

---

# THE HISTORY AND FUTURE OF TRAINING AND EDUCATION FOR FAITH-BASED AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Joseph McNeely

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

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

## THE TRAINING SYSTEM

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

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

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

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

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

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

demonstration of proficiency to “graduate” and those simply requiring attendance and participation (Conservation Company 1997).<sup>3</sup>

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

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

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

## **TRAINING THE FIRST WAVE: THE ORIGINAL CDCs**

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

The first wave began with the original Ford Foundation and federally sponsored CDCs in the period from 1965 to 1975. An amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act in 1966 created the Special Impact Program (Title I; changed in 1972 to Title VII) to provide grants to CDCs. These CDCs were to focus on a special impact area, a specific target area qualified for the federal poverty program and usually already served by the education, health, and social services programs of the federal poverty effort. Only around 50 CDCs had implementation funding (Perry 1973).

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **TRAINING THE SECOND WAVE: NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZING TO DEVELOPMENT**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Higher education also stepped in to meet the need for skill development with both short-term and comprehensive long-term training and education programs.

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

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

### **TRAINING THE THIRD WAVE: DIVERSIFICATION IN THE 1990s**

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

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

## **PROLIFERATION**

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

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

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

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

## **SPECIALIZATION**

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

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

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

## **CONCLUSION**

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

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

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

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

**POLICY RECOMMENDATION: SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION**

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

**POLICY RECOMMENDATION: DEFINE CAPACITY BUILDING**

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

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

**POLICY RECOMMENDATION: SUPPORT LONGITUDINAL EVALUATIONS**

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

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

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

**POLICY RECOMMENDATION: CREATE A FRAMEWORK FOR CROSS-PROGRAM CREDENTIALING**

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

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

**POLICY RECOMMENDATION: MAKE ACADEMIA PRACTICAL**

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

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

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

**POLICY RECOMMENDATION: INCREASE ATTENTION TO PEOPLE OF COLOR**

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

**POLICY RECOMMENDATION: PROMOTE THE FIELD**

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

**POLICY RECOMMENDATION: FOCUS ON HUMAN CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT**

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

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

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

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

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

**BUILDING THE ORGANIZATIONS THAT BUILD COMMUNITIES**

---

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

---

## NOTES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<sup>7</sup>[http://www.snhu.edu/Home\\_Page/Academics/General\\_Info/School\\_of\\_Business/MSCEDNWP.html](http://www.snhu.edu/Home_Page/Academics/General_Info/School_of_Business/MSCEDNWP.html).

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.hud.gov/progdesc/copc.cfm>.

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

## **REFERENCES**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

## ADDITIONAL READING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

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