# Community Development Division (CDD)

## Conversation Themes

## November 10, 2014

# Purpose of the Funding Process Study

The City of Madison Community Development Division (CDD) allocates $12 million annually through purchase of service contracts to be used by recipients to address City goals and support efforts to strengthen neighborhoods, address poverty and racial and social inequities, and improve the quality of life for city residents.

Two key research studies in 2013 – the first being the [Race to Equity Report](#) and the second a study of [Madison's Social Sector](#) by Joiner Sandbrook LLC, highlighted the changing landscape of poverty and well-being in Madison and Dane County.

In the interest of evaluating and improving outcomes produced by City funding efforts, and in response to the Joiner Sandbrook study, the Mayor and Common Council appropriated funds to analyze existing policies and practices and make recommendations to improve them. This effort is intended to formulate and implement quality improvement strategies and offer technical assistance and facilitation to City staff, related policy committees and relevant stakeholders to achieve the following:

1. Develop a clear and focused set of policy goals and objectives for City investments in the social sector that is consistent with priorities expressed by elected City officials and with other relevant City policies and initiatives.
2. Create a funding allocation process that: directs funds to organizations and programs best able to help achieve stated objectives, and holds funded agencies accountable to agreed upon quality and performance standards.
3. Work with CDD leadership and staff to align Division functions with the newly defined goals and objectives and related principles of quality Improvement. This may involve systematic analysis and work process improvements around shared vision and planning for the work of the division, staff and city policy committees.
4. Develop strategies to improve communication and coordination between the City and other major funders of social sector organizations within Dane County.
5. Explore and make recommendations regarding potential roles the City might play with the nonprofit community in nurturing organizational development and alignment with quality improvement principles.

The CDD is engaged in work to redesign and improve the way in which it plans for and carries out these activities and has selected, through an open RFP process, Forward Community Investments (FCI) to provide technical assistance.

*Community development is both a **product** and a **process** that includes problem solving, community building, and systems interaction.*

*Community development efforts build "the capacity of people to work collectively in addressing their common interests."[1]*

# Introduction to the Community Conversations

The primary purpose of the first phase of the Funding Process Study is to engage as many voices and perspectives as possible to build understanding around the current situation.  These community conversations and the findings therein, will be used to enrich the following discussions of what can be done differently or better in the future.

These conversations included 31 separate conversations (focus groups, small group meetings, one-on-one discussions) with stakeholders representing CDD staff, CDD committees, partner City agencies, the Mayor, Common Council, related Dane County agencies, funders, grantees and applicants, faith-based organizations, the University of Wisconsin, Madison Metropolitan School District, and the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission.

The following report presents the framing questions of these conversations and a summary of the themes that emerged in responses.  Where possible, quotes (without attribution) from participants are used to highlight common themes or areas where opinions diverged.  Additional commentary for context is included, as necessary.  These themes will be used to guide the discussion of goals and priorities for CDD throughout this project and in the design and implementation of future funding processes.

Throughout this report, "CDD" is used to describe the division as a whole, not just the funding process.  When references are being made to certain aspects of CDD, additional language indicates the scope (e.g., comments regarding staff, committees, or the funding process specifically are noted as such).

Four key themes were voiced throughout every conversation:
1. ***Change is necessary** to make enduring impact,*
2. *The scope of challenges **requires a coordinated effort** beyond just the Division,*
3. ***CDD can take the first step** by defining their desired goals and agenda,*
4. *There is a broad level of **excitement to be involved and support** this effort.*

---

[1] Maser, C. 1997. Sustainable Community Development: Principles and Concepts. St. Lucie Press, Delray Beach, Florida

# 1. What is your greatest hope for the Madison community?

*"The Two Madisons become One"*

Many conversations began with references to reducing existing disparities – geographic, racial, social and economic – that divide Madison today. Greater equity was often described as being directly related to the amount and type of opportunities available, best summarized in the quote below:

> *"Opportunity and connectedness go hand in hand. I want to see different communities empowered to tell us what they need in their community. A community in which people have a sense of belonging, which includes opportunity."*

Participants mentioned that real equity would involve more than simply providing resources or opportunity, but ensuring awareness, access, and sufficient ability to reach [funding] opportunities.

