Section III
Training and Capacity

Editor's Note

Training to build organizational and individual capacity is given special attention because it provides an obvious leverage point to address many of the organizational challenges facing community-based development. Although training is an important part of the community economic development system, we know so little about curriculum, who needs training, and who provides training. In addition, we need to emphasize the quality of training. Whether training is provided at community colleges or universities, or through training intermediaries or individual consultants, the quality of training is a defining factor in individual and field success.

The Leadership Challenge: Creating an Enduring Organization

Robert O. Zdenek and Carol Steinbach

(This article originally appeared in the November/December 2000 issue of *Shelterforce*.)

Managing a community development corporation (CDC) has never been easy. The task is even harder today. Competition for resources has intensified, and keeping talented staff is especially tough in today's tight job market.

Add to these longstanding CDC trials new organizational challenges. With the advent of the information age, the pace of commerce everywhere has accelerated. Precious little time exists for reflection or recovery from mistakes.

The demands on CDCs are growing, too. Being good at real estate development no longer is enough. To help residents take advantage of rising opportunities in a strong economy, many CDCs feel pressure to become involved in a broader range of unfamiliar activities more closely related to human services—including education and job training, job placement, child and elder care, and transportation to metropolitan counties with a surplus of jobs.

As CDCs mature from upstart organizations to enduring institutions in their neighborhoods, paying attention to management issues can make or break a CDC's ability to respond to these organizational challenges. No management component means more to success than leadership development. CDCs must create good leadership structures and nurture the appropriate kinds of leadership.

Dispersing Decisionmaking

A visionary and entrepreneurial leader lies at the heart of the traditional CDC model—and in the early stage of a CDC's life, this type of leader often performs the best. He or she probably grew up or worked in the community, and often has the high drive and energy needed to catalyze change. CDCs thrive on that special quality of vision: the ability to look out at a block of blighted buildings and imagine a new employment center, a bookstore, or a health clinic. Many entrepreneurs micromanage—but during an organization's formative stage, a hands-on approach can be a plus. Young CDCs need to complete projects to build a track record of success.

As a group begins to mature, gain expertise, and widen its community responsibilities, the traditional CDC leadership model sometimes becomes less effective. The entrepreneurial leader typically builds the organization around his or her specific relationships. These relationships become hard to sustain as the CDC's activities expand. Most entrepreneurs use a "command-and-control" leadership style—an approach that can be a drawback in today's "networked" economy, which places a premium on working collaboratively, forging alliances, and sharing information widely among many people who make decisions for the organization.

What leadership qualities should CDCs seek instead? The single most important is dispersion of leadership. Instead of a dominant director and perhaps a few leaders at the top of the organization who manage everyone else, CDCs should seek the creation of a guiding coalition (composed of staff, board, volunteers, and other stakeholders) whose members take personal responsibility for the CDC's results. In this new configuration, staff teams handle most projects and activities because they have the most knowledge, and ultimately can be held accountable to the particular constituency or project. The executive director does not delegate functions while maintaining overall project control. Instead, the team—staffed with people who can get the job done—takes responsibility.

TRAINING

More and more people believe that leaders are made, not born. A flat decisionmaking structure within a CDC functions as internal leadership training because more people become involved in decisionmaking. CDCs, however, must also focus explicitly on providing employees and volunteers with formal leadership and technical training and other leadership development support such as coaching or mentoring.

CDCs and their funders are starting to invest more in training and learning opportunities, primarily technical training. Increased training, however, is not enough. Technical training has an important place in developing leaders, but too often, a person with technical capabilities is promoted to a management and supervisory level without the needed management and leadership skills. Staff need continuing exposure to both technical training and leadership and management training, as do CDC boards.

CROSS-TRAINING

Any organization, from sports teams to Fortune 500 corporations, relies on versatility and depth. CDCs are no different. As CDCs expand, senior staff need to understand all parts of the organization. For example, workforce development and economic development staff need to communicate clearly and often to ensure CDC job training programs really help make individuals more employable and achieve job-creation objectives.

Such cross-training could be achieved by simply having one day per quarter when professional staff share their expertise. Business development staff could show human services personnel how to identify market opportunities or maximize revenue. Human services staff, in turn, could show business development staff how the services they provide help stabilize businesses by strengthening employees. Such cross-training helps ensure that all CDC knowledge is not lost should senior staff depart. It also encourages a more team-centered environment.

SUCCESSION

Even with dispersed leadership, the executive director's role remains vitally important. Most CDCs, however, do not have succession plans for directors, or for senior staff or their boards. Enough challenges arise when an executive director leaves. When the director and several senior staff depart, a CDC can literally face disaster without a succession plan. That scenario occurred at Eastside Community Investments in Indianapolis, when long-time president Dennis West resigned at the same time as major senior positions were vacant or filled with new staff who had limited knowledge or experience. Already facing serious problems, within a few weeks the CDC collapsed financially. (See http://www.nhi.org/online/issues/104/steinbach.html.)

Succession planning should always be in place for executive directors, as well as for senior management of larger CDCs, especially those with vice presidents, comptrollers, and major program directors. In many large organizations, replacing the executive director can take up to a year. A succession plan will identify and prepare another staff person to maintain the relationships and momentum of the CDC in the short term while the search for a new director commences. A succession plan should define the process and timeline for the search and recognize that a new executive might need a different set of skills than the previous one as the organization moves forward.

Succession planning also is important for boards. A sudden lack of leadership or continuity on the board is like a ship without a rudder. Someone needs to be ready to step in when a volunteer leader leaves. For a board chair, the vice-chair often can fill the role. Someone also needs to be prepared to take over from the treasurer, who maintains the fiduciary health of the organization. A learning curve faces any treasurer for a multifaceted CDC, and an assistant treasurer probably will perform better as interim treasurer than will someone who has been only a general board member.

LEADERSHIP FROM THE BOARD

In many CDCs, executive directors make strategic decisions, with input from the board. That equation should be reversed. Boards should do the strategic planning, with staff input. "Lots of organizations die from making poor strategic decisions," says George Knight, former executive director of the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation. "Private companies fail from taking the wrong strategic path, too. Maybe even nations. That's why strategic decisions should be the top concern of a CDC board."

Community residents, business and civic leaders, and outside professionals typically compose CDC boards. While most board members provide valuable service—and some perform extraordinarily—the Achilles heel of many CDCs is their board of directors.

Sometimes boards conflict with staff or try to micromanage. Other boards ossify. Continuity can be a strength in managing an organization; but boards need turnover, too, to infuse new energy and ideas.

"As the CDC grows, the board needs to have the know-how to assist the executive director and bring sophistication to the policy decisions and monitoring of the corporation," says Anita Miller, former director of the Comprehensive Community Revitalization Program initiative in the South Bronx. "The key is to keep adjusting."

Most successful CDCs spend a great deal of time figuring out how to identify and solicit potential board members whose service could help the organization. "Our board members are carefully selected for their willingness to work," says Jim Dickerson, founder of Manna, Inc., in Washington, D.C. "If a board member misses two meetings, he or she is subject to being replaced."

CDCs use a variety of strategies to ensure a good mix of skills, tenure, and personalities on their boards. "We use a skills grid to decide who to put on our board," says Dee Walsh of REACH Community Development in Portland, Oregon. As with many successful CDCs, REACH makes board training a high priority. "Board members have mentors and can take training courses each quarter in financial management, development and other community development and organizational essentials," Walsh says.

INVEST IN ORGANIZATIONAL NEEDS

CDC funders shoulder much of the blame for poor management practices across the sector. They put their money into CDC projects, programs, and services instead of organizational development. As a result, the community development field tends to offer relatively poor salaries and benefit packages, limited training resources, and limited opportunities for professional development. These poor practices must change if CDCs are going to prosper in the 21st century. In today's competitive environment, it is no longer smart or practical to continue making minimal investment in the human capital and organizational needs of CDCs.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Robert O. Zdenek is an independent consultant specializing in organizational capacity building, asset development, economic development initiatives, and strategic alliances and partnerships. Carol Steinbach is a Washington, D.C.-based journalist who has written extensively about community development and housing.

The History and Future of Training and Education for Faith-Based and Community Development

Joseph McNeely

Training and education opportunities for faith-based and community organizations working to expand the social and economic capacity of low-income communities have been available for 40 years (Mott 2000).[1] This training, however, often has been short term and short-lived. Of the relatively stable programs, a few offer participants an opportunity to master a broad curriculum over a period of time, including a specific graduate degree in community economic development (Conservation Company 1997; Seedco 2001). This paper examines the evolution of these programs, draws some conclusions from the experience, and suggests issues for a research and policy development agenda.

Some definitions will focus this paper and establish a framework for analysis. Most of the terminology in this field is used equivocally or situationally by different institutions and providers. The paper will use the term *community development corporation* to encompass all faith-based and community organizations directly engaged in the process of housing and economic development on behalf of a specific geographic neighborhood or constituency to whom the organization is accountable and representative. These groups are part of the larger field of community development that includes public agencies, large nonprofit housing providers, financial institutions, private developers and foundations, and social investment institutions.[2]

The Training System

The work of community development corporations (CDCs) has grown exponentially in the past 20 years. Their well-documented successes have led public and private policy to increasingly recognize their contributions as an important part of the community development system (Grogan and Proscio 2000). Despite the collective success of these organizations, the field continues to be composed of a large number of small, undercapitalized organizations (Vidal 1992). The training and education system supporting the human capital for these nonprofit small businesses itself suffers from fragmentation and undercapitalization. Few providers operate

more than one consistent training and education program. Those providers with multiple, consistent offerings face a constant struggle for funding. Beyond financial support for operating current programs, virtually none has capitalization for taking successful programs to scale or substantial program improvement and innovation such as distance learning (Conservation Company 1997; Seedco 2001).

Training and education serve as a means for developing and building organizational capacity in several ways. First, training and education help develop better management structures and professional styles for CDCs. They show CDC staff and boards how to plan strategically as well as systematically address their neighborhoods' needs. These management skills also help CDCs respond effectively to changing funding and neighborhood environments.

Second, training and education can help CDCs respond to the interdisciplinary nature of the CDC model. Faced with complex and labor-intensive work, staff and boards seldom have time to step back and look at the broader picture. Training and education programs provide them with an opportunity to develop or re-examine their vision of community development.

Most important, training and education help sustain CDCs over time by reaching the essential component of human resources. Training and education provide a systematic way to transfer skills and knowledge from one generation of leadership and staff to another. Thus, training and education programs also act as vehicles to professionalize the community development field. In summary, training and education programs support the long-term viability of both CDCs and the community development field.

In the discussion of training and education, this paper will distinguish between training, education, and technical assistance. Training encompasses short-term programs that impart information or build skills, generally offering only one session of modest duration (as little as an hour or as long as a week). In the community development context, training often supports the implementation of a new program or set of regulations. Training also may be used to build narrowly focused skills, such as a specialized accounting system for property or asset management. Educational programs last longer and focus on the transmission of discipline-based information, skill building, and, usually, some philosophical or values framework. Educational programs feature more comprehensive content than training programs and more extensive opportunities for learning and application. Education programs may be offered by academic or nonacademic organizations and are not necessarily accredited. Some discussions distinguish between educational programs requiring the

demonstration of proficiency to "graduate" and those simply requiring attendance and participation (Conservation Company 1997).[3]

Some adult education literature argues that the most effective mechanism for building skills and imparting complex information is a program combining several structured educational experiences spread over a finite period with the opportunity for practice and application between sessions. In addition, such a program should incorporate a high degree of participation by the students in setting goals, selecting content, and measuring progress. In general, methods of adult education recognize that participants themselves are a resource and exploit participant interaction and learner-driven initiatives (De Vita and Fleming 2001; Morgan, Ponticell, and Gordon 1996).

Distinct from training and education, technical assistance also builds the knowledge base and competence of individuals and the capacity of organizations. While education and training programs are provided to groups in a formal setting with a structured curriculum (objectives, course outline, materials, method of evaluation), technical assistance often is informal, individual, and responsive to the immediate situation of the individual or organization receiving it. Technical assistance may be fairly narrow or broad, and it may focus in the short or long term on projects, finance, management, organization development, or other topics (Kinsey, Raker, and Wagner 2003).

Some distinguish between technical assistance that builds the capacity of recipients and short-term work approximating the work of full-time staff. Often technical assistance is used for crisis intervention in a project or portfolio or as part of an audit of troubled assets and organizations.

