

# **BUILDING THE ENGINE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN DETROIT: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY BUILDING SYSTEM IN DETROIT DECEMBER 2017**

*“How will the new organization (Ralph Wilson Center for Nonprofit Support) work? This is critical so that it doesn’t become a burden and just another layer. Same question for the “clearinghouse.”*

-- Comment from a 2017 BECDD Summit Participant

## **RESEARCH CONDUCTED**

- “Deep dive” whole-system research on Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Indianapolis and Philadelphia with learnings and recommendations
- 4 site visits with cohorts of 12-17 BECDD stakeholders, to Boston, Cleveland, Indianapolis and Philadelphia
- Documentation and analysis of 8 local focus group meetings with practitioners (2), government officials (2), philanthropy, service intermediaries and funding intermediaries, totaling 40-plus individual who participated
- Documentation and analysis of current Detroit capacity building offerings compared to requested capacity building services by CDOs and GROs

## **FINDINGS BY THE PLANNING TEAM**

- Good work now in play, by committed but under-resourced capacity building providers
- Lane confusion: lack of clarity, competition and redundancy among the providers
- Gap between services being provided and services being requested by CDOs and GROs
- No agreement on what successful capacity building work means
- Difficulty on the part of CDOs and GROs in finding, choosing and paying for capacity building services
- No coordination or information-sharing among providers, no cohesive capacity building strategy

## **RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BECDD STAKEHOLDERS**

### **Overall Strategy: “Central Clearinghouse” Approach**

- ✓ A clearinghouse function, embedded inside an existing organization, manages the process
- ✓ Clearinghouse manages a list of TA providers/consultants/coaches/trainers
- ✓ Clearinghouse handles central intake and referral to providers
- ✓ Clearinghouse entity doesn’t also provide one-on-one support to client organizations (CDOs and GROs), to avoid conflict of interest. Clearinghouse entity potentially do classroom training.
- ✓ Criteria for inclusion on the TA Provider list is co-determined and evaluated collectively, not solely by the Clearinghouse entity.

### **Key Design Guidelines for the Capacity Building “Clearinghouse” System**

- ✓ Combination of “free” and “fee” to clients; where the clearinghouse is vetting, assessing and referring CDOs and GROs to TA providers
- ✓ Services should be linked to neighborhood success metrics
- ✓ Services should be more one-to-one: coaching, consulting, mentoring; not just one-to-many (classroom training)

- ✓ The clearinghouse should be a coordinator and advocate for the right services to be provided.
- ✓ TA Providers should be convened regularly to share learnings and best practices
  
- ✓ The clearinghouse creates guidelines for, and offers different levels of service, based on an organization's capacity and tenure
- ✓ Evaluation of capacity building services is required and must be broadly-shared (with both clearinghouse and providers)

### **Capacity Building System Work to Still be Completed in 2018**

- Finalize Design of the System based on above guidelines including:
  - Fee model (who pays? The client or the TA provider or both?)
  - Quality Control component
  - Baseline qualifications for TA providers
  - Web-based application/intake system
  - Necessary CDO/GRO Assessment Tool(s)
  - Determine the types of expertise needed by the TA providers, based on the "Success Framework" and the Role of CDOs and GROs
- Determine the roles of various intermediaries/TA providers in the system
- Recommend criteria for selection of the Clearinghouse entity
- Finalize costs and funding for the Clearinghouse function

### **SUMMARY OF RESPONSES AT THE 2017 SUMMIT**

- No objection to the overall direction
- How will the new organization (Ralph Wilson Center for Nonprofit Support) work? This is critical so that it doesn't become a burden and just another layer. Same question for the "clearinghouse."
- How will we measure the success of the "clearinghouse"? We will need a lot of conversations about this.
- Any conversation about local expertise, and having local CDOs and other organizations that have best practices, preparing to share their learnings? [**Response:** BECDD, from its inception, has heard from its stakeholders that peer learning is a preferred way for CDOs to build capacity, and this has been a priority]
- Fee/payment scenario – can services include donated professional services? These could be free to the CDO or GRO, and not require cash payment.
- Concern that Detroit has "turf battles" in the neighborhoods. How do we partner if we're only concerned with our own "square" of the puzzle?
- Attach a SMART goal to this effort

### **KEY CHANGES TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS?**

- Inter-generational resources and bartered services. There are elders with professional skills who need help, and they can provide some services in exchange. There is an array of local, untapped talent that should be part of this system. There is a high need for volunteers and seniors can provide these critical services.
- The language is very academic. Not sure if the term "capacity building" should be used because its too much a "community development" term and isn't user-friendly. Make the language more accessible.
- Find immediate action items and start moving forward.

