

Brandon Roberts + Associates

***WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT IN BALTIMORE:
OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES IN MEETING
THE JOB NEEDS OF INNER-CITY POOR***

A REPORT TO THE ANNIE E. CASEY FOUNDATION

May 1997

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	5
OBSERVATIONS ON RECENT EMPLOYMENT TRENDS AND PRACTICES	8
BALTIMORE'S POTENTIAL TO PARTICIPATE IN THE AECF JOBS INITIATIVE	21
PROMOTING WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT IN BALTIMORE	35
APPENDICES	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In late 1995, The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Inc. (AECF) initiated a six-city, national initiative to improve the employment opportunities for young adults and families in inner-city communities. Known as the Jobs Initiative, the effort supports diverse partnerships over an eight-year period to invest in projects and reforms that change the ways that public and private job-related services and systems operate on behalf of economically disadvantaged job seekers.

Although Baltimore was not chosen to participate in the initiative, AECF agreed to take another look at the state of capacities, projects, and leadership in Baltimore for improving job opportunities. In doing so, the Foundation supported an assessment that was similar in nature to the assessments it completed several years ago to identify eleven cities to apply for its Jobs Initiative. A Baltimore-based consulting firm, Brandon Roberts + Associates, managed the assessment. The work was conducted by Brandon Roberts, Marcia Kingslow, and Christine Rico.

The assessment was conducted during January and February 1997. Information was primarily gathered through a series of personal interviews. More than forty people were consulted and they represented a diverse range of interests and institutions, such as government, employment and training providers, foundations, private businesses, community groups, media, academics, and advocates for the economically disadvantaged.

FINDINGS

The assessment was based on four general criteria that were used to examine Baltimore's a) ability to mobilize diverse groups of people and organizations to address poverty alleviation; b) willingness to change and improve the ways in which the labor market and public policies function for disadvantaged job seekers; c) capacity to initiate and sustain a

multi-year effort; and d) need for additional workforce development strategies and projects.

Key findings from the assessment are:

Ability to Mobilize: Changes have occurred in Baltimore since its initial consideration for the Jobs Initiative. Of note are the efforts to mobilize diverse groups and institutions across the community to address an array of development issues. These efforts are demonstrated by such initiatives as the Empowerment Zone (EZ), Bridges-to-Work, and formation of the Baltimore Growth Alliance, as well as two new efforts by Citizens Planning and Housing Association (CPHA) and the Interfaith Action for Racial Justice (IARJ). Although Baltimore deserves credit for these efforts, the results are as of yet unproven, and questions remain about the region's willingness to engage in a public discourse focused on issues of economic equity. The assessment also found no strong candidates to readily convene the players necessary to undertake a Jobs Initiative effort.

Openness to Change: It is important to confirm the community's willingness to take innovative steps to reform or change longstanding practices and systems. The Living Wage campaign, New Schools Initiative, and Housing Mobility program all signify the community's willingness to take bold actions to address fundamental problems and issues. Despite limited outcomes in some efforts, the community's continuing commitment to act suggests that Baltimore is fertile ground for an initiative that advocates systems change and provides resources and technical support to achieve that goal.

Local Capacity: Baltimore still has several limitations important to its participation in the Jobs Initiative. The most prominent issue is that of community capacity. Once again, the assessment found no strong candidate organizations or institutions that could serve as the development intermediary to manage the Jobs Initiative over an eight-year period. This finding is similar to the findings made by AECF when it first considered Baltimore for the Jobs Initiative several years ago.

Need for Strategies and Projects: The assessment found that a number of new and significant employment and economic development projects have either been initiated or are planned for the immediate future. These include such endeavors as Bridges-to-Work, Career Centers, Baltimore Business Advisors, EZ employment and economic development programs, and the newly announced Jobs Plus project targeted for Sandtown-Winchester. Although the employment needs of inner-city residents far exceed the opportunities generated through current employment and job creation efforts, the risk and potential negative affects of overloading the current environment with more activities could easily outweigh the potential benefits of another set of projects. It is important to note that this concern was expressed by several key officials interviewed

during the assessment. There may be, however, potential for assisting current efforts.

Although there are pros and cons for Baltimore's participation, on balance the assessment leads to the following overall finding:

Baltimore is not currently nor likely in the near future to be a good candidate for direct participation in the AECF Jobs Initiative. In fact, it appears that the Jobs Initiative model is not a good fit for Baltimore. The AECF should not make Baltimore the seventh city in its effort.

RECOMMENDATION

Although Baltimore should not join the AECF Jobs Initiative, there are significant workforce development needs and opportunities throughout the community. It is recommended that serious consideration be given to supporting some type of workforce development effort that can stimulate greater understanding of the issue and add value to the current array of project efforts.

Workforce development is not an issue that has been central to public policy debates in the Baltimore region. Other issues, such as education, housing, and facilities development, have dominated discussions and action. It now appears, however, that workforce development is gaining currency as a major topic of regional concern for several reasons: a) worker shortages, b) welfare reform, and c) the increasing need to address economic and social conditions in Baltimore City.

This assessment does not advocate adopting any particular model for Baltimore. Deciding on what might work here should be the product of a local collaborative planning process. There are, however, a number of workforce development ideas warranting attention. These ideas include:

- Conducting ongoing **research and information** in order to generate meaningful data and analyses on workforce and economic conditions in the Baltimore area, particularly from the perspective of “jobs for the poor.”
- Crafting a **comprehensive policy agenda/strategy** that offers an integrated programmatic and jurisdictional approach to connecting the poor to jobs and reforming the overall workforce development system.
- Instituting an **accountability and learning** process that monitors and assesses the performance of local workforce policies and activities from the perspective of furthering learning and guiding constructive action.

- Establishing **technical assistance** capacity in order to assist current policymakers and practitioners in improving program operations.
- Directing resources to **add value to current projects** in order to expand their scope and quality of service.
- Identifying local ways to better **connect job creation and workforce development efforts** to benefit the employment needs of inner-city residents.

It is important to note that taking action on any or all of these matters will be a challenging task. Many of the same limitations found in the analysis of Baltimore's capacity to participate in the Jobs Initiative -- minimal capacity, proclivity for projects -- apply to efforts to undertake a new workforce development endeavor. Perhaps the most critical challenge will be to forge a commitment to build a system of policy mechanisms and institutions that are sufficiently durable to withstand inevitable political changes, as well as the frustration and impatience that accompany efforts to achieve economic and social renewal. Ultimately, any effort must be driven by an overriding commitment to foster ideas and actions that can improve employment opportunities for young adults and families residing in Baltimore's inner-city communities.

INTRODUCTION

This paper presents findings from an assessment of Baltimore's current and potential capacity to provide employment opportunities for young adults and families in inner-city neighborhoods. The study was commissioned by The Annie E. Casey Foundation in response to the interest expressed by several local foundations in Baltimore's pursuit of an employment effort similar to the AECF Jobs Initiative. A Baltimore-based consulting firm, Brandon Roberts + Associates, managed the assessment. The work was conducted by Brandon Roberts, Marcia Kingslow, and Christine Rico.

This piece is organized in four parts. This first part describes the approach and criteria used for the assessment. The second part presents observations about Baltimore's current employment trends and practices, as well as lessons learned from specific project efforts. The third section focuses on the consultants' findings relative to Baltimore's potential for undertaking an employment effort modeled on the AECF Jobs Initiative. The final section identifies significant areas of workforce development that may warrant direct attention.

APPROACH AND CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT

In late 1995, the AECF initiated a six-city, national initiative to improve the employment opportunities for young adults and families in inner-city communities. Known as the Jobs Initiative, the effort supports diverse partnerships over an eight-year period to invest in projects and reforms that change the ways that public and private job-related services and systems operate on behalf of economically disadvantaged job seekers.

The Jobs Initiative represents one approach to possibly improving employment opportunities for inner-city residents. The approach is based on several important ideas about addressing this issue:

- Strategies and projects should be developed and implemented through a set of collaborative partnerships that, at a minimum, include representatives of local government, private businesses, community development groups, and advocates for the economically disadvantaged.
- Local efforts should target benefits (i.e., family wage jobs) to adults residing in a specific distressed place or community.
- Strategies and projects should link job seekers to the larger regional economy, as well as to local labor markets.

- Multiple strategies and projects are useful in generating new employment opportunities for inner-city residents, as well as accessing existing jobs opportunities.
- All efforts and the lessons learned should eventually translate into an agenda for the reform of public and private employment policies and practices.

The Jobs Initiative was directed toward larger cities that have diverse regional economies, a history of cross-sector collaboration, a civic priority for poverty alleviation, and several, but not numerous, jobs projects in operation and planning. It was also important that each Jobs Initiative city have a strong and respected community-wide organization that would have important roles in developing and implementing the Jobs Initiative effort.

Although Baltimore was not chosen to participate in the initiative, AECF agreed to take another look at the state of capacities, projects, and leadership in Baltimore for improving job opportunities. In doing so, the Foundation supported an assessment that was similar in nature to the assessments it completed several years ago to identify eleven cities to apply for its Jobs Initiative. Specifically, the assessment was based on three general criteria (see Appendix A for the specific assessment guide) used to examine Baltimore's

- Ability to mobilize diverse groups of people and organizations across a metropolitan region to address poverty alleviation;
- Willingness to change and improve the ways in which the labor market and public policies function for disadvantaged job seekers; and
- Capacity to initiate and sustain a multi-year effort that can eventually reform how public and private job-related services and systems operate.

The study also solicited information on recent and current endeavors to connect inner-city Baltimore residents with employment opportunities in the regional economy. These experiences were considered important for two reasons. First, the assessment needed to determine the extent to which the Baltimore community was already engaged in ventures of this type, as the Jobs Initiative was not designed for cities where substantial employment efforts were underway. Second, the AECF has learned since the inception of the Jobs Initiative that a stronger understanding of local employment and training experiences can provide important insights that can be useful in developing Jobs Initiative strategies.

The assessment was conducted during January and February 1997. Information was

primarily gathered through a series of personal interviews (see Appendix B). More than forty people were consulted and they represented a diverse range of interests and institutions, such as government, employment and training providers, foundations, private businesses, community groups, media, academics, and advocates for the economically disadvantaged. In addition to personal interviews, but to a much lesser extent, the consultants reviewed written materials pertaining to employment issues and practices in the Baltimore area. These documents were very useful in identifying lessons learned from recent experiences.

The following section presents the observations and findings of this assessment. They are the considered professional judgements of the authors and do not represent judgements or opinions of AECF staff.

OBSERVATIONS ON RECENT EMPLOYMENT TRENDS AND PRACTICES

This section presents observations on Baltimore efforts to connect inner-city residents with employment opportunities. The section is comprised of two parts. The first part focuses on the level of knowledge available in the community pertaining to issues of poverty and employment. The second part briefly examines the workforce development structure in Baltimore and profiles several projects with the intent of better understanding the issues associated with providing workforce development and job creation activities in the area.

