

Collaborative Innovation: A Case Study of Austin's Economic Development Department

By

Rodney Gonzales

Deputy Director

City of Austin, Department of Economic Development

301 W. 2nd Street, City Hall Suite 2030

Austin TX 78701

Phone: 512-974-2313

Email: rodney.gonzales@austintexas.gov

&

Nandhini Rangarajan

Associate Professor

Department of Political Science

Texas State University

UAC 351, 601 University Drive

San Marcos, TX 78666

Phone: 512-245-3285

Email: nr11@txstate.edu

Collaborative Innovation: A Case Study of Austin's Economic Development Department

“government innovation literature has traditionally been much more concerned with the single act of innovation than the organizational settings in which those acts take place”

(Light, 1998, 8- as cited in Jaskyte, 2011).

INTRODUCTION

The city of Austin's multifaceted success in job creation, redevelopment, downtown initiatives, developing tools for small businesses, and growth and diversity in the industry sectors of technology, digital media, film, music, biotechnology, and energy has contributed to its reputation as one of the best cities to live, work and play (Kiplinger, 2010; Badenhausen 2013; Brookings Institute 2013). Austin has been bestowed with awards that recognize it as the most popular city for college graduates and hence one of the biggest brain magnets, most progressive, most digitally savvy, most recession proof and most conducive for small business growth. Such multidimensional success can be attributed in large part to the City of Austin's Economic Development Policy and the creative efforts of the City of Austin's Economic Development Department (COA-ED, henceforth). Kwon, Berry & Feiock (2009) imply that a comprehensive approach to economic development involves not only an overall economic development plan but also includes plans for small businesses, retention of current businesses and attraction of new ones. COA-ED has identified innovative ways to do all that by leveraging cultural arts, music, small business development, business recruitment, global commerce, and redevelopment initiatives to sustain the city's economic, cultural (Scott 2000) and creative vitality (Florida 2002; 2005).

Chapter purpose and organization

The primary objective of our chapter is to explore the genesis of the city's economic development policy and program and to understand the comprehensive, proactive approach to innovation that COA-ED has adopted over the years and its impact on Austin. Numerous singular acts of innovation in economic development are attributed to COA-ED (for example, Meet the Lender, Creative Media Center, the People's Gallery, and Austin-Toronto Music Alliance). Although COA-ED has been central to these

innovations, it has adopted a “collaborative innovation” approach routinely working with domestic and international private, public, non-profit entities.

Community attributes, internal capacity and institutional features have been shown to influence adoption of economic development tools (Kwon et al., 2009, p. 967). COA-ED has been able to harness the aforementioned attributes strategically for Austin’s advancement. COA-ED is also unique in that it houses the largest economic drivers of the city under one department – Cultural Arts, Music, Redevelopment, Small Business Development, and Global Business Recruitment. COA-ED’s structure allows for a unified economic development strategy while simultaneously encouraging cross pollination of ideas between these different sub-divisions. Albury (2005, p. 53) characterizes this type of environment as conducive to “creative tension”. Given its distinctive organizational configuration, a case study focused on the organizational elements contributing to COA-ED’s successful collaborative innovation approach will provide important insights into its experiences that could inform other cities willing to emulate Austin’s success.

Given this overarching objective, the organization of this chapter is as follows. First a brief review of the literature on collaborative innovation and economic development sets up the theoretical foundations of this chapter. Second, we provide details about Austin’s economic development policy and program and trace the evolution of COA-ED. This section also provides comprehensive details about community attributes, internal capacity, structure of COA-ED, institutional features and demonstrable impacts created by the department. Third, we provide details about the methods of data collection for this chapter. Fourth, we present our findings from document analysis and face-to-face interviews. Finally, the discussion and conclusion focus on theoretical and practical implications of this work for innovations in local economic development policy/management.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Innovation

There is a substantial body of work on various aspects of public sector innovation (see for example, Bason, 2010; Bartlett & Dibben, 2010; Borins, 1998, 2001, 2008; Eggers & Singh, 2009). In

general as Torfing (2013, p. 303) observes, innovation encompasses the creation, adoption, implementation and diffusion of new ideas that change “established practices within a specific context”. Hartley, Sorensen and Torfing (2013, p. 2) define innovation as “a complex and iterative process through which problems are defined; new ideas are developed and combined; prototypes and pilots are designed, tested, and redesigned; and new solutions are implemented, diffused and problematized.”. Innovations that arise out of such complex processes according to Jaskyte (2011, p. 78) can be classified into radical/incremental, original/borrowed, and expansionary/evolutionary/developmental. She observes that innovations can be product oriented, process oriented, technological or administrative in nature. Other important types of public sector innovation are governance innovation, policy innovation, service innovation, position innovation, strategic innovation and process innovation (Hartley, 2005, p. 28).

Collaborative Innovation

Collaboration is important to all stages of innovation ranging from ideation to implementation (Hartley, Sorensen & Torfing 2013, p. 5). Innovation is characterized as the product of multi-actor interaction (Hartley et al., 2013, p. 5). Collaboration, according to Hartley et al. (2013, p. 5-6), improves problem framing and definition when individuals with diverse experiences, knowledge and perspectives are brought together. According to Ketchum, Ireland and Snow (2007, p. 375) it is also based on high levels of trust, mutual commitment to honesty and equitable treatment and agreement on mutually beneficial outcomes. Ketchum, Ireland and Snow (2007, p. 372) argue that collaborative innovation in the private sector can facilitate strategic entrepreneurship by allowing large and small firms to engage in a mutually beneficial way that would help them negate each others’ shortcomings. They define collaborative innovation as “the creation of innovations across firm (and perhaps, industry) boundaries through the sharing of ideas, knowledge, expertise and opportunities” (p. 372). They contend that such collaborative innovation can facilitate wealth creation. Particularly in the context of economic development, collaborative innovation could result in improved economic conditions and opportunities. These dynamics are applicable in the public sector innovation ecosystem which consists of political leadership, government organizations, citizens, private and non-profit organizations that routinely work

together to benefit from each others' strengths and to surmount problems.

Collaborative innovation helps close the gap between current and desired levels of innovation (Ketchum et al. 2007). Recent calls for collaborative innovation in government have been made by Hartley (2005), Nambisan (2008) Eggers and Kumar Singh (2009) and Bommert (2010). Bommert (2010, p. 16) observes that collaborative innovation opens up the process of innovation to a network of internal and external actors such that the tangible and intangible innovation assets brought in by multiple actors improve the quality and quantity of innovations. COA-ED is at the centre of a collaborative innovation network/ecosystem where workforce development agencies, technology incubators, real estate developers, universities, city boards and commissions and local chambers of commerce work symbiotically. Torfing (2013, p. 304) observes that in the public sector "innovation is always driven by social and political actors who face specific problems and choose to exploit new opportunities by combining them with existing practices in order to craft novel and creative solutions".

