



# City Council Report

City Council Meeting: November 8, 2011

Agenda Item: 8-A

To: Mayor and City Council  
From: Maria M. Stewart, City Clerk  
Subject: Civility Agreement

## Recommended Action

Recommendation to review and discuss the information provided in this report and direct staff to prepare and return with a resolution establishing a formal City Council policy and standards to promote fair participation and dialogue for all public and community meetings.

## Executive Summary

The City Council wishes to establish a formal policy to promote civil discourse and participation during Council meetings, all board and commission meetings, and community meetings and forums in which the City participates or sponsors. The goal of this policy is not to stifle criticism of the City officials or its policies, but instead to enhance the people's right to speak by allowing all present to express their opinions without the fear of retaliation or verbal attacks.

## Background

At its meeting of July 26, 2011, the City Council directed staff to review civility policies adopted by other cities as well as the principles outlined in "The United States Conference of Mayors Civility Accord" that was adopted in January of this year at the United States Conference of Mayors, and return with a recommendation for a local policy. A copy of the Civility Accord is attached. (Exhibit A.)

## Discussion

There exists a general acknowledgement of the need to strengthen civility and tolerance in the local, State, and national political arenas and much has been written on it. The New Jersey State League of Municipalities published an article in 2009 by John C. Gillespie, Esq., related to civility in local government. The article, entitled *The Need for Civility in Local Government Dialogue*, states in part: "Rhetoric has become too vitriolic; we are losing the ability to discuss things with civility." A copy of this article is attached as Exhibit B. In this article, Mr. Gillespie defines civility as "1) Courteous behavior, politeness; 2) A courteous act or utterance; 3) The act of showing regard for others." Mr. Gillespie explores in this text the possible causes leading to the decline of civility in public forums and ways in which temperance, tolerance and respect can stop the decline and help get society back to thoughtful dialogue. Mr. Gillespie further suggests ten commandments for public civility including: Not interrupting or speaking over someone else; using a calm, reasonable tone; courtesy; no embarrassing "zingers"; exploring common ground; no personal attacks; respect for all; no ridiculing or belittling anyone; no exaggerating just to score points; and, agreeing to disagree.

In the City of Duluth, Minnesota, sponsored by the Duluth Superior Area Community Foundation, a group called "The Millennium Group," created and launched a campaign called the *Speak Your Peace: The Civility Project*, in 2003. This campaign was launched in response to the erosion of decorum in the local City Council and County Commission meetings that had deteriorated to shouting matches and personal attacks. The principles of the campaign are: Pay attention; listen; be inclusive; don't gossip; show respect; be agreeable; apologize; give constructive criticism; and, take responsibility. In addition to the City of Duluth, the cities of Truckee, California, Superior City, Wisconsin and Douglas County, Wisconsin, have adopted resolutions based on the principles of this project whose stated purpose is to urge residents to communicate in respectful and effective ways. Its literature points out that it is not a campaign to end disagreements, but rather to improve public discourse with a reminder of the basic

principles of respect. Attached as Exhibit C is a copy of the principles of the project and more information can be found at <http://www.dsaspeakyourpeace.org/about.html>

The *Institute for Local Government* based in Sacramento has in its website an essay entitled "Promoting Civility at Public Meetings: Concepts and Practice." The text defines civility as "the way people treat each other with respect – even when they disagree," and goes on to illustrate reasons for supporting and not supporting civility. The document includes suggestions for encouraging and increasing civility such as: Separating the individuals from the problem; dealing with facts; understanding the views of those in opposition; being fair and using fair processes; and, while trying to persuade others, allowing oneself to be persuaded. The article (Exhibit D) cites the pledge of civility adopted by the California Public Employee Retirement System Board which ends with the following: "Accordingly, we commit to conduct ourselves at all times with civility and courtesy to both those with whom the board interacts and to each other. We also pledge to endeavor to correct ourselves should our conduct fall below this standard."

In reviewing the principles committed to in the various documents, staff found some commonalities. Mainly:

- Treat everyone with respect and courtesy.
- Listen to others respectfully
- Agree to disagree and don't make it personal; discuss the issue not the person
- Keep an open mind and, if merited, allow yourself to be persuaded to change your opinion
- Acknowledge dissension as a civic right and as a tool to use to reach the best decisions
- Accept responsibility and maintain self-control

#### Implementation

If Council adopts a formal policy, staff proposes a promotional campaign over the next calendar year. The policy would require all Council-appointed board, commissions, task forces, and ad hoc committees to implement it at their respective meetings and would direct staff to use it at all community meetings and forums. The principles of the policy would be included in the cover page of meeting agendas, and all public meetings would

begin with the announcement of these principles. The policy would also be shared with private neighborhood groups who would be invited to voluntarily implement them in their meetings. It would also be shared with any other entity interested in promoting the principles such as the School District, College District, and Rent Control Board. Mention of the principles would be included in materials routinely published by the City and in mailers as appropriate. The policy would also be aired as public service announcements on CityTV.

Staff recommends that Council direct staff to prepare and return with a resolution for adoption outlining the principles selected by the City Council and proceed with an outreach campaign as proposed above, or as otherwise directed by Council. Samples of resolutions adopted by other organizations are attached as Exhibit E.


#### **Financial Impacts & Budget Actions**

Staff expects the cost of this recommendation to be minimal as notification of this policy will be printed in documents for which the expense is already budgeted. Depending on what action Council takes, staff will provide more detailed information on any additional costs when a resolution is presented to Council for adoption.

**Prepared by:** Maria M. Stewart, City Clerk

**Approved:**

**Forwarded to Council:**



Maria M. Stewart  
City Clerk



Rod Gould  
City Manager

**Attachments:**

- A: The U.S. Conference of Mayors Civility Accord
- B: The Need for Civility in Local Government Dialogue – Article
- C: Speak Your Peace: The Civility Project
- D: Institute for Local Government: Promoting Civility at Public Meetings – Concepts and Practice
- E: Sample Resolutions



**THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS  
CIVILITY ACCORD  
January 19, 2011**

On the morning of January 8, 2011, gunshots fired in one of our nation's great cities reverberated through all of America. A federal judge and a nine-year-old girl were among the six people killed that day in Tucson, and Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords, the target of the shooting rampage, was among the 14 more who were wounded. The pain inflicted on them, their families, and the entire Tucson community is shared by people across our nation.

Regardless of what the motives behind the tragedy in Tucson might have been, it occurred in an atmosphere in which public discourse is often confrontational and lacking in civility. We should use this event as a point of departure, to recommit ourselves to building a more civil society in which each person is respected and public and political discourse are aimed at the betterment of our nation and its people and not the destruction of those with whom we disagree. As President Barack Obama said in the January 12 memorial service, "only a more civil and honest public discourse can help us face up to our challenges as a nation."

We believe that because mayors are the elected leaders closest to the people, restoration of civility must begin with us. We are in a unique position to have a positive impact on behavior – individual and collective – and to lead by example. While the tragedy in Tucson is the impetus for this Accord, it represents a commitment that must live on in every mayor in our nation from this day forward.

