

Preface

We are an interdisciplinary group of researchers involved in the fields of community development and family support who came together to work towards identifying more integrated approaches to the strengthening of families and communities. Our basic focus on integrative strategies has been advanced through the generous support of the Annie E. Casey Foundation. Specifically, we have engaged in a research effort to explore the ways in which organizations can and do develop conceptual and programmatic models that form a nexus between building community and the well-being of families.

Traditionally the fields of community development and family support have had little direct interaction both in academic and applied settings. As such the fields have been studied and practiced independently. The research team approach acknowledged this reality. Team members exchanged expertise, literally teaching one another about the respective fields, in order to forge mutual understanding of core concepts. This learning process created a shared model for conducting the subsequent study. That model pointed to the need to examine the formal discourse within the fields, but more importantly, to observe and learn about current practices. Based on issues raised by the Foundation, we sought to identify organizations that were merging practices of community development and family support. We were particularly interested in understanding what factors had led the organizations towards more integrative practices, and whether this transition was based on revised organizational and program philosophies. Ultimately we sought to determine to what extent these emerging integrative practices were affecting the larger fields of community development and family support.

We are indebted to the many dedicated community development and family support professionals who generously shared their time, experience and insights. Our hope is that we have presented a synthesis of those contributions that is honest, fair and of value to those engaged in the strengthening of families and communities.

The Authors:
Helene Delpeche
Raheemah Jabbar-Bey
Bahira Sherif-Trask
Jocelyn Taliaferro
Margaret Wilder

All of the Center for Community Research and Service, University of Delaware
September 2003

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY SUPPORT: FORGING A PRACTICAL
NEXUS TO STRENGTHEN FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 3

Project Report 9

 Introduction 10

 Research Strategy and Findings 11

 Integrating Community Development and Family Support –
 Key Lessons Learned 11

 Challenges, Barriers, and Constraints to Integrated and Effective Practices in
 Community Development and Family Support 20

 Conclusions and Recommendations 28

Appendix A – List of Participants 31

Appendix B – Organizations Visited 45

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY SUPPORT:
FORGING A PRACTICAL NEXUS TO STRENGTHEN FAMILIES AND
COMMUNITIES**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Center for Community Research & Service, University of Delaware
September 2003

Project Team:

Helene Delpeche

Raheemah Jabbar-Bey (Co-Director)

Dr. Bahira Sherif-Trask

Jocelyn Taliaferro

Dr. Margaret Wilder (Co-Director)

Sponsored by the Annie E. Casey Foundation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

FAMILY SUPPORT AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: FORGING A PRACTICAL NEXUS TO STRENGTHEN FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES

The fields of community development and family support share a common basic goal: improving the life chances and well-being of individuals and families. Each field is guided by principles that advocate the shared humanity of all individuals, respect for diversity, and the promotion of social and economic justice. Yet the conceptual models of each field have led to different assumptions, priorities, and strategies of practitioners. Practitioners are increasingly reaching a “conceptual wall” where their fundamental assumptions about how best to strengthen families and neighborhoods are called into question in the face of resistant problems and changing family and neighborhood dynamics. For some practitioners there is an awareness that more holistic approaches are required to effectively address the complexity of needs experienced by disadvantaged families and neighborhoods. In order to develop a more holistic approach to practice, the fundamental linkages between strong families *and* strong communities must be conceptualized and operationalized in practice within each field. Recently a small, but growing number of community development and family support organizations have begun to implement more integrative programmatic approaches.

The major goal of this research is to identify current concepts and practices, as well as potential strategies for the integration of community development and family support initiatives. Specifically, we have engaged in a research effort to explore the ways in which organizations can and do develop conceptual and programmatic models that form a nexus between building community and the well-being of families.

The project team conducted focus group sessions at a special conference on family support and community economic development to identify current programmatic strategies, and major issues confronting practitioners. Over 30 family support and community development practitioners (administrators and staff) from across the country participated in the focus groups. Subsequently, the research team conducted field interviews with six organizations in Chicago, five organizations in the San Francisco/San Jose area, and two organizations in Hawaii. Content analysis of field interview and focus group transcripts was used to identify major practice concepts, current and emerging strategies, and challenges confronting community development and family support organizations.

Key Lessons Learned

Both family support and community development offer a wide range of benefits to the individuals, families, and communities they serve. Each field has experienced a measure of success in improving the circumstances and quality of life for their respective constituencies. But, as the needs of individuals, families, and communities change, and many of their problems persist, there is a pressing need for family support and community development efforts to become more responsive and effective. Each field can learn valuable lessons from the other. Through our research, we have identified specific “lessons” that are of critical importance.

1. *Models of community development should be reformulated;*
2. *Models of family support should be reformulated;*
3. *Mission and vision must inform organizational activities;*
4. *Internal organizational strategies should support mission and goals;*
5. *Collaborations and partnerships should be strategic;*
6. *Development of organizational and community leadership should be a norm;*
7. *Policy advocacy should not be confused with political advocacy; and*
8. *Notions of success should focus on outcomes and impacts.*

Although these “lessons” address familiar themes and issues among practitioners, they take on new significance in the context of efforts aimed at integrating community development and family support. In each instance, these lessons suggest the need for fundamental changes in the traditional conceptualization and implementation of practices associated with each field.

Challenges, Barriers and Constraints to Integrated and Effective Practices in Community Development and Family Support

Obstacles exist at the conceptual level of each field, and within the realities of everyday practice. Most of these challenges and barriers are clearly recognized and articulated, however some remain unacknowledged.

1. **Contradictions Between Ideology and Practice**. A noticeable dissonance exists between what practitioners identify as goals and operating principles versus their actual day-to-day activities.
2. **Constraints Imposed by Variations in Language/Definitions/Terminology**. Differences in terminology and lack of precise definitions affect the way organizations see themselves, their constituents and ultimately their programmatic focus.
3. **Constraints Imposed by Social, Economic, and Political Factors**. Family support and community development organizations operate in areas characterized by significant poverty, increasing ethnic and racial diversity, and other factors such as displacement and social isolation. These areas are particularly vulnerable to the vagaries of the local political climate.
4. **Constraints imposed by funding**. Funding impacts organizations at every level, from their governance and management, to their programmatic focus and implementation strategies.
 - Funding drives strategies;
 - Politics affects funding;
 - Funding forces collaborations;
 - Funding becomes an end goal; and
 - Funding drives evaluation.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study has been to examine the ways organizations have attempted to integrate elements of community development and family support in their conceptual frameworks and programmatic efforts. Multiple efforts are needed in order for community development and family support organizations to participate in the emergence of more comprehensive and integrative strategies. These efforts require the involvement of family support and community development organizations, funders and the academic community. Organizations must have a conceptual framework, organizational and programmatic strategies, and planning and evaluation capacity that empower and address the needs of families and communities. The funding community must support initiatives that promote integrative practices. Although the academic community has traditionally influenced policy and funding priorities, university faculty and staff can contribute to practice in a more direct way. Academics can provide valuable assistance by helping to clarify concepts, identifying and analyzing examples of best practice, and developing programmatic impact measures. We believe that a number of specific steps can be taken to promote integrative practices, and offer the following recommendations:

Recommendations to community development and family support organizations:

- Offer volunteer opportunities and internships to college and younger students to expose them to diverse opportunities within both fields;
- Integrate residents into organizational programs and management who reflect the cultural and ethnic diversity of the community;
- Organize and convene community advisory teams to discuss the relationship between community strategies and public policies;
- Conduct regular strategic planning and organizational self-assessment to insure consistency between values, mission, and activities;
- Research and seek funding opportunities that are consistent with values and mission;
- Conduct a stakeholder analysis to assess the political environment and develop strategies to garner the support of key decision-makers;
- Develop regular mechanisms to monitor changes in the needs *and* assets of individuals, families and communities; and
- Visit other communities to observe family support and community development organizations at work.

Recommendations to the foundation community:

- Provide funding opportunities to establish internship programs within family support and community development organizations;
- Provide funding to enhance expertise and build internal organizational capacity (i.e., administrative support, financial management, personnel management) to match the demands of programmatic initiatives;
- Identify community involvement in organizational programs and management as a funding criteria;
- Underwrite educational and training opportunities that promote practitioner and academic interactions;
- Provide resources to support organizations through the strategic planning process (e.g., funding a retreat, covering the cost of attendance for board members, staff and/or community representatives, or providing a quality facilitator to assist the group);
- Facilitate the sharing of ideas, lessons learned and expertise between organizations by supporting local and national umbrella and intermediary organizations;
- Provide support for regional workshops and the expansion of practitioner networks;
- Offer small grants to facilitate and improve access to information (e.g., internet access, manuals, books, databases, information networks, and industry and expert group discussions).

Recommendations to the academic community:

- Develop direct and regular interactions with family support and community development professionals [e.g. convene practitioner/academic forums, specialized conferences and training workshops, and various communication channels (e.g., list serves, web sites, newsletters)];
- Establish internship programs with family support and community development organizations;
- Prepare best practice case studies that exemplify linkages between community development and family support; and
- Develop indicators, measures and models that can help organizations distinguish between programmatic outcomes and more long-term family and community impacts.

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY SUPPORT:
FORGING A PRACTICAL NEXUS TO STRENGTHEN FAMILIES AND
COMMUNITIES**

PROJECT REPORT

Center for Community Research & Service, University of Delaware
September 2003

Project Team:

Helene Delpeche
Raheemah Jabbar-Bey (Co-Director)
Dr. Bahira Sherif-Trask
Jocelyn Taliaferro
Dr. Margaret Wilder (Co-Director)

Sponsored by the Annie E. Casey Foundation

PROJECT REPORT

FAMILY SUPPORT AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: FORGING A PRACTICAL NEXUS TO STRENGTHEN FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

The fields of community development and family support share a common basic goal: improving the life chances and well-being of individuals and families. Each field is guided by principles that advocate the shared humanity of all individuals, respect for diversity, and the promotion of social and economic justice. Despite these shared attributes, the two fields operate rather independently. Practitioners in both fields rarely express an awareness of integrated practice. This situation is ironic given the similarities found in the day-to-day world of practice in family support and community development. The fields have common contextual boundaries, in that implementation is directed at similar targets (disadvantaged individuals, families, neighborhoods, communities). The distinguishing elements of these fields are their respective “starting points.” Community development embodies a basic conceptual model of action that begins with neighborhoods or communities as the fundamental unit of intervention. The basic goals of building community strength and sustainability are addressed through neighborhood-based or neighborhood-targeted initiatives that enhance the physical, social and economic context in which individuals, families, and their institutions coexist. Alternately, the family support model begins with the basic goal of developing or strengthening personal, social, and human skills of individuals and families to achieve stability, and self-sufficiency. A fundamental assumption of this approach is that by directly assisting individuals and families, we create the foundation for strong and viable neighborhoods, communities, and societies.

Not surprisingly, the different starting points of each approach lead to distinct intervention strategies. The physical and economic change strategies of community development, versus the direct service orientation of family support has created artificial boundaries that limit the effectiveness of each field. This same dichotomy exists in the everyday world of practice, where disconnected and sometimes competing initiatives lead to a fragmented and at times contradictory set of efforts by community development and family support professionals.

Practitioners are increasingly reaching a “conceptual wall” where their fundamental assumptions about how best to strengthen families and neighborhoods are called into question in the face of resistant problems, changing family and neighborhood dynamics, and shifting social policies. For some practitioners there is awareness that more holistic approaches are required to effectively address the complexity of needs experienced by disadvantaged families and neighborhoods. Recently a small number of community development and family support organizations have begun to implement more integrative programmatic approaches. However, these integrative practitioners are the exception. Despite recent calls for comprehensive initiatives, most family support and community development organizations operate in traditional modes that are narrowly focused. Their inertia is due to two considerable barriers: 1) a lack of conceptual models of integrative practice, and 2) the practical limitations of funding, staffing and time.

In order for more integrative practice to become a norm, the fundamental linkages between strong families *and* strong communities must be conceptualized and operationalized within each field. This study examines the core concepts of community development and family support, and explores the

reality of everyday practices in order to identify specific ways in which the fields currently overlap, the ways in which they differ, and the areas in which we can forge new linkages.

