or another person _____
 Other _____
10. If there are other community problems you think should be discussed,
 please state. _____

11. What do you think are the three most important objectives set by
 your group?
 1. _____
 2. _____
 3. _____
12. Would you come to another Citizens' Day in the future?
 Yes _____ No _____ If no, why not? _____
13. What do you expect to happen after Citizens' Day?
 Many goals will be reached _____
 Citizens will get involved in working toward the objectives _____
 Community plans will reflect more the needs of the citizens _____
 Some goals may be reached _____
 Some goals will be disregarded _____
 Citizens will leave it up to the community leaders to work on the
 goals _____
 Nothing will really happen _____
 Other _____
14. Are you willing to get involved with a group to help carry out goals
 set by this Citizens' Day?
 Yes _____ No _____
 If yes, please give your name, address, and phone number

15. What is your age group?
 Under 22 _____ 41 - 65 _____
 22 - 40 _____ Over 65 _____
16. Are you male? _____ female? _____
17. If you live in the county, what community do you live in?

18. Do you feel the City/County funds are well spent in co-sponsoring the Citizens' Day? _____.
19. Please mark an X in the area of the city or county in which you live.
20. We welcome any further comments.

APPENDIX H

AREAS OF DISCUSSION - CITIZENS' DAY 1977

Criminal Justice	Barbara Sarudy 206 Fisher Park Cir (01)	273-2382 378-9109 (Office)
Children and Youth Needs	Lynn Black 1918 Lafayette Ave (08)	379-9726
Senior Citizens	Joe Mullin 1209 Hammel Rd (08)	272-1080 373-0445 (Office)
Family Services	Frances Logan 1421 Wayside Dr (05)	375-5785 379-7894 (Office)
Growth vs. No Growth	Bill Opdyke 5302 E Rockingham Rd (07)	292-1792 697-4002 (Office)
Secondary and Elementary Education	Bonnie McAllister 2109 Medford Ln	379-8383
Adult Education	Harold J. Fegan 5502 Hidden Valley Rd (07)	454-2813 292-1101 (Office)
Arts	Sam Hummel 1614 Liberty Dr (08)	288-7237 373-1711 (Office)
Housing	George Carr 1810 Huntington Rd (08)	275-5539 273-0568 (Office)
Recreation	James Wright 3604-A Lynhaven Dr (06)	855-6185 379-7676 (Office)
Energy	Jon Wimbish 1404 Bear Hollow Rd (10)	855-3086 379-6246 (Office)

APPENDIX I

GREENSBORO/GUILFORD COUNTY GATEWAYS, INC.

THE PURPOSE OF GATEWAYS IS:

To further facilitate communications between citizens, agencies, organizations and government by:

1. Providing a forum (Citizens' Day) at least every two years for assessment and discussion, which would identify goals for the community. 1*
2. Pursuing those goals identified, directing each to the appropriate agency or agencies, requesting responses. 2*
3. Establishing a Citizens Advisory Council which is representative of a cross section of the City and County, is concerned with issues that have area-wide interest, and whose function shall be the policy direction and management of Gateways, and which shall be further sub-divided into four functional areas:
 - A. Administrative
 - B. Citizen Involvement
 - C. Mediating
 - D. Planning

STRUCTURE

CITIZENS ADVISORY COUNCIL

*Administrative
Committee

*Citizen Involvement
Committee

*Mediating
Committee

*Planning
Committee

* All members of these committees serve on the Citizens Advisory Council. Five members representing the initiators of Gateways will serve ex officio on the CAC the first year for the purpose of continuity.

OFFICERS:

Chairman of Citizens Advisory Council
 Vice-Chairman
 Treasurer
 Recording Secretary

STAFF:

Coordinator of Gateways
 Part-time Secretary

CITIZENS ADVISORY COUNCIL

The CAC is responsible for all policy directions of Gateways, and shall conduct its business in accordance with the bylaws of the corporation.

The CAC shall receive the goals immediately after the Citizens' Day, make any consolidation required, determine appropriate agency or agencies to receive the goals, and send letters requesting responses. 2*

Its Membership:

12	Members of present structure to form Administrative Committee
3	Members of Mediating Committee
24	Neighborhood Representatives
5	Members (ex officio) representing initiators of Gateways
<u>1</u>	Member, representing the Greensboro Youth Council
45	Total Members

See PROCEDURE FOR INITIATING THE NEW STRUCTURE, Page 4

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

Its Purpose:

1. To provide public information: public relations - reporting to the community the overall operations of GATEWAYS in conjunction with its committees.
2. To provide financial planning: budget, funding sources, grantsmanship.