> *"Community alignment towards goals."*

A common hope in many conversations, including those within City agencies, was to reduce the silos effect of resources applied independently. This underlying assumption was sometimes made explicit: that greater coordination amongst City resources could lead to more holistic, community-oriented solutions. The aspiration towards coordination spread beyond just City resources:

> *"Leaders [across sectors / organizations] moving outside their agenda to solve issues together."*

**The core takeaways for future planning of CDD goals and process include:**
* *Focus on addressing disparities*
* *Engage the disenfranchised*
* *Increase collaboration across city resources and efforts*

# 2. What is the challenge that the Community Development Division, as a whole, exists to address? In other words, what is the purpose of CDD?

*"Broad-based approach of building community capacity to act on its own to identify and meet its needs."*

*"To help communities organize and identify their own needs, [with long term outcome of] building the leadership and organizational capacity to meet those needs."*

The most common response to the purpose for CDD was to develop capacity of the community to solve its challenges. The target "client" of CDD was frequently framed as inclusive of residents and individuals, neighborhoods and the community at large. Some participants felt strongly that the focus was specific to low income individuals and neighborhoods, while others said the focus is broader community as a whole.

Nearly all participants elaborated on CDD's role by describing it as a gap filler across communities and resources. Participants described CDD's approach as responsive, seeking to support individuals, organizations and needs that otherwise would not be funded by other sources.

> *"CDD tries to address all the gaps in the community – their [primary] resource is money – their limitation then is how much resource exists to give."*

> *"To fill the gaps in County human services. Most cities do not have a CDD, just rely on the county. Madison is organized differently [referring to the combination of block grant, community services, child care and senior services CDD provides]."*

Most participants were unsure whether CDD, as a division, had an explicit set of goals or priorities. Many remarked that this is an appropriate choice if CDD seeks to fill unmet gaps, as such needs will change and vary over time.

> *"Breaking the poverty cycle and filling gaps caused by structural problems are two very different treatment approaches. Which does CDD wish to do?"*

**The core takeaways for future planning of CDD goals and process include:**
- ❖ *Build capacity in communities to address challenges*
- ❖ *Define the primary focus of CDD efforts: Is it the entire community? A specific population?*
- ❖ *Define the approach of CDD efforts: Does CDD fill unmet gaps? Does CDD have a targeted agenda?*

# 3. What has been your experience with CDD (e.g.s, during the funding process, with contract managers, in task forces and other city efforts)?

The overarching theme expressed in nearly all conversations was that relationships with CDD individuals were consistently very positive and experience with the funding process was consistently negative.

## EXPERIENCE WITH CDD STAFF

*"Close the loop on CDD transformation – we were three distinct parts, how do we want to be now? We each have strengths to bring, next steps will be more successful if made with those in mind."*

Both internal and external participants noted distinct differences in the cultures and skill sets of CDD staff. Many staff members lamented the lack of closure or resolution around past conflicts, noting occasional "us and them" sentiment still exists. Observations commonly described Community Services staff as being skilled in community engagement, relationships and networking. Community Development staff were described as business oriented, grant managers with strong assessment skills and knowledge. Judgments and preferences were expressed by some participants, favoring both cultures. Many, particularly those internal to the city and CDD, saw a future opportunity to better organize the talents of each office to reach the collective goals of the Division.

## EXPERIENCE WITH CDD FUNDING PROCESS

*"Priorities shift from year-to-year – does not give nonprofits the opportunity to offer long-term outcomes."*

*"Relationship driven, not organization or outcome. Priority changes from prevention, to crisis, we are doing the same thing with a new sticker…"*

*"Can politics be separated from the product?"*

*"So much input, so little true participation."*

Frustration was consistently expressed in nearly every conversation, especially from those closest to the activity (staff, committee members and grantee/applicants). The most commonly identified shortfall was related to the time dedicated to each process in terms of participation, particularly in comparison to the impact. Multiplying the time

commitment across the number of processes underlines a common demand to find a better means of reaching decisions.

**The core takeaways for future planning of CDD goals and process include:**
* ❖ *Complete the integration of the various functions and cultures within CDD*
* ❖ *Address the amount of time spent in the funding process*

# 4. What role do you see CDD playing, today, in community development?

Participants commonly described CDD as rewarding the ongoing efforts of many agencies with (small) pockets of funding to sustain efforts. There was a general acknowledgement of certain barriers that prevent CDD from making a greater impact, in particular a diminishing pool of resources and a scope that includes many types of services. Most conversations about CDD's current role quickly shifted focus onto potential changes or improvements to overcome barriers (responses to question 6). A commonly identified barrier was the political nature of community development. Participants recognized that although CDD is responsible for managing funding, the authority for allocation decisions rests in a public process.

