



eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Center for Urban Research and Learning:
Publications and Other Works

Centers

12-2003

Neighborhood Voices: Getting It Together -- Connecting Local Neighborhoods and National Advocates

Anne Pasmanick

National Neighborhood Coalition

National Neighborhood Coalition

Recommended Citation

Copyright © [2003] Center for Urban Research and Learning at Loyola University Chicago

This Technical Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Centers at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Center for Urban Research and Learning: Publications and Other Works by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).

Copyright © 2003 National Neighborhood Coalition

Neighborhood *Voices*

National Neighborhood
Leadership Summit

December, 2003



Neighborhood Voices

National Neighborhood
Leadership Summit

December, 2003



Copyright © 2003 by the National Neighborhood Coalition. All rights reserved.

Additional copies of *Getting It Together: Connecting Local Neighborhoods and National Advocates* are available from the coalition. To order, contact:

National Neighborhood Coalition

1030 15th St. NW, Suite 325

Washington, DC 20005

Phone: 202/408-8553

Fax: 202/408-8551

info@neighborhoodcoalition.org

www.neighborhoodcoalition.org

Editor

Lynora Williams, Lyric Editorial Services

Design

Morgan Graphics

Printing

Doyle Printing

Getting It Together

Connecting Local Neighborhoods and National Advocates

**A REPORT BY THE
NATIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD COALITION**

Anne Pasmanick, Executive Director

**THIS REPORT WAS FUNDED THROUGH A GENEROUS GRANT FROM:
THE METLIFE FOUNDATION**

Background on the National Neighborhood Coalition

The Voice for Neighborhoods

The National Neighborhood Coalition (NNC) is a national organization - with a grassroots focus - whose mission is to build, maintain and strengthen neighborhoods, especially those of lower-income residents. With more than 120 members, who collectively reach literally millions of individuals, NNC forms a network of national and local community development leaders working together to forge cutting-edge policies and programs that promote healthy neighborhoods. Our strength lies in the versatility and reach of our members, which include foundations, faith-based organizations, financial institutions, community-based groups and government agencies of all sizes. Whatever their size or scope, all NNC members share a common goal - to maintain and bolster the vitality of our nation's neighborhoods

The NNC serves as a crucial link to Washington, DC for neighborhood- and community-based organizations. It is also the single largest and most comprehensive networking resource for regional and national organizations involved in community development, housing and other neighborhood issues. The NNC convenes people and

"Your coalition of national organizations and legislative and grassroots leaders provides a powerful voice in Washington, one that must continue to be heard."

- Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton

organizations concerned about neighborhoods, serves as a conduit of information about programs and policies and aggressively advocates for neighborhoods and community- and neighborhood-based organizations.

NNC was founded in 1979 to represent the interests of low-income neighborhoods at the national level and to promote to a strong role for community-based organizations in federal policies and programs. NNC has played prominent roles in putting - and keeping - the revitalization of neighborhoods on the national agenda. Accomplishments include shaping the national smart growth debate to reflect the needs of low-income communities, ensuring that banks' community reinvestment exams be made public, and successfully advocating for community representation on the Federal Housing Finance Board.

NNC strengthens neighborhoods and instills positive social change by providing community leaders and advocates with current information used to foster neighborhood growth, an opportunity to learn from each other and work together toward common goals and a powerful forum to make their collective voices heard by policy makers, industry leaders, and the media.

We believe in neighborhoods as the heart and soul of our nation and its communities.











Table of Contents

Introduction	1
The Two-Way Street: Communities Win With Local-National Collaboration	5
The Connectors: Tools for Partnership	7
Local and National Advocacy: The Same But Different	12
From Community Collaborative to Better Schools	15
 Appendices	
Appendix I: About the Research	19
Appendix II: About the Summit	21
Appendix III: About NNC	23





INTRODUCTION

Neighborhoods - and the importance of strong communities to prosperity and cohesion - are often the subject of platitudes from elected officials, business leaders and other decision makers. But the political will to address these problems and invest in neighborhoods' success sometimes flags.

"The health and vitality of neighborhoods is a key indicator of the quality of our life together," says John Carr, executive director for social development and world peace at the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. "Neighborhoods are very much a part of the rhetoric of public life - but the resources go elsewhere; neighborhoods are part of the culture of public discourse - but often the policy and priorities lie elsewhere."

Committed neighborhood residents have organized neighborhood groups to address the gap between rhetoric and reality, to champion the rights of families to decent and affordable housing, access to health care, quality education and fair employment. These groups have mobilized citizenry for social change, built life-saving social service programs, constructed housing and generated hundreds of millions of dollars in community resources. Over time, a movement of neighborhood-based community activists has transformed itself into a professional field engaging in community development and policy advocacy in rural areas, suburbs and cities, presenting informed arguments for change at City Hall, in state legislatures and on Capitol Hill.

Community development professionals and neighborhood leaders and residents still work toward the goals they have aspired to for decades. They want to develop the inventory of resources that more well off communities take for granted. They want to improve the quality of life for people with low and moderate incomes in neighborhoods where disinvestment has stripped away resources and opportunities. Neighborhood leaders, who share a history of community advocacy, say they are particularly

concerned about affordable housing, job creation, education, condition of housing stock, commercial development and redevelopment, homelessness and health care, according to a 2003 study by the Center for Urban Research and Learning at Loyola University Chicago commissioned by the National Neighborhood Coalition (NNC).

Increasingly, neighborhood leaders worry that these many community challenges cannot be addressed adequately and holistically until the complementary relationship between local groups and the Washington-based organizations they rely upon for representation in federal advocacy becomes stronger. They say that a more fruitful connection between groups operating in these different contexts will require:

- ◆ Greater collaboration and coalition-building efforts on short- and long-term goals.
- ◆ Bolstering of mutually beneficial divisions of labor between local and national organizations, informed by an identification of shared interests and strategic priorities of both.
- ◆ Shared response to a crisis in participation and leadership development within low-income neighborhoods most affected by limited resources and opportunities.

This report, focusing on the national relationship to local organizations, local and regional coalitions, and the forging of complementary relationships, shows that the work of advocates based in Washington can be bolstered by a renewed immersion in the day-to-day challenges of "local" groups. The frustrations of the "local" groups can be mitigated with a deeper appreciation of the constrained realities of federal advocacy in a period of devolution, retrenchment in social services and relentless assault on the role of government in providing basic supports for people and their communities.

DIFFICULT, BUT NOT IMPOSSIBLE

Getting It Together: Connecting Local Neighborhoods and National Advocates highlights the experience of organizations that have built complementary relationships between local practitioners and national advocates. Chicanos Por La Causa (CPLC) in Tucson, Arizona, for instance, has found that its influence and effectiveness has multiplied many times over because of the strength of its collaboration with the Washington-based National Council of La Raza. The two groups worked together to mount a powerful voter mobilization campaign in Tucson. Activists profiled here from Albuquerque's Sawmill community drew upon the technical assistance and bridge-building capacities of the national Center for Community Change to pull off the development of a successful energy-efficient low-income housing development. Leaders of several Asian American community development corporations found that policy makers in Washington did not have a sufficient understanding of the issues facing low-income Asian American and Pacific Islander communities, and so forged the National Coalition for Asian Pacific American Community Development (National CAPACD); rural Floridians working to hold on to affordable housing found welcome assistance from the Washington, DC-based Housing Assistance Council (HAC).