II. RESEARCH STRATEGY AND FINDINGS

The major goal of this research is to identify current concepts and practices, as well as potential strategies for the integration of community development and family support initiatives. This study utilizes a combination of traditional fieldwork-based information collection techniques with an extensive review and synthesis of existing research and literature. A variety of sites, organizations, and programmatic efforts were examined to gain as full an understanding as possible of the practices and perspectives within the fields.

During the past two years, the research effort has moved from the development of a detailed plan of investigation to the completion of several research tasks. Those tasks have included: a) the identification of key models and concepts through extensive literature review, b) focus group discussions with practitioners, and c) fieldwork interviews within community development and family support organizations. The literature review resulted in the preparation of two concept papers that delineate the key conceptual dimensions of family support and community development. [*See conceptual papers under separate covers*].

The project team conducted focus group sessions at a special conference of Family Support America, a national organization of family support professionals. The theme of the conference, “*The Bridge to the Future: Community Building, Economic Development and Family Support*,” marked the first national effort of this organization to build linkages between family support and community development practices. The purpose of the focus group discussions was to identify current programmatic strategies, and major issues confronting practitioners. Over 30 family support and community development practitioners (administrators and staff) from across the country participated in the focus groups (see Appendix A for list of participants). In addition to focus group discussions, the plenary panels and individual conference sessions provided valuable insights into the state of family support practice and its relation to community development, as well as, the opportunity to learn from discourse on implementation models.

Subsequently, the research team conducted field interviews with six organizations in Chicago, five organizations in the San Francisco/San Jose area, and two organizations in Hawaii (note—Hawaii interviews done during personal trip of team member, not funded by grant). [See Appendix B for a list of all organizations visited]. Content analysis of field interviews and focus group transcripts was used to identify major practice concepts, current and emerging strategies, and challenges confronting community development and family support organizations. Further analysis led to the identification of organizational and programmatic elements that appear to represent integrative community development and family support. The following discussion reports our findings drawn from focus group discussions and field interviews with practitioners.

A. Integrating Community Development and Family Support—Key Lessons Learned

Both family support and community development offer a wide range of benefits to the individuals, families, and communities they serve. Each field has experienced a measure of success in improving

the circumstances and quality of life for their respective constituencies. But, as the needs of individuals, families, and communities change, and many of their problems persist, there is a pressing need for family support and community development efforts to become more responsive and effective. Each field can learn valuable lessons from the other. Through our research, we have identified specific “lessons” that are of critical importance.

1. Models of community development should be reformulated

“You can’t have a community without families.”

As a field, community development is not guided by a single conceptual or theoretical model. Strategies in community development typically include service provision, community-based economic development and/or community organizing. Yet, all too often community development is equated with "bricks and mortar" and a concentration of activities on housing and property development. There needs to be a revision in the perception of community development to include a more "human" aspect. In the words of one practitioner, "you can't have a community without families." The idea that individuals and families are the smallest common denominators of communities and what affects communities affects families, must be one of the guiding principles of community development strategy building.

Increasingly, practitioners in the field of community development are coming to the realization that their efforts must be linked to family support activities. Thus, the traditional focus on housing and economic development is being retained, but new efforts are being discussed and implemented to add family-oriented programs. This perspective was heard around the country: Chicago “Family strengthening is probably the greatest most important thing you can do, because if you don’t have strong families you can’t have good kids, you can’t have decent schools and you can’t have anything that is useful in the community unless you have strong families. So that’s where you have to spend the money.” San Francisco: “Communities are made out of families – it is family based economic development;” Hawaii: “Now programs in Hawaii blend family support and economic empowerment.”

Another practitioner reflected on the overall process of community development, "you have to begin at the beginning... there are a lot of steps before you can ...just bring K-Mart and have these people employed.” Community development entities tend to begin their interventions at the neighborhood and community level, a process that can obscure the less apparent needs of families and individuals. The typical strategies often advance housing and/or business development as the foundation for community change. But before members of a community can be engaged in neighborhood or community enhancement activity, individual and family stabilization must occur. A family that has no food and is headed by a drug abuser, who has no job, cannot immediately be expected to participate in an Individual Development Account (IDA) program. The underlying premise is that creating strong healthy families is the necessary foundation for creating strong healthy communities. This fundamental notion must be incorporated into a new model of community development that explicitly links the well-being of individuals and families to that of their respective neighborhoods.

2. Models of family support should be reformulated

Family support is conceived as a myriad of activities, most often, as the provision of services to individuals and families exclusively. Two traditional approaches characterize family support: a crisis

intervention model, and a center-based service model. In the crisis intervention model, services are provided on an immediate, individualized, short-term basis. This approach, which is problem-oriented, isolates the issues confronting the individual. It also tends to separate the “client” from the context of her/his family and community. In the center-based approach, a “fixed choice” menu of services is provided to individuals and families on an ongoing basis. The traditional center-based family support organizations operate on a number of assumptions. First, it is assumed that program staff will be engaging and dynamic enough to build trusting relationships with individuals and families. Second is the assumption that individuals and families will have the time to seek such services. And third, it is assumed that individuals and families will seek services regardless of the social stigma attached to such programs.

The results from both crisis intervention and center-based approaches have been mixed, leading some family support organizations to shift their focus of activities. In the words of one practitioner, “a significant shift in family support is a changed notion of *who* is being supported alongside the realization that families can no longer be treated as separate entities from the communities in which they exist.” The concept of a “target population” of clients has been retained; however, there is growing recognition of variations in the personal relations and composition of families. While families were once thought of solely as parents and children, new conceptualizations of family include single individuals, non-custodial parents, single parents, grandparents as parents, and immigrant/ethnic extended families. Moreover, target populations are not always limited to a specific geographic area.

These newer concepts of family support recognize the complex and multidimensional nature of issues confronting individuals and families. Practitioners have become more aware of the interactions of issues such as domestic violence, homelessness, substance abuse, and disabilities with socio-economic factors such as age, race, ethnicity, gender, and poverty. As the importance of these interaction effects has grown, so to has the understanding that families are directly impacted by the communities in which they live. For some practitioners, these insights have shifted the focus of their conceptual model of family support from individuals or individual families, to individuals and families within the context of the community, the nation, and an increasingly global society. Other practitioners echo the same conceptual theme, but express doubts or confusion about how to operationalize such a model. In general practitioners acknowledge that long-term, comprehensive strategies are needed to build strong and stable families and communities.

Those organizations that **are** engaging in integrative practice promote a continuum of services and more comprehensive programming. One family support practitioner articulated a three-step model that captures this new thinking. First, an organization must assist people out of crisis and help them to meet their basic needs (e.g. food, clothing and shelter). The second step is to help stabilize individuals, children and their families. And the third step is to ensure that these families thrive by living in socially and economically viable communities. The emphasis and focus of this emerging view of family support is to engage all family members in a meaningful manner and provide services that address the issues of each person in the household or family system. For example, “dual generational programming” targets both adults (parents, grandparents) and children. Some of the strategies employed include family reading night, school computer labs that remain open for parents, and senior citizens mentoring youth. In addition to these more traditional family services, new initiatives focus on enhancing family economic capacity through such strategies as wealth creation and asset building. This multi-pronged approach promotes the development of individual and family capacity as well as community capacity. As such, this approach epitomizes the type of holistic model of family support that can lead to more effective practice.

3. Mission and vision should determine organizational activities

Underlying each approach to community development and family support are the values and philosophies that guide the various organizations and their work in the field. Many practitioners stated that having a clearly articulated vision and an adherence to a commonly understood set of values and objectives were the keys to success. Some organizations articulate their vision up front and use it to guide every aspect of their work, from fund-raising and provision of services to the selection of staff and board members. One practitioner spoke of the importance of articulating the vision, internally as well as externally, even to the point of obtaining a grant to host a retreat to articulate its mission and values with staff and community members.

The missions and visions of family support and community development organizations are typically born out of a desire to address the needs of disadvantaged, disenfranchised populations. Some organizations explicitly acknowledge their belief that all individuals and communities have valuable assets that must be respected. A guiding philosophy for many organizations is the overarching goal of a healthy community. But most organizations recognize that change does not occur overnight or through isolated initiatives, and that helping disadvantaged families and communities requires a coordinated effort and long-term commitment. Programs and projects need to be grounded in reality, not in the organizations' ideal vision of how things should work. As such, the mission of many organizations has evolved over time, primarily to address the needs of the constituent populations as they change. As new and different problems emerge, organizations are challenged to adapt and revise their initial goals and strategies.

There is a striking array of missions and visions among family support and community development organizations. Most organizations explicitly shape their missions around the needs of their target population such as serving the "neediest of the needy," the homeless, or a particular ethnic group. These varying visions determine the character of the organizations and how they seek to achieve their goals. For example, the conscious choice to remain grassroots in orientation led one organization to forego funding for certain projects. Instead, the organization increased its access to resources through collaboration and partnership. Another organization guided by a vision of "the humanity of all individuals" and an appreciation of different cultures, completely changed its program and staff to become more culturally diverse and sensitive to its target population.

Although most organizations have stated missions and visions, some do not adhere to these guiding principles, but rather allow funding opportunities to dictate their focus. This reality reflects the operational challenges that confront community development and family support organizations. There are tensions within and between organizations over the proper balance between activities directed at the individual, the family, and the community. To overcome these tensions, organizations must be introspective in their planning and visions, and strategic in their operations. As one practitioner stated: "You can do something with the best of intentions and [if] it is the wrong thing for that individual or family...it backfires." Ultimately, organizations must strive to create dynamic missions and visions that are sensitive to the needs of the families and communities they serve, and that are well supported by their programmatic efforts.

4. Internal organizational strategies should support mission and goals

The realization of an organization's mission and vision is directly linked to its internal structure and day-to-day operations. This requires that organizations establish a stable infrastructure, yet retain sufficient operational flexibility to respond to the changing needs of families and communities. Practitioners tend to identify three key characteristics that shape their internal organization and modes of action: staffing, planning, and funding.

4.1. Staffing

The effectiveness of organizations depends on competent and committed staff. Both family support and community development organizations seek staff members who are knowledgeable, well-trained, and culturally representative of the target population. This is a continuous challenge for such organizations given that they must compete with other employers who can provide more lucrative opportunities. Many of the "best and the brightest" potential employees have been lured by the promise of larger incomes in other industries, such as information technology. Despite this disadvantage, most organizations have managed to attract capable and dedicated staff.

Practitioners were unanimous in their belief that the most desirable trait in a staff member is commitment to the work of the organization. In the words of one executive director, "...I want to see someone who's more committed than just 9:00 to 5:00." There is a consensus among practitioners that working with families and communities is a calling that requires dedication, patience, and idealism.

"The expectation is that you have to work at least 12 hours per day- you have to live, eat and sleep this calling; you need a staff that is committed more than 9 -5."

"We attract people that want to change the world."

One effective strategy for attracting dedicated staff has been to draw employees from the target populations. Some organizations draw as much as 75% of their staff from their respective communities. This strategy is based on the premise that people will stay committed to their jobs if they are personally invested and tied to the community. Indigenous practitioners can play a critical role within organizations by drawing upon their awareness and knowledge of the communities. It is widely thought that staff from the targeted population is less likely to adopt hierarchical, top-down modes of interaction with families and community members. Instead, they tend to approach their work as a collaboration, viewing families and communities in terms of their strengths rather than deficits.

While the commitment of staff is crucial, technical and professional competencies play a pivotal role in determining the ability of an organization to fulfill its mission. Organizations are continuously faced with new challenges that necessitate changes in their operations and programs. Their ability to adapt to these demands depends on the staff's mix of skills and knowledge. To address new demands an organization might: reorganize its staff; decline to offer services that staff do not have the capacity to provide (e.g. refer clients to partner organizations); or provide staff with additional training. Ultimately, an organization must strive to match its own capacity to that required by its mission and initiatives.