*Through The U.S. Conference of Mayors, we, the mayors of America's cities, in order to restore civility to our communities and through them to our nation, pledge our commitment to the following principles for civility:*

- Respect the right of all Americans to hold different opinions;
- Avoid rhetoric intended to humiliate, de-legitimize, or question the patriotism of those whose opinions are different from ours;
- Strive to understand differing perspectives;
- Choose words carefully;
- Speak truthfully without accusation, and avoid distortion;
- Speak out against violence, prejudice, and incivility in all of their forms, whenever and wherever they occur.

We further pledge to exhibit and encourage the kinds of personal qualities that are emblematic of a civil society: gratitude, humility, openness, passion for service to others, propriety, kindness, caring, faith, sense of duty, and a commitment to doing what is right.

The immediate need is to help our citizens through this difficult period. Our long term responsibility is to work with them to build that civil society.

222 West State Street  
Trenton, NJ 08608  
(609) 695-3481  
Fax: (609) 695-0151



William G. Dressel Jr.  
Executive Director  
Michael J. Darcy, CAE  
Asst. Executive Director

## **THE NEED FOR CIVILITY IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT DIALOGUE**

**By: John C. Gillespie, Esquire  
Parker McCay P.A.  
Co-Chairman, Municipal & Governmental Relations Department**

The fundamental premise for this article is that, as local public officials, should both show and demand public civility, public tolerance, and civil discourse at this time of increasing political polarization at the national level and in the media. Rhetoric has become too vitriolic; we are losing the ability to discuss things with civility.

Last year's Presidential campaign is proof enough that we are reaching dangerous levels. The President of the United States is called a "cheap thug and a killer", and is morphed into Hitler in a political ad. His opponent calls the Republican party "the worst bunch of crooks and liars". The U. S. Senator who ran for President on the Democratic ticket is a Viet Nam veteran who earned three purple hearts and a silver star; yet opposition loyalists question his patriotism because of anti-war positions he took upon his return home. Unfortunately, negative campaigning is now a fact of life.

But poisonous rhetoric is not limited to federal campaigns, or national political discourse; we find it at the local level as well. Regrettably, there is no "trickle down" effect; we are literally showered with it.

I began outlining this discussion over a year ago. My first draft proposed to simply acknowledge the existence of this condition; to confront it with thoughtful evaluation; and to promote a discussion that would hopefully cause people to conclude that our discourse should be more civil and that Council meetings should be forums for intelligent dialogue and debate; but not stages for rudeness, nasty sarcasm, or intimidation. But after another year of watching the condition deteriorate, it accomplishes little to merely suggest an outcome. We must demand that this change; and that change must begin at the local level, the level where people feel the impact of government actions most directly.

During a very well attended session at November's League convention, we asked a few questions:

1. How many of the attendees shared this concern that political civility is being eroded?
2. How many believed that politics is an honorable profession?
3. Or, should be an honorable profession?
4. How many agreed that this incivility contributes to the negative view the public has of our political system?

The almost unanimous response of the eighty or so attendees was "yes" to each question. Let the discussion, therefore, begin.

What is civility? I like these definitions:

1. "Courteous behavior, politeness"
2. "A courteous act or utterance"
3. "The act of showing regard for others"

Pretty simple stuff, isn't it? Unfortunately, we don't always witness folks actively "showing regard for others" at public meetings. The problem exists both on the dais and in the audience. Residents visiting meetings are often nastier than elected officials can ever be to one another. Yet, the audience takes its lead from the dais. When elected officials are rude to each other, the audience sees this, and feels like it has a "free pass" to act likewise. Eventually, the situation devolves into sarcasm, rudeness and even name calling.

We are a society that requires instant gratification; we decide what products to buy based on thirty second ads; we rely on sixty second news summaries to tell us all we need to know about an incident that took place over the course of hours, if not days. We want to lose ten pounds in four days; develop washboard abs in a week; and go from 0 to 60 mph in 3.5 seconds.

The late Johnny Carson said recently, while discussing contemporary TV talk shows: "Everything today seems to be sound bites. Nobody wants to hear a good conversation. It's kind of a lost art." The same holds true in political dialogue. We want to get our points across, but we assume the sound bite audience will only listen for a little while. So we resort to quick hits that will register. A quick hit is met with an equally short jab; after jabs are traded, somebody decides they need to up the ante, and throws an overhand right. The other side responds with a roundhouse left, and the fight is on. Now the audience is paying attention! And, of course, the tone has completely changed. What started out as a topic for public discussion, which requires the participants to make an argument in support of their point of view, transforms the participants into having an argument -- as in having a fight.

Temperate, thoughtful dialogue designed to find common ground on matters of public interest gives way to shrill hyperbole intended not so much to differentiate

the points of view, and distinguish the issues; but to polarize the parties interested in those issues and points of view. "Agreeing to disagree" is subverted by outright antagonism.

Tolerance for opposing views is an essential ingredient to a successful democracy. I don't have to agree with you; I should however be tolerant of your unfortunate, misguided thoughts! Voting against buying new uniforms for the youth football program does not necessarily mean "you are going to get those kids killed." Voting to approve a bond ordinance for a new municipal building to replace the one that is eighty years old and falling apart, doesn't mean "you're going to bankrupt our children's future". And voting against an emergency squad's request for a new ambulance doesn't mean "you'll have blood on your hands when someone's 9-1-1 call isn't answered in time."

The challenge for local government officials -- the ones who most closely relate to their constituents on a daily basis, at the supermarket, on the soccer fields, and at PTA meetings, is to restore civility to our political discussions, and to improve the tone of those conversations. Perhaps it is the word "political" that causes the change in attitude, volume, and tone. Perhaps if we remember that local officials are less "politicians", and more "public servants", elected to advance the community's interests, it will be easier to remember it is more important to have thoughtful, purposeful conversations, than to "get into" arguments. It is more important to enjoy dialogue with the residents in the community, than to yell at one another. And again, this goes both ways. It requires that we not only treat our elected colleagues in a more dignified fashion; it requires that we demand that of our constituents as well, particularly during the course of a public meeting. Indeed, the Chair's exercise of control over a public meeting is not an example of tyranny; it is the key ingredient to a successful dialogue. If everyone was sitting around a small table discussing community issues, there would be no yelling or personal attacks. That there is a ten foot sea of space between the speaker and the dais should not change the dynamics.

High pitched vitriolic rhetoric has a severe negative impact upon a community, and even the operation of local government. This harsh tone and preference to argue rather than discuss must give way to thoughtful dialogue. Only local public officials can change the landscape and restore the fundamental premise that it is okay "to agree to disagree" without being personally attacked for doing so.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS OF PUBLIC CIVILITY©

JOHN C. GILLESPIE, ESQUIRE  
PARKER McCAY P.A.  
CO-CHAIRMAN, MUNICIPAL &

GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS  
DEPARTMENT

1. Thou shalt not rudely interrupt a colleague midsentence; nor "speak over" a colleague while she/he is speaking.

Example: You can watch and learn from Meet the Press; but cancel any rerun of Crossfire.

2. Thou shalt not assume that shrillness of tone is a substitute for substantive dialogue.

Example: See example #1 above.

3. Thou shalt treat the members of the public with the same courtesy as you would if they were members of your body--and perhaps more importantly, require that they treat you and your colleagues the same way.

4. Thou shalt not resort to "zingers" designed solely to embarrass your target  
(unless, of course, it is the Township Planner--then it's always okay).