In other instances, community development groups need to strengthen linkages in the local or regional context. This report shows how local immigrant rights advocates in and around Washington, DC, found a way to benefit from their pooled efforts; how concerned parents in New York City learned that coalition building in multiple neighborhoods within the city was key to bringing about educational reform.

Such local coalitions and national-local collaborations, however, remain sporadic and far too serendipitous, as shown by the frustrations of

neighborhood leaders that found expression at NNC's 2003 National Neighborhood Leadership Summit and in the Loyola University inquiry, *Local Perspectives on Current and Emerging Issues Facing Urban, Suburban and Rural Communities*.¹

CHALLENGES TO NATIONAL LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS

NNC commissioned *Local Perspectives* in order to increase its awareness and that of a comprehensive national membership about the issues that local groups identify as priorities and their perspectives on how to generate neighborhood transformation in the current climate. With the dramatic social, economic and political changes experienced in the U.S. in recent decades, many nationally based leaders no longer have a unifying big-picture perspective to inform their social change objectives and their relationships to local affiliates.

NNC wanted to understand more fully the dynamics that affect neighborhood leaders and coalitions in their daily efforts, hoping these inquiries and discussions would allow local organizations, often left out of national agenda-setting discussions, to define their own priorities, needs, strategies and challenges. These expectations were realized when participants responded generously with their time and enthusiastically embraced the opportunity to provide input. Their reflections can help advance the ability of national and local organizations to combine their expertise and vantage points to advocate more effectively.

Tensions around communication, comprehension and collaboration between "the base" and "the field" are not unique to community development and neighborhood advocacy. But the unique nature of progressive action - dependent as it is on grassroots activity and fluid hierarchies - requires more creative responses than, say, a political party, a multi-layered corporation or even a

governmental department. With limited resources and enormous pressures on time, effective national-local interaction - and even local-regional linkages - by progressive advocates requires innovation, dedication and persistence.

Community development group members can point to countless instances in which local-national collaboration works well. Action by local groups helps national organizations make their case to national policy makers. Local groups and their constituents benefit from the leadership of their national counterparts in policy making. Yet, local and national organizations are divided by different daily experiences in their work and different demands on their time. Dialogue between national organizations and the local groups directly organizing residents and building civic infrastructure, therefore, can help advocates keep pace with their constituents' challenges and policy priorities.

Advocates may find agreement on fundamental definitions challenging. The *local* label changes its connotation significantly depending on geographic and political context. Local groups tend to work hands-on to provide services, develop housing, organize residents and establish relationships with decisionmakers. The perception of "community" and "neighborhood" also varies by geography - central city organizations tend to describe themselves as "community-based," as opposed to suburban and rural groups, which are often government or quasi-government agencies. Real differences in the political culture of cities, suburbs and rural areas affect the operation of community organizations and the level of participation by neighborhood residents. Groups that identify themselves as community-based are more likely to emphasize the importance of giving a voice to neighborhood residents as part of their mission. These differences in approach

It's important to recognize that the work done at each level is connected. Because they are focused on the day-to-day work of running the organization, local leaders may not immediately see how a change in funding levels or program guidelines made in Washington, D.C. affects them directly.

*- Moises Loza,
Housing Assistance Council*

may have important implications for a national neighborhood agenda as well as for emerging advocacy networks as suburban populations grow.

In turn, the *national* in the national-local connections may not necessarily mean an organization that holds national stature because it has an office in Washington, DC, but because the organization represents a tangible network of *local* organizations and a meaningful knowledge base created by *local* activity. National groups frequently serve as policy advocates on neighborhood issues, safeguarding and developing programs, policies and budget allocations that make the work of local groups possible. Some national groups provide training, technical assistance and funding to local organizations.

Regardless of definitions and disagreements, "communication is important," asserted a summit participant. "We don't have to agree. It's the dynamic and process of communicating that's important. What we need to do next is to develop a set of expectations. NNC should do this. What do local groups expect from national organizations and what do national groups expect from local groups? This set of expectations should be used to guide the direction of NNC's next steps. We could rethink and revise from year to year."

A NATIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD AGENDA - NNC'S NEW DIRECTION

After serving as the voice of neighborhoods in Washington since 1979, NNC is intensifying its efforts to promote a far more intentional and systematic connection between local organizations and the larger, nationally focused organizations. The coalition will also work more intentionally to expand the neighborhood movement to include the myriad neighborhood groups, municipal agencies, civic organizations and others that do not identify strictly as community development groups and do not necessarily affiliate with a national organization.

In its desire to more closely reflect the concerns of its constituent organizations and communities, NNC based *Getting It Together* on the 2003 NNC National Leadership Summit and on the Loyola researchers' national survey, focus groups in five cities, and comprehensive case studies. As a result of what was learned, NNC is expanding its role as a facilitator of healthy, functioning and sustainable neighborhoods. This report, for instance, will serve as the springboard of a pending publication planned by NNC. NNC hopes that such a publication will help catalyze dialogue and

partnership among the country's neighborhood advocates by highlighting the collaborative strategies of community development corporations, immigrant rights groups, affordable housing advocates and other organizations, and by highlighting community views of the state of America's neighborhoods.

NNC's wide-ranging membership, credibility with policymakers and connection to local leaders makes it uniquely qualified to address the gaps neighborhood leaders want so much to bridge. The coalition's 3-pronged strategy for strengthening bonds between local and national neighborhood revitalization groups and building a national neighborhood agenda includes a revised community forum strategy; renewed, more intentional, outreach to organizations outside the beltway that work collaboratively to affect neighborhood change; and a journal that features neighborhood voices. Most of all, NNC hopes to shine its light on the thousands of groups that bring residents, business people, researchers and government officials together to improve the quality of life in low-income neighborhoods. In this way, NNC hopes to help bring the nation's neighborhood-focused rhetoric in line with its policies and priorities.

The "national" in the national-local connections may not necessarily mean an organization that is important because it has an office in Washington, DC, but because the organization represents a network and knowledge base that is, in essence, a network of local organizations and a knowledge base created by local activity.

*- Anne Pasmanick,
National Neighborhood Coalition*

THE TWO-WAY STREET:

COMMUNITIES WIN WITH LOCAL-NATIONAL COLLABORATION

Low-income communities count on local groups like Albuquerque's Sawmill Advisory Council (SAC) and the Florida Low Income Housing Associates (FLIHA) as their advocates. Such groups help community residents solve emergency problems such as unwarranted evictions; develop informed community leadership; press local policymakers to endorse their advocacy positions and deliver essential community services. Many organizations can list impressive successes - helping to reduce poverty in the colonias of New Mexico or garnering statewide support for a Maryland equitable school funding initiative. Despite such achievements, neighborhood leaders are calling out for help in expanding community organizing capacity and increasing financial resources in depressed communities.

