Faith and Community Empowerment
Strategies for Crime Prevention and
Economic Development

Jesse C. Turner

School of Community Economic Development
Southern New Hampshire University
April 2010

Submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the
M.S. in Community Economic Development

Approved by:
Prof. Jolan Rivera, PhD
Acknowledgements

This has been a wonderful journey, and the task has been enormous; however, the reward of completion is a milestone the author will forever cherish.

Thanks to Elder DeWitt Hill Jr., Dr. Rosemarie H. Word, Dr. Theodore B. Elliott, Dr. Calvin Johnson and U. S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas Jane W. Duke for their encouragement and support.

Thanks to the Greater Trinity Church of God in Christ Church Family for the use of their church facility to host the first grant writing workshop specifically for clergy. Thanks to Jacqueline Gorton, program coordinator with the Arkansas Department of Health, for conducting the grant writing 101 workshop for clergy members. Thanks to Barraque Street Baptist Church Family for hosting the first clergy economic development and crime prevention workshop and the Logic Model. Thanks to fellow clergy, Revs. Jerry Williams, R. J. Lightsey, Glenn Barnes, Henry Hellums, Sr., Johnny L. Smith, Jr., Esau Watson, Jr., Lavara Henry, L. K. Solomon, Don Zell Jones, Makeiko Morgan, Robert J. Thompson, Patrick Lockett, Harliss Wright, Walter C. May, Sr., William Shaw, Jr. and Jimmy L. Fisher, Sr. for participating in FACES surveys and workshops.

The author is grateful to the Weed and Seed staff person, Juanita Anthony, for reading several drafts of this project and making important suggestions for its improvement. Finally, the author acknowledges the professor, Dr. Jolan Rivera, for the guidance provided during this journey. Certainly, Dr. Rivera was the anchor in trouble waters, the lighthouse when things were dark and most importantly, he always pushed for the best. The author owes Jolan a great deal of thanks.
# Table of Contents

Abstract ................................................................................................................. Page 4  
I. Community Context .......................................................................................... Page 5  
II. Problem Analysis ............................................................................................... Page 17  
III. Literature Review ............................................................................................ Page 18  
IV. Project Design/Logic Model ........................................................................... Page 27  
V. Methodology and Implementation Plan .............................................................. Page 30  
VI. Monitoring ........................................................................................................ Page 35  
VII. Evaluation ........................................................................................................ Page 40  
VIII. Sustainability ................................................................................................ Page 44  
IX. Results ............................................................................................................... Page 45  
X. Conclusions and Recommendations ................................................................. Page 47  
XI. Appendices  

Bibliography ......................................................................................................... Page 49  

Monitoring Reports ............................................................................................... Page 51
Abstract

The Faith and Community Empowerment Strategies (FACES) project was designed to enhance the involvement and capacity of eight clergy members in crime prevention and economic development within the University Park Weed and Seed neighborhood.

University Park has approximately fifteen churches located in the area; however, there is miniscule involvement from the clergy in crime prevention and economic development. Lack of awareness, knowledge, lack of skills in managing CED and crime prevention initiatives, lack of communication and financial resources are issues among the churches serving the neighborhood that directly contribute to the clergy’s noninvolvement.

FACES addresses the problem through a series of educational initiatives, i.e., crime prevention, economic development workshops and trainings. Through increased and enhanced knowledge and resources the FACES project changes the lack of involvement of clergy members within the University Park neighborhood in North Pine Bluff, Arkansas.

The project was implemented with eight clergy members within the University Park Weed and Seed neighborhood. The project began in early spring 2009 and concluded in late winter 2010.
I. Community Context

The University Park Weed and Seed neighborhood located in North Pine Bluff is one of the oldest in the city and carries with it a rich tradition of history in this predominately African American neighborhood.

Many generations of residents claimed the north side as home; having grown up in the neighborhood makes them feel a strong sense of association. Many recall a once thriving neighborhood with businesses such as dry cleaners, grocery stores, mechanic shops, gas stations and beauty and barber shops; clergy also played a major part in the neighborhood.

The site, contained entirely within Census Tract 5.02, is that area located north of the Martha Mitchell Expressway (U.S. 65B), east of Birch Street, south of Oliver Road, and west of Lake Saracen and Brumps Bayou.

Currently, the neighborhood has depressed and deteriorating housing, poor street lighting, narrow streets and, open ditches; flooding occurs following heavy rains; crime and illegal activity happens often in the neighborhood. There are fifteen churches located in this neighborhood with large to medium size congregations ranging from 50 to 500 members. However, the neighborhood is considered to be crime-and drug-ridden, the use of crack and cocaine has been a serious problem, homicides are high, and drugs are being sold on street corners. Poor housing stock includes old and abandoned properties which impacts the quality of life in the neighborhood. Most tragically the increased incidents of crime have led to limited economic opportunity in the neighborhood.

The boundaries of the site are physical divisions that define the University Park Weed and Seed neighborhood. The population of Census Tract 5.02 is 4,806 persons. The target neighborhood comprises most of this Census Tract; approximately 500 persons reside in the Tract but are not located within the selected neighborhood, making a target population of about 4,300 persons. The following map and tables show the boundaries and demographics of the University Park Weed and Seed site with comparative city totals.
Table 1. Map of University Park Pine Bluff Weed and Seed site

Source of Map: Official Recognition Strategy Pine Bluff University Park Weed and Seed Site
The population of Census Tract 5.02 is 4,806 persons. The target neighborhood comprises most of this Census Tract; approximately 500 persons reside in the Tract but are not located within the selected neighborhood, making a target population of about 4,300 persons. The following tables 1-6 below show the demographics of the proposed Weed and Seed site with comparative city totals.

### TABLE 1 SHOWS POPULATION BY AGE IN THE TARGET NEIGHBORHOOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5 &amp; UNDER</th>
<th>6 - 9</th>
<th>10 - 14</th>
<th>15 - 19</th>
<th>20 - 24</th>
<th>25 - 44</th>
<th>45 - 54</th>
<th>55 - 64</th>
<th>65 &amp; OVER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W/S Site</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>4,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1990 Census of Population and Housing Summary Tape File 3A

### TABLE 2 SHOWS THE POPULATION BY RACE AND GENDER IN THE TARGET NEIGHBORHOOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>OTHER RACE</th>
<th>MINORITY PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W/S Site</td>
<td>1,856</td>
<td>2,444</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4,214</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1990 Census of Population and Housing Summary Tape File 3A
### TABLE 3 SHOWS FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS IN THE TARGET NEIGHBORHOOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Married Couple Family with Children 11 and Under</th>
<th>Married Couple Family with Children Aged 12 - 17</th>
<th>Single Parent Family with Children 11 and Under</th>
<th>Single Parent Family with Children Aged 12 - 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W/S Site</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Total</td>
<td>5,769</td>
<td>2,898</td>
<td>3,384</td>
<td>1,956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1990 Census of Population and Housing Summary Tape File 3A