4.2 Planning

Organizations that have attained noticeable success are characterized by active strategic plans that drive their activities. Once in place, the plan is adhered to, and re-evaluation and adjustments are made on a regular basis. This ensures that there is coherence between vision and strategy as well as responsiveness to family and community needs. Some organizations have developed a strategic plan and treat it as a “living, breathing document.” The plans tend to range in duration from 2 to 5 years. They are often revisited at retreats and in structured planning sessions. One agency has a monthly planning or visioning group. Practitioners concur that the development of programs, services, and models has to be driven by the actual needs of families and communities, and that planning forces consideration of these factors. Organizations utilize needs assessments, focus groups, interviews, and other participation mechanisms to assess those needs and develop strategic plans. In addition, community asset surveys assist organizations in identifying existing strengths and resources within a community. These assessment strategies are essential given the need for flexibility in supporting families and communities in today’s highly heterogeneous environment. Organizations need to provide services that families and communities actually need or want. While most organizations would like to provide as many needed services as possible, they realize that this is rarely feasible given resource constraints. This reality confronts even the larger organizations. Thus organizations must be strategic in the use of their resources. An effective practice is to determine what services are needed, where the organization’s strengths lie, and then to develop a plan that builds upon that knowledge. As one practitioner stated, “We take the pulse and find out exactly how we are doing and do we need to alter something? Do we need to change something?” Practitioners agree that there is no “magic bullet” or single approach when working with distressed families and communities. Effective strategies can only evolve through ongoing assessment and planning.

4.3 Funding

Funding is vital to the existence of family support and community development organizations, and a key determinant of their ability to effectively accomplish their missions. Ultimately, funding determines the types and extent of programs and services offered. Therefore, organizations devote considerable time and energy to obtaining funding for core operations and programming. When not focused on “scrambling” for resources, organizations can, in the words of one executive director, “focus on program quality and program expansion, philosophy, model building ... to create impact for the community.”

Although they prefer to obtain support from private foundations, the majority of funding for community development and family support organizations comes from government sources that impose restrictions on its usage. Organizations often feel constrained by the lack of unrestricted funds. As a result, practitioners were unanimous in articulating the need to have a diversity of funding sources.

Optimally, organizations strive to be self-sufficient in order to maintain program continuity and organizational integrity. They try to create independent sources of revenue to limit the impact of changes in funding opportunities and funders’ priorities. One organization’s goal was “to be as self-sufficient as possible so that when the economy takes a downturn we don’t have to be scrambling around trying to figure out how we are going to keep this service [both the organization and its programs] afloat.”

Financial self-sufficiency is not attainable for most organizations. Some organizations use leveraging and collaboration as strategies for acquiring funds and other resources (e.g. technical expertise). Private funds are frequently used to leverage public dollars. Collaborations and partnerships are often formed at the prompting of funding sources as a means of accessing additional institutional and financial support. Funding is ultimately a strategy and a constraint on the ability of organizations to fulfill their missions.

Organizations that seek to engage in more integrative practices must achieve a synergy between staffing, planning and funding that re-enforces their basic mission.

5. Collaborations and partnerships should be “strategic”

Family support and community development organizations are often overwhelmed by the multitude of needs experienced by their target populations. Collaborations and partnerships are a rich opportunity for organizations to provide comprehensive services and make significant impacts on families and communities. As one practitioner stated, “Collaborations are ways of extending the mission in a way that a lone agency could not.” These relationships provide the vehicle by which organizations can expand their services to larger or different populations, address additional needs of current participants, increase and diversify their funding base, and gain greater expertise and support for the organization.

Despite these potential benefits, weak and poorly structured collaborations and partnerships can be detrimental to organizations. Collaborations and partnerships must be developed strategically, with much thought, investment, and planning. Otherwise, they can be ineffective due to turf wars, lack of commitment, and hidden agendas. Practitioners stress that successful collaborations have their own established goals, mission and values. Effective partnerships are comprised of appropriate stakeholders with clearly defined roles, who contribute relevant expertise. Additional elements that characterize successful collaborations include contributions of ample time and resources, effective leadership, explicit agreements, and honest interactions among participants.

Many organizations have formal as well as informal relationships with other institutions in their immediate neighborhoods and throughout the local area. In the words of one practitioner, “We have a collaboration with other organizations, an association including 6 different [types of organizations]. We collaborate together and have many, many joint projects.” Collaborations typically bring together public and private organizations, churches, and/or neighborhood and community nonprofits. Some funders promote collaborations in order to increase program effectiveness and decrease financial risks. Within both organization and funder-initiated collaborations, the roles and levels of interaction between the partners vary, depending upon their missions and projects.

Collaboration and partnerships can also lead to coalitions among organizations that can exert political influence. A Chicago area practitioner described the impact of several community development organizations forming a city-wide partnership. “Now its more cohesive, it’s more inclusive, whereas people are working together, and these groups are represented by all different organizations . . . by building up as a group – as they say you always fight City Hall better as a group.” As part of a collective unit, individual organizations can be more influential and less vulnerable to political backlash.

The challenge to organizations is to use collaborations and partnerships in a strategic way that maximizes the benefits for their constituencies.

6. Development of organizational and community leadership should be a norm

Strong leadership is at the crux of successful family support and community development organizations and initiatives. Organizations need leaders that are equipped to handle internal and external demands and pressures. However the development of organizational leadership must be matched with an equal commitment to building community leadership and engagement.

6.1 Organizational Leadership

Leadership development is critical to the ongoing success of an organization. Practitioners recognize the value of the continuity of leadership in regard to their organization's sustained growth and longevity. For many organizations, continuity occurs by leaders "coming up through the ranks" from line staff to executive status. Along the way they develop both technical (e.g. budgeting, personnel management) and interpersonal (e.g. conflict resolution, public relations, collaboration) skills that allow them to function as strong, effective leaders. In turn, these internally grown leaders tend to employ the same strategy to groom the next cohort of leadership by highlighting staff members' existing talents. In the words of one executive director, "One of the things I've realized is that I have to really nurture leadership internally – try to bring in somebody. I want everybody to feel like they can do something... we haven't really given them the chance to do the kind of things they have the capacity to do..." Ideally staff members should be given multiple opportunities to develop leadership skills (e.g. organizing events; serving on external committees). One of the most effective strategies is to allow a staff member to take on some of the responsibilities of a different position. In this way a staff member is encouraged to extend her/his knowledge and skills.

In addition to staff members, boards of directors are key sources of organizational leadership. Effective organizations have strong boards whose members are in part drawn from the communities they serve. This ensures that there is a direct link between the organization's activities and community needs. The board can be a significant asset in that members can provide mentorship, direction, and policy recommendations. Board chairs play a particularly critical role in guiding policy discussions, resolving conflicts, and identifying opportunities for organizational development. Practitioners frequently credit their board chairs with creating and maintaining the organization's well-being. Under the guidance of dynamic leaders, board *members* contribute directly to the stability and continuity of organizations.

At its best, organizational leadership stabilizes and ensures the continuity of visions and practices. Finally, the development of internal leadership reaches beyond the boundaries of the organization. Several organizations have groomed political, neighborhood, and community leaders, who in turn, give the organizations consideration in policy and funding decision processes.

6.2 Community Leadership Development

A powerful strategy for strengthening families and building communities is the development of

"[I]ndigenous leadership "creates hope and adds credibility to organizations."

indigenous leadership. Increasingly, organizations are recognizing the need to build leadership drawn from the families and communities they serve. As one practitioner noted, indigenous leadership "creates hope and adds credibility to organizations." One executive commented on the lack of

leadership in poor and distressed communities and felt it was the responsibility of the agency to provide leadership. Another organization developed a leadership institute for its clients in an effort to “prepare people to lead and organize around the city.”

Some family support and community development organizations have made constituent leadership development an explicit goal. One of their primary strategies is to encourage the participation of community members in the governance of the organization (e.g. planning committees and board of directors). Beyond this form of involvement, community members are engaged in broader forms of participation such as: fighting local government on relevant issues, speaking out at community meetings, serving on advisory teams, engaging in legislative and policy education programs, and organizing block clubs, family forums, parent support groups, and public hearings.

Active participation by community members is facilitated through human capital development. Some organizations provide traditional adult human capacity building activities such as continuing education and specialized training. These activities help to develop the capacities of participants and prepare them to play active roles in the organization and the community. Leadership development not only increases the human capital of the individuals involved, but also provides a sense of ownership of the organization among community members.

7. Policy advocacy should not be confused with political advocacy

Although many nonprofit organizations see the need for changes in government policies, many refrain from engaging in advocacy activities for fear of jeopardizing their nonprofit status with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). Nonprofit organizations are restricted from using public sector funds to engage in political advocacy. However, these restrictions do not apply to policy advocacy (e.g. holding public forums, conducting analyses of policy impacts), which is "safe ground" for nonprofit organizations to advocate for the needs of their participants. Where *political* advocacy is an organization's endorsement of one political view, candidate, or party, *policy* advocacy is its promotion of strategies that will best meet the needs of the individuals, families, and communities it serves. However, due to the lack of knowledge about the distinctions between these two forms of advocacy, and the fear of reprisals, many organizations avoid engaging in either form of activity. Many practitioners suggest that advocacy has been abandoned and needs to be revisited.

Advocacy is a logical step in the development of both organizational and community leadership. As individuals and groups become more knowledgeable and experienced in promoting their goals, they seek to make meaningful change to eliminate barriers and constraints to their progress. Often this means that they address micro-level factors that operate within their own individual, family or neighborhood domain. But ultimately there is awareness that external and macro-level factors (i.e. social, economic, political policies and practices) are affecting micro-level outcomes. In order to bring about significant and sustainable change, individuals and organizations must be able to affect the policymaking process to ensure outcomes that are beneficial to families and neighborhoods.

8. Measures of success should focus on outcomes and impacts

Over the last several years, there has been an increased emphasis by funding organizations on immediate and measurable outcomes of their sponsored programmatic activities. In response, practitioners feel compelled to produce and report “tangible” outcomes. These outcomes include

measures such as: number of participants, job placement rates, scores on standardized assessments, and number of people in permanent housing. This type of evaluation ignores a wealth of useful information for organizations and their constituencies. The focus on immediate outcomes neglects more far-reaching, longer-term impacts such as systems change, family strengthening and community building, and fails to recognize the value of examining process outcomes. Process related outcomes such as the development of collaborative relationships with local leaders and organizations, and engagement of family and community members are frequently minimized, if recognized at all. Considering the *how* as well as the *what* is of great import to building the capacity of an organization as well as the families and communities they serve. Organizations are often constrained to a limited set of outcome measures dictated by funders. Practitioners noted that often there is so much emphasis placed on the outcomes of programs and activities that the process involved in generating the outcomes is not as carefully attended to, leading to narrowed decision-making, missed opportunities and a kind of organizational “tunnel vision.”

Similarly, the focus on outcomes leaves the question of actual impacts unanswered. Or worse, outcomes become equated with impacts without taking into consideration the relative level of needs being addressed. Practitioners tend to assume that the provision of new opportunities, services and/or material resources automatically results in significant positive impacts. Yet, there are several ways in which outcomes may have detrimental or only temporary impacts on families and neighborhoods. One executive director cautioned against the singular use of outcome measures since they may be inappropriate for “fluid social situations” in which changing needs negate the actual value and appropriateness of the tangible outcomes.

As organizations produce the tangible outcomes required by funders, they are likely to reap the rewards of continued or increased funding. This dynamic leads many organizations to equate success with the continuation and expansion of the organization’s programs and budget. Because the organization continues to receive funding, the assumption is often made that it is successful in meeting its stated goals. Rather than engage in this type of egocentrism, organizations should gauge their success not only by the quantity but quality and effectiveness of their initiatives. A much more accurate barometer of success is the improvement of the conditions of individuals, families, neighborhoods, and communities served. Ironically, the true success of community development and family support organizations may be most apparent when the need for such organizations has dissipated. In the words of one practitioner: “The success of an organization is basically when it is not needed anymore – it will have accomplished its mission.”

Ideally, organizations should be encouraged by funders to cast a wider net to capture both process and programmatic outcomes. More comprehensive assessments of outcomes and impacts allow organizations to identify the effects (both positive and negative) they are having on families and communities. One practitioner offered this reflection on meaningful outcomes: “We see people out of crisis. We see people get jobs...Basically we see movement in the community, sustainable family groupings.”

