

COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS: WHAT DO THEY OFFER COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT?

JEFFREY S. LOWE
Jackson State University

ABSTRACT: *This article provides case studies of the role of three community foundations in facilitating the establishment of community development collaboratives to galvanize support for local community development corporations (CDCs): the Cleveland Foundation, the Dade Community Foundation, and the Greater New Orleans Foundation. Sentiments about community foundation support or influence upon CDC activity captured from person-to-person interviews with CDC staff and community foundation personnel and board members are included, in addition to secondary data documenting the character and activity of community foundation assistance. The article offers lessons drawn from the three cases. Although it makes no broad generalizations, the article concludes with some recommendations for community foundations interested in community development collaboratives as a means of supporting local CDCs and identifies some areas for future research.*

A major challenge facing neighborhood-based organizations undertaking community development agendas continues to be securing and leveraging necessary resources. Resources from government, corporations, and foundations typically become critical ingredients in the successful implementation of community development initiatives. However, failure to leverage the appropriate level of support can result in neighborhood-based organizations, such as community development corporations (CDCs), becoming undercapitalized, unstable, and unable to follow through on any sustainable plan for community development.

Community foundations, which will be defined later, are likely to play a greater role in influencing future CDC capacity, activities, and successes. Federal tax policy calls for volunteerism, and national foundation initiatives have resulted in expanding the capacity of some community foundations to engage in community development that lends support to CDCs. Also important to the process of community development, community foundation leaders contend that because their organizations are public charities, they maintain a higher level of accountability, and, therefore, accessibility and responsiveness to community interests than private foundations (Covington, 1994). Private foundations, which

**Direct correspondence to: Jeffrey S. Lowe, Jackson State University, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, School of Policy and Planning, College of Public Service, 3825 Ridgewood Road, Box 23, Jackson MS 39211. E-mail: jeffrey.s.lowe@ccaix.jsums.edu*

JOURNAL OF URBAN AFFAIRS, Volume 26, Number 2, pages 221-240.

Copyright © 2004 Urban Affairs Association

All rights of reproduction in any form reserved.

ISSN: 0735-2166.

include corporate, family, and national foundations, make up the largest segment of philanthropy, while the community foundation sector has undergone the most substantial growth since the mid-1980s. Substantial growth along with expanded capacity has some community foundations seeking to continue the sector's legacy by galvanizing contemporary support for CDCs.

This article focuses on the role of community foundations in community development and describes specific foundation efforts to build support for local CDCs through the formation of collaborative relationships to promote development. In general, very little appears to be known about community foundations. Only a scant literature exists on these, the most public of USA foundations. For example, of the 2,212 entries in *Philanthropy and Voluntarism: An Annotated Bibliography* (Layton, 1987), three pertain to community foundations.

This article is derived from research completed in 2001 consisting of personal interviews with community foundation boards and staffs as well as CDC executive directors; secondary data were also collected. Discussion begins with a historic overview of circumstances that gave rise to three generations of community foundations such as calls for greater social investment, renewed patriotism, and desires to lessen the autonomy of foundations, respectively. Cases of community foundation engagement in community development collaboratives that support the efforts of community development corporations (CDCs) in Cleveland, Ohio, New Orleans, Louisiana, and Miami, Florida, and the lessons learned are reviewed in the subsequent sections. The article concludes with some recommendations for the community foundation sector and identifies some areas for future research.

ORIGINS OF COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS

An examination into the birth of community foundations must be properly placed within the context of philanthropy in the United States and its relationship to both the public and private sectors. Hall (1992) argues that modern philanthropy originated during the late nineteenth century as a private sector concession to socialist ideals. Capitalist forces led to such challenges as worker exploitation, poverty, and inequity. However, rather than support increased government intervention, fearing it would impede natural selection (social Darwinism), individual initiative, and the operation of the market, the acceptable alternative became welfare capitalism.

Phase I: Welfare Capitalism and Community Foundations

Beginning in the 1880s and continuing into the early 1900s, welfare capitalism denoted the change in US businesses, whereby employers made substantial investments in human capital. This social compact assured that as businesses achieved success, some profits returned to the community in the form of social investments to reduce need and enhance community life. In turn, many employers experienced increased productivity and loyalty from labor (Brandes, 1976; Nelson, 1975).

While the private sector clearly played the lead role, most welfare capitalism initiatives involved collaboration between business, local government, and non-profit organizations. The continued desire to tackle some of the most pressing and long-standing community challenges though collaborative means spurred the creation of permanent endowments, which received contributions from a broad array of local donors—wealthy and non-wealthy.

These permanent endowments named themselves “community foundations” (Hall, 1989; Hammack, 1989).

The majority of older community foundations can be found in the major population centers of the Midwest and Northeast, once heavily reliant on industry, that sustain substantial old wealth and a civic culture of relatively high involvement by nonprofits (Hammack, 1989). The Cleveland Foundation, established in 1914, the oldest community foundation in the nation, has a significant history of working with the public, private, and non-profit sectors in communities throughout Cleveland, Ohio (Tittle, 1992). A year later community foundations were established in other cities including Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, and Boston. Community foundations continued to experience growth in numbers and assets until the massive loss of wealth and income experienced by many individuals during the Great Depression.

Phase II: Community Foundations during the Post-Depression and Civil Rights Years

After a period of stagnation during the Great Depression and World War II years, the community foundation movement began another period of growth that differed in rationale from the first. Several community foundations, attempting to take advantage of a revived patriotism and sense of community exhibited after World War II, were established to strengthen local community chests grappling with the challenges of rapid urbanization (Hammack, 1989). Some foundations offered community chests struggling with fund-raising an opportunity to engage in long-term and comprehensive planning. These opportunities included planning for receipts of capital gifts from various sources and bequeaths creating programs designed to remedy local challenges (Loomis, 1962). By providing entrée to significant financial resources, community foundations set out to stabilize and legitimize local community chests. In fact, during the 1950s community chests and other associated social agencies working to meet local needs received the majority of community foundation grants for operating expenses (Howard, 1963; Hammack, 1989; Rich, 1961).

After almost 20 years of growth, the community foundation movement found itself in another period of stagnation beginning in the mid-1960s. Ylvisaker (1989) suggests this period of stymied progress occurred due to different definitions of community—some individuals and groups held a sense of community that only encompassed a homogeneous citizenry while others, greatly influenced by the civil rights and women’s liberation movements, believed community to be inclusive of racial and gender diversity.

Another factor for the lack of growth may be attributed to the role national and community foundations played in fostering this new inclusive and diverse sense of community that antagonized some whites, members of European ethnic groups and labor unions, and Catholics, who believed their desires were consequently marginalized (Hammack, 1989). For example, the Ford Foundation faced public scrutiny for supporting voter registration campaigns in black communities, and several community foundations received harsh criticisms for relationship building between women and private-sector leadership (Hall, 1989; Hammack, 1989). Coupled with other public objections to foundation initiatives intended to tackle poverty and inequality and the alleged abuses committed by many family foundations, Congress commenced hearings on the activities of the entire foundation industry in winter 1969.

