**Thursday, October 27th (2:15 PM ET)**

Session 2 – Supporting Place-based Initiatives or Collective Impact Coalitions

Led by Elly Schoen

Notes by Elizabeth Burton

Attendees: Lori Hanson (Children’s Trust), Amy Carroll-Scott (Drexel UHC), Seema Iyer (BNIA), Elly Schoen (USC), Erikka Gilliam (Drexel UHC), Jackie Smith (Johnson Center, GVSU), Dan Potter (Kinder Institute), Kate Eikel (CT Data), Peter Tatian (DC)

Seema: collective impact is in general a theme

Amy CS: data/evaluation lead of West Philly, still going to be research/data partner and hope to continue challenging work. community survey work with residents and indicators work. co located with west Philly promise zone, led by city agency without eval funds and support their indicators work. Byrne work with DOJ and crime hot spot intervention and ways folks visualizing/change over time, working with DA office and transparent data work.

Promise Neighborhood: US department education grant and promise zone is HUD designation, requires specific committee but no funds. both built around collective impact model. federal initiatives from Obama time period.

* data/eval requirements more relaxed than in 2016

Promise Neighborhood based on Harlem Children Zone model

Confusion in the community around promise neighborhood vs zone

funding support community schools but have to figure out your footprint

Amy CS: did organizational network survey for how agencies involved in all the programs are connected to each other. going to do another round but should have done it at the beginning. indicators tanked because of COVID but wish did more incremental change documentation. now organizations captured midpoint but wish captured at beginning and end. interactions between organizations has improved. anecdotal/retrospective but not robust data for the change and important to collect.

Seema: Who is the collective?

Elly: Slate EZ did network mapping survey to understand who was in the community and turning it into asset mapping and sharing contact info/who is doing what work.

* Philly did this too, recommends

Elly: community survey around culture/art in the community. also gone really well. collective impact models and disseminate survey, everyone reaching community. anyone can fill it out. use of network to do community surveys. mapping cultural institutions in the neighborhood

* how were you getting to those cultural aspects?

Elly: asking folks to share three cultural treasures, could be a person, a dance, event, restaurant, type of food, wide range. what benefit it brings to them. getting at the benefits of arts and culture. trying to increase funding for artist programs but everyone asks what the benefit to the community is. preserves culture/exercise/etc.

Daniel: Houston is about to launch this, different from Kinder who takes bigger Houston view and effort to focus on neighborhoods. bringing together organizations, residents, work, collectively have conversations for what they’re doing it specific plan. philanthropic space, not constrained grant. partnership model been working on in education space and exploring it in housing. exciting but a little intimidating. don’t have to fit into grant, coming from Houston philanthropy for freedom. landscape for who is here already. community assets rather than asking what’s wrong, which Rice has done for a while.

Amy CS: wrote another grant and put everything into it they wished they had done. wished had done community-based systems dynamic, structure for community engagement for self-governance and decision making. do this before grant writing. bringing together stakeholders/lifting up power between residents/community vs large institutions. have that prioritize/shape interventions. use that to identify the metrics and measures for evaluation. limitations of collective impact model, review on community led models that aren’t collective impact. big criticism on collective impact doesn’t focus on self-governance with eye of power. power mapping can be helpful with mapping/outcomes/metrics.

Daniel: effort to build body to take and lead?

Amy CS: yes, and compensation to make sure happens for people’s expertise. even small grassroots org being compensated because other people have professional benefit. power of sharing expertise. when not done well, community participation but more bs and end up leaving without voices you wish you had. people equitably and confidently share as community leader.

Peter: bridge park work, Harold’s group yesterday with small business, workforce development, housing folks. project with light rail being built in Maryland and small businesses/housing that is more expensive with new infrastructure. group developing ways to preserve. coalition of nonprofits to help Black/Latino women east of river gain better credentials in early education and work in that space for better compensation. two universities/nonprofits that offer services, financial consulting, childcare. role is working with them around a few things and making sure aligned around common goals/results and what they’re doing align. result about transit safety that didn’t align with what they’re doing. how to measure progress/track results. present data to group, etc. more participants in the program be engaged in the process for early education. cash transfer program recruited people from the community to be community researchers. want to double down on that model and be part of future engagement. quantitative and qualitative and present/share back to people and other people learn what’s going on.

Kate: who’s in charge/who’s organizing everybody? data spills into other things

Amy: data has to be responsive. Drexel was lead agency so had some direction and can’t be happening in silos

Kate: Promise Neighborhood in Hartford with different structure. bringing together folks, foundation says not organizing it.

Peter: have to find the funding to support the work. all funded through JP Morgan Chase funding. funded through this grant, gets tricky because funded by the people who were evaluating. philosophy to not just be academic evaluation at distant. but work with these groups, past year helping them set up things. engaged with them and partnering with them to improve what they’re doing.

Amy: able to beef up community engaged research because of big grant and co-creator any measures with community partnership. they said design should be panel design not repeated cross sample. keep Promise accountable and come back to them. data and research has so much mistrust that decided to be transparent about how spending the budget. decent amount had to go to research because of grant requirement and had to be accountable and democratize data. amount of trust through these three waves, increased response rates after COVID.