### TABLE 4 SHOWS EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF PERSONS IN THE TARGET NEIGHBORHOOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than 9th Grade</th>
<th>9th - 12th Grade, No Diploma</th>
<th>High School Graduate</th>
<th>Some College, No Degree</th>
<th>Associates Degree</th>
<th>Bachelor's Degree</th>
<th>Graduate Degree</th>
<th>Total Persons 25 Years and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W/S Site</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Total</td>
<td>4,951</td>
<td>6,841</td>
<td>10,322</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>4,010</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>34,176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1990 Census of Population and Housing Summary Tape File 3A
TABLE 5 SHOWS THE INCOME COMPARATIVE IN THE TARGET NEIGHBORHOOD 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL PERSONS</th>
<th>TOTAL POVERTY PERSONS</th>
<th>% POVERTY</th>
<th>TOTAL LMI PERSONS</th>
<th>% LMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W/S Site</td>
<td>5,453</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Total</td>
<td>56,636</td>
<td>13,593</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23,787</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INCOME COMPARATIVE TABLE: 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL PERSONS</th>
<th>TOTAL POVERTY PERSONS</th>
<th>% POVERTY</th>
<th>TOTAL LMI PERSONS</th>
<th>% LMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W/S Site</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Total</td>
<td>57,140</td>
<td>15,999</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24,570</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1990 Data: 1990 Census Special Tab Tape
The following table shows the crime of the target neighborhood in relation to the overall crime of the City.

**TABLE 6  SHOWS CRIME COMPARATIVE TABLE: 1980**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIME</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>TARGET AREA</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL CRIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violent Crimes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults</td>
<td>2127</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Violent Crime</strong></td>
<td>2532</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Crimes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>2188</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Property Crime</strong></td>
<td>4100</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Violent/Property Crime</strong></td>
<td>6632</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FY 1999 Crime in the University Park Neighborhood

**Needs Assessments**

From the assessment of the target neighborhood’s problems, its potential, and the resources present in the area, it appears that one of the most pressing needs is a concentrated effort between the neighborhood residents and available agencies and organizations toward neighborhood and individual improvement. The residents are not currently empowered and are not mobilized to engage agencies and organizations that are available to assist in crime prevention and economic development.
The Jefferson County Regional Planning Commission has identified the following nine general problems and needs included in the Weed and Seed Official Recognition Strategy prepared for the target neighborhood:

- Between 1980 and 1990, the area experienced a population decline of over 21%.
- 45% of the population residing in the area who are age 25 years and over did not graduate from high school.
- One-half of the population is living below the poverty level, compared with 28% of the City as a whole.
- Almost one-half of the families with children who reside in the area are single parent families.
- The high school dropout rate is 22% with similar truancy statistics.
- Crime is rampant, particularly burglary, robbery, and assault as a result of drug trafficking.
- Many of the single-family homes in the neighborhood are either severely deteriorated or dilapidated, as are many of the commercial structures.
- Residents who could afford to relocate to neighborhoods with better-quality housing have been doing so, resulting in population loss and neighborhood decline.
- Deteriorating neighborhoods have also caused a loss in business activity within the neighborhood.

The continuing decline of the neighborhood shows that these needs are not being met. As part of its overall strategy, the following are specific needs that the City hopes to address through the Weed and Seed Initiative (Jefferson County Regional Planning Commission November 1999). The need assessment below of University Park neighborhood reveals pressing needs for residents and law enforcement to work together to reduce crime. There is also a need to remove dilapidated housing to market the neighborhood for business development and retention.

Law Enforcement and Crime Related Needs
- To reduce the number of open air drug markets.
- To reduce the overall crime and nuisance violations.
• To reduce the number of drug houses in the neighborhood.
• The need for improved accessibility and approachability of law enforcement officers in general and the neighborhood officer(s) in particular.
• The need to ensure that the police recognize the value or resident input and involvement and that the residents are given a voice on the proposed police practices in their neighborhood.

Housing and Neighborhood Needs
• To develop more homeownership opportunities and to offer a variety of housing choices.
• To diligently pursue the removal of substandard housing.
• The need to market the area to the business community.
• To develop infrastructure having better street signs, streetlights, and other safety features.
• To open an ongoing dialog with neighborhood residents and neighborhood groups about the problems that contribute to the crime, violence, fear, and drug abuse in the neighborhood.
• To reclaim the neighborhood and make it a safe place to live and do business many challenges and needs must be conquered. Addressing the needs listed above will aid in reducing crime and create an economic development environment.

Focusing on the crime in the community is a major starting point for clergy and community. Clergy working with law enforcement and other officials can be the catalyst to reduce drug sales on the streets and criminal activity within the neighborhood.

Clergy members building a relationship with city officials can assist in identifying dilapidated housing which becomes safe havens for illegal activity. The clergy’s involvement can influence removal of old dilapidated structures and produce new housing in the neighborhood.

Clergy members working with city officials and law enforcement can create a neighborhood with a sense of pride and safety allowing the community to become marketable to businesses and new home construction.
FACES Target Neighborhood

There are many statistical reasons that have led to the severe state of decline of the target neighborhood, here are five of them.

First, between 1980 and 1990, the area experienced a population decline of over 21%. According to information provided by the Pine Bluff Community Development Department, many of the single-family homes in the neighborhood are either severely deteriorated or dilapidated, as are many of the commercial structures along University Drive. Residents who could afford to relocate to neighborhoods with better-quality housing have been doing so, resulting in population loss. Deteriorating neighborhoods also cause a loss in business activity within the neighborhood, furthering the decline and also resulting in population loss (Weed and Seed Initiative November 1999, p. 11).

Second, 45% of the population residing in the area who are age 25 years and over did not graduate from high school. Generally, persons who have not graduated from high school have lower paying jobs or subsist on state and federal aid. In fact, the unemployment rate of the target neighborhood was over 25% in 1990 while the City as a whole had an unemployment rate of 11%. Lack of income results in lack of housing choice and many, if not most low-income families resides in substandard housing. Those persons having a better education have been able to relocate to more attractive neighborhoods. Also, families with uneducated parents often do not provide the incentives necessary for the children to realize the value of a high school education, resulting in an increasing number of children dropping out of school. According to the Dollarway School District, of which the target neighborhood is a part, the current drop-out-rate of students who reside in the target neighborhood is 22%, and a like percentage of truancy. This means that for every 100 students, 22 will not acquire the skills necessary to support themselves or their future families, through dropping out or just not attending school (Weed and Seed Initiative November 1999, p. 11).
Third, one-half of the population is living below the poverty level, compared with 28% of the City as a whole. Between 1980 and 1990, the poverty level population of the target neighborhood has increased from 39% to 47%, and there is little reason to believe that this trend has been reversed. Unless the neighborhood is revitalized and its residents provided with the skills necessary to improve their quality of life, it stands to reason that the poverty level of the neighborhood will continue to rise either through out-migration of more affluent residents, continuation of the poverty cycle within the family, or both (Weed and Seed Initiative November 1999, p. 11).