According to the *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report* (US Congress, 1969), the hearings were extensive with four days of testimony from witnesses representing approximately 70 different foundations. During the hearings, community foundations presented

themselves as publicly accountable by highlighting the following four distinguishing characteristics not found among private foundations: (1) a pool of funds created from donors that reflects the different sectors of the community, (2) a board of directors representative of the public interest and appointed by public officials, institutions or the foundation's nominating committee, (3) a more professional staff, and (4) an annual report distributed within the served community.

Congress recognized the important contribution of philanthropic giving, but criticized the virtual autonomy of private and family foundations in particular. It desired giving that could be held accountable and undertook coercive action in the form of tax regulation to ensure the continued involvement of donors. Hall (1992) substantiates the effectiveness of this approach by arguing that tax regulation alters the motives for giving from altruistic reasons to those of tax avoidance. Seeking a way to encourage greater philanthropic involvement that was both innovative and publicly accountable at the local level, the federal government, through tax reform, chose community foundations as that vehicle. Consequently, community foundations and their donors emerged from the Tax Reform Act of 1969 with greater tax advantages than all other foundations.

Phase III: Community Foundations—After 1969 Tax Reform to the Present

The U.S. Department of Treasury did not issue the rules and regulations of the 1969 Tax Reform Act, which provided the best tax advantages to community foundations and their donors, until 1976. Once implemented and continuing throughout the 1980s, community foundations experienced significant growth in assets and numbers due to enactment of the new tax advantages (Hammack, 1989). Additionally, with the Reagan, Bush, and Clinton administrations' calls for volunteerism and national foundation support, a third generation of community foundations, at the close of the twentieth century, made up one of the fastest growing segments of philanthropy. Community foundations number over 300 institutions, counting only those with assets over \$5 million each, in the US (Foundation Center, 2002). In aggregate, this translates into approximately \$30 billion in assets and over \$2 billion in total annual giving by community foundations as a means of tackling some of the most pressing challenges at the local level, including community development (Foundation Center, 2002).

COMMUNITY FOUNDATION INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The role of community foundations in confronting several challenges facing community development at the local level has increased in significance since the early 1980s. Dissatisfaction with federal policies aimed at social and economic justice resulted in a drastic decline in public spending on social programs during the Reagan administration. Reagan convened the Task Force on Private Sector Initiatives to explore what private voluntary activities could take the place of declining government intervention. The task force generated neither substantial research nor concrete policy guidelines during the 1980s (Lenkowsky, 2003). However, it played an important role in promoting voluntarism, particularly on the local level and where political conservatism, such as in the southern region of the US, had previously impeded any substantial development of private philanthropy or community foundation involvement. Additionally, contributing to the desire for community foundation involvement was the previously mentioned fact that some of the largest national foundations faced public scrutiny for supporting activities embracing a more inclusive community.

Just as responsibilities devolved to state and local administrations from the federal government, national foundations began to encourage community foundations to assume leadership roles at the local level. They believed that community foundations maintained a better understanding of local needs and substantial social networks that could produce greater impact in confronting some of the many challenges facing community development (Berresford, 1989; Mayer, 1994). Four national foundations, in particular, sponsored initiatives intended to increase the engagement of community foundations.

The next section describes initiatives undertaken by the Ford Foundation, Lilly Foundation, John D. and Catherine T. McArthur Foundation, and Charles Stewart Mott Foundation to build the leadership capacity of community foundations for greater engagement in community development. The second section highlights the community development collaborative, a model created by the Ford Foundation where community foundations play a central role in organizing local support specifically targeting local CDCs.

National Foundation Initiatives to Build Community Foundation Leadership Capacity

The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation initiated the Community Foundations and Neighborhoods Small Grants program in 1984 with the goal of building the capacity of community foundations to undertake a leadership role in assisting neighborhood-based groups in low-wealth neighborhoods (Scheie, 1997a). Lasting for 11 years, the program served 25 community foundations and found that building support for neighborhood-based organizations internally, among community foundation donors, staffers and governing boards, as well as externally, in cooperation with other institutions, was a critical factor in achieving large-scale change (Scheie, 1997b). The program also recognized the following five principles as key steps community foundations should pursue in building support for neighborhood action: (1) identify individual and institutional stakeholders; (2) determine stakeholder contribution and encourage its growth over time; (3) share and celebrate success, (4) provide opportunities to learn and grow; and (5) assist stakeholders in reflective inquiry that determines if, where, or how their contributions are making a difference (Scheie, 1997b).

From 1987 to 1991, 27 community foundations participated in the “Leadership Program for Community Foundations,” sponsored by the Ford Foundation and John D. and Catherine T. McArthur Foundation. The program targeted small community foundations with permanent assets between \$2 and \$13 million, for capacity building by accelerating asset growth and community leadership. By its end, all participants achieved varying degrees of progress, expanding their capacity in such areas as mobilizing community commitment, increasing resources, and enhancing skills in community building (Mayer, 1984).

Noteworthy because of its contribution to the growth and capacity building of the community foundation sector, Lilly Endowment, Inc. initiated the Community Foundation Giving Indiana Funds for Tomorrow (GIFT) program in 1990. The program assists communities and regions in Indiana in establishing new community foundations as well as strengthening existing ones to assume leadership roles in generating local solutions to local challenges (Lilly Endowment, Inc., 1990). In so doing, the program makes available grants for four categories of activities: technical assistance, asset building, project support, and operating subsidies. Moreover, during the last decade, the number of community foundations in Indiana grew from approximately 12 (with assets totaling approximately

\$100 million) to more than 90 (with assets over \$1 billion). This is the largest concentration of community foundations in any one state (Lilly Endowment, Inc., 2001a).

Since 1990, Lilly Endowment, Inc. has committed \$345 through GIFT to community foundations (Lilly Endowment, Inc., 1999). In 2000, Indiana community foundations participated in "Taking Stock," a one-year self-assessment also funded by the Lilly Endowment, Inc. They determined that their most critical needs center around raising money for unrestricted grantmaking funds and the desire to improve day-to-day operations. Consequently, in 2001, Lilly Endowment, Inc. launched another phase of GIFT and allotted \$191.1 million to encourage community foundations to build unrestricted endowments and organize operations that would lead to better results as leaders in solving community challenges, including community development (Lilly Endowment, Inc., 2001b).

The Ford Foundation Community Development Collaborative Model

Between 1983 and 1999, the Ford Foundation facilitated the involvement of 15 community foundations in establishing community development collaboratives, also known as partnerships, with the public, private, and non-profit sectors. These efforts were aimed at galvanizing local support for CDCs. The Ford Foundation believed that by serving as community leaders, foundations could legitimate both community development collaboratives and maintain their capacity to carry out their administrative functions. However, Glickman and Nye (1995) found that smaller community foundations often view community development collaboratives as competitors in a tight financial resource environment and know very little about the complexity of the community development process.