A. Knowledge on Issues of Poverty and Employment

For at least a decade, Baltimoreans have been presented with thoughtful studies that focused on the issues of poverty as they affected the City and overall metropolitan region. In each instance, the reports, although controversial, were widely publicized and were generally recognized for raising relevant issues of concern. A common theme of each study is that unless something is done to remedy the negative economic and social conditions impacting Baltimore City, the economic and social structure of the overall Baltimore region will suffer.

- In 1986, the Goldseker Foundation published *Baltimore 2000: A Choice of Futures*.¹ The report, in examining future economic and social trends for the Baltimore region, called for a new civic agenda that gave priority to a sounder economy, particularly if the area was to have some expectation of preventing further growth of poverty and decay. In particular, the report noted relative to the goal of a sounder economy that “probably the principle concern was to provide appropriate employment for Baltimore’s existing population, especially for its poor” (p. 24).
- In 1991, five years later, *The Baltimore Sun* published a special report entitled “Baltimore and Beyond.” The report, based on a study conducted by Neal Peirce and Curtis Johnson and funded by The Abell Foundation, examined “the future of Baltimore -- its relations with its neighboring counties, its need for more diverse leadership, its troubled schools, and its deteriorating neighborhoods.” The report noted that “while the city boasts a glittering chain of waterside projects, it also is becoming poorer and poorer....County officials must have the courage to tell constituents that Baltimore City’s well-being is critical to the entire region, that if

¹ Szanton, Peter, *Baltimore 2000: A Choice of Futures*, Baltimore: The Morris Goldseker Foundation, 1986.

the city starts to sink economically, the ripples of decay will spread inexorably out” (p. 1c).

- In 1996, five years after the Peirce report, The Abell Foundation supported another report, *Baltimore Unbound: A Strategy for Regional Renewal*,² raising concerns about the region’s future prosperity. In it, the author found that “the growth and prosperity of the Baltimore region are imperiled by the steady decline of Baltimore City as a place to live. The social deterioration of most city neighborhoods erodes Baltimore City’s vitality and threatens its attractiveness not only as a place to live but as a place to work, to shop, and to visit” (p. xxiii).

These reports, along with others, are illustrative of a widespread concern about the poverty and negative economic and social conditions of Baltimore City and their impact on the future vitality of the region. Interviews conducted for this assessment confirmed an acute awareness of this issue and a desire among officials and citizens in general to take action to address the situation. A number of efforts are underway to examine how the region might work more cooperatively to address common problems of concern. These efforts, some of which will be discussed later, are supported by such groups as the Greater Baltimore Committee, CPHA, and the IARJ.

Aside from the *Baltimore 2000* report, the idea of employment has not been a major feature of some important discussions on the issue of poverty. Although many might argue that it is an implicit piece of any discussion on the subject, neither *Baltimore and Beyond* nor *Baltimore Unbound* devoted any significant attention to the issue. Notably, neither report proposed an employment strategy among its recommendations. One possible explanation may be the serious job loss that occurred throughout the state in the early 1990s. The Baltimore region has just regained the level of employment it had at the beginning of the decade, a fact that has possibly limited the attention given to employment as a strategy for poverty alleviation.

The inattention to the issue of employment in these discussions on poverty should not be taken to suggest that Baltimore is not engaged in employment and training efforts targeted to the inner-city poor. As will be described in the next section, Baltimore has a number of such programs, many of which are highly regarded. What this does suggest, however, is a general lack of information about the City and regional economy, particularly as it relates to labor market conditions and characteristics associated with residents of Baltimore’s impoverished inner-city neighborhoods. In short, Baltimore is bereft of any major study that explicitly analyzes the connection between poverty and employment. It should be noted that among cities across the country, Baltimore is not

² Rusk, David, *Baltimore Unbound: A Strategy for Regional Renewal*, Baltimore: The Abell Foundation, 1996.

alone; only a handful of cities has undertaken comprehensive studies of this type.³ Of note, however, is the fact that the AECF Jobs Initiative requires participants to conduct such analyses.

There are a number of individual pieces of local information that, when considered together, offer some evidence that this may be a fertile area for further analysis and consideration. Based on a cursory review of local materials and a limited number of interviews, the following points on local labor market conditions were noted:

- During the first five years of the decade, Baltimore City lost approximately 40,000 jobs while the counties in the Baltimore region gained 30,000. Overall, the Baltimore region experienced a net job loss of 10,000 jobs. (Maryland Office of Planning, Jan. 1996).
- The Baltimore region is now experiencing overall net job growth. The 1997 projected employment growth in Maryland is 2.0 percent with Baltimore Metro at about 1.5 percent (Michael Conte, Regional Economic Studies Institute, Towson State, *The Baltimore Sun*, Jan. 19, 1997). This translates into about 20,000 net new jobs for the region even accounting for continued job loss in Baltimore City.
- The number of firms expecting to add new workers will increase from 19 percent in 1996 to 38% in 1997 based on a University of Baltimore Maryland Business Research Partnership survey of 250 firms statewide (*The Baltimore Sun*, Jan. 22, 1997). Although the study does not project how many jobs this may lead to, the study did find that approximately 10% of firms in the Baltimore region cite worker availability as an issue of concern. (An important footnote to this survey is that labor issues rank higher than tax issues as a concern to employers.)
- A recent headline in *The Baltimore Sun*, “Jobs in Need of Workers,” emphasized that the state and metropolitan area’s low unemployment (4.1% for Jan. 1997) has resulted in many firms having trouble finding qualified workers. The article did not explore the issue of high unemployment in Baltimore City (approximately 7.5%) relative to the low unemployment of surrounding jurisdictions. (*The Baltimore Sun*, Feb. 9, 1997)
- A recent survey found that there were not enough workers to fill machinists positions in the region. There are approximately 200 new machinist positions available this year in the region, and the number of openings is expected to

³ For an example of a study of this type, see: Leete, Laura, and Bania, Neil, *Assessment of the Geographic Distribution and Skill Requirements of Jobs in the Cleveland-Akron Metropolitan Area*, Report to Summit County by the Center for Urban Poverty and Social Change, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, 1995.

increase to more than 1000 by year 2005. Training programs for machinists are under enrolled, and the number of apprenticeships are declining (only 104 in 1995) (Report from the Governor's Workforce Investment Board, July 1996).

- “Labor Shortage Hampers High-Tech Growth” was the lead article in a local newspaper 18 months ago (*Warfield's Business Record*, Nov. 20, 1995). The article pointed out that there was a “lack of solid middle core of skilled and semi-skilled workers” for the industry. Baltimore City Community College's program to train biotech technicians results in “95% of the program's students going on to earn bachelor's degrees, ... therefore, the technician jobs, which pay \$30,000 to \$40,000 per year, remain open” (p.21).
- Baltimore is expected to generate only 220 new low-skilled jobs in 1997 for the 4700 welfare recipients who must find work (*The Baltimore Sun*, Feb. 2, 1997). A local analysis of employment growth and welfare work participation needs found, however, that recent and projected growth in the Maryland economy, particularly in the service and retail sectors, should result in sufficient jobs to absorb “all AFDC recipients who will be required to participate in work-related activities under the welfare reform program as long as: 1) some recipients get jobs outside the service and retail sectors, and 2) some clients in slow-growth places, such as Baltimore City, avail themselves of jobs in neighboring jurisdictions, either by securing transportation to work or by relocating.” (Regional Economic Studies Institute, Towson State University, “From Welfare to Work: Employment Growth and AFDC Participation,” May 20, 1996.)
- Although overall job growth has been negative in Baltimore City, each year a significant number of new hires occur to replace departing workers. Some estimate that this number could range from 50,000 to 100,000 in a one-year period. (see Harry J. Holzer, *What Employers Want*, Russell Sage Foundation, 1996, p. 28)
- Almost 50% of the approximately 400,000 plus jobs in Baltimore City (193,000) are held by non-residents, that is, people who commute into the City each day for employment. [Maryland Department of Labor, License, and Regulation (DLLR), Office of Labor Market Analysis and Information, “Baltimore City Profile,” Feb. 1996.]
- Approximately 28,000 Baltimore City residents considered part of the labor force are unemployed. (Maryland DLLR, Feb. 1996). It is unclear how many more residents not included in labor force calculations would like or need employment or how many of those working are underemployed.

The absence of any solid study or analysis that considers these points and other economic and labor market data leads to a general lack of understanding on the issue of poverty and employment locally. This contributes to at least two unfortunate outcomes. First, many of the above points go unexamined and thus potential opportunities for action are not realized. For example, if Baltimore City does turn over 50,000 jobs annually, what type of jobs are these, how many are held by non-city residents, and how many might be appropriate for inner-city residents with minimal occupational skills? Similarly, why are occupational skills training programs (e.g., machinist training) under enrolled, when presumably there are hundreds of people in Baltimore City who might want to pursue that particular career path? Second, without solid information and analysis, there is no clear public understanding of the issue. Many of those interviewed expressed dogmatic views, frustration, or even misinformed biases when commenting on the issue of employment for inner-city poor. Comments of note included:

- It is hard to know whether we need to create more jobs to employ the poor or whether there are enough jobs and, as such, we should focus on preparing and training them for existing jobs.
- We have barriers against hiring welfare recipients, as our business requires workers without criminal records.
- The prevalence of substance abuse among inner-city residents may exclude a large number from employment.
- Employment issues for the poor get in the way of effective business assistance and job creation efforts.
- We cannot train ourselves out of welfare reform as there are not enough jobs to absorb everyone into the economy.

Providing empirical data and analytical clarity is important, particularly as more attention is given to the employment needs of the economically disadvantaged. Welfare reform has generated significant interest in this issue, as reflected in the establishment of informal citizen groups, such as the Job Opportunities Task Force,⁴ the formation of a strategic planning group in Southeast Baltimore to examine the linkage between workforce and economic development on an areawide basis, and the fact that a number of local social and human service providers are considering incorporating job development and placement activities into their programs.

⁴ A number of local citizens and directors of non-profit organizations have convened an informal group to explore issues and opportunities for improving the employment prospects of inner-city Baltimore residents.

Although the issue of poverty and employment has not gained as much public attention as other matters in the region (e.g., housing, education), a number of individual actions have been taken or considered by a variety of groups in the Baltimore area. The following identifies a select number of these efforts and, where possible, offers lessons learned from these experiences.

B. Local Workforce and Job Creation Initiatives

Over the last decade, many employment and job creation projects have been undertaken or considered in the Baltimore area. Some of these efforts are outgrowths of the publicly supported employment and training system, and some reflect the innovation and energy of others involved in community and economic development matters.

Before discussing any particular effort, it may be useful to profile the general group of organizational players involved in adult job training and employment matters. As will be seen, a large portion of these efforts are tied to federal resources. Although there are many ways to map such a system, the approach presented is organized according to functions or activities rather than organizational entities.⁵ These include activities for 1) adult literacy, 2) job training, 3) job development and placement, and 4) job creation/economic development.

Appendix C presents a more detailed discussion of this system. Briefly, the current system in the Baltimore area involves the following.