The experiences of SAC and FLIHA, one urban and the other rural, show how their problem-solving capacities can be greatly magnified when they strike partnerships with national groups that understand their needs. One national leader, Bob Reeder of Community Land Trust Network (CLTN), states, "The network is like a two-way street. We're ambassadors. We carry the message from local constituents to the national level."²

SAC fought to protect Sawmill neighborhood residents from industrial pollutants left behind by the now-shut Duke City Lumber Company mills and worked to stop the out-migration of young community members. In 1997, SAC enlisted the help of the Center for Community Change (CCC), a national organization whose staff has extensive community-based organizing experience, after Albuquerque city officials announced that they planned to redevelop Sawmill. CCC suggested residents take advantage of an owner's plans to sell a

Sawmill industrial property by establishing a community land trust. CCC connected SAC with the Institute for Community Economics' CLTN, a national organization providing technical assistance to local communities. With their help, SAC established the Sawmill Community Land Trust (SCLT). Like CCC, CLTN also served as a matchmaker. In the course of their work, they put Sawmill community leaders in touch with leaders from other communities such as Burlington, Vermont, who had successfully established land trusts.

SAC went to the Albuquerque City Council and suggested that the community and the city buy the property for a land trust. The national organizations helped local activists formulate and implement strategies that they might not have accomplished independently. The interaction between the Sawmill advocates and these two national organizations exemplifies the powerful way in which such a relationship can result in dramatically increased capacity at the local level - a form of assistance desperately sought by many neighborhood groups.

CCC organizer Wesley Woo observes that community organizations "will ask for one thing and invariably another thing comes up. A lot of this revolves around developing a relationship and trust" between the national and local organizations.³

Dory Wegrzyn, SCLT project director, echoes this. The original request for assistance to CCC was not specifically for help forming a land trust, but for assistance in organizing the community more effectively. "We had no clue that [the land trust] would come out of the early planning process with CCC."⁴

As the project moved ahead, CLTN helped SCLT "to figure out the structure of the organization, bylaws, and board," states Wegrzyn. The project director adds that CLTN gave them "all of the elements [needed] to give the organization strength and legal capacity to move forward."

One Albuquerque focus group participant explained how it is easy to become absorbed in the work of providing and developing housing, only to discover that there is just as much need to build membership and get the community out there fighting for the cause.

"You can't say enough about organizing because the other sectors are organized: the business community is organized ...the financial community is organized. Just go to the state and see how organized they are," he said.

The further organizations delve into a community problem, the more clear it becomes that organizing is a key step, demanding more staff and resources than many neighborhood organizations have. As a result, organizations must make a choice between focusing on program delivery and administration versus organizing.

As Wegrzyn points out, effective help from outside the community is not just a matter of providing assistance on the technical aspects of such an undertaking. She emphasizes the big difference between "theory and practice. You really need more background in organizing skills than affordable housing expertise." She praised CLTN and its parent group, ICE, for its knowledgeable staff who not only knew about land trusts, but who had experience in organizing them. They knew how to address community politics, how to approach local elected officials as well as how to get financing and set up the legal structures of the trust.

The knowledge that SCLT could fall back on CCC when it needed help significantly strengthened the local-to-national relationship. Some national organizations "jump around" and are not there when you need them weeks or months after an initial contact, Wegrzyn complains, but both CCC and ICE were always "on

call" and fully behind the Sawmill community. This availability was in contrast to SCLT's short-lived relationship with another organization, a link that failed to thrive when Sawmill organizers found its help of less value because the group's staff had no on-the-ground experience and were not as consistently available as the CCC and ICE colleagues.

The relationship may have also worked because of the national organizations' careful attention to the way in which they relate to local groups. CCC's Wesley Woo explains, "I don't think that the reason the relationship worked was because CCC is 'national,' per se. I think it worked because we have a perspective of trying to help grassroots groups develop their own capacities and because we had enough collective or institutional experience to have some ideas and relationships which many local groups do not."⁵ CLTN's Reeder is quick to point out that his network was created by locally based leaders of existing community land trusts who expressed a need for a national network.

The Washington-based Housing Assistance Council (HAC) takes a similar approach when it works with local and regional organizations such as FLIHA, which helps low-income residents in Florida's rural Citrus and Marion Counties. HAC provides loans, technical assistance, research, information and training workshops for community housing and receives funding through HUD's Self-Help Ownership Opportunity Program (SHOP) which it passes on to local communities to help finance site acquisition and infrastructure improvements. Rather than going into a community with a plan, HAC waits to be asked to come in and then, based on what local organizations say they need, offers the appropriate tools. HAC Executive Director Moises Loza feels that most local organizations HAC works with would succeed even if they never received HAC's assistance, but that often HAC helps them to move towards their goals more quickly by providing shortcuts in the process of building affordable housing.⁶

CONTINUED ON PAGE 11

Connectors: Tools for Partnership

Desperate for Connections

Many people feel detached from civic institutions and the political process in our country. This perception is increasing in the face of the federal administration's absence of a domestic agenda and increased investment in wartime activities. Lowest-income people, often operating outside the economic mainstream and excluded from political decision making, are most isolated.

This failure to connect is, in turn, exacerbated by the estrangement of many community-based organizations from their national counterparts and national policymaking. Community leaders believe that national groups are often unaware of the complexity of their daily work and the creativity of the solutions they craft to address local problems.

This isolation, which often appears to be deepening at both levels, translates into a lack of involvement or a general apathy among residents and particularly among youth in a community. Families feel "desperate for connections," said one participant in the Loyola University study commissioned by NNC. Concern is growing about the lack of opportunities for young people to connect to the community; this issue was raised repeatedly in focus group discussions and by NNC National Leadership Summit participants. One community leader expressed anger at an apparent lack of responsibility toward youth at any level of government, saying that many youth have "nothing going for them, and nothing is going to change for them."

At the same time there may be a gap in our perception of participation. "In many low-income neighborhoods, there actually are youth that are involved, but maybe in an informal way. Our perception of youth not being involved may be inaccurate, i.e., 'if they are not involved in our stuff, then they are not involved.'" A summit participant noted that what appears to be civic disengagement really translates into residents not having enough time to participate. It is hard to get large groups out to neighborhood meetings when lower-income residents are working two or three jobs just to survive, so getting them out to do political organizing is almost impossible.

