

Capacity Building

I. Background/Considerations¹:

In *Learning from the Journey* the Annie E. Casey Foundation states that the need for capacity building is “critical and continual.” Initiatives grounded in the community require new capacity building approaches and tools. Structured learning processes, with communities fully engaged in the determination of technical assistance needs, management, and effectiveness, are critical in a comprehensive community-building initiative, as is the recognition that the optimum learning sequence is not always a linear one.

Building capacity refers to the process of educating and assisting residents, organizations, and other stakeholders in the community who are in need of certain skills, knowledge, and resources to successfully participate in transforming their community. In fact, in the Rebuilding Communities Initiative (RCI), the Casey Foundation’s theory of change states that “comprehensive community change cannot occur unless the chosen strategies truly respond to the needs of their residents.” Thus, the RCI capacity-building agenda was not just about organizational development, but encompassed personal development as well. In one community, RCI “helped us to see leadership development as the engine of change that will drive what we are trying to do here. It has helped us gear the community up for thinking together and then moving together...gearing the community up for learning how to learn.” Likewise, the GNI is relying on active involvement of neighborhood residents to identify their needs, and working with the initiative’s partners to assess the most effective way to address these needs.

Interestingly, the Annie E. Casey Foundation explicitly acknowledged the need for capacity building by structuring RCI to include a capacity-building phase, rather than moving directly from the planning phase to the implementation phase. The kind of fundamental changes the communities and the Foundation were seeking required an additional step in the process that would enable each community to build the capacity of its leaders and organizations. Building the capacity of residents, institutions, stakeholders, and others in the community helps them develop the skills, knowledge, technical resources and more to carry out the community’s ambitious rebuilding plans.

The Knight Foundation, CNP, and HIRI joined together to examine the issue of building capacity in nonprofit organizations as it relates to strengthening the quality of life for communities². Investigators presented two papers at a daylong seminar on June 20, 2000, at the Urban Institute. Nonprofit practitioners, technical assistance providers, foundation representatives, and researchers provided feedback to ensure the information would serve the sector. The group discussed in-depth issues related to capacity building for nonprofit organizations, identified gaps in knowledge, and debated how knowledge could best be turned into practice³.

Capacity-building strongly relates to the overall quality of life in the communities nonprofit organizations serve. For nearly a century, nonprofit organizations have fulfilled a variety of functions that help build and maintain civil society. They offer resources to residents of local communities, including social services, advocacy, cultural opportunities, monitoring of government and business practices, and much more (Boris 1999). They enable individuals to take an active role in their communities and contribute to the overall well-being of these communities. Nonprofit organizations also provide the basis and infrastructure for forming social networks that support strong communities. Civil society requires more than linking individuals to institutions; it requires building relationships among people. In these ways, nonprofit organizations add value to community life.

¹ *Learning...*

² *Building...*

³ *Building...*

II. Approaches to Capacity Building⁴

There are a variety of approaches to providing capacity-building services. Some of these include

- Providing access to repositories of information and resources (for example, databases, libraries, and websites).
- Self-directed capacity building through the use of on-line resources.
- Use of project management tools and matrices (ie. Bravelo, Action Planning Team matrix)
- Workshops and trainings on topics identified by residents/stakeholders of the initiative
- Individual consultation (for example, coaching, facilitating, advice, research)
- Coordination of alliances, collaborations, partnerships.