*"[CDD has] responsibility without agency."*

*"CDD answers to the whims of the political winds."*

*"Difficult to assert leadership in a landscape where the final decision may not rest with CDD."*

*"CDD priority is not alignment; it is democracy and participation."*

The nature of the process was seen by many to be highly complicated by politics and reputation, as a result of multiple points of review from several stakeholder bodies. The final comment in particular, regarding priorities, touched on the concern that as a politically responsive agency, CDD is designed to value participation rather than impact. Although rarely stated directly, this concern was implied or hinted at in multiple stakeholder conversations with grantees and applicants.

**The core takeaways for future planning of CDD goals and process include:**
* ❖ *Define the scope of responsibilities for CDD within the larger political landscape*
* ❖ *Clarify the priorities and values of CDD, particularly related to participation and democracy as well as impact*

# 5. Describe the partnership between CDD and key partners in community development.

The discussion of core relationships between CDD staff, committees, partner agencies, funders, was held where contextually appropriate (in conversations where participants have sufficient knowledge and experience to respond).

## CDD STAFF AND COMMITTEES[2]

The CDD staff work in partnership with five committees to deliver and oversee policies, services and funding decisions.[3] The breadth of goals and expertise fitting within CDD's umbrella was often cited as a defining feature for the roles of the staff and committees. Staff roles were often described as generating information, providing recommendations and insights. Committee roles were to bring a broader, more general perspective of community needs and opportunities. Typically, committee members would follow staff recommendations related to funding decisions.

The demands for vast amounts and types of information and data mean that there is an imbalance between staff and committee knowledge that some felt compromised the effectiveness of committee funding decisions.  This suggestion was frequently connected to a lack of clarity and transparency for how decisions and recommendations are determined.

## PARTNER AGENCIES

*"Partnerships exist where relationships do. Not many relationships across agencies."*

*"Think it's changing; NRTs [Neighborhood Resource Teams], Equity Initiatives have pushed agencies together. Have found it refreshing & beneficial – more interaction with CDD than before, more information being exchanged."*

The community development efforts of the City of Madison span multiple departments, including Economic Development, Planning, Public Health, Community Development Authority, Civil Rights, Neighborhood Resource Teams and Finance.   The conversation regarding partner city agencies focused on potential.  Historically, silos existed, but many expressed optimism that change was beginning to form.  In particular, the

---

[2] The five CDD Committees are Community Development Division Conference Committee, Community Development Block Grant Committee, Community Services Committee, Committee on Aging, and Early Childhood Care and Education Committee.

[3] Formal mission statements for each Committee are available at
http://www.cityofmadison.com/CityHall/legislativeInformation/committees.cfm

anticipated update to the Planning Division's 2010-11 Comprehensive Plan in 2016 could provide a blueprint for fitting initiatives together.  A recommendation for supporting the move beyond empty expectations of partnership was to develop formal or explicit charges that guide how partners interact.

## PARTNER FUNDERS

*"Diversity in funding reflects the diverse nature of Madison."*

*"Common priorities would represent a duplication of effort in theory, and be difficult (costly) to execute in practice."*

*"Little willingness [exists] to adopt an agenda that isn't 'mine', even if the collective vision would be more impactful."*

Madison, as a city and region, has many entities that provide resources targeted towards community development.  These partners include (but are not limited to) public agencies of Dane County and local foundations such as United Way of Dane County, Madison Community Foundation, Community Shares of Wisconsin, CUNA Mutual Foundation and the Workforce Development Board of South Central Wisconsin.

The demands for greater collaboration and partnership have become increasingly common in the social sector, at both the grantee level and the funder level.  Promising models for partnerships have been designed to fit varying degrees of centralization, depending on the interest and willingness of the partners.  The collective impact movement suggests three layers of potential collective action.  "Individual action" describes similar organizations that act in isolation.  "Coordinated action" describes alignment under similar outcomes for broad community impact.  "Collaborative action" describes collecting common data for the same outcomes in a coordinated network.[4]

Many participants observed that the degree of collaboration amongst funders has decreased substantially in comparison to past efforts to align grantmaking efforts.  The interest in greater funder collaboration was most frequently voiced in grantee and applicant conversations, but was a common theme in nearly all conversations.  In the funder conversations, several obstacles were cited that complicate collaborative efforts, including maintaining agency identity and individual priorities, balancing additional operational costs against potential benefits.  Despite these barriers, most participants supported at least an incremental shift to improve and coordinate the unique agendas of each funder.