Adult Literacy - Services for this activity, which typically include basic skills development, GED preparation, and possibly job placement, are delivered in Baltimore City by three principal sets of groups: Baltimore Reads, a City-initiated non-profit; Baltimore City Community College; and, approximately 30+ community non-profits. In Baltimore County, the public schools deliver adult literacy services, as do the community colleges. The primary funding source for these efforts is the federal government through the Adult Basic Education program, which is administered in Maryland by the Department of Education.

Job Training - Basic skills and occupational training are offered by a number of groups in the Baltimore area. Community colleges, community non-profits, and for-profit proprietary entities all provide occupational training services, as well as basic skills training. In addition, a number of groups, primarily non-profits, are now offering pre-employment preparation services in order to help program participants better access the labor market. The federal government, through the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)

⁵ Unfortunately, there is no single source of information that describes the workforce development system in the Baltimore region. It also should be noted that neither the City or region has a comprehensive strategy for workforce development.

and the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS)⁶ programs, is the primary resource for these efforts. These programs are administered by the Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation and the Department of Human Resources, respectively. Both Baltimore City and Baltimore County receive separate JTPA and welfare allocations from the state and have distinct organizational structures to administer the programs locally.

Job Placement - Job placement is essentially defined as a set of activities designed to identify employment opportunities and to help connect job seekers to those positions. Most organizations engaged in some form of education, training, and employment matters -- community colleges, community non-profits, proprietary institutions -- have some capacity to provide job placement services. Baltimore also has several community non-profits whose sole mission is to provide job placement services (e.g., Genesis Jobs). In addition, each of the EZ Village Centers is expected to offer this service to neighborhood residents, and increasingly, community social service providers are expanding their operations to help participants connect to the labor market. The largest provider of this service, however, is Baltimore City, which through the Mayor's Office of Employment Development (OED), operates six Career Centers that conduct job placement services. In addition, the City's Department of Social Services, as a result of welfare reform, is supporting job placement services. A number of federal resources are used to support these efforts, although some groups conduct their activities without any government support at all.

Job Creation/Economic Development - This area encompasses a number of strategies and activities, which in very general terms could be categorized according to those focused on strengthening the competitive base of the economy and those directed to meeting the specific needs of distressed people and communities. In general, but not exclusively, such groups in Baltimore as the Baltimore Development Corporation, Baltimore Growth Alliance, High Technology Council, and Maryland Department of Business and Economic Development, are more focused on competitiveness than equity strategies. Groups targeting to distressed people or places include:

- Council for Economic and Business Opportunity
- Baltimore Business Empowerment Center
- Community-based groups, such as Southeast Development Initiative and HEBCAC
- Baltimore Business Advisors, Inc.
- Women Entrepreneurs of Baltimore

⁶ JOBS supported education and job training activities under welfare prior to the passage of the welfare reform act last year. The JOBS program no longer exists as a separate funding program, although the resources have been incorporated into the State's overall welfare block grant and can be used for education and job training activities.

Each of these groups receive support from multiple and varied funding sources. Although there is a growing recognition of the potential benefits of linking economic and workforce development activities, to date most of the efforts have been driven by a desire to meet the workforce needs of firms rather than the employment needs of inner-city poor.

This study was not designed to map the area's workforce system, as the above information was pieced together from the overall assessment process. As several interviewees pointed out, it is easy to conclude that Baltimore does not have a coherent system or overall strategy for workforce development. Instead, the area is comprised of a number of separate governmental and non-governmental groups, all of which conduct a variety of workforce development activities. A recent United Way study of the region's workforce development services noted 36 different groups engaged in literacy services.⁷ Many of these groups also offer job placement services, as do another dozen or more groups not providing literacy services. Most of these efforts are targeted to economically disadvantaged individuals. The United Way study also noted the existence last year of 104 private employment placement agencies that primarily serve highly qualified workers (p. 17).

Although OED has sought to integrate these various activities into a coherent workforce development system, their efforts are challenged by several factors: 1) declining resources; 2) changed state and local welfare policy that has recently allowed social service agencies to develop job placement capacities; and 3) the growth of non-OED financed (or even non-governmental employment) groups that have little, if any, incentive to work with the local public employment and training system.

Amidst this array of workforce and job creation activities, a number of interesting projects have been attempted in recent years. The following profiles a select few of these efforts and is designed to show the diversity in the approaches and interests of large and/or highly respected organizations in the Baltimore area. Although not every effort is fully successful, these projects signify a strong local capacity to undertake individual project activities.

Center For Employment Training Baltimore - The Center for Employment Training ("CET") in Baltimore is a three-year old effort to replicate the work of California-based CET, which has been nationally recognized as a successful employment training program. Based on over 20 years experience in the field, CET was funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in 1992 to establish 10 programs across the U.S. Baltimore is one of the first replication sites chosen by CET

⁷ Keeton, Dr. Morris, *Preparing Disadvantaged Adults for Employment: 1996 Needs Assessment*, A Report for the United Way of Central Maryland, September 1996, p. 17.

which came to Baltimore in large part because of the interest of the City's Office of Economic Development -- the City pledged \$1 million in JTPA training contracts annually to CET.

CET is based on a number of relatively simple but crucial principles. In a recent report on the CET model, *Working on Jobs*, these principles are summed up as follows: "The CET training model is effective because it motivates students to learn job-specific skills and is part of employers' recruiting networks."⁸ Specific aspects of the training model include a curriculum that is self-paced; contextual; open-entry, open-exit; and frequently adapted to meet the needs of specific employers. Locally, CET offers training in automated office systems, building maintenance, shipping and receiving, and medical assistant skills.

In Baltimore, the start-up phase of CET has been difficult, impeded by issues internal to CET, such as inadequate funding for the start-up period, an inappropriate location, and difficulty hiring a program director who was locally known but also steeped in the CET values and organizational culture. More seriously, the Baltimore CET program was started without establishing strong employer involvement up-front. As a result, the program has suffered from lower placement rates than CET strives for and, generally, achieves. This is a serious problem during the start-up period when the program is striving to earn a strong local reputation.

Secondly, CET's model does not fit the State of Maryland's certification requirements for training programs and has not succeeded in having the requirements modified or waived. This serious restriction on the program translates into lost opportunity. As it stands now, CET can only access public job-training funds through contracts with public agencies or certified training organizations. In other states, CET is able to offer customized training programs directly to employers, which provides additional training opportunities and gives CET trainers first-hand knowledge of the employment conditions and skills demands of employers.

Baltimore Healthy Start - Baltimore Healthy Start was established in 1992 by a federal grant to the Baltimore Department of Health. Baltimore was one of 15 cities chosen to participate in the federal program, which was funded to reduce infant mortality by 50% in five years. Baltimore's approach to reducing infant mortality was informed by an earlier pilot "Baltimore Project" that demonstrated the need to address the underlying causes of infant mortality and morbidity. The Healthy Start Program was therefore designed to address families' socio-economic needs and problems, as well as mothers' medical and health issues. Specifically, Healthy Start strives to address issues of poverty,

⁸⁸ Edwin Melendez, *Working on Jobs*, 1996, The Mauricio Gaston Institute. Available from the Annie E. Casey Foundation.

housing, unemployment, and substance abuse within its target area.

One key to the Healthy Start program's success has been the use of a community outreach and education model of service delivery to identify and support families in the target areas. Along with this component, Healthy Start initiated an employment strategy that emphasizes hiring as many community residents as possible in the program. Healthy Start now employs 130 community health workers (CHWs), half of which are participants in Project Independence, the State's welfare-to-work initiative. Through Project Independence, Healthy Start works closely with the City's OED and its Department of Social Services.

In the past four years, Healthy Start has trained 200 CHWs. The training program consists of a basic introduction to the Healthy Start program and job-readiness training. Most skills training is done on the job by experienced CHWs, by supervision from team leaders, and through weekly in-service sessions. CHWs receive constant support and encouragement to take advantage of other educational and job opportunities, as well as to increase their skills on the job. The average length of employment at Healthy Start is 1.2 years for salaried CHWs and 18 months for Project Independence participants.

Healthy Start has developed an effective ladder that moves individuals from welfare and unemployment to work. The position of CHW typically has low barriers to entry and builds on the survival skills that many low-income people depend on -- ability to develop support networks, identify needed resources, and connect with service providers. Through training, CHWs enhance these skills to act as a cultural bridge between community members and needed health and social services. With the added experience of successful employment and the confidence generated by participating in the Healthy Start program, CHWs generally move on to new employment after leaving the Healthy Start program, many within the health care industry.

Healthy Start also incorporates employment support for clients into its program design. Life Planning activities for women in the program covers parenting, stress management, substance abuse, and family planning, and makes linkages to employment and education. In its Men's Services program, Healthy Start provides similar support for the male partners of mothers enrolled in Healthy Start. Recently, Healthy Start has developed collaborative relationships with local job training and placement centers, including HEBCAC and Genesis Jobs, through which they hope to increase job placements for Healthy Start clients.

UMMS Buy Baltimore Program - In 1993 the University of Maryland Medical System, Inc. (UMMS) established an initiative to increase purchasing from minority-owned and local businesses. The underlying goal for this program is to enhance existing businesses or create new businesses in the hospital's community and to stimulate new jobs for

community residents. This goal is consistent with UMMS's historic commitment to serving the community and also reflects the current competitive pressures in the health care industry. UMMS is hopeful that these acts of community stewardship will be perceived positively in the community and will translate into increased market share. UMMS also believes that by promoting local business development in the City of Baltimore and more specifically in West Baltimore, unemployed residents can obtain jobs and health insurance, thus reducing the level of uncompensated care at the hospital. A team of top-level management at UMMS is responsible for developing the institutional purchasing initiative and incorporating the overall goals into departmental workplans. The initiative includes use of minority contractors in construction projects, as well as the purchasing of goods and services.⁹

From the beginning of this initiative, UMMS has partnered with the Council for Economic and Business Opportunity (CEBO), a non-profit organization devoted to economic parity for minorities in Greater Baltimore. Founded in 1968, CEBO works in partnership with city and state government, business, and professional groups, funders, and community organizations. CEBO has been very helpful to UMMS in identifying minority businesses to participate in the program. In total, the purchasing initiative has supported six businesses and led to the creation of over 200 jobs. The types of participating businesses include medical supply warehousing and delivery, linen refinishing, laundry, medical records storage, and patient transportation. Not all of these efforts have been successful in the long-term. The demands of a large contract can place extraordinary stress on the capacity of a small business. In times of rapid expansion, small business owners commonly face problems managing cash flow needs, maintaining product quality, and meeting contract deadlines. All of these issues have come up from time to time in this project. Increasingly, CEBO has sought to provide business assistance to entrepreneurs to help them improve performance and maintain the UMMS contracts.