Nambisan (2008, p. 40) proposes four specific roles that government and by extension administrative organizations/departments could play when engaging in collaborative innovation. Four possibilities emerge based on the nature of the problem (ill defined vs. well defined) and nature of network leadership (community led vs. government led). Government entities could be innovation integrators, innovation seekers, innovation champions and/or innovation catalysts. Government's roles as innovation integrator and innovation catalyst are required when the problem is well defined. As innovation integrator government is expected to initiate problem solving, define acceptable contributions and outcomes, bring together a set of external collaborators and ensure that their contributions are well orchestrated to achieve the desired outcome. Its role as innovation catalyst is to accept community discovered problems and community led solutions related to existing services it offers and expedite the implementation of those solutions. As innovation seeker, it actively solicits ideas from citizens and other external entities to solve ill defined or emergent problems. Those solutions that fit with the agency's agenda are then actively implemented. As innovation champion, once again the focus is on emergent or ill-defined problems where government plays a supportive role to encourage a set of community

innovators that find solutions to problems that are not part of governments service functions.

Collaborative Innovation in Economic Development

The connection between collaborative innovation, innovation milieux, local clusters and entrepreneurship for regional development, economic development and wealth creation been studied extensively (see for example, Porter, 2000; MacKinnon, Cumbers & Chapman, 2002; Ketchum et al. 2007). Porter (2000, p. 26) talks about the role of government in facilitating the growth of “clusters” which are “geographically proximate group of interconnected companies and associated institutions in a particular field, linked by commonalities and complementarities” (p.16). According to Porter (2000, p. 17) these clusters could potentially include private firms, governmental entities, universities, think tanks, vocational training providers, standard setting agencies, trade associations and foreign firms. Porter (2007, p. 26) envisions five important roles for government to bolster the economy- 1) improve macroeconomic capacity 2) improve microeconomic capacity 3) establish overall rules governing incentives for competition 4) develop a long term economic plan that mobilizes government, business, institutions and citizens and 5) facilitating the development and upgrading clusters. Implied in these roles is the notion that government should be innovative in its approach. COA-ED is involved in what Porter (2000, p. 17) identifies as facilitation of productivity and innovation in clusters by eliminating obstacles, constraints and inefficiencies. Nambisan’s (2008) conceptualization of government as innovation seeker, integrator, catalyst and champion could help facilitate such activities.

*****Insert Table 1 about here*****

As we conclude this brief discussion of collaborative innovation and economic development, we turn our focus to the history, context and setting in which COA-ED is undertaking collaborative innovation.

HISTORY OF THE CITY’S ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POLICY AND PROGRAM

The upside to Austin’s 2001 downturn: A new economic development policy is created

The City’s current Economic Development Policy dates back to 2001 with the creation of the Mayor’s Taskforce on the Economy (Taskforce, henceforth) and the appointment of (then) Council

Members Will Wynn and Betty Dunkerley as co-chairs of the Taskforce. Prior to the 2001 national recession and the dot.com bust, Austin witnessed significant increases in home prices, average wages, and new jobs created and was riding high on the rankings bestowed by Forbes Magazine, the Milken Institute, and others. This wave of economic prosperity broke quickly following a high-tech downfall that resulted in 17,000 local technology jobs being eliminated and huge losses in the stock market that reduced the worth of local publicly-traded companies. The resulting impact pushed city of Austin sales tax collections deep into negative decline. For fiscal year 2002-03, Austin had to close a \$54 million budget gap resulting in reductions to the General Fund of over \$31 million. That fiscal year, 321 positions were eliminated; however, there were no layoffs. For fiscal year 2003-04, \$38.2 million in General Fund reductions were made. Another 344 general government positions were eliminated, of which 206 were filled. And, 200 management and administrative jobs were eliminated.¹ Austin's economic growth prior to 2001 quickly turned into economic recession, with no clear plan for the future and significant cuts to government operations and programs.

In November 2002, council members Wynn and Dunkerely, together with Jon Hockenyos, a local economist and principal of Texas Perspectives, Inc. (TXP), and Bill Hudnot, former Mayor of Indianapolis, Indiana and Senior Fellow at the Urban Land Institute, presented recommendations for a comprehensive economic action plan. At the Council work session, Hockenyos presented his white paper, "Austin's Economic Future: The Intersection of Innovation, Creativity, and Quality of Life"². The white paper provided insight into Austin's economic rise and subsequent fall. In the white paper, Hockenyos outlined Austin's assets that should be seized upon and how Austin could utilize those assets in a New Economy driven by innovation, continuous learning, and adaptation. He noted that Austin's embedded strengths of creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship should be put to use in this New Economy that drives long-term economic success to places that are rich in ideas, filled with talented and educated

¹ "City of Austin Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2004-05" presentation by City Staff, July 29, 2004.

² "Austin's Economic Future: The Intersection of Innovation, Creativity, and Quality of Life", Jon Hockenyos, Texas Perspectives, Inc., November 20, 2002.

people, exude physical and cultural amenities, and embody the ability to learn and adapt.

However, as Hockenyos noted in the paper,³ Austin lacked a singular organization that assumed the responsibility for all the factors that would contribute to the City's long-term development of the local economy. He pointed out that the city was in a position to directly influence the local economy by focusing on three specific areas: traditional recruitment and retention, small business and entrepreneurship, and cultural vitality. At their November 2002 work session, Council Members Wynn and Dunkerley, presented four recommendations of the Taskforce asking the city manager 1) to participate in and support three task force subcommittees (Traditional Recruitment and Retention, Small Business and Entrepreneurship, and Cultural Vitality) 2) to review the adequacy of the organizational structure for supporting economic development activities 3) to establish a program honoring businesses and companies that make important quality of life and job contributions to Austin and 4) to present a quarterly economic report for the city. These recommendations were accepted in a subsequent council meeting.

Between November 2002 and April 2003, the Taskforce created and convened three subcommittees to develop recommendations for a comprehensive economic development initiative. The three subcommittees were comprised of city staff, consultants, and 62 individuals representing local businesses, arts organizations, university officials, bankers, city staff, economists, venture capitalists, Texas Governor's economic development staff, local chambers of commerce, local workforce development agencies, Liveable City, and Capital IDEA. Participants were divided into subcommittees focused on traditional industries, small business, and cultural vitality. The participants focused on how Austin could leverage its strengths of innovation, creativity, and entrepreneurship and direct and indirect roles the city of Austin should take in leveraging these strengths to ensure that the local economy thrives in a global marketplace. The subcommittee's recommendations were compiled into a report, "The

³ Page 13, "Austin's Economic Future: The Intersection of Innovation, Creativity, and Quality of Life", Jon Hockenyos, Texas Perspectives, Inc., November 20, 2002.

Mayor's Taskforce on the Economy: Subcommittee Findings"⁴, which led to the comprehensive economic development initiative and economic development policy in use today, including the first divisions that comprised COA-ED (small business development, cultural arts, and business retention & recruitment).

On June 12, 2003, the Austin City Council approved a resolution⁵ for a comprehensive Economic Development Policy and Program for the City of Austin. The resolution authorized the City Manager to take the necessary actions, including administrative changes, to implement the Economic Development Policy and Program. Then, on October 28, 2004, the Austin City Council adopted the Firm-Based Matrix⁶, which is the scoring mechanism used to determine whether incentives should be provided or not for business recruitments. Austin now had a comprehensive economic development policy focused on business recruitment and retention, cultural vitality, and small business and entrepreneurship. This three-pronged approach fully supported by the Austin City Council.