B. Challenges, Barriers, and Constraints to Integrated and Effective Practices in Community Development and Family Support

The preceding discussion has focused on key lessons that can promote more effective integrative practice in community development and family support. Although these “lessons” address familiar

themes and issues among practitioners, they take on new significance in the context of efforts aimed at integrating community development and family support. In each instance, these lessons suggest the need for fundamental changes in the traditional conceptualization and implementation of practices associated with each field. These ideas point to the broader concepts and organizational behaviors that are required to address the needs of economically and socially distressed families and communities in a holistic manner. However it is equally important to acknowledge the considerable challenges that family support and community development organizations face.

While practitioners acknowledge the need to become more comprehensive and integrative in their approaches to family support and community development, their efforts are hampered by a number of significant constraints and barriers. These obstacles exist at the conceptual level of each field, and within the realities of everyday practice. Most of these challenges are clearly recognized and articulated, however some remain unacknowledged. Although this listing is by no means exhaustive, it does reflect frequently cited and observable obstacles operating within each field.

1. Contradictions Between Ideology and Practice

Practitioners in family support and community development typically are well-versed in the concepts and principles that form the philosophical and value basis of their respective fields. However, there is a noticeable dissonance between what practitioners identify as goals and operating principles versus their actual day-to-day activities. Programs designed to promote family self-sufficiency or community empowerment may have elements in practice that do just the opposite: limit autonomy and promote deference to organizations. There is a tendency for some organizations to engage in self-rationalization. Rather than admit that their actions are inconsistent with their stated principles, they re-interpret those basic principles to fit the reality of their activities. In other instances practitioners acknowledge the gap between ideology and practice. For example, some practitioners point to collaboration and partnerships as hypothetically positive, yet these same individuals admit that such relationships are frequently contrived or superficial, and used out of necessity to meet funding requirements.

2. Constraints Imposed by Variations in Language/Definitions/Terminology

One of the greatest challenges within the community development and family support fields is the development of a common language that includes precise definitions and terminology. There are practitioners that believe that the use of ambiguous terminology such as “family support” and “community building” creates artificial distinctions between the two fields. Terms shrouded in uncertainty such as “self-sufficiency” and “collaborations versus partnerships” are subject to multiple interpretations and programmatic responses. Differences in terminology also affect the way organizations see themselves, their constituents and ultimately their programmatic focus. For example, some community development organizations prefer to use the words “affordable housing” rather than “low-income housing” in order to “try to take that stigma away from people.” One organization has found that by changing its offerings from “programs” to “services,” participants are engaged as “consumers” rather than “clients.”

These examples reveal the sensitive nature of wording and the images associated with terminology. In general, practitioners in community development and family support use terms that have assumed clarity, but in reality, are subject to multiple interpretations and responses. The variations in meanings

are most apparent in the different programmatic responses. To take one example, the term “community engagement” may be translated by one organization into the dissemination of a monthly newsletter to constituents that includes a comments/suggestions form, while another organization regularly includes constituents in their planning and project teams. Both organizations would report that their constituents are informed and engaged. Yet there are clear differences in the level of engagement and potential for capacity building.

3. Constraints Imposed by Social, Economic, and Political Factors

Family support and community development organizations operate in areas characterized by significant poverty, increasing ethnic and racial diversity, and other factors such as displacement and social isolation. These areas are particularly vulnerable to the vagaries of the local political climate.

3.1 Ethnicity, Race and Socio-Economic Status

Family support and community development organizations typically work with disadvantaged households and communities, as well as, individuals with special needs (e.g. the homeless, battered women). Problems such as inadequate housing, high rates of unemployment, school dropouts, teen pregnancies, and substance abuse are all too common. Poverty is particularly severe. In Chicago, for example, about 70 percent of the family incomes within the African-American community, fell below the city’s median of \$70,000, and about 50 percent of African-American residents earn less than 30 percent of that amount (e.g. \$21,000). Similar statistics are encountered throughout the U.S. Basic poverty deprivation is accompanied by a host of other complicating factors that challenge family support and community development organizations.

A major challenge for many organizations is the array of needs and issues arising from communities that vary greatly in terms of demographic, ethnic and racial composition. For example, the low-income populations served by organizations in the San Francisco Bay Area, are comprised of long-standing communities of Mexican-Americans, African-Americans, Asian-Americans, and Native Americans. In Chicago some organizations serve low-income residents who have migrated into the city within the past 20-30 years (e.g. Mexican migrant workers, South East Asian political refugees). In neighborhoods where the ethnicity and nationality are diverse and changing, organizations are challenged to focus on the differing needs of first, second, and third generation immigrant families. As one practitioner noted, “I would say that probably about 70 percent are first generation Mexican who do not speak English. Some of them are second and third generation.” One organization reported offering English As A Second Language classes to new immigrants, while encouraging second and third generation residents to study their parents’ native tongue.

While all of these organizations are working with low-income, disadvantaged populations, the differing circumstances and needs of these groups are striking. For example, the relationship between socio-economic status, the cost of living and regional attributes is highlighted by the Hawaiian example. In Hawaii, “a family of four in Honolulu is considered low-income if its annual income is below \$51,000, which is 80 percent of the median family income.” Poverty and social problems are heavily concentrated within the native Hawaiian, Filipino, Samoan and Micronesian communities. These groups live in both urban and rural distressed areas. In other regions of the country, organizations work with low-income participants whose neighborhoods are adjacent to or surrounded by extreme wealth. For example, the high cost of living in the Bay Area creates a significant burden

for poorer families seeking to meet their housing needs. One practitioner commented, “Housing in this community is [a] huge [issue], people are paying 90 percent of their income for housing.” Another practitioner in the Bay Area discussed the dilemma the organization had to overcome in selling the affordable housing they developed within the prosperous Silicon Valley area. “We work with...the highest Latino poverty area, census tracts. And, get this, Fannie Mae still won’t work with us because they’re (the houses)...the price is too high for families for them to get involved.”

3.2 Gentrification and Neighborhood Change

The neighborhoods in which family support and community development organizations operate are frequently *contested* areas. Although the areas may be characterized by significant poverty, economic malaise and social problems, they also may possess attributes that make them attractive to middle- and upper-income households (e.g. architecturally desirable housing, proximity to cultural amenities and to downtown employment centers). Gentrification (i.e. the displacement of lower-income households by more prosperous residents) typically occurs in relatively expensive, low vacancy housing markets (e.g. Boston, Chicago, San Francisco, Honolulu). As one practitioner commented, “most (poor) communities in this country are under attack...because they want this land in the center of the city, because they want to make cities viable. So the mayors are running all the poor people out.” Gentrification is occurring in many guises ranging from private housing redevelopment, to nonprofit-led new developments, to public housing redevelopment through HUD’s HOPE VI program.

As a result of gentrification, many low-income residents are being displaced from their homes and forced to move into other areas, making consumption of housing a greater burden on household income. Unaffordable rent levels sometimes necessitate multiple moves for households. These disruptions affect school enrollment for children, undermine neighborhood support networks, and break connections to community-based programs and services, effectively undermining the development of social capital.

Many community-based organizations are not opposed to middle income families returning to inner city neighborhoods. However, they are concerned about the plight of the low income residents whose housing is being usurped without a replacement option. Some organizations are advocating mixed income housing as an option to lessen the negative impacts of gentrification, while others are aggressively fighting neighborhood redevelopment initiatives that might lead to displacement.

3.3. Isolated Communities and Organizations

Another challenge that some community development and family support organizations must address is social and/or community isolation. This phenomenon is present in both rural and urban communities. In urban communities, community development and family support organizations sometimes identify groups or neighborhoods that are “not on the radar at all for the city.” Likewise, some rural communities that are isolated within unincorporated areas are difficult for organizations to assist. A practitioner described one such area as “a poverty pocket... it’s not big, so it hasn’t gotten a lot of attention.” Within these pockets there can be “generations of people who have lived on welfare, three to four generations of families... a lot of people who live there, lead lives of what you call quiet desperation.” Frequently such communities are known by name but there is little accurate information on the social, economic or physical aspects of the area, which complicates any efforts to assess the needs of households. These communities and their families often have the greatest need for family support and community development.

Similarly, the isolation of community development and family support organizations presents numerous challenges and barriers that impede their ability to operate effectively. Many groups have found that their size, location and constituency have affected their entrée with both public and private sector administrators. One umbrella organization reported that, “there is a tone in the administration that we cannot be bothered with lower fish... they sort of try to marginalize them, I think. Except for again the big one, the ones that got bigger, more powerful.” Organizational isolation is a powerful barrier in that it not only affects access to funding streams, it limits the organizational exchange of ideas. One practitioner noted that because of the isolation of their family support and community development organizations “best practices come here almost last.” Organizational isolation also prohibits collaborative efforts and limits each group’s ability to affect social change through advocacy. Further, a uniform complaint is that organizations have a very difficult if not impossible time finding out what other similar entities are doing. Currently, there are only a few mechanisms for organizations to develop peer relationships that would encourage the dissemination and sharing of information. Within the community development field, there are 23-state and 5- city-wide associations affiliated with the National Congress for Community Economic Development (NCCED), the national trade organization for CDCs. In the family support field, state-wide networks of organizations are members of the national organization, Family Support America (FSA). Through conferences, technical support and dissemination of professional materials, NCCED and FSA encourage the development of peer relationships. Despite the existence of these umbrella organizations, many individual organizations are isolated and do not have access to their peers.

3.4 The Local Political Climate

There is a common realization that the local political climate has a major impact on the way that community development and family support organizations do business. Organizations are constantly challenged to maintain a balance between their need for good relationships that can lead to funding and political support, against their need to remain autonomous and free to advocate for their constituents. The harsh reality is that, in most instances, local government administrators are the gatekeepers that dictate the rules of engagement. One practitioner characterized the local political situation as: “it’s all politics... each of them [local officials], it is like their fiefdoms. They have control over everything. So, in order for an organization to do anything, they have got to have relationships...” Another practitioner also addressed the importance of establishing connections with local decision-makers. “We build relationships, and I often say to anybody that is running a nonprofit that thinks they don’t have to deal with politicians is nuts because you’re not going to be able to get your projects done.”

“...there’s [a] certain amount of fear of vindictiveness and not being on the receiving end if you offend anybody... you can be black listed...”
 -(Quote from a family support practitioner)

There are various instances in which contracts to organizations were awarded or taken away based upon local political relationships. Two family support practitioners disclosed that, “there’s [a] certain amount of fear of vindictiveness and not being on the receiving end if you offend anybody... you can be black listed...” In discussing the culture of family support organizations, another practitioner made the assessment that “I sincerely feel that the industry is more part of the problem than part of the solution, because we simply are reacting to public policy instead of trying to change it.” Importantly, a few practitioners indicated that the political arena included both their individual relationships with policy makers, *as well as*, the broader

relationship between the nonprofit sector and politicians.

In some environments, the gatekeepers to effective practice may be well-established, larger and older community development and family support organizations. These organizations tend to be very sophisticated and well connected to mobilized groups throughout their respective communities. Elected officials, funders and commercial businesses must garner the support of such organizations to avoid potential opposition to their initiatives. A practitioner in the San Francisco Bay Area described the different political environments for nonprofits in San Francisco and East Bay. “. . . the nonprofit sector in San Francisco is very tight and powerful. They know how to lobby well and how to mobilize.” The opposite assessment was made for the East Bay Area.

4. Constraints Imposed by Funding

Funding is arguably the most critical factor in the survival and operations of community development and family support organizations. The majority of funding support comes from public sources (i.e. government), however, private funders (e.g. foundations and corporations) play a vital role. Funders such as Annie Casey, Ford, MacArthur, Robert Wood Johnson, Lilly, and Pew Charitable Trusts, have played major roles in providing funding support to community development and family support organizations. In addition, some organizations have received corporate sector support in the form of direct and in-kind contributions. Donations of staff or volunteer hours, furnishings, and office equipment are examples of this type of assistance. Organizations also derive funding from self-generated revenue (e.g. apartment rentals, child care, house cleaning services, magazine publication, farmers markets). These enterprises have given some organizations unrestricted funds that provide them with the flexibility to support unfunded and/or under-funded initiatives.

