



*A University-Community Partnership Feasibility Study:
Opportunities and Challenges for Southeast Raleigh*
Executive Summary & Final Report

Jocelyn Taliaferro, MSW, PhD
NCSU Department of Social Work

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	3
II.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
III.	INTRODUCTION	11
	a. Community Development	11
	b. University Community Partnerships	12
	c. Southeast Raleigh Demographics	13
IV.	METHODOLOGY	15
V.	RESULTS: SECTION I: ASSETS	16
	a. Human and Social Capital	16
	b. Physical Development	17
	c. Community Institutions	18
VI.	RESULTS: SECTION II: NEEDS, ISSUES, CHALLENGES	23
	a. Physical Capital	23
	b. Human Capital	25
	c. Social Capital	32
	d. Service Coordination	35
	e. Social Problems	37
	f. Barriers to Community Research	38
VII.	DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	41
	a. Focus on Assets	42
	b. Capacity Building	43
	c. Resource Coordination	43
	d. Increased Service Learning	45
	e. Community Based Research	46
V.	APPENDICES	47
VI.	REFERENCES	51

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express gratitude to Tabitha Bivens and Justin Stanton for their coordination efforts during the data collection process of this project. Thank you to Barbara Metelsky, Director of the Institute for Nonprofits at North Carolina State University for her support and patience in the development of this document. Special thanks to the participants in the interviews and focus groups, the candid discussion and honest responses were essential to compiling this report. Your words, thoughts, and ideas will have an impact on the Southeast Raleigh Community beyond what you could ever image!

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Institute for Nonprofits at North Carolina State University commissioned a feasibility study to explore the possibility of submitting a Community Outreach Partnerships Center (COPC) grant to the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The COPC is a collaborative effort to address problems of urban areas through community development. The initiative would be designed to address at least three identified problems in the southeast region of Raleigh, NC. The goal of COPC grant projects is to stimulate community development using partnerships between universities and communities.

Community Development

Community development (CD) is defined using many perspectives, but in general, the goal of community development is to improve communities and enrich the lives of community residents (Chekki, 1979c; Cook, 1994; Head, 1979; Shragge & Fisher, 2001).

While community development has many components and definitions, there are several consistent elements. The underlying basis of community development is social change designed to improve the quality of life for residents and strengthen communities. For the purposes of this document, a broad definition of CD will be used,

“Community development is asset building that improves the quality of life among residents of low- to moderate-income communities” (Ferguson and Dickens, 1999, pg 5).

University-Community Partnerships

The number of university-community partnerships is increasing as many institutions of higher education begin to realize the need to be responsive to community needs. Many institutions are located within miles of severely economically depressed urban and rural areas. It is an awareness of these striking and imminent needs that have caused university administrators, faculty, and often students to recognize the possibilities for collaboration. The Institute for Nonprofits at North Carolina State University is interested in exploring these opportunities in the Southeast Raleigh area.

Southeast Raleigh Demographics:

According to the City of Raleigh Comprehensive Plan (2003), Raleigh's population of 303,971 has increased 28.2 percent since 1990 (Raleigh Comprehensive Plan, 2002). In 2000, Southeast Raleigh had 25,854 residents, but that number has grown to 30,378 according to 2003 counts. The area is 71% African American, 20% White and 9% Hispanic/Latino. Among these residents, 44.8% are male and 55.2% are female. The average family size is approximately three members.

The area is comprised of 11,540.4 acres of land, most of which is outside the I-440 beltline. Southeast Raleigh has 7% of all the housing units in the city and the 2nd highest rate of owner-occupied housing in the city at 71%; only the Umstead area has more. According to the Southeast Raleigh District Plan (2004), almost 50 percent of the area is unused.

METHODOLOGY

Between June and August 2004, researchers from the Departments of Social Work and Psychology engaged in a study that examined the assets, challenges, and opportunities of the Southeast Raleigh, NC area. The research design utilized semi-structured field interviews with key informants. Respondents were selected using purposive and snowball sampling. All the respondents lived and/or worked in the Southeast Raleigh area. The researchers conducted all of the field interviews, which were audiotaped, transcribed and coded. After each interview, the members of the team also recorded their observations about the interviews and any salient issues that were discussed during the interview. An analysis of the transcripts using grounded theory yielded the full report of this executive summary.

FINDINGS: STRENGTHS AND CHALLENGES

Respondents discussed the assets and challenges of Southeast Raleigh. There are many negative perceptions about the area, but all of the respondents acknowledged that the community was also rich in assets. An asset is something considered of value. Overall, respondents were careful to assert the need for strengths based interventions and perspectives on community development.

Human Capital

The residents of Southeast Raleigh were the most commonly mentioned asset of the community. Many respondents discussed the spirit and resilience of the community members. Of particular mention was the stable nature of the community and established social capital networks.

The human capital resources were also discussed as a challenge for the area, particularly as it related to leadership abilities and understandings. The leadership void was described as multidimensional. It existed within both the resident community as well as the organizations that the community relied on for revitalization.

Resident Leadership Development

The respondents described the lack of leadership among community residents. The residents were often described as reactionary rather than proactive when it came to changes needed in the community.

Respondents lamented the following three areas of leadership deficiencies:

- Lack of social action and mobilization processes
- Lack of leadership skills
- Unauthentic Leadership

Community Organization Infrastructure and Leadership Development

Organizations tended to have capacity deficiencies in three major areas, funding, expertise, and organizational structure. It was suggested that many of organizations were unable to address the sheer multitude of issues in the community. Respondents thought much of this inability stemmed from the lack of management and programmatic capacity of the organization. Many of

the organizations had few staff members or staff members that did not have the knowledge, skills, and abilities to perform optimally.

Several respondents discussed the need for training, education, and overall capacity building within the organizations that serve the Southeast Raleigh community. These organizations were deemed deficient in terms of their ability to manage their own programs and organizations. This performance gap was critical because since there has been a decline in public resources, community organizations have been expected to fill the gaps for communities.

Church Capacity and Cooperation

Respondents overwhelmingly pointed to the churches as a primary asset of the community. Many asserted that it was the churches role to assist the community in areas of social action and community economic development. However, many of the churches that would lead the charge experience deficiencies in capacity to meet those needs. Many area churches had very little administrative capacity or no “administrative office”, other than the pastor. Few churches had the full compliment of administrative capacity and support required to manage the types of projects and activities that would lead to the type of economic development that was expected, desired, and needed within the community.

Social Capital

The social capital of the residents was also deemed valuable to any sustained community improvement. However, the strength of these social capital networks and bonds were being challenged.

Socio-economic shifts

Southeast Raleigh, once an African American, relatively affluent area, was experiencing significant transitions. The first change was the decrease in the area’s socio-economic status. Many of the wealthy African American families that once lived in Southeast Raleigh have migrated to more affluent areas of the city such as North and Northeast Raleigh, leaving a much poorer resident population. It was perceived that his transition made the area much more vulnerable to social problems and their attendant issues.

African American to Hispanic American Transition

The area also experienced a rise in the number of Hispanic residents. Respondents attributed the transition to the area’s accessibility and high rates of relatively low income housing opportunities. However, some believed that this transition had the potential to cause racial tension in the area. In particular, many poor African American families that resided in the Chavis Heights public housing development have moved out of the area as the development was demolished for the creation of HOPE VI housing. Many of those residents will not return as a result of the HOPE VI strategy. Therefore, the appearance to many residents was that African Americans were being *pushed out* and Hispanics were *coming to* the area.

Physical Capital

Many respondents mentioned the accessibility and “prime location” of the Southeast Raleigh area as an asset. The area is close, or connected to, major routes such as New Bern Ave, Raleigh Blvd, Sunnybrook Road and Martin Luther King Blvd. Many respondents were pleased

with the planned extension of the I-540 outer beltline. Many respondents hoped the extension would increase the level of community economic development of the area including opportunities to build residential and commercial structures.

Several respondents commented specifically on the need for physical development and the lack of facilities and services in the area. Many respondents discussed the deficiency of grocery and retail stores, dry cleaners, eateries, movie theaters, and other commercial entities that would bring people to the area to live and shop. In addition, some commented on the aesthetic undesirability of the existing community structures. Respondents suggested that adding things as simple as sidewalks and planting trees would help to increase the perception and characterization of the area.

Inside and Outside the Beltline

Respondents were also articulate in pointing out that there are two sections of Southeast Raleigh, inside the beltline and outside the beltline. The community inside the I-440 beltline is an older community. It is traditionally African American, long standing, well established, but typically poorer neighborhoods. In contrast, the community outside the beltline has more racial diversity, more land, and is typically comprised of middle class neighborhoods. These sections were considered very different, each having its own needs and challenges.

Community Institutions

Beyond the infrastructure, community organizations were also considered an asset. Southeast Raleigh is served by City of Raleigh government agencies as well as several community based organizations. These organizations provided varied health and human services to community residents. These included the faith communities, nonprofits, sororities and fraternities, other universities, and small businesses. Of particular note were the Southeast Raleigh Assembly (SERA), Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU), community organizations, Citizens Advisory Councils, and churches.

However, the level of communication between these organizations was considered a hindrance to effective service coordination. Organizations did not have a mechanism to stay connected and to share ideas, innovations, and strategies. These communication obstacles created a sense of isolation at best and competition at worst. Over the last decade, the human service funding landscape contracted, making organizations compete for scarce dollars. This reality was thought to hinder collaboration between organizations, even those with similar missions and visions.

Social Problems

Respondents were not at a loss to provide a list of community problems. Many of the issues listed were not specific to Southeast Raleigh, but included those encountered by many United States urban areas. Respondents believed Southeast Raleigh carried a stigma as the seat of crime and social problems in the city. While many respondents were not sure of the reality of this stigma, they understood the impact of the perception of increased crime in the area. They believed that these social problems, perceived or real, diminished the real property and investment value of the area. Specific social problems included: *Public Safety, Education, Affordable Housing, Economy Health, Environment, and Transportation*

City/Resident Interaction

The relationship between Southeast Raleigh residents and the City of Raleigh was identified as a source of contention. The respondents discussed the need for the city to reinvest in the community in a way that residents perceived as sincere.

Much of the community development initiated by the City of Raleigh omitted the voices of residents. Many of the efforts were “top down” and did not empower residents. Empowerment was considered a significant aspect of any community development effort.

Barriers to community based research

In addition to challenges in the Southeast area, there were other challenges that are associated with university community partnership development. University community partnerships are often desired, but difficult to achieve. Barriers to these types of collaborations can be found both in the university and in the community. Specifically the university must address issues of faculty and student capacity and the community must manage issues of trust.

Faculty Capacity

Previously, the capacity issues of the community were discussed. However, there are capacity concerns in the university as well. The number of faculty members who conduct applied research, while in currently in the minority, is increasing. In general, community based or applied research is not taught or encouraged in many disciplines. While faculty members are often expected to incorporate service learning into their coursework, it is often not rewarded. Further, many faculty are not trained in techniques for implementing university community partnerships.

Student Capacity and Community needs

Many respondents were hesitant to entertain the idea of utilizing students in their programs. Students, particularly undergraduate students were not seen as having the requisite skills, knowledge, and commitment to work effectively in community organizations. Further, students' time lines (i.e., semester schedules) often do not coincide with the needs of local community projects. Students often engage in community based or outreach activities as part of a class. Since these classes are only one semester, students often separate from the project before it is over.

Trust

Trust was cited by all of the respondents as a serious concern for the implementation of university research and outreach projects in the community. Southeast Raleigh residents have developed a healthy distrust of outsiders providing services. Many residents were perceived as being skeptical of the sustainability of community service activities.