Seema: a couple resources: 1) Brookings Institution released book called hyper local, if you want to create great places have to have governance structure at the local level. 2) gealim.org 2017 conference in Baltimore, cultural mapping to look at existing dataset and asking the community, when had blank space and asked community to fill it in, more difficult when fill it some of the information. lot’s of documentation on that. asked people what they do in their community. 3) Byrne criminal justice awardee 13-16. did a book about case studies on first round people, embedded partner and went to every single community meeting every month for 3 years. by attending, show up as community partner and help them track how many people are coming to their meetings. track that as indicator. did pretty simple data work but weren’t capable of doing themselves. fascinating to watch community take over process and how to document that. they learned so much from that work and no way to document how much they learned. figured out their budget/how much to pay them/etc. hear what people wanted to do and documented everything. 169-point thing they wanted to do, organized by different issues. which one evidenced based to actually reduce crime, potlucks in neighborhood can actually reduce in crime over time. workforce training has oblique relationship with crime reduction. everyone picked top three things to work on. a lot of the dots on workforce training still. pivoted and decided to pick other things next year when crime rates didn’t go down. 500 days homicide free at the end of 3 years.

Daniel: provided evidence about potential solutions that they generated, where was that coming from?

Seema: crimesolution.gov, this is promising/supporting/etc. vacated landlords on blocks that don’t clean up structures. DOJ suggested that they use. Byrne grant enabled them to do that. after looking at their own data and crime didn’t go down.

Lori: who is the they?

Seema: helped the city apply for it, showed them that they have three competing neighborhood organizations in that area so created umbrella organization to bring those together. individual organization but coordinating council. community leaders that were residents but not paid. paid through the grant but not salaried. presidents of neighborhood association.

Amy CS: resident leaders, violence interrupters and grassroots organization.

Amy CS: think DOJ model is fabulous because come together to decide, then implement, then see. Promise is way to adjust but more solidified. not a bad idea to be able to adjust. some things take longer time, workforce development could take up to 10 years.

Daniel: workforce development, give it 10 years but immediacy of what to address gives reason to build up and open up space for 10-year goal.

Amy CS: supporting community organizing must have initial wins, taking on speed bumps before malt liquor sales. shared space for failures to learn how to do things better the next time. if not constrained by short term funding cycles, work takes time, and philanthropic partners allow for shorter term outcomes for theory of change to link to long term and then be able to look over long term, able to learn from that.

Daniel: partners say here for the long haul, what do you want to do. freedom from funding source but allows to play in spaces for short term wins for long term strategy too.

Peter: big challenge to try and get different partners thinking as themselves as collaborative. people doing work in housing, workforce, etc but all should be thinking how they are working together and how to connect that.

Seema: very clear goals as early as you can, can be lofty. Byrne deals with crime reduction and hotspot and mapping helps with why hot spot next to school from design point of view and address that dark alley next to school. streetlights go out and 311 doesn’t come back to fix lights. started analyzing 311 calls for light outages, repeated outages were coordinated with crime because would shoot out the light and city doesn’t come back and fix them.

Amy CS: look at change over time

Seema: 311 indicators for all neighborhoods in Baltimore

Amy CS: sustainability is an issue, infusion of PN grant $30 million with requirement for matching, 5 years and 6 years with no cost extension. as academic institution as lead, community organizations didn’t feel like they had the capacity so push it slowly to them. with pandemic, caseloads quadrupled. even more don’t have the capacity for some of this work. happy for the trust built and remain at Drexel but data infrastructure is sustainability issue. how to attract funding from community led infrastructure. Promise Zone for priority points in fed grants. 18 different research/medical institutions came into West Philly to collect prelim data for grant proposals and overburdened predominantly Black neighborhood. Promise Zone Research Collection building capacity and applying for 501(3) for anyone who collects research has to come to them first. community IRB model. Hyden facilitator, amazing at doing that. good at asking who is getting the jobs and how to report that back, did you consult back with anyone. researchers glad they’re getting feedback to improve research. conditional approvement without endorsement, approval and endorsement (help with next steps). byproduct of data/research to take power back and drives application/evaluation of large grants and ability to get them. participatory grant writing to submit proposals. West Philly research day to bring together people with COBs to pitch research needs and build partnerships/collaborations.

Peter: NNIP partner in Denver used to do that

Seema: Johns Hopkins does that too

Amy CS: hard to find funding for this that doesn’t have exact funding

Seema: keep the place as the core thing of these grants, people can come and go but place always going to be there. workforce example: not live in neighborhood or not stay in neighborhood, through governance structure or other ways. potluck worked best, helps build trust. second round of DOJ had extra point for Promise Neighborhood and suppose to go to them, but partner went to the Urban Institute rather than Baltimore.

Peter: helping them collect/report robust data and takes time to do that.

challenges: data sharing on conflicts of interest; folks thinking as themselves as collaborating

Amy: community IRB only placed based IRB usually based on institution. interesting moment when community board realized they thought IRBs communicated geographic/topical interest which they don’t. only place-based IRB.

Amy: Biden admin increased place-based initiative funding

Kate: city applies for things and asked them to put in things about data