TRAINING THE FIRST WAVE: THE ORIGINAL CDCS

In *Corrective Capitalism*, Neil Pierce and Carol Steinbach (1987) argue that CDCs evolved in three waves: an original group of the Ford Foundation and federally sponsored CDCs; a significant growth of development activity by community organizing groups in the 1970s and 1980s; and the movement of many direct service, constituency-based, and faith-based institutions into development activity in the late 1980s and 1990s. Here I will use the three time periods to discuss a sample of the development of training efforts and programs for CDC organizations and practitioners.

The first wave began with the original Ford Foundation and federally sponsored CDCs in the period from 1965 to1975. An amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act in 1966 created the Special Impact Program (Title I; changed in 1972 to Title VII) to provide grants to CDCs. These CDCs were to focus on a special impact area, a specific target area qualified for the federal poverty program and usually already served by the education, health, and social services programs of the federal poverty effort. Only around 50 CDCs had implementation funding (Perry 1973).

To undertake this mission, the CDCs were given multiyear core operating support that would allow them to retain a highly qualified, experienced professional development staff, especially staff reflecting the ethnic character of the impact area. They were to use private sector techniques and private sector financing to buy and expand or create business ventures. These CDCs were given venture capital with "no strings attached" to invest in businesses and other development projects, as well as special access to federal programs (Perry 1973).[4] This funding included support for creating a National Training Institute for Community Economic Development (NTICED), a government organization under the Office of Economic Opportunity created to train CDC practitioners and establish training and organizational development standards for CDCs receiving Title VII Special Impact funds. A companion corporation, the Center for Community Economic Development, provided information and research and maintained a library of books and documents related to the work of CDCs. NTICED first focused on training CDC boards of directors and later worked on comprehensive provision of staff training. Like many efforts, though, the loss of these organizations meant that stock knowledge and practice could not be preserved and built upon, so that subsequent training efforts had to start from the beginning.

Apart from training for the burgeoning CDC movement, many of the federal government's Great Society programs paid considerable attention to training community volunteer leaders, new staff, paraprofessionals hired from the target communities, and Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) volunteers. These programs helped train a significant number of community leaders who went on to manage many social programs and, in some cases, hold elective office.

Nongovernmental national centers and programs of religious denominations offered training in federal affordable housing programs to nonprofit sponsors and consultants.[5] Through VISTA, the "War on Poverty" sought to enlist the American Institute of Architects (AIA), AIA members, and university schools of architecture and planning to help provide technical assistance and planning to poor communities. In addition, the oldest university-based advocacy planning organization in the country,

the Pratt Institute Center for Community and Environmental Development (PICCED), was established in 1963 to serve organizations struggling to address issues of urban deterioration and poverty. PICCED launched three interrelated program areas: technical assistance (consulting), training and education, and public policy analysis and advocacy. PICCED assistance to the Bedford Stuyvesant Planning Council led to the formation of the Bedford Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation—one of the first CDCs (Carlson and Martinez 1988).

As the "second wave" of CDCs grew in the seventies, more formal training programs evolved, in many of which the first wave CDCs participated. During the 1980s, budget cuts in social welfare and other public assistance programs dramatically impacted the community development field. In 1981, the Community Services Administration, which assumed the responsibility for programs formerly operated by the Office of Economic Opportunity, was dismantled, along with the National Training Institute. The few remaining resources, allocated through discretionary funds under the Department of Health and Human Services and through community service block grants, became more fragmented and limited. This increasingly restrictive funding environment had a detrimental effect on the original CDCs as they struggled to maintain their approach of integrating social service delivery with physical and commercial revitalization activities.

In terms of training, what did we learn from this initial period of social intervention and experimentation? In retrospect, a lack of examination limits what can be said regarding the efficacy and impact of education and training efforts between 1965 and 1977. We do know that education and training for community economic development evolved in much the same fashion as support for the larger field. In a time of perceived social crisis, funds flowed to support social change, but as the crisis abated, and competition for scarce resources increased, these resources declined sharply. The resulting deficit stymied a move to learn about the impact of community-based development organizations and building the capacity of the people leading them.

TRAINING THE SECOND WAVE: NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZING TO DEVELOPMENT

The neighborhood development organizations that constitute the second wave of CDCs arose in the mid-1970s. The CDC model started to resonate beyond core neighborhoods and communities characterized by high poverty. Many communities, including many ethnic communities, began to organize around neighborhood

revitalization, rehabilitation, community reinvestment, and neighborhood commercial revitalization (Carlson and Martinez 1988). Thousands of community groups fighting urban renewal plans, highway construction, private disinvestment, and property abandonment changed major public policy and brought private businesses to the bargaining table. Soon, many groups viewed developing and owning real estate and business ventures as the best method of institutionalizing their gains (Boyte 1980; Carlson and Martinez 1988).

Second-generation CDCs, however, did not have the resources enjoyed by the first-wave organizations, such as multiyear operating support, venture capital, or priority standing to get public subsidy for development. Gone were the program-specific federal grants directly from Washington to individual nonprofit organizations and communities. Nonetheless, their number grew (Carlson and Martinez 1988). Without flush support from the federal government and the foundation community, the emerging CDCs often could not hire staff with private sector development and management experience. National organizations such as the Center for Community Change and the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs served as intermediaries between large national foundations and emerging organizations. The national centers provided consultants, training programs, and seed money to help build organizations and, subsequently, to move some of those organizations into development (Carlson and Martinez 1988).

The Carter administration responded to the growing neighborhood movement by creating an Assistant Secretary for Neighborhoods at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The Office of Neighborhood Development launched a $5 million program of short-term training offerings through a diverse set of contractors and an information program covering the basics of community-based development coupled with 125 Neighborhood Self-Help Development Grants. Though it ended in 1981, the office helped many community and faith-based organizations take their first steps toward development.[6]

Several CDC directors for the early CDCs held senior posts in different agencies of the Carter administration, opening a variety of new resources to community-based developers. Despite its focus on neighborhoods, however, the Carter administration presided over the reduction or elimination of many programs targeted to the original CDCs. In some cases, those programs were opened to a larger number of organizations. The Reagan administration reversed those changes and further cut programs for communities.

Testimony to its mounting significance, the CDC movement continued to grow without large-scale help from the federal government. As the number of community development groups grew in the 1980s, so did the need for formal skill development programs that were more comprehensive and/or longer term than the short workshops offered previously.

In 1982, the Development Training Institute (DTI), then a division of Public/Private Ventures in Philadelphia, created the National Internship in Community Economic Development. The program was the first sustained comprehensive education program for executive leadership of CDCs.

DTI has been active in developing and providing training and education programs for community economic development (CED) practitioners. DTI's original program goal was described as "helping individuals and groups engaged in community economic development gain the technical skills to plan, finance and manage development projects in their neighborhoods." DTI has developed a wide variety of programs not only for CDCs but also for other CED actors, such as funders and banking institutions. The following summaries describe DTI's programs:

- **The National Internship in Community Economic Development.** DTI's oldest and largest program is an 8-month session in Baltimore providing training in finance, real estate and business venture development, strategic planning, and organizational effectiveness. The internship targets senior-level management staff—executive directors and senior development managers—in community-based development organizations.
- **The Project Development Training Program.** Designed to train community-based organizations with some experience in development, this program helps groups to successfully plan, finance, and manage their first project. The program consists of four workshop series, the delivery of direct technical assistance, and the availability of predevelopment funding and project financing. The Project Development Training Program usually is undertaken through local intermediaries, such as Community Development Partnerships, regional organizations serving CDCs, or local offices of national groups such as the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC).
- **Training on Community Development Lending for Financial Institutions.** DTI developed this training to educate bankers and help improve their ability to develop coherent programs, practices, and systems for meeting their obligations under the Community Reinvestment Act. The

goal of the program is to increase bankers' participation in the community development lending process.

- **Organizational Management and Board Training.** DTI has developed training programs focusing on the organizational management of CDCs and the role and responsibility of CDC boards of directors. The training program, which is similar to the Project Development Program, is contracted by local or regional intermediaries.
- **CED Training for Foundation Program Staff.** This training program gives corporate and nonprofit foundation program staff a working knowledge of the community economic development field. The goal of the program is to improve the program officers' ability to design, evaluate, and revise foundation program policies in CEDs and evaluate CED projects and potential grantees. The 2-day workshop covers the evolution of CED, an overview of foundation approaches to CED, real estate development, housing development, business development, commercial real estate development, and some case practices.

It is worth noting that DTI remains the only national training intermediary, proving that mounting a sustained, high-quality training effort requires significant resources over time. Such resources have not been direct and continuous from philanthropy, the public sector, or the private sector. As a result, no other major effort to provide national training to the community economic development field has come forward.

Higher education also stepped in to meet the need for skill development with both short-term and comprehensive long-term training and education programs. Southern New Hampshire University, then New Hampshire College, created the first dedicated master's degree in community economic development in a university.[7] The Pratt Institute in Brooklyn, New York, supplemented its highly regarded technical assistance to neighborhood organizations with a formal 1-year program based on and jointly designed with the Development Training Institute's National Internship in Community Economic Development. These education and training efforts, however, are very expensive and rely in large measure on grants from the philanthropic world. One recent assessment of these programs shows how they struggle severely to keep their offerings going, and some have even shut down. Unless community economic development education is added to the regular curriculum of planning and other disciplines such as management and law, internship-based programs will have difficulty sustaining themselves (Seedco 2001).

The late 1980s saw a number of locally sponsored training programs initiated by state associations, community development partnerships, and national intermediaries working with their local offices (and DTI), CDCs, or affordable housing providers. With some exception, most of these training programs focused on completing real-estate projects. While the field needs competent real estate developers and managers, helping these community-based organizations grow their internal strength and governance structure also is important. Many different institutions in the CED field now realize the importance of organizational development and human capital development as the field faces mounting challenges, such as limited scale and impact. The knowledge base, however, on how to build strong community-based organizations remains limited. Even if our knowledge base was on solid footing, however, resource providers may not direct continuing support toward building human capital and organizations.

TRAINING THE THIRD WAVE: DIVERSIFICATION IN THE 1990S

Observing the success of the first two waves of CDCs and responding to the growing recognition of CDCs in the late 1980s by government and private funding sources, many organizations without a geographic base decided to incorporate development techniques into their program activity. Faith-based institutions and social service organizations, such as centers serving youth or the homeless, saw business development as an opportunity to generate income and job experience. Constituency-based organizations, such as those serving immigrants, the homeless, and women's groups, saw economic development as an avenue to help their constituents. All of these organizations recognized the challenge to their constituents of finding affordable adequate shelter and regarded the success of CDCs in rental housing as a model for new program activity.

DTI, the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, LISC, and The Enterprise Foundation had started new training programs for emerging organizations during the second wave. These flourishing programs became a major training support for third-wave organizations entering development for the first time in the 1990s. New private resources, however, did not enter the system. Instead HUD's new HOME program became the major new source of expansion capital for training and education. In 1995, HUD announced the first request for proposal for technical assistance and training under funds provided by the HOME program and the specific funds set aside for Comprehensive Housing Development Organizations. That funding and other major changes in the industry spawned both proliferation and specialization of training and education.

PROLIFERATION

The significant resources brought to education and training by the HOME program ushered in a "new era." Many of the earlier local and national programs received infusions of HUD resources or expanded their offerings. While welcomed, the field (and specifically HUD) should not have let the moment pass to elevate and track carefully the performance of training organizations. Such tracking would have been somewhat difficult until we solved the complex issue of which competencies and what type of training and education produce the best community economic development practitioners. HUD could have used this key opportunity to establish and highlight innovative training providers. A recent GAO study of the HOME technical assistance program noted the success of individual providers to produce desired outcome but the lack of an overall program framework in HUD for defining and then evaluating the success of the total program (General Accounting Office 2003).

On a limited scale, a knowledge-building exercise has been going on for the past 7 years. The National Community Development Initiative (NCDI), a collaboration of HUD, foundations, and financial institutions pooling their funds to support CDCs through Enterprise and LISC, created a special Human Capital Development Initiative (HCDI) to respond to the demands of the field for building human capital and supporting groundbreaking research work. NCDI allocated $8 million and housed the initiative at the National Congress of Community Economic Development. The vast majority of the funding provided grants for human capital initiatives to local Community Development Partnerships. Six of the 13 demonstration sites in HCDI created training and education programs. Their local sponsors have now continued several of these initiatives, even though HCDI is no longer a feature of NCDI (Glickman 2003).