Part of the reason for this skepticism and distrust was due to the exclusion of residents in planning processes. Many interventions were brought to the community and executed *in and on* the community without the input of community residents.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the field research conducted, Southeast Raleigh would benefit from a university community partnership. However, multiple efforts are needed for the success of such an initiative. These efforts require substantive investment and the involvement of the university community and the Southeast Raleigh Community. Organizations and institutions within the community are in need of the conceptual frameworks, organizational and programmatic strategies, as well as planning and evaluation capacity that can be provided by the university community. However, the community must be empowered to direct the process.

Most glaringly missing from this feasibility study was the voices of residents. This omission is not by accident. It was the intent of the researchers to first examine the practicality of offering any type of services to the community before engaging residents and getting their perspectives on the opportunity. As many respondents noted, community residents have been disappointed and disenfranchised repeatedly. To avoid raising expectations, this study was conducted to determine the needs and to be able to assess the NC State University Institute for Nonprofits' capacity to address those needs before making any "offers". As such, the first recommendation is to garner community resident input. The full report, which can be obtained from the NC State University Institute for Nonprofits, may be used to initiate those conversations.

In addition to resident participation, there are other possible strategies for university-community collaboration. Respondents were asked what types of activities they would like to see a proposal include. Many noted that a number of specific steps can be taken to promote integrative practices, including the following recommendations:

- ✓ Focus on Asset Based Community Development
- ✓ Develop Centers for Capacity Building and Training
- ✓ Coordinate Resources
- ✓ Increase service learning and internships
- ✓ Encourage Community Based Research

Conclusion

University community partnerships offer opportunities for significant change, development, and learning. They are excellent mechanisms for residents, students, faculty, and staff to collaborate to meet a myriad of needs. However, it is important that these partnerships be entered carefully and strategically. Each partner has to be fully aware of the goals, mission, and culture of the others. Further, each needs to hold realistic expectations for the outcomes of the partnership. As The North Carolina State University Institute for Nonprofits contemplates the feasibility of these partnerships, The Institute will have many tasks prior to engagement. The Institute will have to clearly articulate why Southeast Raleigh was chosen as the site for activity; what community engagement methods will be used; and what activities it has the capacity to offer among other things. But the aforementioned determinations need to be made with constant and sincere communication with community representatives, particularly residents.



*A University-Community Partnership Feasibility Study:
Opportunities and Challenges for Southeast Raleigh*
Final Report

Jocelyn Taliaferro, MSW, PhD
NCSU Department of Social Work

INTRODUCTION

North Carolina State University commissioned a feasibility study to explore the possibility of submitting a Community Outreach Partnerships Center (COPC) grant to the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The COPC is a collaborative effort designed to address problems of urban areas through community development. This initiative would seek to address at least three identified problems in the southeast region of Raleigh, NC. The university will work with community leaders, government agencies, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and citizens to identify and address the current assets and needs of the Southeast Raleigh community.

The COPC grants are relatively small grants that not only encourage, but require collaboration with the community. With a maximum award amount of \$400,000 for 3 years, the proposed center may focus on outreach activities, public service projects, technical assistance, applied research, as well as engagement of the community and the university in a collaborative initiative to address the needs of the Southeast Raleigh community. If the grant is received, the center would become a permanent fixture in the community, as it will be incorporated into the university's overall outreach and urban mission.

The goal of COPC grant projects is to stimulate community development using partnerships between universities and communities. There are many sources of funding that could be used to support these partnerships. However, the focus of this study was to specifically explore the feasibility of implementing a COPC. Before discussing the results of the study, it is important to contextualize community development, community-university partnerships, and the Southeast Raleigh community.

Community Development

Community development (CD) is defined in a myriad of ways. There are many perspectives, but in general, the goal of community development is to improve communities and enrich the lives of community residents (Chekki, 1979c; Cook, 1994; Head, 1979; Shragge & Fisher, 2001).

Community development as a process focuses on enhancing capacity of individuals and institutions to make change (Gittell & Vidal, 1998). "[Community development] entails building practical capacities-physical, social, intellectual, financial, and political assets-to improve the quality of life among residents of targeted neighborhoods" (Armacost as quoted in Ferguson & Dickens, 1999 p. vii). CD serves as a training process by which individuals and organizations are able to strengthen the community.

Further, CD viewed as a framework seeks to change the social and economic structure of society (Chekki, 1979a). Inherent in the community development paradigm are issues of social justice, redistribution, and equity (Clavel, Pitt, & Yin, 1997; Fisher, 1994a). Community development is often a catalyst around which communities mobilize for change (Shragge 1990; Kahn, 1991). Through CD, systems may be changed from top down to bottom up, thereby reconfiguring power structures and control (Drier, 1996; Fisher, 1994a; Kahn, 1991)

CD is a crusade, a cause to which people become committed. It is not neutral (like process) but carries an emotional charge; one is either for it or against it (Christenson & Robinson, 1980 Pg. 11).

Finally, CD is a strategy or set of activities used to accomplish a goal. CD is concerned with deliberate and planned social and economic change. Community development is often seen as an intervention strategy that can be used by residents and organizations to initiate neighborhood or community change.

A group of people in a locality initiating a social action process (i.e., planned intervention) to change their economic, social, cultural and/or environmental situation. (Christenson & Robinson, 1989 Pg. 14)

While community development has many components and definitions, there are several components that are consistent. The underlying basis of community development is social change designed to improve the quality of life for residents and strengthen communities.

For the purposes of this document, a broad definition of community development will be used, “Community development is asset building that improves the quality of life among residents of low- to moderate-income communities” (Ferguson and Dickens, 1999, Pg 5).

This definition provides a backdrop to further explore the feasibility of a community development effort in Southeast Raleigh. However, prior to engaging in the discussion, it is important to explore university-community partnerships and their accompanying issues.

University-Community Partnerships

The number of university-community partnerships is increasing as many institutions of higher education begin to realize the need to be responsive to community needs. Many institutions are located within a few miles of severely economically depressed urban and rural areas. It is an awareness of these striking and imminent needs that have caused university administrators, faculty, and often students to recognize the possibilities for collaboration.

Further, communities are often seeking answers to the very complex problems of poverty, racism, joblessness, inadequate education and other areas of lack. Finding responses to these challenges require the combined expertise of all the community's resources including residents, organizations, and the capacity of faculty and students in institutions of higher education. University-community partnerships are becoming powerful forces for this type of collaboration. Funding organizations and intermediaries such as the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Office of University Partnerships, Campus Compact, The Annie E. Casey Foundation, and the Ford Foundation, are actively promoting opportunities for universities and communities to work together. Therefore there are many incentives for collaborations

There are a myriad of activities across the nation that utilize these types of partnerships. While this is certainly not an exhaustive list, some of the types of programs include “intergenerational programming and volunteering for the Special Olympics” (Brotherton, 2002 pg. 20); teaching, mentoring (Kirkwood, 1999; Zinicola & Devlin-Scherer, 2001); technology development and

bridging the digital divide (Davis & Trebian, 2001); offering health services (Homan, Oleskevich, Foster, Domahidy, & Hogan, 1998; Taylor, Beane, & Genee, 1998); community organizing (Austin, 2003); participatory research (Channels & Zannoni, 1999; Holkup, Tripp-Reimer, Salois, & Weinert, 2004) conducting "business climate" studies (Sabatine, 1991), pg 26); and economic development (Pumphrey, 1998).

However, while many collaborations have been forged and rewards for these partnerships are great, there are often just as many complications to successful partnerships. Issues of turfism, lack of communication, and insufficient cultural exchange and learning are all threats to successful collaborations. Turfism is the inability or unwillingness to relinquish any resources, territory, or power. When there are barriers to committing resources collaborations suffer. It is particularly important for each member of the collaborative to provide some resource. While all members will not provide the same level of engagement or contribution, no one member should bear the bulk of the tasks, risks, or outcomes. Each member should participate in and contribute to the collaboration as much as possible. Equity, rather than equality, of investment may minimize resentment and ownership, as the partnership does not belong to any one stakeholder but to each entity involved. As such, stakeholders must be willing to be forthcoming and compromising in regard to their desired outcomes.

In addition to reservations about relinquishing resources, unclear goals of the collaboration often sabotage the partnership process. It is essential that universities and communities articulate expectations about the partnership. Often each has very disparate objectives for the process. Most universities value knowledge production opportunities, while most communities are looking for assistance, models, and strategies -- more tangible outcomes than theory development. These differences must be discussed prior to engaging in the partnership. Each stakeholder must be willing to invest the time in this early stage to ensure that everyone is in agreement with the collaboration's strategy, mission, values, and vision. Often, this step is rushed or omitted, which later leads to misunderstandings and bitterness. It is enticing to develop a proposal and "get on with the tasks" rather than spend the time thinking about the collaboration itself.

It is particularly important that these preliminary steps be taken due to the differences in culture between universities and communities. Each has a very different way of doing things and it is essential that each learn the other's culture. For university community partnerships to be successful, each must teach the other constraints of their respective histories, values, bureaucracies and decision making processes. It is important for communities to be aware of the reward systems, timelines, and large bureaucratic procedures of universities. Alternatively, it is important for universities to understand the distrust and suspicion, the value of residents' participation, and unresolved conflicts within the community.

University community partnerships have a great deal to offer. This study examined the feasibility of initiating a collaborative relationship with the Southeast Raleigh, NC community.

Southeast Raleigh Demographics:

The City of Raleigh is located in Wake County, North Carolina. Wake, Durham and Orange counties comprise the Research Triangle for which North Carolina has gained wide acclaim.

Southeast Raleigh is served by City Council members James West (District C), Janet Cowell (At Large) and Neal Hunt (At Large).

According to the City of Raleigh Comprehensive Plan (2003), Raleigh's population of 303,971 has increased 28.2 percent since 1990 (Raleigh Comprehensive Plan, 2002). However this growth is not evenly distributed throughout the city. Southeast Raleigh has experienced slower growth than other areas of the city.

In 2000, Southeast Raleigh had 25,854 residents, but that number has grown to 30,378 according to 2003 counts. The area is predominantly African American in that it is 71% African American, 20% White and 9% Hispanic/Latino. Among these residents, 45% are male and 55% are female. The average family size is approximately 3 members.

The area is comprised of 11,540.4 acres of land, most of which is outside the I-440 beltline. Southeast Raleigh has 7% of all the housing units in the city and the 2nd highest rate of owner-occupied housing in the city at 71%; only the Umstead area has more. According to the Southeast Raleigh District Plan (2004), the "district is substantially underdeveloped, 5,919 acres or 49 percent of the land, is vacant." (Pg 12).

METHODOLOGY

Between June and August 2004, the researchers from North Carolina State University engaged in a study that examined the assets, challenges, and opportunities of the Southeast Raleigh, NC area. The primary goal of the research was to determine the feasibility of submitting a grant proposal to The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to provide a Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC).

The research design utilized semi-structured field interviews with key informants. These interviews were audiotaped. Respondents were selected using purposive and snowball sampling. All the respondents lived and/or worked in the Southeast Raleigh area. The respondents were contacted by telephone to set up meetings with the researcher and, subsequently, were visited for field interviews. Interviews were conducted with 37 respondents. There was no attempt made to employ random sampling methods, as the study was exploratory in nature. Several respondents were initially selected due their specialized knowledge of the Southeast Raleigh area. Other respondents were located through a snowball sample. It is understood that non-probability samples do not provide highly generalizable information, but because of the idiographic nature of the partnership opportunity, generalization was not the priority (Babbie, 2001). In depth interviews often yield powerful insight and specialized knowledge.