III. A few good practices and/or promising capacity-building projects⁵:

- Flintridge Foundation—Nonprofit Leadership Program is a multitiered, interactive program that offers management resources to nonprofits serving children and youth. Designed and administered by Lee Draper Consulting, a firm specializing in nonprofit management assistance, this program was completed by six southern California non-profits in its pilot year (1998); eight organizations began a new cycle in April 2000. The Nonprofit Leadership Program is offered to eligible organizations for a nominal registration fee, and includes (a) six educational workshops on topics such as strategic planning, fundraising, and communications planning; (b) a special workshop on self-assessment to identify organizational needs; (c) funds to conduct a special project with individualized technical assistance consultation provided (each agency selects a consultant from a team roster); and (d) a board retreat for each agency, facilitated by the program's consultant. One example of a special project was the design and implementation of a fundraising auxiliary group to increase community involvement and support for the organization's work; another involved comprehensive board development.
- James Irvine Foundation—Central Valley Partnership provides capacity-building services to a group of community-based organizations working with immigrant communities in the Central Valley of California, helping people learn English and building their civic participation. The Foundation works strategically with each organization, connecting them with management consultants to promote strategic planning and financial strength; provides core operating support; and links agencies with public policy experts to help provide this region with a better voice in state policy development. Of particular interest is the learning community that has developed. Partnership agencies meet quarterly and have together created the Central Valley Forum to bridge the gap between grassroots organizing and state policy development. The Partnership also created the Small Grants Program to support grassroots organizations in very rural areas. A faculty member from a local university serves as the group's "learning coach."
- Los Angeles Urban Funders (LAUF) is a coalition of 21 foundations supporting comprehensive community building in three Los Angeles communities, operating under the umbrella of the Southern California Association for Philanthropy, the Regional Association of Grantmakers for Los Angeles. LAUF starts with large-scale efforts to organize residents around issues that concern them, taps into neighborhood associations, and then convenes the nonprofits and moves into management assistance and planning activities. The four goals of LAUF are to (1) encourage funders to gain an in-depth knowledge of three Los Angeles neighborhoods, coordinate their grantmaking within these communities, and work collaboratively; (2) strengthen the capacity of leaders and organizations to work together on collaborative research, asset mapping, strategic planning, and decisionmaking; (3) create healthier neighborhoods through comprehensive strategies that integrate human services,

⁴ Types...

⁵ Building...

economic development, and community organizing; and (4) share lessons learned with other grantmakers, neighborhood leaders, and policymakers. Most of the capacity building is contracted out to local management service providers. A qualitative evaluation is documenting the process of the program and some of its accomplishments.

- Urban Strategies Council: <http://www.urbanstrategies.org/programs/commblding/index.html>
The Council works with community-based organizations (CBOs), residents, public agencies, elected officials, foundations and other stakeholders to build community capacities, to create and sustain change that improves outcomes for children, families and residents of low-income neighborhoods. Projects include providing capacity building, technical assistance and training; strategy and program development, and tool development for community building initiatives at the neighborhood, community and national levels. The Council's approach is to improve the myriad conditions affecting low-income neighborhoods and residents by working comprehensively to apply community building principles and practices. The Council works with partner organizations across the country in building organizational and collective capacities within the community building field to support community building practitioners. The Council engages in a variety of activities -- from research and publication, to fiscal sponsorship and organizational development, to participation in national organizations -- that are aimed at developing the field of community building. For more information see the Council's "Community Building Principles and Practices."
- Market Creek Plaza/Policy Link: <http://www.policylink.org/Projects/MarketCreek/>
PolicyLink has worked directly with Market Creek Plaza 's Ownership Design Team (composed of area residents and facilitated by JCNI) to map out a framework for evaluation of the development's ownership strategy. PolicyLink assisted the Team in thinking through the meaning of ownership and in defining the outcomes anticipated by enabling residents to own units in the development. Through an inclusive process, residents developed a conceptual model for evaluating the ownership strategy, which involves the testing of their plans against actual experience. While PolicyLink will not conduct the evaluation, it will provide assistance to JCNI and residents as they select an evaluation team able to work in a way that empowers residents to learn new skills and act as decision-makers in the project. The results of the evaluation, in addition to providing key information to JCNI and residents about the process and outcomes of the ownership strategy, will contribute a valuable knowledge base for practitioners, funders, and policymakers about the risks and possibilities of involving residents as partners and shareholders in local development activity. An additional resource of Policy Link, once fully developed, is the Equitable Development Tool Kit: <http://www.policylink.org/EDTK/tools.html>

IV. Levels of Capacity-Building within the GNI:

It is imperative to note that neighborhood residents, stakeholders, and community groups bring their own set of knowledge and skills to the planning and development process, and that these complement the knowledge and skills of the technical assistance providers⁶. All partners involved in a community initiative should be seen as both experts, as well as learners.

