

NOTES FROM 2017 BECDD ANNUAL SUMMIT

MORNING PRESENTATION SESSION – 9:00-10:00 AM

National Scan (Presented by Joon Kim, LTU) [VIEW SLIDES 3-13 HERE](#)

Comments/Questions:

- How were the 5 cities chosen? (mature community development systems, cities with similar conditions when possible, and we looked for cities where there was a “common narrative” about the system)
- How were the 7 System Elements chosen? (started with the work done through CDAD in 2008-2010, further developed during Phase One, then modified in early 2017 based on findings from Phase One)
- Why were the “best practices” designated as such? (through the scholarly articles we reviewed, and through the subsequent site visits to four of the cities, the bottom line is that people believed they were best practices; they each needed/exemplified collaboration with city/foundations/and other entities including elected officials; they represented good stewardship of funding; and there was competitive validation of the work by CDCs)
- “Social Cohesion” has to be more than a “side car” issue – it should be an important part of the framework.
- Need to do better at pointing the research findings to the recommendations

Documenting Community Development Work in Detroit (Presented by Sarida Scott, CDAD [VIEW SLIDES 15-24 HERE](#)

Comments/Questions:

- We have interviewed 50 organizations, only 30% of the total goal, so the screens being presented are a sampling, and not yet the full picture. We expect to be done with the interviews in spring of 2018.
- Maps are helpful to see the gaps.
- It will be good to have a base of understanding.
- What does “frequency” mean? On a 1-5 scale, we wanted to find out which of the 5 Community Development roles were done most or least frequently by the organization being interviewed.
- It’s going to be important to see where the “advocacy” and “resident engagement” is happening – that’s a key to engaging neighborhoods.
- Not all organizations act as CDOs but might identify as such (we are aware of this and asked very specific questions to help the organization correctly identify their “type.” In some cases, we had to guide the organization to the correct definition based on what they are now doing, versus what they hope to do, or plan to do.)
- The “Definition of Community Development and CDOs” was crucial with the interviews. This definition was a consensus definition that came out of Phase One, and we will be talking about it again today to see if the definition needs to be updated.
- What are the differences between these maps and the current CDAD maps (these are based on face-to-face interviews; and they are based on the 5 Community Development Roles defined in Phase One; and they are specific to CDOs and GROs.)
- How are we prepared to work with all neighborhoods, versus just a “chosen few”? (that is the challenge; through this system-building process we hope to make it possible for any neighborhood that wants a CDO and GROs to have a way to create these organizations; and,

next year's work will be focused on look at the gaps and trying to find ways to reduce those gaps).

- There are "turf battles" in neighborhoods
- We need a data collection system and one cohesive system to support this. Data will have to be updated.
- Where did list of organizations to be interviewed, come from? (from Department of Neighborhoods District Managers, CDAD list and BECDD list; then we asked each organization we interviewed to refer us to other organizations). If your organization wants to be interviewed/included in the data base, see Lauren at BECDD.

National Consultant Recommendations, Academy Without Walls, WSU/MNA Center for Nonprofit Support (Donna Murray Brown) [VIEW SLIDE 14 HERE](#)

National Consultants Recommendations. Donna reviewed the 6 Key Recommendations that rose from the intensive study/visiting of 5 cities: Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Indianapolis, Philadelphia, and provided a summary of how BECDD has responded to those recommendations. Recommendations:

- ✓ Building consensus on a definition and roles in community development. In Detroit there is a lack of clarity around goals, roles and success measures. What is a common vision we can all embrace?
- ✓ Secure local public support from Detroit government. In the other cities there is strong alignment between neighborhoods and City Hall. That does not occur in Detroit right now.
- ✓ Pursue a coordinated system to provide technical assistance for community development. Right now, in Detroit the resources are confusing and hard to navigate, and there is a lack of clarity on what is being offered and what is needed.
- ✓ Determine how CDAD, LISC and other support organizations can play a role in the system. This speaks to the idea of intermediaries in Detroit doing much more coordinating and advocating on community development and neighborhood work.
- ✓ Conduct a comprehensive review of the costs of the system and create a funding strategy. There needs to be an in-depth study on this topic and determine how philanthropy and government will resource this system.