Higher education, often encouraged by HUD, has expanded its role.[8] As documented by Brophy and Shabecoff (2001), 176 programs, specializations, and degrees at colleges and universities help prepare individuals for jobs in community development. Most are graduate degree programs offering some opportunity for specialization. Since many of the programs are modifications in longstanding degree programs in business, planning, social work, public administration, and public policy, it is difficult to date the evolution of these programs. The HUD Office of University Partnerships database and the Brophy and Shabecoff (2001) Appendix offer ample information on the programs and their availability. A few offer a full degree in community economic development, such as Southern New Hampshire University, Eastern University in Pennsylvania, or Los Angeles Trade-Technical College. Some offer a specialization within a more generic degree, such as the Pratt Institute, Cleveland

State, UCLA, or University of North Carolina. Most offer a course or two as an elective within a graduate program, such as the University of Maryland, University of North Carolina, and Case Western Reserve. In all cases in which these degree programs have survived and thrived, they are an integral part of the intellectual life and course offerings by their departments and schools (Seedco 2001).

SPECIALIZATION

In addition to the growth and proliferation of the earlier types of programs for emerging and moderately successful development organizations, the 1990s saw an increase of specialization for advanced or mature groups. Some specialized training drilled down into narrow topics, such as property management, that had been a shorter part of more comprehensive programs. Other specialized training expanded beyond earlier boundaries, looking for more comprehensive approaches to community development. Still other specializations focused on particular sets of partner organizations such as banking institutions.

For example, in 1990 the Association for Neighborhood and Housing Development (ANHD), a 20-year-old umbrella organization of 82 New York City nonprofit housing developers and operators and community organizing groups, created an extended education program leading to a certificate in apartment management. A collaboration of banks that lent to ANHD members operated the training and provided the funding.

The Enterprise Foundation, LISC, and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation also responded to the need of the groups successful enough to be overwhelmed by the burden of managing a considerable stock of rental housing. They joined forces to create the Consortium for Housing and Asset Management (CHAM). After extensive planning and some short programs, CHAM began offering two certifications in 1999: the Nonprofit Housing Management Specialist and later the Certified Housing Asset Manager.

CONCLUSION

A substantial number of training and education programs now serve CDCs. By most reports, however, they meet only a portion of the training, education, and human capital development needs of the field. Brophy and Shabecoff (2001) identified 176 academic programs offering at least one course. Mayer (2003), in the first structured

cross-program comparison of academic and nonacademic training and education for CDCs, estimates attendance at a variety of sessions at 25,000 in 2002 (allowing that some of the same people probably attended more than one session). Most of the offerings are short-term trainings. In addition, the number of comprehensive programs grew only marginally in the last 20 years, during which the number of CDCs quadrupled and the largest, most successful CDCs expanded dramatically.[9]

We have learned much over the last 40 years about *how* to provide training and successful comprehensive education that leads to high-quality skill enhancement, increases in housing and other production, and improvements in genuine organizational and community leadership development. The two longitudinal surveys that exist indicate a high correlation between comprehensive training and success in the field (Kirkpatrick 1998). But we still need to know more.

Mayer (2003) identifies the dramatic level of success of the nonacademic programs in producing participants who find and stay in jobs in CDCs compared to the academic programs. Nonacademic programs, however, are vulnerable regarding long-term funding. A notable exception is the Neighborhood Reinvestment Institutes with their substantial annual federal funding. Either federal funding needs to be dedicated to some of the other programs or there needs to be experimentation with alternative financial stabilization models that will ensure the long-term availability of these programs so clearly needed in the field (Seedco 2001).

POLICY RECOMMENDATION: SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION

Among federal agencies, HUD is notable for its low level of support for education for critical workforce elements. The Department of Education supports teacher education. Health and Human Services supports social work education. The Public Health Service supports nursing education. HUD has only a small program supporting work-study students in planning. Because HUD depends on a well-educated workforce at the local level to administer its programs, the Department should increase its investment in professional education, not just training. What are the appropriate policy frameworks, mechanisms, and administrative structures for such financial support? What is the case, both in policy research and politically, for that investment? Should the investment be made by HUD alone or in collaboration with private philanthropy, academic institutions, or others? These questions should have a fair hearing and be resolved or rejected on their merits. The status quo, though, continues to ignore the ever-increasing supply of those willing to work in community economic development coupled with an almost random access to the tools that would make them competent professionals.

POLICY RECOMMENDATION: DEFINE CAPACITY BUILDING

Only minimal research exists in the identification of critical indexes of community development capacity and measures for grading the effect of different investments. Apart from specific program evaluation, the last theoretical work completed under HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research funding was conducted by the Urban Institute in 1978 (Mayer and Blake 1978). More recently, Norman Glickman and his associates have published a widely regarded framework for specifying capacity-building objectives (Glickman and Servon 1999). Walker uses other measures in evaluating NCDI (Walker and Weinheimer 1998; Walker 2002). The HUD headquarters CPD technical assistance office is working to establish a common evaluation framework for capacity building by providers under technical assistance in the HOME program. A recent General Accounting Office (GAO) report (2003) on technical assistance and Section 4 of the Community Development Block Grant also addressed the need for a better evaluation framework for capacity building on the part of HUD. The GAO report commented that individual providers of capacity building often have rich and well-structured evaluation mechanisms for their individual activity, but that HUD lacks an overall framework for evaluating whether the Department is getting what it needs and intends through its dispersed capacity-building efforts.

Very little research specifically focuses on the effect of capacity building (even when well defined) on program goals, such as housing production and neighborhood impact. The absence of that evidence makes it even harder to make the case for training and education or to track specific differences that have allowed a better selection among or improvement in training and education programs (Lamore et al. 2003).

POLICY RECOMMENDATION: SUPPORT LONGITUDINAL EVALUATIONS

Like most academic institutions, training and education programs can demonstrate the achievement of specific education objectives by participants. They also can collect and report the evaluation of their program by participants. These evaluation data might be considered immediate *outputs* of the training and education programs. Many education programs also have documented the application of program gains by participants to organizations and programs in their communities, thereby identifying *outcomes* that result from the outputs of the programs. The degree of causality cannot be objectively established but must rely on the report of the participants. The degree of specificity in the participant report of the connection between elements of the program and specific outcomes in the application is one indicator of the strength of the data. Many sponsors of education and training,

however, are interested in the long-term impact of substantial investments in education on community development goals, such as transformation of target neighborhoods. These impacts are only achieved over a long period of time and are less subject to an acid test of causality.

Longitudinal studies, however, are rare and, to the extent they exist, highly focused. Sociometric data collection, ethnographic field observation, and case studies are appropriate methods to incorporate in the longitudinal study. Mayer (2003), for example, notes that only the Development Training Institute (DTI) and Southern New Hampshire University have attempted longitudinal studies of their past participants on the issue of longevity in the field. Longitudinal studies are useful to investors who supported the educational programs with the hope of building talent that would stay in community development for long periods.

POLICY RECOMMENDATION: CREATE A FRAMEWORK FOR CROSS-PROGRAM CREDENTIALING

The field needs a method of common credentialing so that participants can cross-matriculate at academic and nonacademic programs and achieve some recognized universal credential. One method of cross-certification would be to anchor program offerings to a set of competencies required by various jobs in the field, and having each of the institutions (or some common body) identify their offerings that pertain to a particular competency. Participants cross-matriculating could then build a competency resume.

To make the cross-program credential valuable, employers also would have to recognize the validity of the competency resume. A related piece of research, therefore, is to cross-tabulate the competencies with key jobs in different fields that are related to community development. A framework for that research is presented by the cross-tabulation of jobs to institutional settings found in Brophy and Shabecoff (2001). Some level of study of core competencies might be necessary. To date, only one formal competency study in the field exists, and that study looked at coordinators of collaborations for comprehensive community building (Development Training Institute 2000).

POLICY RECOMMENDATION: MAKE ACADEMIA PRACTICAL

Mayer (2003) reports the significant underachievement of academic programs in producing graduates who find jobs among the CDCs. Both participants and employers reported that graduates lack the particular skills needed to work within CDCs at the level the CDCs were willing to hire the graduates. In most cases, even where

participants in academic programs wanted to work in CDCs, academic graduates moved disproportionately to the public sector. If academic programs are to become a reliable source of new talent for CDCs, further research is needed on better defining the deficits and identifying alternative remediation measures.

It is especially critical that community colleges are allotted a higher level of involvement in training and education since community and economic development is a significant feature of their overall mission. Some funding for such research might be offered under HUD's Community Outreach Partnership Center program.

POLICY RECOMMENDATION: INCREASE ATTENTION TO PEOPLE OF COLOR

Mayer (2003) identifies deficits in existing programs for specific ethnic groups, most particularly Latinos and Asian-Americans/Pacific Islanders. Others have noted the disproportionate absence of African-Americans in senior positions in intermediary and funding organizations in the community development field. Better documentation is needed of the demographic facts and dynamic analysis of underlying causes so that appropriate remediation might be designed, demonstrated, and implemented.

POLICY RECOMMENDATION: PROMOTE THE FIELD

Investigators in the field constantly report that employers complain about the small supply of talent (Vidal 1992; McNeely 1995; Brophy and Shabecoff 2001). People who would like to work in CDCs complain of the inability to find a job. There needs to be some investigation, testing, and careful tracking and evaluation of alternatives for promoting the field and its access point to the potential supply lines of new talent, like undergraduate and graduate departments in academic institutions. Perhaps some bridge mechanisms or employer education might help overcome the gap.

POLICY RECOMMENDATION: FOCUS ON HUMAN CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT

In 1992, the Senate Appropriations Committee took the initiative to fund an analysis and create a human capital development plan for the field by designating resources within the budget of the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for a joint venture with the DTI. After completing a field-wide analysis, they organized the Human Resources Consortium representing 14 major organizations in the CDC

field, both national and regional. The report *Human Capital for the Year 2000* (McNeely 1995) captured the research and the work of that group. The Consortium initiated several programs: a common pension for the field; an Internet-based job and resume posting service; a collection of human resource management tools; a practitioner-oriented, real-time database of training in the field; and regular news features on human capital.

Subsequently, the National Community Development Initiative, in which HUD participates, invested $8 million dollars in a multiyear human capital demonstration program operated by the National Congress of Community Economic Development. The final evaluation and closing report on the demonstration was done by Rutgers University and published in 2003 (Devance-Manzini, Glickman, and DiGiovanna 2002). The large Human Capital Development initiative has been replaced by a smaller research and development effort by NCDI (now called Living Cities) at the New School Milano Center in New York. The investment, however, is small compared to the need for ongoing work in stimulating human capital investments. Supporters of the community development field, including foundations and HUD, should aggressively fund research on human capital needs, demonstration of human capital interventions, and dissemination of best practices in human capital investment and human resource management in the CDC.

APPENDIX. CHRONOLOGY OF SOME FORMAL TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR FAITH-BASED AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

1963	Office of Economic Opportunity, the War on Poverty Training
1963–Present	Pratt Institute Center
1972	National Training Institute in Community Economic Development (NTICED)
1971–75	National Council for Equal Business Opportunity (NCBO): Economic development internships
1978–86	Neighborhood Reinvestment Director Training
1978–81	HUD Office of Neighborhood Development
1978–Present	Community Economic Development Assistance Corporation (CEDAC)
1977–Present	Chicago Rehab Network
1978–Present	National Development Council (NDC) Economic Development Finance Program
1980–81	NTICED Master's
1981–92	Development Training Institute (DTI): National Internship in Community Economic Development
1983–90	DTI-NFG Foundation Training in Community Economic Development
1982–Present	Southern New Hampshire University (formerly New Hampshire College): Master's Degree in Community Economic Development
1983–2001	Tufts Summer Community Economic Development Institute
1985–95	Pratt Internship in Community Economic Development
1985–92	MIT Minority Developers Program
1985–Present	DTI Project Development Program (PDP)
1987–Present	Neighborhood Reinvestment Institute
1987	LISC Bay Area PDP
1988–Present	LISC Expanded Training

1989–Present	The Enterprise Foundation Rehab Workgroup & Training Department
1990–Present	ANHD Apartment Managers Training
1990–Present	New Jersey Affordable Housing Network Housing Development Program
1990–93	North Carolina Association of CDCs, Community Development Training Program
1994–Present	National Community Development Lending School
1995–Present	HUD HOME/CHDO Funded Training
1995–Present	NDC Housing Finance Training
1995–Present	Neighborhood Reinvestment Community Leadership Institutes
1995–99	DTI Leadership and Management Program (LAMP)
1996–Present	Atlanta Neighborhood Development Partnership Certificate
1997–2000	HCDI (Human Capital Development Initiative) of the National Community Development Initiative (NCDI)
1997–Present	DTI Bank of America Leadership Academy
1998-Present	Proliferation of University and College Programs
1998–Present	Southern New Hampshire University Ph.D.
1998–Present	HUD Section IV Capacity Building
1998–2002	US Treasury Community Development Finance Institutions (CDFI) Training
1999–Present	Consortium for Housing and Asset Management (CHAM) Management Training
2002	Neighborhood Reinvestment Advanced Practitioners Program

NOTES

[1] The author is the founder and president of the Development Training Institute, the only national training organization operating in the community economic development field. He has participated in the development of the community economic development field from his role as a CDC director to the assistant secretary of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

[2] CDCs are distinguished from community-based planning and citizen participation organizations by their direct engagement in the sponsorship, development, and management of housing, commercial real estate, business ventures, and loan funds. They may undertake community organizing, youth and family services, education, health, or arts and culture activity in addition to their development work.