Indeed, several community foundations followed the model proposed by the Ford Foundation and established collaboratives as a means of galvanizing local resources and legitimizing the efforts of CDCs. For over three decades, the CDC industry has maintained an increasing presence and commitment to improving the quality of life in oppressed communities. Moreover, CDCs are often the premiere organizations engaged in community development at the local level. Many CDCs, in fact, may be classified as elite-tier organizations. Their longevity and success in adjusting to changing social, economic, and political environments has provided greater influence, enhanced service delivery (particularly in the affordable housing arena), and expanded their social networks. These networks include businesses, foundations, and policymakers. These advances are often made at the expense of other organizations working in oppressed communities (Venkatesh, 1997). As community foundations recognize this fact and contribute more resources to community development, the number of collaboratives engaging public, private, and non-profit sectors with CDCs will increase.

The three cases to follow, the Cleveland Foundation, Greater New Orleans Foundation, and Dade Community Foundation, illustrate the community foundations' role in community development collaborative formation. Each community foundation received assistance in facilitating the formation a community development collaborative from the Ford Foundation. Moreover, two of the three participated in the capacity building efforts mentioned above. Specifically, the Greater New Orleans Foundation participated in the Leadership Program for Community Foundations that was jointly sponsored by the Ford Foundation and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. The Dade Community Foundation was also a participant in this program as well as the Community Foundations and Neighborhoods Program sponsored by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.

Cleveland: CDCs and the Cleveland Foundation

A rich history of community development activity in Cleveland exists beginning with the rise of CDCs in the late 1960s. Urban renewal activities attempting to reverse population and economic decline through redevelopment of several predominant African American neighborhoods on Cleveland's east side for institutional and commercial uses caused overcrowding, large-scale displacement of residents, and stimulated the summer of 1966 Hough rebellion (Bartimole, 1995; Keating, Krumholz, & Metzger, 1995). The Hough Area Development Corporation (HADC) was established in 1968 as a response to neighborhood distress and rebellion. Although now defunct, HADC was the first Cleveland CDC.

At present, several CDCs serve Cleveland's east-side neighborhoods as well as the city's predominantly white west side. Early west-side CDCs did not originate because of challenges stemming from urban renewal, but primarily from such issues as housing abandonment and arson. Their emergence, like most Cleveland east-side CDCs, reflected community organizing for social justice, enforcement of housing code violations and neighborhood reinvestment.

Since the 1970s, the Cleveland Foundation has continued to support the physical revitalization of neighborhoods through CDCs. Many Cleveland Foundation trustees, members of the local professional class, felt uncomfortable supporting community organizing due to possibilities of confrontation between CDCs and the private sector, in addition to inherent problems quantifying its impact (Tittle, 1992). Therefore, the primary means of support from the Cleveland Foundation consistently favored housing and commercial redevelopment activities over neighborhood advocacy (Yin, 1998).

In 1981, substantial backing from the Cleveland Foundation resulted in the formation of the Cleveland Housing Network, a coalition of CDCs that garners and shares resources by providing operating support for housing rehabilitation, development, and management targeting low- and moderate-income families. However, a year later other local philanthropies instantaneously shifted their funding focus away from advocacy and community organizing to housing development due to the protest of CDCs against a major corporate donor, Standard Oil of Ohio (SOHIO), who posted record profits for two consecutive years but continued to levy high energy costs against the poor.

Immediately, the Cleveland Foundation pursued a policy of consolidating support for physical neighborhood revitalization that would expand the social networks, technical expertise, and financial resources of CDCs (Tittle, 1992). For example, the same year of the CDC protest, the Cleveland affiliate of the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), which promotes investment in affordable housing and provides technical assistance to CDCs, began operations. The Cleveland Foundation not only made a sizable contribution but also galvanized support from local private philanthropies and corporations, including SOHIO, towards Cleveland LISC's establishment.

In 1985, the Cleveland Foundation made its first housing-associated Program Related Investment (PRI) to the Famicos Foundation, a CDC, for the construction of Lexington Village, the first market-rate rental housing development in over 50 years in Hough. Because the Famicos Foundation found no private developer willing to invest in Lexington Village, the Cleveland Foundation also assumed responsibility for assembling project financing and eventually amassed the necessary capital from 27 public and private resources (Tittle, 1992). However, the following year the Enterprise Foundation arrived and along with LISC increased physical production by CDCs through Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) syndication.

The Cleveland Foundation continued to explore avenues that would fulfill its policy intentions of consolidated backing for neighborhood revitalization. As one of the first community foundations to receive Ford Foundation assistance to establish a community development partnership, the Cleveland Foundation galvanized local support to establish the Cleveland Neighborhood Partnership Program in 1986. Initially housed at the Cleveland Foundation, the purpose of the Cleveland Neighborhood Partnership Program entailed aggregating financial contributions from philanthropic, government, and private sector sources for CDC operating support.

In 1989, the Cleveland Foundation sought to institutionalize the Cleveland Neighborhood Partnership Program through the creation of Neighborhood Progress, Inc. (NPI), a community development collaborative that would sustain CDCs by means of two primary functions: (1) conducting community development research and analysis, and (2) continuing the Cleveland Neighborhood Partnership Program operating and administrative support (Tittle, 1992). Significant to the formation of NPI was the Cleveland Foundation's ability to garner support of Cleveland Tomorrow, a coalition of CEOs from the top 50 corporations in Cleveland. Cleveland Tomorrow brought the full weight and energy of the local business elite to the community development arena, further legitimizing efforts consolidating public, corporate, and foundation investment necessary for NPI establishment and sustainability (Shatten, 1995).

Since its founding, NPI has evolved into a broad service delivery organization and financial intermediary. In addition to aggregating foundation and private sector funds, NPI operates the following subsidiaries and programs (Neighborhood Progress, Inc., 2000):

- Cleveland Neighborhood Partnership Program contributes multi-year core operating support to designated CDCs.
- New Village Corporation furnishes real-estate development services as a facilitating partner with CDCs and private developers.
- Quantum Leap offers training and technical assistance around human capital and organizational development issues to the entire CDC industry.
- Village Capital Corporation, a wholly-controlled NPI subsidiary, provides project gap financing for targeted physical investment.

Corporate and foundation resources now flow through NPI. A formal agreement also exists between the Enterprise Foundation, Cleveland LISC, and NPI to increase funding for CDCs, avoid redundancy, and to foster better program coordination (Bogart, 2003). Moreover, although NPI has assisted the Cleveland Housing Network, it strategically concentrates investments, primarily through the Cleveland Neighborhood Partnership Program, New Village Corporation, and Village Capital Corporation, into several assisted-CDC target areas up to the point where there will be a return of normal market activity (OMG Center for Collaborative Learning, 2001).