Comments/Questions:

- If everyone plays the right role we can move forward
- Detroit Public Schools Community District needs to be a part of this (we are working now with the Office of Community and Parent Engagement to find a way to engage).
- We should include the concept of "peer expertise"
- Are we looking at existing entities to play key roles?

Academy Without Walls. Donna presented a brief summary that we remain engaged with the Housing and Revitalization Department on a community development capacity building partnership we are currently calling the "Academy Without Walls." We expect by mid-2018 to be ready to launch this effort.

- What is the role of the City in developing local practitioners?

Ralph Wilson Foundation Center for Nonprofit Support. Donna and Graig Donnelly of WSU/TechTown then announced the opening of this resource in mid-2018, at a building now being renovated at Grand Blvd and 6568 Woodward. The goal is to build capacity of the larger nonprofit sector in the Detroit

region, focusing initially on Ralph Wilson Foundation grantees. WSU and MNA are partners along with Community Wealth Partners. They will be launching a search for a Director, who will be employed through WSU. Graig emphasized that he expects this Center will be a helpful resource for the work now being undertaken through the Building the Engine process and they expect to partner with CDAD, MNA, MCR and many others.

- How will this center be different from CDAD and MCR? (this center will focus on the whole nonprofit sector, whereas CDAD focuses
- How will this center be different from CDAD and MCR? (this center will focus on the whole nonprofit sector, whereas CDAD focuses on community development and neighborhoods. MCR and CDAD will be partners).

MORNING SESSION: 10:00-11:30

RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISCUSSION OF PLANNING TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS

Career and Education Pathways Planning Team Recommendations (presented by Raul Echeverria)

Raul Echeverria of UNI presented on behalf of the Planning Team [VIEW SLIDES 25-32 HERE](#)

Comments/Questions

- We have to do a better job of highlighting community development career choices
- Be more explicit on the importance of CD career mobility among the various allied sectors, so residents can see the career options
- Professional development is important; but being to hire CD professionals on a sustainable basis is essential
- What role is the city of Detroit playing in this component?
- Finding the right resources/pathways is a challenge for aspiring CD professionals
- “bridging the gap” to find CD careers is key
- Skill sets are important to success for people pursuing various jobs in CD
- Where is Wayne County Community College and other educational leaders in this process (the Planning Team table includes 8 academic institutions, but not WCCD which was invited)
- The Cody High School Community Leadership track is underway now and offers high school seniors community college credit by the time they graduate from high school, in community leadership.
- Are there internships in Urban Planning that can be offered by the various universities?
- AmeriCorps and other similar programs should be utilized (the Planning Team includes the LISC AmeriCorps program and the Public Allies AmeriCorps program, and we are now exploring ways for those placements to earn college credit)
- We have to find a way to equitably compensate and acknowledge the talents and skills of everyone – especially resident leaders – who provide their expertise, to help us reach our goal.

Concluding Discussion:

- No objection to the overall direction, with the changes/additions suggested
- Add a SMART Goal for these recommendations
- Do a better job of showing the connection between the research findings and the recommendations

- We have to provide opportunities for residents to receive credentials in this work – residents who are already in leadership roles in the Grass Roots organizations or on the boards of CDOs.
- What policies and processes can we put in place NOW to support this goal? We can change our internal evaluations and job descriptions to support the recruitment of local people of color, we can change how we recruit.
- Why is there a 3-5-year goal for this component? Why not 3? Or 2? Or no time-oriented goal at all? We have to act now and not wait.
- “Acquiring values” doesn’t sit well. Doing work in this field means that practitioners come with that value set already.
- There is no unifying “theme” for these recommendations.
- The language around achieving equity in these career paths is inconclusive – make it more explicit
- How many jobs/positions will there be in 3-5 years? Can we create an action strategy and goal around the number of CD jobs we want to create? We need to get a better handle on job demand in this field
- Create a definition of a community development professional that is more inclusive

Certification and Capacity Building Planning Team Recommendation (presented by Shamyle Dobbs)
 Shamyle Dobbs of MCR presented on behalf of the Planning Team [VIEW SLIDES 33-38 HERE](#)