The researchers conducted all of the field interviews, which were audiotaped, transcribed and coded. After each interview, the members of the team also recorded their observations about the interviews and any salient issues that were discussed during the interview. According to Guba and Lincoln (1981), conformability or member checking is used to determine the validity of qualitative research. It seeks to verify the study findings can be confirmed. A member check was conducted by inviting study participants for a presentation of the preliminary report. Twenty participants attended the meeting. The member check confirmed identified themes and no new themes emerged, providing saturation. Because saturation was reached, data collection was concluded. A final analysis of the transcripts, tapes, and field notes (using grounded theory) yielded the following report.

SECTION I: ASSETS

Respondents discussed the relative assets of Southeast Raleigh. There are many negative perceptions about the area, but all of the respondents acknowledged that the community was rich in assets. An asset is something considered of value. Many respondents were careful to assert the need for strengths based interventions and perspectives on community development.

Strength or asset based community development (ABCD) has at its core, the belief that communities have the ability to make positive change. While many intervention strategies are based on a deficit model, asset based community development rejects this notion of dysfunction as the starting place. As its name suggests, the concept is based on the process of mapping and identifying resources, which can be built upon to improve community conditions (Green & Haines, 2002). Many respondents shared this theoretical perspective.

However, of all the topics discussed, respondents provided the least elaboration on the community's resources, spending much more time on the community's deficiencies. Nevertheless, three primary assets, human and social capital, physical capital and community institutions emerged from the interviews.

Human and Social Capital

Human capital is the combination of individuals' knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA). It encompasses the education, experience, and confidence of individuals. While many scholars would point to financial capital as the predominant source of the world's wealth, a 1995 World Bank report, suggests that 60% of the world's total wealth is in social and human capital (Hancock, 1999). Therefore, unlike capitalist ideology, that holds financial capital most important, community development strategies place greater emphasis on human capital development. This notion was supported by the outcomes of this study.

The most commonly mentioned asset of the community was the residents of Southeast Raleigh. Many respondents discussed the spirit and resilience of the community members. Of particular mention was the stable nature of the community.

One asset is that Southeast Raleigh has a long history of a fairly cohesive identifiable community.

These houses are passed down from generation to generation. People are aging out and leaving their homes to their children. But they stay in the family.

The people have the energy and want to do something.

One respondent discussed the human capital potential of the area.

Another asset is the human capital that is largely untapped and untrained.

This respondent was hopeful about the ability to mobilize residents and provide training in an effort to revitalize the area.

The people. We need to tap into that. We need to spend time listening to people and then figure out who and what institutions would come into the mix and really move people. We need not just a critique but also a solution.

In addition, several respondents discussed the need to redirect some of the current activities of the area. While some of the current economic activity is negative, such as drug sales, respondents were hopeful about reframing and redirecting the entrepreneurial spirit of the some of the residents.

There are also a lot of entrepreneurs in Southeast Raleigh. There are businessmen/women, clergy, drug dealers, and gangs. How can we have something that is more enticing for the drug dealers and the gangs?

Collectively there is a lot of money in Southeast Raleigh. We need to look at deciding where the residents and the organizations put their money.

Finally, respondents discussed the established social capital networks in the community. Social capital is the range of systems that are found in the interactions of individuals and organizations that foster cooperation and mutual aid to enhance education, economic, and social resources (Foley & Edwards, 1997; Greeley, 1997; Warren, 1998). Social capital enhances the productivity of any one entity by providing support, sharing information, developing trust, and transmitting cultural norms and mores (Gittell & Vidal, 1998; Greeley, 1997; Newton, 1997; Stack, 1974). Some researchers assert there has been an overall decline in social capital all over the United States (Putnam, 2000). However, many of the residents of Southeast Raleigh had established networks that served them well.

... a mixture of old and young families that support each other and work together. People should look after each other's children.

Physical Capital

Beyond social capital, physical capital was deemed an asset. Physical capital is defined as the natural and man-made resources that make up the infrastructure or environment (housing, roads, water, forest, energy) of the community (Hancock, 2001). One of the hallmarks of community development is its concentration and focus on this "bricks and mortar" development (Drier, 1996).

Location and Space

Many respondents mentioned the "prime location" of the Southeast Raleigh area. The area is accessible to many well-traveled and well-developed roads and transportation arteries. The area is close, or connected to, major routes such as New Bern Ave, Raleigh Blvd, Sunnybrook Road and Martin Luther King Blvd.

The infrastructure of Southeast Raleigh. Infrastructure refers to the physical structure such as the roads and highways. Another asset is the location. All the highways are close and accessible.

One asset is the space and land available for development

There are plans to extend 540 to that area. However it's probably not the best asset. That's the people.

Many respondents were pleased with the planned extension of the I-540 outer beltline. It was commented that this extension would further increase the accessibility to, and value of, the area. Respondents felt that there was a significant potential for development in the area and that the placement of the outer beltline would increase the level of community economic development in the form of residential and commercial structures.

Community Institutions

In addition to physical infrastructure related assets, community organizations were also considered an asset. Southeast Raleigh is served by City of Raleigh government agencies as well as several community-based organizations. These organizations provide varied health and human services to community residents. These include the faith communities, nonprofit organizations, sororities and fraternities, other universities, and small businesses. Of particular note were the Southeast Raleigh Assembly (SERA), Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU), community organizations, Citizens Advisory Councils, and churches.

The Southeast Raleigh Assembly

The Southeast Raleigh Assembly (SERA) is a quasi governmental organization, which was created to assist the community economic development strategy for the area. This volunteer body is comprised of 45 community members who serve for one year terms and are appointed by the Raleigh City Council. The SERA has six issue teams including Community Involvement, Human Capacity Building, Public Safety, Commercial and Business Development, Housing, and Equity and Resource Development. Each team's goal is to integrate community resident participation and input as it engages in activities that promote positive revitalization of the community.

Each issue team is responsible for garnering community input from residents. While the SERA's organizational structure seeks to have direct connection with the community, respondents suggested that it has limited grassroots interaction with residents. When asked about the extent of the direct interaction, one respondent commented, "They are supposed to. That is something they are working on." Many of the issue teams were having difficulty mobilizing and reaching residents.

All of the respondents in the study were aware of and mentioned the work of the SERA during the course of the interview. Yet, the perception of the organization was mixed. Some respondents were less optimistic about the ability of the organization to achieve its goals. When asked if the SERA was perceived positively or negatively, one respondent replied "Somewhere

between the two. Maybe there are not enough grassroots efforts.” Others were even more critical.

All the groups in Southeast Raleigh have a hidden agenda. The Southeast Raleigh Assembly is trying to do what needs to be done, but they don't know how.

Another respondent commented on the need for leadership development with in the Southeast Raleigh Assembly.

[I would] like to conduct leadership training for the Assembly and for the city

However, others were positive about the entity.

The issue teams would know better what needs to be done and how you can get involved.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU)

Colleges and universities play an important role in their surrounding communities. Colleges have a wealth of intellectual capital that is often untapped for developing strategies for community needs. Respondents specifically pointed to St. Augustine's College and Shaw University as stakeholders in any community development initiatives. These two institutions were considered significant community assets. These institutions are bastions of knowledge that represent a degree of authenticity in the community. Respondents felt that many residents respected the reputations and contributions of these institutions of higher education.

Working with the HBCUs would be critical.

The HBCUs would like to be involved, but it has been a struggle actually getting them involved. There needs to be collaboration and strong partnerships so that projects can be supplemented and expanded.

These institutions have much to offer to the community. Respondents saw opportunities to work with various departments including design, social work, psychology, mathematics, business, and sociology. The respondents were eager to have students and faculty engage in a myriad of activities and programs. While Peace College, Meredith College, and North Carolina State University were assets, the HBCUs were considered *essential* to the process of working in Southeast Raleigh. Further, it was intimated that working with these HBCUs would provide a level of authenticity for community residents.

Community and Civic Organizations

In addition to HBCUs, there are many civic organizations that are housed in Southeast Raleigh. Many of these organizations are known for their commitment and work in the community. Several historically Black sororities and fraternities have local headquarters and chapters in the Southeast Raleigh community. Historically, Black fraternities and sororities have over 100 years of commitment to empowerment, social justice, and social action. These entities are less social and more civic focused than their white counterparts (Gittings, 1988). Further, membership activities extend well beyond the college experience. These organizations either separately or

through the Pan-Hellenic Council are currently providing services (e.g., voter registration, economic and homeownership programs, mentoring and after school activities) in Southeast Raleigh.

In addition to fraternities and sororities, several nonprofit organizations operate in the Southeast Raleigh area. They include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Southeast Raleigh Assembly
- El Pueblo,
- NAACP,
- Triangle Urban League,
- Passage Home Community Development Center,
- Wake County Cooperative Extension
- Raleigh Organizing for Action and Results (ROAR)
- Strengthening the Black Family, and
- Boys and Girls Club

These organizations have the missions that seek to assist disadvantaged populations and promote social justice. These organizations seek to increase the community's social, physical, economic, and human capital.

Citizen Advisory Councils

Citizen Advisory Councils (CAC), which are resident-volunteer consultative bodies of the Raleigh City Council, were considered substantial assets to the community. CACs are forums for residents to become involved in the activities of their neighborhoods. There are 18 CACs across the City of Raleigh. The south and central CACs represent Southeast Raleigh residents. However, resident participation is limited. Respondents noted that while CACs were important venues of participation they were not widely utilized.

The Citizen's Advisory Councils have also been very active.

There are 18 of them. The Central CAC has a mailing list of about 19 members; however, there are typically about 10 members at the meetings.

...the CAC's are not very strong and there has not been much participation from all of them. However, the East CAC has recently been very active.

The South CAC has good advocacy

In South Park there is some advocacy. There are historical advocates who are 70-80 yrs old. The Central, South Central and South CAC's have a good representation. However, they are still older people. There are about 20-30 people on the Central and South Central CAC's

While the CACs are not widely used, respondents still suggested that CACs be used as a mechanism to encourage resident participation with any proposed grant submissions.

Churches

Most respondents suggested that churches were an asset of the community. Churches were also viewed as a potential remedy to the capacity issues of the area. Southeast Raleigh has approximately 120 churches. These churches range from small “store front” churches with memberships of 20, to huge “mega” churches with memberships of over 1000.

There has been a shift toward engaging the faith community in neighborhood and community revitalization efforts. "Faith-based" is a nondenominational term used to describe any religious organization and encompasses local congregations, denominational regions, a collaboration of religious groups, or religiously-affiliated social service, advocacy, or economic development organizations (Warren, 2001). Faith-based entities have long been considered an anchor in many low-income areas and a resource to the community. As established centers of social organization, religious institutions provide a range of social service, advocacy and economic development programs.

Faith-based community development (FBCD) is based on the religious teachings of stewardship as well as the theory of social justice. Most religions support the teaching that the earth belongs to God and that individuals are stewards or trustees of all therein. Further, most religions make provision for the well-being of the poor. This combination of stewardship, social justice, and collective responsibility for the poor are the underpinnings of faith based involvement in community development (DeVries, 1998; Reed, 1995).

In December 2002, the Federal government initiated an Executive Order to allow equal protection of the law for faith based community organizations. The order specified that faith based organizations would be able to compete for public funding for the provision of social services. This Faith Based Initiative, as it has come to be called, signaled an official endorsement by the government of the faith community's role in the provision of social welfare and public services. As a means of community change, FBCD has experienced mixed rates of success. However, respondents consistently commented on the role they thought churches should play.

Some churches have CDC and nonprofit arms [that are providing job training]. Some [churches] are providing outreach and grassroots services.