5. Thou shalt, where possible, explore areas of common ground where legitimate disagreements exist, in an effort to move forward on matters of public importance.

6. Thou shalt not allow legitimate critique of policy and practice to become a personal attack aimed at the person who devised the policy or implements the practice.

7. Thou shalt always recognize that your colleagues were also elected, just as you were, and deserve the same level of respect for having run and won.

Example: Remember that the members of the public who elected the colleague that you don't like, may be the same folks who send you packing next time around.

8. Thou shalt not ridicule or belittle a colleague, or a member of the public, simply because he or she disagrees with you on an issue.

Example: Believing that the words "under God" belong in the Pledge of Allegiance doesn't make someone a "theocratic moron". Conversely, someone who articulates a position urging that the words "under God" should be excluded from the Pledge of Allegiance, doesn't make that person a "heathen".

9. Thou shalt not pretend something is much more important than it really is, simply to score points with an audience.

10. Thou shalt always remember that it is okay to agree to disagree, and that reasonable people can indeed disagree reasonably.

222 West State Street  
Trenton, NJ 08608  
(609) 695-3481  
Fax: (609) 695-0151



William G. Dressel Jr.  
Executive Director  
Michael J. Darcy, CAE  
Asst. Executive Director

## **THE NEED FOR CIVILITY IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT DIALOGUE**

**By: John C. Gillespie, Esquire  
Parker McCay P.A.**

**Co-Chairman, Municipal & Governmental Relations Department**

The fundamental premise for this article is that, as local public officials, should both show and demand public civility, public tolerance, and civil discourse at this time of increasing political polarization at the national level and in the media. Rhetoric has become too vitriolic; we are losing the ability to discuss things with civility.

Last year's Presidential campaign is proof enough that we are reaching dangerous levels. The President of the United States is called a "cheap

thug and a killer", and is morphed into Hitler in a political ad. His opponent calls the Republican party "the worst bunch of crooks and liars". The U. S. Senator who ran for President on the Democratic ticket is a Viet Nam veteran who earned three purple hearts and a silver star; yet opposition loyalists question his patriotism because of anti-war positions he took upon his return home. Unfortunately, negative campaigning is now a fact of life.

But poisonous rhetoric is not limited to federal campaigns, or national political discourse; we find it at the local level as well. Regrettably, there is no "trickle down" effect; we are literally showered with it.

I began outlining this discussion over a year ago. My first draft proposed to simply acknowledge the existence of this condition; to confront it with thoughtful evaluation; and to promote a discussion that would hopefully cause people to conclude that our discourse should be more civil and that Council meetings should be forums for intelligent dialogue and debate; but not stages for rudeness, nasty sarcasm, or intimidation. But after another year of watching the condition deteriorate, it accomplishes little to merely suggest an outcome. We must demand that this change; and that change must begin at the local level, the level where people feel the impact of government actions most directly.

During a very well attended session at November's League convention, we asked a few questions:

1. How many of the attendees shared this concern that political civility is being eroded?
2. How many believed that politics is an honorable profession?
3. Or, should be an honorable profession?
4. How many agreed that this incivility contributes to the negative view the public has of our political system?

The almost unanimous response of the eighty or so attendees was "yes" to each question. Let the discussion, therefore, begin.

What is civility? I like these definitions:

1. "Courteous behavior, politeness"
2. "A courteous act or utterance"
3. "The act of showing regard for others"

Pretty simple stuff, isn't it? Unfortunately, we don't always witness folks

actively "showing regard for others" at public meetings. The problem exists both on the dais and in the audience. Residents visiting meetings are often nastier than elected officials can ever be to one another. Yet, the audience takes its lead from the dais. When elected officials are rude to each other, the audience sees this, and feels like it has a "free pass" to act likewise. Eventually, the situation devolves into sarcasm, rudeness and even name calling.

We are a society that requires instant gratification; we decide what products to buy based on thirty second ads; we rely on sixty second news summaries to tell us all we need to know about an incident that took place over the course of hours, if not days. We want to lose ten pounds in four days; develop washboard abs in a week; and go from 0 to 60 mph in 3.5 seconds.

The late Johnny Carson said recently, while discussing contemporary TV talk shows: "Everything today seems to be sound bites. Nobody wants to hear a good conversation. It's kind of a lost art." The same holds true in political dialogue. We want to get our points across, but we assume the sound bite audience will only listen for a little while. So we resort to quick hits that will register. A quick hit is met with an equally short jab; after jabs are traded, somebody decides they need to up the ante, and throws an overhand right. The other side responds with a roundhouse left, and the fight is on. Now the audience is paying attention! And, of course, the tone has completely changed. What started out as a topic for public discussion, which requires the participants to make an argument in support of their point of view, transforms the participants into having an argument -- as in having a fight.

Temperate, thoughtful dialogue designed to find common ground on matters of public interest gives way to shrill hyperbole intended not so much to differentiate the points of view, and distinguish the issues; but to polarize the parties interested in those issues and points of view. "Agreeing to disagree" is subverted by outright antagonism.

Tolerance for opposing views is an essential ingredient to a successful democracy. I don't have to agree with you; I should however be tolerant of your unfortunate, misguided thoughts! Voting against buying new uniforms for the youth football program does not necessarily mean "you are going to get those kids killed." Voting to approve a bond ordinance for a new municipal building to replace the one that is eighty years old and falling apart, doesn't mean "you're going to bankrupt our children's future". And voting against an emergency squad's request for a new

ambulance doesn't mean "you'll have blood on your hands when someone's 9-1-1 call isn't answered in time."

The challenge for local government officials -- the ones who most closely relate to their constituents on a daily basis, at the supermarket, on the soccer fields, and at PTA meetings, is to restore civility to our political discussions, and to improve the tone of those conversations. Perhaps it is the word "political" that causes the change in attitude, volume, and tone. Perhaps if we remember that local officials are less "politicians", and more "public servants", elected to advance the community's interests, it will be easier to remember it is more important to have thoughtful, purposeful conversations, than to "get into" arguments. It is more important to enjoy dialogue with the residents in the community, than to yell at one another. And again, this goes both ways. It requires that we not only treat our elected colleagues in a more dignified fashion; it requires that we demand that of our constituents as well, particularly during the course of a public meeting. Indeed, the Chair's exercise of control over a public meeting is not an example of tyranny; it is the key ingredient to a successful dialogue. If everyone was sitting around a small table discussing community issues, there would be no yelling or personal attacks. That there is a ten foot sea of space between the speaker and the dais should not change the dynamics.

High pitched vitriolic rhetoric has a severe negative impact upon a community, and even the operation of local government. This harsh tone and preference to argue rather than discuss must give way to thoughtful dialogue. Only local public officials can change the landscape and restore the fundamental premise that it is okay "to agree to disagree" without being personally attacked for doing so.

#### THE TEN COMMANDMENTS OF PUBLIC CIVILITY©

JOHN C. GILLESPIE,  
ESQUIRE  
PARKER McCAY P.A.  
CO-CHAIRMAN, MUNICIPAL &  
GOVERNMENTAL  
RELATIONS DEPARTMENT

1. Thou shalt not rudely interrupt a colleague midsentence; nor "speak over" a colleague while she/he is speaking.

Example: You can watch and learn from Meet

the Press; but cancel any rerun of Crossfire.