The nature of funding support creates numerous challenges for community development and family support organizations. These challenges impact organizations at every level, from their governance and management, to their programmatic focus and implementation strategies.

4.1 Funding drives strategies

It is important to point out that comprehensive or holistic approaches to community development and family support face significant challenges since funders are often only willing to support one dimension of the organizations’ efforts. Despite a growing trend towards diversification of services and projects among family support and community development organizations, there is a strong residual tendency towards single dimension strategies. Organizations tend to focus their activities in one primary area (e.g. housing, child care, youth programs, job training). Each funder identifies specific priorities and areas of support (e.g. education, mental health, welfare, youth and teens). Therefore, some organizations may find that they have to reconfigure their programs to fit the priorities set by funders. In some instances, organizations have couched their primary interests as a subset of another project that is a priority to funders. For example, an organization’s primary interest may be financial literacy. However, this interest might become embedded in a credit repair program, which is the funder’s primary focus. Secondary areas of focus are usually allocated modest resources and tend to be less directly integrated into the organizations’ programmatic agenda. There are compelling reasons for this type of specialization. Organizations tend to develop competencies and track records that lead to continued funding in a particular activity. Thus they are reluctant to move away from what has “worked” in the past. This tendency is a limiting factor in the potential of family support and community development organizations to address the kinds of multi-dimensional needs and challenges faced by disadvantaged families and neighborhoods. In short, what may be good operating strategies

for the stability and perpetuation of the organizations may be inadequate to meet their ultimate goals of advancing the well-being of families and neighborhoods.

4.2 Politics affects funding

Many organizations rely on public funds to support their operating budgets. In fact, most organizations report that public funds (i.e. city, county, state, federal) make up the majority of their budgets. As such, they must weigh the costs of advocacy for families and communities, against the need to retain amiable relationships with local political leadership. Organizations that directly oppose local political leadership can find themselves excluded from funding opportunities. An organization that provides supportive services to community development and family support organizations described one of their functions as “building sophistication of groups” so that they can figure out “how much they should push” and how to engage in effective negotiations. They found “one challenge is that a lot of groups get funding from the city. So, you are getting funding, and then at the same time you may have some issues with them.” In describing the impact that community advocacy has had on an organization, one executive director stated, “we’ve picketed City Hall, and they’ve cut off our money.”

Funding streams can also place limitations on the way that organizations manage their human resources and provide services. For example, organizations that rely heavily on public funding are often restricted in their use of those funds so that “their model is still more of a traditional social service model.” Government funding typically entails high levels of bureaucratic red tape (e.g. paperwork, strict eligibility requirements, re-certifications). There are frequent tensions between organizations and public sector agencies. As one practitioner stated, “... sometimes we have to fight with the bureaucratic structures of government and particularly the social service kind, so that they respect you and understand you.”

Tensions also develop between organizations as they frequently compete with one another for funding. Government, philanthropic and corporate funders establish priorities and criteria for awarding resources, but must make choices among eligible fund seekers. This form of competition operates at local, state, regional and national levels. Most organizations are acutely aware of the competitive nature of funding opportunities. Competition also occurs among organizations that are seeking contracts to provide direct services to individuals and families. In some instances, these organizations literally compete for “clients” or “customers” in order to obtain or retain funding. These forms of competition tend to discourage collaboration between organizations and allows for greater duplication of efforts, tendencies that result in less efficient use of limited resources. Some practitioners acknowledge the need to link services and programs between organizations that serve constituents in the same communities. However, they point out that there is no specific funding for such activities. Others assert that while it is obvious that no one organization can meet all of the needs of a family or community, funders seem to ignore this reality, sometimes sending an implicit message that organizations should “do it all.”

4.3 Funding forces collaboration

Organizations are also challenged by the expectations of funders regarding collaboration. Practitioners often feel that funders are pushing collaborations without understanding what is required for them to be both positive and effective. One issue consistently raised by practitioners are the inherent turf battles between groups that may have similar missions, but different operational

strategies. For example, many organizations might seek to address teen pregnancy. Some will see their role as educational (preventive), while others may give priority to housing and health care (intervention) for teen mothers. Given limited funds, the tension created by competing priorities generates conflicts between groups, the same groups that are being asked to collaborate. Funders tend to assume that any conflicts will be resolved as a consequence of the collaboration process itself. Practitioners are acutely aware that this is not the case. The funding period often creates an unrealistic timetable for the development of cooperative relationships between organizations. Ironically collaborations can lead to the deterioration of relations between groups when conflicts arise, but are not resolved.

In some instances, collaborations have been compromised by large organizations playing the dominant roles (i.e. lead agency), leaving little room for the involvement of smaller grassroots groups. Smaller organizations are often “unequal” partners in collaborative relationships. They may be “used” initially to meet funding criteria, but subsequently they may be excluded from the management of funds received. Overall collaboration is frequently hampered by a lack of awareness of the challenges presented to organizations.

4.4 Funding becomes an end goal

In order to get adequate funding many organizations have resorted to “chasing the money.” One organization’s director explained the situation this way, “to do what I do obviously requires big bucks. It’s very difficult to get any one foundation to double your budget... It’s very risky and so forth, so I’m finding myself chase these \$15,000 to \$20,000 grants... I’ve got about a half-a-dozen grants out there now, and probably will develop about another half-a-dozen to fund some other initiatives.” This strategy significantly affects some organizations that grow rapidly by aggressively pursuing different funding opportunities. In the process these organizations can lose their focus and become quite vulnerable to the variability and unpredictability of funding. One umbrella organization reported “what has happened with a lot of groups, and even with their city contracts, is that they chase the money. Wherever the money is. It is like I am doing housing now, but there is the money for violence prevention, so I am going to do that... it’s everywhere. But it is so damaging. There are literally groups that have gone under doing that.” It is important to point out that there are some organizations that are wary about funding driving their focus. In the words of one practitioner, “we decide what it is we want to focus on. And, we don’t focus on something just because there’s a lot of money.”

4.5 Funding drives evaluation

Both public and private funders are challenging community development and family support organizations to determine their real outcomes, and to develop ways of measuring the impact of their services. Many organizations cannot adequately meet this expectation without increased support for evaluation services. As one practitioner noted, assessment and tracking strategies often require community development and family support organizations “to bring in specialized personnel, that means more money. And many times foundations don’t want to pay for that. So that’s a barrier.”

III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study has been to examine the ways organizations have attempted to integrate elements of community development and family support in their conceptual frameworks and programmatic efforts. Multiple efforts are needed in order for community development and family support organizations to participate in the emergence of more comprehensive and integrative strategies. These efforts require the involvement of family support and community development organizations, funders and the academic community. Organizations must have a conceptual framework, organizational and programmatic strategies, and planning and evaluation capacity that empower and address the needs of families and communities. The funding community must support initiatives that promote integrative practices. Although the academic community has traditionally influenced policy and funding priorities, university faculty and staff can contribute to practice in a more direct way. Academics can provide valuable assistance by helping to clarify concepts, identifying and analyzing examples of best practice, and developing programmatic impact measures. We believe that a number of specific steps can be taken to promote integrative practices, and offer the following recommendations:

Recommendations to community development and family support organizations:

- Offer volunteer opportunities and internships to college and younger students to expose them to diverse opportunities within both fields;
- Integrate residents into organizational programs and management who reflect the cultural and ethnic diversity of the community;
- Organize and convene community advisory teams to discuss the relationship between community strategies and public policies;
- Conduct regular strategic planning and organizational self-assessment to insure consistency between values, mission, and activities;
- Research and seek funding opportunities that are consistent with values and mission;
- Conduct a stakeholder analysis to assess the political environment and develop strategies to garner the support of key decision-makers;
- Develop regular mechanisms to monitor changes in the needs *and* assets of individuals, families and communities; and
- Visit other communities to observe family support and community development organizations at work.

Recommendations to the foundation community:

- Provide funding opportunities to establish internship programs within family support and community development organizations;

- Provide funding to enhance expertise and build internal organizational capacity (i.e., administrative support, financial management, personnel management) to match the demands of programmatic initiatives;
- Identify community involvement in organizational programs and management as a funding criteria;
- Underwrite educational and training opportunities that promote practitioner and academic interactions;
- Provide resources to support organizations through the strategic planning process (e.g., funding a retreat, covering the cost of attendance for board members, staff and/or community representatives, or providing a quality facilitator to assist the group);
- Facilitate the sharing of ideas, lessons learned and expertise between organizations by supporting local and national umbrella and intermediary organizations;
- Provide support for regional workshops and the expansion of practitioner networks; and
- Offer small grants to facilitate and improve access to information (e.g., internet access, manuals, books, databases, information networks, and industry and expert group discussions).

Recommendations to the academic community

- Develop direct and regular interactions with family support and community development professionals [e.g. convene practitioner/academic forums, specialized conferences and training workshops, and various communication channels (e.g., list serves, web sites, newsletters)];
- Establish internship programs with family support and community development organizations;
- Prepare best practice case studies that exemplify linkages between community development and family support; and
- Develop indicators, measures and models that can help organizations distinguish between programmatic outcomes and more long-term family and community impacts.

Appendix A

-

List of Participants

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY SUPPORT: FORGING A PRACTICAL
NEXUS TO STRENGTHEN FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES**

Agency Profile Catalogue

Agency: Allegheny County - Family Support Policy Board
Office of Child Development
5600 Penn Avenue, Suite 208
Pittsburg, Pennsylvania 15206
Phone: (412) 661-9280, ext. 12
Fax: (412) 661-9288
Web Address: www.pitt.edu~ocdweb

Primary Contact: Bryce J. Maretzki
Title: Executive Director
Phone: (412) 661-9280, ext. 12

Mission: Self-Sufficiency- to encourage self-sufficiency for families and children through education, training and employment; Healthy Development - to assure healthy development and access to health-care services for children and families; Child Development and Parenting - to promote positive child development through effective parenting, early intervention and outreach activities; Family Stability - to support and preserve the family unit as the foundation for success for children and families; Collaboration / Service Integration - to provide a seamless, comprehensive and easily accessed network of services for children and families.

Projects/Activities: Self-Help and mutual aid groups, programs, classes and family activity nights; Individual family support work and advocacy that can provide support in family goal-setting, may include home visiting; effective referrals and advocacy on behalf of families to other programs and services, including schools and income maintenance services and health services; Parent-child, parent, and child-focused developmental activities and efforts, included in center-based and individual family support activities; outreach and community education efforts specifically around very young children and their families, including a strong center focus on families with children pre-natal to school age; Attention to quality and management, including training and staff development for the family center workforce that insures workers share the philosophy and have the skills for their particular job.

Number of Staff: 1-3 people

Agency: ARCHS - Area Resources for Community and Human Services (sustainable neighborhoods)
4236 Lindell Boulevard, Suite 400
St. Louis, MO 63108
Phone: (314) 534-0022
Fax: (314) 534-0055
Web Address: http://www.mofit.org/stl.htm

Primary Contact: Shirlyotta Taylor
Title: Neighborhood Facilitator
Phone: (314) 534-0022

Mission: The initiative was purposefully developed to make sure that residents are organized in pursuing the best interests of the neighborhood; residents have access to safe, effective transportation systems; residents have access to decent and affordable housing; residents live in neighborhoods with quality parks, open space, recreational institutions, community centers and a clean environment; residents have access to financial capital for homes, businesses and personal needs; A public information system links residents to resources and opportunities throughout the region.

Projects/Activities: Rebuilding the Benton Park West / Fox Park / Gravois Park / McKinley Heights area; proposing a position of a community health nurse to provide home visits, act as health educator, health consultant and health advocate; South Side Day Nursery, a family support childcare center serving children in that area; Neighborhood clean-up day; State Department of Economic Development and the Edward Jones Company funded a home-owner repair program to support six families in Covenant Blu; awarded Stevens Middle School twenty air circulators to minimize effects of heat exposure and heat exhaustion during summer school; health care classes, screenings, and team building for youth and seniors in the community; more than fifteen new homes built in Covenant Blu / Grand Center / Vandeventer area; similar developments in Emerson Park, Illinois, Forest Park Southeast, Jennings, Lemay, Walnut Park, and Wellston areas.