[3] Training may be rendered in person or through distance learning via printed materials, audio and video reproduction, cable and satellite TV, or computer-based applications using CDs and/or the Internet. Educational programs may also incorporate distance learning, but almost always require regular face-to-face contact between participants and "faculty" or content experts.

[4] The program was changed in the late 1970s to project-specific, annual competition open to all community- and faith-based organizations. It currently is administered by the Department of Health and Human Services.

[5] The Health and Human Services Office of Community Services still offers training programs for some of the federal programs that remain, including Community Action and the successor to the CDC funding program.

[6] Not all of the activity at this time happened at the national level or through federal agencies. In 1978, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts created the Community Economic Development Assistance Corporation (CEDAC) to serve organizations funded by the Commonwealth's new community economic development funding program. CEDAC began providing technical assistance, predevelopment lending, and consulting services to nonprofit community economic development organizations. Today, CEDAC has added services to groups involved in housing development, workforce development, neighborhood economic development, and child-care facilities. These organizations include community or neighborhood development corporations, nonprofit developers, and tenants' associations (http://www.cedac.org).

At the city level, the Chicago Rehab Network (CRN), one of the nation's first city-wide coalitions of neighborhood-based nonprofit housing organizations, was founded in 1977 to create and preserve affordable housing in Chicago and the region through research, publications, policy and advocacy, training, and technical assistance (http://www.chicagorehab.org). After years of offering short-term training programs, in 2000 the Chicago Rehab Network and the College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs at the University of Illinois at Chicago began offering a comprehensive educational program, the Urban Developers certificate (http://www.uic.edu/cuppa/gci/programs/profed/udp/index.htm).

[7] http://www.snhu.edu/Home_Page/Academics/General_Info/School_of_Business/MSCEDNWP.html.

[8] http://www.hud.gov/progdesc/copc.cfm.

[9] No census of organizations as defined for this paper exists. Existing surveys define the groups to be counted differently. The NCCED survey uses a narrow definition of CDCs and relies on voluntary mail back. They count 3,000. On the other hand, HUD has a list of 3,000 CHODs, 2,700 of which have been funded.

REFERENCES

Boyte, Harry. 1980. *The Backyard Revolution*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Brophy, Paul C., and Alice Shabecoff. 2001. *A Guide to Careers in Community Development*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Carlson, David B., and Arabella Martinez. 1988. The Economics of Community Change. Unpublished manuscript. Washington, DC: Center for Policy Development.

Conservation Company. 1997. *Management Assessment of the Ford Foundation Community Development Human Capital Initiative Leadership Development Grants*. New York: Conservation Company.

Devance-Manzini, Donita, Norman J. Glickman, and Sean DiGiovanna. 2002. *Building Capacity in Community Development Corporations: Lessons From the Human Capital Development Initiative*. Final report. Washington, DC: National Congress for Community Economic Development.

Development Training Institute. 2000. *Competency Study of Leaders Who Facilitate Successful Community Building Initiatives*. Paper presented at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, Office of University Partnerships Teaching and Learning for Community Building Conference, University of the District of Columbia, Washington, DC.

De Vita, Carol J., and Cory Fleming, eds. 2001. *Building Capacity in Nonprofit Organizations*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.

General Accounting Office (GAO). 2003. *HUD Management: Impact Measurement Needed for Technical Assistance*. Washington, DC: GAO #-03-12.

Glickman, Norman. 2003. Building the Capacity of Community-Based Development Organizations: The Case of Community Development Partnerships. In *Building the Organizations That Build Communities: Strengthening the Capacity of Faith- and Community-Based Development Organizations*, edited by Roland V. Anglin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research.

Glickman, Norman J., and Lisa J. Servon. 1999. More Than Bricks and Sticks: What Is Community Development Capacity? *Housing Policy Debate* 9 (3): 497–539.

Grogan, Paul S., and Tony Proscio. 2000. *Comeback Cities: A Blueprint for Urban Neighborhood Revival*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Kinsey, David J., J. Russell Raker, III, and Lilya D. Wagner, eds. 2003. *Capacity Building for Nonprofits: New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kirkpatrick, Donald. 1998. *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels*. 2d ed. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

LaMore, Rex L., et al. 2003. *Organizational Capacity and Housing Production: A Study of Nonprofit Organizations in Michigan*. Paper presented at Seeds of Growth, Third Community Affairs Research Conference 7a CD, Washington, DC.

Mayer, Neil S. 2003. Education and Training for Community Development. In *Building the Organizations That Build Communities: Strengthening the Capacity of Faith- and Community-Based Development Organizations*, edited by Roland V. Anglin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research.

Mayer, Neil S., and Jennifer L. Blake. 1978. *Keys to the Growth of Neighborhood Development Organizations*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

McNeely, Joseph. 1995. *Human Capital for the Year 2000: A Five-year Action Agenda for Enhancing Staff and Board Leadership in Community-Based Development*. Washington, DC: Development Training Institute and Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.

Morgan, Ronald R., Judith A. Ponticell, and Edward E. Gordon. 1996. *Enhancing Learning in Training and Adult Education*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Mott, Andrew. 2000. Twenty-five Years of Building Power and Capacity. *Shelterforce* March/April.

Perry, Stuart. 1973. Federal Support for CDCs: Some of the History and Issues of Community Control. *Review of Black Political Economy* 3: 17–42.

Pierce, Neal R., and Carol F. Steinbach. 1987. *Corrective Capitalism: The Rise of America's Community Development Corporations*. New York: The Ford Foundation.

Seedco. 2001. *An Overview of Community Development Leadership Training Programs and Lessons Learned From Selected Colleges and Universities.* New York: Seedco.

Vidal, Avis. 1992. *Rebuilding Communities: A National Study of Urban Community Development Corporations.* New York: Community Development Research Center, New School University.

Walker, Christopher. 2002. *Community Development Corporations and Their Changing Support Systems*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Walker, Christopher, and Mark Weinheimer. 1998. *Community Development in the 1990s*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

ADDITIONAL READING

Abt Associates. 1973. *An Evaluation of the Special Impact Program: Final Report*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.

Cross, K. Patricia. 1992. *Adults as Learners: Increasing Participation and Facilitating Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ducker, Katherine, and Kinnard Wright. 2000. *An Inventory of Curricula for Community Building*, edited by Victor Rubin. Washington, DC: Office of University Partnerships, Office of Policy Development and Research, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Feature series on leadership programs. 2002. *Chronicle of Philanthropy* 14.

National Congress for Community Economic Development (NCCED). 1995. *Tying It All Together: The Comprehensive Achievements of Community-Based Development Organizations*. Washington, DC: NCCED.

Neighborhood Reinvestment Training Institute (NRTI). 2001. Data on participants attending Neighborhood Reinvestment Training Institutes. Unpublished PowerPoint presentation. Washington, DC: NRTI.

Office of University Partnerships. 2000. Teaching and Learning for Community Building: New Roles, New Skills, and Stronger Partnerships. Unpublished manuscript. Washington, DC: Office of Policy Development and Research, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Pierce, Neal. 1991. *Enterprising Communities: Community-Based Development in America*. Washington, DC: Council for Community-based Development.

Ylvisaker, Paul. 1963. *Remarks to the Conference on Urban Extension*. New York: The Ford Foundation Archives.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Joseph McNeely is the President of the Development Training Institute (DTI), a national leadership development organization for the community-building field, headquartered in Baltimore, Maryland.

Urban Ministry Training and Capacity-Building Programs of Faith-Based Organizations

David J. Frenchak

This paper presents an overview of the history of training opportunities for urban ministry from the mid-1960s to the present time for individuals preparing for ministry within the Christian faith, specifically the Protestant tradition. The reader will get a big picture of Christian faith-based training opportunities during this time, some of which continue today. The paper also enables the reader to appreciate the shifting focus and direction that faces organizations, churches, and individuals seeking to prepare for urban ministry. Two characteristics of this shift immediately stand out. First, we see a significant emphasis on developing leaders who know how to become effective agents of change in communities with heavy concentrations of people, diversity, and issues. Second, we see an emphasis placed on community building and community development as part of urban ministry.

The programs identified by name in this paper serve only to illustrate its points, with apologies to the many fine training programs that might serve as equally credible examples. One outcome of this paper might very well be identifying the need for research that could create a credible list and clearinghouse for the multiple constructive efforts at faith-based training presently under way. Such a list would be a valuable resource to community development efforts seeking to further develop their leadership potential, and also that of others, around the complex environment of the city.

While highlighting the educational and training options of the past 40 years, this paper will provide a framework to aid individuals seeking to expand their understanding of leadership that responds to the ever-changing environment of our urban world. This short paper concludes with a brief suggestion that an opportunity exists to do some "out-of-the-box" thinking about the development of a faith-based training process that respects the definition of collaborative learning and community building.

Historically, training for urban ministry has been outside the well-established seminary and official academic leadership development programs of most Protestant denominations. Such limited opportunity for education and training for urban min-

istry remains true today. With few exceptions, urban ministry and urban ministry training receive, at best, only very limited resources from the ecclesiastical system. Preparing for urban ministry is most often seen as "specialized ministry;" therefore, opportunities for faith-based education and training stand apart from and often are outside of the established faith-based educational system.

Because urban ministry and community development education and training programs are successfully marginalized, many of these education and training programs are underfunded, resulting in a pattern of urban ministry training programs becoming transient and existing for only a limited time.

Urban ministry frequently involves a working relationship with segments of our society who have been marginalized politically, socially, and economically. Education and training for urban ministry shares this marginalization. While such a conclusion may warrant further analysis, we do no favor to the church, to its educational programs, or to the religious systems they serve by allowing this perspective. We now live in an urban society that requires those doing ministry anywhere, whether professional or lay, to understand the dynamics and dimensions of the contemporary urban environment. If the church desires to grow and keep pace with the present growth patterns of our world, then urban ministry and community development should be central to denominational and faith-based institutions of education and training at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

This paper takes some generalized looks at faith-based training options that have been available to the church and to individuals over the past 40 years. Divided into four sections, it begins with the response of the organized church to the demographic changes and social dynamics that occurred in cities in the late 1960s to the mid-1970s and the rapid development and decline of action-training centers around North America. Following close on the heels of the decline of these centers, a number of seminary programs emerged, designed to give students not only exposure to the city but also a theoretical basis for thinking critically and strategically about cities, as well as training in the skills to conduct effective ministry in an urban environment. The third section focuses on community organizing that seems parallel to the action-training centers and the seminary programs. Much of the community-organizer training focused particularly on the faith-based community. The fourth section brings us closer to our immediate time, enabling us to see the shift in focus. The further away in time we get from the crisis epitomized by the burning cities of the 1960s, the more strategic becomes the thinking and direction in urban ministry. Issue-orientation programs and service-provision programs give way to a more holistic approach that emphasizes community development. Many faith-

based educational and training programs for urban ministry in the 1980s and 1990s reflect this type of shift. In some cases, education played an instrumental role in developing the thinking behind the shift, particularly about the role of the church in community.

EXPOSURE/ORIENTATION

The 1960s proved to be a critical period in the history of the United States in recognizing and addressing the complexities of modern city life, particularly the issues of racial division and poverty. Throughout this period, urban centers experienced unprecedented levels of unrest and revolt. For many, the eruption of violence in major metropolitan cities made it clear that the problems associated with the social, political, and economic inequalities among the races could no longer be ignored as they had been in the past. As the civil rights movement moved into full swing, powered for the most part by African-American church leaders, the churches and seminaries of White Protestant denominations recognized a need to develop new tactics and strategies to educate their clergy and laity for mission and nurture in inner cities. These religious institutions recognized that they were "called upon not only to contribute to change in others, but to change themselves as well," and so set about developing a kind of training distinct from that which had come before (Younger 1987, 2).

One important methodology shared by many of the theological educational programs that developed during this period was the practice of learning through "action/reflection." Focusing on education through experience, many of the programs assigned great importance to their students' developing an understanding rooted in and followed by personal engagement. According to Clinton Stockwell, "Before we move to the 'world as it should be,' we must understand 'the world as it is'" (Stockwell 1994).