At the same time, the capacity-building needs among stakeholders (residents, community groups, non-profit organizations) may or may not be the same. While many of the capacity-building topics/needs are common across levels, it is important to note that each type of entity may have its own unique capacity-building needs - resulting in the implementation of targeted capacity-building activities at varying levels to various audiences throughout the initiative:

⁶ Peterman

- √ Capacity-building needs of neighborhoods (residents and community groups): refers to capacity-building needs of neighborhood residents or groups. Some of these capacity-building needs may include:
 - Leadership development, including community organizing and advocacy
 - Conflict resolution
 - Grantwriting and fundraising
 - Team-building
 - Data, research, and technology
- √ Cross-neighborhood capacity-building needs: describes capacity-building and learning needs that are common across GNI neighborhoods, and once met, will serve to move the overall initiative forward.
 - Governance/Infrastructure
 - Leadership development, including community organizing, advocacy.
 - Partnerships/Collaborations
 - Communication
 - Resident engagement (including Youth)
 - Community building⁷ – may include mapping existing skills, capacities, and assets of the community; identifying a community agenda and goals for action and development.
- √ Capacity-building needs of organizations/non-profits: refers to the capacity-building of individual organizations or non-profits engaged with the Good Neighborhoods Initiative. Some of these capacity-building needs may include:
 - Strategic planning and organizational development
 - Grantwriting, fundraising, and fiscal management
 - Marketing (research, promotions)
 - Program evaluation, data, research
 - Partnerships/collaboration
- √ Capacity-building needs of the overall Good Neighborhoods Initiative: refers to capacity-building needs that will assist the Good Neighborhoods Initiative with determining appropriate strategies, future projects, evaluation mechanisms, and the like.

Dr. Leslie Hollingworth has completed two reports outlining the capacity needs of the GNI communities per feedback collected from neighborhood residents and stakeholders: “Themes from ‘Dreams’ and ‘Strategies’ of Brightmoor and Osborn Residents: Implications for Technical Assistance” and “Capacity Building Needs and Learning Implications”. Located at the end of this brief, these reports contain information about the specific technical assistance, capacity-building, and learning needs expressed by GNI residents and stakeholders during the planning phase and early readiness phase of the initiative, and may help to delineate the capacity building needs at these different levels.

V. Characteristics of Effective Capacity-building Programs (funded by Foundations and geared primarily toward non-profit organizations)⁸

- Comprehensive. While narrowly-defined interventions can work, foundations’ most effective capacity-building activities offer some degree of “one-stop shopping” in which grantees can access a range of assessment services, technical assistance, financial aid, and

⁷ Community....

⁸ Building...

other kinds of support.

- Customized. The most effective capacity-building services are custom tailored to the type of nonprofit, its community environment, and its place in the “organizational life cycle” (young, start-up nonprofits are likely to have needs very different from more-established organizations).
- Competence-based. The most effective capacity-building services are those that are (a) offered by well-trained providers (both foundation staff and expert service suppliers) and (b) requested by knowledgeable, sophisticated “consumers” (nonprofit managers and board members).
- Timely. The most effective capacity building happens in the balanced space between action taken too slowly to be relevant (often because of funder delays in acting on grant applications) and action performed too quickly to allow the flowering of an intervention in a complex context.
- Peer-connected. The most effective capacity building happens when there are opportunities for peer-to-peer networking, mentoring, and information sharing.
- Assessment-based. The most effective capacity building begins with a thorough assessment of the needs and assets of the nonprofit and the community in which it operates, which in turn drives the types of capacity-building services provided.
- Readiness-based. The most effective capacity building occurs when the nonprofit “client” is ready to receive this specialized kind of service (e.g., the nonprofit is not in the midst of a major crisis that would make it unable to benefit from the intervention at that time).
- Contextualized. The most effective capacity building occurs in the larger context of other strengthening services a nonprofit is receiving, other activities of the sponsoring foundation, and other elements of the current community environment.