Comments/Questions:

- Do a better job of showing how the research findings are connected to the recommendations
- Any conversation about local expertise, and having local CDOs and other organizations that have best practices, preparing to share their learnings? (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)
- 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.” (Next year’s BECDD work will focus on building out these services, criteria for participation and quality control for this very reason).
- How will we measure the success of the “clearinghouse”? We will need a lot of conversations about this.
- Clearinghouse is an excellent idea. We observe, though, that’s it’s one thing to develop a vision and mission statement, but how the organization acts is a separate question.
- Fee/payment scenario – can services include donated professional services? These could be free to the CDO or GRO, and not require cash payment.
- We need to really cultivate our young people. At the BECDD Forum in November the young people who spoke were so willing to “own” this work, if we would only listen and engage them. We must cultivate their innate sense of wanting to help their neighborhoods.
- 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.
- 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?
- Great work to the planning team for thinking about these issues.

Concluding Discussion:

- No objection to the overall direction, taking into account the comments from the morning.
- Find immediate action items and start moving forward.
- Attach a SMART goal to this effort – what do we want to achieve with this work?
- The language is very academic. Not sure if the term “capacity building” should be used because it’s too much a “community development” term and isn’t user-friendly. Make the language more accessible.

Research, Data and Evaluation Planning Team Recommendation (presented by Darnell Adams, Jane Morgan and Maggie DeSantis)

Darnell Adams of the Detroit Land Bank Authority and Jane Morgan of JFM Consulting Group presented on behalf of the Planning Team [VIEW SLIDES 39-60 HERE](#)

Comments/Questions on “Neighborhood Vitality” Success Framework recommendations:

- Do a better job of connecting the research to these recommendations
- The Success Framework should allow for “storytelling” around each neighborhood to see the diversity and differences in each neighborhood, and to life up those stories – that happened in Philadelphia and was powerful
- We must understand the distinctions between Detroit’s current conditions and other cities
- City Council district don’t always align with how Detroiters think about where they live. Resident leaders’ priorities/feedback wasn’t taken into account when these lines were drawn.
- In developing indicators, we must ask residents in neighborhoods what a “healthy neighborhood” feels like
- One of the challenges will be finding the balance between technical data, and information from the community, and building the capacity of the community to get the data
- Think hard on what “changes” we want to report on in the neighborhoods
- Department of Neighborhoods’ District Managers are not engaging enough. If they are going to be partners in this we have to hold them accountable.

Comments on Neighborhood Cluster Presentation and Discussion:

- Add a SMART goal to this component
- How are neighborhoods defined now? [currently the DLBA and Dept. of Neighborhoods are using a map of 208 neighborhoods, derived from DONs work in organizing block clubs, and relying on resident organizations declaring neighborhoods.]
- Are there models for this in other cities? [Not really. No need to benchmark against other cities – they are all struggling with this question. Detroit should stick with this process of trying to figure out cluster/naming concepts]
- The “combination strategy” of using census tracks and finding ways to cluster neighborhoods, is the right strategy for data and reporting – but we have to retain the ability to “go small” when necessary
- Create some kind of community engagement process to “name” neighborhoods that seeks and listens to resident’s input – keep everyone informed and engaged in this process

- There is “power in naming” – even if we can’t figure this out cleanly, we can at least live up the questions and the struggle and tension itself as we move forward – don’t take this process lightly
- Plug into the CDOs for information on neighborhood boundaries as part of the process
- Planning Department would like us to figure this out together
- As you get information to name these clusters, don’t just consume it, challenge it
- One of the challenges will be consistency in the data so we can measure changes for the long run
- Each neighborhood is different – can’t be the same measures for all neighborhoods
- For each neighborhood, the indicators need to be tied to the specific strategies that are chosen for that neighborhood

Concluding Discussion on Success Framework and Neighborhood Clusters:

- No objection to the “Neighborhood Vitality” framework
- Be Practical!!!
- Gear the “clusters” toward the kinds of changes we want to see in neighborhoods
- We must stick this “cluster” and “naming” process out for the long run – thanks for the expertise that has been brought to this
- Involve the DLBA Community Partners in the naming process
- The D-Community map you are creating from the interviews should be helpful with naming process
- We have to trust the expertise from the grass roots organizations about boundaries and what makes a good neighborhood
- City government has to be invested for this to work [this is why we are working to create a partnership with DLBA/DON around these indicators and especially reporting on progress]
- Think about developing a “community life cycle” concept and fitting each neighborhood into specific points on that life cycle at any given point in time, as a way to measure progress: “beginning,” “middle,” “end,” “transform” cycles
- Don’t let this system set up some communities for failure. Each community is so different, and there are some that will look like “losers” depending on what the indicators are. [we are looking at creating “core indicators” that could go across all neighborhoods, and then “secondary indicators” that would be different in each neighborhood depending on conditions, priorities, strategies; also, we are looking at a “progress index” versus a numerical scoring system so that we don’t encourage or create a false sense that some neighborhoods are failing]
- Understand the importance of “reporting clusters” and that’s fine, but we have to retain the ability to “drill down” to the neighborhood level – this should be added to the language of these recommendations. [
- Do we really want to create success measures? How will this be helpful to what we are trying to do? [from day one every conversation we have – whether it’s with philanthropy, or capacity building strategies, or even with CDOs about what work they are doing – it always comes down to “what are we aiming for”? “what does success mean for our neighborhoods.” And different foundations, different capacity builders, different CDOs each have a different idea about this. It’s not that those ideas are wrong, but it’s clear from our research that we need some kind of consensus about an over-arching success framework and how to measure it].
- In order for this to be embraced, have thriving neighborhoods, we have to be on the same page on this question

- Have we found models for the “cluster” concept or naming neighborhoods in other cities?
[there are really no other cities that have figured this out – they are still struggling with this –

AFTERNOON/LUNCH SESSIONS: BREAKOUT GROUPS WITH CDOS (NOTES NOW BEING PREPARED)

AFTERNOON SESSIONS: KITCHEN CABINET MEETINGS

WHAT IS “EQUITABLE DEVELOPMENT” IN DETROIT? PERSPECTIVES FROM THE KITCHEN CABINETS....

From the Grass Roots Organization Kitchen Cabinet. Equitable Development means....

- ✓ Equitable Development is “smart growth” that meets the needs of underserved communities through projects, programs and policies that reduce disparities, retain spaces that belong to low income people; and through inclusive language and storytelling that keeps everyone in a community engaged.
- ✓ Local residents are being priced out of some of the neighborhoods – it’s a form of gentrification
- ✓ Entities come into the community and make decisions without consulting with existing residents.
- ✓ Equitable Development = Residential Involvement.
- ✓ Strong policies with developers that are enforceable, favoring communities
- ✓ Holistic approach to community life, focusing on quality of life for the citizens of the community
- ✓ Strategizing around the most consistent complaints from residents
- ✓ Doing surveys to find out what is most important to the community

From the Philanthropy Kitchen Cabinet. Equitable Development means....

- ✓ Philanthropy is unclear about what it is, but we know it is critical for community development organizations; strong CDOs make sure there is vigorous discussion around this question
- ✓ Sometimes we think we are the “champions” of Equitable Development
- ✓ It’s hard to define Equitable Development because it’s hard to find many examples
- ✓ Includes going thru the process of developing an equity statement as part of a development project
- ✓ Includes taking the time to think about what structures are in place that prevent equitable development, while acknowledging the power relationships between the developer and the community, and the biases that exist on both sides
- ✓ Asking who has the decision-making power over the development? It means asking where do the resources flow from the development: both the developer and the workers involved in it? Who is ultimately benefitting?
- ✓ Projects in which the community has played a role
- ✓ Sustainability: harnessing the resources of the planet, the people, the economy
- ✓ Making sure that certain elements of municipal development focus on quality of life: where do the roads go? The parks? The water service lines? Who pays for these amenities? Who gets the jobs? Nobody owns equitable development – it’s a human rights question, one that the government needs to focus on.

From the Practitioners Kitchen Cabinet. Equitable Development means....