Its membership: (12 members)

Initially, these members are drawn from the present Gateways Review Board and Assessments Committee.

CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT COMMITTEE

Its Purpose:

1. To plan the forums (Citizens' Days).
2. To work with the Coordinator in the establishment of a citizens' resource file whereby citizens are listed according to areas of interest and from which task forces or study groups could be formed upon request. 3*
3. To facilitate the development of the concept of citizen involvement through determining citizen opinion on issues by:
 - a. attending the meetings of existing neighborhood groups
 - b. calling ad hoc neighborhood meetings to obtain such information
 - c. providing through the office of the coordinator an appropriate referral service, working in conjunction with community agencies and institutions
 - d. employing other appropriate procedures
4. To assess needs, discuss priorities between forums and prepare suggestions for yearly budget planning at City and County levels.
5. To consider issues raised in the community when compatible with the GATEWAYS purpose.
6. To determine strategies for goals not implemented by agencies or institutions which could be:
 - a. educating the community
 - b. advocacy
 - c. lobbying
 forming ad hoc task forces to devise goals solutions

Its membership: (24 members)

To obtain broad cross-sectional community representation on the Citizens Involvement Committee the City and County will be divided into four quadrants. Three City residents and three County residents from each quadrant will serve on the CIC. One candidate from each quadrant will be slated by the present nominating committee to work with the Administrative Committee in steering the program in its initial stage. Two additional candidates from each quadrant will be appointed by the steering group from nominations which may be submitted in the following manner:

1. A candidate may nominate himself.
2. Any citizen may nominate a candidate.
3. Existing neighborhood organizations will be encouraged to nominate qualified candidates.

MEDIATING COMMITTEE

Its Purpose:

To facilitate communications between GATEWAYS participants and between the participants and institutions when implementation of goals is blocked due to the inability of the parties to come to terms.

To facilitate communications, if deemed necessary, when the Citizens Involvement Committee is considering issues raised in the community.

Any GATEWAYS participant may request that the mediating committee intervene to facilitate communications.

Its membership: (3 members)

Persons who have professional skills and expertise. They will be selected jointly by the Administrative and Citizen Involvement Committee.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Its Purpose:

Planning future directions of the program, ongoing evaluation, coordination of plans for Citizens' Day.

Its membership:

7 to 10 members drawn from 3 committees and including the Youth Council representative.

PROCEDURE FOR INITIATING THE NEW STRUCTURE

Initially a twenty-member Steering Committee will be formed. Twelve of these people will be slated by the present nominating committee to form the Administrative Committee and will come from the present Review Board or Assessments Committee. In slating, careful consideration will be given to representing the four quadrants which are the basis for citizen participation in GATEWAYS. The other eight people, also slated by the present nominating committee, will come from the four quadrants of the City and County and will eventually form the nucleus of the CIC. The nominating committee will name a chairman and a treasurer of this steering group.

The first responsibility of the steering committee will be to invite the five ex officio members (representing the initiating bodies of GATEWAYS) and the Greensboro Youth Council representative to membership on the Citizens Advisory Council. In addition, the Steering Committee will receive nominations from the four quadrants of the City and County in order to complete formation of the CIC.

The Administrative Committee and the CIC will together name the Mediating Committee. At this point the total Citizens Advisory Council will be established.

A Nominating Committee chosen from the total CAC by the Chairman will slate officers and chairmen of the committees.

The Executive Committee, which consists of the officers and the chairmen of the committees, will appoint the Planning Committee.

GREENSBORO/GUILFORD COUNTY GATEWAYS, INC.

ADDENDUM

The following ideas were considered in further defining the responsibilities of the CAC and should be given consideration:

1. Citizens' Day - suggested format
 1. Set prioritized short-term goals in areas of concern for implementation by appropriate agency, institution - government.
 2. Include on agenda some objectives of planning units in the community and allow citizen reaction.
 3. Encourage the identification of long-term areas of concern (i.e. - energy, growth, community development). Mayor and Chairman of County Commissioners or any other established group currently working in this area would be encouraged to use GATEWAYS skills bank for additional citizen participation.
2. When Goals are sent to agency - a prepared form should be included for response:
 1. The appropriateness of the goal from their perspective.
 2. Are they dealing with it?
 3. Do they intend to deal with it?
 4. Would they like involvement from the GATEWAYS process?

3. Resource File

Resource information housed in GATEWAYS office.

1. Publicity about new plan would encourage citizens to fill out form, which could be coupon in paper.
2. Self-nomination form would include resource file information.
3. Citizens' Day evaluation form would include resource file information.