Number of Staff: 10-15 people

Agency: **Bethel New Life, Inc.**
4952 Thomas Ave.
Chicago, Illinois 60651

Phone: (773) 473-7870

Fax: (773) 473-7871

Web Address: www.bethelnewlife.org

Primary Contact: Mary Nelson

Title: President

Phone: (773) 473-7870

Mission: If you put an end to oppression, to every gesture of contempt, and to every evil word; if you give food to the hungry and satisfy those who are in need, then the darkness around you will turn to the brightness of noon. And I will always guide you and satisfy you with good things. I will keep you strong and well. You will be like a garden that has plenty of water, like a spring of water that never goes dry. Your people will rebuild what has long been in ruins, building again on the old foundations. You will be known as the people who rebuilt the walls, who restored the ruined houses.

Projects/Activities: cultural arts, employment, housing and economic development, Brownfield Redevelopment, family support, seniors, community development, walk for life, Gumbo Gala

Number of Staff: 325 people

Agency: **Children's Home Association of Illinois**
Children's Home Association of Illinois, Knoxville Campus
2130 N. Knoxville
Peoria, Illinois 61603

Phone: (309) 685-1047

Fax: (309) 687-7299

Web Address: www.CHAIL.org

Primary Contact: Farrell Davies

Title: Vice President

Phone: (309) 685-1047

Mission: Giving children a childhood and future by protecting them, teaching them and healing them, and by building strong communities and loving families.

Projects/Activities: Foster care, supervised independent living, residential treatment, group homes, Project Success, Teen REACH, day and after school programs, youth services, family preservation, community development, the Good Beginnings program.

Number of Staff: 400 people

Agency: **Chicago Association of Neighborhood Development Organizations (CANDO)**
123 West Madison, Suite 1100
Chicago, Illinois 60602-4589

Phone: (312) 372-2636

Fax: (309) 829-2469

Web Address: www.uwaymc.org

Primary Contact: Holly Marshall

Title: Vice President of Development

Phone: (312) 372-2636

Mission: CANDO, is a Citywide umbrella for CED organizations throughout Chicago. CANDO provides networking opportunities for its members, conducts research on CED issues relevant to Chicago CBDs, seeks favorable policies and regulations for its members with City agencies, provides small business financing, convenes forums and discussions between its members and public and private sector decision-makers on items of import to CED in Chicago, conducts studies on policy issues identified by its members, and raises funds for the project and program areas of its member organizations.

Projects/Activities: Loans for Small business enterprises by organizational members; conducts community and neighborhood economic development research; provides networking opportunities for members and public and private sector decision-makers; interacts with City agencies on policies and issues of importance to its members.

Number of Staff: 5-7 people

Agency: **Connecticut Parents Plus / United Way of Connecticut**
CT State Department of Education - Bureau of School-Family-Community
Partnerships
P.O Box 2219
Hartford, CT State Department of Education - Bureau of School-Family-
Community Partnerships 06145 - 2219

Phone: (860) 566 - 7856

Fax: (860) 566 - 2957

Web Address: www.state.ct.us/sde/dsi/sfcp/index.htm

Primary Contact: Eric Herrmann

Title: Director, Connecticut Parents Plus

Phone: (860) 566 - 7856

Mission: To develop a strong connection between community and family support and the education of young children; To think about what the school can do for the community and form truly mutual beneficial partnerships between them; To increase parental and community involvement in education.

Projects/Activities: School-Family-Community Partnerships; Family pledge, Student pledge; Teacher Pledge.
Number of Staff: 4-6 people

Agency: **The Children First Initiative**
Child and Family Agency
255 Hempstead Street
New London, CT 6320
Phone: (203) 797-8088
Fax: (203) 792-7626
Web Address: www.wcgmf.org

Primary Contact: Linda A. Kosko
Title: Collaborative Director
Phone: (203) 797-8088

Mission: To communicate, support and promote within the minority population the Children First Vision: "All Meriden children will come to school ready to learn and will be successful."

Projects/Activities: Early Childhood Directory, Helping Hands, Home-Based Childcare, Multi-cultural Parents Day, New Infant, Toddler and Preschool Childcare Facility, Parent Information Bureau, ParentNet, School-Based Childcare, Hartford Parents' Network, LION (Leaders in our Neighborhood), PALS (Parents as Leaders), PASTA (Parents and Supporters of the Arts), Playground Revitalization, PLTI (Parent Leadership Training Institute), RFP (Request for Proposals), School Readiness Review Panel, The Voice of Hartford Parents.
Number of Staff: 4-6 people

Agency: **Dorchester CARES**
Dorchester CARES for Families and Children
610 Sullivan Street
Dorchester, MA 2122
Phone: (617) 474-1256
Fax: (617) 474-1261
Web Address: http://www.eureka-boston.org/christa_martinez.htm

Primary Contact: Crista Martinez
Title: Executive Director
Phone: (617) 474-1256

Mission: To coordinate, develop and institutionalize comprehensive community-based programs which will support families and prevent child abuse and neglect in target neighborhoods.

Projects/Activities: Family Fun Events; Center-Based Activities: Family Coops, Play Groups, Support Groups, advocacy; Nurturing programs, pre-natal, teen, spanish, creole, english; Meld for young dads; ongoing home visitation; welcome baby visits; parent leadership development; services linkage: adult education, basic needs, etc. food pantry, clothing closet, drop-in child care, sewing class, community lunches.

Number of Staff: 10-15 people

Agency: **Eastside Boys and Girls Club**
610 Sullivan Street

Phone: Wichita Falls, TX 76301
(940) 767-7202
Fax: (940) 767-0293
Web Address: <http://www.uway-wftx.org/eastsidegirlsandboys.htm>

Primary Contact: Barbara Green
Title: Executive Director
Phone: (940) 767-7202

Mission: To build each child's capacity for responsible and confident adulthood, economic independence and fulfillment. Each Child is given the chance to become a productive citizen through six program areas and supportive programs.

Projects/Activities: Career & Life Planning: Related skills to future employment. Health & Sexuality: Programs that enable each child to take charge of maintaining healthy bodies. Leadership & Community Involvement: Programs that enable each child to analyze and contribute to positive changes in the community. Self Reliance & Life Skills: Programs that enable children conquer life's basic challenges. Culture & Heritage: Programs to enable creative expressions. Sports & Adventure: Programs to enable children to be competitive and promote sportsmanship.

Number of Staff: 1-3 people

Agency: **Emma Family Resource Center**
37 Brickyard Road
Asheville, NC 28806

Phone: (828) 252-4810
Fax: (828) 281-3723
Web Address: <http://www.childrenfirstbc.org>

Primary Contact: Debby Genz
Title: Coordinator
Phone: (828) 252-4810

Mission: To help all families build upon the strengths they have; to support them in a way that challenges and empowers them to make positive choices for themselves; to making Emma community a safe, beautiful, welcoming place to raise children.

Projects/Activities: The homework club; MOTHEREAD, medical clinic, early childhood enrichment, on site delivery of services, emergency assistance, help with parenting questions, emergency and supplemental food, community gardening.

Number of Staff: 1-3 people

Agency: **Family Connection**
UNAVAILABLE

Phone: (706) 369-3969
Fax: (706) 353-1375
Web Address:

Primary Contact: Virginia Walker
Title: Diversity Coordinator
Phone: (706) 369-3969

Mission:

Projects/Activities:

Number of Staff: 1-3 people
Agency: **Family Support Washington**
The Tahoma Center
1323 South Yakima Avenue
Tacoma, WA 98405
Phone: (253) 779-9947
Fax: (253) 779-9948
Web Address: no web address

Primary Contact: Martha Scoville
Title: Director
Phone: (206)233-0156

Mission: To provide technical assistance and training which embodies family support principles; To build community capacity for expansion of family support; To infuse family support-based policy into practice.

Projects/Activities: Making Room at The Table facilitator training (topics such as assessment and an annual family support institute), technical assistance and consultation to organizations; Results-based accountability and evaluation for Family Support services and programs.

Number of Staff: 1-3 people

Agency: **First Step**
325 East 6th Street
Port Angelos, WA 98362
Phone: (360) 457-8355
Fax: (360) 457-3820
Web Address: no web address

Primary Contact: Venita L. Quan
Title: Executive Director
Phone: (360) 457-8355

Mission: To provide support and educational services to encourage healthy development

Projects/Activities: Parent education classes; support groups; drop in centers; clothing / equipment / food closet - Direct Assistance fund; Family night out; mom's craft day; Job Retention / coaching; First Books Literacy Project; Home visiting; work force training site.

Number of Staff: 10-15 people

Agency: **Homan Square Community Center Foundation**
Homan Square Community Center Foundation
821 South St. Louis
Chicago, Illinois 60624
Phone: (773) 265-4404
Fax: (773) 265-4405
Web Address: www.homansquare.org

Primary Contact: Kristin Dean
Title: Executive Director
Phone: (773) 265-4404

Mission: To bring health care, family services, day care, recreation facilities and learning opportunities together in one place. Six of Chicago's best non-profit organizations will work side-by-side to meet the needs of North Lawndale and West Side residents.

Projects/Activities: Infant day care; Child Day care; After school child day care; After school peer group Interaction programs; After school gang prevention programs; After-school male responsibility / Leadership training; After-school teen pregnancy counseling; school based health services and education; school-based tutoring and parenting programs; family crisis intervention, Life skills education; mother and child advocacy; Child Welfare Casework; Substance abuse prevention; X-ray services; Aerobics classes; dance, martial arts, arts and crafts, running, swimming, basketball, and summer day camp.

Number of Staff: 1-3 people

Agency: **Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development**

7100 Connecticut Avenue
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

Phone: (301) 961-2847

Fax: (301) 961-2894

Web Address: <http://www.theinnovationcenter.org>

Primary Contact: Hartley Hobson

Title: Vice President

Phone: (301) 961-2847

Mission: To help youth workers find, experience, create, and understand the newest and best thinking in youth development.

Projects/Activities: As we bring together communities and organizations, youth and adults, we discover new processes and techniques for sparking their creative energy and helping them create successful partnerships. Our services further our mission of testing and promoting innovative concepts that benefit the entire field of youth and community development.

Number of Staff: at least 80 people

Agency: **Memphis City Schools**

Family Focus, Inc.
310 South Peoria Street, Suite 510
Chicago, IL 60607-3534

Phone: (312) 421-5200

Fax: (312) 421-8185

Web Address: mail@family-focus.org

Primary Contact: Joe C. Harmon

Title: Eligibility Coordinator with WIA

Phone: (312) 421-5200

Mission: To promote the well being of children from birth by supporting and strengthening their families

Projects/Activities: Since 1976, Family Focus has offered community-based programs to help parents gain confidence and competence as the primary care givers and educators of their children. Through parent-child activities, prevention programs for adolescents, parent workshops and education, Family Focus promotes the well being of children from birth by supporting and strengthening families

in and with their communities. In 2001, Family Focus provided holistic family support services to 6,500 individuals, including 3835 children at centers in Evanston, Aurora, and in the Chicago neighborhoods of Lawndale and West Town. In March 2002, Family Focus began serving the south side of Chicago for the first time at its new center in Englewood. On July 1, 2002, a merger between Family Focus and Family Network of Highland Park added a sixth center to Family Focus. In addition, the Midwest Learning Center was established to provide training for family support practitioners at agencies in eleven Midwestern states.

Number of Staff: 10-15 people

Agency: **Multi-Culture Development Services**

444 Pine Tree Lane
Spring Lake, NC 28390

Phone: (910) 497-4905

Fax: (910) 497-6059

Web Address: no web address

Primary Contact: Blenda Waters

Title: Neighborhood Paraprofessional Worker

Phone:

Mission: To provide safe and stable environment to provide intensive, parent and child, interaction, education and family development.