The program needed to support the policy

Austin's Economic Development Policy and Program are much more than giving incentives for business recruitment. The Taskforce leaders utilized a cross-section of community interests to develop recommendations that leveraged Austin's key economic strengths. The diverse representation of workforce development, state agency, college and university, small business, civic organizations, cultural arts, banking, corporate, technology, parks, minorities, artists, and arts institutions ensured that the strengths of Austin's economy would receive increased investment as part of this new economic future. The foundation for a collaborative innovation platform was created.

The Austin City Council's initiative to establish the Taskforce was needed to both give the Taskforce credibility and to ensure that ensuing Taskforce work and recommendations would receive the much needed attention and deliberation. The Austin City Council's action to approve the Taskforce's 90-

⁴ "Austin's Economic Future: The Mayor's Taskforce on the Economy Subcommittee Findings", prepared for the City of Austin, April 9, 2003.

⁵ Austin, Texas City Council Resolution No. 030612-15.

⁶ Austin, Texas City Council Resolution No. 041028-3.

day action plan and ultimate approval of a comprehensive Economic Development Policy and Program put the city in a position of proactively driving Austin's economic future. The next key step for Austin was to develop a centralized department that took primary responsibility for implementing the Economic Development Policy and Program.

STRUCTURE OF THE CITY'S ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Building a comprehensive team focused on collaboration from multiple industry sectors

The City's Economic Development Department (COA-ED) started as the Redevelopment Services Office and was created through adoption of the City's fiscal year 2001-02 budget. Austin Energy, which is the city's wholly-owned electric utility, funded the Redevelopment Services Office with a \$4.2 million transfer into the city's Economic Development Fund. The benefit to Austin Energy was continued growth in its service area through the attraction of new business and encouragement of local businesses to expand.⁷ The Redevelopment Services Office was to work with primary employers that want to relocate to Austin as well as plan for downtown development and the redevelopment of the former Robert Mueller Airport property.⁸

For fiscal year 2002-03, the department name changed to Economic Growth and Redevelopment Services Office to reflect not only a focus on redevelopment, but also a focus on business recruitment and sensitivity to maintaining Austin's cultural identity. One (1) position was transferred from the Parks and Recreation Department for the "Austin Sense of Place and Cultural Identity" activity. The purpose of the activity was to enrich and enliven public spaces in the downtown area in order to attract new residents, businesses, and visitors.⁹ On March 6, 2003, the Austin City Council amended the fiscal year 2002-03 budget to create the Cultural Arts Program within the department and adding seven (7) positions for this purpose.¹⁰

⁷ City of Austin, Texas Fiscal Year 2000-01 Adopted Budget, Volume IV, Page 128.

⁸ City of Austin, Texas Fiscal Year 2000-01 Adopted Budget, Volume IV, Page 135.

⁹ City of Austin, Texas Fiscal Year 2002-03 Adopted Budget, Volume IV, Page 116.

¹⁰ Austin, Texas City Council Ordinance No. 030603-07.

With the June 12, 2003 approval by Austin City Council of a new three-pronged approach to economic development, the ensuing fiscal year 2003-04 budget proposed to move the Small Business Development activity from the Department of Small and Minority Business Resources into COA-ED. Additionally, the proposed budget included a formal “Cultural Arts Division” within COA-ED.¹¹ The adopted fiscal year 2003-04 budget for COA-ED increased the position count to 29 and now included divisions responsible for Cultural Arts, Economic Growth and Redevelopment Services, and Small Business Development. The adoption of the fiscal year 2004-05 budget for COA-ED marked the final action to fully assemble an economic development program charged with the full responsibility for implementing the City’s adopted Economic Development Policy. The department now had a team of 36 individuals all focused on the economic well being of the city from the vantage points of traditional industries recruitment, redevelopment, small business development, and the creative industries sectors of cultural arts, music, film, and digital media.

Current Structure

COA-ED has implemented programs to assist with creating and retaining small and large businesses, recruited national and international corporate expansions, led key redevelopment projects, and bolstered the creative arts industries through significant investment of tourism tax dollars. The functions and outcomes of these divisions are similar in that jobs and capital investment are created, within the respective industries, through each division’s programs and services. The sharing of this commonality and the underlying premise of supporting the local economy creates a close relationship between the divisions that allows for projects, programs and services to serve multiple industry sectors simultaneously. The department is organized along divisional lines with managers over each specific division. The responsibilities for various divisions are shared by the Assistant Director and the Deputy Director who both report to the Department Director.

¹¹ “2003-2004 Proposed Budget Presentation”, a presentation by City Staff for the Austin, Texas City Council, August 28, 2003.

*****Insert Figure 1 about here*****

*****Insert Table 2 about here*****

Nature of government

The City of Austin operates under a City Council-City Manager form of government. Within this structure, the City Council hires the City Manager as the day-to-day administrator of government operations. The City Council is the legislative body of the city and adopts resolutions and ordinances that establish policies, appropriates spending authority, and sets the overall vision for the city. The City Manager functions as the chief executive officer for city operations and oversees the day-to-day work of all departments and agencies that implement city policies. COA-ED is a department under the City Manager's purview. As an example of the Council-City Manager form of government, the resolutions and ordinances described above were adopted by City Council to establish a policy for economic development. The City Manager hires the Director for COA-ED who oversees the programs and operations of COA-ED in order to implement the Council's policy for economic development.

Austin's plentiful universities and colleges

Austin's economic success can be largely attributed to the City's Economic Development Policy and implementation of that policy by COA-ED. However, the policy and program were developed to leverage Austin's existing strengths of entrepreneurship, creative class, and collaborative innovation. These strengths are not unique. Other cities possess one if not more of them. Enrico Moretti (2012) observes that human capital is now the best predictor for a city's economic success rather than physical capital. Cities like Austin which possess a high ratio of college graduates and innovative employers are the "...the new factories where ideas and knowledge are forged." And, Moretti writes that the high degree of educated talent and innovative companies correlates to (1) a larger share of research and development expenses, venture capital, and patents per capita; and (2) an ecosystem being developed that attracts

similarly talent labor and innovative businesses.

179,795 is the number of students enrolled as of Fall 2012 in the Austin area technical colleges, community colleges, and four-year universities and colleges.¹² The quantity and quality of available higher education opportunities translates into 44.9% of Austin residents possessing a bachelor's degree or higher.¹³ And, when a 200-mile radius is drawn around Austin, the available post-secondary enrollment increases by another 292,212. With the available pool of talent both graduating from higher education institutions and the talent in the pipeline, businesses identify Austin as a hub for talent. In May 2011 and on behalf of the Greater Austin Chamber of Commerce, The Benchmark Company conducted a national survey of C-level executives and site selectors. The purpose of the survey was to evaluate how C-level executives and site selection consultants view Austin as a potential city for either relocation or expansion.¹⁴ When asked the open question, "What makes Austin a more viable candidate," the largest response (28%) was "university, educated/tech workforce."¹⁵ "educated workforce" was identified as the second most important acknowledged asset of Austin just slightly behind "strong high tech community."¹⁶

Austin's quality of life

Quality of life measures can include, but are not limited to, cultural amenities, entertainment options, recreation options, housing availability, healthcare facilities, parks, transit options, schools, colleges and universities, housing costs, costs of living, crime rate, community diversity, climate, and weather. Although not an exhaustive list, a few of Austin's quality of life rankings are as follows: 3rd lowest crime rate among cities with 500,000 or more population (CQ Press, 2013 City Crime Rankings); 2nd best city on Livability Index for People Under 35¹⁷ (vocativ.com, November 7, 2013), including the

¹² Source for Austin area colleges and universities is the website for the Greater Austin Area Chamber of Commerce. Last revised Fall 2012: <https://www.austinchamber.com/site-selection/greater-austin-profile/education.php>.

