# Education and Training for Community Development

Neil S. Mayer

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

The following seven broad questions frame this study:

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

## Research Methods

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## WHO PROVIDES CD EDUCATION AND TRAINING?

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

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

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

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

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

## ACADEMIC VS. NONACADEMIC PROGRAMS

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

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

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

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

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

## FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

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

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

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

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

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

### MAJOR FINDINGS WITH CLEAR EVIDENCE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### NARROWER FINDINGS WITH CLEAR EVIDENCE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### PRELIMINARY FINDINGS REQUIRING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION/RESEARCH

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

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

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

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

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

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

## NOTES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## REFERENCES

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

## ADDITIONAL READING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Magee, Judith. 2002. Untitled memo for UCLA.

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

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

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

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

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

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

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

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