Fourth, one-half of the families with children who reside in the area are single parent families. This can cause several problem where a large percentage of the children are latchkey kids having no supervision after school because the parent works. Also this means there may not be some one at home to insure that the children get up and go to school. For the most part, it means that one-half of the children in the target neighborhood do not have a male role model at home, and it also means that the family is most likely living on limited income (Weed and Seed Initiative November 1999, p. 12).

Fifth, the area’s population is comprised of over 98% minority persons, compared to 54% of the City as a whole. According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, disproportionately greater need exists when the percentage of persons in a category of need who are members of a particular racial or ethnic group is at least ten percentage points higher than the percentage of persons in the category as a whole. Since the strategy neighborhood is nearly 100% African American, any category of need of the neighborhood would be a disproportionately greater need (Weed and Seed Initiative November 1999, p. 12).

The above five factors are major causes of the deterioration of the neighborhood. The decline by the clergy diminishes the opportunity for clergy to play a major role in economic development and crime prevention. Without the ability, monetary or otherwise, for the City or the residents to make improvements, the neighborhood begins to decline.
When a neighborhood starts to decline, an out-migration of those residents who can afford to relocate to more affluent neighborhoods occurs. In many instances, the former owner-occupied houses become rental properties, and upkeep on the homes is neglected. Then other property owners are hesitant to put any money into improving their properties, so the housing stock ages and deteriorates. The new population base becomes comprised of low-income persons who, out of necessity, must live in substandard housing. New, younger homeowners look elsewhere to live. A shrinking, low-income population base is increasingly unable to support area merchants.

Existing merchants relocate to other areas or fold altogether, furthering the neighborhood decline. This is the scenario that has resulted in University Park as it appears today. With neighborhood decline comes a corresponding increase in the amount of neighborhood crime. For years, open and highly visible drug dealing has plagued the University Park neighborhood. At the same time, many of the businesses and residences in the neighborhood have been experiencing burglaries, armed robberies, declines in business, and damage to property. The burglaries, robberies, and thefts have a direct correlation to the drug trafficking. They also correlate to truancy and unsupervised youths after school.

Clergy members who do not utilize their influence or voice, as relate to poverty and crime, have not connected crime and neighborhood deterioration to their lack of involvement as a contributing factor to poor neighborhoods.

The minuscule involvement of clergy has had a major impact on the quality of life, job creation and safety within the University Park Weed and Seed community.

Clergy members, having a lack of awareness in CED based approaches and crime prevention strategies, are not equipped to address economic development and crime related issues. Furthermore, the lack of knowledge regarding crime and economic condition in the community poses a very serious threat to security and economic opportunity.
Clergy members who lack skills in managing CED initiatives cannot mobilize their membership to become involved in economic development and crime prevention projects or neighborhood improvement initiatives.

Clergy who remain deficient in organizational support are at a disadvantage regarding the implementation of programs related to economic development and crime prevention. As a result of poor organizational support the clergy’s voice and influence becomes silent while the neighborhood suffers lack direction to a path of revitalization and crime prevention.

A lack of venue(s) for communication such as a website, newsletter, etc., and a lack of financial resources are the impetus as well as major factors for miniscule involvement of clergy.
II. Problem Analysis

Problem Statement Causes and Effects

This project intends to address the problem of minuscule involvement of clergy in economic development and crime prevention as indicated in the problem tree below.

There are a number of effects and causes shown above which clearly indicates the lost opportunities for clergy members to spearhead economic development and crime prevention within the poor and disadvantaged neighborhood.
III. Literature Review

Communities with high unemployment rates and high school drop-out rates are prone to having a large number of residents who are living in poverty. Poverty has been credited by many researchers to be a major factor contributing to the high incidences of crime in communities (Wilson, 1998). Further research is needed to determine how to effectively deal with these social problems because every American, despite his or her socioeconomic status, should be afforded the opportunity to live in a safe environment.

Research indicates that the effects of high unemployment and high school drop-out rates extend far beyond the physical boundaries of impoverished communities (Eitzen & Zinn, 2006). The high social and economic costs of poverty, unemployment, and dropping out of school adversely impact the entire nation. Because of the high social and economic costs of unemployment and dropping out of school, various programs have been developed to address these issues (Atkinson, T., Liem, J., & Liem, R., 1986).

During the 1990s there was great concern about the high incidences of crime in the United States (U.S.), this concern led to a period when a large number of prisons were constructed. The increases in violent crimes and sentencing reforms in the 1980s and in the 1990s led to a record number of adults and juveniles being sent to prison. Many practitioners involved in crime prevention believe that if the crime rate increased, this could cause officials to divert government resources from schools, community development, and other public amenities to prevention activities. Historically, when addressing the issue of crime prevention, the justice system has focused its attention on the individual committing the crimes and the victims of crimes; little attention was paid to the role communities might play in crime prevention. Due to the ever-increasing crime rates, it has been determined that the community must have a more active role in the prevention of crimes (UAPB Pine Bluff Weed and Seed Evaluation 2006).

The University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff (UAPB) researchers suggests that effective crime prevention is dependent upon the development and sustaining of relationships in a community setting.
The Weed and Seed initiative pairs agencies and individuals who have a stake in communities with high crime rates to work toward reducing crime and revitalizing their neighborhoods. Residents, law enforcement, school officials, business owners, and other community organizations work together to “weed” out crime and “seed” the community with economic development. This is important because the absence or presence of relationships in communities has been identified as a factor that greatly affects crime. The shift in the focus of crime prevention from people to places has revealed that crime is not equally distributed throughout cities, criminals make decisions about where they will commit crimes, and impoverished areas are more likely to have problems with crime than other areas within a city (Wilson, 1998).

In order to reduce the crime rate and to minimize the impact of crime on children, family, and communities, more focus should be given to economic and community trends that influence poverty. Crime rates appear to be influenced more by persistent poverty rates than any other factors; therefore extra attention should be placed on reducing poverty. Unemployment and lack of education and failing to complete high school are contributing factors to the high U.S. poverty rates (Wilson, 1998).

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the poverty rate in 2004 increased from 35.9 million in 2003 to 37.0 million. This means that 37 million Americans had a standard of living below the minimum needed to maintain adequate diet, health, and shelter (United States Census Bureau, 2004). They were “ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed” (Eitzen & Zinn, 2006).

The greatest poverty concentrations are among non-Hispanic white native-born Americans 18-64 years-of-age, with full-time employment. Yet, African Americans and other people of Hispanic origin have the highest levels of poverty relative to their overall population numbers (Cadena & Sallee, 2005). Poverty rates for African Americans and Hispanics are much higher than the national average. In 2004, 24.7 percent of African Americans and 21 percent of Hispanics lived in poverty, compared to 8.6 percent of non-Hispanic whites and 9.8 percent of Asians. Families headed by single Black or Hispanic women had the highest poverty rates. Also in 2004, close to 40 percent of single parent households headed by Black or Hispanic women lived in poverty compared to only 13.5 percent of households headed by men and 5.5 percent of married-couples living in poverty (University of Michigan, 2006). It is poverty, not race, sex, or age that has the highest correlation with crime and violence.
Some researchers believe that poverty helps create and maintain the behaviors and attitudes that lead to crime, violence, and the onset of criminal activity (Wilson, 1998). Unemployment, underemployment and lack of education are some of the factors that interfere with a person’s ability to break free of poverty.