There aren't "go-to" pastors anymore. The pastors do not have the same connections and influence they once did. There is the Ministerial Alliance... There was a push to get faith-based organizations involved and they ended up establishing a nonprofit and an LLC. [Individual name] is a Pastor with a lot of land and a large church but is has been difficult bringing him to the table.

The faith-based community in Southeast Raleigh needs to be engaged. Civil society outcomes need to come out of the church.

Churches were considered change agents or catalysts. Respondents felt that churches had the ability to initiate many of the needed improvements in the community. The following exchange was held between three respondents:

Respondent 1: *There needs to be a way to include people for whom we are writing the grant. It is also difficult to write a grant for development without including the churches. The church members are the movers and shakers. The churches could build hotels and restaurants.*

Respondent 2: *Would the churches manage it?*

Respondent 1: *No. They would have a management company.*

Respondent 3: *If one minister could organize something like this...*

In addition, there were several pastors that are trying to initiate community change and engage in faith based community development. The following churches were repeatedly mentioned as potential stakeholders in the Southeast Raleigh community.

- Dr. Duma Harshaw (First Baptist Church)
- Dr. Charles Bullock (Martin St. Baptist)
- Rev. David Forbes (Christian Faith Baptist)
- Rev John Vincent Terry (Mount Peace)
- Rev. Wilkins (Wake Chapel)
- Rev. Wooten (Upper Room)
- Bishop Frank Summerfield (Word of God)
- Pastor Walker (Mount Pleasant Church)
- Dr. Harold Miller (Tupper Memorial Baptist Church) and
- Superintendent Stenneth Powell (Abundant Life Christian Center).

While respondents were adamant about the idea that churches are necessary players in community development in Southeast Raleigh, many acknowledged that churches have many of the capacity issues experienced in the larger community. These challenges will be discussed more fully in the next section of this report: Needs, Issues, and Problems.

SECTION II: NEEDS, ISSUES, AND PROBLEMS

The needs, issues, and problems associated with the study were divided into two primary groups: community needs and barriers to community-university collaboration. While these are the two broad categories of need, each has several subheadings. What follows is an explanation of the concerns as raised by the study's participants.

The Southeast Raleigh area has been identified as the part of the city that needs the most intervention due to the myriad of problems and issues. These problems could be classified in four groups: physical capital, human capital, social problems, and city/resident interaction.

Physical Capital

Several respondents commented on the need for physical development, specifically the lack of facilities and services in the area. Many respondents discussed the deficiency of grocery and retail stores, dry cleaners, eateries, movie theaters, and other commercial entities that would bring people to the area to live and shop.

There is a lack of a central hub or core, something that draws people [this] way. Something like a mall, major employer, or a business.

There is a lot of residential development but not a lot of services. People are being priced out. Some people are scared that they will be bought out.

In addition, some respondents commented on the aesthetic undesirability of the existing community structures. Respondents suggested that there was a need for beautification and that adding things as simple as sidewalks and planting trees would help to increase the perception and characterization of the area.

The typical employer is industrial and non-scenic. Some major employers are the petroleum place, the salvage yard, and the methadone treatment place. This makes Southeast Raleigh thought of as a place for the undesirables. We need to change that in order for businesses to come in.

One need is to have design, landscape architecture, and architecture students do something to beautify the area.

Southeast Raleigh is not being paid much attention in terms of beautification. There is a perception that the city might not care about Southeast Raleigh. However, this is not just a city problem. It is also a community problem. Basic needs need to be met.

The Chavis Park Carousel needs a new house. We need help with the documentation of the needs and blight.

While many respondents discussed the physical deterioration of the area, they acknowledged that there were areas without blight. Many respondents commented on the fact that Southeast

Raleigh was not a physically or culturally homogenous community; there is more than one Southeast Raleigh.

Disparities Within Southeast Raleigh

Respondents were articulate in pointing out that there are two sections of Southeast Raleigh, inside the beltline and outside the beltline. The community inside the I-440 beltline is an older community. It is traditionally African American, long standing, well established, but typically characterized by poorer neighborhoods. In contrast, the community outside the beltline has more racial diversity, more land, and is typically comprised of middle class neighborhoods. These sections are economically and aesthetically different and each is dealing with its own issues.

There is old Raleigh versus not so old Raleigh and this causes problems

You should talk with a wide variety of stakeholders because Southeast Raleigh does not act as one community. Much of the community is changing. For example, housing is changing and I don't know how much has been discussed.

One other thing to keep in mind is that there is an old Southeast Raleigh and a new Southeast Raleigh. The old Southeast Raleigh doesn't want to change the status quo and the new Southeast Raleigh is a little more open to change. There is a tension between these two groups, so when you are asking residents to get involved, you need both.

There are two Southeast Raleigh's. One inside the beltline, the inner-core, and one outside the beltline, the outer-core. The outer-core has a new infrastructure, new parks, and new schools. If the city doesn't focus on the inner-core then there will be a leap frog effect from the outer-core to downtown. If you develop on area and not the others you will still have pockets of crime. The geography of Southeast Raleigh looks like this: There is downtown, the ring around downtown and then the outer beltline. You should concentrate on the inner-core or the ring around downtown.

There is a big difference between inside and outside the beltline. Outside the beltline is the urban sprawl. The most familiar Southeast Raleigh is inside the beltline. This is the area where we should be involved.

I see Raleigh as three Raleighs. There is old Raleigh, which is the Five Points area. There is Southeast Raleigh. Then there is everyone else. Historically, geography has been an issue but it has been compounded with more people. Another issue is job training. Yet another is connecting people to technology. We would like to know how many homes have web access. This is a huge barrier. There is a large technological divide.

These comments signal the inequities in the Southeast Raleigh area. The outer beltline area is the picture of prosperity, including new home construction and luxury amenities (e.g., planned golf courses, movie theaters). However, the inner beltline area is experiencing increased blight and deterioration with few basic amenities like supermarkets, dry cleaners, and eateries. Respondents were aware of this divide and its implications. This equity disparity will be more fully discussed in Section III of this report.

Human Capital

As mentioned in Section I, human capital is the mixture of individuals' knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA). Community development efforts rely heavily on the resources found within the community residents themselves.

Youth Development Activities

Many respondents discussed the need to get youth involved in community development, educational, and leadership development activities. Respondents expressed concern about the aging resident population of the inner beltline, traditional, Southeast Raleigh area. Many felt that it was the responsibility of youth to lead the community economic development of the Southeast Raleigh area. However, respondents were disturbed about the lack of training and leadership education for all residents, especially youth.

There is a need for youth activities because there is nothing for them to do. [Individual citizen name] has held entrepreneur classes at Southeast Raleigh High School. The Garner Road YMCA and the Boys and Girls Club on Raleigh Boulevard both provide activities for youth.

Cooperative Extension is doing [youth development activities]...these programs invest in human capital. Traditionally, the Cooperative Extension focused on rural programs. Children are leaving the small towns and are not prepared to live in the large city. Kids need self-confidence to take on problems. This is where the nonprofit world should focus.

The Cooperative Extension is important. 4-H trains leaders. There should be camps for kids in all [NC State academic] departments. The role of the nonprofits is to see these opportunities and make it happen.

Leadership

The deficiency of leadership in the Southeast Raleigh community was by far the most frequently cited problem of community development in the area. The leadership void was multidimensional. It existed within both the resident community and the organizations that the community was relying on for revitalization.

Resident Leadership Development

The respondents overwhelmingly described the lack of leadership among community residents. Leadership, which is based on the strength of personal relationships is essential to community development because it helps to drive and determine the orientation and process of change (Alinsky, 1946; Robert J Chaskin, Brown, Venkatesh, & Vidal, 1998). The orientation shapes the organizing approach as well as determines the actors, targets, strategies, and tactics. Respondents asserted that many of the residents were not familiar with advocacy or social change methods. Respondents felt that residents were often reactionary rather than proactive when it came to changes needed in the community.

Social Action and Community Mobilization

When communities are unable to mobilize it critically hinders the community development process. Community mobilization and participation are critical to community development,

particularly community organizing. The goal of community organizing is to redistribute power and systems change through social action (Mondros & Wilson, 1995).

Community development and community organizing are collective activities. There is very little that can be done without the recruitment, motivation and retention of community residents at every aspect of the social change process. This inclusion is what differentiates organizing from advocacy. Where advocacy is voice of one for the many, organizing is the voice of the many for themselves. While advocacy is not negative, it does not hold the same empowerment opportunities. Advocacy is particularly useful for populations who *can not* speak for themselves and it has the potential to provide benefits to the community. However, community mobilization is a step toward equalizing power differentials between communities and existing systems.

As community members are mobilized and experienced success, their ability to believe in their own capability is enhanced. This type of empowerment is essential to the sustained involvement of volunteers and community residents in the community development process. As individuals gain success in their small efforts, and issues get resolved, personal power is enhanced for those who participate and win (Kahn, 1991). Community organizing fosters the ability for community members to take control of their own destinies and learn the power of supporting one another and working cooperatively (Kahn, 1991).

Respondents commented on the absence of these experiences and successes. The lack of community organizing activities was attributed to lack of knowledge and apathy.

One need is having a community that understands how to come to the city and request services.

We used to know all of what was going on but we don't have the education anymore.

A community leadership center, the center would work to empower the residents, teach the residents how to interact with the city, help the residents create better things for themselves. The city should be working with the residents. In terms of redevelopment, citizens need to understand who to ask and what to ask for.

Another issue is getting the communities involved. Right now, the residents are reactive instead of proactive. They need to be informed on where to go and what to do to get problems resolved.

There is a deficiency of leadership. Someone needs to mobilize residents with direct, hands-on activities.

There is a need to build the capacity of the residents for them to be better able to solve the local community problems.

Leadership Skills

Leaders have to create an environment where individuals feel that their efforts are appreciated, that they will be supported, and that they will make a difference. Effective leaders must address

fear in order to wage an effective social change campaign. Fear of retaliation and failure are real issues for residents. The ability to create a culture of safety and competence is a major task of social action and community development leadership. Unfortunately, the inability of leaders to perform these tasks have been lamented as one of the deficiencies of effective mobilization.

They [residents] are looking for leadership.

The weakness of communities is a lack of leadership. This university could identify people and strengthen them and provide the tools they need and establish a network of people for support.

Absolutely, [They are willing to come together] if they had leadership. They can't fight each other. They need to come with a consolidated plan.

Many of the leaders are leaders by default but most are not equipped to lead.

The following is a discussion between two respondents:

Respondent #1: *They aren't aware of anything. For example, there is an election today and not many will show up at the polls. One reason is that they have no way to get there.*

Respondent #2: *There is a lot of apathy. There is also a lack of leadership in the community. The politicians aren't advocates.*

Respondent #1: *What I'm hearing is that now there is a big void. The people that have the grassroots organizing are discouraged from leadership because they don't have the degrees or the social status.*

Barriers to effective mobilization, which in addition to fear include lack of leadership, and apathy, are quite problematic but surmountable obstacles.

[Authentic Leadership](#)

Representativeness and authenticity are paramount to leadership development since the leader is the catalyst for change. The external leader should not direct the organizing effort, but should facilitate it (Kahn, 1991). The leader in community organizing is not a power broker, but a conduit for promoting change (Fisher, 1994a). The community is in essence the leader, directing the process. The organizer's role is to contribute expertise, offer suggestions, and provide technical assistance. The difference is that the community provides the direction and the organizer serves as facilitator. It is careful to avoid the "ailment known as local-people-itis" which is the extreme resistance to persons outside the community making a leadership contribution with the belief that community residents are always right and outsiders should never initiate decisions or provide any type of leadership (Fisher, 1994 pg. 226).