¹³ Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2012 American Community Survey.

¹⁴ "A Research Presentation for the Austin Chamber of Commerce," prepared by The Benchmark Company, October 2011.

¹⁵ "A Research Presentation for the Austin Chamber of Commerce," prepared by The Benchmark Company, October 2011, p 19.

¹⁶ "A Research Presentation for the Austin Chamber of Commerce," prepared by The Benchmark Company, October 2011, p.21.

¹⁷ vocativ.com Livability Index assessed the country's 50 most populous cities against 20 criteria it deemed essential indicators for those between 18 and 35.

following : 2nd highest ranking in Green Commuter Index, 12th in Public Transportation Ridership, 29th in Average Rent for a 2-Bedroom Apartment and 17th in cost of electricity.

The State of Texas

Austin is located in business friendly Texas which is viewed positively by site selectors. The Benchmark Company survey of site selectors and C-level executives indicated that Texas received the most #1 rankings among this group (34%).¹⁸ Two more factors that make Texas attractive for businesses are that Texas has no state income tax, and that Texas is a “right to work” state.¹⁹ The results of the 2012 Corporate Survey conducted by Area Development Site and Facility Planning also ranks Texas as #1 in terms of low labor costs. Texas is also one of seven states that does not tax personal income. Tyler Cowen’s recent article for Time speaks to Texas’ “cool factor” and the state’s ethnic and cultural diversity that draw people to Austin and Texas.²⁰ Cowen also cites the number of jobs being created in Texas, the lower cost of living, the reshaping of the American middle-class, and lower housing prices as reasons why Texas is attracting new residents and talents. Additionally, the Governor’s Office of Economic Development offers several incentive programs targeted at business recruitment and expansion. Coupled with local incentives, the programs have been utilized effectively to create new jobs and to spur business growth.

DEMONSTRABLE IMPACTS

Job creation, economic stability, increasing the local tax base and diversification of the local economy have been identified as the top priorities of local governance (Blakely & Bradshaw, 2002; Liou, 2009; Zheng & Warner, 2010). COA-ED’s initiatives in the past few years have resulted in demonstrable impacts in all those areas, specifically in business recruitment such as the attraction and expansion of internationally reputed companies like Samsung, Apple, National Instruments, Facebook, and Visa.

¹⁸ “A Research Presentation for the Austin Chamber of Commerce,” prepared by The Benchmark Company, October 2011, p 10.

¹⁹ There are 24 “right-to-work” states where joining a union is not a condition of employment.

²⁰ “Why Texas Is Our Future,” by Tyler Cowen, published in Time, October 21, 2013.

Through its business recruitment efforts, COA-ED has commitments from the private sector to create over 7700 jobs, make taxable investments of \$4.5 billion, and provide opportunities for local hiring of minority and women-owned businesses. Throughout the terms of these agreements, it is estimated that the city of Austin will net \$43.6 million in taxes and revenues, which includes factoring in \$77.6 million in incentives to these private sector employers. Another significant demonstrable impact is the city of Austin's ability to leverage state economic incentives for business attraction and expansion. COA-ED has partnered with the Texas Governor's Office of Economic Development to secure \$174 million²¹ in state incentives as leverage to the city of Austin's \$77.6 million in incentives. Since formation, COA-ED has led the successful recruitment of major employment centers in Austin and led several large catalyst redevelopment projects that have spurred growth in Downtown and other parts of Austin. The incentives for these recruitment and redevelopment efforts are paid from the Economic Incentives Reserve Fund. And, COA-ED administers the distribution of 11.7% of the City's hotel occupancy tax, a portion of which goes to large arts-related facilities in Austin.

In the realm of redevelopment, COA-ED has leveraged private sector investment through innovative public-private partnerships aimed at reinvigorating underutilized city land. Since its inception, COA-ED has created 6.1 million square feet of new residential, office, industrial, and commercial space designed using the principles of The Congress for the New Urbanism²² as a guide. COA-ED has another 6.8 million square feet of mixed-use development under contract to be completed in the next 10 years. Through its redevelopment portfolio, COA-ED has returned non-tax producing properties into mixed-use, walkable neighborhoods and places that promote green design and transportation choices. As an early leader in Austin's regenerative growth, COA-ED's redevelopment efforts catalyzed new private sector development within the city that follow the same new urbanism design techniques.

Downtown redevelopment projects led by COA-ED resulted in a resurgence of retail and

²¹ City of Austin Economic Development Annual Report, February 2014

²² The Congress for the New Urbanism is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization and is the leading organization promoting walkable, mixed-use neighborhood development, sustainable communities and healthier living conditions.

downtown living that had fled to the suburbs from the 1940's through the 1970's. During that period, residents living in downtown Austin decreased from 12560 in 1940 to a mere 3084 in 1980.²³ Since its inception, COA-ED has focused on bringing life back into downtown Austin, including implementing a city council goal to achieve 25,000 residents living downtown²⁴. As recent as the 2010 census, downtown Austin's population stood at 7413 residents, with more downtown residents on the way due to increased residential unit construction.

COA-ED is an exemplar for how innovative government can have a positive impact on constituents/citizens. For Austin Energy, new businesses recruited and large redevelopment projects resulted in 1.7 billion kilowatt hours of electricity sold for 2009, which translates to \$45 million in annual electric utility revenue. And, the City's 10 largest arts facilities, which receive arts funding through hotel occupancy tax, produced a combined \$136,236 in revenue to Austin Energy for 2009. The captured electric usage and revenue does not include usage nor revenue associated with the 2,600 direct, new jobs created since 2003. In addition, the redevelopment projects led by COA-ED in Downtown Austin, the Domain, and Mueller have cumulatively resulted in \$11.5 million in chilled water facility revenue for Austin Energy during fiscal year 2009.

Another return on investment indicator is the number of small business start-ups, associated new jobs created, and capital investment made by these small businesses. In fiscal year 2009, the Small Business Administration (SBA) reported 242 loans approved in Austin valued at \$74.8 million. These small business loans resulted in 84 new business start-ups and 1,418 new jobs created. The COA-ED Small Business Development Program (SBDP) works directly with the SBA to host classes for entrepreneurs who seek SBA financing. SBDP advertised and marketed 5 classes during fiscal 2009 which drew 100 participants, combined.

In the course of its economic incentive work, COA-ED implements unique and extraordinary

²³ September 2008 presentation by Michael Knox, Downtown Officer of COA-ED.