- ✓ Creating real communities
- ✓ A space for candid conversations with developers to collectively discuss what it means to a community – but this is difficult and time consuming (cannot be done in one day) and requires specific resources

- ✓ Residents should be funded to help do the work of coordinating these conversations and getting residents' perspectives
- ✓ Developers' matching resources to the "talking points" of a proposed development
- ✓ Accounting for the systemic inequalities that exist in high poverty communities
- ✓ Adjusting the project to touch the hardest hit residents and communities
- ✓ Valuing "common sense" ideas in high poverty communities
- ✓ Everyone benefits – equitable for all – all stakeholders' outcomes are accommodated
- ✓ Believing that all families at all income levels deserve to have healthy and safe communities
- ✓ Where both the developers and the CDOs are compensated for their work in bringing about the development
- ✓ Everyone is engaged with the vision and implementation process of the development

From the Intermediaries Kitchen Cabinet. Equitable Development means....

- ✓ Capacity building for communities; it's not just about the jobs being created
- ✓ Residents having equity in a development ID being able to save through IDAs
- ✓ Development that decreases inequality
- ✓ Having everyone at the table; making sure we ask how is the developer getting feedback?
- ✓ Giving youth a voice in the development; structuring meetings that encourage youth development – we need to incorporate young people into these spaces
- ✓ Neighborhood residents and members are involved in decision making in the development
- ✓ Reminding ourselves why we do this work; being responsible to do things in a better way, including being more vocal on behalf of residents
- ✓ Influencing policy that affects development including census and voter engagement
- ✓ Thinking deeply about the systems that stop equitable development

From the Government Kitchen Cabinet. Equitable Development means....

- ✓ Opportunities for everyone
- ✓ Listening to the community – the activists and those who live and work there
- ✓ Getting the organizations in the community involved, although some don't know how
- ✓ Policies that have an equity lens
- ✓ Development without displacement
- ✓ Opportunities from the development, for those affected by the development
- ✓ The role of the CDO is to help facilitate opportunities for those who live where development is happening; to identify the "common points" of the community's advocacy; and get people to the table

From the Academia Kitchen Cabinet. Equitable Development means....

- ✓ From an education standpoint, focusing on all ages beginning with pre-school; providing students with appropriate tools to meet their needs; not every student receives equal coverage/services educationally; we have to look at what the student's aspirations are
- ✓ From a community development perspective, we need "helping hands" along the way so that other organizations can become CDOs, IE Success Coaches
- ✓ We need to bridge educational institutions through credit transfers
- ✓ More apprenticeships are needed – look at federal and state funds
- ✓ Opportunities are needed for employment of residents and to be engaged in the community – there have to be conscious efforts to involve the community
- ✓ "Success metrics" are needed

From the Civic Organizations/Social Entrepreneurs Kitchen Cabinet. Equitable Development means....

- ✓ Intentionally acknowledging and addressing inequities across the spectrum, for housing development or any other new development that hadn't previously existed
- ✓ Calling out all the elements where inequities exist
- ✓ Providing access to all the information related to the development: market studies, sources of funding, etc.
- ✓ Providing exposure to the opportunities that are out there
- ✓ Understanding that communities differ one from another, culturally; and there needs to be an understanding of the "eco-environment" and social elements of each neighborhood, capturing the community's "image" and culture first, then focusing on the economics
- ✓ People/residents are part of the development process; there is discussion with all the stakeholders in the room to remove "segregated" views or definitions of development
- ✓ In entrepreneurship, its equal access to business resources for all entrepreneurs, democratizing the capitalization process
- ✓ Going beyond traditional development
- ✓ Development that is not just driven by the numbers, but includes the wants/needs/desires of the neighborhood

FROM PRACTITIONERS KITCHEN CABINET: WHAT KIND OF COLLECTIVE/INDUSTRY-WIDE SUPPORTS WOULD BE VALUE-ADD FOR CDOs, TO HELP THEM BE MORE EFFECTIVE?