While the professional organizer brings value to the community development effort, building indigenous leadership is optimal. Providing community residents with the opportunity to learn the skills and capacities to lead their own efforts provides a tremendous amount of empowerment

which continues to fuel the development effort. Although it is rare that one person is the expert in all areas, the process of leadership development is to cultivate proficiency in myriad areas so that individuals can be more holistic in their leadership activities, thereby expanding the ranks of their followers (Alinsky, 1974).

The idea of finding and cultivating authentic leaders was discussed by several respondents.

There are organized groups but the same people are at all of the meetings. If new people are not brought into the process, the project will not be self-sustaining or self-sufficient.

One issue is getting the residents to understand what the needs are without someone taking over.

You have to listen to the residents.

One problem is that elected officials from poorer neighborhoods are con artists and don't deliver what they say they will deliver. They come from the bottom of the barrel. The people that come up to the top are corrupt. They need to spread the wealth and not just line their pockets. Residents need to know/understand the process. There needs to be leadership training and getting jobs.

We have a highly educated and strong African-American community in Southeast Raleigh. But we have had a lack of leadership. This causes confusion. Where's the shared power in the Triangle? There is no shared power here. If Shaw [University] could empower the residents they could get the city to commit money to beautify.

[Organization name] tries to support the growing Hispanic community. One of the main issues in getting them involved is getting to them.

Leadership development is needed to get people who aren't usually involved to the table.

Community Organization Infrastructure and Leadership Development

In addition to individual leadership challenges, many community organizations experienced leadership problems. Generally organizations tend to have capacity deficiencies in three major areas, funding, expertise, and organizational structure. Capacity is generally defined as the ability of organizations to garner the resources and skills (internal and external) to increase or maintain their effectiveness. Organizations rarely feel like they have enough funding or financial capital to be as effective as they can. Of particular interest is the lack of operating support. Many agencies have program specific funding and lack the resources to pay non-program related expenses such as financial management, fund development, and volunteer coordination. Therefore, organizations tend to have weak infrastructure, often held together by the strong personality of the leadership. This clearly places these organizations in a tenuous position in that one person cannot support the entire organization.

As discussed previously, there are a myriad of community organizations in the Southeast Raleigh area. While they can be an asset, many of these organizations are unable to address the

multitude of issues in the community. Much of this inability stems from the lack of management and programmatic capacity of the organizations. Many of the organizations have few staff members or have staff members that do not have the knowledge, skills, and abilities to perform optimally.

Therefore, many organizations expend considerable effort and capital maintaining the organization as opposed to offering quality services to the constituents. A few respondents criticized the organizations for “working so hard to keep their doors open” that they are not able to address community needs.

There needs to be some nonprofit training and capacity building taking place in order to help organizations establish and sustain CDC's. Training and capacity building would include topics such as management or financial training, needs assessments, and asset mapping.

Several respondents discussed the need for training, education, and overall capacity building within the organizations that serve the Southeast Raleigh community. These organizations were deemed deficient in terms of their ability to manage their own programs and organizations. This performance gap is critical because with the decline in public resources, community organizations are expected to fill the gaps for communities.

[They need] assistance with funding and providing grant-writing training for the CDC's

Smaller community organizations were especially in need of training such as “board development, fundraising, [and the] incorporation process.” This training would need to be substantive, rather than a single workshop.

At least a day or two. Yes, they love stuff like that, especially if they are free. It would also be helpful to have organizations mentor other organizations, especially in setting up a nonprofit. The North Carolina Center for Nonprofits helps but you must become a member first. Other nonprofits don't want to share and they are very territorial. There are also issues with management. Oftentimes, the director is not always the best person for the job. We need some sort of checks and balances.

[They need] technical assistance, training, support, strengthening groups/programs through fundraising, organizational development, and staff development. Organizations tend to flounder especially in organizational development.

As the funding landscape becomes more competitive, many community organizations have to increase their technical expertise and increase professionalism. To have access to additional funding and resource options, such as fee for services and grants, organizations must have the capacity to manage billing and reporting procedures that have become more and more complex. In addition, individuals providing services need to be high level professionals or licensed. Therefore, the management capacity of organizations is essential to meeting community needs.

Typically, funding for prevention does not allow for funding for sustainability. All grant money is pilot or seed money. There is also a capacity building need around meeting the cultural needs of the clients. Organizations need the capacity to meet [clients] where they are.

While many respondents acknowledged this increased need for management and organization leadership development, they were not sure where to get it.

The people asking for help need to be more professional. The Institute should be about training these people.

Training and development opportunities come in many different modes. Technical assistance and management training programs are two popular options. Technical assistance (TA) is the provision of expertise for problem solving. TA is provided to the organization by an external specialist, while management training programs are designed to increase the knowledge of existing staff. However, to access most training opportunities, resources are required. One respondent discussed that many of the resources “available” to nonprofit organizations are unattainable to small nonprofit organizations. The membership fees of organizations designed to build nonprofit capacity are often prohibitive for small, new, and startup organizations.

Church Capacity and Cooperation

Respondents overwhelmingly pointed to the churches as a primary asset of the community. Many respondents asserted that it was the churches role to assist the community in areas of social action and community economic development. However, many of the churches that would lead the charge lack capacity to meet those needs.

One problem is that many people that attend churches located in Southeast Raleigh do not live in Southeast Raleigh. These church members often travel from North and Northeast Raleigh to attend church services. Therefore, because they are not community residents, the emphasis on development of Southeast Raleigh, the church’s physical community, may not be a priority for the church’s members.

The following interchange was between two respondents:

Respondent #1: They need to reinvest in the community where they are sitting.

Respondent #2: We can’t just ask them to take on economic development.

Respondent #1: No, just reinvestment. We have the largest numbers of people at the churches.

Most community organizations that have tried to engage the faith community have met with little or no response.

Many [residents] are waiting for their churches to take the initiative. However, from what I can see, the churches are not organizing. For example, First Baptist and St Paul are not coming to the table.

St. Ambrose is very involved. There is also Davie St. Presbyterian. First Baptist is not involved as much any more. Some of the smaller churches are very supportive. Elevation has been involved. We are trying to get more involved with the churches with the [program name].

There was a faith-based meeting called and Pastor Walker from Mount Pleasant Church asked for letters of commitment and didn't receive any. He has been trying to work with some of the smaller churches.

There is a lack of coordination everywhere. There has been some effort to coordinate the faith-based organizations. A plan was developed, but the ministers did not follow through.

Some respondents recognized that although there were several churches in the area, many of the churches had very little administrative capacity or no administrative office other than the pastor. Capacity is the increased ability of communities to obtain resources and engage in activities (Chekki, 1979b; Glickman & Servon, 1998). When communities are capacity poor, especially regarding leadership, decision making is impoverished making institutions unresponsive to local needs, therefore threatening the well-being of community members (Ewalt, Freeman, & Poole, 1998). However, capacity is fluid and malleable, therefore communities and organizations are not relegated to the dichotomy of success or failure. In fact, communities are able to build capacity by remaining both flexible and resilient in their efforts.

Nevertheless, few churches have a full compliment of administrative capacity and support that would be required to manage the types of projects and activities that would lead to the type of economic development that is expected, desired, and needed within the community.

The smaller churches don't have the capacity. The mega churches are not bending or helping the smaller churches create an infrastructure.

There are other clergy who have built mega churches. I don't know if we will get them and I don't know if we need them.

They [churches] are lacking the requisite skill set to get things done.

Respondents were also concerned about the large churches' disinterest in collaboration. Many respondents felt that the larger churches were not compelled to engage in community development. Much of their activities were centered on the internal needs of their congregation members who were in many instances not community members. When asked about pastors who were powerful enough in the community to initiate change, a respondent replied

We are more fractured here. Many will not come to the table. There are a few that have a great deal of weight: Wooten, Wilkins, Powell, J. Vincent Terry. They can bring the sheer numbers and the voice.

They are interested in stuff like this but their ministries are so large that this stuff takes them away from what they are doing with their own churches.

Yet another respondent was much more critical of the faith community, “Pastors vacated their role as community leaders. They now have a whole lot more to lose.”

The churches in this part of the country do not have a ready and full understanding of community service. The church and social group that people align themselves with become the primary focus, not the community. People make the church their community.

It was suggested that smaller churches would especially benefit from capacity building and training on how to build organization’s infrastructure. It was suggested that any training be initially offered as a faith-based initiative.

There are a few groups doing things. For example, there is ROAR. However, because they have a mixture of denominations some pastors say they can’t plug into it.

Social Capital

Many respondents asserted that an asset of Southeast Raleigh was the human capital of its residents. The social capital of the residents was also deemed valuable to any sustained community improvement. However, the strength of these social capital networks and bonds were being challenged by larger influences.

Socio-economic shifts

One challenge is the changing demographics of the residents. Southeast Raleigh, once an African American, relatively affluent area, is experiencing significant transitions. The first change was the decrease in the area’s socio-economic status. Many of the wealthy African American families that once lived in Southeast Raleigh migrated to more affluent areas of the city such as North and Northeast Raleigh, leaving a much poorer resident population. This transition made the area much more vulnerable to social problems and their attendant issues.

Southeast Raleigh was a very affluent neighborhood of African American residents. There were larger well-kept homes. Even though there are some affluent areas, most of the community has changed dramatically.

This area is depressed in the sense that there are a lot of rental homes and only a few residents own their homes.

The perception is that there are a large number of rental properties, which is common for depressed neighborhoods. However, the area has a relatively high owner-occupied housing rate, the second highest in the city.

African American to Hispanic Transition

A second transition is also occurring. The area is experiencing a rise in the number of Hispanic residents. Hispanic residents may find the area appealing due to its accessibility and high rates of relatively low income housing opportunities. However, this transition has the potential to cause racial tension in the area. In particular, many poor African American families that resided in the Chavis Heights public housing development have moved out of the area as the development is demolished for the creation of HOPE VI housing. Many of those residents will not return as a result of the HOPE VI strategy. Therefore, the appearance to many residents is that African Americans are being pushed out and Hispanics are coming to the area.

A tension between the Hispanic community and the older, more established families in the area. This tension could be due to the cultural and language barriers. There is also some generational tension.

There are some housing complexes where residents were predominantly African American and now they are predominantly Hispanic. There was some conflict at first. An example of this is a complex on Rock Quarry Rd. There has been some conflict with the gangs. There is still some gang activity. However, many of the African American gangs are not as obvious because they are not wearing their colors. This is because with the colors, the Hispanic gangs can identify them and I have heard that the Hispanic gangs are a little more violent.

There is a rising Hispanic population. This has created a very diverse community. There haven't been too many problems with the Hispanic community and the African American community getting along. There have been some problems but not as many as Durham and Chatham county have had. The African American community has been pushed out by the Hispanic community. A community diagnosis found that Fox Ridge and Chavis Heights has been transformed from African American communities to Hispanic communities and this has caused some problems.

Break down the hostility between the Hispanics and the African Americans. The nonprofits need to get people in. They should be there to stop the wedge from being driven.

Integration of the Hispanic community. There could be tension between the Hispanics and the African Americans in the community.

One respondent questioned the implications of this racial/ethnic transitions.

Southeast Raleigh as a whole is not diverse. This leads to the question of race relations. How do residents feel/not feel integrated into the larger community? This has not been explored. The racial mix is changing. How do we live together in a pluralistic community?

Other respondents discussed a public safety implication of this transition.