VI. Possible capacity-building outcomes⁹:

- New attitudes toward community development, most notably a greater capacity to engage in comprehensive community development processes that are more responsive to the community.
- Greater ability to use data, technology, evaluation techniques, and outcomes planning in future community-building work.
- Stronger infrastructures with which to continue community-building work.
- New ways of thinking about and treating residents within agencies.
- Enhanced skills among staff in community-based organizations.
- Stronger relationships between neighborhood institutions and external power groups such as government, foundations, and business.
- Improved community image and greater ability to attract resources and political attention
- Stronger non-profit agencies with more staff, better management systems, and expanded resources.
- Sustainability of the initiative and its activities beyond the time-limited support of the foundation.

Additional outcomes may include¹⁰:

- Stronger community relationships: higher levels of trust, connectedness, resilience – including the ability to join together during crisis or difficulty.
- Increased number of community-based opportunities – such as work or skills and training.

⁹ Learning...

¹⁰ Community...

- Enhanced ability of members to share their ideas and actions for change.
- Increased competency in setting and achieving goals.
- Increased pride of place.
- Increased use of community facilities, public amenities, and open spaces
- Increased respect for difference and a willingness to assist neighbors.
- Increased civic participation, leadership, local and political participation.

VII. Other potential local technical assistance partners for capacity-building:

Several organizations exist that may be of assistance in providing for the capacity-building and learning needs of GNI residents and stakeholders. Some of these organizations include the following, many of which are active participants in the Skillman Learning Partnership:

- New Detroit – The Coalition¹¹:

New Detroit has been one of the principal incubators of small community and faith-based organizations since its inception in the late 1960s. We have made tremendous progress in creating a model of capacity building that can be used by grassroots organizations, specifically those struggling in urban communities due to effects of racism. These organizations work everyday to keep their doors open and be available to address serious issues plaguing communities of color.

New Detroit's capacity building efforts offer expertise to these organizations in the areas of organizational development, program development, information technology, financial management, research, evaluation, fundraising, strategic planning, and board development.

- Local Initiative Support Corporation (LISC)¹²:

Technical Assistance: LISC assists organizations with information, advice and direct technical assistance on organizational issues and housing development projects through its own staff and through contracts with outside consultants.

Projects Financing: LISC provides recoverable grants, loans and lines of credit for pre-development and construction costs for housing development projects. LISC's funds are often the "first" money invested in a project, making funding by conventional sources more accessible.

Resource Library: LISC provides access to national and local resources in the areas of organizational development, real estate and commercial development.

Training: LISC provides both on-site and classroom training for CDC staff and board in the areas of organizational development and real estate development.

Acting as Intermediary: LISC helps groups leverage their own funds by assisting them in getting grants and loans from financial institutions, city and state programs, and foundations.

- Wayne State University:

Joanne Sobek, faculty-person with the Wayne State University School of Social Work, is working closely with New Detroit to implement a capacity-building survey of non-profit organizations and block clubs in the six Good Neighborhoods Initiative neighborhoods.

¹¹ www.newdetroit.org

¹² www.lisc.org/detroit/

Results from these surveys may have important implications for fulfilling the capacity-building and learning needs of residents and stakeholders of the GNI.

- City Connect¹³:
Securing the resources to build a better community is most often accomplished by public, private, and nonprofit leaders who collaborate and gain access to funding information. Members of City Connect Detroit enter a network of dedicated community leaders with a wealth of knowledge around available funding opportunities and a willingness to partner for the greater good. Members also gain access to an online fund development community which is home to thousands of currently available grants, articles on trends in philanthropy, research and resources to improve your applications, and external links to the movers and shakers who will help organizations make their dreams a reality.
- Metropolitan Organizing Strategy Enabling Strength (MOSES)¹⁴:
MOSES is able not only to concentrate on neighborhood concerns, such as community reinvestment and safety, but addresses larger systemic problems, such as urban sprawl, lack of affordable housing, lack of adequate transportation and education, infringement upon the civil rights of immigrants, land use, and blight.