The importance of active experience for these clergy and lay folks can be traced largely to the population distribution at this time. Following World War II, many major cities experienced a significant population shift, as Whites (along with their churches and institutions) moved out to the suburbs and southern African Americans and Hispanics migrated into the inner cities. For the White and/or middle-class students who wanted to minister in urban environments, it was therefore a crucial first step to witness and identify with a reality very different than their own. In his analysis of the religious training programs of this period, George D. Younger identifies this level of involvement as "Orientation—exposing the training

group to information about urban society, racism, Afro-American history or other subject areas in which they had little previous experience." While this initial level of involvement was considered primary to the education process, the goal was to eventually move beyond orientation to analysis and the cultivation of concrete skills relevant to the specific problems of the city. The extent to which programs realized this goal varied, and oftentimes participants did not move far beyond the exposure and orientation phase (Younger 1987).

A specific example of the "action/reflection" theological education that emerged from the ferment of this time can be seen in the action-training centers that developed in major cities around the country. The first of these centers, known as the Urban Training Center for Christian Mission (UTC), was established in a West Side ghetto of Chicago in 1963. Inspired by a proposal of Donald L. Benedict to the National Council of Churches for developing an ecumenical training center, UTC's purpose was "to explore and communicate the relationship of the Christian faith to the urban industrial society, in order that the church as the carrier of the Gospel may find renewal in our generation." Among the action-training centers, UTC had the largest budget, staff, and number of trainees. In addition, it generated the most widespread publicity and acted as a key consultant and resource for the other emerging training centers (Younger 1987).

A program known as "the plunge" most vividly illustrates UTC's commitment to experiential learning. Participants would live on the streets for days at a time, dressed in shabby clothing and with little or no money, to experience firsthand the powerlessness and frustration of poverty and glimpse the citadels of wealth and affluence from a different perspective. This symbolic experience could be interpreted in widely different ways. In Carl Siegenthaler's analysis, this "prophetic fellowship" could be understood as any or all of the following: a commitment to be with people in very different situations, an openness to both the chaotic and redemptive forces within our society, a desire for greater sensitivity to the Word of God as expressed in the inner city, and an indication of the church's willingness to be changed while engaging in the work of transformation. When reporting on their time in the UTC program, many participants cited the plunge as a profound part of their urban experience, as well as their day-to-day visits to the center on the West Side (Younger 1987).

ACADEMIA

Academia, often influenced by individual faculty whose social consciousness found fuel through participation in one of the action-training programs, began to explore ways to provide educational opportunities for students who shared the faculty's social consciousness. Two patterns evolved in academically accredited programs of urban ministry study. First, a pattern of consortia efforts developed, with schools joining together to organize and structure an educational experience offered to all students from the member schools. Second, a pattern of individual efforts emerged, with schools joining forces with an urban ministry program in the city to provide training and educational opportunities for workers in the ministry and students from the school.

The first pattern can be easily identified in a program entitled Urban Ministry for Pastoral Students (UMPS). In 1973 Dr. Gill James, a professor from Asbury Theological Seminary, sought and received funding from the Lilly Endowment, a long-standing supporter of urban ministry endeavors, for this 3-year, 8-week summer program for students from eight evangelical seminaries in the Midwest. Using the teaching technique of the plunge as the starting point, followed by an orientation to the city, this program set up students in urban ministry internships that forced political and theological discussion regarding a variety of urban issues. The program was well attended and well received; when the funding ran out, however, the program—like most of the action-training programs that preceded it—ceased.

The concept of consortia programs for urban ministry education lived on, however, and several consortia efforts for urban ministry training emerged in the 1970s and 1980s in cities that included New York, Philadelphia, Atlanta, San Francisco, Washington, and Chicago. History has not been kind to this pattern of academic efforts to provide education and training for urban ministry. The only consortium program of theological education for urban ministry begun during this time and still operating today is the program in Chicago. The Seminary Consortium for Urban Pastoral Education (SCUPE), which traces its roots to the earlier UMPS program, continues to offer its twelve member schools contextual and experiential education, including academic course work integrated with urban ministry internships. Linked with the seminary program, SCUPE also has designed a new program of theological studies called Nurturing the Call. The market for this program is not those already registered in an institution of theological education, but those engaged in ministry in the city who have not had the opportunity to pursue theological studies. This program allows participants to begin their theological studies by taking courses in urban ministry and to transfer these credits into an accredited

degree program at one of its member schools. A third program SCUPE designed and now operates, in partnership with a Chicago university, is a master of arts in community development. SCUPE organizes the Congress on Urban Ministry, which is the largest biennial conference on ministry in the city and is designed to address leadership development for both lay and professional ministers. This event provides a variety of workshops, academic courses, and site visits that reflects the diversity of urban ministry programs in the metropolitan area. An outgrowth of the Congress on Urban Ministry is a 3-week Summer Institute on developing grass-root and local church leadership with the vision, skills, and competencies for community revitalization. Finally, SCUPE now is creating an urban ministry network, the Association for Metro/Urban Ministry (AMUM). This membership network serves as a central clearinghouse of information on urban ministry and connects people doing urban ministry across lines of geography, denominations, professions, and more.

In the 1990s the Pew Charitable Trusts initiated the startup of several new consortia efforts of training for urban ministry. A couple of these efforts stand out as examples of renewed consortia programs. Contextualized Urban Ministry Education Northwest works with three Bible colleges in developing an associate's degree in Christian ministry for ethnic leaders. It also networks four seminaries in the Northwest to provide programs in urban ministry studies. The City Gate Project in the Twin Cities of Minnesota, under the administrative care of North Central Bible College, works with 15 different colleges and seminaries to develop coordinated curricula at varying levels of study. City Gate has created institutional partnerships among schools that cross lines of denominations and among urban ministerial partnerships that surmount theological, cultural, racial, and economic differences that have served as barriers to collaboration.

Many academic programs of urban ministry studies were initiated either by individual schools or church-related agencies in the major cities in partnership with academic institutions. One such program is the Bresee Institute, a church-based training and resource center for urban studies and ministry located in Los Angeles. Bresee offers an educational experience that integrates theological, practical, and spiritual foundations in course offerings for urban ministry at both graduate and undergraduate levels. The Institute also offers an inner-city internship for students. Another program is the Center for Urban Theological Studies of Westminster Seminary in Philadelphia offers four bachelor of science programs and a master's degree program "to provide education, training and resources to develop servant-leaders for the urban church, community and marketplace." Westminster also offers a doctoral degree in ministry in urban mission with a

strong emphasis on international contexts. The Institute for Urban Studies, accredited by Colorado Christian University, aims its program at urban youth and allows college students linked with the Denver public schools to teach character and life skills in for-credit classes. The program not only provides a real context of learning but also provides a series of college-level courses focused on understanding the city.

Perhaps the most adequately resourced program in this category is the Center for Urban Ministerial Education in Boston. This program, initiated and developed by urban ministry leaders from the city, has become Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary's Boston campus and offers graduate-level courses primarily for the in-service training of both Spanish- and English-speaking pastors and church leaders. Courses are scheduled either in the evenings or on weekends throughout the metropolitan area. The program emphasizes "seeking the shalom of the city—a shalom which breaks down the cultural, ethnic, and socioeconomic barriers that divide us."

COMMUNITY ORGANIZING

The curriculum of the earlier action-training centers and many academic programs, such as SCUPE, includes an emphasis on community organizing. The history of community organizing can be traced to the ideas of the Founding Fathers, as witnessed in their fundamental concern for the creation and promotion of justice and equality through the democratic process, and their protection of the right of groups to assemble and organize for political purposes. Community organizing gives voice to marginalized people and expands public conversation and decision-making through the development of the human resources of communities, as individuals and as collaborative associations. Conceptually, community organizers' central and most basic issue is *power*, as agitation promotes the ability of people without resources to act in ways that combat destructive existing power structures and secure the health of their environments.

The methods of community organizing employed by the church largely can be attributed to groundwork and writings of Saul Alinsky, who continues to be a major influence on many of the faith-based organizations in the city. Alinsky often worked with faith-based organizations and institutions, though their relationship was controversial at times. Catholic parishes were important in his early work with the Back of the Yards Neighborhood Council, and starting in the 1950s he received

institutional support from Protestant and Catholic sources throughout the country (Parachini and Covington 2001).

Religious institutions have a variety of intersection points with community organizing. First, the language of faith and ideas that exists in churches and denominations has a certain congruence with the organizers' work of inspiring, affirming, and motivating marginalized people for positive change, as the prophetic tradition has been about the work of "comforting the afflicted and afflicting the comfortable" (Adams-Leavitt 2003). Second, religious institutions share the common goal of developing the social/human capital and vital networks essential to creating livable, just, and free communities. In a culture in which market values increasingly overflow into all spheres of life, and as group identities disintegrate while contractual and client relationships abound, the bonds formed through a common faith and place of worship are a rare and valuable asset. It may seem only natural, then, that the faith-based organizations that sought to educate leaders for urban transformation collaborated with the community organization groups active in the inner cities, and incorporated their insights and methodologies into their training programs.

In the late 1960s an organization called the Gamaliel Foundation in Chicago attempted to link local religious bodies with groups organizing around housing issues. The name of this organization was inspired by Biblical references to Gamaliel, a religious leader of Jerusalem who looked for God's hand in the activities of agitating groups and who was the teacher of Paul (who then went on to found many of the early Christian communities). The name reflects the organization's mission to recognize the existing forces for renewal, as well as train people for organizing. With its expansion over the years and reorganization in 1986, the Gamaliel Foundation now represents another unique model of faith-based education, one that seeks to empower community leaders through a congregational approach and attempts to "organize the organizers" on a national level.

The Gamaliel Foundation creates affiliates and sponsoring committees, who then work with local communities to identify priority issues and train people for the action necessary to realize their vision. Typically, developing these affiliates takes about a year, and currently the Gamaliel Foundation has 45 affiliates in 17 states. As part of the affiliate development process, the Gamaliel Foundation provides local groups with a step-by-step plan designed to organize local congregations across racial and denominational lines for the goal of public "actions" that give them influence among the other decisionmaking bodies of the community. The Gamaliel Foundation helps implement the plan in two ways: first, by helping to select and hire a professional organizer who can identify potential leaders and guide the activities,

and second, by providing retreats and educational events that teach participants the basic concepts of organizing and the skills needed to interact personally with political, corporate, and institutional leaders (Parachini and Covington 2001). While most of the educational events are open to all participants, the Gamaliel Foundation offers courses specifically for clergy designed to help them balance "the demands of maintaining their own institutions while at the same time addressing issues of justice and community concerns."

URBAN MINISTRY AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Most recently, the practice of urban ministry throughout North America placed significant emphasis on community and community development. Closely attendant to this link between urban ministry and community development is an emphasis in education and training programs on the necessity for understanding the dynamics of community and community transformation. Leadership development and the implementation of competencies and skills related to taking a leadership role in community transformation have become prominent. While an argument might be made that urban ministry is more than community development, it is helpful to recognize that community development provides a working framework for all the dynamics and dimensions associated with urban ministry that is not strictly service oriented.

The case for understanding urban ministry as community development begins with a very basic proposition: God created life to be lived in harmonious community. This theological proposition provides the basis for all religious dialogue and efforts for community building, community organizing, and community development that are not focused on gain of power. It provides the foundation and philosophical base for determining the content of community training, investment, and work for all humane and faith-based efforts aimed at revitalizing community. The proposition contains not only the theological but also the sociological, psychological, political, and economic implications for understanding urban ministry. Theologically, the proposition assumes an understanding that both life and community have their origin in the divine order of creation. Sociologically, the proposition states not only the possibility of harmonious community but establishes it as the objective of life. Psychologically, the assumption asserts that "well-being" does not come solely from finding oneself but from finding oneself in association with others. Politically, the statement sets priorities: the common good is politically correct. Economically, the proposition challenges the assumption that a scarcity of resources in God's cre-

ation naturally leads to competition rather than harmony both within community and among communities.

More and more established educational and training programs for urban ministry now focus on community development, with new programs springing forth. Two such newly developed educational and training programs that serve as examples of this combined emphasis of community development and leadership development are the Campolo School for Social Change at Eastern University in Philadelphia, and the master of arts in community development at North Park University in Chicago.