Respondent #1: *Fox Ridge has seen an increase in crime and the police department is ill prepared to deal with Spanish speaking residents. There have been communication problems. There has also been an increase in gang activity.*

Respondent #2: *Someone needs to look at how you get the African Americans residents and Hispanic residents together to communicate and overcome the language barrier to work on shared issues. There needs to be leadership development.*

Respondents were careful to point out that Hispanic residents must be included in any community development projects that are initiated.

The Hispanic community should also be involved. Hispanic interests are not typically represented and they have not been engaged in the past.

City/Resident Interaction

The relationship between Southeast Raleigh residents and the City of Raleigh was identified as a source of contention. The respondents discussed the need for the city to reinvest in the community in a way that residents will perceive as sincere.

When organizations try to do focus groups they are resisted because the residents see them as government.

The leadership is there; however, the Southeast Raleigh Assembly is a big organization and is having trouble dealing with the little guy. The Community Services and Community Development Departments should be more in the mix. Some people need more care. They need to be walked through the process of interacting with the city.

We probably never would have had the Indian War if the people who came in had talked to the Indians and arrived at a compromise. There are different thought processes. The city offers money and support but is driven by market economy. The city becomes the conscious of the community. What has kept the city from putting sidewalks and curbing Southeast Raleigh? They chose the convention center over beautifying the community. This is not a race thing. How does the community fight that? How can [organization name] help? We have to beat the city. Let's demand what we want before the city decides what it wants.

There are other needs such as economic development in terms of funding, a commitment from the city, safety, and beautification. The city would have so much more trust if they would go and beautify the walking spaces in this area. Where is the evidence of the commitment?

There is a neglect of city administration. The City is overlooking the need to develop this area.

It is hard to fight the hand that feeds you.

Some respondents suggested that much of the community development initiated by the City of Raleigh omitted the voices of residents. Many of the efforts were characterized as “top down” and did not empower residents.

The citizens need to be at the front end of the process. This way we will learn from them what is needed.

One of the problems of Southeast Raleigh is that the public and the government are addressing the needs from different directions.

Empowerment is a significant aspect of any community development effort. As stated previously, empowerment is the self-determination of residents to identify their own problems and address them as they deem reasonable (Chekki, 1979a; Mondros & Wilson, 1995). At the core of empowerment is the use of governance structures to make sure that service users or community representatives have a voice, and ultimately control (Shragge, 1990). Empowerment requires an internal problem solving method and fosters self help, which increases the esteem of community members and assist in the momentum building of community development efforts as it promotes a pattern of increased human capacity (Robert J. Chaskin, Joseph, & Chipenda-Dansokho, 1998; Cook, 1994).

This lack of empowerment was evidenced in statements from City representatives. The comments displayed the tone of the comments of some city representatives.

The residents are very reactionary and do identify problems. However, they are not solution oriented.

Someone needs to teach them how to do more than make noise.

Empowerment relies on full member participation, which is also a major theme in community development. Community development places great importance on citizen involvement, consensus, and localism (Mondros & Wilson, 1995). However scholars caution against merely representative, manipulative or contrived participation (Chekki, 1979b; Cook, 1994; Fisher, 1994b; Guinier, 1994; Head, 1979). Resident participation must be authentic. The idea that citizens are directly and actively involved with the issues that affect them is one feature that distinguishes community development from other representative options of social change (Cary, 1979).

Service Coordination

Respondents also cited service coordination as a challenge for the community. Respondents acknowledged that many different organizations and agencies were providing services to the Southeast Raleigh community. Often, residents from other parts of the city were not pleased with the sheer amount of resources focused on the Southeast Raleigh area, feeling that Southeast Raleigh was getting more than its share of services and government resources. However, many respondents acknowledged that the area seemed to have the greatest needs. Nevertheless while the area has a myriad of needs and received myriad services and resources, the lack of

coordination produced inefficiency and duplication of efforts. So while community resources were often focused on the community, residents may not be gaining the greatest benefit due to the lack of coordination and collaboration.

A lot of different people are all working on different initiatives. A center could coordinate all of these efforts.

There are a lot of organizations in Southeast Raleigh so there still seem to be problems there. However, because there are so many organizations in that area, there needs to be an organization upfront to promote any new efforts.

There are not many [coalitions] that are strong. There is the Raleigh Wake Citizens Association and the NAACP.

There are some Latino coalitions. El Pueblo is one. There is also the Homelessness Steering Committee.

The [organization name] is working on a faith-based initiative. One thing that needs to be done is to determine who is doing what, which would encourage collaboration. There is a lot of legwork to be done.

Over the last decade, the human service funding landscape has become limited. Respondents felt that organizations were competition for scarce dollars. This resource scarcity has increased the competition, rather than collaboration, between organizations with similar missions and visions.

Dollars are shrinking; so we need to know what is going on and need to be able to collaborate.

There are a lot of groups working on projects and they shouldn't be doing battle.

There is turfism among the organizations. They look at each other like foes. If they don't get what they want they leave the table.

The level of communication was considered a hindrance to effective coordination. Respondents did not feel like organizations had a mechanism to stay connected and to share ideas, innovations, and strategies. These communication obstacles created a sense of isolation at best and competition at worst.

We have no way to communicate with each other. When we have meetings, those of us without cars have no way to get there.

We don't know who we are. I know some of the larger nonprofits but I don't know about the smaller nonprofits.

We need to help encourage the establishment of social networks. People need to be brought together.

It takes an educational process to get people to the table and working on the same goals. Everything is so disconnected that it will take an organization to sell the [program name] concept to individuals.

There are a lot of people doing that [conducting youth after school programs] but people aren't getting together to collaborate.

I receive phone calls all the time where people ask where to find things. Many are just struggling.

Social Problems

Respondents were not at a loss to provide a list of community problems. Many of the issues listed were not specific to Southeast Raleigh but include those encountered by many United States urban areas.

- Public Safety,
 - Crime (particularly prostitution)
 - Drugs
 - Violence
- Education,
 - Achievement gap
 - Literacy programs
 - Adult Education
 - English as a Second Language
- Affordable housing
 - Decreased low rent housing
 - Lack of housing stock
 - Deteriorating conditions of older homes
- Economy
 - Poverty
 - Lack of job opportunities and job training (particularly for African American males)
 - Business and community development
 - Inability to obtain credit
- Health,
 - Substance abuse
 - Obesity/overweight issues
- Environment
 - Air and water quality and
- Transportation

Southeast Raleigh carries the stigma as the seat of crime and social problems in the city. Many respondents discussed the perception or reality of increased crime in the area. These social problems (perceived or real) diminish the real quality of life for residents as well as the property and investment value of the area.

I don't know the crime rate. There is a perception of crime. The perception is that the poorest areas have the most crime.

The area needs job opportunities for its residents and affordable housing. Fulfilling both of these needs would lead to a reduction in crime. Another problem is the perception of crime. Crime tends to be higher in rental areas.

Southeast Raleigh needs decent programs for job training and decent programs for employment creation. There is a real lack of income, which is the result of lack of education.

There is a need for training but the main issue is opportunity. How do we get them into the job after the training?

Other communities don't understand why there is so much focus on Southeast Raleigh since these other communities have needs as well. Someone should be talking with organizations in southeast to find out if there is a need for a coordinated effort.

[There] is a huge disparity between the haves and have nots. Southeast Raleigh is the area with the have nots. Nothing brings people to that area.

The following discussion was between two respondents:

Respondent #1: *The police chief is the one that is saying there is a gang problem. This is a way to get more police officers. We have a group of boys who are selling drugs but they are not a gang.*

Respondent #2: *But there is a lot of crime. There is prostitution and drugs.*

While the respondents acknowledge that there is a problem with crime, the characterization of a gang problem has been overstated both in the community and outside of it. However, respondents were concerned about the perceptions of such a characterization. While it may garner additional resources, it also intensifies the stigma already attached to the area.

Barriers to community based research

In addition to challenges in Southeast Raleigh, there are other challenges that are associated with university community partnership development. University community partnerships are often desired, but difficult to achieve. Barriers to these types of collaborations can be found both in the university and in the community. Specifically the community deals with issues of trust and the university must address issues of faculty and student capacity.

Trust

Trust was cited by all of the respondents as a serious concern for the implementation of university research and outreach projects in the community. Southeast Raleigh residents have developed a healthy distrust of outsiders providing services. Many respondents thought residents were skeptical of the sustainability of community service activities. Many of the respondents discussed the political nature of helping communities.

They are suspicious of anything new. A lot of people in Southeast Raleigh have lived there their whole life and you have to show them that change is good. The city has focused on Southeast Raleigh for a long time. Promises have been made to the residents, yet the promises have not been kept.

[Community organization name] conducted an analysis of citizen engagement. They found that there is a large distrust for government in Southeast Raleigh. There is distrust yet the citizens still expect the government to fix the problems in the area. Once the government proves they can fix the problems, the citizens will begin to trust them.

People who live here have a broken spirit. The trust is gone with both the city and the churches. They are not getting back a benefit from what they are giving. They need a core group of people/stakeholders that will get things moving.

One issue that needs to be addressed is the citizens' distrust for the government. There was a stakeholder analysis conducted that found that citizens distrusted the government and were not involved in the decision-making.

People are always asking what are needs are but they don't always give us what we ask for. People have promised a lot of things but haven't always kept their promises. We need transportation. This is the largest need.

Anyone and everyone who wants to do a project does a survey of this area. The residents feel they are being used/studied to death.

The poor communities have been helped to death. There is a reason they don't have trust and it is because programs backfire.

You need to be aware you shouldn't raise expectations beyond what's reasonable. Our job is to find/create people with a fire in their belly.

There is a barrier to get people to talk because they have been surveyed to death.

Promises need to be kept and they haven't been. Trust has been broken so many times. There needs to be accountability and follow through. It takes time to strategize with people.

The history of NC State is poor and might affect older residents.

[This is] a community that has had a lot of students that have come in and the community has some resistance and distrust of the university coming into community. They feel they have been over studied. This might be a barrier. They may pose reservations because you have “selected” Southeast Raleigh.

Part of the reason for this skepticism and distrust is due to the exclusion of residents in planning processes. Many interventions are brought to the community and executed in and on the community without the input of community residents.

Many plans are not developed by the residents.

The residents may be resistant because you have already decided that you are going into Southeast Raleigh. You have “selected” them without their input. You need to have a strong statement of why you are coming into southeast

Others suggested that the development of a university community partnership could be done, but it would have to be done very carefully and strategically. One way to overcome the potential barrier or distrust was to work through existing respected community organizations and institutions.

Through connectedness. People need to feel that they can trust you with information. You need to know the significance of the history. There is also a pedigree check. Before people tell you, you need to know the significance of what they tell you. In the beloved community these are the major people. It is rampant across North Carolina.

Some respondents thought using the Southeast Raleigh Assembly as an entrée into the community would be beneficial.

There is a significant gatekeeper mentality. The Southeast Raleigh Assembly Community Involvement issue team might be the best road in.

Others thought being sincere in purpose and goals could penetrate the community. This sincerity was particularly important in regard to the intent of faculty staff and students.

Yes, if your intent is noble. We need people to come together and put this thing into action. If you make a little noise, people will come out. People need to understand that things don't need to stay the way they are.

We don't want to use the community for what the university needs.

People will believe in you is you show them you are sincere. There have been mandates but no resources to back them up. It takes being sincere.

Faculty Capacity

Previously, the capacity issues of the community were discussed. However, there were capacity concerns in the university as well. The number of faculty members who conduct applied

research, while in currently in the minority, is increasing but, in general, community based or applied research is not taught or encouraged in many disciplines. While faculty members are often expected to incorporate service learning into their coursework, it is often not rewarded. Further, many faculty are not trained in implementing university community partnerships.