2. Thou shalt not assume that shrillness of tone is a substitute for substantive dialogue.

Example: See example #1 above.

3. Thou shalt treat the members of the public with the same courtesy as you would if they were members of your body--and perhaps more importantly, require that they treat you and your colleagues the same way.
4. Thou shalt not resort to "zingers" designed solely to embarrass your target (unless, of course, it is the Township Planner--then it's always okay).
5. Thou shalt, where possible, explore areas of common ground where legitimate disagreements exist, in an effort to move forward on matters of public importance.
6. Thou shalt not allow legitimate critique of policy and practice to become a personal attack aimed at the person who devised the policy or implements the practice.
7. Thou shalt always recognize that your colleagues were also elected, just as you were, and deserve the same level of respect for having run and won.

Example: Remember that the members of the public who elected the colleague that you don't like, may be the same folks who send you packing next time around.

8. Thou shalt not ridicule or belittle a colleague, or a member of the

public, simply because he or she disagrees with you on an issue.

Example: Believing that the words "under God" belong in the Pledge of Allegiance doesn't make someone a "theocratic moron". Conversely, someone who articulates a position urging that the words "under God" should be excluded from the Pledge of Allegiance, doesn't make that person a "heathen".

9. Thou shalt not pretend something is much more important than it really is, simply to score points with an audience.
10. Thou shalt always remember that it is okay to agree to disagree, and that reasonable people can indeed disagree reasonably.

**NJLM  
HOME**



CONTACT US

Spreading civility around the world.



Speak Your Peace Poster

**SITUATION**

Between 2001 and 2003, city council and county commission meetings in the Duluth, Minnesota/Superior, Wisconsin region had deteriorated into shouting matches filled with personal attacks. The toxic atmosphere made decisions difficult to reach and turned residents away from the political process. Under the leadership of the

SHARE

**SEE MORE CASE STUDIES**

**WHY OUR NAME CHANGE WILL GET YOU PICKER GOING**

When rebranding a well-known energy company, the name has to say it all. [MORE](#)



How a regional bank grew deposits with a "Nice Guy" image. [MORE](#)



Consumers loved this movie trailer, leading to a banner year for Duluth's tourism industry. [MORE](#)

Duluth Superior Area Community Foundation (DSACF), a group of young leaders called the Millennium Group sought to strengthen community decision making, expand civic engagement and increase residents' interest in elected office by improving the civility of public discourse in the region.

#### STRATEGY

The DSACF's Millennium Group recognized the need for a massive public education campaign based on the nine tools of civility—pay attention, listen, be inclusive, don't gossip, show respect, be agreeable, apologize, give constructive criticism, take responsibility—in Dr. P.M. Forni's 2002 book *Choosing Civility*. Realizing the tremendous impact such a campaign could have on the community, HTK responded by making the public service campaign its pro bono effort that year.

#### EXECUTION

The target audiences included elected officials, active citizens and the general public. The name, Speak Your Peace, and positioning line "It's not what you say. It's how you say it." were created for the project. The nine rules of civility were featured in print and broadcast public service announcements, billboards, a Web site, poster, window clings, wallet cards, buttons and even a song. The campaign also included tactics such as: Millennium Group members and DSACF staff directly presenting the nine tools of civility to elected bodies, civic groups, associations and nonprofit organizations; getting the local media involved; and distributing free materials such as posters, window clings and wallet cards to anyone expressing interest.

#### RESULTS

Since 2003, nine regional bodies of government have adopted the Speak Your Peace project. In 2005, the Duluth Public School District (DPS) created a Speak Your Peace in the Classroom curriculum for middle school students based on the project. To date, more than 2,500 DPS students have completed the three-year curriculum. Speak Your Peace in the Classroom has also been made available for school districts across the country. In 2006, Nick News featured Speak Your Peace as one solution to addressing civility among politicians during a tense election season. In addition, the DSACF has shared the campaign with groups around the world. More than 10,000 educational materials have been distributed since 2003. The campaign has been translated into Spanish and requests for materials have come from as far away as Russia and Australia. In 2008, the Community Foundation Leadership Team of the Council on Foundations highlighted Speak Your Peace on its national Web site because of its relevancy in other communities.

- Our People
- Culture
- Our Roots
- The Redstone
- Careers
- Internships
- News
  
- Healthcare Case Studies
- Regional Case Studies
- Cause Marketing Studies
  
- Healthcare Clients
- Regional Clients
- Cause Marketing Clients
  
- Healthcare Marketing Blog
- Newsletter
- Healthcare Roundup
- Podcasts



**What's it all about?**

**Common Resolution**

**Tools of civility**

**Free stuff**

**SYP Accomplishments**

**Contact**

**Home**

**Speak  
your  
Peace**  
The Civility Project

## VISION STATEMENT

The best way to determine what a community wants is to listen to what its people have to say. This is a fundamental principle of democracy. Disagreements can lead to healthy debate, which brings new information and ideas to light.

When a particular issue strikes at the fundamental beliefs of a group or individual, the debate can be especially fierce. In these situations, it becomes more important than ever to practice civility.

The purpose of the Speak Your Peace Civility Project is to urge the citizens of the Duluth/Superior area to communicate in a more respectful and effective way. This is not a campaign to end disagreements. It is a campaign to improve public discourse by simply reminding ourselves of the very basic principles of respect.

By elevating our level of communication and avoiding personal attacks and general stubbornness, we can avoid unhealthy debate. This will lead to a more effective democracy, and help maintain our sense of community by increasing civic participation. We hope to reach not only elected officials and political groups but also regular people, like neighborhood organizations, church groups and even the parents on the sidelines of youth athletic contests. We are not just targeting those who are uncivil, but those who allow uncivilized behavior to happen.

Our key message is to promote nine simple tools for practicing civility, taken from P. M. Forni's book *Choosing Civility*.

**Pay Attention.** Be aware and attend to the world and the people around you.

**Listen.** Focus on others in order to better understand their points of view.

**Be Inclusive.** Welcome all groups of citizens working for the greater good of the community.

**Don't Gossip.** And don't accept when others choose to do so.

**Show Respect.** Honor other people and their opinions, especially in the midst of disagreement.

**Be Agreeable.** Look for opportunities to agree; don't contradict just to do so.


**Apologize.** Be sincere and repair damaged relationships.

**Give Constructive Criticism.** When disagreeing, stick to the issues and don't make a personal attack.

**Take Responsibility.** Don't shift responsibility and blame onto others; share disagreements publicly.

In his visit to the Duluth/Superior area in the spring of 2001, Robert Putnam, author of *Bowling Alone*, noted that the area is above the national average when it comes to 'social capital,' or civic participation by its citizens. In order to harness that passion toward useful ends, it is important, then, to communicate in a more civil, productive way.

*Speak Your Peace: The Civility Project* is a project of the Duluth Superior Area Community Foundation.



It's not what you say.  
It's how you say it.