Leadership Development

At the heart of faith-based community organizing is the development of leaders who are committed to one another and to building a powerful organization. To that end, MOSES has contracted with the Gamaliel Foundation, a network of professional community organizers and key institutional leaders working to rebuild American cities. MOSES pays the Gamaliel Foundation an annual affiliation fee that provides staff recruitment and development resources, extensive leadership training, strategic planning assistance, issue development resources, and fundraising expertise.

- Detroit Agricultural Network¹⁵:
Garden Resource Program Collaborative: In an effort to maximize these benefits, the Detroit Agriculture Network, Earthworks Garden/Capuchin Soup Kitchen, The Greening of Detroit and Michigan State University have teamed up to help provide access to resources and educational opportunities for community, school and family gardeners.

VIII. References

Learning from the Journey: Reflections on the Rebuilding Communities Initiative. The Annie E. Casey Foundation. www.aecf.org

Types of Capacity Building Activities. Adapted from “Field Guide to Consulting and Organizational Development with Nonprofits”. Authenticity Consulting, LLC.

Peterman, William. Neighborhood Planning and Community-Based Development: The Potential and Limits of Grassroots Action. Thousand Oaks, CA, 2000.

New Detroit – The Coalition: www.newdetroit.org

¹³ www.cityconnectdetroit.org

¹⁴ <http://mosesmi.org>

¹⁵ www.detroitagriculture.com

Local Initiatives Support Corporation: www.lisc.org/detroit/

City Connect Detroit: www.cityconnectdetroit.org

Metropolitan Organizing Strategy Enabling Strength: <http://mosesmi.org>

Detroit Agricultural Network: www.detroitagriculture.com

Atkinson, Dr. Rowland, and Paul Willis. *Community Capacity Building: A Practical Guide*.
School of Sociology and Social Work; University of Tasmania.
W:<http://www.utas.edu.au/sociology/HACRU/>

DeVita, Carol and Corey Fleming, Eds. Building Capacity in Non-profit Organizations. The Urban
Institute. April, 2001.

Policy Link: <http://www.policylink.org/Projects/MarketCreek/>

Urban Strategies Council: <http://www.urbanstrategies.org/programs/commbliding/index.html>

*“Dreams” and “Strategies” from Brightmoor and Osborn Residents:
Themes and Implications for Technical Assistance*

Goals for each community respectively were:

Brightmoor: “All Brightmoor youth will have access to, and participate in a range of year-round programs during non-school hours that encourage academic growth and positive social development.”

Osborn: “Families have all the resources and support necessary to make their children successful in life.”

Purpose

The purpose of this analysis was to discern implications for technical assistance offerings from themes reflected in input provided by residents of Brightmoor and Osborn neighborhoods. Transcribed reports from 15 small-group discussions occurring in July and August 2006 by residents of each of the two neighborhoods respectively provided the data from which this project was carried out.

Results

Overarching theme: Minimal expectations of governmental systems

A pervasive theme was the reality that many of the services participants “dreamed of” to accomplish their community goal were services residents of other communities take for granted and expect. Examples were dreams of:

- Clean and fully-paved streets
- Paved sidewalks for residents to walk on and for children to ride their bikes on. (The dream of a bike path, a reality in many communities, was mentioned by only one resident.)
- Clear, well-equipped and well-cared for parks that children played safely in.
- Recreation centers in which children, adolescents, and adults played and took part in a range of activities.
- Neighborhoods that adults and child residents walked safely in
- Neighborhoods in which burned out houses were immediately demolished
- Regular and frequent removal of bulk trash
- Regularly mowed and cared for medians and public areas
- Schools that were accessible at non-school hours
- Schools that were child and family friendly.

Where strategies were discussed, residents suggested approaches that involved taking responsibility themselves for implementing the changes and for doing the work, in a few cases through soliciting help from foundation and other grant funds. While accountability and commitment are important, in neither community did residents seem to hold governmental systems accountable for providing the services to the community, nor did they seem to expect a commitment from these systems in that regard. In the context of this observation, specific themes were identified that were related to public service improvement needs.

A. Themes related to Improvements in Public Services

Of the five most frequently-appearing themes overall, three in Brightmoor and four in Osborn meetings focused on areas for improvements in public services. (See Appendix 1 for a complete list of frequencies of themes according to neighborhood.) Several potential directions were implied from neighborhood comments.