Projects/Activities: Development program that allows parents to stay with their children as guests in a transitional village for women and their children, ages birth to 11, while they learn positive parenting skills to better nurture their children. Parenting assessment is provided along with structured, individualized parenting classes, which are developed to meet the parenting needs.

Number of Staff: 4-6 people

Agency: **The National Economic Development and Law Center**

2201 Broadway-Suite 815
Oakland, CA 94612

Phone: (510) 251-2600

Fax: (510) 251-0600

Web Address: www.nedlc.org

Primary Contact: Ana Cortez

Title: Program Manager

Phone: (510) 251-2600

Mission: To contribute to the abilities of low-income persons and communities to realize their full potential. We do this by collaborating with community organizations to develop integrated community-building skills, indigenous leadership, and community building creativity in order to build local capacity and achieve greater economic, social, cultural and human development.

Projects/Activities: East Bay MAPP; Violence Prevention Initiative Youth MAPP; Strong Latino Communities Research Project; National Sector Conference; Community Development and Child Care Initiative; Statewide Training and Discussions and the Individualized Technical Assistance Program.

Number of Staff: 31-40 people

Agency: **Massachusetts Parent Involvement Project**

350 Main Street

Phone: Malden, MA 2144
(781) 338-3488
Fax: (781) 338-3395
Web Address: www.doe.mass.edu/pip

Primary Contact: Joel Nitzberg
Title: Director
Phone: (781) 338-3488

Mission: To Increase involvement of families in their children's mathematics, science and technology / engineering (MST/E) education bu creating partnerships and supporting parents in communities where students are underachieving in MST education.

Projects/Activities: School presentations of community events; Parent Involvement meetings; math, science, and technology in a Bag curriculum-related activities for families of students in grades three and four; workshops to teach parents the curriculum; Elementary math and science story hour at Robbins library; family activity night; parent leadership workshops; Multicultural Fairs;

Number of Staff: 10-15 people

Agency: **South Bay Center For Counseling**
360 North Sepulveda Blvd. Suite 2075
El Segundo, CA 90245

Phone: (310) 414-2090
Fax: (310) 414-2096
Web Address: sbaycenter@earthlink.net

Primary Contact: Mary Hammer
Title: Program Director
Phone: (310) 414-2090

Mission: To meet the mental health, social service, and child care needs of all individuals and families who may benefit from them

Projects/Activities: Child care, youth enrichment, Job training, child abuse prevention, community outreach, counseling services, health care, in home social services, school based support programs welfare to work, child neglect prevention, child trauma reduction, healthy start, school support.

Number of Staff: 4-6 people

Agency: **Sustainable Neighborhoods Initiative**
Phone: (314) 534-7119
Fax: (314) 652-7409
Web Address: http://www.stlouis2004.org/html/ap_neighborhoods.html

Primary Contact: Serena Muhammad
Title: Neighborhood Facilitator
Phone: (314) 534-7119

Mission: To revitalizie nine St. Louis-area neighborhoods under an ambitious plan directed by residents of the neighborhoods themselves through an unprecedented partnership of community groups, financial institutions and state and local governments.

Projects/Activities: Four local banks, in cooperation with the Missouri Housing Development Commission and the Regional Housing and Community Development Alliance, unveiled a below-

market-rate home improvement loan program in August 2001. Commerce Bank, First Bank, UMB Bank and US Bank are offering a streamlined, affordable loan product geared for making improvements to owner-occupied, single-family residences. Loans are available throughout the entire city of St. Louis, as well as in select census tracts of St. Louis County; Sustainable Neighborhoods Initiative hosted the Second Annual Connecting Neighborhood Leaders Conference in September 2001. The conference gave residents an opportunity to develop and plan for their neighborhood's progress. A Youth Summit allowed young people to set goals for themselves and their neighborhoods; Nearly 175 multi-family rental apartments were completed in the Parsons Place Development in the City of East St. Louis. Parsons Place, a \$25 million project, represents a key initiative in redeveloping the community; Two hundred and fifty new rental units are available in the Covenant Blu/Grand Center, Vandeventer neighborhood; More than 750 volunteers and youth assisted Sustainable Neighborhoods on World Wide Youth Day in April 2001. Highlights included: improvement of city landmarks and parks in Wellston, a health fair in Forest Park Southeast, and cleanups in Lemay, Jennings and Walnut Park East/Walnut Park West/Mark Twain.

Number of Staff: 10-15 people

Agency: **United Family Services**

515 Village court
Charlotte, NC 28203

Phone: (704) 907-9223

Fax: (704) 338-1939

Web Address: <http://www.unitedfamilyservices.com/cb.htm>

Primary Contact: Alex Wagaman

Title: Project Coordinator

Phone: (704) 907-9223

Mission: To connect individuals, families, and the community with resources that promotes stability, security, and self-sufficiency.

Projects/Activities: Big Brothers / Big Sisters; Community education; Consumer credit counseling; employee assistance; family counseling; the shelter for battered women; victim assistance.

Number of Staff: approx. 100 people

Agency: **West Virginia Prevention Resource Center**

100 Angus East Peyton Drive
South Charleston, WV 25303

Phone: (304) 746-2077 ext. 14

Fax: (304) 746-6246

Web Address: <http://www.prevnet.org>

Primary Contact: Tammy Collins

Title: Evaluation Specialist

Phone: (304) 746-2077 ext. 14

Mission: The overall mission of the WVPRC is to facilitate the development of a comprehensive, interactive prevention system for West Virginia. This is done through the following goals: 1) Promote best practice; 2) Develop and maintain comprehensive data systems; 3) develop and maintain comprehensive information and communication systems; 4) provide statewide technical assistance; 5) provide prevention workforce development; 6) provide quality management

Projects/Activities: Beginning Alcohol and Addictions Basic Education Studies (BAABESWORLD); WVTeen Institute, Natural Helpers.

Number of Staff: 31-40 people

Agency: **Wilksburg Family Support Center**
807 Wallace Ave. Suite 205
Wilksburg, PA 15221

Phone: (412) 871-7948

Fax: (412) 871-7991

Web Address: www.wfsc.org as our domain name, our website is currently being developed.

Primary Contact: Paulette Davis

Title: Director

Phone: (412) 871-7948

Mission: To unify families, create self-sufficiency and interdependency and to become a tax exempt social service agency.

Projects/Activities: Case management services, family goal planning, child development assessments and child development and parenting planning. Advocacy and Referral – Staff members are available to locate, coordinate and monitor necessary services for families based on goals that the family defines. Child Assessment – Development screenings and assessments of children ages 0-5 are provided twice each year. Child Development Plans are written and updated to support the developmental needs of these children. Parenting Support - Parent Educators are available to model parent and child interaction and assist in the creation of a Parenting Plan for each child.

Number of Staff: 10-15 people

Agency: **Windham Children First Initiative**
Connecticut State Dept. of Education
P.O. Box 2219, room 227
Hartford, CT 06145-2219

Phone: (860) 423-4534

Fax: (860) 423-2601

Web Address: no web address

Primary Contact: Judith Jordan

Title: Coordinator

Phone: (860) 423-4534

Mission: To engage parents in creating quality early childhood education alternatives and increasing parent involvement

Projects/Activities: Connecticut Family Literacy Initiative

Number of Staff: 1-3 people

Agency: **Womens Institute for Housing and Economic Development**
14 Beacon Street
Boston, MA

Phone: (617) 367-0520

Fax: (617) 367-1676

Web Address: www.wihed.org

Primary Contact: Felice Mendell
Title: Executive Director
Phone: (617) 367-0520

Mission: To build supportive communities that work for low income women and their families.

Projects/Activities: Shelters and domestic violence, transitional housing and special programs, permanent housing with supports, affordable home ownership, economic security initiatives, transition house 2002, Casa Esperanza, 2000, Crescent Field Condominiums, 2000.

Number of Staff: 10-15 people

Agency: **Workplace, Inc., The**
350 Fairfield Avenue
Bridgeport, CT 6604
Phone: (203) 576-7030
Fax: (203) 335-9703
Web Address: info@workplace.org

Primary Contact: Barbara Stracka
Title: Director of Marketing, Communication and Planning
Phone: (203) 576-7030

Mission: To develop a well educated, well trained, and self-sufficient workforce that can compete in the changing global marketplace...creating a seamless, coordinated system of education, training and employment that is customer centered and easily accessible; meets the needs of both employers and employable people and of persons who face barriers to the kind of employment that provides economic self-sufficiency; has a high level of commitment and collaboration from business, education, government and community agencies including economic development, employment and training, and human services; and has defined goals and performance standards.

Projects/Activities: Workforce Investment Act; The Workforce Centers: Welfare-To-Work; ITAA Federal Competitive Grant; FlexBuild; FlexBuild META; H1B Technical Skills Training; UBS Warburg Workforce Development Program; WorkPlace Scholarships; People to Jobs; Chase Job Start; Brownfields Job Training

Number of Staff: 11 companies; 1655 employees

Agency: **YMCA of Greater Charlotte**
500 East Morehead Street, Suite 300
Charlotte, NC 28202
Phone: (704) 716-6290
Fax: (704) 716-6293
Web Address: www.ymcacharlotte.org

Primary Contact: Cynthia Flynn
Title: Vice President of Community Development
Phone: (704) 716-6290

Mission: To put Christian principles into practice through programs that build healthy spirit, mind and body for all.

Projects/Activities: Afterschool, preschool, dance, aquatics, gymnastics, family services

Number of Staff: 10-15 people

Appendix B
-
Organizations Visited

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY SUPPORT: FORGING A PRACTICAL
NEXUS TO STRENGTHEN FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES**

Participating Agencies

Chicago, Illinois

Agency: **Bethel New Life, Inc.**
4952 Thomas Ave.
Chicago, Illinois 60651
Phone: (773) 473-7870
Fax: (773) 473-7871
Web Address: www.bethelnewlife.org

Primary Contact: Mary Nelson
Title: President
Phone: (773) 473-7870

Mission: If you put an end to oppression, to every gesture of contempt, and to every evil word; if you give food to the hungry and satisfy those who are in need, then the darkness around you will turn to the brightness of noon. And I will always guide you and satisfy you with good things. I will keep you strong and well. You will be like a garden that has plenty of water, like a spring of water that never goes dry. Your people will rebuild what has long been in ruins, building again on the old foundations. You will be known as the people who rebuilt the walls, who restored the ruined houses.

Projects/Activities: cultural arts, employment, housing and economic development, brownfield redevelopment, family support, seniors, community development, walk for life, Gumbo Gala

Agency: **Centers for New Horizons**
4150 South King Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60653

Phone: (773) 373-5700
Fax: (773) 373-0063
Web Address: www.cnh.org

Primary Contact: Sokoni Karanja
Title: President & CEO
Phone: (309) 373-5700

Mission: To develop the capacity of families to become more self reliant, to improve the quality of their lives and to participate in rebuilding our communities.

Projects/Activities: Leadership training, community building, early learning centers, Headstart, after school programs, extended nightcare, daycare, in school child care, foster care family support, case management, recreational and social services for seniors, infant/toddler care, individual, youth and family counseling, employment, housing development, and workforce development.

Agency: **Chicago Association of Neighborhood Development Organizations (CANDO)**
123 West Madison, Suite 1100
Chicago, IL 60602-4589

Phone: (312) 372-2636
Fax: (309) 829-2469
Web Address: www.uwaymc.org

Primary Contact: Holly Marshall
Title: Vice President of Development
Phone: (312) 372-2636

Mission: CANDO, is a Citywide umbrella for CED organizations throughout Chicago. CANDO provides networking opportunities for its members, conducts research on CED issues relevant to Chicago CBDs, seeks favorable policies and regulations for its members with City agencies, provides small business financing, convenes forums and discussions between its members and public and private sector decision-makers on items of import to CED in Chicago, conducts studies on policy issues identified by its members, and raises funds for the project and program areas of its member organizations.

Projects/Activities: Loans for Small business enterprises by organizational members; conducts community and neighborhood economic development research; provides networking opportunities for members and public and private sector decision-makers; interacts with City agencies on policies and issues of importance to its members.