*Everyday Ethics for Local Officials*

## **Promoting Civility at Public Meetings: Concepts and Practice**

*August, October 2003*

---

### **QUESTION**

*We are concerned about the tone of our meetings. Discussions about important community issues degenerate into personal attacks – both between elected officials and between elected officials and the public. I'd like to raise this issue, but I don't want to be accused of engaging in the same kind of personal criticism that I am lamenting in others. It seems like a no-win situation. Could you address this issue?*

### **ANSWER**

The issue you raise is one of civility. Like many of the issues addressed in this Guide, civility involves competing sets of "right" values: the value of free expression versus the value of respect for fellow participants in the democratic process. Critics have attributed the erosion of civility in society to the elevation of self expression over self-control.<sup>1</sup>

However, this is a fairly easy ethical dilemma to resolve insofar as it is possible to be both expressive and civil and therefore maximize both values. In fact, there is an argument that more people will be inclined to participate in a public deliberative process that focuses on the merits and demerits of an issue, as opposed to focusing on personal attacks.

This first piece will examine the civility issue in more conceptual terms; the second will share the more practical experiences of local officials in promoting civility at public meetings.

### **PART ONE**

#### **What Is Civility?**

Civility refers to the way people treat each other with respect – even when they disagree. Even though disagreement and confrontation play a necessary role in politics, the issue is how that disagreement is expressed. The key is to focus on the strengths and weaknesses

of proposed solutions to community problems – not to engage in personal attacks against those who favor different solutions.<sup>2</sup>

## Why Should We Care About Civility?

Scholars are concerned (and the data seem to demonstrate) that public officials' incivility to one another contributes to voter alienation and antipathy toward government.<sup>3</sup> Some believe that government's inability to deal with a broad range of problems results from the destructive way in which issues are being addressed.<sup>4</sup> For example, 60 percent of poll respondents are "very concerned" that candidates attack each other instead of discussing the issues.<sup>5</sup>

There is a "reap-what-you-sow" element to this analysis for elected officials. If public officials themselves attack their fellow officeholders, who can blame the public for: 1) believing the attacks; and 2) engaging in the same kind of attacks? Interestingly, the rules of professional conduct for one bar association recognize this dynamic by encouraging its members not to "attribute bad motives or improper conduct to other counsel," recognizing that such accusations bring the entire legal profession into disrepute.<sup>6</sup>

Thus, if personal attacks permeate the interactions of public officials, there is the significant risk that all participants will be tarred by the same brush. This phenomenon is exacerbated by media coverage that, in the words of one analysis, "stoke the fires of negativity"<sup>7</sup> by emphasizing such attacks in their coverage.

## The Case Against Civility

On the other side of the debate, researchers have theorized that, while civility is an "indispensable prerequisite to a democratic society," it can also reinforce the status quo in terms of power relationships.<sup>8</sup> One scholar, Virginia Sapiro, notes that, for much of U.S. history, women could violate the norms of civility by "simply appearing in public places or certainly, by attempting to engage in politics at all. There simply was no way for women to advance their interest through politics in a civil manner."<sup>9</sup>

Syndicated talk show host and then-presidential son Michael Reagan made a similar point when he argued that what really matters is not who is more civil, but who wins. "After all, revolutions aren't made without ruffling feathers, and revolutionaries aren't renowned for their etiquette."<sup>10</sup>

Along the same lines, political scientist Sapiro observes that "contentious acts occur when people are excluded from participating in more mainstream political processes."<sup>11</sup>

If any agency finds itself in a situation in which those with the minority view are acting increasingly contentious and uncivil, a question to ponder is whether they would have a more constructive approach if they felt their views were being listened to and taken into

account. Being perceived as a force of unity in the community as opposed to a force of division can have real political benefits as well. Put another way, constant bickering among community leaders can reflect poorly on all who engage in it.

### **Incivility as an Antidote to Arrogance?**

Sociologist Charles Flynn notes that insults directed at political leaders symbolize important democratic values as well, insofar as we live in a country where “freedom to insult one’s political opponents is an indispensable democratic privilege.”<sup>12</sup> He also notes that insults “provide a check against those in power who may be tempted to think of themselves in grandiose terms, above the rest of humanity.”<sup>13</sup>

The case for incivility also brings to mind the British Parliament, where insults are bandied about in relatively good humor. Within the rigid confines of parliamentary procedure, even the prime minister exchanges slurs and barbs with members, and is able to move things forward in the spirit of wit and open debate.

### **Promoting Civility**

Ultimately, however, the quest for civility has merit for public officials. Martin Luther King Jr.’s observations are instructive:

In a neighborhood dispute there may be stunts, rough words, and even hot insults; but when a whole people speaks to its government, the dialogue and the action must be on a level reflecting the worth of that people and the responsibility of that government.<sup>14</sup>

#### **Is it Possible to Legislate Civility?**

Legislating civility can be a tricky undertaking, as one Northern California city discovered when it considered adopting a code of conduct for council members that emphasized civility. The proposal garnered international attention and was (probably unfairly) characterized as an effort to stifle free expression (possibly because the policy discouraged the use of facial expressions to signal disapproval).<sup>15</sup>

Some agencies have had better success with codes of ethics that generally emphasize respect for those with divergent viewpoints.<sup>16</sup> The theory underlying such codes is not to create an enforcement mechanism so much as to create an opportunity to engage in discussion and identification of shared values. As political scientist Sapiro noted, “Civility is itself something that needs to be sought, deliberated and negotiated.”<sup>17</sup>

On the other hand, the Greek philosopher Aristotle believed that virtuous behavior had to be voluntary and that civility is a form of virtuous behavior.

### **An Opportunity for Self Reflection?**

At the risk of being accused of blaming the victim, it may be useful for those in communities beset by extraordinarily contentious politics to engage in some self reflection.

Could the reason be that those contributing to the contentiousness feel excluded from the decision-making process? As hard as it may seem, the “solution” to the lack of civility may be greater inclusion of those who feel disenfranchised. This presents an interesting question to ponder. Will the inclusion of those who truly care about solving the community’s problems in problem-solving processes produce better results for the community in the long run? Will those who feel excluded from the process support demagogues who will stop at nothing to force inclusion? It is undeniably risky to include those who disagree with you in the decision-making process; but perhaps it is riskier in the long run not to do so.

This also raises the question of what constitutes leadership. There is a line of thinking that the traditional autocratic and hierarchical modes of leadership are yielding to the notion of “servant-leadership,” a concept coined by management consultant Robert Greenleaf in 1970.<sup>18</sup> According to Greenleaf, “The servant leader is servant first. . . He or she is sharply different from the person who is leader first, perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material possessions.” Servant-leadership emphasizes a collaborative approach to problem-solving, which involves listening to others’ ideas as well as proposing solutions.

Frances Hesselbein of the Drucker Foundation makes a similar point when she observes that true leaders know that leadership has little to do with power. In her essay “The Power of Civility,”<sup>19</sup> Hesselbein says that civility has to do with respect for other people. She also notes that we have to demonstrate that attitude for ourselves before we can expect it of others.