While the UMMS initiative seeks to create new jobs, program success is measured by purchasing dollars spent locally. UMMS has no data regarding the employment impact of the program, other than the numbers of jobs created as reported by businesses at the time the business relationships are established. UMMS has not tracked the jobs over time and has no information on employer hiring practices, employee retention, or job quality. In interviews, senior management at UMMS recognize that linkages to local employment training and placement programs could help to enhance the employment impacts of the program. However, no connections have been made at this time.

Furthermore, while the Johns Hopkins Medical Center established a similar purchasing

⁹ See: Seedco, *Jobs and Economic Development: Capitalizing on Opportunities in the Health Care Sector*, Annie E. Casey Foundation, 1995 and Mt. Auburn Associates, *Jobs and the Urban Poor: Publicly Initiated Sectoral Strategies*, The Ford Foundation, 1995.

initiative in 1995, the competitive environment in the health care industry keeps these institutions from working together. City government or some other outside entity would have to play a convener or mediator role to broaden impact of these strategic purchasing initiatives to a city-wide or regional scale. To date, UMMS has maintained a minimal relationship to City agencies while Hopkins has included both Empower Baltimore and City OED on the initiative's advisory board.

Lessons Learned - These three efforts -- CET, Healthy Starts, and UMMS -- represent a small portion of the innovative and interesting projects that have been considered in recent years.¹⁰ They very well demonstrate some of the necessary ingredients for any program to succeed: willingness to act, capacity for innovation, and availability of funding.

While different in method, organization, and background, each of these programs has benefited from strong institutional backing: the City Department of Health backed by a federal demonstration initiative, a nationally recognized employment training program backed by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development, and a large hospital system with significant political support and talented management dedicated to the project. In each case, significant resources have been devoted to establishing the program and adapting it to respond to local conditions.

However, these programs also demonstrate that these qualities are, by themselves, insufficient. Strong institutional backing, stable funding, and good program design certainly helps to establish programs. However, heavy hitters do not guarantee success. After five years, Healthy Start is facing severe cutbacks in its federal funding stream and is struggling to adapt to the changing health care environment; the UMMS institutional purchasing initiative slowed dramatically in the last year as both UMMS and CEBO have worked through personnel changes at leadership levels; and CET is backing off its quest for State certification to concentrate on improving employment outcomes for its clients by focusing on its core mission, values, and program design.

Secondly, while the programs have relationships to a variety of public and private agencies, the programs themselves operate as stand-alone programs that have only modest connections to public and private employment systems. Each program can, therefore, have limited impact on reforming existing systems to more effectively address the issues related to job creation and retention. For example, CET's battle over certification issues could have had a much different outcome if Baltimore supported an employment policy advocacy network, and CET's placement rates could more easily be

¹⁰ These projects were profiled because information existed on their efforts and experiences, thus facilitating an ability to identify lessons learned. Other workforce experiences and ideas that might also be interesting to examine to identify lessons learned include: GBC supported transportation program between Cherry Hill and BWI; the Abell Foundation proposed American Manufacturing Company program; the Life Sciences Training program of BCCC; and OED job placement activities for PTP, Inc.

improved if more private sector employers become involved with OED and others to identify and address employment training needs.

The issues these efforts raise are not unique to Baltimore. As was discussed earlier, Baltimore like many other communities across the country, does not have a workforce development system per se, but a collection of employment-based strategies and projects that may or may not connect. Given these conditions, it would appear that Baltimore could benefit from a systems reform effort. The following section specifically addresses the question of whether Baltimore is a good candidate to join AECF's Jobs Initiative.

BALTIMORE'S POTENTIAL TO PARTICIPATE IN THE AECF JOBS INITIATIVE

This section addresses the consultants' findings relative to Baltimore's potential for undertaking an employment effort modeled on the AECF Jobs Initiative as represented by the criteria articulated in the introduction. Or in other words, this section answers the question of whether Baltimore should become the seventh city in the Jobs Initiative.

Baltimore was not selected to participate in the Jobs Initiative for several reasons.

- First, it was perceived that Baltimore did not have a strong history of regional collaboration or civic partnerships focused on addressing issues of poverty. As noted earlier, the 1991 Peirce report specifically noted Baltimore's lack of civic infrastructure. It was not clear that the region had taken actions to address these concerns as AECF was considering potential sites for the Jobs Initiative.
- Second, it did not appear that Baltimore had a strong candidate with the capacity and credibility to convene and manage an effort like the Jobs Initiative. Of particular concern was the availability of a commonly accepted body that could bring diverse groups in the community together around this issue.
- Third, it was believed that Baltimore's selection as an Empowerment Zone participant would occupy a significant amount of time, attention, and resources within the community. The AECF expected the Jobs Initiative to generate similar attention and, thus, did not want to overly burden the community's capacity to effectively implement its other obligations.

This assessment reexamined the above issues and others, recognizing that conditions may have changed in the Baltimore area over the last two to three years. The analysis is organized in four parts that correspond to the earlier mentioned assessment criteria: a) ability to mobilize, b) openness to change, c) local capacity, and d) need for new employment initiatives. The section concludes with the consultants' overall finding and recommendation to the AECF concerning Baltimore's potential to join the Jobs Initiative.

A. Ability to Mobilize

In carrying out this assessment, the consultants interviewed representatives from a range of non-profit organizations, governmental agencies, businesses and community-based organizations -- key leaders who provided a framework for understanding Baltimore's civic infrastructure. The AECF embraces a definition of civic infrastructure recognized

by the National Academy of Public Administration as "the capacity of individuals and organizations to work together effectively -- mobilizing resources and diverting them to a common purpose."¹¹

To this extent, the assessment sought to better understand the institutions and processes, relationships and experiences, and attitudes and understandings that provide the foundation for addressing complex social problems, specifically those associated with connecting poor people to local and regional labor markets. To gauge Baltimore's capacity to mobilize diverse resources and institutions, we were interested in understanding:

- a) the range of perceptions that might influence Baltimore's ability to create economic opportunity for residents of low-income communities;
- b) the level of participation and influence of specific types of organizations and institutions in local and regional dialogues about economic development, job creation, and workforce development; and
- c) attitudes toward and experience in undertaking partnerships or collaborations that reach across sectoral, regional, and racial lines.

As noted above, Baltimore was not asked to participate in the Jobs Initiative for a number of reasons, including the perception that it lacked the substantive civic infrastructure and history of regional partnerships devoted to poverty alleviation that the initiative requires. As discussed elsewhere in this report, Baltimore has shown considerable fortitude creating public-private partnerships to mobilize resources for large-scale physical development and infrastructure projects. Its skyline and waterfront are a testament to this.

Less certain, however, is Baltimore's ability to mobilize the diverse array of organizations and resources needed to substantively address conditions of poverty and joblessness in its economically distressed communities and to connect the people living in these communities to economic opportunities in the metropolitan area. Although laudable efforts have been undertaken to address conditions in these communities, they have often been ad hoc, geographically confined to small pockets of poverty, or undertaken without significant buy-in from the private sector. Often, mobilization around issues affecting disenfranchised groups and communities has resulted from confrontation rather than from a collective civic will to spread economic opportunity; to wit, the Housing Mobility effort, the living wage campaign, and the State/Local school financing and education reform compact.

¹¹ National Academy of Public Administration, *Building Civic Infrastructure for Jobs Creation*, A Report for the Annie E. Casey Foundation, 1995.

One of the conditions looked for in this assessment was a level of public discourse¹² that reflects an understanding on the part of public and private decision makers and citizens of the conditions found in poor communities, the influence these communities have on the City's well-being, and the interdependence between Baltimore's health and the region's viability. Reflected in such discourse should be a common commitment to strengthening the social and economic sustainability of these communities and their residents. Additionally, organizations directly involved with or representing distressed communities and populations should both initiate and contribute to the civic discourse and decision making.

Over the last three years, the EZ program stands out as the most significant effort to mobilize the greater community to address the needs of the inner-city poor. Baltimore has received high marks for its application process and its first two years of program implementation. Nonetheless, the E.Z. process and program is still developing and mobilization strategies, such as connecting inner-city businesses with the greater regional economy have yet to be acted upon. Our interviews found frustration with the process and skepticism that development efforts would translate into significant benefits for poor communities and residents.

Besides the E.Z. mobilization effort, little else has occurred in the Baltimore area. As noted earlier, this is about to change, as CPHA and IARJ are embarking on region-wide public processes to create better understandings of the social and economic issues that impact all residents within the metropolitan area. The CPHA effort, called a "Campaign for Regional Solutions," is designed to craft an agenda of specific regional strategies that hold promise for ensuring the long-term vitality of the Baltimore region and to build a region-wide constituency to support the agenda's implementation. The IARJ, which held its kick-off meeting March 18, 1997 with over 400 people and is known as "A Call to Community," is a grassroots effort "to build community between Baltimore City and the surrounding counties so that citizens and leaders within the entire metropolitan area can cooperate across class and racial lines in dealing with many pressing economic and social problems."

Overall, the assessment did not find compelling evidence to suggest that 1) Baltimore has the capacity to mobilize the variety of entities needed to execute the type of jobs initiative modeled by AECF, and 2) that there is any one entity that could convene all the respective players.

Baltimore does not have a well-developed network of community-based advocacy

¹² Public discourse is defined as an open process that facilitates an exchange on issues through the citizenry, not just public and private leaders. It is different than the issuance of studies such as the previously mentioned Peirce and Rusk reports.

organizations or a history of community organizing and mobilization for social change. There are examples within low-income communities of grassroots mobilization, the EZ being one. However, as the Enterprise Foundation's exercise in Sandtown-Winchester shows, in the context of comprehensive initiatives, grassroots mobilizations are often much more process-intensive than the pace of the physical development models Baltimore is used to. Additionally, in order to engage potential partners from other sectors in community development initiatives, dual mobilization efforts often result.

The general perception among representatives of community-based organizations is that Baltimore does not possess significant capacity to mobilize; most interviewees were quick to distinguish between mobilizing in support of physical and other types of development and mobilizing for economic equity. On the other hand, many of these representatives think the timing is right for grassroots organizing around employment issues. Beyond groups such as Baltimoreans United in Leadership Development (BUILD) and CPHA, few organizations were cited as possible catalysts. The larger community development corporations, most of which have little capacity in jobs creation and workforce development, are not viewed as being able to bring business and government to the table or to mobilize on a regional level. The network of employment and training service providers is perceived as being too fragmented to effectively mobilize itself and other sectors, and unsuccessful past attempts at systems reform may have left many providers wary of change.

Several interviewees suggested that local foundations collectively are the appropriate vehicle to mobilize the variety of constituents needed create a jobs initiative. However, various foundation officials were quick to point out that beyond a catalyst or convening role, philanthropy may not be the right vehicle to actually implement such an initiative. Perceptions vary within local philanthropy about its willingness to work together around jobs for the disenfranchised. Some foundation officials perceive a climate that is ripe for collective action, while others say there is no formal commitment to working together. None of the local foundations currently has an explicit program focus on job creation and workforce development.