²⁴ On December 15, 2005, the Austin City Council adopted a resolution to recognize Mayor Will Wynn's stated goal of 25,000 residents living in Downtown Austin within 10 years and initiated the process for creating the Downtown Austin Plan.

transparency measures for economic incentives such that the Washington, D.C. based watchdog firm, Good Jobs First, gave COA-ED a perfect 100 score for transparency and information access.

Transparency measures implemented by COA-ED include a two-meeting process prior to City Council consideration of an incentive proposal, a public hearing to allow citizen comments and concerns, publication of the proposed agreement, fiscal impact analysis, company information and project information (including detail of jobs created, salaries, capital investment, quality of jobs), posting of all executed agreements, annual compliance reviews, and annual payments and posting of the independent, third-party review and assessment of COA-ED's annual compliance review. This interesting history and setting of COA-ED and evidence about demonstrable impacts created by it makes it fertile ground for innovation research.

METHOD:

To delve deeper into its innovation practices, we used a multi-method approach to gather evidence for our case study of COA-ED. A careful review of organizational documents were undertaken to analyze how organizational elements contribute to collaborative innovation at COA-ED. To clearly evaluate innovation potential and demonstrable impact created by COA-ED in the central Texas community, we analyzed policy documents and reports that provide details about the success of each program. In particular the following documents were analyzed in detail: 1) Annual Report: Generating Jobs, Tax Revenue, and Investment a report and presentation by City Staff, February 13, 2014 2) "Austin's Economic Future: The Intersection of Innovation, Creativity, and Quality of Life", whitepaper prepared by Jon Hockenyos of TXP (November 20, 2002) 3) Mayor's Taskforce on the Economy: Report on Findings (April 9, 2003) 4) Staff Report on Recommendations from the Mayor's Taskforce on the Economy (June 4, 2003) and 5) The Role of the Cultural Sector in the Local Economy: 2005 Update" (January 2006, TXP, Inc). We also conducted in-depth semi-structured interviews with members of the COA-ED team to understand what internal and external factors stimulate and inhibit collaborative innovation. We used a snowball sampling technique where each interviewee referred us to a subsequent interviewee who was well informed about COA-ED. The final list of interviewees were top level

employees of COA-ED. Each division (Cultural arts, Small Business Development, Global Business, and Redevelopment) was represented by at least two interviewees. In addition to the eight interviewees representing each of the four aforementioned divisions, we also interviewed the financial manager and Director of COA-ED. Four out of the ten interviewees were women. We prepared a set of ten questions that tapped into the variables listed in Table 3. We also asked follow up questions after each main question to seek clarification about the responses offered. Each interview lasted about forty five minutes to an hour in length and were conducted at COA-ED.

*****Insert Table 3 about here*****

FINDINGS

Nature of work done by COA-ED

Our exploratory analysis of key policy documents and data from face-to-face interviews of COA-ED employees provided important insights into collaborative innovation dynamics at COA-ED. The nature of work undertaken by COA-ED was seen as innovative, visionary and critical. It was seen as performing diverse functions that were citizen centric in meeting the economic needs of Austin. One respondent characterized COA-ED as “city of Austin’s economic investment broker”. The department is perceived to be very good at *balancing* the long term and short term goals, visions and demands of different divisions and their clients. It is perceived as preserving Austin’s character and environment while conducting its economic development activities. In addition to these observations by respondents about the nature of work undertaken by COA-ED, we discuss three specific themes that were reinforced by the archival analysis and interviews. The three themes are 1) unique organizational structure, 2) strategic leverage of internal and external resources through collaborative innovation, and 3) barriers to innovation potential.

Unique Organizational Structure

The assembly of small business, redevelopment, business recruitment, cultural arts, and music and entertainment (added in 2009), under one structure reinforces the economic development focus for each area. An attempt to find another economic development agency that covers this breadth of a city's economy yields no results. A few other cities include cultural arts, which recognizes the importance of the creative industries sector as a vital component of a city's economic future. However, redevelopment is typically administered through separate redevelopment authorities or bodies as is small business development. And, even fewer cities have a music and entertainment component to their economic development strategy.

The result of such a wide swath approach to economic development is that the network of COA-ED stakeholders is extensive, thus furthering the breadth of impact on the Austin economy. The other result is the creative and innovative collaborations that are formed when melding two or more of these areas to solve problems. As is often the case, COA-ED approaches problems not from a small business perspective or a business recruitment perspective, but rather, a blend of all forces. The outcome is usually a solution that is much more comprehensive than had the problem been approached with a singular focus.

Leveraging internal and external resources through collaborative innovation

Collaborative Innovation: Role of Internal Factors

The department benefits immensely from top level leadership that champions innovation. Apart from just dreaming big, top leadership has the foresight to plan meticulously for everything it aims to achieve and displays exemplary commitment and discipline to execute every plan conceived. Damanpour and Schneider (2009) found that managers' personal characteristics have significant direct effects on innovation adoption. More specifically, managers' "pro-innovation attitude" and education have been shown to positively impact innovation adoption (Damanpour & Schneider, 2009, p. 510). In line with this

argument, the director of COA-ED is perceived as being pro-innovation. Damanpour and Schneider (2009) also found that innovation cost and complexity do not inhibit innovation adoption. Kevin Johns the director of COA-ED was seen by all respondents as being open to generation and implementation of new ideas to deal with complex issues. Respondents felt that his attitude towards holistic innovation sets the tone for the rest of the department to be innovative. He envisions a more collaborative approach among cities themselves. Instead of competing with other cities, he wants to work with them in a global network strengthening all involved. Collaborative efforts with International Association of Science Parks and Austin and the sister-cities initiative are initiatives on this front. Many felt that the physical location of the department lent itself to collaborative innovation. The main office is located in city hall right by the offices of the Mayor and city council. Physical location seems to symbolically reinforce the need for balancing political constraints, private sector needs and governmental capacity. City hall itself is situated in the second street district which is bustling with activities evocative of Austin- music, art, business and government. Although COA-ED is spread among four locations (including City Hall), the department conducts routine meetings among division managers to ensure continued communication and collaboration. The department frequently uses cross-divisional teams to tackle problems or develop new initiatives. For example, COA-ED formed a task force of younger staff from each division to focus on international economic development strategies to boost local exports, thus creating jobs. The team developed the Global Commerce Strategy which won the 2013 Gold Award from the International Economic Development Council (IEDC) for the category, “Responding to Globalization.” The team developed a creative and nontraditional strategy that reinforced the premise that cities must take a holistic approach to leveraging the forces of globalization to strengthen the local economy. Respondents indicated that despite having been created only ten years ago the department it deals with issues in a very evolved manner. Its internal commitment to transparency allows it to forge trustworthy stable partnerships with myriad external actors.