In order to provide the basic necessities of life, most Americans need a source of income. Individuals who are physically and mentally able to work and who have actively sought work in the prior four weeks, but are unable to find work are considered unemployed. While the unemployment rate is relatively low, 4.6 percent, many of the jobs held by the individuals most profoundly impacted by poverty are being outsourced to other countries where the labor is cheaper and there are no requirements for worker benefits (United States, Department of Labor, 2006).

Corporations are restructuring to become more efficient and to improve their profits. This restructuring usually results in the laying off of individuals who lack the skills and training to qualify for more specialized and technical jobs (Eitzen & Zinn, 2006).

The lack of, or loss of, income sufficient enough to provide adequate food, clothing, and or housing increases the risk of participation in criminal activity as a means of meeting unmet needs. High unemployment rates lead to higher rates of property crime, homicide rates, and drug and alcohol abuse (Eitzen & Zinn, 2006). They also increase the risk of child abuse, spousal abuse, and or marital problems occurring in the home (Atkinson, T., Liem, J., & Liem, R., 1986). When a large number of poor individuals are segregated in a neighborhood, the individuals and the community suffer. Communities, which are both socially and economically distressed, tend to promote behaviors and attitudes conducive to crime (Wilson, 1998.) In addition to exposure to high crime rates, children raised in poor communities are also deprived of the same quality of education as children who are raised in more affluent neighborhoods. These children are less prepared for employment and or college when and if they graduate from high school. They have a higher risk of dropping out of high school and find it more difficult to find and maintain adequate employment (Logan, Oakley, & Stowell, 2003).

In 1998 more than 1,100 youths dropped out of school every day in the U.S. Completion of formal education and the mastering of basic academic skills is very important for success in finding adequate employment (Wilson, 1998). “Those young adults who fail to complete high school are in
the most precarious economic position, facing a bleak economic and social future (Harrington, & Sum, 2003).” Studies have shown that dropouts receive lower wages, change jobs more frequently, have higher unemployment rates and are more likely to live in poverty than individuals who complete their high school education (Chan, Davenport, Ernest, Guven, & Kato). In every state and large public schools in America, men tend to drop out of school more than women and the dropout rate is higher among Blacks and Hispanics than among Whites. Researchers attribute the below average college attendance and degree attainment rates of young men to the high incidence of high school drop outs among young men (Harrington, & Sum, 2003).

The faith community can play a role in reducing violence in Pine Bluff where domestic violence has been a problem in the city for too long and it is time to do something to curb it. “More than 450 cases have been reported so far this year … averaged 56 cases a month … Program coordinator at the Pine Bluff Weed and Seed program, Jesse Turner, says his surveys show that a faith-based program will really draw the numbers down (Abubey 2009).”

Crime constrains economic development and business expansion in the University Park neighborhood. However, the involvement of clergy members in areas where crime is high can have a major impact on business development, job creation and crime prevention within these neighborhoods.

During a meeting sponsored by the Pine Bluff Weed and Seed Program, Cook told a group of church ministers that, “they are the key to reaching the community.” –Reginald K. Cook, Assistant Pine Bluff City Attorney (Abubey 2009).

Pine Bluff clergy gathered Saturday in a public show of support for the Pine Bluff Police Department’s illegal-gun seizure initiative and the Jefferson County Sheriff’s Department’s zero-tolerance campaign (Pine Bluff Commercial 2010).

"I think it’s important for our citizens to see that we’re not only active within the walls of our churches, but within our community,” said the Rev. R.J. Lightsey II, pastor of Jubilee Christian Center (Pine Bluff Commercial 2010).
The Greater Fellowship Ministries in Pine Bluff, Arkansas took on a project of housing development for Senior Citizens in 2001. The project called Joshua Manor Apartments has been an economic plus for the community. The development initiative, which provided jobs and employment for citizens in the community, is clearly a development project with the potential to help reduce crime. “We wanted to improve the community and provide some decent housing for the neighborhood (Watson 2009).”

The black church has untapped resources and influence in economic development and if utilized can provide much needed jobs and businesses - from shopping centers to senior citizen housing for example, the Hartford Memorial Baptist Church leaders laid out a plan in 1985 to reclaim their northwest Detroit community. It involved no small endeavor. All the telltale signs of a neighborhood beyond hope were there: doors of once prosperous businesses were shuttered; abandoned buildings sat crumbling for blocks; rats and vermin had overtaken vacant lots and the streets had become a public dumping ground (Gite 1993).

Today, that once vacant land is leased to African-American entrepreneurs operating McDonald’s and KFC franchises. Several social service agencies and a school also use the land. In August, the church broke ground on a reported $17-million, 80,000-sqft shopping center that will include a supermarket, drug store and restaurant (Gite 1993).

Hartford Memorial also has plans to construct a 40,000-sq-ft. auto-care and commercial center and a multimillion-dollar housing project. Initially, church members paid $500,000 for the vacant properties now under development.

Today, the land is believed to be worth more than $5 million."Hartford Memorial Baptist Church has established a grand model for other churches to follow. This is a city where economic resources have been sharply curtailed and white flight has occurred on a massive scale. White business interests have withdrawn and in large measure they have failed to be active partners in the rebuilding of Detroit. Hartford is now a partner (Johnson, Detroit's Wayne State University)."

In the heart of the Martin Luther King Jr. historical district you find the Wheat Street Baptist Church in Atlanta. Auburn Avenue reminds one of the civil rights struggle, a rich black business legacy and Sunday morning sermons at some of the largest African American congregations south of the
Mason Dixon line. A quarter-block stretch of the avenue is lined on both sides by Wheat Street Plaza North and South and its two strip malls that house 10 small businesses. What makes these malls significant is that they are the product of the Wheat Street Charitable Foundation, the nonprofit organization that serves as the development arm of Wheat Street Baptist Church (DePriest and Jones 1997).

Wheat Street has known for some time what many black churches across the country are quickly discovering: that they can be catalysts for the creation of black businesses, jobs and wealth in African American communities (DePriest and Jones 1997).

Through the efforts of its Charitable Foundation, which was essentially created to separate church and state for tax purposes, Wheat Street boasts more than $33 million in real estate. The church holdings include Wheat Street Towers, a senior citizens' home, and Wheat Street Gardens, a low-income family housing development. The Towers were built in 1973 and the Gardens in 1964, financed with a combination of grants from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and church contributions.