Advocacy on these issues:

- Funders switching priorities to local versus national
- Funders supporting collaborations
- Banks seem to be in control and foundations are supporting them
- CDOs need to stay on mission; they often change focus to adapt to funders
- Salary levels for CDOs are too low
- Funders dictating the work of CDOs ("don't tell us how to do our jobs")
- Too many planning decisions are made before residents can make a choice about their neighborhood
- When developers conduct a process, but don't follow through on promises, it's a "failure"

Facilitation/Coordination

- Facilitating non-threatening conversation among funders, CDOs and residents
- Facilitating conversation around "how do we work together in an environment of famine?"
- Unifying CDOs to make a unified approach to foundations
- Leveraging small place-based projects to raise additional funding support
- Conversation around "how are our missions aligned to make a greater impact"

Training/Coaching

- Diversifying the CDO revenue portfolio: the science and the art
- Achieving major/planned gifts (can't be afraid to research wealthy individuals and make the ask)
- Fund Development in general
- Long-term planning (organization)
- Tools to deliver development projects; execution is important

Marketing/Communications

- Link to Detroit Homecoming Ex-Pats to showcase work going on in Detroit communities

City-wide organized “one voice” for neighborhoods

Common/centralized services

- Medical/health benefits
- Retirement

FROM THE PHILANTHROPY KITCHEN CABINET: WHAT ARE SOME STRATEGIES FOR BUILDING A COLLABORATIVE FUNDING TABLE FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT?

Vision

- ✓ The hope is for an actual funding collaborative for community development in Detroit
- ✓ What has worked: having a clear, structured governance structure where the foundations have an advisory role only; then you make sure there is an equal voice among those who pay. You pay, you play, equally.
- ✓ In the end it’s about the clarity of the vision; it will be good for this body to get this clarity
- ✓ If a collaborative is set up there must be some clear success measures
- ✓ Cleveland Neighborhood Progress structure shows that it’s easier to have effective community development when there is an existing pool of funds

Setting up and Managing a Collaborative

- ✓ A Funding Collaborative has to have some backroom capacity; a “backbone” organization that is the administrative hub, structurally
- ✓ The “External Party” that holds the funds should not also contribute dollars to the fund
- ✓ Decisions around goals with the monies must be decided up front
- ✓ There should be very explicit acknowledgement: what is your agenda with the funding? Are you donating to a philosophy? Is this co-funding?
- ✓ One example of another funders collaborative: once the purpose was set, a company was hired to manage the funding; we were able to determine the grantmaking process and structure really quickly, facilitated by the company that was hired.
- ✓ The funders should not drive the agenda of the recipient organizations; they should not be at the center of the recipients’ decision-making
- ✓ Funders should not get involved in the in the administration; they should make a grant to the collaborative; they should participate in building the vision but they shouldn’t drive the funding process
- ✓ There should be minimal reporting requirements for the recipient organizations; the due diligence should be done up front so recipients are not stressed.

Challenges

- ✓ If any given funder has too much specificity with their money, they may not be able to participate
- ✓ There may be some space up front for these restrictions/specifics but that should be known up front
- ✓ Today, many of the funding entities are meeting together and they are not shy about their perspectives

FROM THE INTERMEDIARIES KITCHEN CABINET: HOW CAN WE RESOLVE THE ACKNOWLEDGED PROBLEM OF “LANE CONFUSION” AMONG THE INTERMEDIARIES?

Vision

- ✓ Should there be an integrated, centralized capacity building function?

Challenges

- ✓ There are difficulties in getting with the right people – where do we go to talk together? How do we get these meetings? We are not reaching the people we want to reach
- ✓ Connecting to various communication vehicles is difficult – it’s not clear – for example there are over 200 workforce alliances
- ✓ Not everyone is using the same language
- ✓ Difficulty in making sure everyone is accessing the services of the various organizations
- ✓ “Lane Competition” is similar to “Lane Confusion” – how do we relate to other organizations?
- ✓ There are internal challenges – some organizations will have to let something go; how do we communicate with our teams and with others?
- ✓ “Chasing dollars” is a problem; everyone wants to contribute to make a difference but there is no cohesion
- ✓ We never seem to get to a point to flip the power dynamic to collaborate and therefore have more leverage together
- ✓ When are we able to say “we shouldn’t take that money, another organization does this better”?
- ✓ We are looking to not be co-dependent
- ✓ We have to be aware of the real cost of our services, our cost of doing business
- ✓ We are unsure of each other’s expertise

How do we decide?