Internally, multidisciplinary programs such as art, music, business recruitment, redevelopment, and small business bring to bear a plethora of skilled professionals with particular talents in their own fields. For example, Don Pitts, the Manager for the Music and Entertainment Division, has over 16 years of experience working with Gibson Guitar. COA-ED leverages Don's extensive music industry experience to not only develop programs that support Austin musicians, but also to engage the private sector for collaborative partnerships. As another example, Vicky Valdez, the Manager for the Small Business Development Program, has six (6) years of experience in owning her own small construction company. Vicky brings over 15 years of commercial and residential construction experience. As the head of the COA-ED small business programs, Vicky is intimately familiar with the tools and resources need to start and grow a small business. Peter Zeiler, the Manager for the Redevelopment Division, has over 14 years of experience in working with the private sector on real estate development projects. Peter's real estate experience with transit development will help COA-ED in its efforts to focus on commercial corridor revitalization projects centered near transit development.

Collaborative Innovation: Role of External Actors

COA-ED collaborates extensively with the private sector when seeking to initiate new solutions to emerging or existing problems. Because of COA-ED's wide breadth of responsibility for the city's largest economic drivers (redevelopment, business industry diversification through recruitment, cultural arts, music, and small business development), the department harnesses the forces of the private sector in order to leverage scarce public resources. In doing so, the department creates networks of stakeholders from diverse backgrounds all of whom share similar goals and objectives and/or an understanding of responsibility for supporting Austin's economy. COA-ED and stakeholders form an environment of creativity and innovation by sharing knowledge and resources. In some cases, COA-ED plays a supportive role to lend the city's name and support for convening stakeholders' forums and to nurture community-led solutions. In other cases, COA-ED leads by clearly identifying a problem, the available resources, and seeking external partners with the skills and expertise to implement innovative solutions.

Nambisan (2008) identifies four roles that government pursue in network-based collaborative innovation and problem solving: government as innovation integrator, innovation seeker, innovation champion, and innovation catalyst. COA-ED exemplifies itself in these roles through a myriad of initiatives. Below are examples of each role COA-ED has played by utilizing its network of stakeholders to solve economic development problems in Austin.

1) Innovation Integrator

In March 2012, the Brookings Institute, in conjunction with JPMorgan Chase, launched their five-year Global Cities Initiative. The initiative is aimed at assisting metropolitan areas to become more globally competitive by leveraging their regional assets.²⁵ According to Brookings, metro areas must “go global” to create jobs and avail themselves of a burgeoning global market. Brookings data suggests that the global middle class in developed and emerging markets will expand from \$38 trillion in 2010 to \$64 trillion in 2025. And, Brookings contends that only 1% of American businesses²⁶ currently export, suggesting that the international marketplace is an untapped market for many metropolitan areas. COA-ED agrees that Austin’s current share of international trade is strong but stands to benefit from new, untapped markets. As a rapidly emerging center for international business opportunities, a strategy for international economic development was needed to develop and strengthen ties to global markets. And, Austin’s geographic position along the North American Free Trade Agreement corridor is a strength to be leveraged for increasing global trade opportunities. By increasing trade, Austin businesses stand to not only increase revenue, but also increase production, thereby creating new jobs in the local economy. And, COA-ED, as a leader in local economic development needed to more clearly define the problem in order to develop a network of partners that could create innovative approaches toward growing Austin’s

²⁵ Source for information about the Brookings Institute Global Cities Initiative is the website for the Brookings Institute. Last revised 2014. www.brookings.edu/about/projects/global-cities/about

²⁶ Source for information about the emerging and developed international markets and percent of American businesses that export is a June 26, 2013 infographic titled, “The 10 Traits of Globally Fluent Metro Areas” on the website for the Brookings Institute. <http://www.brookings.edu/research/interactives/2013/global-metro-traits-infographic>

presence in the global marketplace.

COA-ED developed an internal team of young, creative staff from each division (Redevelopment, Business Recruitment, Small Business Development, Music, and Cultural Arts) whose focus would be to identify a network of stakeholders to collaborate on innovative strategies for addressing the identified problem of increasing Austin's share of international trade and commerce. The network included the Texas Governor's Office of Economic Development and Tourism, International Association of Science Parks, Austin Area Translators and Interpreters Association, Austin Area Chambers of Commerce, Austin colleges and universities, Austin Convention and Visitors Bureau, Austin Technology Council, Austin Sister Cities International, the International Trade Center at the University of Texas at San Antonio, Interpuerto Parque Logistico (San Luis Potosi, Mexico), GlobalAustin, Laredo Development Foundation, North America's Supercorridor Coalition, Inc., United Nations Association USA - Austin Chapter, and the U.S. Department of Commerce's Austin U.S. Export Assistance Center.

COA-ED identified the goals as: (1) creating jobs at all income levels and increasing the tax base through global trade and foreign direct investment; (2) fostering Austin's international reputation as a multicultural city; and (3) strengthening ties to international cities and international business associations to engage in more productive economic development partnerships and bilateral trade relationships. The results were eleven (11) innovative strategies and 33 action items developed to increase international collaboration between global innovation hubs and to reach tangible global economic development goals.

2) *Innovation Catalyst*

Music is a powerful economic driver for the Austin community. According to a recent economic impact study of the creative industries²⁷, live music and music tourism is generating more than \$1.6 billion annually with more than \$38 million in local tax revenue each year. The Austin music industry, a

²⁷ "The Economic Impact of the Creative Sector in Austin - 2012 Update", Jon Hockenyos, Texas Perspectives, Inc., February 2012.

mainstay of the creative industries sector, provides over 18,148 jobs and includes over 9,000 musicians. As music professionals, artists must possess or develop an agile and entrepreneurial perspective and willingness to self-represent, self-market and self-promote, in addition to continually improving their musical skills.

COA-ED identified the above problem and shared its information from the creative industries economic impact study in order to bring visibility to the matter at hand. COA-ED collaborated with forward-thinking stakeholders to address the issue, including the Austin Music Foundation (local non-profit) and the two private sector businesses (Dell Inc., and nVidia). The collaboration resulted in the creation of the Creative Media Center, which provides artists with free project management and mentoring services, access to digital and educational resources, and one-on-one training from experts in various business aspects of the creative arts. The space brings together Austin's creative artists from music, film, and gaming and is open Monday through Friday from 11:00am to 6:00pm. The Creative Media Center is located inside Stage 4 of the Austin Film Studios in East Austin and is a walk-in center that offers: free career training and a computer lab equipped with multimedia software; classes on software programs such as Photoshop and ProTools, which are used for music and website production; and small group sessions that bring together 20 to 40 artists to network and discuss the music business.

Austin Music Foundation provides the day-to-day operation and management of the space costing approximately \$50,000 annually, and Dell and nVidia provide hardware and software technology for the computer labs and training. COA-ED provides \$20,000 in annual funding to rent the space for the center. Since its creation in 2011, the Creative Media Center has had over 2,500 visitors to address the needs of the musicians and industry professionals in the Austin and surrounding areas. There have been over 466 one-on-one consultations with musicians to provide professional advice on the business side of the music industry. And over 2,000 artists and industry professionals have attended 34 workshops and panels. The workshops focus on topics such as Creative Fundraising, Music Publishing, Tour Like a Pro!, and Making the Video and are led by industry professionals including Jerry Tubb, Ed Fair, Andy Langer, Troy

Campbell, Stuart Sullivan, Adrian Quesada, John Pointer, Dominique Preyer, and Michael Barnes.