---

[4] Definitions taken from Strive Together presentation, *Collaborative Action: Identifying and Forming Networks around Priority Outcomes*, 2012.

**The core takeaways for future planning of CDD goals and process include:**

❖ *Establish a set of expectations for staff and committee activity that is reasonable, given broad range of projects and programs*
❖ *Ensure the funding process is transparent in recommendations and decisions*
❖ *Explore formal or explicit changes to increase connections between the activities of City agencies and CDD*
❖ *Explore opportunities and types of collaboration (activities, resources, geographies, issues) with a purpose of increasing benefits to the community*

# 6. Imagine we are three years from now and CDD has been wildly successful. What would they be doing? What would it look like in the community?

There was significant engagement and excitement amongst participants around what is possible for CDD. The conversation was often divided between recommendations for the potential role of CDD and expected results after such changes. To illustrate these changes, participants often cited comparison organizations to consider as models.

## ROLES

Funding was seen as a finite resource and limiting constraint to CDD. Participants suggested CDD consider redefining its role in more relational terms – as an advisor, a connector, a community member, and an advocate. Many participants in the grantee and applicant conversations stressed the need for more technical assistance related to access and use of resources (CDD's, other city resources, and third party resources). This example was cited as part of a larger interest in CDD becoming a more active connector: to resources, to networks and towards developing holistic approaches. Some noted that this role of connecting could be shared with the Planning and Public Health agencies.

Acting as a participating community member may conflict with CDD's identity as a political and bureaucratic agency, but was suggested by many as a way to build greater awareness and relationships.

> *"[As a community member, CDD should be] actively involved in conversations with organizations currently funded as well as those that fit high priority community needs. CDD could generate greater [credibility] about how the funding would work and where it should be moving if it felt present in the community."*

Some suggested a more active role than community member, arguing that CDD should be an advocate for issues as the "eyes and ears" of decision makers.

*"[CDD can be] the boots on the ground: take that information and feedback and move it upwards to directors, planning, elected officials."*

## RESULTS

The resulting, aspirational outcomes of a successful CDD in the community included:

*"CDD sets forth a connecting dialogue for what to do. We all don't have to agree with it, but makes for a provocative statement for what we can do."*

*"The clarity to say, 'no, that is out of our scope.'"*

*"CDD brings in others that touch poverty, so it isn't a set of isolated efforts."*

*"This work is about social cohesion. How do we [support] Madison's communities [to] connect? [CDD can help] connect job training, education, health care, transportation, and child care."*

*"Being a leader in change, as opposed to reacting to politics or reacting to nonprofits in the community, would be a major shift."*

*"No longer following the need, chasing it from neighborhood to neighborhood, but actually creating conditions that prevent it from returning."*

## COMPARISON ORGANIZATIONS

Two organizations were frequently mentioned as organizations that have made substantial progress in a similar situation, Madison Metropolitan School District ("MMSD") for their approach to developing clear goals and Public Health Madison and Dane County for establishing a local presence in the community as an organizing resource.

MMSD was frequently cited as being several years ahead in taking a similar approach to (re)defining its role with greater clarity. Participants applauded the process taken to engage voices and develop a clear purpose for aligning investments.

*"Start with big goals, then move into expectations of how that can happen, lastly involving infrastructure and support for organizations to make that transition."*

Public Health was referenced as an organization reorganized in terms of scope and priorities. Many participants praised the efforts of Public Health to drive change and connection in the community in a role similar to community organizing around developing outcomes. Several others mentioned the expanded scope of Public Health,

serving as a City and County agency, could be a model for CDD to replicate through closer partnerships with the County and other funders to benefit the community by operating at a larger scale.

> *"Not always particularly smooth, but taking a lead in areas and active in making collaboratives happen."*

**The core takeaways for future planning of CDD goals and process include:**
- ❖ *Increase role as connector to resources and provider of technical assistance*
- ❖ *Increase presence, visibility and relationships in community conversations around high priority issues, needs and opportunities*
- ❖ *Be a leader for change and create conditions for success*

# 7. What role do you see CDD playing (in the future) with …

As context in evaluating the suggestions below, many participants felt CDD should be doing all of these things more.  Some participants would temper their enthusiasm, noting the challenge CDD faces with a constraint in resources. Prioritizing one area may result in tradeoffs in others.  Suggestions to pursue greater focus in one (or all) of the below activities was explored deeper with follow up around relative priorities and emphasis, when possible.