"This isn't think-tank stuff. This isn't theory. This isn't ideology for us. This is every day experience. When people ask, 'How do you educate kids? How do you fight crime? How do you build housing? How do you overcome disinvestment?' the answer is: 'That's who we are and what we do every day with our colleagues and allies on a local level.' " - John Carr, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops

Connectors: Tools for Partnership

Neighborhood Leaders' Key Concerns

ADDRESSING DISENGAGEMENT

National organizations have no hope of developing a winning policy agenda for neighborhoods if residents are not engaged at the local level. The struggle to engage residents is made more difficult by a lack of resources and time - local organizations are loaded to capacity with the daily requirements of fundraising, service delivery, advocacy, administration and the hands-on details of neighborhood outreach. Youth engagement is particularly challenging. Local organizations need better, more timely and more compelling strategies to successfully engage residents in meaningful youth development programs. There is a dire need for youth-focused leadership training programs and resources, particularly those that link young people with meaningful engagement in public decision making forums.

Community-centered, participatory research provides people with an opportunity to actively engage in dialogue and shared agenda setting. Community members are powerfully linked when they experience the capacity of research to enable people to play a role in creating information about their own communities. Thus such research becomes an important tool for breaking community isolation.

BUILDING TWO-WAY CONNECTIONS BETWEEN NATIONAL AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

Local community-based organizations and national advocates fulfill different roles and have distinct experiences. Some local leaders feel as though the complexity of the issues they deal with at the neighborhood level and their contribution to social justice work is not fully understood by national organizations. There is also a sense of isolation among local organizations who feel there is not a larger movement around issues important to neighborhoods.

National organizations can help by working directly with local organizations to uncover and examine the issues that are important to neighborhoods and to use this information to inform their work on national policy. There is also a need to support the kind of community-based research conducted by neighborhood groups, local universities and community-oriented research organizations. As one focus group attendee said, "it would be nice if there was a more clear...linkage between the people that are actually doing the work and people who are creating the policy."

PROMOTING COLLABORATION AND COALITION BUILDING EFFORTS

Coalitions at the local, state and national levels are an effective way to strengthen the community voice in policy venues. Local community leaders value coalitions because they help coordinate and distribute workloads. Coalitions can put their weight behind neighborhood-friendly legislative action and can leverage resources beyond the individual capabilities of member organizations. While local organizations value the importance of coalitions, there are constraints to formation and maintenance, including funding for daily operation and staffing. A lack of organizational density in non-metropolitan areas is a significant problem. As a result, many rural organizations lack the kind of support that coalitions can offer. National organizations and funders can provide technical assistance and funding for the creation and maintenance of these types of support networks and can increase the profile of coalitions that work.

Connectors: Tools for Partnership

Current Neighborhood Priorities

Participants in the surveys and focus groups identified core issues that are essential to healthy, functioning communities. These issues (listed below) are largely taken for granted by those fortunate enough to have access to them.

- ◆ Affordable housing
- ◆ Education
- ◆ Job creation
- ◆ Condition of housing stock
- ◆ Homelessness
- ◆ Health care
- ◆ Childcare
- ◆ Neighborhood and commercial development/revitalization

Emerging Neighborhood Agendas

What's new on the agenda? Although the emerging concerns vary from one locality to another, community leaders are finding that they must find solutions for:

- ◆ Engaging youth in civic activity
- ◆ Addressing homeland security
- ◆ Gentrification
- ◆ Displacement of low-income families
- ◆ Energy concerns
- ◆ Race and ethnic group tensions
- ◆ The need for stepped-up leadership development

Connectors: Tools for Partnership

National Neighborhood Coalition's Plan

NNC is responding to what was learned through the research and summit, affirmatively and strategically. NNC is reshaping its program to emphasize opportunities for exchange between neighborhood-based and national policy advocates, broadening networks to include the range of organizations and sectors engaged in neighborhood work, identifying a national neighborhood agenda, and capturing the leading voices of the neighborhood movement.

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT FORUMS

NNC will hold quarterly forums in Washington, DC, featuring leaders in national and local neighborhood advocacy. Speakers will engage in dialogues about the policies, resources and collaborative strategies they view as essential to creating sustainable change in low-income neighborhoods. These sessions will help to deepen bonds between local and national change makers, encourage innovative collaboration between them and increase their influence with local, state and national public policy officials. Forums will identify and build support for a shared national neighborhood agenda.

NNC IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD

NNC will increase its presence in conferences and forums outside the beltway, bringing a national perspective to neighborhood groups and taking back local messages on how national policies are affecting neighborhoods and residents.

In these venues, NNC will share the lessons learned from our research and summit discussions and promote collaboration and coalition building among community organizations, universities, businesses, and other leaders in community development. NNC will help to identify potential areas of collaboration that are not already supported by local organizations' current affiliations. In particular, NNC will make special efforts to connect with the work of universities that are cooperative and collaborative in their relationship to local communities.

A NEW NATIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD PUBLICATION

NNC will fill a significant gap in the neighborhood revitalization movement by producing a quarterly journal and biennial periodical featuring the voices, perspectives and strategies for neighborhood and social change. The quarterly publication will elicit thoughtful articles and essays by national and local neighborhood leaders with underdocumented perspectives on low-income neighborhood conditions, the toll they take on families and communities, and the strategies required to overcome them. These original writings will articulate the national neighborhood agenda generated by NNC's work in the nation's capital and neighborhoods.

The biennial publication, the State of the Nation's Neighborhoods Report, will feature original essays by national community development leaders and will complement more data-driven reports. The State of the Nation's Neighborhoods Report will examine how neighborhood goals for housing, health and other key factors for community well being are being met and where the gaps are most acute. The publication will serve as a resource for local and national advocates, as well as policymakers at the local, county, state, regional and national levels.

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 6

In the mid-1990s, when FLIHA was working on a single-family home ownership project in Citrus County, its staff applied to HAC for a loan from its Rural Housing Loan Fund. The subsequent funding enabled them to complete much of the predevelopment work and to become eligible for a Florida Housing Finance Agency HOME grant. Since those beginnings, FLIHA has participated in SHOP, the Rural Housing Loan Fund, technical assistance, HUD pass-through money and other HAC-generated opportunities.

In Sawmill, meanwhile, 23 affordable, energy-efficient homes and a surrounding community plaza have already been completed on the reclaimed 27-acre site. Ninety more units are planned along with additional development including a community center, a neighborhood park and job-producing commercial and industrial sites. The trust retains permanent ownership

of the land and sells housing developed on this land to low- and moderate-income families. Resale restrictions in the land lease to homeowners insure that housing will be affordable for generations to come. And in November 2003, SCLT founder and associate director Debbie O'Malley won a seat on the Albuquerque City Council, an election hailed as a major victory by smart growth advocates and likely to solidify the future of Sawmill's land trust. As O'Malley explains, "The land trust idea is founded in a way people have traditionally felt, that the land is not real estate, but part of the people's history." She adds, "It's a sense of community, with tight groups of people who have lived beside each other for decades and will continue to live in the area for future generations."⁷

LOCAL AND NATIONAL ADVOCACY:

THE SAME BUT DIFFERENT

When it comes to strengthening neighborhoods, "Washington needs a different perspective," argues John Carr of the Washington-based U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. "Washington thinks it knows best [but] we have to find ways to connect the people making the decisions to the everyday realities of the people living with those decisions. It's our relationships, our experiences, our connections and our sense of reality that we try to bring to this discussion. Given our ideas, our knowledge, our experience, our presence, our people, our leaders, if we get our act together we could make gains and a helluva difference."