The Campolo School's program in public education and the public school system addresses not only the problems but also the attending issues and causes of inadequate funding for city schools. It focuses on the need for job creation among the poor and has created graduate programs designed to equip students to empower indigenous people to develop and own faith-based microbusinesses and industries. The program intentionally looks to and at urban churches as resources and incubators that will nurture into existence a variety of microbusinesses. The school also implemented a new graduate program in urban public policy that engages students in the theories and techniques for impacting government and commerce with values that reflect Christian teachings about the Kingdom of God. The school has a commitment to working for structural change in the economic and political systems of the city and to this end has developed specialized programs in urban studies and leadership.

The master of arts degree in community development offered by North Park University is a practitioner-oriented degree program for working professionals who find their responsibilities demand enhanced skill sets and knowledge bases. The program was designed by SCUPE, which continues as a partner with North Park in the implementation of the design. The common mission is the creation of a supportive learning community of committed professionals from diverse backgrounds who share a passion for social, economic, and environmental justice and a desire to advance in the leadership skills necessary to build an inclusive and holistic community. The program seeks to prepare leaders in city neighborhoods to engage in effective grassroots community building by combining insights from business, politics, policy, economics, and social theory. A sample of courses includes Christian Traditions in Community Revitalization; Practical Applications and Theoretical Understanding of Social Change; Community Organizing; Advocacy, Ethics, and Policymaking; Advanced Skills in Statistical Analysis, Finance, and Urban Planning; and Networking Lending Institutions, Funders, Government Officials, and Programs with Community Leaders.

The program finds inspiration in the historical and religious understanding of the creation of communities, theories of social change, and a critical review of current strategies and programs in community development. The faculty members are all community practitioners, and the program is built around the experiences of seasoned community organizers, youth workers, executive leadership, community boards, agencies, churches, and organizations committed to serving people and families in the city. Students have the benefit of completing hands-on master's projects with classes and courses often taught within community-based organizations or churches. In 4 years the program has grown from an initial group of 8 students to a student body of more than 80. Such training programs, particularly when they stress asset-based community development, take urban ministry in a new direction that has potential for bringing health both to the community and to the congregations in urban settings.

CONCLUSION

While identifying patterns of movement that have occurred in urban ministry over the past 40 years is not easy, three patterns stand out. First, we have moved away from the issue orientation of the action-training centers toward a more holistic emphasis on the understanding of diversity. Second, we have moved further away from allowing urban ministry to be defined out of a service-industry motif toward that of a capacity-building work. Third, confrontation has become less of a hallmark of urban ministry, and community development has replaced community organizing as the more descriptive work of the church.

If these patterns prove correct, we must ask how training programs keep pace with the changing patterns. Unfortunately, the designs and structures of most educational and training programs simply do not lend themselves to strategic alliances with the broader community. Most programs, both academic and nonacademic, are organized and designed for the learning objectives and gain of the *individual* rather than the *group* or the *community*. Individuals who choose to benefit from training are most often required to leave their community where they live, often times never to return, to go to a center of training or institution of education. This movement out of community in order to get education drains communities of some of their best human resources and disrupts the flow and balance of developing community. Such disruption need not happen if we could consider a totally different design, structure, and process of training and education that does not exploit, disrupt, or take away from community—one in which the educational process actually builds and contributes to building healthy communities.

First, we should consider structuring an educational process that reverses the direction or flow of obtaining the community development training. Instead of individuals moving toward educational opportunities outside their community, what if they could take advantage of educational and training opportunities in their community? Imagine a faith-based training program in community development coming to a community or neighborhood for 1 year. The program would be only for churches, agencies, and organizations of that community that desire to collectively address the projects, concerns, issues, opportunities, and capacities of their community.

Second, we should build an educational curriculum, structure, and process around community learning objectives, which would be an improvement on emphasizing individual learning objectives. This approach would mean designing an educational process that would be responsive to cohort groups and the collective community of learners. Imagine a 1-year training program in your community that resulted in the following action:

- Having a real impact to improve your community and your neighborhood.
- Developing a collective network among faith-based leaders that is neighborhood-based and ward-based, as well as citywide.
- Linking faith-based community leaders to resources, government, and other institutions.
- Expanding the capabilities and capacities of the community.
- Expanding the field of possibilities of practitioners.
- Teaching leadership and community change skills.
- Emphasizing an asset-based/self-empowerment framework.
- Holding community-issues forums.
- Developing a neighborhood-information service.
- Using skill-building learning modules.

Such a vision is well within the realm of possibility and deserves the energy, attention, and resources of those who understand the importance and the strategic role that the faith-based sector can play to develop healthy communities.

REFERENCES

Adams-Leavitt, Warren. 2003. Ideology and the Prophetic Tradition. http://www.piconetwork.org/reflections.

Gamaliel Foundation Web site. 2003. http://www.gamaliel.org.

Parachini, Larry, and Sally Covington. 2001. Community Organizing Toolbox: A Funder's Guide to Community Organizing. http://www.nfg.org/publications/index.htm.

Stockwell, Clinton E. 1994. Education for Ministry in an Urbanized World: The Chicago Connection. In *Beyond Theological Tourism: Mentoring as a Grassroots Approach to Theological Education*, edited by Susan Brooks Thistlewaite and George F. Cairns. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Younger, George D. 1987. *From New Creation to Urban Crisis: A History of Action Training Ministries, 1962–1975*. Chicago: Center for the Scientific Study of Religion.

ADDITIONAL READING

Wood, Richard L. 1998. *Faith and Power*. Paper presented on COMM-ORG: The On-Line Conference on Community Organizing and Development. http://comm-org.utoledo.edu/papers98/warren/faith/Wood.html.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

David J. Frenchak is President of the Seminary Consortium for Urban Pastoral Education in Chicago.

Education and Training for Community Development

Neil S. Mayer

Understanding how community development (CD) practitioners acquire education and training necessary to do their work is not well understood or documented in the literature. This study describes the state of education and training for community development practitioners. The growth of CD as a set of activities devoted to improving the quality of life in urban and rural communities has depended in significant part on the field's ability to build community-based institutional capacity. The professional education and training of community developers as they enter the field and progress in their careers form an important part of building community institutional capacity.[1]

The following seven broad questions frame this study:

1. Who provides CD education and training?
2. Who are the students receiving the CD education and training? What characteristics define that pool of students?
3. What types of education and training do institutions provide?
4. What do participants in the CD education and training programs learn?
5. What do trained students do (or plan to do) after completing their programs?
6. How do employers rate the readiness of community development workers?
7. What can philanthropy and other stakeholders do to support, revise, and/or expand the preparation of new and continuing CD workers starting from the baseline detailed in these ways?

Research Methods

This study employed the following four principal means of gathering information:

1. Reviewing existing literature and quantitative materials on CD education and training practice.

2. Surveying participants (students) in current CD education and training programs, undertaken specifically for the study.
3. Interviewing faculty and administrators of CD education and training programs and other experts in the field of CD education and training delivery.
4. Interviewing employers of CD practitioners who graduated from institutions in the participant survey.

The research team fielded a survey of current students at 17 educational institutions. Faculty at the institutions asked their students to respond to the survey. In all, 324 out of 405 students returned their surveys, for a response rate of 80 percent.[2] The survey focused on students' past education and training in CD, their past experience in CD work, their entry into the CD field, the nature of their current education or training in CD, the breadth and quality of the current experience, their plans for the future, and basic demographic and socioeconomic characteristics.

In addition to surveying students, the research team interviewed 49 faculty, training directors, and administrators at education and training organizations. These individuals responded to questions focusing on how their academic institution or organization helps prepare community developers for work in the field.

Finally, faculty members suggested the names of employers who had hired their graduates in the past. A limited set of 26 such employers were questioned using a separate open-ended interview guide. Employers identified key qualifications for hiring entry-level or experienced workers, the types of education and training they found helpful or unhelpful, and the roles of education and training, experience, and other factors in enabling people to succeed in CD jobs.

We analyzed the results of the student survey using basic statistical computations: frequency distributions, comparisons of means and medians, and cross-tabulations. We summarized the narrative information from faculty/observer and employer interviews and highlighted that information using qualitative methods.

WHO PROVIDES CD EDUCATION AND TRAINING?

Overall, community development education and training are widely available. According to a seminal study of the pathways to careers in community development (Brophy and Shabecoff 2001), 176 education and training programs operate

in a wide array of colleges and universities and a diverse set of nonacademic institutions.[3] In 2002, an estimated 25,000 individuals attended some form of CD education and training sessions.[4] While double counting of people involved in more than one training program substantially inflates this number, participation is clearly widespread.

Most CD education and training programs are in academia, in some combination of community colleges, 4-year colleges, and universities. After eliminating programs focusing exclusively on community organizing, about two-thirds of the community development efforts (counting each institution's program as "one," regardless of size) take place in academic institutions.[5] The great bulk of that education is at the graduate level. At least among the 12 academic institutions selected in our potential sample, undergraduate education in CD was uncommon (two programs) and community college level programs less common still (one program).[6]

Nonacademic training is presented by many types of organizations: those that primarily focus on community development training (such as the Development Training Institute); community development intermediaries that provide training as one of several functions; associations of community development practitioners (such as the National Congress for Community Economic Development); and for-profit firms, faith-based institutions, and others. The largest categories of training programs are national training, faith-based training, and regional training. Some of these training programs work principally or partially with an internal audience of the trainers' own staff and that of partners (such as the National Reinvestment Training Institute).[7] Because a few nonacademic training organizations present many multicourse sessions with hundreds of participants for a few days, a far larger number of people receive training in nonacademic settings than in colleges and universities.

The institutions and institutional categories cannot be divided into neatly independent groups. For example, the Fannie Mae Foundation (nonacademic) and the Miami-Dade Community College (academic) formed a partnership to implement a training module for organizations wanting to underwrite mortgages. Often two or more organizations partner with an educational institution to provide training. A good example is the housing-focused trainings in Chicago led by the Chicago Rehab Network and University of Illinois at Chicago. Later in the report, we will see that both academic and nonacademic institutions provide training and education for people ranging from those just entering the community development field to people with significant experience.

ACADEMIC VS. NONACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The study found that academic and nonacademic programs differ sharply in many ways. To adequately report these important differences, we decided to present separate results for the two elements of the system. In doing so, the report will use the words "academic" programs interchangeably with "education" programs and "nonacademic" programs interchangeably with "training" programs.

In general, CD academic institutions tend to employ faculty with doctorates in a CD-related area, although often not in the specific field or department in which they teach. Neither faculty nor students found this difference to be an issue. Not surprisingly, the training institutions focused more on particular field skills, generally using current and former practitioners as faculty, drawing from their own staffs and the wider CD community. In interviews with training administrators, we learned that training participants consistently expect trainers to demonstrate current experience in the field to be credible. From informal observation, it appears that academic programs also often invite practitioners to speak in class as a way of exposing students to real-world issues in their programs. Many full-time faculty members also share information about their experience in directing field projects.

An enormous range of community development fields and skill areas is available in the education and training programs. Table 1 lists the departments and concentrations in which students can participate from just our sample of 12 academic institutions. The largest numbers of academic students in our sample pursue degrees in urban affairs, business, nonprofit management, public administration, and planning.[8]

Table 1. Academic Institutions in the Student Survey Sample: Schools, Departments, Areas of Degrees and/or Concentrations

Institution	School or Department	Main Community Development Degree: Fields
New School University	Graduate School of Management and Urban Policy	Master's: Urban Policy, Nonprofit Management
MIT	Department of Urban Studies and Planning	Master's: Urban Studies and Planning: Housing, Community, and Economic Development
Cleveland State University	College of Urban Affairs	Master's: Urban Planning, Design, and Development
San Francisco State University	Urban Studies Program	Bachelor's: Urban Studies
Los Angeles Trade and Technical College	Community Development Technical Center	1-Year Certificate Associate's: Community Development
University of New Mexico	School of Architecture and Planning	Master's: Community and Regional Planning
Cornell University	Department of City and Regional Planning	Master's: Regional Planning
Northwestern University	Graduate School of Management	Master of Business Administration: Nonprofit Management, Executive Education
University of Maryland	School of Law	J.D.: Clinic in Economic, Housing, and Community Development
Georgia State University	College of Health and Human Services, Department of Social Work	Master's: Department of Social Work Partnerships
Mississippi Valley State University	Department of Social Science, Public Administration	B.A.: Public Administration Program Community Development
University of California-Los Angeles	School of Public Policy and Social Research, Department of Urban Planning	Master of Urban Planning: Community Development and Built Environment

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The student survey and faculty, observer, and employer interviews yield a substantial list of conclusions about the process of CD education and training. These conclusions have direct implications for efforts to improve opportunities for intervention and investment. This section highlights these findings and implications in three groups:

1. **Major findings with clear evidence**: findings with broad implications for the field, supported by substantial evidence, often from more than one major source.