King’s admonition to his listeners to set their standards of discourse high – irrespective of how others behave – is consistent with the quote from Gandhi that “you must be the change you wish to see in the world.” Moreover, as Mark Twain observed: “Few things are harder to put up with than the annoyance of a good example.”<sup>20</sup>

### **Strategies for Achieving Greater Personal Civility**

So how do we achieve more civility in public discourse? In their essay *The Meaning of Civility*,<sup>21</sup> Guy and Heidi Burgess, co-directors of the University of Colorado Conflict Research Consortium, offer these suggestions:

- Separate the people from the problem. Recognize that other thoughtful and caring people have very different views on how best to address their community's many complex problems. Focus on solutions that are most likely to be successful. Avoid resolving disputes on the basis of "us versus them" animosity and seek the relative merits of competing problem-solving strategies.
- Obtain the facts. Many public policy disputes involve factual disagreements that are amenable to resolution through some type of fact-finding process. Work together to resolve factual disagreements wherever possible. There are, of course, many cases in which factual issues can't be resolved because of irreducible uncertainties associated with the limits of scientific inquiry. When this is true, contending parties need to publicly explain the reasoning behind their differing interpretations of the factual information that is available.
- Limit interpersonal misunderstandings. Make an honest and continuing effort to understand the views and reasoning of your opponents.
- Use fair processes. Genuinely solicit and consider public input. Make decisions on the basis of substantive arguments.
- Keep trying to persuade and allow yourself to be persuaded. One crucial element of civility is the recognition by conflicting parties that it is possible they are wrong and the policies advocated by their opponents are actually better. Seriously consider the persuasive arguments made by your opponents and explain your own position.
- Another strategy suggested by Tom Terez in *Civility At Work: 20 Ways to Build a Kinder Workplace*<sup>22</sup> is to "identify the biggest redeeming quality of that person who's always driving you crazy. Keep it in mind the next time the two of you interact."

## Conclusion

A great deal more can be said on this important subject, and it would be naïve to suggest that following some of the strategies revealed by our research in this area would guarantee that others will follow your example. Regrettably, the sine qua non of ethical behavior is that it involves risks and possible personal costs. However, the potential reward for such risks is more respect for your leadership and a greater sense of public confidence in your agency.

## **PART TWO**

### **QUESTION**

*Okay, so now we understand what civility is and the role it plays. What specific strategies have local officials used to promote greater civility at their meetings?*

### **ANSWER**

We polled various local official listserves and received some helpful ideas. The strategies fall into three major categories:

1. Measures agencies can take generally to promote civility;
2. Strategies for dealing with specific controversial items or instances of incivility;  
and
3. Thoughts on gadflies.

These generally deal with civility between elected officials and the public. Techniques for promoting civility among elected officials could be considered as another category.

### **The Importance of the Presiding Official**

Many of the elected officials responded by emphasizing the role of the presiding official at meetings. Here are some of the experiences people shared:

- The City of Pleasanton, in conjunction with the Pleasanton School District, developed a “Community of Character” program. The elements are: integrity, honesty, responsibility, respect, compassion and self discipline. At the beginning of each council meeting, the mayor points to a plaque that describes our Community of Character and goes through the elements. He then goes on to say, “This forum is not a place to attack neighbors or each other. With self-discipline and respect, keep to your five minutes of time to speak.” “This has worked out very well, and our meetings have been very civil.”— Council Member Steve Brozosky, Pleasanton
- “At our council meetings, we ask folks before ‘Matters From The Audience’ (which we do at the beginning of our meetings) and public hearings not to applaud, boo or otherwise make remarks about other people’s testimony. I try to appeal to their sense of fairness by saying that we know how hard it is to get up to speak at council meetings, and out of respect for each person’s feelings, we should allow them to have their say without comment from the public. I have

found in my 11 years in office that if you ask nicely and explain it as a courtesy to others, almost everyone complies.”– Former Mayor Bev Perry, Brea

- “The presiding officer controls the emotions of the crowd a great deal. He or she sets the tone for public comments by reflecting an openness and interest in public input, and by setting ground rules for time and constructive discourse. The mood turns ugly if the public thinks: 1) the matter has already been decided; 2) the council doesn’t care about public input; or 3) the council is being impolite or inconsiderate of the public it serves.” – City Manager Kevin Northcraft, Tulare

In this regard, it is important to remember that the presiding official is the protector of the process. His or her role is to make sure that all viewpoints are heard, decision-makers have all the information they need, and the public feels its input matters to the decision.

### **Valuing Dissension Is an Important Element of Democracy**

One Bay Area community has made a point of recognizing that differing opinions are the cornerstone of the democratic process. Dana Whitson, city manager of Sausalito, writes:

- Our city council has worked very hard to embrace dissension as a civic right. Part of that tradition means that our citizens treat everyone respectfully and honor other citizens’ right to have a viewpoint that is different than their own. The mayor usually reminds citizens to be respectful, including the withholding of applause or catcalls. This nearly always works, but we have found that simple peer group pressure (citizens “shushing” those who are impolite) works wonders.
- ...Each community develops a culture around its public life. A council cannot change a culture based on incivility overnight, but its members can create a climate where trust and respect can flourish. In that type of climate, civility will grow. Unfortunately, many communities shun dissension, which is viewed as impolite and as a breakdown in the deliberative process.
- ...Because dissension has become more widely embraced as a community value [in Sausalito], our public meetings have become more inclusive, respectful and harmonious. The public regularly comments that democracy is alive and well in Sausalito, and citizens from all walks of life and economic circumstances (from the homeless to wealthy individuals) feel equally comfortable and accepted in the council chambers. As a result, lack of civility is rarely a problem for us.

Santa Cruz Council Member Ed Porter emphasizes that it is important to respect what the public is saying. He says that when elected officials give short shrift to someone’s input, it can be devastating to the speaker and can result in a hateful reaction. Part of this respect, according to many of those who responded, is making sure that the public comment periods are appropriately timed.

For example, according to former Mayor Audra Gibson of Mt. Shasta, that council's practice is to make sure the public has adequate time to be heard and allow for lengthy discussion of issues so long as everyone maintains a mutually respectful attitude.

On the respect issue, two city attorneys counsel that it is important to remain aware of body language, both positive and negative. Facing the speaker, sitting still and making eye contact all indicate that you are listening. Crossing your arms, rolling your eyes, grimacing and turning your chair away from the speaker all signal that you are not listening.

These thoughts were shared by Michael Jenkins and Michael Colantuono, each of whom have served as counsel to a number of cities and special districts.

These attorneys also noted that it is always best to treat the audience with respect and in the manner that responsible adults wish to be treated. In general, it is better to serve as an example than to be perceived as a bully or an object of ridicule. As Dwight D. Eisenhower said, "You do not lead by hitting people over the head – that's assault, not leadership."

### **Pledge of Civility**

This pledge is adapted from the Pledge of Civility adopted by the California Public Employee Retirement System Board.

- The manner in which we govern ourselves is often as important as the positions we take.
- The organization's collective decisions will be better – and truer to our mission – when differing views have had the opportunity to be fully vetted and considered.
- All those who appear before the organization's board and committees have the right to be treated with respect, courtesy and openness. We value all input.

Accordingly, we commit to conduct ourselves at all times with civility and courtesy, to both those with whom the board interacts and to each other. We also pledge to endeavor to correct ourselves, should our conduct fall below this standard.

### **Codes of Civility**

Some agencies have discussed and adopted a more specific commitment with respect to civility. For example, Professor Craig Dunn at California State University, San Diego, shares that the governing boards with which he has worked find the Pledge of Civility useful (see "Pledge of Civility," below).