The Cleveland Foundation ranks second in the nation in terms of assets with approximately \$1.5 billion among community foundations (Foundation Center, 2002). While giving to community development activities has varied, the Cleveland Foundation has maintained a strong commitment to supporting NPI since the very beginning when it commenced the Special Initiative in Housing and Neighborhood Development by committing \$500,000 to NPI's establishment and first three years of operation (Tittle, 1992). In fact, NPI has received more support in the form of grants and program-related investments from the Cleveland Foundation than any other single community development organization in Cleveland. From 1992 to 2002, it provided approximately \$14 million in support to NPI.

In 1998, the Cleveland Foundation (1999) made its largest award to NPI. The \$5.5 million multi-year contribution amounted to 55% of The Cleveland Foundation's community development allocations for that year. NPI used the funds to co-develop projects that need its technical expertise and test new ways to expedite the neighborhood revitalization process. It also will continue building the capacity of CDCs. The award consists of two program related investments totaling \$2.5 million. Village Capital Corporation received a \$2 million investment, capitalizing its community development efforts. The other investment, worth \$500,000, went to NPI for the Cleveland Housing Network's Homeward Program. The remaining \$3 million grant will be shared between the Cleveland Neighborhood Partnership Program, Village Capital Corporation, and New Village Capital.

Several leaders of CDCs describe the Cleveland Foundation as marginally responsive in meeting their needs and desires for real-estate production (Lowe, 2001). Interaction between CDC staffs and Cleveland Foundation staffers occurs on a very limited basis. Virtually none occurs between CDC staffs and the Cleveland Foundation board members. CDC executive directors speak of the Cleveland Foundation as one of the primary parents of NPI. They contend that the Cleveland Foundation emphasizes real estate activities through NPI and provides very few direct grants to CDCs for other community development activities. As a result, most CDC respondents see little reason to approach the Cleveland Foundation. Instead, they refer to the responsiveness of NPI, which in essence is an indirect response from the Cleveland Foundation.

CDCs did not receive an invitation to participate in the formation of NPI, creating an extremely tense relationship. That tension has lessened over the years as CDCs gained a presence on the NPI's governing board and NPI broadened the scope of capacity-building efforts beyond real-estate development. Also, the tension may have lessened due to a change in NPI leadership more attuned to CDC needs and desires. The current NPI executive director once served as director of a Cleveland CDC. At present, CDCs believe NPI does a good job of capitalizing CDC projects. Both NPI and CDCs suggest that targeted development with input from CDC strategic planning encourages better relations.

In spite of the better relations enjoyed between NPI and CDCs, some friction still exists. NPI autonomy appears to be the root cause of this friction. Some CDC directors believe NPI sets the community development agenda without any accountability to CDCs. One CDC executive director described the funding challenge in the following manner:

What scares me a little bit and what scared all the CDCs when NPI was created, and I think that fear is still out there, is that the Cleveland Foundation and other local foundations started pouring the majority of their funding into NPI and CDCs would no longer be able to receive funds from these organizations. I think NPI's job is to fund raise. The question then becomes: how do they dole it out? They have built the housing but the residents do not feel safe. They need to do community organizing in addition to the bricks and mortar. It is very difficult to get funding for these other things.

These sentiments suggest a real challenge on the part of CDCs for funding and survival. NPI appears threatening because of its ability to singularly determine funding allocations to CDCs. Also, while there has been some support for non-confrontational-style community organizing by NPI since 2000, a concern exists regarding CDC ability in obtaining local funding, on their own, for non-housing related activities that are important to neighborhood revitalization.

New Orleans: CDCs and the Greater New Orleans Foundation

Little recorded history exists regarding CDC activity in New Orleans. In fact, the establishment of New Orleans CDCs occurs as a relatively recent phenomenon. These nascent organizations began to emerge in the early 1990s offering an alternative response to the massive scale of abandoned and dilapidated housing, as New Orleans attained the highest vacant housing rate of any major US city at 17%—37,000 units (Warner, 1994a).

Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, housing failed to become a top priority of city government, and very few community-based organizations established themselves to tackle the challenges of blight by taking on the role of real-estate developers (Mullener & Cooper, 1992). For example, Central City Housing Development Corporation, New Orleans' first CDC founded in 1968, which began as the housing committee of the neighborhood's Community Action Agency, did not engage heavily in housing and economic development until the early 1990s. Prior to that time, it provided housing counseling services as its primary activity. In addition, inadequate use of federal funds for local housing programs contributed to the decline of New Orleans' housing stock. An investigation of the city's Office of Housing and Urban Affairs resulted in over \$6 million paid to the federal government for mismanagement that occurred from 1992 to 1994 (Division of Housing and Neighborhood Development, 1999; Warner 1994b).

About the same time, in the early 1990s, the Greater New Orleans Foundation became engaged in local community development efforts. Initially established in 1924 as a community chest, the Greater New Orleans Foundation became a community foundation in 1983. It ranks 33rd among all community foundations with \$93 million in assets and has made significant contributions to local community organizing, job creation, and housing rehabilitation (Lawrence & Ganguly, 2002).

The Greater New Orleans Foundation provided training grants initiating the formation of All Congregations Together and the Jeremiah Group, Saul Alinsky-style community organizing groups in 1991. That same year, the Greater New Orleans Foundation facilitated opportunities for neighborhood-driven agenda setting and skill building with the sponsorship of New Orleans LISC, raising over \$1,000,000 from the local private sector. An alternative to LISC's traditional approach of working with well-established CDCs with expertise in real-estate production, New Orleans LISC, as a National Demonstration Program location, began working with volunteers to build community-based organizational and human development capacity and establish collaborative networks between funders and neighborhood residents (Gittell & Vidal, 1998).

Realizing that many emerging CDCs and other non-profits in general needed assistance with proposal writing, board development, and training, the Greater New Orleans Foundation played the lead role and established, in conjunction with the United Way and other funders, the Center for Non-Profit Resources in 1993. Almost four years later, the Greater New Orleans Foundation joined the Council for a Better Louisiana and two other community foundations, The Baton Rouge Area Foundation and The Community Foundation of Shreveport-Bossier, to establish the Louisiana Association of Nonprofit Organizations. The Louisiana Association of Nonprofit Organizations attempts to strengthen the state's nonprofit sector by creating statewide and regional nonprofit networks that share information and increase professional capacity through a variety of initiatives such as shared health insurance and group purchasing plans (Greater New Orleans Foundation, 1998). It also serves nonprofits as a resource for education, training, and advocacy (Louisiana Association of Nonprofit Organizations, 2002).

In 1995, the Greater New Orleans Foundation convened the Citywide Tenants Association, The Jeremiah Group, All Congregations Together, and the Metropolitan Area Committee. In partnership with the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the New Orleans Jobs Initiative was also established. Serving the city of New Orleans and parts of Jefferson parish, the New Orleans Jobs Initiative connects unemployed and underemployed persons 18 to 45 years old living in and around public housing developments to living-wage employment training and opportunities. In addition, the Initiative advocates for public policies and regulatory reform that promotes skilled workforce development and capacity building (New Orleans Jobs Initiative, 2000). Also in fall 1995, the Greater New Orleans Foundation, with assistance from the Ford Foundation, completed a year-long strategic planning process involving CDCs, philanthropy, public housing tenant leadership, church-based and grassroots community organizations, LISC, and the public and private sectors, that culminated in establishing the New Orleans Neighborhood Development Collaborative (NONDC).