2. **Narrower findings with clear evidence**: findings with specific meaning for one dimension of CD education and training, supported by substantial evidence.

3. **Preliminary findings requiring additional information/research**: hypotheses suggested and/or supported by limited information that requires more research to clarify and determine implications for action.

In the interest of space, we present neither the detailed discussion of survey and interview results nor the actual tabulations from the student surveys (some 150 pages) that underlie many of the findings. The author can provide that analysis, as well as the interview and survey instruments and lists of institutional and individual respondents.

MAJOR FINDINGS WITH CLEAR EVIDENCE

Our research pointed clearly to 12 lessons for broad priority setting and substantive change in CD education and training policy and practice.

1. Continued, expanded training of project managers. The need continues for the technical and broader training of real estate project managers for community development corporations (CDCs) and other CD employers in housing and other types of development. The skill level of the people in these jobs has improved as more employees receive formal training to complement their on-the-job learning and as more employees enter the field with strong academic backgrounds. Expectations also have grown. To be taken seriously in project negotiation and management requires technical skills.

Students and faculty agree that nonacademic institutions do an excellent job of preparing these people in skills obtainable in the classroom. Project managers represent the occupation with the largest number of participants in nonacademic programs, followed by program assistants.

Employee turnover, however, remains a significant challenge, especially for CDCs, according to employers and training and education providers. The same observers say that even people newly graduated from master's degree programs do not have the full set of skills for this work. Academic faculty believe their schools do a good job preparing project managers and state that it is easier to teach the technical skills for this job than to teach many of the other skills future community development leaders need. Academic students, however, do not rate the project management area very highly. A significant share of academic students of community development study in programs that do not emphasize, or in many cases even include, the practical skills and approaches of real estate development and project management. Important subgroups, notably African Americans, are less likely than others to have these skills included in their programs. Finally, growing interest in nonhousing development seems to have outstripped growth in providing training in commercial and real estate development.

The various stakeholders agree that a well-equipped real estate project manager needs both experience and training, even after obtaining a master's degree. Obtaining project experience is often difficult in large organizations in which experienced staff often lack the time to train newcomers. In small organizations, a single new project manager may be the only staff person in a particular field, such as housing or commercial revitalization (or may be executive director and chief developer). Nonacademic providers must sustain and expand specific, hands-on training, and broaden their efforts in scope to include more aspects of nonresidential development. Training also needs to go well beyond "penciling deals" to teaching how to choose the right tools to solve problems, design strategies and select strategic projects, bring together necessary players, build support, and communicate effectively.

2. Expanded fieldwork. Students in academic programs need more opportunities for work in the field beyond the classroom. Expert observers—faculty, employers, and others—repeatedly cite experience on real-life projects and activities as critical to effectively prepare new (and senior) community developers. The survey data show that academic students most likely will enter the field without any experience in CD, and often without any experience or past schooling on the "development" side of community development. Only a portion obtain fieldwork opportunities, paid or unpaid, during their schooling. Many need to find those opportunities

on their own, without any assistance from their schools, especially if they hope to extend beyond modest hours in a single class. Some, however, rely on paying jobs outside the CD field, making the addition of unpaid CD work to their schedule very difficult. Faculty make substantial efforts to simulate fieldwork in classroom exercises of various kinds. It would be valuable, however, for schools, their potential clients, and funders to systematically extend the availability of internships, unpaid services, and jobs in the community to more of the participants, for more extended periods, and as part of a greater share of classes.

3. Further development of education and training for leaders. With the growing complexity, scale, and sophistication of CDCs and the array of other community development organizations comes a need for more effective leadership training, according to education and training providers and CD employers. Such preparation would best serve those who likely will succeed current leaders, including less seasoned executive directors of the CDCs and other institutions and senior staff (whether deputy directors or others). Shaping the next level of leadership education and training to be more effective in producing an expanding cadre of topflight performers in the CD field will require work. We must discern how best to identify potential stars not yet in top management positions and then nurture them to become future leaders.

The skills required of future leaders include a sensitivity to community dynamics and understanding of how to engage community members and develop and retain their support; management of an organization's growth; design of neighborhood revitalization strategy, despite the entire field's incomplete understanding of the process of community change; effective use of financial management information and other business management skills; fundraising for an organization and its projects from a broad array of sources; building staff capacity from diverse backgrounds; complex real estate development; elements of political and community organizing; provision of successful leadership given one's own personality and other characteristics; and other aspects of both organizational and community development. As one employer and training provider remarked succinctly about today's job as a CDC director: "This is not a hobby." The leaders of other types of community development organizations require a similarly challenging set of skills.

Many academic and nonacademic institutions provide training in leadership skills and functions, and most get ratings of good or adequate from students. A small but growing number dedicate programs providing midcareer training to experienced CDC executive directors and other leaders. Thoughtful faculty and administrators, along with employers and other senior observers, however, recognize they still

struggle to create programs that deliver the right combination of generic and CD-specific capabilities—especially capabilities that in the past emerged from long experience on the job or have grown from the new needs of a maturing and growing industry. Curricula, teaching methods, and some important parts of the theory and practice themselves must be further developed and improved.

Furthermore, CD leaders struggle to make use of the available training and education. Many of the skills require longer education and practice than leaders can (or believe they can) spare away from their offices and more attention to a specific task than competing demands allow. Educators and trainers seek to overcome these challenges in numerous ways, including partnering with those in related fields who have developed effective programs and tools, restructuring their programs to reduce consecutive time burdens and integrate leaders' regular work with their training, and expanding distance-learning and peer-learning components, as well as continuing to work on content and basic teaching methods.

Observers differ about the way efforts and resources should be split between current top management and potential successors. Some advocate advanced executive training for very mature leaders of sophisticated organizations, while others highlight the importance of developing successors, and also developing the leaders of new and emerging organizations.

Support for program *development* that addresses these various issues, along with continuing support for the most effective examples and models of leadership training, may be a fertile area for inquiry by CD stakeholders and resource providers.

4. Differentiated approaches to academic education and nonacademic training. This study found that academic and nonacademic CD programs consistently perform very differently. The nature and extent of these differences suggest that funders' and other policymakers' intervention strategies should be differentiated between academic and nonacademic programs of CD preparation. Careful thinking about how best to improve the performance of education and training systems should treat them separately. For example, many academic programs likely need expanded attention to actual development practice and to the use of fieldwork projects and other hands-on experiences in the education process. Nonacademic programs already focus heavily on the former and increasingly use students' own projects as the basis for training activities. The changes and extensions for which funders want to provide incentives inherently differ in the academic and nonacademic cases.

Some areas might benefit from making the education and training programs more similar to each other, by such measures as increasing real-world experience within both curricula, or coordinating and connecting them more substantially (for example, linking graduates of both types of programs to each other to expand peer-learning groups). But their objectives and modes of operation differ sufficiently to require continuing separate consideration.

5. The importance of combinations of skills. Choice of specific field of education/training—particularly among academic departments—does not seem very important in CD preparation for most purposes. The combination of academic and nonacademic preparation, plus on-the-job experience, proves more important in covering the mix of skills and knowledge needed for the technical specifics of development projects and growth into positions of management and leadership. Academic education and nonacademic training provide different types of preparation for community development, complemented by on-the-job learning. Some participants miss an essential piece, such as those who prepare in programs and jobs that do not focus on development—for example, by combining human services before school with education in a nondevelopment academic field. For people heading into or continuing in housing and other project development, a guided exposure to project work is important.

6. The importance of targeting the community development field. Academic programs often encompass community development as a specialization. They vary substantially in their proportion of students within the CD focus and in their proportion of students entering CD jobs. Interventions and investments that intend to support preparation for work in the CD field need either to target programs specifically in community development or be directed instead to individual students who have demonstrated a commitment to the field. A program or subprogram/concentration specifically defined as a community development track would serve the first approach.

Supporting nonacademic CD training of people already in the field best assures that graduates work in CD and that a significant percentage works for community-based organizations.

7. The importance of targeting concentrations of experience and education in CD. People with both prior education in CD and some, albeit often modest, experience in the field make up the bulk of participants in CD nonacademic training programs. Most participants in academic CD programs have neither previous education nor experience in the field. It seems sensible to design *training* programs

principally for the CD-educated and mildly experienced and *education* programs principally for the CD novice.

Faculty, administrators, and students concur that most programs are designed for everyone from novices to people well schooled and trained, current participants more likely represent the universe of people in CD pretty well. Aiming the design of respective programs to match the backgrounds of their principal clientele is a good place to do more rational targeting.[9]

The second largest groups of students in both training and academia have experience but not education or training in the field. These groups might sensibly be the second-level targets of education and training. Those in training, however, have significantly longer experience that might be taken into account in designing programs of study.

8. Issues for population groups. Our analysis points to significant differences in the education/training experience of key populations, focusing on race/ethnicity and gender. Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders appear, at least on average, at an education training disadvantage relative to other students. They operate with less previous schooling, CD work experience, financial aid, access to individuals and institutions to help them, and other challenges. Perhaps as a result, they rate their programs much less highly than do others. Latino students systematically rate education and training for developing leadership skills in particular as less available and at a lower quality than do others. African Americans obtain less academic preparation for CD work than do students overall. In seeking eventual resolutions of the questions these findings raise, we must find out more from Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, and Latinos about the sources of their dissatisfaction, and from African Americans about any impact of their different mix of training and education.

9. Training in fundraising. Community developers express a significant need for more training in fundraising, both in the narrow sense of writing proposals and in the broader sense of planning strategies and campaigns, identifying possibilities, and building networks. Fundraising is one of the least widely taught subjects among both academic and nonacademic programs. Students describe fundraising as the subject least often presented at a high-quality level in both types of programs, and most often needing improvement or addition. Faculty report strong demand for fundraising courses that are presented. Employers say they look for fundraising skills in hiring more senior people.

While training opportunities in this skill outside the confines of community development programs are available, some combination of more information about those options and additional courses and resources within the CD network may be needed.

10. Missing: An introduction and portal to CD. The field of community development lacks an easy and widely available mechanism for introducing itself to people not already connected to the field. A reference publication could be extremely valuable. Brophy and Shabecoff's book potentially represents such a resource by identifying the nature and substance of the field, giving it a human face, and providing for next steps of entry. It has a long way to go, however, to become widely known and available so that people with a hint of interest would be directed to it.

The field lacks visibility in the mind of the general public and the popular press. Too few know the field exists to even search out and find the Brophy and Shabecoff book and similar resources. Lack of entrants limits the value of any education and training program. Toward the other end of involvement, no organized market exists for people seeking employees or employment opportunities following completion of an education and training program. Perhaps the growth of computer-based job networks creates opportunity to connect fragmented segments of the CD employment market. Such networks, if marketed well, might produce a more accessible portal to the field.

11. Importance of distinguishing training levels. In general, CD education and training programs attempt to serve people across the spectrum of previous experience and schooling. Programs lower costs and expand revenues by serving people with fewer courses and course sequences. Unfortunately, the undifferentiated offerings are difficult to teach to students with so broad a spectrum of skills and do not satisfy more knowledgeable students. Investment to present some courses at multiple levels of complexity and offer some additional advanced elements of course sequences could move the field forward and perhaps attract additional people into education and training programs.

12. Importance of recognizing that training and education do not stand alone. Past experience and study indicate that capacity-building activities such as training and education need to be complemented by other elements to build strong CD organizations. Other tasks requiring attention include building systems inside CD institutions, supplying adequate funding for basic operations, providing technical assistance on site and at a distance, developing organizational strategies, and delivering project and program monies.

Therefore, decisions about investment in training and education should not be made in isolation from information about the availability and impact of other capacity-building elements. Funders and other policymakers need to make resource-allocation choices not solely within the education and training category of support for CD organizations and workers, but between education and training and those other capacity-building elements. This study should help in that process by providing specific information about the needs and opportunities within the education and training field that must be balanced against other components.

NARROWER FINDINGS WITH CLEAR EVIDENCE

In at least six areas, our study produced findings about very specific issues, again based on strong and consistent evidence but with narrower implications for policy and practice.

1. Underserved fields. Smaller, community-based organizations have difficulty finding well-trained people in financial, asset, and property management. Many types of organizations with new interests in nonresidential development find it difficult to recruit well-prepared staff in those areas. Expanded training may deal with some of the problems, but salary levels may prove a large challenge.

2. Hands-on trainers. Providing training by experienced practitioners with current knowledge of their fields is attractive to training participants with some experience and establishes credibility for training programs. Participants also expect the training to be applied and interactive—at least by simulating challenges that they face or will face in their positions.

Academic students also prosper with practitioners as teachers, both with their own faculty who have field experience and projects and with people brought in from outside.