The 2,000-member congregation (Wheat Street Baptist church) also has a 1,000-member credit union with over $1 million in assets. "By belonging to a credit union, you are paying yourself first because you are saving and growing what you earn. Besides, if you go to a commercial bank, you're nothing but a customer. If you join a credit union, you become an owner and share in the proceeds through interest dividends (Logan, Wheat Street Baptist Church)."

A good example is the Rev. James Wallace Edwin Dixon II, senior pastor of the 2,500-member Northwest Community Baptist Church in Houston. The church's budget under Dixon, who took over as pastor 16 years ago at the age of 18, has increased from $50,000 to $1.5 million. Under his leadership, Northwest has engineered the construction of a 36,000-sq.-ft. shopping center, home to several small businesses including the Deliverance Grocery and Deli Institute Inc., a grocery store training initiative.

The church also owns a drug rehabilitation center, and in 1990 purchased 22.6 acres of land, at a price of $955,000, on which it will build a 3,000-seat sanctuary, community life center and Christian educational facility (DePriest and Jones 1997).
Crime tends to be prevalent where there are few jobs, also communities with a high unemployment rate tend to have high crime. The University Park neighborhood is such a community. “Pine Bluff crime rate soared as its economic fortune dropped (Associated Press 2003).”

The Rev. Jesse C. Turner described area ministers as a “under utilized resource” and said they must get involved “if the community is to grow and prosper (King 2004 p. 1).”

“If you want people to listen and do what you want them to do, you have to use the two “Ms”.... one of those is mommas and the other is the ministers....” - U. S. Attorney Jane W. Duke (King 2007, p.1.). Duke’s statement indicates the importance of the clergy’s involvement in crime prevention.

“....the most powerful people in the city...you have the power to turn this city around...you have the voices.” –Pine Bluff Police Chief John W. Howell. Source: (King 2007, p.1)."

“I’ve always felt that the churches had a responsibility that they’re not standing up to…” -Steve Sumner, Criminal Justice instructor at Southeast Arkansas College (King 2003, p. 1).

The church and pastor remain one of the greatest untapped resources in the neighborhood when it comes to encouraging business development and crime prevention. “... as we take into account the impact murders have on the economy and the city’s ability to attract new industry and new business." –Rev. Jesse C. Turner (King 2003, p. 2A).

During a Respect for Life Symposium held at the Pine Bluff Convention Center, Charlina Lacy with the Pine Bluff Police Department describes some of the homicides reported in Pine Bluff is a result of domestic violence.

Many of the speakers at the symposium described the murder problem as one the entire community must work together to solve first by eliminating apathy. “When you look around this room, one of the things which stand out is the apathy which a lot of people show.” –PBPD Chief Daniel Moses (King 2003, p. 2A).

“The church is the place where our young people learn the importance of family, and learn respect for authority....” Kyle Hunter Chief Deputy Prosecuting Attorney (King 2008, p. 1).
Marion Orr, author of the book “Transforming the City and Community Organizing and the Challenges of Political Change” reports that the decline of civic engagement and the “hijacking” of grass-roots or local organizations are not good news for the United States, and this problem for the inner cities is magnified due to a high concentration of low income and disadvantage residents (Orr, 2007, p. 7).

Orr further reports that due to the concentrations of low-income and disadvantaged residents, cities are disproportionately hurt by civic disengagement because the “professionally operated and top-down advocacy organization” now dominates the civic landscape and they are not targeting low-income, central city residents. The effects of this policy has resulted in schools that are disproportionately failing, high unemployment, difficulty finding safe and affordable housing, and daily exposure to crime and drug use for residents (Orr, 2007, p. 7).

According to Orr, community organizing is a catalyst for change and it is paramount in devising an effective strategy that will address many of the social and economic challenges now facing the inner city. Orr defines community organizing as, “the process that engages people, organizations, and communities toward increased individual and community control, political efficacy, improved quality of life, and social justice (2007, p. 7)” because they operate at the local level (working with city officials, civic and corporate leaders, and state level officials) making it a process and strategy designed to build political power.

The Minnesota Wheel of Public Health Nursing Interventions implemented a program called “The Hmong Task Force” that addressed the growing issues of young Hmong girls running away from home, being truant from school and experiencing subsequent sexual exploitation and violence in one of the Midwestern states and it identified community organizing and coalition building as effective strategies for addressing these issues (Saewyc, 2008).

This report further identified Community organizing and coalition building as “population-focused” interventions that were appropriate in addressing complex problems that involve multiple systems within a community (Saewyc, 2008).

The Community Research Group, Columbia School of Public Health, conducted a qualitative study on inner city violence that included field observations and semi-structured interviews in
Washington Heights, New York, a study designed to examine the effects of violence on an inner-city community plagued with drugs and violence (Fullilove, 1998).

The results showed violence in all parts of the neighborhood inhibited social interactions; it injured individuals and fractured social relationships leading to social disarray referred to as "anomie". The Public Health recommendation for response to inner city violence is community organizing (Fullilove, 1998).

A report from the Black Church Research Group (TBCRG) reported, “that the answers to the socioeconomic problems that exist with The African American community are within the African American church, (TBCRG 2006). Historically, the black church from its inception, has been the force for CED as it relates to socioeconomic development and voice to the rest of the world, especially in the south, and this is true from slavery to the Freedom marches and to today (A Travelogue of American Spirituality, Landmark Odyssey production 1999).
IV. Project Design/Logic Model

In order to change the miniscule involvement of clergy members FACES implemented a series of activities to improve clergy participation in crime prevention and economic development to achieve the desired outcomes as indicated in the chart below.

The project activities implemented over a period of time decrease incidents of criminal activity, i.e., homicides, domestic violence, and open air drug sales within the University Park Weed and Seed neighborhood.

Through the implementation of FACES, the neighborhood can experience a greater opportunity for business development, business expansion and growth. The project increased the influence of the church, giving them a greater platform to impart economic development and crime prevention knowledge that can bring back a sense of neighborhood pride.