There are indications that the business sector is hearing the message about the interrelationship between Baltimore economic strength, its neighborhoods, and firms' access to labor. There is, for example, an emerging effort to organize Baltimore's financial sector to examine the prospect of connecting inner-city residents to entry-level jobs in that sector, using Genesis Jobs as the provider. The local hospitals have exhibited some willingness to partner around job creation and service delivery in poor communities and around the School-to-Work initiative, and other firms have taken advantage of tax incentives aimed at stimulating employment opportunities for residents in distressed areas. However, the ability to mobilize the range of employers required to undertake a successful jobs initiative is questionable. Questions were raised about the

ability of the dominant business interests to mobilize the diversity of sectors and firms that comprise the regional economy. The Greater Baltimore Committee (GBC), for example, is mainly comprised of large businesses that have limited connections to the manufacturing, suppliers, and warehousing/distribution. Efforts aimed at stabilizing small- and medium-size enterprises as well as those to stimulate minority business development do not appear to be particularly well developed, nor have past attempts to organize business networks or industry associations been very successful, indicating a general reluctance of firms to work cooperatively.

The idea of the GBC as an effective mobilizer of a jobs initiative had some advocates and many critics. In addition to its members not being representative of the diversity of regional economic activity, the GBC appears to have lost some of its local power base as firms have left the city, and new businesses have less local allegiance. The GBC also lacks the organizational capacity to engage proactively and do the necessary outreach to mobilize an initiative. Moreover, its commitment to stimulating job opportunities for Baltimore's inner city residents is nebulous. Taking its cues from the Rusk Report, *Baltimore Unbound*, GBC is reportedly focusing its attention on regional development issues around taxation, housing, and education, suggesting that any attention given to the jobs issue is implicit in the housing discussion. The Baltimore Growth Alliance (BGA), established under the auspices of the GBC, is compiling an inventory of technical training programs to be used to recruit firms to the region as part of its overall mission of regional business development. There is little indication that the BGA is focused on jobs for inner-city residents, and hence would not be a candidate to mobilize participants of an AECF type initiative.

There are dubious perceptions on the part of many leaders in business, academia, philanthropy, and in some nonprofit circles about the City's ability to mobilize diverse constituents and lead a major initiative. Many interviewees were particularly doubtful about the City's ability to bring business and foundations to the table. There was generally good regard for OED. Its "Employ Baltimore" program -- a collaborative with the Baltimore Development Corporation, the State Job Service, AFL-CIO, Empower Baltimore Management Corporation, the Baltimore Urban League, and the Private Industry Council designed to provide employers with recruitment, screening, customized training, and placement services across occupational categories and skill levels -- is an encouraging step toward partnership. However, there was little confidence that, as a City agency, OED could stimulate the required level of regional participation.

Questions were also raised about the City's willingness to engage in regional alliances that might ultimately undermine City-focused funding streams, its political influence, and the racial balance of local representation. Several interviewees pointed out that Baltimore does not have a history of strong regional partnerships, which when they do occur, are usually driven by external forces -- by court decree in the case of open housing

efforts and by substantial federal funding in the reverse commute demonstration. In the case of the latter, several critics suggested that Bridges-to-Work might not have been necessary if regional transportation planning hadn't failed to develop strategies to connect inner-city communities to areas of concentrated economic activity. Others noted the BGA as a new indication of the region's willing to work together;, however, as several people remarked, BGA is not focused on issues of creating economic equity.

Although business and philanthropic leaders, as well as public officials, may comprehend the degree to which the region's viability is integrally linked to that of Baltimore City, it remains a hard sell politically. Wide skepticism was voiced about the ability to convince the counties to responsibly partner with the City to create jobs for poor urban residents. As one person put it, "there is no sense of moral responsibility to address the poor." No one entity was perceived to have the influence needed for cross-racial mobilization in support of, but not exclusive to, predominantly low-income African American communities.

The degree to which the media respond evenly to issues affecting inner-city communities is another important indication of Baltimore's limited ability to mobilize for a major jobs initiative. There seems to be a loose collection of neighborhood newspapers and local broadcast outlets that augment the coverage given to inner-city issues by *The Afro American Newspaper*. However, the general consensus is that issues affecting low-income communities in general, and the African American community in particular, receive marginal coverage in the mainstream media, and that much of the coverage received is quite negative. While the mainstream media are not the only vehicles to facilitate candid public discourse about important community issues, the general lack of substantive discussion about the importance of the City to the metropolitan region, the need for economic development in poor communities, and the need to connect these residents to regional labor markets indicate that they are not particularly disposed to helping advance an agenda for change.

Based on the interviews and observations undertaken in this assessment, we offer the following finding:

Baltimore, through its EZ program and other initiatives, has demonstrated some capacity to mobilize groups and resources toward a common purpose. These efforts, however, have been driven primarily by external forces (grant dollars, court orders, etc.) as opposed to a community-generated commitment to improve social and economic conditions of poor neighborhoods. Although newly initiated efforts by such groups as CPHA and IARJ reverse this trend and suggest hope for the future, they are just getting started. Serious questions remain about how easily Baltimore could mobilize for a program like the Jobs Initiative. There are no strong candidates that could readily convene such an effort.

B. Openness to Change

A key goal of most AECF activities, including the Jobs Initiative, is to promote and facilitate systems change. In AECF terms, this means a fundamental restructuring of the way communities plan, finance, deliver, and influence the provision of certain services whether they be related to education or health, or in the case of the Jobs Initiative, employment training and placement. Given this goal, it was necessary to assess whether potential Jobs Initiative sites demonstrated a historical willingness to change and improve the ways in which public policies function for disadvantaged populations.

Baltimore has a widely deserved international reputation for change and for making things happen. Over the last 20+ years, the community has virtually transformed the urban landscape of downtown and brought new vitality to the area.

These efforts did not occur by happenstance. They were the product of years of planning and investments, as well as an enduring belief in a vision that downtown Baltimore could be revitalized. They also were the product of an untested theory of redevelopment: a partnership between the public and private sectors that served both to guide the development process and to insure implementation. Today, public-private development partnerships are a given across the nation, and Baltimore is often credited with effectively pioneering this approach.

The physical revitalization of downtown Baltimore continues as represented recently by major projects such as CamdenYards, the Columbus Center, the Civic Center expansion, and now, current developments of a new football stadium and Children's Museum. Already, mention has been made of the need for a new sports arena to replace the existing facility and of the City as host of a future Summer Olympics.

As Baltimore has successfully moved forward with the revitalization of downtown through the development of a "glittering chain of waterside projects,"¹³ other economic and social elements of the city have not fared so well. These conditions, however, have not been ignored as Baltimore over the last eight years has shown, once again, a willingness to take innovative and challenging actions to address local problems, particularly those that directly relate to the living conditions of Baltimore's inner-city neighborhoods.

These recent efforts cover a number of issues and in most instances represent "leading edge" actions within the country. They include an attempt to privatize some public schools (Education Alternative Inc.'s "Tesseract" program); the institution of a needle

13 Peirce Report, *Baltimore and Beyond*, p. 1c.

exchange program; the public distribution of the Norplant contraceptive; the demolition and reconstruction of public housing complexes; the acceptance of community policing; the implementation of a “living wage” policy for some low-income workers; and the comprehensive revitalization of a very distressed inner-city neighborhood (Sandtown-Winchester). In addition to these actions are ongoing efforts, such as the Housing Mobility and the Local/State school financing and reform initiatives.

Each of the above projects signifies Baltimore’s openness to addressing major problems of concern, and if necessary, challenging existing practices and systems. In this regard, Baltimore has demonstrated a continuous willingness to change both in confronting problems of downtown development and the needs of the neighborhoods. As was noted by many, Baltimore is a national leader in its willingness to experiment and innovate to solve local problems.

It is, however, at this point -- a commitment to act -- that the similarities of addressing the problems of downtown revitalization and the problems of inner-city communities ends, and questions about achieving change and success emerge. In fact, as was revealed through this assessment, Baltimoreans have strong views on the community’s ability to realize change and achieve success. Simply put, many of those interviewed see downtown development as a success attributable to the competent efforts of the public-private partnership. In contrast, they believe that many of the efforts directed at the economic and social needs of the neighborhoods have achieved little and generally attribute this lack of success to poor management, particularly management as performed through public agencies.

The point in noting these distinctions is not to dispute them. The perceptions are real and they reflect a recurring theme that surfaced during this assessment: the inclination to apply the standards of action associated with downtown development to the actions focused on inner-city neighborhoods. The result, whether justified or not, is a growing frustration across the community with the capacities of anyone -- both public and private sector leaders -- to solve salient problems today, which most agree, revolve around the economic and social conditions of inner-city communities.

As has been found in other cities, the transformation of the local development process from one focused on physical revitalization to one focused on social and economic renewal is difficult.¹⁴ Numerous factors appear to impede such efforts, not the least of which is that the processes for problem solving and strategic action are different. Major differences are most apparent relative to expectations of success and the implementation process.

¹⁴ Edward W. Hill, *Policy Lessons from Cleveland’s Economic Restructuring and the Accompanying Case Studies*, The Urban Center, Cleveland State University, February 1997.

For example, success in downtown development is most often characterized -- not always appropriately -- by the completion of a building or project. Success is visible and achieved typically in a fairly short time frame; in other words, action was taken and can be seen. Success for many of the issues associated with economic and social problems of inner-city neighborhoods is often less tangible, depends on a variety of circumstances, and typically takes a longer time to accomplish.

Another major difference between these two areas is the implementation process. Whereas downtown development is characterized by a well-planned, committed public-private partnership, that same approach does not exist for initiatives targeted to the needs of inner-city communities. Instead, these efforts are more likely the product of several committed individuals or groups, and implementation is often the responsibility of government and/or non-profit organizations. Few, if any, of these efforts have the broad base of business or private sector involvement found in downtown development. A recent national report on economic development commented on this very issue in Cleveland by noting that "Projects downtown can begin to build community consensus and leadership, but the tasks of improving inner-city schools, healing fragmented communities, and helping local manufacturing firms become more competitive are much tougher, and it is easier to mobilize leaders around high-visibility downtown projects than around a long-term agenda."¹⁵

It is also important to recognize that the conditions of change are very different between downtown development and inner-city renewal. Most efforts to address economic and social issues strike at two very difficult issues not found in physical revitalization: ownership and behavior change. Whereas in downtown development, all owners are rewarded for change, most economic and social reform efforts challenge an existing ownership or power structure and a traditional way of doing business. Those subject to change often do not see or agree with the proposed benefits. As local experience has shown, managing such a process is not an easy task. Similarly, there are no precise designs or methods for changing personal behavior as there are for constructing a building.

In addition to these core issues, there are other concerns that appear important to efforts in Baltimore to achieve social and economic renewal. As identified by a number of interviewees, these include:

1. an open tension in the public policy arena that intermingles racial sensitivities and political power with efforts to solve problems;
2. a lack of confidence in public institutions to achieve change, as well as limited

¹⁵ National Academy of Public Administration, *A Path to Smarter Economic Development: Reassessing the Federal Role*, Washington, D.C., November 1996, pg. 22.

patience with such change efforts;

3. a unique proclivity for creating parallel and uncoordinated programs most readily reflected through the actions of foundations both locally and nationally;
4. limited efforts by local media to take a significant and informed interest in issues and problems of economic and social renewal;
5. the absence of evaluation or feedback mechanisms in order to measure performance and learn lessons from past experiences; and
6. as noted earlier, the absence of a civic infrastructure that embraces an open and consensus-building process for problem solving, particularly around issues involving poor communities and people, rather than a process based on confrontation and court challenges.