NONDC's mission is to reinvigorate the physical, economic, and social fabric of New Orleans' neighborhoods by supporting the professional development of community-based development organizations and expanding and stabilizing the community development industry in the New Orleans area (NONDC, 2000). It also believes that CDCs have an obligation to invest in neighborhoods by investing in people. As a consequence, it adopted the following three goals in support of CDC community revitalization efforts to:

- Act as a catalyst to accelerate production of affordable housing by CDCs,
- Expand financial resources, primarily from the small but locally based private sector, to ensure available funding to CDCs for affordable housing production, and
- Establish and maintain a forum for continuing dialogue, partnership, and functioning as an ombudsman and advocate for the CDC industry engaged in affordable housing production.

NONDC works toward fulfilling its mission and attainment of goals by assisting CDCs in three key areas. First, it invests in neighborhood leaders involved in affordable housing production by providing operating support to cover staff and administrative costs. Second, CDCs obtaining operating support also get funding to hire consultants who perform organizational assessments that identify CDC strengths and areas needing technical assistance as a way to enhance long-term stability. Third, NONDC provides resources for technical assistance and training in an effort to ensure that a CDC can carry out its contractual workplan and build internal capacity.

Despite its relatively small size, the Greater New Orleans Foundation provides significant support to NONDC. The Greater New Orleans Foundation deems disbursements of \$10,000 or more large grants. However, since its founding, NONDC has received over \$200,000 in financial support as well as significant in-kind resources from the Greater New Orleans Foundation (Lowe, 2001).

In 1995, the Greater New Orleans Foundation provided newly established NONDC with in-kind support, primarily in the form of office space. Beginning in 1998, NONDC received its first multi-year award for operating support from the Greater New Orleans Foundation. In addition, that year, 9% of the Greater New Orleans Foundation's grants supported the region's community-based housing and counseling efforts (Greater New Orleans Foundation, 1999). Of that amount, NONDC received the full allocation for housing rehabilitation and production to assist New Orleans CDCs. In addition to funding for housing production, CDCs remain able to obtain non-real estate production assistance from the Greater New Orleans Foundation.

Many CDC executive directors believe the Greater New Orleans Foundation exhibits keen sensitivity for observing local trends and seeks ways of understanding CDCs in order to improve support (Lowe, 2001). New Orleans CDCs undertook significant involvement in the initial formation of NONDC. In fact, local CDCs devised the 21-member board structure of NONDC, which consists of an equal number of representatives from city government, local philanthropy, the private sector, and CDCs. Several CDCs also gained access to Greater New Orleans Foundation staffers and trustees through NONDC.

While CDC executive directors view real estate production as very important, building organizational capacity appears just as important, given their relative nascent stage of development. Indeed, a tension exists between production and organizational capacity building. However, the words of one CDC executive director best express the sentiments of most New Orleans CDCs about NONDC's approach: "We must make sure we produce housing without sacrificing the human development part. This is what NONDC has fairly generously been able to provide up to this point and very willingly so."

Consequently, CDCs appreciate the sensitivity of NONDC to building CDC organizational capacity by providing support for operating expenses, organizational assessments, and technical assistance while attempting to accelerate the production of affordable housing.

Miami-Dade: CDCs, National Intermediaries, and the Dade Community Foundation

Community development activity in the city of Miami and Dade County (Miami-Dade) must be placed within the perspective of recurrent social change, fragmentation, and conflict. Miami-Dade experienced one of the most rapid transformations of any US region. It changed from a sparsely populated tourist destination and agricultural area to a mid-sized, ethnically and racially diverse metropolis in less than 30 years. In 1960, Miami's Latin population totaled less than 3%; however, by 2000 it comprised over 66% (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1960, 2000). Cuban-Americans constitute the largest Latin subgroup at 34% (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000). Other significant Latin populations include Columbians, Nicaraguans, and Puerto Ricans. Alternatively, while the Latin-black population increased from about 5,000 in 1960 to approximately 8,600 in 2000, the native-black population continued to decline (Stowers & Vogel, 1994; U.S. Bureau of Census, 2000). As a result, the black population of Miami proportionally has remained virtually unchanged over the 40-year period at approximately 22% (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1960, 2000).

A lack of local identity and unity complicates Miami-Dade's ethno-racial diversity. The most visible populations: Cubans, native-blacks, and Haitians retain separate identities and cultures. While native-blacks gained substantial civil rights and political-economic concessions in other cities, those in Miami-Dade achieved less success due to the fact that Cuban exiles, primarily middle-class and politically active and conservative, received considerable federal aid for housing and economic resettlement (Pedraza-Bailey, 1985). In turn, the native-black population continued to suffer from poor housing, unemployment, and racial discrimination (Stack & Warren, 1992).

Decades of neglect and political-economic marginalization resulted in bouts of civil unrest during the 1980s within native-black communities. The unrest served as the impetus for significant community development activity in Miami-Dade. The area's first CDCs, which include Martin Luther King Economic Development Corporation, New Century CDC and Tacolcy Development Corporation, were established in Liberty City following the 1980 uprisings that occurred after the acquittal of four white police officers for the

death of an unarmed black man. These CDCs primarily engaged in community business development and some affordable housing (De Lollis & Whitefield, 2000).

The Florida State Legislature passed two bills specific to Miami-Dade CDCs in an effort to revitalize areas most affected by the uprising. House Bill 1871 authorized a 50% tax credit on the state corporate income tax of companies making contributions to CDCs, and House Bill 1875 provided \$5 million in loans to CDCs. CDCs quickly organized and began applying for the state funding. By 1982, 11 CDCs each received approximately \$100,000 in administrative support for economic and affordable housing development (Porter & Dunn, 1984). Also, shortly after the 1980 uprising, the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) entered Miami, undertaking as a pilot project the refurbishing of a Liberty City grocery store and raising local support for 25 units of single-family detached housing (Stein, 1984).

Greater Miami United, a public-private coalition of influential Latin, black, and non-Latin leaders established in 1980 after the uprising to mend Miami's social fabric, spearheaded the effort that led to LISC attaining a permanent presence in 1984. It raised approximately \$1.5 million for Miami LISC's establishment, including \$300,000 from local corporations, and \$350,000 from the city of Miami ("Organization," 1984). Greater Miami United also played the key role in raising seed money for the establishment of Homes for South Florida, an organization providing technical assistance to CDCs in the areas of appraising, accounting and finance (Wolff, 1985).