An essential component of the process of getting it together, neighborhood groups believe, lies in learning to more fully appreciate the differences in policy advocacy at the local and national levels and in more intentional cooperation between local and national strategies.

Two national organizations, one relatively young, the other seasoned in civil rights struggle, are trying to find new ways of doing it right. The process is not easy, but it is doable. The National Coalition for Asian Pacific American Community Development (National CAPACD) and National Council of La Raza (NCLR) believe that close connections to the local groups they represent can make the most of everyone's strengths.

Leaders of local organizations appreciate the expertise of national advocacy organizations and acknowledge the critical role national advocates play in safeguarding federal resources in the era of devolution and in the absence of a domestic agenda. These contributions, they feel, can be even more useful if national policy issues can be approached in a less segmented fashion. The high degree of fragmentation makes it difficult for local organizations to build

constituent support for national campaigns. Viewing policies and programs from the vantage point of a community resident or family, they say, produces a more accurate picture of real needs and the effectiveness of private and public initiatives to address those needs. Local leaders are pressing for a greater national emphasis on issues with local impact, and for a greater role in the priority-setting process. (*For more on community priorities, see The Connectors, page 9.*) More significant than any specific issue identified by organizations at the top of the priorities list is the recognition that many issues are interrelated - affordable housing, job creation, education and childcare for example - and that community organizations need support and resources to address multiple issues in a holistic, sustainable way.

One Baltimore leader summed it up by observing that when you think about community development, you have to think about all the different components at once, but when issues are advocated at the state (or national) government level, they get broken down into separate pieces.

The timeline of national policymaking is also problematic for local organizations struggling with long-term comprehensive change. Community leaders are frustrated with the unrealistically short time periods in which government and foundations expect to see results from programs and initiatives they have supported. Education and children's health programs may need to be in place for a generation before results are fully realized, but if politicians or funders don't see change in two, four, or six years, they think it's time to move on to the next initiative.

Washington-based advocates call for greater appreciation of the impact of federal policy. Moises

Loza of Housing Assistance Council, for example, stresses that it is important to recognize that the work done at each level is connected. Because they are focused on the day-to-day work of running the organization and meeting constituent needs, local leaders may not immediately see how a change in funding levels or program guidelines made in Washington, DC, affects them directly.

Leaders of NCLR, the preeminent Latino-based civil rights organization and a long-time progenitor of voter registration/voter education issues, knew that local mobilization was the key to increased voter participation in 2002. In Tucson, NCLR teamed up with Chicanos Por La Causa Tucson (CPLC) to mount a voter mobilization campaign that drew upon NCLR's established expertise and CPLC's deep roots in Tucson's Latino communities.

The working relationship between NCLR and CPLC Tucson is the product of an evolving national organization benefiting from its grassroots origins, the long-term working relationships between national and local staff, integration of complementary local and national knowledge into ongoing projects, and effective use of communication technology that facilitates better information sharing and better interaction between partners.

Both organizations are dedicated to addressing the poverty that it sees as the root of Latino disenfranchisement. In a sense, these two groups grew up together. The "2002 Get Out the Vote" campaign presented a unique opportunity for Tucson Latinos, working through CPLC Tucson, to capitalize on the organization's local, statewide and national partnerships.

CPLC Tucson is an affiliate of Phoenix-based CPLC, a state-wide organization. Organized in 1969, CPLC first began its work in response to educational discrimination in the Phoenix public schools. When statewide measures, political influence or expertise are called for, CPLC is poised to step in. Its multitiered organizational structure facilitates the local connection,

since affiliates like CPLC Tucson are able to provide a direct connection to local issues for national organizations like NCLR. In 2002, CPLC Tucson and NCLR sought to increase participation in that year's election and to increase long-term civic engagement in local community and city politics. "Get Out the Vote" blended national and local resources and expertise. At the national level, NCLR engaged in the high-tech aspect of political campaigns, using national databases, direct mail, and computer-generated phone calling to contact potential voters. At the local level, armed with the data, local groups like CPLC Tucson followed up with what they knew how to do well -door-to-door mobilization of Latino turnout for the November 2002 national, statewide and local races. CPLC Tucson Assistant Vice President Tillie Arvizu points out that the national organization "needs to rely on grassroots organizations to do something like Get Out The Vote because we are embedded in the community."⁸

The program's success also springs from a well-integrated and multilevel organizational relationship between national and local partners. NCLR is structured in such a way as to encourage local and regional input in programs and planning. Established in 1968, NCLR itself grew out of local organizing in the Southwest. Although NCLR is now firmly established in Washington with tentacles throughout the country, the council once rented office space from some of the same Southwest local organizations that it now works with. Much of its staff has come from the local organizations. For example, Lauturo Diaz, an NCLR vice president, was a CPLC Tucson staff member before moving to the national organization. Diaz "took knowledge gained at the local level to the national organization," Arvizu observes.

Arvizu believes that these productive working relationships have evolved, facilitated by improved communications systems available to local and national organizations. Reflecting on her 20 years of work with CPLC and NCLR, she explains, "We used to have to remind the national leaders that we're here too.

Information needs to be filtered down to the local level." She also notes that there was sometimes a gap in the local organization's knowledge of "how to benefit from their relationship with NCLR beyond the annual conference." In addition to developing national structures that are more responsive to local interests and priorities, Arvizu points to e-mail and other newer, accessible, more efficient modes of communication between national and local organizations as facilitating more timely information-sharing.

The relationship between the two groups allowed "each partner to maximize what they do best," observes National NCLR Coordinator Clarissa Martinez. It also "diminished the learning curve" for local organizations adapting sophisticated national campaign tools or for national organizations campaigning locally, enabling the project to move ahead quickly and efficiently.⁹ In essence, local and national organizations were training each other in the process of achieving their goals while inventing and testing voter and civic engagement strategies. As the data from the joint effort is analyzed, NCLR intends to use the results to provide other organizations with advice and a manual on proven strategies to increase Latino political participation.

While NCLR has relied on years of experience to hone its working relationships, National CAPACD is bent on forging new terrain. Created in 1999, National CAPACD supports activities ranging from the creation of more affordable housing and economic opportunities to political empowerment and advocacy on the behalf of diverse AAPI communities.¹⁰ As this young organization grows, it must find ways to establish a national presence while remaining connected and relevant to its grassroots organizational founders.