Exactly how each of these issues impacts on the community's ability to achieve change deserves further examination.

Based on our assessment and the observations noted above, we offer the following finding:

Baltimore has a demonstrated willingness to seek new ways for addressing major problems in the community. Similar to many other cities, achieving success around economic and social issues has proved difficult. Despite limited outcomes, the community's continuing commitment to act suggests that Baltimore is fertile ground for an initiative that advocates systems change and provides resources and technical support to achieve that goal.

C. Local Capacity

There are many approaches that might be used to address the employment needs of inner-city residents. The AECF approach, as outlined earlier, is based on a conceptual model that relies on the existence of a strong and respected community-wide organization -- a development intermediary -- that would have important roles in developing, implementing, and managing a Jobs Initiative effort.

The Jobs Initiative model calls for a development intermediary to take responsibility for spearheading, managing and sustaining the Jobs Initiative process over the eight-year period. Important characteristics of such a group include: 1) an ability to work with diverse interests across the community, 2) commitment to addressing issues of poverty, 3) staff expertise and track-record in managing projects, and 4) ability to raise matching

funds and sustain the initiative for an eight-year period.

The assessment found that Baltimore has few organizations that fit these criteria. As noted earlier, there are no easily identified organizations that have a strong track record of working with diverse interests across the community, particularly around issues of poverty. In addition, few organizations have experience managing complex, long-term initiatives. Importantly, two organizations suggested as potential candidates by interviewees did not view themselves as currently being suited to this role. Based on this information, we offer the following finding:

Identifying a development intermediary to spearhead, manage, and sustain a Jobs Initiative project in Baltimore would not be an easy task. Selecting an existing organization would likely require significant efforts to overcome resistance of some major players. Creating a new organization, an idea that was suggested by several interviewees, would require substantial time and effort that would raise serious questions about how readily Baltimore could join the other six Jobs Initiative sites as an equal partner. There are not strong candidates to assume the role of development intermediary.

D. Need for New Employment Initiatives

Discussion in Section II noted the existence of a number of workforce and job creation projects in the Baltimore area. As was pointed out, most of the projects created in past years were small in scale and somewhat isolated from other employment-related efforts. Much has changed in the past two years. The assessment found that a number of new and significant employment projects have either been initiated or are planned for the area in the immediate future.

Briefly, these projects include:

- The creation of six, one-stop Career Centers in the City that are expected to become the central point for accessing employment related services throughout Baltimore. Importantly, these Centers which operate a centralized and coordinated workforce information and job bank system (CareerNet), will be electronically connected and integrated into the employment efforts of each E.Z. Village Center. This overall effort is a multi-million dollar enterprise.
- The EZ program has resulted in significant attention for workforce and economic

development matters. As noted above, each Village Center is expected to receive resources that will enable it to conduct job placement services for its residents, as well as link residents to other employment-related activities such as literacy and job training services. In addition, the E.Z. created the Baltimore Business Empowerment Center, which has a number of business assistance and economic development initiatives underway.

- Baltimore, through the Historic East Baltimore Community Action Coalition, Inc. (HEBCAC) was selected last year as one of five cities nationally to participate in a major employment initiative. The effort, known as Bridges-to-Work, is a multi-million dollar federal initiative designed to connect inner-city residents to suburban jobs. This effort, which is targeted to an East Baltimore area within the boundaries of the E.Z., also receives E.Z. funding.
- The Sandtown-Winchester project, as managed by The Enterprise Foundation and Community Building in Partnership, was recently selected to participate in a national employment initiative operated by the Rockefeller Foundation, Chase Manhattan Bank and the U.S. HUD. One part of the project will focus on generating employment opportunities for residents of Gilmore Homes, a public housing complex. Another part of the project (yet to be approved), would extend the workforce development efforts to cover all of the Sandtown-Winchester territory.

In addition to these efforts, Baltimore has a number of other related initiatives targeted to improving the economic and employment prospect of inner-city residents either underway or in the planning stage. These include such ventures as the Baltimore Business Advisors (an effort started in 1996 based on Michael Porter's ideas for strengthening inner-city economies), replication of the Chicago South Shore Community Development Bank, replication of the Pittsburgh Bidwell Training Center program, and development of a home health care program that employs inner-city residents. On top of these efforts, are anticipated investments in new organizations to help transition welfare recipients into employment. The assessment found several groups or institutions (e.g. Sojourner-Douglas College) that were looking to develop new capacity in workforce development in order to assist the City's Department of Social Service fulfill its welfare reform mandate.

The most important distinction of these recent projects is the size and commitment of resources. Whereas many of the earlier projects were characterized by their limited scale and financial support, many of the more recent projects represent major obligations of funds (multi-million dollar initiatives) and long-term commitments. They also are designed to assist a larger number of community residents and, in many instances, are connected to other key groups involved in workforce development. An important factor

of each initiative will be its ability to develop and maintain staff capacity and community support over the long-term.

Based on the information gathered for this element of the assessment, we offer the following finding:

Given the number of new or planned employment-related initiatives in the Baltimore area, there is considerable danger that the Jobs Initiative model, which calls for the development and testing of multiple new strategies and projects, could conflict with the array of existing or future planned projects. Although the employment needs of inner-city residents far exceeds the opportunities generated through current employment efforts, the risk and potential negative affects of overloading the current environment with more projects could easily outweigh the potential benefits of another set of employment activities. It is important to note that this concern was expressed by several key officials interviewed during the assessment process.

E. Recommendation for Participation in the Jobs Initiative

Changes have occurred in Baltimore since its initial consideration for the Jobs Initiative. Of note are the efforts to mobilize diverse groups and institutions across the community and region to address an array of development issues. These efforts are demonstrated by such initiatives as the EZ program, Bridges-to-Work, and formation of the Baltimore Growth Alliance, as well as two new efforts by CPHA and IARJ . Although Baltimore deserves credit for these efforts, the results are as of yet unproven, and questions remain about the region's willingness to engage in a public discourse focused on issues of economic equity.

It is important to confirm the community's willingness to take innovative steps to reform or change long-standing practices and systems. The Living Wage campaign, New Schools Initiative, and the Housing Mobility program all signify the community's willingness to take bold actions to address fundamental problems and issues.

In contrast to these efforts, Baltimore still has several significant limitations to its participation in the Jobs Initiative. The most prominent issue is that of community capacity. As indicated above, the assessment found no strong candidate organizations or institutions that could serve as the development intermediary to manage the Jobs Initiative over an eight-year period. This finding is similar to the findings made by AECF when it first considered Baltimore for the Jobs Initiative several years ago.

Although there are pros and cons for Baltimore's participation, on balance the

assessment leads to the following recommendation:

Baltimore is not currently nor likely in the near future to be a good candidate for direct participation in the AECF Jobs Initiative. The AECF should not make Baltimore the seventh city in its effort. There are, however, significant workforce development needs and opportunities in Baltimore. The AECF and its local foundation colleagues should give serious consideration to supporting some type of workforce development effort that can stimulate greater understanding of the issue and add value to the current array of project efforts.

PROMOTING WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT IN BALTIMORE

Workforce development is not an issue that has been central to public policy debates in the Baltimore region. Other issues, such as education, housing, and facilities development have dominated discussions and action. It now appears, however, that workforce development is gaining currency as a major topic of concern.

There are several factors that appear to be driving interest in this issue. One is that the economy is growing and employers are starting to express concern about their ability to find qualified workers. Many recognize the large pool of jobless people in Baltimore City as a potential source of employees. Another reason is the attention welfare reform has generated on the issue of work. Concerned policymakers and citizens alike want to take positive steps to insure that recipients have real opportunities to become economically self-sufficient.

And yet another factor is the growing recognition that the viability of the Baltimore region is integrally linked to the economic and social conditions of Baltimore City. Although there are many issues that might be addressed from a regional perspective -- housing, education, tax sharing -- workforce development represents an issue that creates positive opportunities for all participants and raises few of the concerns or barriers that underlie other issues. As one interviewee noted, "workforce development represents a win-win situation for public officials, private businesses, the jobless and underemployed, and citizens in general."

As noted above, the AECF Jobs Initiative is not the answer to this need and opportunity in Baltimore. The assessment found that current conditions in Baltimore did not fit well with the specifications of the Jobs Initiative. What is most needed, however, is a workforce development initiative that enables a variety of people and interests to come together to address an issue of mutual concern: economic opportunity for residents of inner-city communities.

This assessment does not advocate adopting a particular model for Baltimore. Deciding on what to do should be the product of a local collaborative planning process. There are, however, a number of workforce development ideas warranting attention. These include:

Research and Information - There is a significant lack of meaningful information and analysis on workforce and economic conditions in the Baltimore area, particularly from the perspective of "jobs for the poor." The absence of strong analytical information hampers efforts to craft effective policies and strategies. Similarly, the community's

overall understanding and engagement in this issue, while growing, could be strengthened. Baltimore could benefit from a major, comprehensive analysis of this issue and an education campaign to communicate the findings to government and business leaders, as well as the general public.

Comprehensive Policy Agenda and Strategy - It was suggested by a number of interviewees that Baltimore's workforce development agenda and system is similar to most others in the country: there is no overall strategy to guide efforts; policymaking is diffused and uncoordinated; and service delivery is often fragmented, duplicative, and competitive. Despite the committed efforts of key government leaders to craft a more integrated system locally, the above observations seem valid. In fact, it is very unlikely that these issues can be addressed by government leaders alone; efforts must include outsiders who are not vested in the system or the activities of particular stakeholders. Baltimore could place itself at the cutting edge of workforce development efforts nationally if it were to successfully craft and enact an integrated and comprehensive workforce development strategy focused on the employment needs of inner-city residents.

Accountability and Learning - A major frustration exists in Baltimore with the ability of public and private leaders to effectively address critical problems. A contributing factor to this frustration is the general inability to objectively demonstrate performance, whether positive or negative. This is magnified by a general sense that there are few efforts to learn and build on the lessons of past experiences. Baltimore could be well served by the development of objective, professional capacity that could play a neutral but strong role in monitoring and assessing the performance of local workforce development policies and activities. An important feature of such an effort would be a predisposition to assess performance for the purposes of furthering learning and guiding constructive action, rather than serving as a tool of criticism.

Technical Assistance - The assessment found that both policymakers and practitioners have a strong desire and openness to improving program operations of the variety of groups engaged in employment and training matters. Unfortunately, there is little capacity within the region to provide technical assistance and even fewer resources to pay for such assistance. This is an issue warranting attention in the Baltimore area.