The Enterprise Foundation set up affiliate operations in Miami-Dade in 1985. In conjunction with Greater Miami Neighborhoods, a technical assistance non-profit provider serving as the pass-through, Enterprise Foundation provided four CDCs with predevelopment funding for architects, construction engineers, and housing specialists (Gaiter, 1986). The effort led to the development of the first lease-purchase homes in Miami-Dade. Among other commitments, Enterprise-Greater Miami Neighborhoods funded Miami-Dade Community College's Owner-Builder's School, which provided prospective homeowners with home-maintenance and home-budgeting and financing skills. The city of Miami, Dade County, and private sector donations through the efforts of Homes for South Florida contributed \$750,000 to initial Enterprise-Greater Miami Neighborhoods efforts.

The Enterprise Foundation, the Miami-Dade County Commission, and residents of the Overtown community in Miami created Overtown Neighborhood Partnerships in the aftermath of the 1989 uprising that took place after a Columbian-born police officer fatally shot a black motorcyclist. A significant community development activity also occurred in 1989 with the formation of a community development collaborative, the Dade Partnership for Community and Economic Development (the Partnership), to coordinate and enhance financial and technical assistance to Miami-Dade's CDCs.

Prior to the formation of the Partnership in 1989, the Dade Community Foundation awarded grants to some CDCs and local supporting intermediaries but remained involved only peripherally. For example, the Dade Community Foundation's initial interactions with local CDCs occurred in the mid-1980s and resulted from a negotiated settlement for low-income housing. It did not participate in the negotiations and only served as the fiscal agent, disbursing \$1.6 million each to two Miami CDCs—East Little Havana Community Development Corporation and Tacolcy Economic Development Corporation.

The source of Dade Community Foundation grants for operating or project-specific support to CDCs and local intermediaries including Miami-LISC and Greater Miami Neighborhoods, Inc. derived from the organization's discretionary funds. The Dade Community Foundation channeled discretionary funding into projects based on emerging

community needs (Dade Community Foundation, 1990). The grants awarded, however, tended to be small.

Interested in becoming more involved in the community development field, the Dade Community Foundation approached the Ford Foundation with an offer to assist those Miami CDCs receiving direct Ford Foundation funding as well as the Miami-Dade community development field in general. The Ford Foundation countered with a proposal to establish a public-private collaboration that would provide core financial support and technical assistance for Miami-Dade CDCs. The Dade Community Foundation acted upon the proposal and, as mentioned above, the Partnership formalized operations in 1989.

The Dade Community Foundation remained responsible for generating the Partnership's expansion and financial support. However, it experienced difficulty in fund-raising efforts due to its limited CDC expertise. Moreover, with less than \$50 million in assets up to the mid-1990s, the possibility of conflict of interest existed as the Dade Community Foundation sought to simultaneously build its endowment and the Partnership's. A similar challenge existed with other partnership members. Because the Partnership consisted mostly of intermediaries (each in the business of fund-raising primarily within Miami-Dade's relatively small corporate and philanthropic sector), it is often described as a "collaboration of competitors." As a result, members may have been quite unwilling or even incapable of raising money for the Partnership for fear of receiving fewer resources for their own organizations (Thurston & Rothman, 1995).

Phase Two of the Partnership began in 1997. Greater Miami LISC assumed responsibility for daily administration and established a special committee of its local advisory committee to govern the Partnership (Greater Miami LISC, 1996). The Dade Community Foundation remains a member of that special committee and serves as asset manager for the collaborative. The Partnership established a Special Initiative Fund with the Dade Community Foundation to ensure that CDCs remain the specific beneficiaries of grant awards.

Since the restructuring of the Partnership, the Dade Community Foundation resumed its role as a minor player in Miami-Dade community development. Outside the purview of support for community building to the local nonprofit sector more generally, the Dade Community Foundation undertakes no special programs or initiatives targeting CDCs. It may assist individual CDCs, often taking on the role of problem solver, negotiator, etc. However, it neither initiates nor participates as a key collaborative partner in any of the industry-wide community development programs or efforts. CDCs requesting funding from the Dade Community Foundation apply for small grant allocations that will aid in the successful accomplishment of specific time-limited projects.

The CDCs that have utilized Dade Community Foundation services or received grants since the second phase of the Partnership describe the community foundation as accessible and attempting to be more responsive to their needs (Lowe, 2001). Some believe Dade Community Foundation's flexibility to be a virtue, allowing CDCs to work towards fulfilling some desires and needs besides housing and economic development, but contend grant amounts are too small. The size of the grant is the same regardless of organization size. As one CDC executive director put it:

I would rather have larger grants. It is hard when you are running a large agency to stop and do something for \$5,000 or \$7,000 because the amount of work that goes into it is considerable. But, we are grateful for their participation. When you have a small staff and a lot to do, it is hard to go after small amounts of money. It is also hard to go after a number of different sources to leverage the small grants.

Even executive directors whose organizations have never received a grant believe that Dade Community Foundation could play a greater role in facilitating CDC work. Several CDC executive directors think Dade Community Foundation's impact could be greater on community development through resource concentration. Given the Dade Community Foundation's prestige, some CDC executive directors believe it could form a lending consortium consisting of local and national philanthropies to support concerns mutually agreed upon with a select group of Miami-Dade CDCs beyond bricks and mortar such as advocacy, human capital, or welfare reform.

LESSONS

These three cases cannot produce generalizations to all community foundations. However, the following lessons emerge from their efforts to build local support for CDCs:

- Community Foundations must possess a thorough understanding of local CDC work in order to assert long-term influence as players in community development collaboratives.

In Miami-Dade, most of the players were already involved in community development, except for the Dade Community Foundation, before the formation of the Partnership. The existence of established and reputable affiliates of national-intermediaries in Miami-Dade perceived Dade Community Foundation as a novice competitor rather than partner in the local community development milieu. This factor contributed greatly to the demise of the Partnership. Alternatively, efforts by the Cleveland Foundation to establish NPI and Greater New Orleans Foundation facilitation regarding the formation of NONDC produced substantial interest from the private sector about CDCs for the first time. Both community foundations also played key roles in building local community development infrastructure and institutions, including the formation of local affiliates of the national intermediaries LISC and the Enterprise Foundation, before establishing these collaboratives. As a result, they learned a lot about community development along the way. This finding suggests that although the financial contributions of community foundations to CDCs are important, their point of entry and knowledge of CDCs is a very important factor influencing their involvement in community development collaboratives.

- Community foundation involvement in community development collaboratives is validated by their ability to galvanize private sector resources for and participation in community development collaborative efforts.

Each of the three community foundations maintains extensive networks both locally and with national foundations, which is important for community development collaborative formation. However, community foundations must fulfill another role. Community foundations must assert an ability to obtain local enterprises as long-term partners in community development in order to increase the level of support for CDCs. This action must be achieved regardless of size of the community foundation and the local corporate sector. The Cleveland Foundation and Greater New Orleans Foundation successfully garnered formerly untapped corporate participation, which validated the important role of community foundations. The Dade Community Foundation, however, experienced greater difficulty acquiring support from the Miami-Dade business community. As a result, it became a minor player in second phase of the Partnership. The proficiency of community foundation networks to garner private sector participation aid in their ability to maintain primary roles in community development collaboratives. Thus, while the

relationship among national and community foundations and intermediaries appears important to community development collaboratives, the foundation's ability to increase local private sector support strengthens the likelihood of their long-term participation in community development.