Residents become dissatisfied living next to old abandon and dilapidated houses that require the city Zoning and Inspection Department to take the necessary actions for removal. Houses that are run down boarded up and in disrepair become nuisances and safe havens for illegal activities. The influence of the church mobilizes neighborhood residents to collaborate with other agencies and organizations to help cleanup blighted conditions and vacant lots and properties.
Project Design/Logic Model

**Long Term Outcome 1:** Decreased incidence of crime

**Long Term Outcome 2:** Greater economic opportunity

**Long Term Outcome 3:** Increased Church influence

**Intermediate Outcome**
Improved involvement in crime prevention and economic development

**STO 1:** Enhanced awareness of crime and economic condition in the community
- Outputs: 8 pastors become aware of the community’s crime and economic condition
- Activities: Workshops/Training in crime prevention and economic development

**STO 2:** Improved knowledge of CED-based approaches and crime prevention strategies
- Outputs: 8 pastors trained in CED based approaches and crime prevention strategies
- Activities: Workshops and Training in CED and crime prevention

**STO 3:** Improved skills in managing CED initiatives
- Outputs: 8 pastors participate in workshops and training sessions on management of CED and crime prevention initiatives
- Activities: Expert in CED and crime prevention presents workshop and training sessions

**STO 4:** Improved access to organizational support
- Outputs: 8 Pastors attend meeting with community organizations
- Activities: Community network meetings

**STO 5:** Improved venue(s) for communication (website, newsletter, etc)
- Outputs: 8 pastors trained to access web site and develop newsletter
- Activities: Develop web site and newsletter

**STO 6:** Increased access to financial resources
- Outputs: 8 pastors attend workshop to become familiar with grants and foundations
- Activities: Grant writing workshops and proposal writing Foundation web sites
The FACES project provides community economic development training workshops involving eight University Park Weed and Seed pastors and creates dialogue and involvement with the intentions of providing and disseminating crime prevention and economic development information. Training workshops conducted by CED professionals gave clergy a greater appreciation and understanding of how economic development and crime prevention can have an impact on the neighborhood where they pastor.

Pastors were exposed to CED-based approaches and strategies that improved and enhanced their knowledge in crime prevention and economic development. Clergy members attending the workshops and training gained greater skills in managing a CED initiative.

Experts in crime prevention offered tips and instruction on crime prevention, gang identification, bullying, conflict resolution, and drug prevention among other things. The knowledge gained by these pastors helped them become familiar with other community organizations and the services they offer the neighborhood.

Pastors learned the importance of collaboration and what it means to support other organizations that are not affiliated with their churches. Specifically, the training and workshops encouraged ministers to share power with other clergy from smaller congregations, female pastors, and different denominations. Pastors also learned how to network with other churches in order to build community economic development and crime prevention skills for neighborhood change. FACES’ training offered pastors the opportunity to learn how to develop effective newsletters, explore how a web site can be an important tool in the sharing of information, and networking with other churches and organizations within the neighborhood. Pastors became familiar with grants and foundations and increased their knowledge regarding foundation funds. Grant writing tips were offered during workshop and training on how to write a proposal.
V. Methodology and Implementation Plan

The project began in February 2009 and ends in 2010. University Park Weed and Seed served as the host agency for the implementation of the Faith and Community Empowerment Strategies (FACES). The project targets the University Park neighborhood in North Pine Bluff, Arkansas located in Census Tract 5.02 with a population of 4,806 persons. The target neighborhood comprises most of this Census Tract; approximately 500 persons reside in the Tract but are not located within the selected neighborhood, making a target population of University Park 4,300 according to the US Census Data, 2000. 52.2% of the population is female 46.8% is male according to US Census Data, 2000.

This project, Faith and Community Empowering Strategies (FACES) enhanced the capacity of clergy members located in the University Park Weed and Seed neighborhood. Utilizing training workshops, FACES equipped eight clergy members with tools and information needed to revitalize and reclaim their neighborhood. FACES and Community Development Corporations in the area serve as information vehicles delivering to clergy related economic development and crime prevention programs.

The recruitment of the Mayor, County Judge and other elected officials to help promote clergy involvement is another outreach factor. The city and county officials were asked to join this project, commit resources and address pastors at Weed and Seed Coffee with the Chiefs meetings. The County Judge and members of the quorum court promoted clergy involvement as well as encouraged Faith Leaders to participate in crime prevention and economic development strategies.

The project's amplification of benefits as relate to clergy involvement served to inspire other clergy in the neighborhood. The Neighborhood Watch Program is instrumental in recruiting volunteers and providing resources and community crime prevention information for the clergy.

FACES used the Crime Victims Programs to share victim’s stories revealing the need for clergy to be involved as consolers and supporters for victims of crime.
FACES, in collaboration with the Economic Research and Development Center at the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, provide technical support while increasing business awareness of clergy members.

Clergy members were recruited as volunteers and mentors during the school week to build moral character among youth and help reduce juvenile delinquency in the University Park neighborhood.

The long-term outcome of clergy involvement takes into consideration the intention of developing housing and home rehabilitation in the neighborhood to build wealth and neighborhood stability. Residents are encouraged to developed and collaborate with nonprofits similar to the Community Enterprises Development Corporation (CEDC) to rehabilitate and build affordable energy efficient homes in the University Park neighborhood.

The clergy’s involvement sets in motion a plan of action to host grant writing workshops among other community-building activities. The FACES project, collaborating with Interested Citizens for Voter Registration, Inc., the City of Pine Bluff Economic Development Department, Simmons First National Bank, Union Bank and Trust Company, Southern Good Faith Fund and Pine Bluff National Bank, provide services and resources to promote asset-building ideas that can be explored and implemented in the University Park Weed and Seed neighborhood.

The FACES project brings about a social and economic change for the neighborhood through wealth building using an asset-based approach. Utilizing clergy in community development and crime prevention advances the neighborhood past the point of its present existence as clergy engage residents to organize, network, and mobilize thus enhancing the living conditions within the University Park Weed and Seed neighborhood.
The project activities are implemented based on the following work plan.

Figure 12: Implementation Work Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feb-09</th>
<th>Apr-09</th>
<th>May-09</th>
<th>Jun-09</th>
<th>Jul-09</th>
<th>Aug-09</th>
<th>Sep-09</th>
<th>Oct-09</th>
<th>Nov-09</th>
<th>Dec-09</th>
<th>Jan-10</th>
<th>Apr-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify Seven Local Pastor to Participate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Survey with Pastors</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop training curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CED and Crime Prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop outreach and marketing/newsletter/website strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct initial CED training classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct initial crime prevention classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant writing Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate program for effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Short Term Outcome 1:** Enhanced awareness of crime and economic condition in the community

**Short Term Outcome 2:** Improved knowledge of CED-based approaches and crime prevention strategies

**Short Term Outcome 3:** Improved skills in managing CED and crime prevention initiatives

**Short Term Outcome 4:** Attend community meetings improving access to organizational structure and network

**Short Term Outcome 5:** Improved venues(s) for communication (website, newsletter, etc.)

**Short Term Outcome 6:** Increased access to financial resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Outcomes/Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/Training in crime prevention and economic development awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eight pastors become aware of community’s crime and economic development condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops and Training in CED and crime prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eight pastors improve knowledge of CED-based approaches and crime prevention strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert in CED and crime prevention presents workshop and training sessions</td>
<td>Eight pastors improve skills in managing CED and crime prevention initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight pastors attend community meetings improving access to organizational structure and network</td>
<td>Attend community network meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight pastors trained to access web site and develop newsletter</td>
<td>Develop web site and newsletter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight pastors attend workshop to become familiar with grants and foundations</td>
<td>Grant writing workshops and proposal writing Foundation web sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACES Project Budget Summary

FACES budget, as shown in Figure 13, has been developed to specify the organization’s investment to develop and implement the project. The FACES project is the first of its kind in Pine Bluff and specifically within the University Park Weed and Seed neighborhood.