## EVALUATING PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS AND OUTCOMES

> *"We lack context when making decisions."*

> *"We need a sense of making outcomes, what is the impact of the work being done?"*

> *"Encourage best practices, as opposed to evaluating vanity metrics of numbers served. CDD could be the source for that information, gathered from experience, from grantees, from experts…"*

> *"Small money equals small results, why evaluate at that level?"*

> *"If we require a lot of outcome evaluation and reporting, which takes away from time spent elsewhere – how is it being used? What is learned from it? The reporting hasn't brought our organization new insights, so what is it doing for them?"*

The conversation around evaluation frequently began with "yes, but what are we evaluating?"  Evaluations can focus on the programs, the organizations, the issue areas

or the communities at large.  Each form of evaluation changes the context and nature of the information being collected.

There was no clear majority of opinion on what to do, but a general consensus that more can and should be done.  Participants consistently acknowledged that barriers of resources (money, time and focus) exist for both the CDD and providers and must be mitigated for any evaluation efforts to be successful.

Several suggestions and opportunities were frequently mentioned, including (1) partnering with other city agencies (Public Health and Planning, most frequently), (2) revising funding structures to incentivize performance or incorporate contingencies on meeting goals, and (3) shifting the focus of evaluation away from outputs (numbers served) and outcomes (resulting changes) and onto learning and development (to identify and spread emerging practices that present promise for greater impact).

**The core takeaways for future planning of CDD goals and process include:**
- ❖ *Encourage collaboration through incentives and collective goal setting*
- ❖ *View agencies and programs in context of the larger community*
- ❖ *Engage community and grantees in goal setting and definition of impact*

## ENCOURAGING NONPROFIT CAPACITY BUILDING

*"Could we pay a salary that supports strong leaders?"*

*"Is this for CDD, or is this for someone else like United Way?"*

*"Could we 'learn together' on issues and best practices?"*

*"Connecting to other resources in the community would an easy way to build capacity building – there is a lack of awareness and knowledge around what opportunities exist."*

*"[The city and CDD] should invest more in educating, training and supporting leaders – that would really be more impactful."*

FCI defines capacity building as intentional, coordinated, and mission-driven efforts aimed at strengthening the management and governance of nonprofits to improve their performance and impact. There was a common agreement to frame capacity building as a strategic result of any funding activity.  However, disagreement existed between grantees about whether they would prefer program funds versus capacity building funds.

Many pointed towards using the skills and talents of CDD staff to provide technical assistance.  Concerns were noted from CDD staff and other participants that the time capacity currently does not exist to expand TA.  Any changes to responsibilities that shift time investment must incorporate a corresponding decrease elsewhere to be successful.

> *"Currently we don't have the capacity to fill that role well, but we should partner with agencies that already do it well."*

> *"Do not want to set an expectation without the support to actually deliver on it."*

**The core takeaways for future planning of CDD goals and process include:**
- ❖ *Determine the role of CDD, if any, in funding and supporting nonprofit capacity building (e.g., invest within program grants, develop separate funding stream)*
- ❖ *Engage grantees in best practice development and knowledge sharing*
- ❖ *Review contracting procedures to incorporate capacity building goals*

## SUPPORTING COLLABORATION

> *"Convener, supporter, but not our job to go out and tell people who to collaborate with."*

> *"If we do it, should lead by example."*

> *"This could be program collaboration, or, it could be to fund an issue or sector more broadly. Could we leverage impact by growing the whole versus the parts?"*

> *"We tell agencies to collaborate, but we don't support it well with clear direction about how that should take place. Collaboration can be at a variety of intensities, and we need to define it."*

> *"City and United Way have been doing a lot of forced collaboration – I was resistant – but I have to say, it is working – we are building actual relationships that can learn [to increase impact]"*

> *"You can't fund trust."  "But, you can fund the things that lead to greater connection, which may lead to trust, or lead away from it."*

FCI considers partnership as (any) collaborative relationship between entities to work toward shared objectives through a mutually agreed division of labor.  Collaborations occur across a wide spectrum of programmatic and administrative functions and degrees of integration, ranging from joint-programming, shared administration support and service networks to parent corporations and mergers.

Opinions differed more on whether and how CDD could support collaboration than on any other topic, including within grantee and applicant conversations. Perspectives varied on the appropriate degree of collaboration that could or should be encouraged as well as which methods CDD could employ to encourage it (e.g., funding contingencies or prioritization). Another suggestion was to shift how funding is organized to focus on issues, rather than organizations, which would result in more creative collaboratives. A common caution was noted that should CDD prioritize collaboration, it would do well to start by working more closely with partner agencies and other funders.