- Community foundations lack significant ability to garner long-term private sector support when national and international corporations dominate the local economy.

In Cleveland and New Orleans, many of the corporations participating in the community development collaboratives are headquartered in those cities. The Cleveland Foundation garnered the support of Cleveland Tomorrow, a coalition of the top 50 corporations in Cleveland, for the establishment of NPI. The Greater New Orleans Foundation obtained substantial support from the largest corporations based in New Orleans for NONDC. Alternatively, the corporate sector in Miami-Dade is comprised primarily of regional affiliates of international corporations. Dade Community Foundation staffers expressed a great difficulty in obtaining support from many of those businesses. These findings suggest that community foundations are ineffective in galvanizing support from the non-local or regional hubs of businesses, particularly those based outside of the US. National and international corporations often have little interest in local community development and community building efforts.

- As community development collaboratives emerge and develop, community foundations become less assessable and responsive to CDCs.

Overall, CDC respondents in each of the three cases acknowledged the impact of the community development collaboratives in their work and respective locales. Yet, they believe community foundation assistance is needed beyond their involvement in NPI, NONDC, and the Partnership. For example, some CDC executive directors in Cleveland would like support from the Cleveland Foundation to expand beyond real estate development and include community organizing. In New Orleans, quite a few CDCs want to maintain direct relations with the Greater New Orleans Foundation because of staffers' sensitivity to their concerns, access to information, and extensive social network. Many Miami-Dade CDCs suggest that the Dade Community foundation undertake a targeted approach to building CDC capacity in the social dimensions of community development. In essence, community foundations and CDCs need direct interaction with each other to determine the best response to local community development challenges.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The article has described the efforts of three community foundations in galvanizing local support for CDCs by facilitating the formation of community development collaboratives. Given the current state of affairs, more community foundations will seek innovative approaches to assist CDCs and many will choose to foster community development collaboratives. The following recommendations are offered to community foundations desiring to enhance or establish community development collaboratives that benefit CDCs and local community development more generally.

- Clearly articulate the primary objectives for involvement from the onset of community development collaborative formation.

Community Foundations must pay close attention to and keep other members focused on the need for, as well as the specific capabilities each brings to, the community

development collaborative. This requires a clarification of goals and their subsequent priority in determining the types of activities undertaken, appropriate measures, and desired results. Otherwise, failure to do so may result in shifts in priority, frustration with the process, and even the demise of the community development collaborative.

- Form a clearinghouse to sustain existing community foundation efforts and encourage other community foundations to galvanize support for CDCs.

Such a vehicle would help create greater public awareness of community foundation efforts nationally, within the sector, and at the local level. In addition, a network would permit community foundations engaged in community development collaboratives to exchange information and ideas and experiences about successful and unsuccessful activities intended to meet CDC needs.

Community foundations have benefited CDCs greatly by facilitating community development collaboratives that raise and aggregate local support, particularly multi-year support covering operating expenses and technical assistance. A Community Foundations Clearinghouse could focus on expanding multi-year funding for operating cost, technical assistance, and empowerment activities as a means to enhance CDC capacity in both scope and depth. This recommendation does not suggest that the clearinghouse should operate in isolation. It should engage National Foundations, particularly the Ford Foundation because of its legacy of involvement in community development and with CDCs. National intermediaries and their local affiliates should also participate in identifying new approaches to funding that expands support for CDCs in these areas.

- Improve accessibility and responsiveness to CDCs.

Community foundations must put forth a more concerted effort at becoming more responsive to CDC desires for community development beyond the bricks and mortar. Not to include CDCs in the decision-making process of determining corrective action often leaves out the premiere or elite-tier of actors engaged in revitalization at the local community level. Community foundations may initiate greater interaction with CDCs by, for example, holding meetings and focus group sessions. While this suggestion might appear trite, such actions would bring CDC leadership and staffs in face-to-face contact with community foundation governing boards and staffs. Moreover, these activities could inform community foundation plans and intentions for community development activities by providing an opportunity to listen and share information.

Other recommendations might be drawn from broader generalizations based on additional research that describes more widespread participation of community foundations in community development collaboratives that galvanize support for CDCs. For example, examination of a larger number of community foundations might identify a number of different roles and additional factors for involvement. One such determination could be to what degree do community foundations undertake or become involved in community development initiatives without the support of national foundations. Another could be how community foundations carry out their community development initiatives, particularly those addressing social justice concerns, in locales heavily impacted by the globalization of capital.

The private sector brings significant resources but poor public accountability to collaboratives. Future research should examine the techniques utilized by community foundations to obtain support from multinational corporations for local community development. In addition, it should also examine the extent to which community foundations can influence or facilitate decision making in such a way that public accountability among community development collaboratives increases.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: This article is based on research funded by the Aspen Institute Nonprofit Research Sector Fund. However, the research findings reported here do not necessarily reflect the views of the Aspen Institute Research Sector Fund. I acknowledge all community foundation board members and staffs, and the staffs of CDCs who shared their perspectives with me. I also thank W. Dennis Keating, Donald A. Krueckeberg, William M. Harris, Almudena Ocejo, Sigmund C. Shipp, Avis Vidal, and the two anonymous referees for their comments on earlier drafts of this work.