3) *Innovation Seeker*

The Cultural Arts Division (CAD) of COA-ED encourages, develops and facilitates an enriched environment of artistic, creative, cultural activity in Austin. As a component of many services and activities, CAD manages the Core Cultural Funding Program which utilizes a diverse network of nonprofit arts and cultural organizations and creative individuals provide services and programs to serve Austin's equally diverse population. Through the vast network of cultural agencies and creative individuals, the Core Cultural Funding Program brings forward projects and activities in all disciplines that provide quality arts and cultural programming to the Austin community. Every other year, CAD reaches out to its network (through an application process) to identify innovative ideas that reinforce the artistic and cultural industry and celebrate and promote Austin as an exciting, vibrant, and diverse cultural destination for visitors and tourists throughout the world.

4) *Innovation Champion*

Since 1989, the Austin Technology Incubator (ATI) has operated as the business incubator of the IC² Institute of The University of Texas at Austin. Its mission is to create jobs and to provide teaching and research opportunities. ATI incubates seed- and pre-seed-state technology startups through three programs: Bio/Health Sciences, Clean Energy, Development, and IT/Wireless. As an innovation champion, COA-ED understands the the role that technology startups play in Austin's emerging and developing tech environment. COA-ED supports the collaborative space where ATI and a network of many other stakeholders can gather to develop the innovative infrastructure that addresses the needs for incubating these vital components of Austin tech. COA-ED provides 40% of the funding for three of the incubators, thus emphasizing that the department shares in the goals of supporting this critical organization.

*****Insert Table 4 about here*****

Externally, COA-ED has the political buy-in through policies adopted by its governing body, the Austin City Council. COA-ED has corporate stakeholder support, small business support and societal support for creativity and innovation to ensure continuity of its efforts in the community. COA-ED also has contractual relationships with many stakeholders to achieve the city’s economic development policy. The names of these stakeholders are listed by category in the following table.

*****Insert Table 5 about here*****

Barriers to Innovation Potential

Despite COA-ED’s innovative approach to economic development, significant barriers impede its work. Respondents felt that many citizens are unaware of COA-ED. Citizens simply attribute Austin’s success in multiple domains to the strength of the economy. COA-ED could benefit from explicit recognition from the public about the positive impact it creates for the city. While the main office is located in city hall, the entire department is not in one physical location. According to almost fifty percent of the respondents, “because the department staff are spread out between four different physical locations, this separation reinforces dividing lines between units and makes spontaneous conversations and informal brainstorming between divisions less frequent”. While the level of interaction is much higher compared to similar departments elsewhere, respondents expressed concern about being siloed. The need for nurturing and strengthening community organizations and non-governmental organizations was also brought up by interviewees. The city and department could benefit in the long run if such organizations became strong and self-sufficient. If COA-ED is able to bolster such organizations during the current period of relatively good economic health, then, when times get tough COA-ED will have strong community level partners to sustain the community.

Respondents also indicated unanimously that certain human resource issues could have a negative

effect on the department. First, impending retirements of key employees could be a major barrier to its innovation potential. Some of them have been key players in initiating innovative partnerships with external entities. Their separation from COA-ED would negatively impact the innovation process. Second, budgetary constraints associated with hiring new personnel and implementing new ideas may stall proceedings. Third, the success of COA-ED has meant more work with less personnel. While there is no dearth of physical resources, addressing the human capital intensive nature of work at COA-ED was deemed necessary. Albury (2005, p. 55) observes that “over-reliance on current high performers as sources of innovation” could be a huge barrier to innovation. In line with his observation, there was a strong feeling among respondents that the department could probably be more successful if it had more employees.

DISCUSSION

COA-ED is operating in what Hartley (2005, p. 28) characterizes as a networked governance paradigm where the context is continuously changing, the population is diverse, where needs and problems are complex and public value is created through collaborative partnerships. Albury (2005, p. 51-52) remarks that certain important yardsticks for gauging public sector innovations in such environments are 1) whether an “effective set of linkages” between the innovators and clients have been developed 2) whether a senior level champion is supporting the process 3) and whether innovations occur in the context of other developments in associated areas. Our case study of COA-ED demonstrates that COA-ED not only meets these standards but also excels in each of those fronts.

We found evidence for COA-ED’s roles as innovation seeker, innovation integrator, innovation catalyst and innovation champion. Nambisan’s (2008) conceptualization of government roles in collaborative innovation calls for these four roles. As shown in Table 4 COA-ED has routinely engaged in collaborative innovation activities that have resulted in numerous innovations. Miles (2013, p. 85) remarks that most public sector innovation evokes the metaphor of a “roll-out” and that innovation management processes are heavily biased towards top down approaches. This was evident from the

interview data obtained for our case study of COA-ED. Respondents felt that the department primarily uses a top-down approach when COA-ED is the epicenter of such innovation. While bottom-up ideas are always well received, thus far the department has used a top down approach whereby managers of the different divisions, the director and deputy director and senior level political authorities have come together to envision an innovative path to economic development. As shown in Table 4 COA-ED is meeting the demands and expectations of networked governance through collaborative innovation.

However, as Bommert (2010, p. 27-28) remarks, the risks associated with collaborative innovation have not been studied in depth. COA-ED has had much success with this approach. Most of the policy and service innovations it has espoused has worked for Austin thus far. The city also has been riding on an economic high that has prevented most from questioning the risks associated with collaborative innovation. Future research could potentially explore what aspects about COA-ED and the linkages it has created with local and international partners could be overhauled to minimize risks. Future research could also offset some of the data collection limitations of this study. We began our data collection effort with an exploratory mindset. Given that collaborative innovation has emerged as one of the central foci of COA-ED, inclusion of diverse respondents from the pool of collaborative innovators would probably have provided a more comprehensive picture of the innovation dynamics at COA-ED.

CONCLUSION:

In conclusion, despite the aforementioned limitations, we believe that COA-ED is a public sector entity that has adopted a creative/innovative approach to further Austin's economic, cultural, and technological impact in local, national and international circles. It engages in collaborative innovation with a variety of partners and "clusters" of organizations in the greater Austin region. We believe that this detailed case study on its efforts provides important insights. Systematic analysis of its history and evolution, collaborative innovation approach to economic development, structure, demonstrable impacts it has created, unique strengths, constraints faced and inventive ways in which it surmounts them provides a comprehensive collaborative innovation blueprint for cities that wish to promote programs analogous to that of COA-ED in Austin.