Agency: **Gads Hill Center**
1919 W. Cullerton St
Chicago, IL 60608

Phone: (312) 226-0963
Fax: (312) 226-2248
Web Address: n/a

Primary Contact: Barbara Castellan
Title: Executive Director
Phone: (312) 226-0963 ext 238

Mission: Gads Hill Center is a community based family resource center serving the low-income population of Chicago's Lower West Side since 1898. The Center provides comprehensive programs for children, youth, adults, and families that promote positive personal growth, strengthen the family unit, and develop a strong sense of community.

Projects/Activities: tutoring, mentoring, educational support services, recreational activities, parent education and support services, Early Head Start, Home Based Head Start, child care, Club Learn, Project Sanctuary, Learning Connection (GED/ESL), Seniors Clubs, Conexion de Aprendizaje, Family Reading Night, Teen Connection

Agency: **Vietnamese Association of Illinois**
5252 N. Broadway, 2nd Fl
Chicago, IL 60640

Phone: (773) 989-6164
Fax: (773) 728-0497
Web Address: www.vaichicago.org

Primary Contact: Tam Duc Nguyen
Title: Executive Director
Phone: (773) 989-6164

Mission: To foster the development and strength of the Vietnamese community. VAI is a nonprofit community-based mutual assistance association, an agency founded by and for the Vietnamese people. Targeting its free bilingual services to the most vulnerable community members, The Vietnamese Association of Illinois serves limited-English-speaking, low-income refugees and immigrants in the Chicago area.

Projects/Activities: Community Economic Development Program (CEDP) to provide technical assistance to refugees who aspire to start and/or to expand a business; Naturalization services and citizenship services, employment, literacy, senior services (homecare, volunteer and employment opportunities), Women's Health (counseling, education, support), youth services (Academic Assistance, Life Skills Education, HIV/AIDS, substance abuse, teenage pregnancy prevention, and health career workshops, Supervised Sports Activities)

Agency: **West Humbolt Park Family and Community Development Council**
3601 West Chicago Avenue
Chicago, IL 60640

Phone: (773) 334-3456
Fax: (773) 334-3211
Web Address: <http://ccts2.cti.depaul.edu/whpdc/index.htm>

Primary Contact: William Howard
Title: Executive Director
Phone: (773) 334-3456

Mission: To be a catalyst for family, community, economic development that responds to the needs of local stakeholders, including peace-loving residents and responsible businesses who serve the best interests of these same residents.

Projects/Activities: Family Development (Cultural Enrichment, Youth Intervention Workshops, Youth Future's Program - involving youth in an investment in their future, Health

Care Issues); Community Organizing (Leadership Development, Beat Meetings / CAPS - working together with the police in neighborhood, 11th District Men's' Club, Block Club Initiatives, Super Block, Crime and Safety Committees, Women's Club, Liquor Store Committees, SODA Orders - Stay Out of Drug Areas); Economic Development (Chicago Avenue Commercial Reinvestment, Entrepreneurial Development, Employment Training & Placement, Chicago Avenue Redevelopment Task Force) and Annual Events (West Humboldt Park Health Fair, Chicago Avenue Clean-Up, Anti-Drug March, Prayer Vigil)

San Francisco/Bay Area, California

Agency: **Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency (BOSS)**

2065 Kittredge Street, Suite E
Berkeley, CA 94704

Phone: (510) 649-1930

Fax: (510) 649-0627

Web Address: www.self-sufficiency.org

Primary Contact: boona cheema

Title: Executive Director

Phone: (510) 649-1930

Mission: BOSS is dedicated to helping poor, homeless, and disabled people achieve health and self-sufficiency, and to fighting against the root causes of poverty and homelessness

Projects/Activities: Permanent and transitional housing, economic development, adult education classes, computer lab, educational testing, literacy services, GED preparation -- partnership with Berkeley Adult School; job training, paid training internships in clerical, culinary, janitorial tracks, Job readiness assessments, job search assistance, referrals to training, resume preparation, practice interviews, job development, job placements. Urban gardening program for homeless and low-income residents of our shelters and housing programs. Paid internships teach residents a variety of gardening, horticultural, nutrition, and micro-enterprise skills. Interns take part in bringing vegetables and herbs grown in BOSS's gardens to the Berkeley Farmer's market 3-18 months housing for adults linked with the Jobs For the Homeless Consortium plus on-site services (peer support, housing/employment search, education, case management); Daytime drop-in center: mental health, benefits, advocacy, housing assistance, counseling, support groups, food, information, and referral. Community Organizing Team (Popular education, leadership development, community building, advocacy for social and economic justice.

Agency: **Family Service Agency of San Francisco (FSASF)**

1010 Gough Street
San Francisco, CA 94109

Phone: (415) 474-7310

Fax: (415) 931-3773

Web Address: www.fsasf.org

Primary Contact: Lonnie Hicks

Title: Executive Director

Phone: (415) 474-7310

Mission: To strengthen families by providing caring, effective human services with a special emphasis on low-income families, children, the elderly, and the disabled. Poverty, child abuse, divorce, aging, disability, substance abuse, and mental illness weaken the ability of families to solve problems independently. We will work to eliminate conditions that contribute to the deterioration of family life.

Projects/Activities: Geriatric Psychiatric Day Treatment Program; Foster Grandparent/Senior Companion Program; Long -Term Care Ombudsman Services; Adolescent Family Life Program; Adolescents Seeking Paths toward Independence, Responsibility, and Empowerment (ASPIRE); Early Childhood Mental Health Program (ECMH); Early Crisis Intervention and Eviction Prevention/Eviction Assistance Program; Family Developmental Center (FDC); Family Intervention and Recovery Services Team (FIRST); Family Service Counseling; Family Violence Prevention; Hilltop Developmental Center; Intensive Day Treatment Program; Quality Child Care Development Collaborative (Prop. J); Teen Parent Lifeskills; Teenage Pregnancy and Parenting Project (TAPP); Teen Male Services: Together Taking Care of Business (TTCB) and Lil Bros; Tender Lion Family Program; Young Teen and Child Development Program Adult Care Management; Asian Pacific Islander Wellness Center Integrated Services Project; CARE Mental Health Services; Community Aftercare Program (CAP); HIV Mental Health Services; HIV Neuropsychological Services; Japanese Family Service Program; Victim Restitution

Agency: **Mexican American Community Services Agency, Inc. (MACSA)**
130 N. Jackson Ave.
San Jose, CA. 95116

Phone: (408) 928-1122

Fax: (408) 928-1169

Web Address: www.macsa.org

Primary Contact: Esther Medina

Title: Executive Director

Phone: (408) 928-1122

Mission: Our Mission is to enrich the lives and to advance the interests of the Latino Community of Santa Clara County.

Projects/Activities: youth development programs offered at three youth centers, fifteen schools, library and community sites; Adult Day Health Care Senior Center; two subsidized senior apartment projects (is in the process of developing an additional 50-unit subsidized senior apartment complex and a 65-unit family housing project for low to moderate income first-time home buyers) Nursing Care; Health classes; occupational therapy; Physical Therapy; Speech Therapy; Social Services; Male Involvement Program; School Linked Services; Mental Health Services; Project Health/Proyecto Salud; Mothers and Sons Programs; Parent Education Classes; English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) Classes; El Portal Leadership Academy and Academia Calmecac Charter High School; Academia Calmecac;

Agency: **The National Economic Development and Law Center**
2201 Broadway-Suite 815
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: (510) 251-2600
Fax: (510) 251-0600
Web Address: www.nedlc.org

Primary Contact: Ana Cortez
Title: Program Manager
Phone: (510) 251-2600

Mission: To contribute to the abilities of low-income persons and communities to realize their full potential. We do this by collaborating with community organizations to develop integrated community-building skills, indigenous leadership, and community building creativity in order to build local capacity and achieve greater economic, social, cultural and human development.

Projects/Activities: East Bay MAPP; Violence Prevention Initiative Youth MAPP; Strong Latino Communities Research Project; National Sector Conference; Community Development and Child Care Initiative; Statewide Training and Discussions and the Individualized Technical Assistance Program.

Agency: **The Unity Council**
1900 Fruitvale Ave., Suite 2A
Oakland, CA 94601

Phone: (510) 535-6900
Fax: (510) 534-7771
Web Address: www.unitycouncil.org/

Primary Contact: Arabella Martinez
Title: Chief Executive Officer
Phone: (510) 535-6900

Mission: The mission of The Unity Council is to help build the assets of families and low-income communities through a comprehensive program of sustainable physical, economic and social development.

Projects/Activities: **Fruitvale Village** (a transit oriented, mixed-use development); Job readiness, Early Head Start, affordable housing development, family services (multicultural and multi-lingual and include extensive activities, training, and education), **CIRCLES** (Comprehensive Integrated Resources for CalWORKs Limited English Speakers is a comprehensive job readiness and employment program that serves limited English language proficiency clients), **Fruitvale Main Street Initiative** (a comprehensive revitalization project with the goal of developing the economic potential of the Fruitvale commercial district), **Senior Services** (case management, translation, education, recreational activities and referrals), **HomeOwnership Center** (HOC) (provides comprehensive bilingual homeownership, financial fitness education, counseling programs, free monthly education workshops offered in English and Spanish, seminars and counseling in financial management, budgeting, savings and investment, information about and access to flexible community lending products) and Affordable Housing Development.

Honolulu, Hawaii

Agency: **Healthy Mothers, Healthy Babies Coalition of Hawai'i**
1500 S. Beretania Street, Suite 408
Honolulu, HI 96826

Phone: (808) 951-5805
Fax: (808) 941-4102
Web Address: www.hmhb-hawaii.org

Primary Contact: Nancy Partika,
Title: Executive Director
Phone: (808) 951-5805

Mission: Healthy Mothers, Healthy Babies Coalition of Hawai'i (HMHB) initially was established as a statewide steering committee and became a nonprofit (501-C-3) organization in 1992. This local nonprofit agency is part of a national network of organizations and individuals committed to improving Hawaii's maternal, child and family health through collaborative efforts in public education, advocacy, and collaboration.

Projects/Activities: **Development of cross-cultural educational materials for pregnant adolescents and women** ("Healthy & Hapai" Pregnancy Calendar -10,000 copies distributed annually; Educational notecards and poster development featuring artwork donated by noted Hawaii artist, Pegge Hopper, "Ho' oulu ola i ke aloha - Nurturing Life With Love."; "Success Against The Odds" video for pregnant teens; "Live Life Before You Make One," Teen Pregnancy Prevention Campaign), **Collaborative advocacy** (Passage of expanded Medicaid/MOMI coverage for pregnant women and children; Advocacy for solutions to access for pregnant women under HealthQUEST; Passage of policy changes, such as Workplace Policy for Breastfeeding Women; Initiated Community Teams in Action, a statewide collaborative project on teen pregnancy and adolescent wellness with 10 community teams statewide)

Agency: **Consuelo Zobel Alger Foundation**
110 N. Hotel Street
Honolulu, HI 96817

Phone: (808) 532-3939
Fax: (808) 532-3930
Web Address: www.consuelo.org/index.html

Primary Contact: Dave Washburn
Title: Family Loan Program Manager
Phone: (808) 532-3939

Mission: The mission of Consuelo Foundation is to operate or support programs in Hawaii and the Philippines that improve the quality of life of disadvantaged children, women and families.

Projects/Activities: **Ke Aka Ho'ona Self-help Housing** -meaning the Spirit or Hope of Consuelo (a program to help working poor families on Oahu's Leeward Coast create their own neighborhood free of violence and substance abuse while building their own affordable homes. Efforts now focus on resident-centered leadership and management. Various homeowner committees have assumed most of the responsibility for covenant enforcement, planning community programs and activities for youth and adults, and creating a homeowners association. **Individual Development Accounts** (create matched savings accounts so that participants can accrue funds to pursue education, purchase a first home or repair an existing home. IDA savers must save a small amount monthly and attend money management seminars to build their financial skills) **Joint Venture with Hawaiian Home Lands** (A joint community-building project with the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL) will provide 32 self-help homes and a community center by the end of 2005)