Figure 13: Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel (Wages/Fringe)</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site and Newsletter Development (Contract)</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Travel</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/Outreach</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>$4,600</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>$103,600</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. FACES Monitoring Plan

Indicators

FACES monthly monitoring allows the project staff to reevaluate timelines and make adjustments when necessary for the proper implementation of the project. These steps are important and necessary to keep the project on track and to meet the outputs set forth by the logic model. The monitoring plan developed in Figures 14A and 14B below is a sample of the monthly monitoring report utilized with the project.

The monitoring tools developed coincide with the activities and included an attendance report for each training session to allow FACES an opportunity to monitor the participation levels of pastors. FACES intends to strengthen and improve the initial project; therefore, based on the six (6) outputs indicated in the project’s Logic Model serves as benchmarks for the purpose of monitoring the project.

Output 1: Eight pastors become aware of the community’s crime and economic condition
Output 2: Eight pastors trained in CED based approaches and crime prevention strategies
Output 3: Eight pastors participate in workshops and training sessions on management of CED initiatives and crime prevention strategies
Output 4: Eight pastors attend meetings with community organizations
Output 5: Eight pastors trained to access web sites and develop newsletter
Output 6: Eight pastors attended workshop to become familiar with grants and foundation.

The monitoring plan helps the project track pastors following the completion of workshops and training exercises. The project monitors the impact of outputs, inputs and activities within the neighborhood in an effort to track any changes to the quality of life with the University Park neighborhood. FACES enhances, improves and increases the knowledge and skills of clergy in the areas of CED and Crime Prevention, and through the monitoring process, FACES can assess how to improve and implement future projects. FACES workshops and training delivered tools that can assist clergy with web site design, newsletters, etc. tools which enable better communication
among fellow clergy members. The project monitoring determines if clergy were able to become aware of grant writing techniques and foundation funding that can be used to develop community development initiatives. Monitoring helps FACES provide information regarding the success of the project to foundations and community. FACES final and inclusive monitoring report (Figure 14) below reveals the outputs as a result of the project’s activities, which reflect any adjustments made as the project was implemented.

The final report shows pastors committed to engaging in crime prevention, economic development, attending community meetings as well as creating jobs and businesses, which are vital to the success of the project, neighborhood revitalization and an improved quality of life for all residents in the neighborhood. The Weed and Seed Steering Committee is engaged and active in the promotion, assessment and outreach of the project.

**Monitoring Charts**

The monitoring of the project utilized a monitoring chart. An example is found here. The actual six (6) monthly monitoring charts are located in the attachment. The logic model and implementation plan provide the indicators and foundation for the monitoring function of the project, long term, intermediate and short term outcomes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Timeliness</th>
<th>Explanation for Delay</th>
<th>Alternative Action</th>
<th>Attainment of Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify participating pastors progress</td>
<td>Start February 27, 2010</td>
<td>Grant writing workshop</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> To Date: February 19, 2010 – One clergy member is hosting a grant writing workshop at his church Saturday February 27, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of CED training classes</td>
<td>Start February</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> One clergy member applying for grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>To Date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of Crime Prevention training classes</td>
<td>Start:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>To Date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Outreach strategy</td>
<td>Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>To Date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CED Strategies Implemented</td>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>End:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Target To Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention Strategies Implemented</td>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>End:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Target To Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Identified and proposals written Grant Writing Workshop</td>
<td>Start:</td>
<td>End:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Target: To Date: graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VII. Evaluation Plan

The logic model and implementation plan provide the indicators and foundation for the monitoring function of the project, long term, intermediate and short term outcomes:

Long Term Outcome 1: Decreased incidents of crime in University Park.

Indicator: The percentage crime decrease in the University Park Weed and Seed neighborhood during a one year period.

Long Term Outcome 2: Greater economic opportunity.

Indicator: The number of new homes built and rehabilitated through Faith-based housing development initiatives, new and expanding businesses and shops in the University Park Weed and Seed neighborhood.

Long Term Outcome 3: Increased Church influence.

Indicator: The number of churches within the University Park Weed and Seed site becoming of CED and crime prevention and the impact it has on quality of life issues.

Intermediate Outcome: Improved involvement in crime prevention and economic development in the University Park Weed and Seed site.

Indicator: The number of churches within the University Park Weed and Seed site starting Neighborhood Watch groups, hosting crime and economic development workshops, projects and initiatives.

Short Term Outcome 1: Enhanced awareness of crime and economic condition in the community.

Indicator: Pre and post surveys determine awareness of pastors in CED-based approaches and crime prevention in the University Park Weed and Seed neighborhood.

Short Term Outcome 2: Improved knowledge of CED-based approaches and strategies.

Indicator: The number of pastors sharing their CED and crime prevention training with other clergy and churches in the Weed and Seed site.
Short Term Outcome 3: Improved skills in managing CED and crime prevention initiatives.
Indicator: The number of pastors University Park Weed and Seed starting church CED initiatives.

Short Term Outcome 4: Improved access to organizational support.
Indicator: Increased number of pastors in the University Park Weed and Seed neighborhood attending community, school board, and city council meetings.

Short Term Outcome 5: Improved venue(s) for communication (websites, newsletters)
Indicator: The number of pastors/churches starting web sites and newsletters in the University Park Weed and Seed neighborhood.

Short Term Outcome 6: Increased access to financial resources.
Indicator: An increased number of pastors/churches within the University Park Weed and Seed neighborhood submitting grant proposals and conducting fundraising activities during a twelve month period.

The project’s weed and seed staff will conduct monthly monitoring reports to ensure the project operates within the timeline set. Clergy members will be revisited to ascertain that they are successful with neighborhood mobilization. Through the evaluation process, FACES can better understand how clergy members mobilize the neighborhood as a result of their influence and advocacy in the University Park neighborhood. The aim of the project is an increased amount of new businesses and startups, also business retention and neighborhood revitalization. The evaluation should indicate how the influence of clergy spurs neighborhood involvement in crime prevention and economic development. The SWOT analysis performed as part of the project development uncovered the organization’s strengths as it relates to neighborhood resources. These strengths include the number of churches in the area, their influence, human resource and the people and facilities as viable assets. Additionally, the analysis addressed working with other churches in the neighborhood to understand the opportunities each provides as well as utilizing the resources each provides. FACES identified its weaknesses as clergy members without an action plan for neighborhood engagement, lack of knowledge in CED and crime prevention strategies, and minute fellowship among black and white clergy.
Methods, tools, forms for data gathering

Specific outcomes data will be gathered by the following methods and the following sources:

- Long Term Outcome 1: Pine Bluff Police Department crime data.
- Long Term Outcome 2: Pine Bluff Community and Economic Development Department and University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff Economic Research and Development Center.
- Long Term Outcome 3: University Park neighborhood Interviews.
- Intermediate Outcome 1: University Park neighborhood Interviews.
- Short Term Outcome 1: Participant surveys.
- Short Term Outcome 2: Participant surveys.
- Short Term Outcome 3: Participant surveys.
- Short Term Outcome 4: Interviews with specified organizations within the University Park neighborhood.
- Short Term Outcome 5: Review of pre and post venues data.
- Short Term Outcome 6: Participant surveys.

