

CREATING ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES

WINTER 2001 NO. 49

IDEAS YOU CAN USE

The role of leadership in a successful development process

The summer 2000 newsletter informed readers about a formula for success: $ED = (A \times V \times P \times R)$. This is an expanded version of the *Harvard Change Model* published in the *Harvard Business Review* some years back. This essay will discuss the role of leadership in the implementation of this model.

Leaders are strongest when they bring positive energy to a group they lead. *A* stands for the attitudes of leaders and group members who are working in an organization. The ideal situation is for leaders to be positive people who have a set of values that their group identifies with and reinforces. County and city elected officials, as leaders, should be committed to a progressive agenda that benefits all in their communities. They should be open to new ideas and support projects that have multiple benefits such as tourism activities. Negative attitudes have always been a troublesome problem for those who work with communities in the development process. Many elected and self-appointed leaders have blocked progress in the communities that they claim to serve.

Leaders have to be visionaries or be willing to champion a vision that others have created. The vision, *V*, brings focus and direction to planned efforts. Without a vision for the future, any outcome will do. No one outcome is determined to be best. Leaders will have a difficult time leading others unless they have a vision in mind and can communicate it in a way that energizes, motivates, and mobilizes people and other resources.

Leaders have to be able to lead the process of constructing a plan. They must also be proficient at implementing it. The plan, *P*, should be vision charged. This means that the vision is the overarching driver of the plan. Implementing the plan is done to realize the vision. Planning can be a complicated process and successful leaders are those who master the planning and implementation process. Often one person is gifted with the ability to vision, another great at drafting a plan, while others are excellent implementers. Organizations must rely on the leadership talents in all of its members to succeed. The ideal leader knows the gifts within the team and matches tasks with talents.

This brings the discussion to resources, *R*. All community and organization members are part of the resource base to be tapped in the process. Leadership resources have been discussed. Management resources always are needed in the implementation phase. Other resources may include financial, technological, physical, and social ones. The trust and goodwill built up by leaders over time is often called *Social Capital*.

Leaders have to find, gain control of, and use the necessary resources needed to implement the plan. It takes hard work to move from a vision to accomplishments. That is why community development professionals always are impressed, pleased, and complimentary of community groups who get great things done.

FACTS YOU CAN USE

The new, 2000 County Trade Pull Factor statistics are now available on the Internet at agecon.ksu.edu/ddarling.

This year's base data is better than ever. The Department of Revenue in Topeka has been able to allocate all FY 1999 sales tax revenue to individual counties and

almost all FY 2000 data to individual counties.

Map 1 displays the FY 2000 data and each county's rank. Only 14 counties top the list with high numbers, 1.00 CTPF values or greater. These are, from top to bottom Johnson, Saline, Seward, Ellis, Shawnee, Sedgwick, Pottawatomie, Sherman, Finney, Thomas, Ford, Reno, Barton, and Pratt counties. In FY 1999 there were two more, Grant and Lyon counties. Also, Johnson County is now stronger than ever. It has a 25 percent market share of the Kansas retail pie.

In FY 2000 the CTPF values range from a low of 0.25 in Wabaunsee County to a high of 1.56 in Johnson County (See *Map 1*). All counties with a population less than 6,000 have a CTPF value below 1.00. Sherman County with a population of 6,511 has a CTPF of 1.16. Pratt County with a population of 9,700 has a CTPF of 1.01. Sherman County is the smallest county to have a high CTPF.

The 105 counties in Kansas can be divided into six regions, northwest, southwest, south central, north central, northeast, and southeast. The northwest region has three counties with CTPF values of 1.00 or greater. They are Ellis, Sherman, and Thomas.

The southwest region also has three, Finney, Ford, and Seward counties. The south central region has four counties, Barton, Pratt, Reno, and Sedgwick. The north central region has just two counties, Pottawatomie (the Manhattan effect) and Saline. The northeast region has just Johnson and Shawnee counties. Finally, the southeast region has no counties with high CTPF values. The county with the highest value is Neosho with a CTPF of 0.90.

Residents in southeast Kansas shop in the malls and specialty shops in Johnson County, Joplin, MO; Bartlesville, OK; Tulsa, OK; and Wichita.

Map 2 shows percent changes in sales tax collections over time.

Pearl Collection

"Everyone's favorite subject is themselves."

"If you can't find a leader, be a leader."

"The easiest thing to do is to complain about someone else and the hardest thing to do is to serve others without the support of their praise."

Comments by Mike and Deborah Bacon from Gothenburg, Nebraska at a community meeting in Washington, Kansas on January 24, 2001.

Conference Date Book

Community Economic Development Conference

When: April 18-19, 2001

Where: The Manhattan Holidome

Featuring Ernesto Sirolli, founder of the Enterprise Facilitation approach to economic development.

Contact K-State Continuing Education office at 785/532-5569.

Exploring the Policy Options for a new Rural America.

Put on by the Federal Reserve

Center for the Study of Rural America.

When: April 30 - May 1st, 2001.

Where: Kansas City, Missouri at the Weston Crown Center Hotel.

Contact Katherine Sheaff at 800/333-1010, extension 2478.