The institutions need to make a commitment that the faculty who do this kind of work would be considered for tenure. The faculty who might have an interest would need to be trained. They currently don't have the knowledge or experience on how to rework their discipline to lead students to do work on civil society outcomes.

Student Capacity and Community Needs

Many respondents were hesitant to entertain the idea of utilizing students in their programs. Students, particularly undergraduate students, were not seen as having the requisite skills, knowledge, and commitment to work effectively in community organizations. When asked how she could use students, one respondent skeptically asked "You mean undergraduates?" She then went on to discuss how she could use graduate students on assessment and evaluation activities of the organization.

Sometimes people have issues with age. Some are not comfortable with students teaching workshops. There is a lot of overlap in general. We need to look at their needs and try to match those needs.

*We need help with recruitment of volunteers. We need **consistent** volunteers to work with the children. We have found that providing incentives to student gets them to volunteer. If you don't pay them, they don't come.*

Further, students' time lines (i.e., semester schedules) often do not coincide with the needs of local community projects. Students often engage in community based or outreach activities as part of a class. Since these classes are only one semester, students often disengage from the project before it is over.

SECTION III: DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS (AREAS OF INTEREST & ACTIVITIES)

The purpose of this study was to examine the feasibility of an application from the Institute for Nonprofits at North Carolina State University for a Community Outreach Partnership Grant. Based on the field research conducted, there is interest from faculty and Southeast Raleigh would benefit from a university community partnership. Organizations and institutions within the community are in need of the conceptual frameworks, organizational and programmatic strategies, and planning and evaluation capacity that can be provided by the university community. However, multiple efforts are needed for the success of such an initiative. These efforts require substantive investment and involvement from the university and Southeast Raleigh communities. Additionally, the community must be empowered to direct the process.

In light of the need for resident driven efforts, most glaringly missing from this feasibility study were the voices of residents. This omission was not by accident. It was the intent of the researcher to first examine the practicality of offering any type of services to the community before engaging residents and getting their perspectives on the opportunity. As many respondents noted, community residents have been disappointed and disenfranchised repeatedly. To avoid raising expectations, this study was conducted to determine the needs and to be able to assess the NC State University Institute for Nonprofit's capacity to address those needs before making any offers. As such, the first recommendation is to garner community resident input.

Efforts to engage residents will be essential. Considerations of the different stakeholder groups (e.g., the inner and outer beltline areas, youth, elders, etc) will need to be carefully negotiated. The lack of inclusion could be detrimental to any helping efforts. Therefore engagement efforts will need to be implemented in a manner that shows respect, deference, sincerity, and humility.

Town meetings, workshops, focus groups, and forums should be held with Southeast Raleigh residents to determine their perception of their needs. Coordinating these types of efforts with existing community institutions may provide an entrée into the community. As one respondent commented, "Working with the HBCU's would be critical." Using respected organizations may provide a level of endorsement to the effort.

This report may be used to initiate those conversations. Residents should be asked to provide a validity check for the comments provided by nonresident stakeholders. It is imperative that community members be empowered to engage in and guide any community development activities in the Southeast Raleigh area.

In addition to resident participation, there are other possible strategies for university-community collaboration. Respondents were asked what types of activities they would like to see a proposal include. Many noted that a number of specific steps can be taken to promote integrative practices, including the following recommendations:

Focus on Asset Based Community Development

Asset-based community development (ABCD) was created as a result of the concentration of professional driven helping process. The use of the medical model to provide human service interventions leads to the crisis intervention orientation rather than a preventive or strengths based orientation when seeking to address community problems (McKnight, 1995). The social service or helping professions create powerful institutions that do not lend themselves to client centered or driven interventions. This type of professionalism undermines the very basis of community development, empowerment. John McKnight (1995) asserts that a framework that blames the victim and denies self-determination exemplifies the prevailing hegemony of help. Asset based community development seeks reverse that paradigm and to reintroduce empowerment in communities.

As such, any projects proposed within Southeast Raleigh must use a strengths based perspective such as asset-based community development. The guiding principles of the activities and even the mission statement for any projects must reflect the strengths based nature of the work to be done. Additionally, this ideology must be exemplified in all aspects of the program, not just

stated mission and advertised goals. The implementation of the project must be inclusive and build upon existing competencies in the community.

Development of Capacity Building/Training Centers

Many respondents discussed the need for a Leadership Training center. There are many residents who want to make positive changes in the community. However, the capacity to do so may be limited by the lack of skill and experience with social change. While residents have a great deal to offer, an opportunity would be to build on the existing hopefulness and energy of residents and leaders to promote sustained community development, building, and organizing efforts.

Respondents repeatedly commented on the need for youth leadership development. Many of the Southeast Raleigh residents were elders and may not be able to lead community change efforts. However, youth were seen as entrepreneurs and creative thinkers. Garnering young people and teaching them how to be activist and responsible citizens would be helpful to the community.

Holding leadership institutes that not only educate youth, but residents of all ages would be helpful. Providing workshops and classes on how to access services (particularly social and human services), hold meetings, mobilize people, and engage in community development tactics or strategies would be of benefit. Other topics for workshops could include communication, group dynamics, public speaking, persuasion, listening, writing, team building, and social responsibility.

While there is need for individual resident leadership development, there is also the need to increase the capacity of organizations in the Southeast Raleigh area. Communities are experiencing many transitions. Changes brought about by welfare reform, downsizing of government programs, budget reductions, privatization, and managed care have impacted the nature and scope of community organizations. The current economic, social, and political environment has created a greater demand than ever for knowledge of organization administration and management. Therefore, like trainings for residents, a nonprofit management training would increase the capacity of community organizations to address the needs of the community within the community.

A nonprofit training could provide workshops and technical assistance in the following areas: strategic planning, financial analysis, leadership, technology, social policy advocacy, human resources management, program evaluation, and marketing and fundraising. North Carolina State University faculty and staff serve as trainers in each of these areas. There are faculty members who currently teach each of these topic areas who could be module trainers.

Resource Coordination

The lack of coordinated resources presents numerous challenges and barriers that impede organizations' ability to operate effectively. Many organizations feel isolated and disconnected because they do not see their connection to the larger systems that affect change. This type of organizational isolation is a powerful barrier in that it limits the exchange of ideas and ability to collaborate.

Further, the lack of coordination increases the likelihood of duplication of services. Many respondents talked about the "turfism" and counterproductive activities in the community. To alleviate some of these issues, an entity could be identified to act as a clearinghouse for community resources. One respondent suggested, "A lot of different people are all working on different initiatives. A center could coordinate all of these efforts." Another respondent said "NC State could help by bringing in students and conducting evaluations. There needs to be an evaluation of what's out there now. There needs to be a way to see where we are going, what has already been done, and what didn't work."

A resource clearinghouse may be a way to increase the knowledge of and access to existing community resources. This clearinghouse would provide information, referral, and linkage to community organizations and individuals. A resource clearinghouse has the potential to help struggling nonprofits and individuals connect to resources that will foster increased capacity.

The clearinghouse could offer a service directory for individuals. This component might provide a resource information on a myriad of community social services. Resources included could include housing, education and training, legal and advocacy, support and self help to name only a few. This system could even be provided electronically.

Asset Mapping

A more specific recommendation regarding resource coordination, is asset mapping. An asset map is a detail of the strengths and assets of the community and its members. An asset map reveals the assets of the entire community and highlights the interconnections among them, which in turn reveals how to access those assets. Often asset mapping is used at the beginning of the community organizing and/or visioning process. The ability for community residents to see the wealth of existing resources and capacity create a space for visioning and community building efforts.

One suggestion was made that Geographic Information Systems (GIS) be used to map the area. GIS is a layered visual depiction of an area. Using GIS software enables the user to combine information from various databases and data sources and creating a coordinated visual image of the information. For instance, many of the respondents were interested in an asset map of the area. Using GIS to create this map has many potential benefits. Suppose the community resources were cataloged in a database. These would include libraries, recreation centers, shelters, community organizations, commercial centers, etc. These entities would be mapped using GIS. It could then be made accessible to community members at the local library, church, or supermarket so that residents could easily find services and be empowered to access them. The Wake County government web site offers GIS IMAP service (<http://imaps.co.wake.nc.us/imaps/>), which may be a resource for this type of activity.

However, a coordination effort of this magnitude would require a great deal of transparency in systems and procedures. The coordinating organization would need to carefully gain the trust and confidence of the community and its institutions to be able to adequately assess the community's resources and begin to suggest and facilitate ways to maximize the existing resources. Eventually this body would actively engage in cultivating new resources.

Increased Service Learning and Internships

Service learning is a pedagogical method that combines service and learning objectives where both the student and the recipient experience beneficial outcomes. Service learning plays an important role for universities and students. Service learning helps to promote and develop "civic minded citizens." (Brotherton, 2002 pg. 20) Students learn by practical application and accompanying self-reflection activities. In addition, students get credit for out of class, community based experiences and communities gain the benefit of students' activities and skills.

Internships are opportunities for students to exemplify skills they have learned in the classroom. By using internships, students are able to learn by doing and being exposed to professionals working in the field. Internships provide valuable experience, a professional reference and often lead to a position upon graduation. Specifically fields such as social work and psychology require successful internship experiences prior to graduation. Students must demonstrate that they have mastered the practice skills learned in the classroom.

The Southeast Raleigh Assembly (SERA) would be specifically benefit from engaging students in service learning and internship opportunities. A Coordinator, who is the backbone of the organization, currently staffs the SERA. SERA has a list of volunteer needs that include assistance with preparation and distribution of newsletters; cable television production assistance; leadership trainers; Southeast Raleigh historians or individuals who can record oral histories; students to develop asset and blight maps; and individuals to conduct and volunteers to facilitate town meetings. Since SERA is viewed as a major stakeholder in the community, it's capacity is of primary importance to the health of the area.

In addition, other community organizations are in need of much of the same type of student engagement. NC State has 29,637 students that could potentially engage in activities within the Southeast Raleigh area. All of the organizations in the community have lists similar to that of SERA. Each organization has needs that could be filled by students who are interested in learning from community experiences. However, it is important balance the objectives of the organizations with the learning needs of the students. This equilibrium is very important to maintain in order to preserve the, often delicate, relationship between universities and communities.

Of particular interest to several respondents was the use of students to participate in community beautification efforts for the area. Community beautification efforts seek to increase the visual and aesthetic value of the area. Projects such as design; landscaping for residential, commercial and public spaces; community gardening; and debris removal. While beautification is not a solution to all of a community's problems, it does often initiate community pride and engagement.

Finally, an additional opportunity for service is to assist nonprofit and public service entities to access AmeriCorps Volunteers in Service To America (VISTA) members. VISTA members have a 40-year history of helping hundreds of nonprofit organizations and public agencies throughout the country. There is an opportunity to help nonprofit organizations develop projects and host VISTA members so that they can expand their capacity to make lasting social and community change.

Community Based Research

Communities are in need of new, updated, and proven interventions and strategies for addressing the problems they face. Staff members of community organizations do not engage in research activities for a multitude of reasons. Most often, direct and executive staff do not have the time or staff capacity to engage in evaluation or other research activities. Many organizations barely have the staff capacity to provide direct services to the large needs of the community. Therefore research activities are relegated to lesser value. Reasonably, organizations then concentrate their efforts where they will make the biggest impact, which is often the provision of services.

However, many organizations are faced with evaluation and research demands from funders. Funders are increasingly interested in outcomes and impacts of the investments they are making into organizations and the communities they serve. This new demand is an opportunity for universities to engage with communities.