REFERENCES

- Albury, D. (2005). Fostering innovation in public services. *Public Money and Management*, January Issue, 51-56.
- Badenhausen, K. (2013). Best cities for future job growth. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/kurtbadenhausen/2013/08/07/austin-heads-list-of-best-cities-for-job-growth/>
- Bartlett, D & Dibben, P. (2010). Public sector innovation and entrepreneurship: Case studies from local government. *Local Government Studies*, 28 (4), 107-121.
- Bason, C. (2010). Leading Public Sector Innovation: Co-creating for a Better Society. The Policy Press: Bristol, UK.
- Blakely, E.J., & Bradshaw, T.K. (2002). *Planning Local Economic Development Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Borins, S. A. (1998). Innovating with Integrity: How Local Heroes are Transforming American Government. Georgetown University Press: Washington, D.C.
- Borins, S. A. (2001). Public management innovation toward a global perspective. *American Review of Public Administration*, 31(1), 5-21
- Borins, S. (Eds). (2008). Innovations in government: Research, Recognition and Reputation. Brookings Institution Press: Washington D. C.
- Bommert, B. (2010). Collaborative innovation in the public sector. *International Public Management Review*, 11 (3), 15-33.
- Damanpour, F. & Schneider, M. (2009) Characteristics of Innovation and Innovation Adoption in Public Organizations: Assessing the role of Managers. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19, 495-522.
- Eggers, W.D. & Singh S.K. (2009). The Public Innovator's Playbook: Nurturing bold ideas in government. Deloitte Research
- Florida, R. (2002). The rise of the creative class and how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life. New York: Basic Books.
- Florida, R. (2005). Cities and the creative class. New York/London: Routledge.
- Frick, B. (2010, July). 10 Best Cities for the Next Decade. Retrieved from <http://www.kiplinger.com/article/business/T012-C000-S002-best-cities-2010-austin-texas.html>
- Friedhoff, A. & Kulkarni, S. (2013). Metro Monitor, Retrieved from <http://www.brookings.edu/research/interactives/metromonitor#US-recovery-overall-nv>
- Hartley, J. (2005). Innovation in governance and public services: Past and present. *Public Money and Management*, 27-34
- Jaskyte, K. 2011. Predictors of Administrative and Technological Innovations in Nonprofit Organizations. *Public Administration Review*, Jan/Feb, 77-86.
- Ketchen, D., Ireland, D. & Snow, C. (2007). Strategic entrepreneurship, collaborative innovation and

wealth creation. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 1, 371-385.

Kwon, M. Berry, F. & Feiock, R. (2009). Understanding the adoption and timing of economic development strategies in US cities using innovation and institutional analysis. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19, 967-988.

Light, P. (1998). *Sustaining Innovation: Creating Nonprofit and government organizations that innovate naturally*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Liou, K. (2009) Local Economic Development in China and the United States: Strategies and Issues. *Public Administration Review*,: S29-S36.

Nambisan, S. (2008). Transforming government through collaborative innovation. *The Public Manager*, 37 (3) 36-41.

Porter, M. (2000). Location, competition, and economic development: Local clusters in a global economy. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 14 (1), 15-34.

Scott, A.J. (2000). *The Cultural Economy of Cities*, New York: Sage.

Torring, J. (2013). Collaborative innovation in the public sector in Osborne, S.P. & Brown, L. (Eds.) *Handbook of Innovation in Public Services*. Cheltenham, GBR: Edward Elgar.

Wise, L.R. (1999). The use of innovative practices in the public and private sectors: The role of organizational and individual factors, *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 23(2), 150-168.

Zheng, L., & Mildred Warner. (2010). "Business Incentive Use among U.S. Local Governments: A Story of Accountability and Policy Learning." *Economic Development Quarterly*, 325-336.

Table 1: Examples of COA-ED Innovations

Global Business Recruitment and Expansion	Cultural Arts Division	Small Business Development Program	Redevelopment Division	Music and Entertainment Division
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Global Commerce Strategy • Business Expansion • International Trade and Investment • International Welcome Program • Sister and Friendship Cities • Austin Technology Incubator • International Association of Science Parks and Cities • International Direct Flights • EB-5 Visa Program • Formula One™ U.S. Grand Prix 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mindPOP • Art in Public Places • Faces of Austin • Create Austin Cultural Master Plan • Cultural & Heritage Tourism • Cultural Contracts • Take it to the Next Level • The People's Gallery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family Business Loan Program • LocallyAustin.org • BizAid Business Skills Classes and Certification • BizOpen • Business Solutions Center • ElevateAustin • Getting Connected & Meet the Lender 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mueller • Seaholm District • 2nd Street • Green Water Treatment • Downtown Redevelopment • Waller Creek • Sustainable Places Project • Contributions to affordable housing programs • Commercial corridor revitalization strategies • Innovation Zone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Music Ambassadors • Austin Music Memorial • Austin-Toronto Music Alliance • Creative Media Center • HopeFM First Live Music Series • Music For Kids • House of Songs • Music Venue Assistance Loan Program • Leaders in Austin Music • Outdoor Music Venue Permitting • Music Industry Relations

Table 2: COA-ED 2013-2014 Budget and Full Time Equivalents

Division	FTE's	Budget
Cultural Arts	10.5	\$ 1,098,009
Global Business Recruitment and Expansion	7.0	\$ 914,496
Music	4.0	\$ 413,463
Redevelopment	11.0	\$ 1,753,635
Small Business Development	12.5	\$ 2,087,620
Support Services	8.0	\$ 1,661,813
Totals	53.0	\$ 7,929,036

Table 3: Data Collection Procedures

Method	Data Collection Procedure	Number	Variables
	Archival Analysis	5 Main Documents	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Importance of COA-ED 2. Interconnectedness of work done by individual divisions to overall goals of COA-ED 3. Collaborative Innovation Potential 4. Nature of Innovation at COA-ED 5. Strengths & Weaknesses 6. Efforts to overcome weakness to increase innovation potential.
	Semi-structured Interviews	10 Interviews	

Table 4: COA-ED Examples of Innovations by Roles*

Innovation Integrator	Innovation Seeker	Innovation Champion	Innovation Catalyst
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EB-5 Visa Program • Meet the Lender • LocallyAustin.org • Global Commerce Strategy • Family Business Loan Program • Music Venue Assistance Loan Program • 2nd Street Retail District • International Welcome Program • Austin-Toronto Music Alliance • The People's Gallery • Music Ambassadors • Formula One™ Planning and Preparation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mayor's Taskforce on the Economy • Commercial Corridor Revitalization Strategies • Mueller Airport Redevelopment • Cultural Contracts • Seaholm District Redevelopment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austin Technology Incubator • mindPOP • House of Songs • Leaders in Austin Music • International Direct Flight to London 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creative Media Center • Downtown Redevelopment • Austin Music Memorial • Creation of the Music and Entertainment Division

Innovation roles as conceptualized by Nambisan (2008)

Table 5: COA-ED External Stakeholders

City Boards and Commissions	Local Chambers of Commerce	Local Schools, Colleges, and Universities	Workforce Development, Business Alliances, Incubators	Developers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austin Music Commission • Austin Arts Commission • Robert Mueller Municipal Airport Advisory Board • African American Quality of Life Commission • Community Development Commission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austin Gay and Lesbian Chamber of Commerce • Greater Austin Chamber of Commerce • Greater Austin Asian Chamber of Commerce • Greater Austin Black Chamber of Commerce • Greater Austin Hispanic Chamber of Commerce 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austin Independent School District • Austin Community College • Huston-Tillotson University • The University of Texas at Austin 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capital Idea • Skillpoint Alliance • Austin Technology Council • Austin Technology Incubator • Austin Independent Business Alliance • Downtown Austin Alliance • 6th Street Owners Association 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southwest Strategies Group • Catellus • Trammell Crow • AMLI Residential

Figure 1: Structure of COA-ED