- ✓ Unsure who gets to decide who should be in what lane and who fills what niche

Resolving the problem

- ✓ There should be regular meetings among the statewide organizations
- ✓ We should have quarterly meetings to strengthen the relationships, for collaboration and to strengthen the body of work; these group meetings on a regular basis require time and work

FROM THE GRASS ROOTS KITCHEN CABINET: WHAT ARE SOME STRATEGIES TO ORGANIZE A “NEIGHBORHOOD VOICE” FOR DETROIT?

Vision

- ✓ Residents need to be heard

The Role of Grassroots Organizations

- ✓ Clarify and convey the purpose and responsibility of Grass Roots Organization

Leadership Structure

- ✓ Have to have strong leadership by creating a leadership team among the neighborhoods that speaks and acts as One Voice
- ✓ Have to effectively use team energy
- ✓ There should be leadership training for residents, mentorships and opportunities for leadership growth
- ✓ Need Rules of Engagement, Agreement on core behavior, and Goals and Objectives

Communication and Information Sharing

- ✓ Need multi-channel communication strategies (text, email, social media, face to face, other)
- ✓ Deal with language barriers
- ✓ Have to have transparency
- ✓ Research is important
- ✓ Be able to have one-on-one discussions to diffuse conflicts among residents and groups
- ✓ Engage all stakeholders
- ✓ Groups have to be willing to compromise
- ✓ Have to convey/communicate the End Results of each project

Goals and Strategy

- ✓ Give voice to local businesses
- ✓ Develop some “asks” for the CDOs
- ✓ Have to build in strategy for accountability from local and state officials
- ✓ The groups have to be aligned with goals and collaborative
- ✓ Need “back up” intervention plans
- ✓ Need funding for outreach, materials, staff
- ✓ Have to have effective strategy around the issues, then implement the strategy

FROM THE GOVERNMENT KITCHEN CABINET: WHAT ARE THE APPROPRIATE ROLES FOR CITY AND STATE GOVERNMENT IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT?

City Government should:

- ✓ Conduct a master plan process
- ✓ Demystify development and city policies
- ✓ Make information accessible
- ✓ Standardize processes and practices
- ✓ Define community engagement: what does effective community engagement look like?
Reshape community engagement
- ✓ Create partnerships and take new approaches
- ✓ Listen to the community
- ✓ Provide supplemental human services
- ✓ Look at community development as an industry and provide operational funding and other funding

FROM THE ACADEMIA KITCHEN CABINET: WHAT ARE SOME STRATEGIES TO BUILD EARLY AWARENESS OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AS A CAREER?

Barriers

- ✓ Lack of information
- ✓ Power imbalance between students and those with resources
- ✓ Social exclusion

Potential Strategies

- ✓ Internships
- ✓ Apprenticeships
- ✓ Awareness strategies, of the opportunities available in CD
- ✓ Bridging programs where credit transfers

- ✓ Outreach in High Schools
- ✓ High Ed students can do Mentoring within with young students in high school and elementary school
- ✓ People are looking more at “relevance” and “relationships” than hard skills: Social Capital
- ✓ Looking for students who have a certain skill set that matches community development
- ✓ Teams of people (academia? CDOs? Others?) should be collaborating together to outreach on community development careers
- ✓ Focus by academia should be on communities (read “Well Connected Community”)
- ✓ Can DPS students shadow community development organizations at an early age
- ✓ Students need/want transferable skills, incentives to work and to be educated
- ✓ Hold job fairs for community development

FROM THE CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS/BUSINESS/SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS KITCHEN CABINET: HOW DOES THE NEGATIVE PERCEPTION OF CDOs CHANGE FOR THE BETTER?