**The core takeaways for future planning of CDD goals and process include:**
- ❖ *Explore different types of collaboration and role of CDD*
- ❖ *Consider establishing fiscal agency, subcontracting or collaborative support models, mentorship program*
- ❖ *Explore connection with other funding agencies to support collaborative efforts*

## ENCOURAGING INNOVATION

*"Creating something new versus tweaking something existent – hard impulse to control."*

*"Funding new ideas means funding learning, not outcomes. Are we willing for ideas to fail?"*

*"Do we know how to be innovative? Do we know how to support those being innovative? It has to be a different model than the same way we do things."*

Innovation can take multiple forms – whether incremental or disruptive, and from existing or new organizations. While many participants supported the idea of innovation, in concept, there were several concerns voiced that a major benefit of city funding has been its stability and support for long term impact. Several grantees expressed a desire to support new ideas, but voiced concern that they cannot move from what was done in the past, as described in their applications, without jeopardizing future funding.

**The core takeaways for future planning of CDD goals and process include:**
- ❖ *Evaluate fit and balance priorities of innovation and stability*
- ❖ *Formalize risk tolerance and willingness for experimentation*
- ❖ *Clarify anticipated roles of CDD, grantees, and others in exploring and identifying emerging best practices*

# EMERGING OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM (EOP)

*"The concept is promising, I am not sure if we have designed the best system, at least not yet."*

*"The emerging opportunities program isn't working. Designed to help create more nonprofits, which isn't what's needed, just underfunds them, and just for one year, not connect them with other organizations, designed for failure."*

*"Emerging opportunities could be new needs, but it should also be for new ways of providing services."*

The EOP fund was considered by most participants as a means to be more responsive and creative. The common feedback was that the concept and idea is strong, but the execution requires adjustments. Particularly, the regulations around the process to receive and deliver funds felt slow and overly burdensome. A second concern was often expressed as "what's next?" Participants desired a vision for how they can move from EOP funds to the next step.

**The core takeaways for future planning of CDD goals and process include:**
❖ *Define the priorities, goals and pathways to success for EOP grantmaking*
❖ *Explore ways to improve and simplify the implementation of the EOP concept*

# IMPROVING COMMUNITY EQUITY AND INCLUSIVITY

*"Make it consistently part of the conversation is an easy start. Making it part of decisions is harder."*

*"Setting standards, expectations for race, economy, and social status. Federal agencies do a good job, so do many LGBT funders. The city doesn't need to recreate the wheel here."*

*"Isn't it worth prioritizing and valuing solutions that come from people of color for people of color? That is real capacity building."*

Feedback was consistently positive that CDD can, and should, take action to improve equity. There was no easy consensus around how to do that, but many were optimistic with the progress towards implementing an Equity Tool. Several participants worried that focusing on certain measureable aspects equity, such as race, may reduce the focus on other harder to quantify social or economic disparities.

Nearly all said that more than just a tool or system need to be adopted, but a true dedication of resources. A staff member described this sentiment well, as follows:

*"This [prioritizing equity] requires real investment, which is more than adding the tool, but investing in training and integration into our work."*

Several promising models for incorporating equity that were mentioned included cities and counties (Seattle and King County, Kansas City, Twin Cities area), thought leaders (PolicyLink, Kerwin Institute) and potential tools (Childhood Opportunity Index).

**The core takeaways for future planning of CDD goals and process include:**
❖ *Establish means of incorporating equity and inclusivity into decision making process*

# Next Steps: Where do we go from here?

There were four key themes voiced throughout every conversation, presented again here for emphasis:

1. *Change is necessary to make enduring impact,*
2. *The scope of challenges requires a coordinated effort beyond just the Division,*
3. *CDD can take the first step by defining their desired goals and agenda,*
4. *There is a broad level of excitement to be involved and support this effort.*

CDD has formed a team and workplan to incorporate the feedback, insights and takeaways into a strategic framework with a theory of change and an operational design that supports reaching these goals. The resulting effort will chart CDD's direction and approach in context of the opportunities and assets, barriers and risks, partners and stakeholders that exist in our community.

Ultimately, success will be measured by community change, which requires far more involvement and activity than CDD alone. As such, this process is designed to be participatory, and opportunities for feedback into the design will be communicated through multiple channels, including through the CDD website. Please contact Project Managers Ben Williams, benw@forwardci.org, and Laura Noel, lnoel@cityofmadison.com, with questions and comments.

CDD CONVERSATION THEMES