Add Value to Current Projects - Baltimore now has a number of new workforce development projects underway. Rather than adding new initiatives to the mix, it may be more productive to direct additional resources to current projects in order to expand their scope and quality of service. As noted in Section II, resource constraints have been an important factor limiting the success, expansion, and possibly continuation of some impressive initiatives.

Connect job creation and workforce development efforts - An ongoing challenge for most development efforts is the attempt to insure that job creation efforts benefit those most in need. Given the number of economic and workforce development initiatives currently underway in Baltimore and the resources supporting them, a real opportunity exists to link these efforts together in ways that directly address the employment needs of inner-city residents. An important first step in such an effort is the recognition among economic development specialists that linking job creation to the employment needs of the disadvantaged strengthens rather than detracts from the goal of competitiveness.

This assessment supports and endorses action in any or all of these areas. As noted earlier, deciding on what to do and how to do it should be the product of a local planning process. Obviously, the magnitude of effort and level of resources required for action depends on the type of workforce development initiative selected. For example, an initiative could range in scope from a small, highly concentrated effort, such as providing technical assistance to existing projects, to an endeavor that is broad-based and multi-faceted, such as fostering a policy agenda targeted to systems reform .

What is important is that Baltimore take some action now to begin devoting attention to this important issue. Perhaps noteworthy are the significant efforts in workforce development already underway in many parts of the country. States such as Florida, Massachusetts, Oregon, and Texas have in recent years created regionally-based workforce development boards to guide and integrate a variety of areawide workforce development activities (including education in some places), as well as to bring some degree of accountability to the system.¹⁶ These efforts are statewide, thus including metropolitan areas, but do not exclusively focus on serving the needs of the inner-city jobless and underemployed.

Examples of metropolitan areas working to specifically serve inner-city residents are less common. There are, however, a handful of examples across the country. Although there is great diversity in approaches -- these efforts cover the range of ideas/approaches noted above -- all have one element in common: they are seeking to enhance, reform or expand current activities, rather than supporting new project activities. Examples include:

- *Columbus Employment Consortium* - Columbus, Ohio enacted a strategy from their 1994 HUD-approved Enterprise Community application that called for the formation of region wide employment program. The Consortium is a collaboration of 12 member job training, economic development, and human resource agencies intent on strengthening linkages between job creation and economic development activities and the efforts of local employment training and placement agencies. The primary mission of this group is to empower and assist

¹⁶ See Jill Hyland, *Forging Partnerships Through Human Resource Investment Councils*, National Governors' Association, Washington, D.C., 1996.

E.C. residents in overcoming the barriers that prevent their participation in central Ohio's thriving job market. The Consortium now has 23 major Columbus corporations participating with approximately 1000 entry-level jobs available at any one time.

- *Twin Cities Economic Group* - In Minneapolis-St. Paul, a consortium of local governments, businesses, foundations, and community groups committed to improving the conditions of low-income communities in the metropolitan area. At this time, the Group is holding forums with business leaders and others to create an understanding of the opportunities for connecting employers and employees. The Group expects to develop a comprehensive plan for institutionalizing a workforce development effort over the next year.
- *Chicago Jobs Council* - In Chicago, a network of neighborhood groups acts to monitor existing workforce development activities and advocate for policies, programs, and resources to better serve the employment needs of disadvantaged populations in Chicago.¹⁷
- *Louisville Industrial Network Program* - The city/county economic development department has helped the Plastic Manufacturers Network to work with local job training providers to develop an entry-level training program targeted to workers residing in some of the poorest neighborhoods of Louisville.¹⁸
- *Cleveland Jobs and Workforce Initiative (JWFI)* - Established by the Greater Cleveland Growth Association, JWFI is a business- and foundation-led effort to build a world-class regional labor force in Northeast Ohio. An important goal of the effort is to develop a coordinated, regional employment training system.
- *Rebuild LA (RLA)* - After concluding that its development strategy to attract large firms to the inner-city would not work, RLA recast its efforts to revitalize the areas affected by the 1992 civil disturbance. One new approach was to develop sectoral networks among the small- and medium-sized firms in the area to help them connect with similar firms and other economic development resources in the greater Los Angeles region. One aspect of the effort was targeted to developing a training partnership between the networks and education and job training providers in order to enhance the job skills and placement of low-income people.¹⁹

17 Bennett Harrison, *Building Bridges: Community Development Corporations and the World of Employment Training*, A Report to the Ford Foundation, Jan. 1995, p.53.

18 Mt. Auburn Associates, Brandon Roberts, et.al., *Jobs and the Urban Poor: Publicly Initiated Sectoral Strategies*, A Report to the Ford and Charles Stewart Mott Foundations, Nov. 1995, p.70.

19 Carl Rist and Puchka Sahay, *Community-Based Organizations and Business Networks: New*

In addition to these specific workforce initiatives, examples exist in other development fields -- housing, community, and economic development -- that illustrate other ways of supporting and enhancing existing project activities. For example, national intermediaries, such as the Enterprise Foundation and Local Initiatives Support Corporation, have played important roles in expanding the technical capacities of community groups to finance, build, and manage low-income housing and conduct community-based retail development. Another example is USNet, a consortium of manufacturing assistance organizations in 11 states, that provides assistance and offers training programs on the theory and practices of inter-firm collaboration.²⁰

It is important to note that taking action on any or all of these type ideas will be a challenging task. Many of the same limitations found in the analysis of Baltimore's capacity to participate in the Jobs Initiative apply to efforts to undertake a new workforce development initiative. These limitations include: a) unclear regional commitment to address issues of economic equity, b) the absence of organizational capacity to spearhead and manage an effort, c) a local proclivity to focus on projects rather than policy matters, and d) a potential reluctance of funders to mutually cede control to an outside group.

Perhaps the most critical challenge in developing a workforce development initiative is to forge a commitment to build a system of policy mechanisms and institutions that are sufficiently durable to withstand inevitable political changes, as well as the frustration and impatience that accompany efforts at economic and social renewal. This means that some group of community leaders will need to assume the role of objective custodian for a workforce development initiative in the Baltimore area. Explicit in this role is the active need to foster ideas and actions that can improve employment opportunities for young adults and families residing in Baltimore's inner-city communities.

Ideas for Creating Job Opportunities for Inner-City Residents, Corporation for Enterprise Development, Dec. 1996, p.34.

20 *Ibid.* p. 32.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL TOPICS

Annie E. Casey Foundation Jobs Initiative Assessment, Baltimore, MD, 1997

I. ABILITY TO MOBILIZE COMMUNITY

- Importance of employment/jobs in area (workers, government, communities, business)
- Key challenges confronting inner-city job seekers
- Local perceptions/attitudes on poverty
- Mechanisms/processes to engage poor communities in civic/political dialogue
- Mechanisms/processes to engage poor communities in substantive dialogues and activities
- Institutions/non-profits representing the interests of poor communities
- Influence of poor communities in local political/development processes
- Local actions to address issue of poverty
- Community/regional actions to address inner-city poverty
- Partnerships among key institutions -- government, business, labor, communities, advocates, universities -- to address issues of poverty
- History of business involvement in issues of poverty and employment
- Existence of business associations/networks, particularly sectorial

II. OPPORTUNITIES AND WILLINGNESS TO CONSIDER POLICY CHANGES

- Perceptions on local labor force policies and programs
- Lessons from notable successes and failures
- Lessons from long-term initiatives (Sandtown; Commonwealth, Family Support Centers)
- Lessons from systems reforms around other issues
- Issues influencing project-based development vs. policy-based development
- New promising initiatives
- Use of labor market information and market-based strategies
- Environment for innovation
- Environment for government reform/change
- Local processes for learning: networking and sharing of ideas and experiences
- Local processes for monitoring and accountability
- Role of media
- Actions and responsiveness of business organizations to local policy issues
- Impact of past policy/research reports

III. CAPACITY TO LEAD, UNDERTAKE AND SUSTAIN A JOBS INITIATIVE EFFORT

- Capacity of current organizations to manage a Jobs Initiative effort
- Existence and capacity of community groups serving possible impact areas
- Availability of local match resources to support effort
- Patience among supporters to sustain effort for eight year period
- Potential overload on current initiatives and commitment (dollars and intellectual support)
- Capacity to sustain partnerships and expand

**Field Guide for Site Suitability Assessment
Baltimore, MD: 1997**

Study Question: Is there the ability to mobilize diverse groups of people and organizations across the metropolitan region to address the employment needs of inner-city residents?

1. What are the general perceptions about creating economic opportunity for residents of poor communities? Do these perceptions vary across institutions, sectors, the region?

2. What is the general attitude of Baltimore institutions toward collaboration and partnerships? Is there a willingness to partner with new entities or across sectoral lines? Is there an environment of trust? Is there a willingness to work across racial and class lines?

3. What partnerships or collaboratives stand out in your mind?

4. Are there notable examples of collaboration or partnerships across regional lines? (This would not be limited to efforts benefitting poor people, but might include governmental/legislative efforts, educational compacts, business/industrial development, or other regional alliances.)

5. What are the primary barriers to forming partnerships and collaborations designed to improve conditions for disadvantaged job seekers?

6. To which entities or individuals do institutions in Baltimore respond? Who are the change agents? What is the degree of influence of business leaders, public officials, community pressure, etc.?

7. Are there community-based advocacy organizations working in the area of workforce development and economic opportunity? How are they regarded by community residents, government, the business sector?

8. Which community-based organizations are best able to mobilize residents and connect them to employment and training opportunities?

9. To what extent are colleges (including community colleges) and universities in the region involved in economic development, job creation, workforce development, and other efforts designed to improve social and economic opportunities for residents of distressed communities?

10. Are there local or regional examples of businesses and employers forming strategic partnership or networks? Are there viable systems of support for business and industrial development?

11. Are there sectoral or geographic clusters of business activity that are having particular difficulty meeting their labor force needs?

Study Question: Is there a willingness to change and improve the ways in which the labor market and public policies function for disadvantaged job seekers?

12. Why are Baltimore's poor people disconnected from neighborhood, local and/or regional labor markets?

13. How would you characterize Baltimore's attempts to integrate economic development, workforce development, and human services? How would you characterize the region's experience?

14. How would you describe Baltimore's approach to problem solving? Would you characterize it as being innovative and entrepreneurial? Is there a willingness to "think outside of the box?"

15. Is the problem solving approach different for problems affecting poor communities? Could Baltimore's general attitude toward problem solving accommodate an effort of the magnitude of the Jobs Initiative?

16. What has been the region's experience with public and/or private systems reform, either specific to workforce development or in other areas? Are there existing systems reform efforts currently underway?

17. To whom is local government perceived to be accountable?

18. Are there recent examples of governmental actions that have improved the access to and retention in the labor market of residents of disenfranchised communities?

19. What lessons have been learned from Baltimore's experiences with long-term initiatives, such as Neighborhood Transformation in Sandtown-Winchester, Commonwealth, and the Family Support Centers?