As executive director of San Francisco's Chinatown Community Development Corporation (CCDC) and National CAPACD board chair, Gordon Chin says the idea of creating a national organization that could complement the work of local community development

corporations (CDCs) floated around in the AAPI network for some time. Lisa Hasegawa, National CAPACD executive director, notes that leaders of many of the organizations involved in the creation of National CAPACD felt frustrated by what they perceived to be a lack of familiarity with AAPI issues on the part of Washington policymakers.¹¹ Her organization commissions reports, issues policy briefs and conducts documentation studies of local communities. Although local CDCs engaged in housing development made up National CAPACD's initial membership, over time it has broadened to include a more diversified group of community-based organizations. One coalition priority, Chin stresses, is to nurture new leaders from the ranks of the diverse AAPI communities - people who are immigrants, welfare recipients and low-wage workers.

As a young organization, National CAPACD is still working out the nature of its relationships with local organizations. Hasegawa believes that as the director, she must find ways to get local organizations to trust her and to convey their top concerns. National CAPACD's strength derives from its member local organizations. Part of this ongoing effort to build the connections between the national organization and local groups includes the development of the "Community in the Capital" project. The project will train grassroots leaders on public policy engagement and bring them to Washington to advocate on Capitol Hill. This can result not only in local community leaders gaining a greater understanding of policy, but can also provide National CAPACD with insights into what is important locally.

Hasegawa says National CAPACD provides an "AAPI lens" on the impact that policy proposals will have on communities it represents; at the same time "the local organizations hold National CAPACD accountable for creating programs of value to local organizations," an accountability measure critical to forging partnerships that can deliver meaningful gains.

FROM COMMUNITY COLLABORATIVE TO BETTER SCHOOL

Local leaders generally credit national organizations as having in-depth knowledge of policy issues and value their big-picture perspectives. But they feel that their own local outlook is a holistic one, and that they have a special appreciation of how policy affects people where they live. Sometimes a local coalition can be as powerful as a productive partnership with a national organization. Local coalitions can put their weight behind neighborhood-friendly legislative action and can leverage resources beyond the individual capabilities of member organizations.

For instance, the Community Collaborative to Improve District 9 Schools (CC9), a New York City neighborhood-based group of parent and other advocates, is the first attempt by a community and parents' group to work collaboratively to address the problem of educational failure across an entire school district. Although New York City is now undergoing a transformation of its educational governance structure, traditionally schools have been organized into 32 school districts with representative community school boards. The superintendents in each district report to the citywide school chancellor. CC9 is trying to forge new partnerships between teachers, school administrations, parents and the community in order to change the way educational policy and practices are shaped and delivered.

CC9's successes demonstrate the power of coalition efforts. CC9 can trace its roots to the mid-1990s and the collaboration between New Settlement Apartments (NSA), a housing development of nearly 900 families in the South Bronx, and the Institute for Education and Social Policy (IESP), a center at New York University that provides policy studies, research, evaluations, and technical assistance to groups engaged in educational

reform.¹² This joint effort spurred the development of the Parent Action Committee (PAC).

PAC initially focused on the failure of District 9 to promote literacy adequately; they later narrowed the focus to one school, P.S. 64, after parents realized that they were not yet ready to tackle the problems of the entire district. IESP was able to provide the parents with the information and resources they needed to push their claims with the local school administration. They discovered that the school principal and district superintendent were unwilling to recognize the magnitude and urgency of the problem.

At the beginning of the 1997-1998 academic year, PAC moved to build a broader base of support by engaging in community-wide organizing activities. Once again, the IESP staff served as a resource; in particular, the staff shared organizing experiences with PAC members based on its work with other community groups across the city. NSA continued to provide important resources as well, including the assignment of a new social worker with community organizing experience to work with PAC. The parents held a series of forums and community meetings to recruit other parents and develop a more complete picture of the local school situation. The group began to realize that the low literacy rate at the school reflected a failure of leadership; it focused its demand for change on the removal of the principal.

PAC organized public demonstrations at local school board meetings. It gathered 1000 signatures on a petition for the principal's removal; then delivered the petitions to the district superintendent and the city's school chancellor. With the assistance of IESP staff, PAC produced a report documenting the failure of the school administration and making a case for its

replacement. These actions paid off when, just before the end of the school year, the principal resigned.

Although PAC members participated in the process of hiring a new principal, parents were left with the feeling that nothing substantial had changed. PAC was beginning to realize that to be effective it would need to build a broader movement by organizing parents across the district. PAC and IESP began to make initial

overtures to a number of community-based organizations. The result: creation of the Community Collaborative to Improve District 9 Schools (CC9), the first attempt in New York City to create an entity that would bring together community-based organizations to organize parents and neighborhood residents to effect educational reform in the South Bronx. Collaborative members include New Settlement Apartments, Highbridge Community Life Center, ACORN, Citizens

Advice Bureau, Mid-Bronx Senior Citizens Council, Northwest Bronx Community and Clergy Coalition and IESP.

Within a relatively short timeframe, the collaborative has accomplished a great deal. In its first year (2001-2002), it secured foundation funding, hired organizers for each of the member organizations, developed an organizational structure, formed school-based organizing committees and held a series of public demonstrations that resulted in greater visibility.¹³ During the second year (2002-2003), it developed the Platform for Educational Improvement. This platform recognizes that educational reform needs the support of teachers, principals, families and the community to succeed. It calls for building a stronger teaching force through the recruitment and development of lead teachers, increased professional development opportunities and partnerships with

Coalescing East to West

CC9 is just one example of a successful community coalition operating in today's complex economic and political environment. Other such coalitions include:

- ◆ The Balanced Development Coalition in Chicago is coordinated by the Organization of the NorthEast (ONE) and the Logan Square Neighborhood Association (LSNA), two long-standing umbrella organizations for a range of community-based organizations, religious congregations, educational institutions and other groups. The coalition has almost 20 organizational members representing organizations in many of Chicago's 77 community areas. Over the past two years, coalition activities, including citywide demonstrations attended by more than 1,000 residents have put direct pressure on local officials and have brought about the establishment of more than 120 new affordable housing units in the city.
- ◆ Rally for the Region in Maryland, coordinated by the Citizens Planning and Housing Association (CPHA), is an annual event that brings organizations together to focus on legislative issues ranging from improved public transit to drug treatment centers. The 2002 rally brought out over 2,500 people from more than 100 organizations. This large turnout is much harder for policymakers and press to ignore than a small event by a single organization.
- ◆ At the 2003 NNC National Summit, former Seattle Mayor Norm Rice, now leading the Seattle Federal Home Loan Bank and president of the Council of Federal Home Loan Banks, pointed with pride to the power of community coalition building in Seattle. There a host of job development groups joined together as the Seattle Jobs Initiative to respond more effectively to a large foundation's workforce development grant. As a result, thousands of previously unemployed people now earn a livable wage.
- ◆ The National Capital Immigration Coalition (NCIC), formed in 2002 in Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia, according to one leading member, "to harness the strength and vitality of Washington's Latino and immigrant groups." This group includes immigrant advocates, community-based organizations, churches and local unions. Jaime Contreras, Service Employees International Union Local 82 secretary-treasurer and an organizer of NCIC, believes that the coalition has come a long way with a clear set of goals and the ability of member groups to put aside their individual agendas in order to focus on common issues like legalization, voting rights and civic participation. While Contreras has found his international union and several other national organizations supportive, in general NCIC has not worked very closely with national groups. He says national organizations are valuable information sources but they rarely commit additional resources to help. National groups, he believes, are focused primarily on policy positions; his coalition takes action.

university schools of education. It includes leadership training and mentoring of school principals. Finally, it recognizes that school reform will require stronger connections between educators and families in the community.¹⁴

Connections made with other institutional forces involved in educational reform proved invaluable. By involving United Federation of Teachers (UFT) representatives in the platform planning process, the collaborative won union support. A sign of the growing political muscle of CC9 came in June 2003 when representatives of the Central Office of the New York Department of Education, regional school staff and local elected officials attended a public rally organized by CC9. In front of 450 parents and neighborhood residents, these stakeholders signed a pledge to work together to implement the platform.¹⁵

The group achieved a major victory when the chancellor of the New York school system approved the regional superintendent's recommendation to include all 10 schools that are part of the collaborative within one school network.