Opportunities for research include needs assessments, outcome studies, impact evaluations, and resident opinion surveys. Each of these research options are needed to develop tools for increasing resources for and building capacity of the community. Community based research provides mutually beneficial outcomes for both entities in that knowledge production is developed by the researcher and communities benefit from its results, which include best practices, evidence based practice models, and practice theory development (Holkup et al., 2004).

Conclusion

University community partnerships offer opportunities for significant change, development, and learning. They are excellent mechanisms for residents, students, faculty, and staff to collaborate to meet a myriad of needs. However, it is important that these partnerships be entered carefully and strategically. Each partner has to be fully aware of the goals, mission, and culture of the other. Further, each needs to hold realistic expectations for the outcomes of the partnership. As The North Carolina State University Institute for Nonprofits contemplates the feasibility of these partnerships, beyond wanting to provide services to Southeast Raleigh, The Institute will have many tasks prior to engagement. The Institute will have to clearly articulate why Southeast Raleigh was chosen as the site for activity; what community engagement methods will be used; and what activities it has the capacity to offer among other things. But the aforementioned determinations need to be made with constant and sincere communication with community representatives, particularly residents.

SECTION IV: APPENDICES**Appendix A: Contacts**

Mitch	Owen	North Carolina State University Personal and Organizational Development	Innovation & Organizational Development Leader
James	West	City of Raleigh, City Council	Councillor for Southeast (District C)
William	Thurston	Shaw University - Center for Ethics & Leadership Development	Faculty and Executive Director of CELD
Ken	Maness	City of Raleigh Planning Department	Area Planner
Nicole	Sullivan	State of North Carolina Department of Corrections	Research and Evaluation Analyst
Stanley	Green	Mechanics and Farmers Bank	Vice president and City Executive
Greg	Hatem	Empire Properties	CEO
Michele	Grant	City of Raleigh Community Development Department	Director
Hardy	Watkins	City of Raleigh Community Services Department	Director
Shawn	McNamara	City of Raleigh Community Development Department	Program Manager
Brent	Henry	North Carolina Cooperative Extension-Wake County Center (Extension Director)	Extension Director
Andrew	Meyer	North Carolina Cooperative Extension-Wake County Center	Agricultural Extension Agent
Morris	Dunn	North Carolina Cooperative Extension-Wake County Center	4-H Youth Development/Team Leader
Marisol	Jimenez	El Pueblo	Legislative Initiative Dir.
Annette	Watson	Strengthening the Black Family	Director
Kim	Lukes	St. Augustine's College	Provost
Lillian	Thompson	City of Raleigh City Manager's Office	Economic Development Strategist
David	Stein	North Carolina State University College of Design	Planning Specialist
Regina	Petteway	Wake County Human Services	Community Initiatives Director
Pam	Martin	NCSU-Psychology in the Public Interest	Assistant Professor
Karen	Morant	Wake County Human Services	Community Initiatives Project Leader
Lachelle	Wardell	Wake County Human Services	Human Services Leader II - Community Health
Katherine	Williams	North Carolina Cooperative Extension-Wake County Center	Human Services Program Manager
Katrina	Simon	City of Raleigh Planning Department	Area Planner
Craig	Brookins	North Carolina State University	Director Africana Studies
Mike	Giancola	North Carolina State University - Center for	Director

		Student Leadership, Ethics, and Public Service	
Tierza	Watts	North Carolina State University - Center for Student Leadership, Ethics, and Public Service	Associate Director
Pam	Martin	North Carolina State University -	Assistant Professor
Frank	White	Antioch Bible Fellowship	Pastor
Keith	Sutton	Triangle Urban League	President and CEO
Larry	Jones	Garner Road YMCA	Director
Pat	Malone-Johnson	Community Advocates for Parks in Southeast Raleigh	Retired Teacher
Norman	Camp	South Citizen Advisory Council	Chair
Josephine	McCullers	ICC	
Brenda	Sanders	Raleigh Nursery School	
Kim	Best		
Martell	Perry	Shaw University	
Chris	Bishop	ROAR	
Robert	Jones	RSE	
Francine	Taylor	Passage Home	

Appendix B: Interview Protocol for Interviews and Focus Groups

1. Are you familiar with a COPC grant?
2. What are the most pressing issues in SE Raleigh?
 - a. What would you say were the top 3 problems the COPC should address?
3. How do you define community development?
4. Are residents interested in community development?
5. Do residents engage in advocacy?
 - a. If yes, how?
 - b. If no, why not?
6. Does advocacy make a difference?
7. Is there an Enterprise Community or an Empowerment Zone in SE Raleigh?
8. Would you be interested in receiving any of the following from a joint program between the SE Raleigh community and NC State University?
 - a. Technical assistance,
 - b. Training,
 - c. Interventions,
 - d. Programs and services
9. Which of the 4 listed above? How would you envision a project that would address a SE Raleigh's issues using those mechanisms?
10. Are there coalitions that you know of in the SE Raleigh area?
 - a. If so, what are they doing? How effective are they?
 - b. If not, would you be interested in participating in one?
11. If you had a magic wand and could change anything about SE Raleigh, what would it be?
12. How can those things be changed?
13. What could NC State offer to SE Raleigh?
14. If an advisory committee were established for this project, would you be interested in serving on it?
 - a. How much time per month would you be able to commit to it?
15. Would you be able to commit space for this project? Do you know of an agency that could?

16. Would you or your organization be able to commit any resources to this project?
 - a. What kind of resources?
 - b. To what extent?

17. Are there other people to whom we should be speaking?

SECTION V: REFERENCES

- Alinsky, S. D. (1946). *Reveille For Radicals*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Austin, D. E. (2003). Community-based collaborative team ethnography: A community-university-agency partnership. *Human Organization*, 62(2), 143.
- Cary, L. J. (1979). The Present State of Community Development - Theory and Practice. In D. A. Chekki (Ed.), *Community development : theory and method of planned change* (pp. 32 - 46). New Delhi: Vikas.
- Channels, N., & Zannoni, D. (1999). Trinity center for neighborhoods: Connecting a small liberal arts college to its neighborhoods. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 42(5), 855.
- Chaskin, R. J., Brown, P., Venkatesh, S., & Vidal, A. (1998). *Building Community Capacity*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Chaskin, R. J., Joseph, M. L., & Chipenda-Dansokho, S. (1998). Implementing Comprehensive Community Development: Possibilities and Limitations. In P. L. Ewalt, E. M. Freeman & D. L. Poole (Eds.), *Community Building: Renewal, Well-Being, and Shared Responsibility* (pp. 17 - 28). Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Chekki, D. A. (1979a). *Community Development Theory and Method of Planned Change*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House PVT LTD.
- Chekki, D. A. (1979b). *Community development : theory and method of planned change*. New Delhi: Vikas.
- Chekki, D. A. (1979c). A Prolegomena to Community Development and Planned Change. In D. A. Chekki (Ed.), *Community Development: Theory and Method of Planned Change* (pp. 3 - 24). New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt Ltd.
- Clavel, P., Pitt, J., & Yin, J. (1997). The community option in urban policy. *Urban Affairs Review*, 32(4), 435-459.
- Cook, J. B. (1994, October 4.). *Community Development Theory*. Retrieved February 2, 2001, from <http://muextension.missouri.edu/xplor/miscpubs/mp0568.htm>
- Davis, T., & Trebian, M. (2001). Shaping the destiny of Native American people by ending the digital divide: The nation's tribal colleges and universities. *EDUCAUSE Review*, 36(1), 38.
- DeVries, B. (1998). *Champions of the Poor: The Economic Consequences of Judeo-Christian Values*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

- Drier, P. (1996). Community Empowerment Strategies: The Limits and Potential of Community Organizing in Urban Neighborhoods. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 2(2), 38.
- Ewalt, P. L., Freeman, E. M., & Poole, D. L. (1998). *Community Building: Renewal, Well-Being, and Shared Responsibility*. Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Fisher, R. (1994a). Community Organizing in the Conservative '80s and Beyond. *Social Policy*, 11-21.
- Fisher, R. (1994b). *Let The People Decide*. New York: Twayne Publishers.
- Foley, M., & Edwards, B. (1997). Editor's Introduction. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(5), 550 - 561.
- Gittell, R., & Vidal, A. (1998). *Community Organizing: Building Social Capital as a Development Strategy*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Gittings, P. (1988). *In Search of Sisterhood: Delta Sigma Theta and the Challenge of the Black Sorority Movement*. New York: William Morrow and Company.
- Glickman, N. J., & Servon, L. J. (1998). More Than Bricks and Sticks: Five Components of Community Development Corporation Capacity. *Housing Policy Debate*, 9(3), 497 - 539.
- Greeley, A. (1997). Coleman Revisited: Religious Structures as a Source of Social Capital. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(5), 587 - 595.
- Green, G. P., & Haines, A. (2002). *Asset Building & Community Development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Guinier, L. (1994). *The Tyranny of the Majority*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Head, W. A. (1979). Community Development in Post-Industrial Society - Myth or Reality? In D. A. Chekki (Ed.), *Community development : theory and method of planned change* (pp. 101 - 113). New Delhi: Vikas.
- Holkup, P. A., Tripp-Reimer, T., Salois, E. M., & Weinert, C. (2004). Community-based participatory research: an approach to intervention research with a native American community. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 27(3), 162 -176.
- Homan, S. M., Oleskevich, D., Foster, P., Domahidy, M. R., & Hogan, M. E. (1998). Neighbor to neighbor: Working together for healthy families through an urban community partnership. *American Journal of Public Health*, 88(6), 977.
- Kahn, S. (1991). *Organizing A Guide For Grassroots Leaders* (Vol. 1): Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.

- Kirkwood, T. F. (1999). Integrating an interdisciplinary unit in middle school: A school-university partnership. *The Clearing House*, 72(3), 160.
- McKnight, J. (1995). *The Careless Society: Community and Its Counterfeits*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Mondros, J., & Wilson, S. M. (1995). *Organizing For Power and Empowerment*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Newton, K. (1997). Social Capital and Democracy. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(5), 575 - 585.
- Pumphrey, G. (1998). Workforce preparedness: A community partnership for economic development. *Economic Development Review*, 15(4), 30.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone : the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Reed, P. (1995). Toward a Theology of Christian Community Development. In J. M. Perkins (Ed.), *Restoring at Risk Communities* (pp. 27 - 46). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Sabatine, F. J. (1991). A Partnership That Works: Determining the Business Community's Needs and Concerns. *Economic Development Review*, 9(1), 26.
- Shragge, E. (1990). Community Based Practice: Political Alternatives or New State Forms? In E. Shragge & L. Davies (Eds.), *Bureaucracy and Community: Essays on the Politics of Social Work Practice* (pp. 137 - 178). New York, NY: Black Rose Books.
- Shragge, E., & Fisher, R. (2001, April 25 - 28). *Community Development Practices: New Forms of Regulation and/or Potential for Social Change*. Paper presented at the Urban Affairs Association - Annual Meeting, Detroit, Michigan.
- Stack, C. B. (1974). *All our kin: strategies for survival in a Black community*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Taylor, J. R., Beane, G. E., & Genee, C. L. (1998). The Michigan public health institute: A model for university, government and community research and practice partnerships. *SRA Journal*, 30(1/2), 17.
- Warren, M. (1998). Community Building and Political Power. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 42(1), 78 - 93.
- Zinicola, D., & Devlin-Scherer, R. (2001). A university-museum partnership for teacher education field experiences in science. *The Clearing House*, 74(5), 248.