Dan Hentschke, general counsel to the 34- member San Diego Water Authority, also has observed that such pledges or codes can make a difference. The authority's commitment to civil behavior was the product of a series of facilitated workshops (see "Commitment to Civil Behavior," below).

Another approach is to adopt rules of decorum. Sample rules are posted on the League of California Cities website at [www.cacities.org/samplerules](http://www.cacities.org/samplerules).

## **Dealing With Controversial Items On the Agenda**

Mayor Liz Harris of Big Bear Lake finds it useful to meet in advance with the city manager to discuss strategies for presiding over the discussion at difficult council meetings. Such meetings are an effort to anticipate the kinds of issues that are likely to be raised and what the appropriate response should be. Is the speaker raising an informational issue that staff can help clarify? Can/should an issue be separated into parts, to identify what there is reasonable consensus on and what are the points of controversy? Are there some issues that may need further work or that can be postponed if an unexpected development occurs?

Others suggest that it can be helpful for staff to meet with stakeholders on a particular agenda item to make sure that:

1. The public has all of the information that the agency has;
2. The public knows that the agency understands their concerns; and
3. Possible resolutions to the controversy can be explored.

Staff can also sometimes play a role in encouraging the public to respect the agency's elected officials. It can be useful to take breaks in discussions that get too heated. Mayor Ed Henderson of Napa reports that sometimes self-deprecating humor can defuse a tense situation at a meeting. He explains that the humor should not be at anyone's expense and that elected officials should conduct themselves with the grace and dignity befitting their office.

## **More Assertive Techniques**

One city attorney reported a situation involving the award of grants, noting that there were always more grant-seekers than funds. The recommendations on grant recipients were made by a committee of volunteers, who became the objects of verbal attacks by disappointed grant-seekers. Some volunteers resigned rather than continue to endure the lack of civility. In response, decision-makers let it be known repeatedly that such outbursts would affect their decisions on the worthiness of organizations to receive city

funds, both now and in the future. According to the city attorney, this seemed to cause the uncivil behavior to simmer down.

City attorneys Jenkins and Colantuono note that disruptive people can be ejected from meetings if necessary. They recommend establishing a record that the disruptive people were given ample warnings and opportunities to leave or reform their behavior voluntarily. Calling in the sergeant-of-arms should be a last resort.

## Reaping What You Sow

Tulare City Manager Kevin Northcraft believes that the way in which council members treat each other makes a difference. He observes, "The civility provided in the council chambers by staff and council helps set the tone. We do annual team building for both groups to make sure that disagreements on issues don't get personal. The staff always formally addresses council members as 'Mr./Mrs. Mayor and Council,' uses their own titles and last names at meetings and avoids interrupting the council during their discussions. Our council is respectful to each other, the public and the staff and avoids negative comments about any of them."

Others suggest that council members abide by similar time limits for comments set for the public, keeping their remarks on a given matter brief and limited to the merits of the issues – not the personalities involved. It can be frustrating for the public to be told to keep their remarks brief and to the point, when it appears that council members are not endeavoring to do the same.

## On Gadflies

Virtually every community has them: individuals who show up at every meeting to voice their complaints, often repetitiously and sometimes with a tenuous grip on reality and the facts. No one responding to our query had a magic solution to the problem that these individuals' contributions to public meetings create, often by crowding out others who have more specific and constructive reasons for wanting to share their views with the council.

Rich Holmer, city manager of Riverbank, however, shared a chapter from a book he is writing, called City [Silly] Hall. The chapter is on gadflies. One particularly poignant account is of Jake, a longtime community resident who ultimately fell on hard times. Here's an excerpt:

*As for Jake, we saw less and less of him [over the years]. His attendance at council and historical society meetings became less frequent. He looked withered and thinner, many times un-shaven, and wearing the same wool shirt. The chief had told me his officers had rousted him on more than one occasion for sleeping in the parks or in his truck.*

*It was a crisp December night and I had just exited early from a transit tax meeting. ... I began the 10-mile drive home [and]... Starbucks... beckoned to me.... As the door closed behind me, I was taken aback to see Jake... sitting at a table, newspapers covering its top, and a large cup of coffee sitting precariously at its edge. He looked up and our eyes met. I walked over and gave him an obligatory handshake. We exchanged small talk and he mentioned that the police chief should let people sleep in their automobiles. I said it was good seeing him. I excused myself to purchase coffee and... started to pay the cashier when Jake rushed over and said he wanted to buy the coffee. I protested; here was a homeless person buying me a cup of coffee. It didn't feel right... but I stepped aside and said, "Thank you, Jake." ... When I turned around, he was gone.*

*As I gazed out at the clear night sky, I remembered the second meaning of a gadfly: "A person who rouses you from complacency." ... I knew I had been presented a precious gift that evening.*

Gadflies undoubtedly have many different motivations. One theory is that there is a sense of personal importance and belonging that goes with their regular participation in public meetings. Another is that they truly believe that there are wrongs that need to be righted – and, of course, sometimes the gadflies are right.

### Online Resources

The Institute for Local Government website has a section to assist local agencies in learning some of the ins and outs of participating in the process as it relates to land use matters. The site explains the land use decision-making process (including a glossary of terms) and includes a "public hearing checklist" to assist members of the public in preparing for public hearings. Visit [www.ca-ilg.org/publicparticipation](http://www.ca-ilg.org/publicparticipation).

The bottom line is that gadflies are an intrinsic aspect of democracy, and there really is no "solution" to gadflies except to try to understand what motivates them and appreciate the underlying democratic principle they represent. The worst strategy, of course, is to allow yourself to respond in kind to the type of angry, personal attacks gadflies are known to make. In addition to having your meetings sinking to the lowest common denominator, responding in kind also hands control over your behavior to others.

### More on Public Comment and Participation

Some governing bodies have a suggested time limit for public comment, noting that it is not a reflection of a lack of interest by the elected officials but a matter of mutual respect among all speakers, to make sure their key points are heard.

Coaching the public on effective techniques for participating in public hearings may be helpful. It is possible that some members of the community learned to try to persuade others by force of emotion and conviction (and possibly intimidation) rather than reason.

### **Commitment to Civil Behavior**

To maintain a cohesive, productive working environment, the members of the San Diego County Water Authority Board of Directors have committed to:

1. Support the authority's mission;
2. Bring authority-related concerns, issues and conflicts to the authority board for discussion;
3. Offer alternative solutions when addressing a problem or issue;
4. Show respect to each other as appointed representatives of their member agencies;
5. Promote civility during board meetings and tolerate nothing less;
6. Maintain the confidentiality of material discussed during closed board meeting sessions. Similarly, do not disclose the content or substance of confidential or privileged communications relating to authority business; and
7. Limit the length of comments during board meetings to three minutes per director per item and do not repeat points that already have been stated by other directors.

---

This piece originally ran in *Western City Magazine* and is a service of the Institute for Local Government (ILG) Ethics Project, which offers resources on public service ethics for local officials. For more information, visit [www.ca-ilg.org/trust](http://www.ca-ilg.org/trust).

---

### **Endnotes:**

<sup>1</sup> Stephen L. Carter, "Just Be Nice," *Yale Alumni Magazine* (May 1998) (with attribution to James Q. Wilson).