The CC9 experience demonstrates that not all community-based roads lead directly to national organizations. In some cases, sophisticated, experienced community-based organizations can coalesce to bring about policy changes at the citywide and regional level.

While local organizations everywhere can benefit from such coalitions, constraints to formation and maintenance can include the lack of philanthropic support for daily operation and staffing. A lack of organizational density in non-metropolitan areas is also a significant problem. As a result, many rural organizations lack the kind of support that coalitions can offer. National organizations and funders can provide technical assistance and funding for the creation and maintenance of these types of support networks and can provide and promote examples of coalitions that work.

In the 2003-2004 school year, CC9 is working to implement the platform. The collaborative plans a series of specific actions on the recruitment and training of principals and teachers, on parental access to principals, teachers and school information and on student performance. It is also working on ways to build stronger connections between the schools and the surrounding neighborhoods; by the end of the fall, approximately 300 teachers in eight out of the 10 schools had completed community tours and plans were under way to recruit volunteer classroom tutors from the area. As the collaborative pursues this strategy, it will demonstrate that community development work augments housing development, service delivery and other community initiatives and empowers local citizens to create the kind of community they need and desire.

¹For a full copy of the CURL report presented at NNC's National Neighborhood Leadership Summit, see www.neighborhoodcoalition.org.

²Center for Urban Learning and Research. Telephone interview with Bob Reeder. September 25, 2003.

³Center for Urban Learning and Research. Telephone interview with Wesley Woo. September 19, 2003


⁴Center for Urban Learning and Research. Interview with Dory Wegrzyn. Albuquerque, NM. July 25, 2003.

⁵Center for Urban Learning and Research. Email from Wesley Woo. September 22, 2003.

⁶Center for Urban Learning and Research. Telephone interview with Moises Loza. September 12, 2003.

⁷Kelly, Chris. "Albuquerque's Sawmill Community Land Trust Creates and 'Orchard of Life' for Neighborhood Residents." *Friends of the Catholic Campaign for Human Development Newsletter*. Fall 2000.

⁸Interview with Tillie Arvizu, Executive Director, Chicanos Por La Causa, Tucson, October 14, 2003 (telephone interview).



⁹Center for Urban Learning and Research. Telephone interview with Clarissa Martinez. October 14, 2003.

¹⁰National CAPACD Website: <http://www.nationalcapacd.org/about.htm>.




¹¹Center for Urban Learning and Research interview with Lisa Hasegawa. September 25, 2003.

¹²Zachary, Eric and Shoal Olatoye. *A Case Study: Community Organizing for School Improvement in the South Bronx*. Institute for Social and Education Policy, New York University. March 2001.

¹³Institute for Education and Social Policy. Unpublished documents.

¹⁴Institute for Education and Social Policy.

¹⁵Center for Urban Learning and Research interview with Eric Zachary. November 11, 2003.



Appendix I

About the Research

Center for Urban Research and Learning

An in-depth study by the Center for Urban Research and Learning (CURL) of Loyola University Chicago provided much of the material used in this report. The study, was commissioned by NNC in late 2002 and completed in 2003.

A total of 216 surveys were completed. Focus groups were conducted in Albuquerque, Atlanta, Baltimore, Chicago, San Francisco. Additionally CURL conducted a set of case studies of local and national neighborhood leaders.

CURL seeks to promote equality and to improve people's lives in communities throughout the Chicago metropolitan region. CURL pursues this goal by building and supporting collaborative research and education efforts. These partnerships connect Loyola faculty and students with community and nonprofit organizations, civic groups, and government agencies. Such collaborations link the skills and wisdom present within every community with the specialized knowledge and academic discipline of a vital urban university. Working together, community needs are addressed and the academic experience is enriched.

For more information about CURL, or to see the report and its case studies, visit the center online at <http://www.luc.edu/curl/>.

Case Study Interviews

Otilia (Tillie) Arvizu, Assistant Vice President
Chicanos Por La Causa Tucson

Gordon Chin, Executive Director
Chinatown Community Development Center

Jaime Contreras, Secretary-Treasurer
Local 82, Service Employees International Union,
Washington DC

Lauturo (Laut) Diaz, Deputy Vice President for
Community Development
National Council of La Raza

Lisa Hasegawa, Executive Director
National Coalition for Asian Pacific American
Community Development

Jennifer Kinney, Senior Loan Financial Officer
Housing Assistance Council

Sarah Jane Knoy, Executive Director
Organization of the NorthEast

Moises Loza, Executive Director
Housing Assistance Council

Clarissa Martinez, Director of State/Local Policy
National Council of La Raza

Aleyamma Mathew, Director of Programs
National Coalition for Asian Pacific American
Community Development

Bob Reeder, CLT Network Director
Community Land Trust Network, Institute for Community
Economics, Inc.

Dory Wegrzyn, Project Director
Sawmill Community Land Trust

Maureen Wilson, Executive Director
Florida Low-Income Housing Associates

Wesley Woo, Field Staff, San Francisco Office
Center for Community Change

Eric Zachary, Co-Director of the Community
Involvement Program
Institute for Education and Policy Studies

Focus Group Participants

ALBUQUERQUE

Isleta Pueblo Housing Authority, Isleta
 Dona Ana County Colonias Development Council, Las Cruces
 Habitat for Humanity of Valencia County, Belen
 Housing Assistance Council, Albuquerque
 Neighborhood Housing Services of Albuquerque, Albuquerque
 Archdiocese of Santa Fe, Albuquerque
 Enlace Comunitario, Albuquerque
 Housing Assistance Council, Albuquerque
 Sawmill Community Land Trust, Albuquerque
 Office for Community Learning and Public Service, Albuquerque
 Los Alamos Housing Partnership, Los Alamos
 Dona Ana County Colonias Development Council, Las Cruces
 Dona Ana County Colonias Development Council, Las Cruces