- Community Organizing for Political Action. Recognition of a need for political advocacy was reflected in a Brightmoor resident's call for "a community voice and outcry/outrage to get something done...." The importance of this strategy was evident in the statement by another resident that: "We [need to] responsibly advocate for [the] police and other basic city services to do their jobs."
- Partnership-building. In addition, themes emerging from some resident comments were suggestive of establishing community partnerships. Suggested areas and the frequencies of their appearance in the data for Brightmoor and Osborn residents respectively were:
 - Church-Community partnerships (n=14 and n=4)
 - Police-Community partnerships (n=11 and n=1)
 - Business-Community partnerships (n=10 and n=4)
 - Arts and Humanities and Community partnerships (n=2 and n=10)
 - School-Community partnerships (n= 11 and n=6)
 - Government-Community partnerships (n=3 and n=1)
 - Industry-Community partnerships (n=0, 1)
 - Union-Community partnerships (n=0, 1).
- Establishment of Local Chambers of Commerce. Business Development and Entrepreneurship was the fourth most frequently appearing theme overall among Brightmoor resident comments and was not infrequently mentioned among comments by Osborn residents. Residents were particularly interested in business start-ups by residents and others, attracting and sustaining new businesses in the communities, promoting businesses that offer a range of services needed by residents, and training residents in entrepreneurial skills. Residents also placed emphasis on businesses whose owners had a commitment to the neighborhood and who would provide needed employment to community members. Several mentioned a need for tax incentives that would motivate business development and practices, such as welcome committees that would encourage families to settle. These efforts are often realized through local chambers of commerce.

B. Themes related to Building and Sustaining a Sense of Community

A second pervasive theme reflected an emphasis on a strong sense of community among residents of Brightmoor and Osborn neighborhoods and a belief that strengthening this characteristic was necessary to accomplish their overall community goals. Three specific themes with implications for technical assistance were:

- Community-Building. This theme appeared most frequently among comments of Brightmoor residents (n = 60) and was a close second among Osborn residents' comments and suggestions (n = 54). The definition of community emerging from residents' comments was of efforts perceived as unifying the community and its members (youth and adult) behind a shared mission and set of goals.
- Block Club Development. Also reflected in the category of *community* were themes of block club development and block activities, usually mentioned specifically in residents' comments.

- Neighborhood Beautification. This theme appeared frequently throughout discussions and seemed to encompass residents' emphasis on improving the physical attractiveness of their neighborhood, thus engendering community pride.

C. Themes Related to a Need for Preparedness

A third prevalent theme involved residents' recognition of the need for preparation in going forward with actions aimed at attaining the overall community goal. This theme seems to reflect a need for attention to leadership development, including volunteerism, strategic planning, and ongoing public relations and communication.

- Adult Leadership Development. Summing up this theme was an Osborn resident's suggestion that "leaders be identified in every neighborhood" and the suggestion, also by an Osborn resident, that adult leadership and direction were important. Also apparent within this theme was volunteerism, generally defined by residents simply as encouraging and sustaining parent participation.
- Strategic Planning. Strategic planning will assist residents in finalizing priorities for moving forward, translating goals and priorities into action steps, identifying remaining technical, person-power, and resource needs and how those will be realized, and developing an action plan.
- Public Relations and Communication. Members of both neighborhoods stressed the importance of keeping all residents notified of the work Initiative, particularly calling attention to success and improvements. Frequently seen was a theme of publicizing the accomplishments of community members.
- Grant procurement, conducting needs assessments, fund-raising, and asset building were identified in an earlier cursory analysis of Southwest Community data and have been or are being responded to.

D. Themes Related to Youth Development

These themes are mentioned *in addition to* already-mentioned themes related to needed improvements in education and school-related services and school-community partnerships. The following were prominent in comments from residents of both communities (See Appendix 1 for a complete list of frequencies of themes according to neighborhood).

- Youth Leadership Development.
- Positive Youth Development.
- Mentoring
- Tutoring

Additionally, after school programs were mentioned as a strategy for community goal attainment.