20. What have been the impacts from past policy and research reports, such as "Baltimore 2000," the Pierce Report, and Baltimore Unbound?

21. What is the overall level of public debate and discourse about issues affecting disenfranchised people and communities?

22. How would you characterize the degree of participation and influence of inner city constituents in the broad public discourse? On the issues of jobs for poor people?

23. Are mainstream media perceived to provide coverage and inform the public about issues affecting poor communities in general and about the severe disconnect of these communities to labor markets in particular? Do they address issues of economic disparity within the metropolitan regional?

24. To what extent do Baltimore employers and business leaders become

engaged in efforts designed to improve the quality of the labor force in general, and the access of disadvantaged job seekers to the labor market in particular?

Study Question: Is there the capacity to spearhead a multi-year effort that can eventually reform how public and private jobs-related services and systems operate?

25. Which organizations have the respect, track record, and ability to reach across barriers to convene the diverse group of organizations and interests required to formulate a Jobs Initiative plan?

26. Which organizations have the ability to serve as a Development Intermediary for a Jobs Initiative? Do they have the wherewithal to forge partnerships with and across diverse institutions, garner and manage financial resources, coordinate an open planning process, and implementation of a long-term initiative?

27. Are there particular organizations that are noted for having positive working relationships with community/neighborhood institutions and government, and employers?

28. Which community-based organizations have the experience and credibility to commit to a long-term effort to connect residents of low-income communities to the regional labor market?

29. Is there significant capacity to leverage local matching support and patience to sustain a long term jobs initiative? How would such an initiative be balanced against existing commitments?

30. What are the primary barriers to implementing a Jobs Initiative in the Baltimore metropolitan areas? Can these barriers be surmounted?

APPENDIX B

Completed Interviews (in chronological order)

Ursula Powidzki Baltimore Advisors, Inc. Baltimore, MD	Baltimore, MD
Audrey Theis Consultant on School-to-Work Baltimore, MD	Marion Pines Johns Hopkins/Institute for Policy Studies Baltimore, MD
Carl Stern, President Provident Bank Baltimore, MD	Ghassan Shah, Vice President CEBO Baltimore, MD
David Gruber Consultant on Youth Development New York, NY	Dr. Charles Simmons, President and Jamal Mubdi-Bey Sojourner-Douglas College Baltimore, MD
David Stevens University of Baltimore Baltimore, MD	Mike Seipp, President Historic East Baltimore Community Action Coalition, Inc.(HEBCAC) Baltimore, MD
Tim Armbruster Goldseker Foundation Baltimore, MD	Freeman Hrabowski, President UMBC Catonsville, MD
Robert Embry and Jane Harrison Abell Foundation Baltimore, MD	James Bond, President Living Classrooms Foundation Baltimore, MD
Mary Burkholder Maryland Dept. Business and Economic Development Baltimore, MD	Jonathan Lange BUILD Baltimore, MD
Jan Rivitz Straus Foundation Baltimore, MD	Amanda Crook-Zin, President Women Entrepreneurs of Baltimore Baltimore, MD
John Oliver, Publisher Afro-American Newspaper David Bernie and Nathaniel Peacock	Joe Stevens, Director Center for Employment and Training (CET) Baltimore, MD Baltimore Reads

Baltimore, MD

Barbara Samuels
ACLU
Baltimore, MD

Dana Stein
Civic Works
Baltimore, MD

Margaret Williams
Friends of the Family
Baltimore, MD

Roger Lyons, President
The Urban League
Baltimore, MD

Mary Lynn Devlin and Thomas Little
Baltimore Community College
Baltimore, MD

Sarah Engram
Baltimore Sun
Baltimore, MD

Neil Spritz
BWI Business Partnership
Lithicum, MD

Joe Nathanson
Baltimore Metropolitan Council
Baltimore, MD

William Strickland
Bidwell Job Training Center
Pittsburgh, PA

Jim Callahan, Executive Director
Governor's Workforce Investment Board
Baltimore, MD

Joanne Nathans
Job Opportunities Task Force
Baltimore, MD

David Casy
Jubilee Jobs
Baltimore, MD

Bart Harvey
The Enterprise Foundation
Columbia, MD

Jim Smith, V.P.
Legg-Mason
Baltimore, MD

Linda Harris and Karen Sitnik
Mayor's Office of Employment
Development
Baltimore, MD

Diane Bell
Empower Baltimore Management
Corporation
Baltimore, MD

Don Hutchinson
Greater Baltimore Committee
Baltimore, MD

Emily Thayer
Genesis Jobs
Baltimore, MD

Dr. Craig Smith
Guilford Pharmaceuticals
Baltimore, MD

APPENDIX C

Adult Literacy

Literacy and basic employability skills are a key issues within Baltimore. A number of organizations are engaged in delivering these services. In general, resources to support these efforts come from several sources: 1) federal Adult Basic Education (ABE) funds which are administered by the Maryland Department of Education and is the largest source of funds for this activity in the state (Baltimore City receives \$879,555 annually); 2) a state Literacy Works grant program; and 3) private donations and grants which are typically used by community-based groups. Key local groups engaged in this activity include:

- Baltimore Reads, a non-profit, initiated by city government, is one of two citywide organizations delivering adult literacy services. Baltimore Reads operates two centers where it delivers literacy services and provides technical assistance and other support services to the 31 community organizations who also deliver literacy services throughout the city. Baltimore Reads is primarily supported with federal ABE and welfare dollars. It also receives state funds (the LiteracyWorks program), as well private donations.
- Baltimore City Community College provides literacy services throughout the city. In addition to its campus efforts, BCCC operates in 40 sites across the city such as its program at CivicWorks which provides basic literacy services to new CivicWorks participants. Federal ABE dollars are a major source of funding.
- Approximately 30 community organizations (e.g., COIL, Friends of the Family, New Directions, SECO) operate literacy programs. Approximately one-quarter of these efforts are funded with federal ABE resources. Others are supported with other public funds as well as private donations.
- Each of the six Empowerment Zone Village Centers will be receiving funds for employment and training. Each may use those funds for literacy services and basic skills preparation. BCCC is positioned to help the VCs deliver these services.

It should be noted that federal ABE dollars are competitively awarded from the state Department of Education. Welfare resources used for literacy purposes were previously channeled from the Mayor's Office of Employment Development (OED) to local groups. Now such resources are also being distributed from the City's Department of Social Services (who appears to have asserted full control over all welfare resources) and it is unclear whether OED will play a role in the future.

Baltimore County receives almost \$400,000 annually from the state for adult literacy activities. The entire amount is directed to the Baltimore County Public School System

which operates adult literacy programs. All of the county's community colleges offer adult education classes which are supported with general community college resources. (Baltimore City's ABE funds used to go to the public school system, however, that changed several years ago to the current process of supporting the community college and numerous non-profits.)

Job Training

A number of private and public organizations provide job training services for adults in Baltimore. In most instances, these efforts are sponsored by a larger institution that is responsible for specific training resources. Generally, two types of employment training services are offered: 1) general employment preparation, and 2) occupations skills training. Key players include:

- The Mayor's Office of Employment Development is responsible for administering federal JTPA funds (adult resources include those for economically disadvantaged as well as dislocated workers) in the City (approximately \$10-\$12 million annually). (It should be noted that each surrounding county jurisdiction has its own JTPA entity and program. Baltimore County gets approximately \$3 million annually in adult job training funds.) OED does not deliver adult training services, but contracts with a variety of providers (non-profit and for-profit) for employment preparation services and occupational skills training. In the past, OED also used welfare JOBS funds to support training programs. It now appears that DSS will assume this role, if, such training is continued. OED also administers a number of small training funds that cover veterans, workers impacted by NAFTA, etc.
- Baltimore City Community College, as well as the community colleges in Baltimore County (Essex, Dundalk and Catonsville) offer job training services. In some instances, these programs are supported with JTPA funds. The community colleges also have received welfare dollars (JOBS), as well as contractual dollars from local businesses to develop customized training programs. Community colleges also use their general funds to support technical training programs (BCCC now only offers electronics, Catonsville offers a machine shop assistant certificate).
- The Baltimore City Housing Authority now has several million dollars of HUD resources for job training, primarily associated with public housing demolition and reconstruction.
- The Maryland Rehabilitation Center (located in Baltimore) provides job training services for adults with physical and mental disabilities. The Center offers 16 occupation training programs. Approximately \$3.5 million dollars of federal rehab funds are available annually in the Baltimore region for training activities. The Center also provides fee-based services, including services paid with private insurance and workers compensation. In addition to the state Rehabilitation

Center, the Baltimore area has a number of community rehabilitation centers

Job Placement

It now appears that all groups engaged in some form of education, training and employment matters have focused their attention on job placement. Job placement is essentially defined as a set of activities designed to identify employment opportunities and to help connect job seekers to those positions. Federal JTPA, Welfare and ABE funds can be used to support this activity. In fact, most groups operating a literacy program and/or job training program, now have their own staff who are responsible for job development and placement. In addition to these efforts, are two other focal points of job placement activities:

- The Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation operates the Job Service across the state through a number of local career service centers. Supported with federal dollars, these centers are typically known as the place where one files for unemployment insurance and gets referrals to employers for open positions. Career centers (as they are now referred to in Maryland) have substantial federal dollars which are used to support staff that undertake job development and placement activities. In recent years, the federal government has encouraged states to bring all U.S. Department of Labor employment activities together into a one-stop job service system. Maryland is one of the early implementors of this effort and its efforts involve a partnership between local job service centers, JTPA administrators and community college (at a minimum). (Other states have also required that the partnership include welfare, vocational rehabilitation, school-to-work, etc.) In Baltimore, the effort as represented by the Eastside One-Stop Career Center involves, the local Jobs Service Office, the Mayor's Office of Employment Development (OED) and Baltimore City Community College. Despite the development of one-stop Career Centers in Baltimore, community groups funded with OED job training resources still have their own job development and placement staff.

Baltimore City also has a number of non-profit organizations who do not offer literacy and job training services, but concentrate their workforce development efforts strictly on job development and placement activities. In some instances (e.g, Genesis Jobs), these efforts are conducted without the use of public funds. In other instances, community groups tap a number of funding sources to support their effort. A good example is HEBCAC, which operates a number of job development and placement activities. These efforts are supported by general organizational funds, special grants (Bridges-to-Work), E.Z. dollars and others.

Economic Development

Economic development encompasses a number of strategies and activities which in very general terms could be categorized according to those focused on strengthening the

competitive base of the economy and those directed to meeting the specific needs of distressed people and communities. In general, but not exclusively, groups in Baltimore such as the Baltimore Development Corporation, High Technology Council and Maryland Department of Business and Economic Development, are more focused on competitiveness than equity strategies. Efforts more targeted to distressed people or places include those of groups such as:

- Council for Economic and Business Opportunity
- Baltimore Business Empowerment Center
- Community-based groups such as Southeast Development Initiative and HEBCAC
- Baltimore Advisors, Inc.
- Women Entrepreneurs of Baltimore

Each of these groups are supported from multiple and varied funding sources.