ATLANTA

Georgia Coalition to End Homelessness, Atlanta
 Georgia Community Development Association, Atlanta
 Federal Home Loan Bank of Atlanta, Atlanta
 Cobb Family Resources, Marietta
 Mercy Housing SouthEast - Atlanta, GA. Office, Atlanta
 United Way of Metro Atlanta, Atlanta
 Reynoldstown Revitalization Corporation, Atlanta
 Community Alliance of Metropolitan Parkway, Atlanta
 The Atlanta Project, Atlanta
 University Community Development Corporation, Atlanta
 Cooperative Resource Center, Incorporated, Atlanta
 Community Alliance of Metropolitan Parkway, Atlanta
 Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Atlanta
 English Avenue Community Development Corp., Atlanta
 National Council of Negro Women of Greater Atlanta, Atlanta
 East Point Community Action Team, East Point
 Trinity Community Ministries, Atlanta

BALTIMORE

Interfaith Housing of Western Maryland, Frederick
 Housing Opportunities Commission of Montgomery County, Kensington
 Tri-Churches Housing, Inc., Baltimore
 United Way of Central Maryland, Baltimore
 Maryland Center for Community Development, Baltimore
 Baltimore Coalition for Community Schools, Baltimore
 Southern Maryland Tri - County CAC, Hughesville
 Citizens Planning and Housing Association, Baltimore

CHICAGO

West Avalon Civic Group, Chicago
 Southeast Chicago Development Commission, Chicago
 Greater North Pulaski Development Corporation, Chicago
 Project Jobs, Chicago
 Corporation for Supportive Housing, Chicago
 Rogers Park Community Development Corporation, Chicago

SAN FRANCISCO

Filipino American Development Foundation/Wildflower Institute, San Francisco
 Toolworks, San Francisco
 Cameron House, San Francisco
 Asian Neighborhood Design, San Francisco
 Telegraph Hill Neighborhood Center, San Francisco
 Charity Cultural Services Center, San Francisco
 Manos Cooperative, Oakland
 Housing Conservation and Development Corporation, San Francisco
 Resources for Community Development, Berkeley
 Filipino American Development Foundation, San Francisco
 Council for Responsible Public Investment, Oakland

Appendix II

About the Summit

National Neighborhood Leadership Summit Agenda

June 25, 2003
Hotel Monaco, 700 F Street NW
Washington, DC

- 9:15-9:30am Summit Welcome and Objectives
John Carr, US Conference of Catholic Bishops
- 9:30-9:45 NNC Welcome
Thomas Shellabarger, US Conference of Catholic Bishops
NNC Co-Chair
- 10:00-10:45 ***LOCAL PERSPECTIVES ON NEIGHBORHOOD ISSUES***

Introduction: Susie Sinclair-Smith, Fannie Mae Foundation
Findings: Phil Nyden, Loyola University Chicago,
Center for Urban Research and Learning
- 11:00-12:30pm ***DISCOVERING COMMON GROUND***

Introduction: Jim Park, Freddie Mac
Moderator: Conrad Egan, National Housing Conference
- 12:30-1:30pm Lunch
Introduction: JoAnn Kane, McAuley Institute
Keynote: Norm Rice, Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle
- 1:30-4:00pm ***SOLUTIONS FOR EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP***
Introduction: Jane Henderson, Wachovia Bank
Moderators:
Anne Pasmanick, National Neighborhood Coalition - a discussion with local leaders
Lisa Hasegawa, National CAPACD - mobilizing local and national collaboration
- 4:00-4:15pm ***CLOSING CHARGE***
Deepak Bhargava, Center for Community Change

Appendix II

About the Summit

Summit Roundtable Discussion Participants

We would like to take this opportunity to thank the roundtable discussion participants at NNC's National Neighborhood Leadership Summit.

Conrad Egan, National Housing Conference (Moderator)

Lisa Hasegawa, National Coalition for Asian Pacific American Community Development (Moderator)

Anne Pasmanick, National Neighborhood Coalition, Executive Director

Orlando Artze, Local Initiatives Support Corporation

Sheila Black, Colonias Development Council

Pablo Eisenberg, Georgetown Public Policy Institute

Jane Henderson, Wachovia Corporation

Sandra Jibrell, Annie E. Casey Foundation

Bonnie Johnson, Community Alliance of Metropolitan Parkway

JoAnn Kane, McAuley Institute

Spence Limbocker, Neighborhood Funders Group

Moises Loza, Housing Assistance Council

Joe McNeeley, Development Training Institute

Jeff Nelder, Charity Cultural Services Center

Debbie O'Malley, Sawmill Community Land Trust

Vincent Pan, Heads Up

Jim Park, Freddie Mac

Roy Priest, National Congress for Community Economic Development

Nan Roman, National Alliance to End Homelessness

Becky Sherblom, Maryland Center for Community Development

Loretta Tate, Marshall Heights Community Development Organization

Martha Toll, Butler Family Fund

Robert Tourigny, Southern Maryland Tri-County Community Action Committee

Cathy Vates, Rogers Park Community Development Corporation

Matthew Weinstein, Citizens Planning and Housing Association

Appendix III

About NNC

2003 Board of Directors

NNC would like to take this opportunity to thank Julio Barreto and Marcia Sigal co-chairs of NNC's summit and research committee.

CHAIR

THOMAS SHELLABARGER
US Conference of Catholic Bishops

FOUNDING CHAIR

RAUL YZAGUIRRE
National Council of La Raza

VICE CHAIRS

KEN GROSSINGER
AFL-CIO

JOANN KANE
McAuley Institute

ROY PRIEST
National Congress for Community
Economic Development

BRITISH ROBINSON
Jesuit Conference USA

TREASURER

JOHN LEITH-TETRAULT
National Trust for Historic
Preservation

SECRETARY

STEVE TUMINARO
Neighborhood Reinvestment
Corporation

AT-LARGE MEMBERS

JULIO BARRETO JR.
National Association of Housing
and Redevelopment Officials

MILDRED BROWN
Acorn

JANE DEMARINES
National American Indian Housing
Council

RICHARD DINES
National Co-op Business
Association

CONRAD EGAN
National Housing Conference

RON FIELD
Volunteers of America

ALLEN FISHBEIN
Center for Community Change

KIRK GIBSON
National Alliance to End
Homelessness

LISA HASEGAWA
National Coalition for Asian Pacific
American Community Development

JOHN HOLDSCLAW
NCB Development Corporation

JEFF NUGENT
Development Training Institute

MARVIN OWENS
National Urban League

BRIAN PETERKIN-
VERTANESIAN
Community Action Partnership

ANNE RADER
SeedCo

MARCIA SIGAL
Council of State Community
Development Agencies

THERESA SINGLETON
Housing Assistance Council

ELLIE WEGENER
Employment Support Center

STOCKTON WILLAIMS
The Enterprise Foundation

NANCY WILLIS
Unitarian Universalist Affordable
Housing Corporation

NNC Staff

Anne Pasmanick, Executive Director

Janice Clark, Program Coordinator

Leah Kalinosky, Research Coordinator