105 County Average = 0.64

MAP-1

Maximum Value = 1.56

Minimum Value = .25

FY 2000 County Trade Pull Factors and Rank Orders

David L. Darling

January 2001

July 1999 – June 2000

Cheyenne 67 .51	Rawlins 93 .38	Decatur 84 .40	Norton 30 .73	Phillips 48 .62	Smith 69 .50	Jewell 103 .28	Republic 68 .51	Washington 86 .40	Marshall 36 .67	Nemaha 46 .63	Brown 63 .53	Doniphan 88 .39			
Sherman 8 1.16	Thomas 10 1.13	Sheridan 56 .58	Graham 43 .65	Rooks 52 .61	Osborne 65 .53	Mitchell 22 .82	Cloud 21 .83	Clay 47 .63	Riley 39 .66	Pottawatomie 7 1.20	Jackson 51 .61	Atchison 61 .55			
Wallace 60 .55	Logan 24 .81	Gove 32 .71	Trego 59 .56	Ellis 4 1.28	Russell 41 .65	Lincoln 81 .42	Ottawa 98 .33	Dickinson 45 .64	Geary 25 .79	Wabaunsee 105 .25	Shawnee 5 1.27	Jefferson 102 .30	Leavenworth 66 .52	Wyandotte 31 .73	
Greeley 73 .47	Wichita 71 .49	Scott 23 .81	Lane 92 .38	Ness 29 .73	Rush 99 .33	Barton 13 1.02	Ellsworth 50 .61	Saline 2 1.40	McPherson 18 .88	Marion 74 .46	Morris 57 .56	Lyon 15 .94	Osage 82 .41	Franklin 27 .76	Miami 38 .66
Hamilton 53 .61	Kearny 101 .31	Finney 9 1.16	Gray 64 .53	Hodgeman 85 .40	Pawnee 55 .59	Stafford 97 .33	Reno 12 1.06	Harvey 28 .76	Butler 35 .67	Greenwood 90 .39	Woodson 96 .33	Allen 37 .66	Bourbon 40 .65		
Stanton 80 .43	Grant 19 .87	Haskell 94 .38	Ford 11 1.09	Kiowa 70 .50	Pratt 14 1.01	Kingman 77 .44	Sedgwick 6 1.22	Butler 35 .67	Greenwood 90 .39	Elk 91 .39	Wilson 79 .43	Neosho 17 .90	Crawford 20 .83		
Morton 54 .60	Stevens 58 .56	Seward 3 1.30	Meade 83 .41	Clark 100 .32	Comanche 72 .48	Barber 44 .65	Harper 42 .65	Sumner 78 .44	Cowley 34 .68	Chautauqua 104 .26	Montgomery 26 .79	Labette 33 .70	Cherokee 87 .40		

Source of Sales Tax Data : Kansas Department of Revenue

MAP-3

State Percent Change = 5.5

Maximum Value = 53.8

Minimum Value = -18.9

Percent Change in Sales Tax Collections

FY 1999 Compared to FY 2000

David L. Darling

January 2001

Cheyenne 9.5	Rawlins 8.5	Decatur 6.2	Norton 3.0	Phillips 3.7	Smith 1.9	Jewell 18.1	Republic 11.6	Washington 16.5	Marshall 1.5	Nemaha 3.2	Brown 4.7	Doniphan 24.4		
Sherman 2.7	Thomas 1.4	Sheridan 7.7	Graham 9.1	Rooks 7.3	Osborne 1.9	Mitchell 3.0	Cloud -4	Clay 9.9	Riley 4.8	Pottawatomie 4.7	Jackson 6.7	Atchison 1.3		
Wallace 11.5	Logan 7.6	Gove 6.8	Trego 7.6	Ellis .6	Russell 3.9	Lincoln 19.5	Ottawa 26.5	Dickinson 3.6	Geary 7.5	Wabaunsee 19.6	Shawnee 11.9	Jefferson 23.2	Leavenworth 7.3	Wyandotte 10.4
Greeley 27.1	Wichita -5.8	Scott -1.5	Lane 9.6	Ness 10.5	Rush 13.4	Barton -1.0	Rice 9.7	McPherson 8.8	Marion 2.8	Morris 6.3	Lyon -9	Osage 14.0	Douglas 6.0	Johnson 7.3
Hamilton 14.7	Kearny 28.1	Finney 5.3	Hodgeman 3.4	Pawnee 6.9	Edwards 9.2	Stafford 14.8	Reno .1	Harvey 1.9	Butler 7.6	Chase 12.2	Coffey 9.1	Anderson 11.9	Franklin 3.0	Miami 16.9
Stanton 5.6	Grant -18.9	Haskell 24.0	Gray 23.4	Ford -1.7	Kiowa 12.1	Pratt .7	Kingman 2.3	Sedgwick 1.4	Greenwood 5.5	Woodson 20.5	Wilson 13.7	Allen 1.5	Bourbon 6.3	Crawford 3.2
Morton -2.7	Stevens 7.2	Seward -2.1	Meade 15.4	Clark 6.7	Comanche 6.7	Barber 9.9	Harper -4.1	Sumner 6.3	Elk 53.8	Chautauqua 12.8	Montgomery 1.0	Neosho 2.6	Cherokee 10.9	Linn 31.0

Source of Sales Tax Data : Kansas Department of Revenue