REFERENCES

- Bartimole, R. (1995). Who governs: The corporate hand. In W. D. Keating, N. Krumholz, & D. C. Perry (Eds.), *Cleveland: A metropolitan reader* (pp. 161–174). Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press.
- Berresford, S. A. (1989). Collaboration: Models, benefits, and tensions. In R. Magat (Ed.), *An agile servant: Community leadership by community foundations* (pp. 137–146). New York, NY: The Foundation Center.
- Bogart, W. T. (2003). *Civic infrastructure and the financing of community development*. A discussion paper prepared for the Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Brandes, S. (1976). *American welfare Capitalism*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Cleveland Foundation. (1999). *1998 annual report*. Cleveland, OH: Author.
- Covington, S. (1994). *Community foundations and citizen empowerment: Limited support for Democratic renewal*. A working paper. Washington, DC: National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy.
- De Lollis, B., & Whitefield, M. (2000, May 14). Redevelopment of county's urban core still a big challenge. *Miami Herald*, p. L1.
- Division of Housing and Neighborhood Development. (1999). *Housing New Orleans: Five-year consolidated report*. New Orleans, LA: Division of Housing and Neighborhood Development.
- Foundation Center. (2000). *The foundation directory, 2002 Edition*. New York, NY: The Foundation Center.
- Gaiter, D. (1986, November 21). Escaping poverty takes more than money. *Miami Herald*, p. A27.
- Gittell, R., & Vidal, A. (1998). *Community organizing: Building social capital as a development strategy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Glickman, N. J., & Nye, N. (1995). *Expanding local capacity through community development partnerships*. CUPR Policy Report 14. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research.
- Greater Miami LISC. (1996). *The greater Miami LISC's Dade partnership for community economic development round II: The program design*. Miami, FL: Greater Miami LISC.
- Greater New Orleans Foundation. (1998). *1997 annual report*. New Orleans, LA: Greater New Orleans Foundation.
- Greater New Orleans Foundation. (1999). *1998 annual report*. New Orleans, LA: Greater New Orleans Foundation.
- Hall, P. D. (1989). The community foundation in America, 1914–1987. In R. Magat (Ed.), *Philanthropic giving: Studies in varieties and goals* (pp. 180–199). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, P. D. (1992). *Inventing the nonprofit sector and other essays on philanthropy, voluntarism, and nonprofit organizations*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hammack, D. C. (1989). Community foundations: The delicate question of purpose. In R. Magat (Ed.), *An agile servant: Community leadership by community foundations* (pp. 23–50). New York, NY: The Foundation Center.
- Howard, N. R. (1963). *Trust for all time: The story of the Cleveland Foundation and the community trust movement*. Cleveland: The Cleveland Foundation.
- Keating, W. D., Krumholz, N., & Metzger, J. (1995). Postpopulist public-private partnerships. In W. D. Keating, N. Krumholz, & D. C. Perry (Eds.), *Cleveland: A metropolitan reader* (pp. 332–350). Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press.
- Lawrence, S., & Ganguly, D. (2002). *Foundation yearbook: Facts and figures on private and community foundations*. New York, NY: The Foundation Center.

- Layton, D. N. (1987). *Philanthropy and voluntarism: An annotated bibliography*. New York, NY: The Foundation Center.
- Lenkowsky, L. (2003, January/February). The Bush administration's civic agenda and national service. *Society*, 7–12.
- Lilly Endowment, Inc. (1990). *Community foundation GIFT: A major, new philanthropic program for Indiana communities*. Indianapolis, IN: Author.
- Lilly Endowment, Inc. (1999). *Lilly Endowment funds 309 community projects in GIFT IV Initiative*. Press release. Indianapolis, IN: Author.
- Lilly Endowment, Inc. (2001a). *Taking stock: Executive summary*. Indianapolis, IN: Author.
- Lilly Endowment, Inc. (2001b). *Lilly endowment allots \$191.1 million to "build self-reliance" of Indiana community foundations*. Press release. Indianapolis, IN: Author.
- Lowe, J. S. (2001). Case studies of community foundation support for community development corporations. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62(10), 3595A. UMI No. 3027991.
- Louisiana Association of Nonprofit Organizations. (2002). *Mission statement*. Available: <http://www.lano.org> [March 5, 2003].
- Mayer, S. E. (1994). *Building community capacity: The potential of community foundations*. Minneapolis: Rainbow Research, Inc.
- Mullener, E., & Cooper, C. (1992, January 22). City offers few solutions: Part I of series: The disappearing city—Abandoned houses, abandoned hope. *Times-Picayune*, p. A1.
- Neighborhood Progress, Inc. (2000). *Programs*. Available: <http://www.neighborhoodprogress.org> [March 5, 2003].
- Nelson, D. (1975). *Workers and managers: Origins of the new factory system in the United States, 1880–1920*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- New Orleans Jobs Initiative. (2000). *New Orleans jobs initiative*. [Brochure]. New Orleans, LA: Author.
- New Orleans Neighborhood Development Collaborative. NONDC. (2000). *New Orleans Neighborhood Development Collaborative: A partnership in revitalizing neighborhoods*. [Brochure]. New Orleans, LA: Author.
- OMG Center for Collaborative Learning. (2001). *A decade of development: An assessment of neighborhood progress, Inc.* Philadelphia, PA: Author.
- Organization to promote black economic growth. (1984, May 20). *Miami Herald*, p. B3.
- Pedraza-Bailey, S. (1985). *Political and economic migrants in America: Cubans and Mexicans*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Porter, B., & Dunn, M. (1984). *The Miami riot of 1980: Crossing the bounds*. Lexington, KY: Lexington Books.
- Rich, W. S. (1961). *Community foundations in the United States and Canada, 1914–1961*. New York: National Council on Community Foundations, Inc.
- Scheie, D. M. (1997a). *Helping neighborhood groups and leaders grow stronger: Lessons from the Community Foundations and Neighborhoods Program, 1991–95*. Minneapolis, MN: Rainbow Research, Inc.
- Scheie, D. M. (1997b). *Building support for neighborhood action: Lessons from the Community Foundations and Neighborhoods Program, 1991–95*. Minneapolis, MN: Rainbow Research, Inc.
- Shatten, R. A. (1995). Cleveland tomorrow: A practicing model of new roles and processes for corporate leadership in cities. In W. D. Keating, N. Krumholz, & D. C. Perry (Eds.), *Cleveland: A metropolitan reader* (pp. 321–331). Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press.
- Stack, J. F., & Warren, C.L. (1992). The reform tradition and ethnic politics: Metropolitan Miami confronts the 1990s. In G. J. Grenier & A. Stepick III (Eds.), *Miami now! Immigration, ethnicity and social change* (pp. 160–185). Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
- Stein, G. (1984, March 5). New group to coordinate economic programs for poor in Dade. *Miami Herald*, p. B2.
- Stowers, G. N. L., & Vogel, R. K. (1994). Racial and ethnic voting patterns in Miami. In G. E. Peterson (Ed.), *Big city politics, governance and fiscal constraints* (pp. 63–84). Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- Thurston, M. A., & Rothman, D. M. (1995, September 20). *Dade partnership for community and economic development: Strategic planning interview report summary*. Miami, FL: The Thurston Group, Inc.

- Tittle, D. (1992). *Rebuilding Cleveland: The Cleveland Foundation and its evolving urban strategy*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1960). *Census of the population and housing*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2000). *Census of the population and housing*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Congress. (1969, February 18). Tax reform. *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, 9, 306.
- Venkatesh, S. A. (1997). The three-tier model: How helping occurs in urban, poor communities. *Social Service Review*, (December), 574–606.
- Warner, C. (1994a, August 25). Morial asks community to play role: Blighted houses targeted. *Times-Picayune*, p. A1.
- Warner, C. (1994b, June 1994). Inquiry alleges housing wrongs: Says officials abused power. *Times-Picayune*, p. B1.
- Wolff, L. (1985, April 2). Laurie Raskin's idealism is pragmatic and realistic. *Miami Herald*, p. D1.
- Yin, J. S. (1998). The community development industry system: A case study of politics and institutions in Cleveland, 1967–1997. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 20(2), 137–157.
- Ylvisaker, P. (1989). Community and community foundations in the next century. In R. Magat (Ed.), *An agile servant: Community leadership by community foundations* (pp. 51–62). New York, NY: The Foundation Center.