E. Themes Related to Information on Availability and Accessibility of Resources

- Resource Information, Exchange, and Coordination. A theme appearing in both communities was a perceived need for a mechanism by which residents could be continuously made aware of the service resources that exist and that are already available in their communities. Themes related to the dissemination of information and coordination between services and resources were noted.
- A Centralized Social Service Delivery System. Closely related to a desire for information about available services was the theme of accessibility and provision of "one stop shopping" for multiple family services. The definition of this theme was best summarized by an Osborn resident at Table 15 as "community centers that provide services [such as]

parenting classes, counseling for children, transportation for after-school programs, meals, counseling, and mentoring.”

Discussion

Analysis of Brightmoor and Osborn data suggests a number of similarities. For example, residents of both neighborhoods seem to place a great deal of emphasis on building a sense of community, unity, and pride. Among themes related to needed improvements in public services, the five most frequently appearing themes were the same among residents of both neighborhoods. And other than in three instances involving very small frequencies, no themes appeared in the text of one neighborhood and not at all in that of the other. However, there were some differences in emphases, the most noteworthy of which were the different public service improvement needs mentioned most frequently – police and public safety needs among Brightmoor residents and education and school-related needs among Osborn residents. It is not known whether these and others represent differences in the direction of efforts needed by residents of each neighborhood. However, they are worthy of further exploration. (See Appendix 1 for a complete list of frequencies of themes according to neighborhood).

Conclusions and Recommendations

In summary, input from residents of Brightmoor and Osborn neighborhoods in Detroit was consistent with themes of needed improvements in public services, building partnerships with social systems in the community, building and sustaining unified communities, developing technical preparedness skills, facilitating youth development, and ensuring that resources that do exist are available and accessible. Attention is particularly called to the importance of assisting communities to organize and advocate for governmental systems fulfilling their responsibilities with regard to public services, in addition to direct actions taken by residents in their own behalf (for example, in neighborhood beautification efforts). Themes and the frequencies of their appearance should be considered for their implications for neighborhood specific and cross-neighborhood technical assistance offerings.

Appendix 1. Technical Assistance Themes by Category and Frequency of Appearance

Technical Assistance Themes	Brightmoor	Osborn
Needed Improvements in Public Services		
Parks and Recreation Services	32	24
Police and Public Safety Services	41	24
Employment and Career Training and Development Services	23	15
Housing Development and Rehabilitation Services	13	16
Education and School-Related Services	25	57
Information Technology/Library Services	9	12
Human Services	7	10
Social Services	29	31
Transportation Services	11	6
Health and Wellness Services	13	11
Street/Sidewalk Repair and Maintenance Services	2	4
Business Development and Entrepreneurship Services	30	18
Snow Removal and Trash Removal Services	6	1
Zoning Adherence Services	1	2
Neighborhood Revitalization Services	5	1
Responses to Needed Improvements		
Political advocacy	7	2
Community organizing	10	10
Suggested Partnerships		
School-Community	11	6
Business-Community	10	4
Police-Community	11	1
Church-Community	14	4
Government-Community	3	1
Arts and Humanities-Community	2	10
Industry-Community	0	1
Labor Union-Community	0	1
Unified Community		
Community Building	60	54
Block Club Development	17	11
Neighborhood Beautification	34	22
Preparedness Needs		
Strategic Planning	4	3
Leadership Development (Adults)	5	6
Public Relations and Communication	8	6
Grant Procurement	5	1
Fund-raising	5	4
Asset Building	0	5
Needs Assessment/Surveys	3	1

Appendix 1 Continued.