<sup>2</sup> Guy and Heidi Burgess, *The Meaning of Civility*, Conflict Research Consortium at [www.colorado.edu/conflict/civility.htm](http://www.colorado.edu/conflict/civility.htm).

<sup>3</sup> Carter, *Civility: Manners, Morals and the Etiquette of Democracy* (1998), at 9.

<sup>4</sup> Burgess, *The Meaning of Civility*.

<sup>5</sup> Project on Campaign Conduct, *Poll Shows Voters Want Greater Civility, Ethics Behavior in Campaigns; Cynicism and Distrust of Politicians Remain High* at [www.campaignconduct.org](http://www.campaignconduct.org).

<sup>6</sup> Maryland State Bar Association Code of Civility, available at [www.msba.org/departments/commpubl/publications/code.htm](http://www.msba.org/departments/commpubl/publications/code.htm).

<sup>7</sup> The Harwood Group, *Money Politics: People Change the Equation* at <http://democracyplace.soundprint.org/polls3.html>.

<sup>8</sup> John Kasson, "Rudeness and Civility," 1990, discussed in a paper called "*Considering Political Civility Historically: A Case Study of the United States*," delivered by Virginia Sapiro at the annual meeting of the International Society for Political Psychology in 1999, at 6-7.

<sup>9</sup> Virginia Sapiro, "*Considering Political Civility Historically: A Case Study of the United States*" (1999), at 16.

<sup>10</sup> Michael Reagan, "Reagan: 'Bye to the GOP,'" *USA Today*, April 17, 1997, at 15A, and discussed in Carter, *Civility*, at 22.

<sup>11</sup> Sapiro, "*Considering Political Civility*," at 13-14.

<sup>12</sup> Charles P. Flynn, *Insult and Society: Patterns of Comparative Interaction* (1977), at 101, 103, 15A, and discussed in Carter, *Civility*, at 22-23.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

<sup>14</sup> Martin Luther King Jr., John Lewis, James Farmer and other civil rights leaders, in the purpose for the *March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom*, August 28, 1963. See Civic Renewal Movement website at [www.cpn.org/crm/essays/declaration.html](http://www.cpn.org/crm/essays/declaration.html).

<sup>15</sup> "Rude Looks: Face-off in Palo Alto," *The Cincinnati Enquirer*, April 18, 2003 (editorial), available at [www.enquirer.com/editions/2003/04/18/editorial\\_memo18ray.html](http://www.enquirer.com/editions/2003/04/18/editorial_memo18ray.html) (characterizing the attempt as "silly").

<sup>16</sup> For more information on codes of ethics and sample codes of ethics, see [www.ca-ilg.org/trust](http://www.ca-ilg.org/trust).

<sup>17</sup> Sapiro, *Considering Political Civility*, at 18.

<sup>18</sup> See generally The Greenleaf Center for Servant-Leadership at [www.greenleaf.org](http://www.greenleaf.org).

<sup>19</sup> Frances Hesselbein, "The Power of Civility," *Leader to Leader* (Summer 1997), at 6-8, available at the Leader to Leader Institute website: <http://leadertoleader.org>.

<sup>20</sup> Mark Twain, *Pudd'nhead Wilson* (1893).

<sup>21</sup> Burgess, *The Meaning of Civility*.

<sup>22</sup> [www.betterworkplacenow.com/civilityart.html](http://www.betterworkplacenow.com/civilityart.html).

03-0638R

RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE NINE RULES OF CIVILITY.

BY COUNCILOR NESS:

WHEREAS, the residents of the city of Duluth place a high value on respect and civility in their lives and they understand that these characteristics are essential to any healthy community; and

WHEREAS, the Duluth City Council supports opportunities for civil discourse and discussion in the community and at City Hall; and

WHEREAS, the city council sometimes addresses controversial issues about which people often feel passionately, which at times leads to uncivil behavior; and

WHEREAS, an atmosphere of incivility and disrespect can have a damaging effect on the proceedings, on the quality of debate, and on the practice of democracy itself;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Duluth City Council recognizes nine tools of civility that will provide increased opportunities for civil discourse in order to find positive resolutions to the issues that face our city. These tools include:

- (a) Pay attention;
- (b) Listen;
- (c) Be inclusive;
- (d) Do not gossip;
- (e) Show respect;
- (f) Be agreeable;
- (g) Apologize;
- (h) Give constructive criticism;
- (i) Take responsibility.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Duluth City Council shall promote the use and adherence of these tools in conducting the business of the council.

Resolution 03-0638 was unanimously adopted.

Approved August 25, 2003

GARY L. DOTY, Mayor

**WATERFORD CITY COUNCIL  
RESOLUTION 2011-10**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WATERFORD  
SUPPORTING THE CHOOSE CIVILITY INITIATIVE**

**WHEREAS**, civility is a core value of a well functioning community and one of its defining components; and,

**WHEREAS**, the civility level in a community underscores its general health and wellness and quality of life depends in great part on how community members treat each other; and,

**WHEREAS**, concern for the common good and well-being of all citizens is one of the highest virtues of American democracy; and,

**WHEREAS**, two-thirds of the public believe that American society is uncivil; and seventy-two percent of Americans think the problem has gotten worse in recent years; and,

**WHEREAS**, the American people strongly believe that every citizen is responsible for improving such behavior; and,

**WHEREAS**, in collaboration with organizations throughout the community the Stanislaus County Office of Education is implementing the "Choose Civility" campaign to promote civil behavior.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the City of Waterford recognizes and supports the "Choose Civility" initiative and encourages others to participate in this campaign through activities that demonstrate to the public the importance of civility.

The foregoing Resolution was passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Waterford, County of Stanislaus, State of California, at a regular meeting thereof held on the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of February 2011, by the following vote:

**AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSENT:  
ABSTAIN:**

**City of Waterford,**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Charlie Goeken, Mayor**

**ATTEST:**

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Lori Martin, CMC, City Clerk**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Corbett J. Browning  
City Attorney**

**RESOLUTION R03-12467**

**RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY COUNCILOR NORBIE ACCEPTING  
THE NINE TOOLS OF CIVILITY.**

**WHEREAS**, the residents of the City of Superior place a high value on respect and civility in their lives and they understand that these characteristics are essential to any healthy community; and

**WHEREAS**, the Superior City Council supports opportunities for civil discourse and discussion in the community and in the Government Center; and

**WHEREAS**, the Superior City Council addresses sometimes controversial issues about which people often feel passionately B which at times leads to uncivil behavior; and

**WHEREAS**, an atmosphere of incivility and disrespect can have a damaging effect on the proceedings, on the quality of debate, and on the practice of democracy itself.

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SUPERIOR, WISCONSIN**, that the Superior City Council recognizes nine tools of civility that will provide increased opportunities for civil discourse in order to find positive resolutions to the issues that face our city. These tools include:

1. Pay attention.
2. Listen.
3. Be inclusive.
4. Don=t gossip.
5. Show respect.
6. Be agreeable.
7. Apologize.
8. Give constructive criticism.
9. Take responsibility.
- \*10. Tell the truth (\*Amended at the 9/2/03 Council meeting)

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Superior City Council shall promote the use and adherence of these tools in conducting the business of the Council.

Passed and adopted this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of September, 2003.

Approved this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of September, 2003.

---

Mayor Dave Ross

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk Margaret Ciccone