3. Well-educated participants. Consistent evidence shows that most academic and nonacademic students have college and postgraduate degrees. Therefore, further education and training should be designed to fit that profile. Since most students, especially in training, left college long ago, adult learning methods should be standard in their programs.

Few avenues to enter the CD field exist for people who have strong interest and experience but less education. Additional community college and undergraduate programs—such as the Los Angeles Community Development Trade Technology

program—may be needed to provide tracks to further CD skills and knowledge, including opportunities to improve basic skills. The Urban Developer's Program (between the University of Illinois at Chicago and the Chicago Rehab Network) and Southern New Hampshire University's Community Economic Development program provide additional model elements. They permit entrance by some people without formal college degrees, although they do expect students to have the ability to pursue studies at the graduate level.[10] Additional thought should be given to providing more widely for a full sequence of steps from interest in CD to systematic education and training in the field for those with limited academic history.

4. Improved opportunities for upgrading basic skills. People with less education but substantial interest and perhaps experience face significant barriers to entering the CD field. Few programs integrate opportunities to raise basic skills in communication, computer literacy, math, and writing. Employers, however, stress the importance of these skills for both entry-level and advanced positions in CD. In CDCs in particular, we know that people from low-income neighborhoods (who, for various reasons, need to upgrade their basic skills more than others) are not as well represented in CD-specific education and training as the basic mission of CD would suggest as ideal.

Additional components for building basic skills, linked tightly to CD content, could aid workers and their employer institutions. Opportunities for remedial strengthening of some basic skills before starting CD education and for all students to build them during their programs could be valuable. In the basic skill of being able to work with the community, some students from low-income neighborhoods no doubt have much to teach as well as learn.

5. Commitment to communities in need. A wide consensus of employers, faculty, students, and other experts point to commitment to serving disadvantaged people and underserved and vulnerable communities as a crucial characteristic of people in CD and especially in community-based development organizations. This commitment cannot be learned principally from education and training, although most programs do emphasize the importance of the topic in at least some of the courses, and most current students depart their CD education and training with a clear focus on these issues.

Fieldwork with community members themselves helps grow this sensitivity, observers concur, and the leaders of education/training programs can provide student opportunities in that arena. Not surprisingly, the more direct contact students get with neighborhood stakeholders and real-life issues (whether working with a

professor and community members on a live problem, representing low-income clients through legal clinics, or interning at a CDC), the more likely the experience will produce a commitment of value.

In assuring commitment to the needs of low-income people and places, it would also be useful to increase the share of CD students who come from low-income neighborhoods. The low proportion of students currently coming from such areas exemplifies the need for additional and revised strategies in outreach, recruitment, and retention.

6. The value of additional tracking of graduates. Much could be gained by improving on the fragmentary information available about how well CD graduates have been prepared and the career tracks they have followed. Students, funders, employers, and consultants would be among the beneficiaries of greater information on the value of investment in CD education and training.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS REQUIRING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION/RESEARCH

Because this research constituted the first detailed examination of many issues, it produced suggestive evidence on a number of policy and program matters that need further examination. Six important preliminary findings are summarized below.

1. Expanded financial aid in academia. A need may exist for additional scholarships/fellowships in *academic* institutions in particular. Most nonacademic participants receive stipends and/or continue paid employment during their training, but most academic students receive no stipend. More problematic, most very-low-income academics get no stipend. Further investigation may be warranted to determine whether paid jobs or other means serve satisfactorily to make academic programs accessible in CD, or whether the lack of stipends deters at least some potential students.

Nonacademic training providers believe a need also exists to expand funding for project managers, other senior staff, and executive directors in their programs. The survey data show that most of those in training already receive assistance in paying for training and living expenses, but employers might have additional people they would like to send but cannot afford the cost. This report does not have sufficient information from employers to determine the extent of that need, although the listing of financial aid as one of the primary determinants in choice of training programs supports the notion that it may be substantial. Need for additional funding for training warrants further investigation.

2. Peer learning. Peer learning and learning groups (within education and training programs and continuing or originating outside) are popular mechanisms among their participants. These methods may be effective means to link otherwise isolated people with similar work, to exchange information, and to solve problems. Peer groups formed with specific purposes and tasks at the outset appear particularly useful, often within a formal training program, and perhaps especially those with at least some limited resources to help move forward. It could be valuable to further investigate their effectiveness, along with simultaneous efforts to support their blossoming in additional forms and situations.

3. Project skills in academia. On the surface, it seems inefficient for students in master's degree programs to go to work (for example, at a CDC) and be faced immediately with a need for basic training in housing and other development, especially if the timing of the organization's training cycle happens not to match the timing of the student's hiring. Field experience during schooling or summers meets some of the needs, but for students with a strong interest in the field, universities could integrate more practice in these areas into their academic programs and provide more summer opportunities.

4. Retention in CD and within CDCs. Our limited information suggests a substantial share of people who receive schooling and training in community development remain in the field, while retention is lower within the narrower category of community-based organizations, where concern for this issue is acute. Availability of good jobs, quality of education and training, salary levels, and other factors may play key roles. Providing additional resources for core staffing to CDCs might be helpful in keeping trained and experienced people, but we need more information on the reasons for turnover to sort out an issue that relates only in part to training and education.

5. Needs of Native Americans. Given the smaller population of Native Americans and Alaska Natives, our survey sample was not of sufficient size to examine separately these groups' experiences with CD training. Thus, we still need a targeted first exploration.

6. More information sharing among faculty and administrators. Few of the expert observers we interviewed would comment about education and training other than in their own institution. Most said they simply did not know enough about how CD preparation was being done elsewhere. It might be useful to expand mechanisms for sharing information among providers (for example, about success-

ful and unsuccessful approaches to particular issues or about experiments in overall approach).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The growth of CD as a set of activities devoted to improving quality of life in neighborhoods and communities has depended in significant part on the field's ability to build capacity among community development institutions. Education and training of community developers, both as they enter the field and as they improve their skills, is one important part of that capacity building. This study provides perhaps the first empirically based look at the broad range of CD education/training, examining who the providers and students are; what types of education/training are delivered and absorbed, and how; in what roles students will use what they learned; and what role for and value of education/training employers perceive. But the primary goal is to translate the answers into lessons for action: lessons for investment in education and training; for approaches to teaching and learning; for development of new areas of and mechanisms for education and training; and for choices between education/training and other means of building capacity.

Our research shows that carefully focused analysis can better inform our choices and actions. For example, we now know the training and education skills project managers need to be effective. The other findings of the study suggest many more such areas for attention.

The findings of previous sections suggest that a wide array of institutions must refocus some of their work. Designers of CD education/training will want to revise and extend their programs. Faculty must reprioritize, funders must make adjustments in selecting and promoting program models, students and employers need to take a new look at education/training choices, and all groups must together discuss the best means to take on new challenges. The next generation of CD leaders must be prepared to address the issues raised by larger and more complex organizations; to lead and serve more diverse and changing populations and communities; and to perform new CD functions and pursue new opportunities. New technologies need to be implemented in training/education and in action in neighborhoods. Education and training will need to change if it is continue to play a central role in successful capacity building and neighborhood building.

Finally, we must remember where we stand in a continuing process. The CD education and training field has expanded enormously, helping to produce a highly

competent, skilled, educated workforce in an area of endeavor that did not exist a few decades ago. Only in the past few years has it expanded in critically important directions, such as supporting the movement of CDC organizations to significant individual scale. Now we find opportunities to measure the education/training field's progress and assess the focus needed for our next steps. We must sustain efforts to learn from our experience and use the lessons to support the next stages of growth and adjustment to change.

NOTES

[1] The Ford Foundation, with its continuing interest in capacity building, commissioned this study in an effort to inform the funder community and others about effective ways to invest in preparing community developers for work in the field.

[2] The total number of students in class may be slightly inaccurate because some faculty were uncertain about how many people were systematically taking their classes (versus drop-in, auditors, and the like).

[3] Because a large-scale effort to enumerate all the community development education and training programs in the country had been carried out so recently (Brophy and Shabecoff 2001), this study did not attempt to replicate and expand the list. We found that most programs listed in Brophy and Shabecoff (2001) were still operating. We asked faculty and other experts in the field if they had observed systematic additions to the field within the past 2 years. Some identified the field of nonprofit management as a growing area, often within business schools and including community development and many other types of nonprofit organizations. These programs may be modestly under-represented in our sample.

[4] For several reasons, we cannot determine exactly how many people are participating in training and education programs. First, a given course or program may serve (and count) people who also are taking other courses and being counted there. Second, even within their own classes, faculty often do not know how many students are studying community development as opposed to taking a single course outside a different college major. Third, most community development courses, especially in academia, are contained within areas of concentration with overlapping interests, and then within departments. No simple rule enables even faculty observers to determine which students to include in a community development count.

[5] We firmly acknowledge the vital contributions of community organizing to community development (as well as being an important path of action in its own right). For this study, however, Ford's emphasis on community development meant that training programs emphasizing organizing but not development were not included in this study. Many of the programs in the study, however, have community organizing components within them.

[6] A possibility exists that researchers have a harder time finding the community college programs given their lower national visibility individually and the possibility that their CD programs target relatively narrowly fields (such as the Miami-Dade/Fannie Mae mortgage officer program in our sample, treated as a nonacademic training program with specific certification objectives).

[7] National Reinvestment Training Institute (NRTI) is a large-scale training offshoot of the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation (NRC). More than half of NRTI's training participants are NRC staff or members of the NRC network of community-based organizations.

[8] The number of students per field is an imperfect indicator of concentration in the student body since our sampling procedure selected only one class per institution, whereas some may have many more classes than others. The study does at least give a rough sense of distribution across fields.

[9] Individual programs can and do differ in the types of students they attract.

[10] Southern New Hampshire University provides courses for basic skill upgrade first for those who need it.

REFERENCES

Brophy, Paul C., and Alice Shabecoff. 2001. *A Guide to Careers in Community Development*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

ADDITIONAL READING

Arthur Andersen. 2000. *Report to the CDFI Fund, U.S. Department of the Treasury: Training Market Analysis of CDFIs, Financial Services Organizations, and Training Providers*. Chicago, IL: Arthur Andersen.

Bay Area Local Initiative Support Corporation (LISC). 2001. *Evaluation of San Francisco Bay Area LISC's Affordable Housing and Community Development Training Program*. San Francisco: Bay Area LISC.

Clavel, Pierre. 2001. *Thesis Topics and Job Titles Once Placed, MRP Students*. Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press.

Ducker, Katherine, and Kinnard Wright. 2000. *An Inventory of Curricula for Community Building*. Ed. Victor Rubin. Washington, DC: Office of University Partnerships, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Development Training Institute. 2001. *Training Plan for the Bank of America Leadership Academy*. Washington, DC: Development Training Institute.

———. 2000. *Competency Study of Leaders Who Facilitate Successful Community Building Initiatives*. Paper presented at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, Office of University Partnerships Teaching and Learning for Community Building Conference, University of the District of Columbia, Washington, DC.

Dill, Jennifer. 2000. *Results From a Nationwide Survey of Planning Students*. Paper presented at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, Atlanta.

Keating, W. Dennis, and Norman Krumholz. 1998. *The State of the Art in Planning Education*. Washington, DC: American Planning Association.

Leveen, Debbie. 2000. *Urban Studies Program Alumni Network*. San Francisco: San Francisco State University.

Local Initiative Support Corporation (LISC). 2002. *Organizational Development Initiative Staff Development Training Programs*. New York: LISC.

Los Angeles Trade Technical College. 2002. *Community Planning Graduates, Current Status*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Trade Technical College.

Magee, Judith. 2002. Untitled memo for UCLA.

McNeely, Joseph. 2002. Career Longevity of DTI Graduates.

Neighborhood Reinvestment Training Institute (NRTI). 2001. *Data on Participants Attending Neighborhood Reinvestment Training Institutes*. PowerPoint presentation. Washington, DC: NRTI.

New England Market Research. 1999. The Community Economic Development Program Graduate Survey Prepared for Southern New Hampshire University. Norwalk, CT: New England Market Research.

Office of University Partnerships. 2000. Teaching and Learning for Community Building: New Roles, New Skills, and Stronger Partnerships. Unpublished manuscript. Washington, DC: Office of Policy Development and Research, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Rubin, Victor. 2000. Evaluating University-Community Partnerships: An Examination of the Evolution of Questions and Approaches. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research* 5 (1).

Vidal, Avis, et al. 2002. *Lessons From the Community Outreach Partnership Center Program*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Neil S. Mayer is an economist and principal of Neil Mayer & Associates, a research and consulting firm specializing in community and economic development and housing.