Technical Assistance Themes	Brightmoor	Osborn
Youth Development		

Youth Leadership Development	14	9
Positive Youth Development	23	4
Mentoring	13	20
Tutoring	5	4
Resource Availability and Accessibility		
Information Exchange and Coordination	15	8
“One-Stop Shopping” (Centralized) for Services	6	9

Capacity-Building Needs and Learning Implications
 Action Planning Team Meeting Notes (January 20, 2007 – March 3, 2007, as provided)

CAPACITY-BUILDING NEEDS IDENTIFIED: Review of notes suggested the need for building capacity in the following areas:

1. How to identify a centralized information /resource system containing existing programs and how to access them, by age group, identified neighborhood, and strategy area.
 - a. Brightmoor – Crime and Safety
 - b. Brightmoor – Non School Hours
 - c. Southwest – Youth Programs
 - d. Southwest – Health and Safety
 - e. Brightmoor – Schools
2. How to get (strengthen) existing agencies and organizations to do their jobs more effectively and in a way that leads to accomplishment of objectives in specific strategy areas – e.g., removal of abandoned houses, effective fire prevention, elimination of illegal dumping.
 - a. Brightmoor Crime and Safety (Police)
 - b. Osborn – Community Neighborhood Improvement
 - c. Osborn – Education Services
 - d. Brightmoor Non-School Hours (Police)
3. How to engage in effective planning (e.g., stay focused on strategy area/avoid overlapping into other strategy areas; move from strategy area to objectives, indicators, actions; move from small, micro focus to strategies aimed at influencing larger, more influential systems; prevent overlap in priorities with regard to action planning; establish measurable objectives and implementation plans; identify potential or existing barriers to accomplishing objectives)
 - a. Brightmoor – Crime and Safety
 - b. Brightmoor - Parent Involvement
 - c. Brightmoor – Schools
 - d. Osborn – Educational Services
 - e. Osborn – Community and Family Support
 - f. Osborn - Special Opportunities
4. How to advocate politically.
 - a. Osborn Community Neighborhood Improvement
5. How to use effective public relations principles and procedures to improve neighborhood image and community identity.

6. How to facilitate new programs and services (e.g., recreation centers; more jobs for youth and adults; accessible and local transportation for youth and adults)
 - a. Southwest - Youth Programs

LEARNING NEEDS IDENTIFIED:

1. Consultation with United Way regarding existing programs and services by neighborhood.
2. Conflict resolution for youth and adults.
3. Relationship building/partnership-building with community partners – e.g., police, schools, businesses. (Question: Is this happening at the Learning Group level and, if so, can it be used as a model to assist the neighborhoods with this need?) Presenters for the Organizing Workshop may be able to link this need to what they will cover.
4. Political advocacy. (May be covered in upcoming Organizing Workshop.)
5. Organizing for community change. (Should be covered in upcoming Organizing Workshop)
6. Community-building. (Including info on best practice models locally and nationally, and including Block Club development strategies.)
7. Public relations strategies.
8. Conducting statistically reliable surveys.
9. Effectively engaging youth at all levels and sustain youth involvement over the process of the Initiative.
10. Strategic planning. (See #3 under Capacity Building Needs)
 - a. Immediate need for this to assist facilitators/residents.
 - b. How to identify, use, and apply existing evidence and best practice models.
 - c. How to move from resident observations about what's happening to effective plans.

COMMENTS:

1. Before the Action Planning Team process started, it would probably have been helpful if the Initiative had been more specific about what the desired final product would look like (at the end of the Action Planning process) and what were effective methods for reaching it (strategic planning), then trained residents or at least facilitators in that. (Number 3 under TA Implications above contains some directions for what the particular needs are.)
2. The websites Kristin provided on 3/7 with the matrix contain some strategic planning tips but someone needs to provide those to the Action Planning Teams that have most need of them and as soon as possible, so the remainder of their work can be more effective. If possible, it would be good if we could find a way that the Teams that seem to be planning effectively could share what they've found works with the other teams.
3. We need to find a way (system) to translate what's being learned from Learning Grants, Learning Group, and other GNI activities to the ongoing overall Initiative planning – a system of integrating all the various activities, as we move forward. Perhaps the Theory of Change system will be the driving focus in this regard.
4. The need for knowing what programs and services exist in particular areas (information/resource exchange) and what the gaps are keeps coming up. Some attempts have been made to address it but not in a comprehensive way. Do we need a comprehensive, scientific survey in this regard?
5. The need for accessible (neighborhood) services keeps coming up.
6. The need for accessible transportation services keeps coming up.