Current Perception of CDOs

- ✓ The work is shifting because of the increase in city engagement; the city views the work differently; there are “new layers” in the city with Planning, HRD and Dept. of Neighborhoods
- ✓ CDOs “filled in gaps” of things the City should have been doing but didn’t have the capacity
- ✓ There has been a loss of investment in CDOs over time
- ✓ CDOs help the City know “who is who” in the neighborhoods
- ✓ There are silos and divisions among the CDOs, and they are competing for the same resources – some convening body can bring them more together

Changing Perception: Redefine CDO Roles

- ✓ We need to redefine the role of the CDOs: they should be coordinators of activities, and the link to a city master planning process – up to this point they have acted like representatives of “mini-municipalities”
- ✓ A “day of reckoning” is coming – CDOs should re-evaluate strategically, and do succession planning/strategic planning based on the rapidly changing city climate; and come up with exit strategies to transition to a new role – sharing resources instead of holding them close while others lack resources
- ✓ CDOs should manage the transition of residents from low income to higher income
- ✓ CDOs should focus on what the gaps are the neighborhoods and fill those gaps, doing what they do well and not chasing money for things you don’t do well
- ✓ CDOs should help maintain the boundaries of a community in a way that sustains the community
- ✓ CDOs should do “community life cycle” planning

AFTERNOON SESSION: 3:00 – 4:30

Comments from Arthur Jemison, Director of Detroit’s Housing & Revitalization Dept.

- ✓ There is a community development model in Boston called “Pay for Success” that worked with youth offenders where the State paid the CDO for, in effect, government saved by reducing barriers to employment and re-entry programs for youth offenders.
- ✓ Working with “un-housed” individuals is important to the City
- ✓ How can CDOs do more with vacant land activation plans?
- ✓ CDOs could get more involved in facilitating “Business Improvement District” activities

- ✓ HRD is revisiting the concept of compensating residents for their participation in community planning processes and in recent negotiation around the Jeff-Chalmers planning process this will be happening

Dialogue with Arthur Jemison

- ✓ Question: In the cities BECDD visited we saw across the board that when communities were supported/incentivized to develop plans, they did so and then the city and philanthropy accepted those plans; but in Detroit we have the city “picking” neighborhoods and then bringing plans drawn up to that neighborhood for feedback. Why is that?

Jemison: Mayor felt he had to choose neighborhoods that already had high occupancy where investment would have more impact, and to keep residents in those neighborhoods, and he is fulfilling that mandate. Residents are using advocacy to lobby hard for what they want and philanthropy and other organizations are assisting with taking the lead with different approaches. The Planning Department and the Housing & Revitalization are working together on this. But the Mayor has “no plans” for the other neighborhoods so there can be a dynamic process in those neighborhoods. In the past, philanthropy has driven planning.

- ✓ Question: During the planning process will there be a community engagement component?
Jemison: Money is being provided to support projects (local and federal funds). Vendors are being chosen to focus on engagement in the chosen neighborhoods.

- ✓ Question: What is HRD’s concept of “partnering” with neighborhoods?
Jemison: The City should give parameters. There needs to be an understanding of what the City can and can’t do (can work on streets, city lights, sidewalks, zoning), and then the city and the neighborhood choose what the projects should be, together. Partnerships should focus on changing the economics of a neighborhood.

- ✓ Question: Teachers are being given discounts to purchase homes in Detroit. Is this a good idea? Some areas don’t seem to be eligible (IE District 3).
Jemison: Yes, this is a good idea.

AFTERNOON SESSION: 3:00-4:30 – DIRECTION AND DEFINITION OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

- ✓ No significant objections to current definition
- ✓ CDO Role should include “being the sustained voice” for the neighborhood
- ✓ Don’t focus on what a CDO is not – focus on what it actually is
- ✓ Wordsmithing is required to edit the verbiage – too many words
- ✓ Using the term “capacity building” could alienate some stakeholders; it is a term understood in this sector but is not widely used
- ✓ Add verbiage about the importance of neighborhood names – residents should determine names
- ✓ We saw in the research that “social cohesion” is important, it shouldn’t be a “sidecar” to the whole concept, has to be part of the train
- ✓ In defining a CDO shouldn’t we be saying that the majority of the board of directors should be residents, instead of “stakeholders”?
- ✓ But if the CDO is primarily a business association dedicated to a commercial corridor, the majority of the stakeholders will be those businesses. It’s a “balancing act” to make sure that the board of

directors represents the major stakeholders of the organization, but also gives residents the major voice because the organization is operating on behalf of a certain neighborhood