Data analysis

Data that is gathered as outlined above will be analyzed using appropriate methods.

Long Term Outcome 1: UPWS staff along with community volunteers will review and compare pre and post data to determine the impact of our project.

Long Term Outcome 2: UPWS staff and volunteers will review the city’s and the University’s data to determine the impact of our project on the neighborhood.

Long Term Outcome 3: University Park neighborhood Interviews.

Intermediate Outcome 1: Same analysis as Long Term Outcome 3.

Short Term Outcome 1: UPWS staff and volunteers will review surveys to determine what percentage of pastors has gained greater knowledge as a result of training.
Short Term Outcome 2: UPWS staff and volunteers will review surveys to determine what percentages of pastors have gained greater knowledge as a result of training.

Short Term Outcome 3: UPWS staff and volunteers will compare pre and post survey to determine whether their knowledge base increased as a result of these workshops.

Short Term Outcome 4: UPWS staff and volunteers will interview specific organizations to determine if there is greater participation from pastors.

Short Term Outcome 5: Staff will compare pre and post venues to determine any increase as a result of the workshops and training.

Short Term Outcome 6: UPWS staff and volunteers will interview pastors to determine whether they have access to additional financial resources.

The analysis of the data gathered as outlined above will be shared with the city of Pine Bluff Community and Economic Development Department and the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff Economic Research and Development Center.
VIII. Sustainability Plan

The University Park Weed and Seed FACES Project recognize that sustainability is an ongoing challenge for any grant-supported program. Although the future outcomes cannot be positively predicted, the organization will continue to evaluate and search for new ways to identify and implement sustainable projects. The organization’s sustainability plan is focused on increasing local support and awareness for CED projects through increased collaboration between clergy, community leaders, and other outside organizations through trainings and workshops needed for successful implementation and sustainability of the project. The detail sustainability plans for FACES project including the following actions are ongoing:

1. Collaboration: Partnerships, businesses and organizations both within and outside of the designated Weed and Seed community to develop economic development initiatives and decrease the involvement of residents in criminal activity.

2. Activities: Development of community activities to increase venues for relationship and support materials needed for clergy via website and newsletters.

3. Funding: Organizing a fundraising team to solicit funds both inside and outside the University Park Weed and Seed community and continued trainings on reporting requirements relating to funding.

4. Training: Scheduling and conducting trainings for clergy to increase awareness of resource availability, neighborhood conditions, and relationship building to foster advocacy for the FACES project.

5. Communication: Utilizing the website, newsletter, and other methods which promote effective communication.
IX. Results

The following section outlines the results of FACES and submitting analysis and recommendations to expand and/or duplication of the project.

Outlined in the Project Design/Logic Model in Section IV, the long term outcomes of FACES is to decrease incidents of crime, provide greater economic opportunity and increase the influence of the church. FACES developed, organized and implemented a number of activities that led to the completion of the Short Term Outcomes, as indicated below.

On Short Term Outcome 1 and 2:

- Enhance awareness of crime and economic condition in the community.
- Improve knowledge of CED based approaches and crime prevention strategies.

Output: 18 clergy members attend CED workshop.

Achievements: Eight pastors become aware of the community's crime and economic condition.

Six pastors attended the grant writing workshop; one pastor is writing a grant and a grant writing workshop has been held by a participating pastor in the CED workshop.

In a post-workshop survey done by Weed and Seed staff, 60% of pastors became somewhat familiar with crime prevention. 60% felt communications, i.e., web site and newsletter were needed. 80% received increased knowledge in economic development. 40% gained skills in managing a crime prevention program.

Challenges: Regarding clergy members schedules, FACES learned it was very time-consuming and difficult to organize ministers for this event. Staff underestimated the magnitude and barriers to organizing a group of pastors, spending numerous hours contacting and re-contacting pastors in the University Park Weed and Seed site to secure their attendance. While the process was time consuming, staff did manage to secure the attendance of 18 pastors for the daylong crime prevention and economic development workshop held at
the Barraque Street Baptist Church in Pine Bluff. The workshop was conducted by Dr. Jolan Rivera, School of Community and Economic Development at Southern New Hampshire University, Manchester, New Hampshire.

Learning: Talking with other clergy outside of the University Park Weed and Seed community, some has indicated an interest in supporting economic development and crime prevention initiatives. Additionally, FACES has been asked to speak to a Christian men’s group to encourage a greater role of their pastors in crime prevention and economic development. To date, one pastor, in the community has hosted two grant writing workshops.

Output: Six clergy members attended grant writing workshop to improve knowledge and skills.

Achievements: One clergy who attended grant writing workshop is applying for a grant.

On Short Term Outcome 3:

- Improved skills in managing CED and Crime Prevention Initiatives.

Output: Fourteen clergy members participated in CED and Crime Prevention training session.

Achievements: Clergy member received knowledge regarding the Logic Model and participated in developing a logic model to increase resources, knowledge and skills which changes behavior.

Challenges: While trying to accommodate schedules of clergy, staff finds it difficult to developed a regular schedule date to hold additional classes.

Learning: Because FACES found it very difficult to synchronize pastor’s schedules for meetings, staff has concluded to reach out to additional clergy in the community and replicate the CED and Crime Prevention training model across the city.
On Short Term Outcome 4 and 5:

- Increased access to organizational support.
- Improve venues for communication (web site, newsletter).

Output: Eight pastors attend community meeting, trained to access web site and develop newsletter and attended workshop to become familiar with grants and foundations.

Achievements: Clergy attended grant writing workshop; one clergy member is developing and writing a grant. Clergy attended Weed and Seed community meetings. Clergy member who received training in CED and crime prevention workshop has hosted two grant writing workshops at his church.

Challenges: The challenges are educating faith-based organizations to the separation of church and state when receiving federal funds.

Learning: Some clergy members are hesitant to receive federal funds because of the separation of church and state.

On Short Term Outcome 6:

- Increased access to financial resources.

Output: Eight pastors attend workshop to become familiar with grants and foundations.

Achievements: Clergy members attended workshop to become familiar with grants and foundations.

Challenges: Some clergy members are hesitant to receive federal funds because of the separation of church and state.

Learning: Some clergy members are hesitant to receive federal funds because of the separation of church and state.
X. Conclusions and Recommendations

Prospects of Attaining Intermediate and Long-Term Outcomes

Despite the primary challenges – educational and logistical – FACES staff believe that the project is in position to attain the intermediate and long-term outcomes. With the realization of a host of short-term outcomes, through training and workshops clergy will gain a greater appreciation for CED-based approaches and crime prevention programs. FACES staff believes the impact clergy has on the overall safety and economic development of the community can be realized through greater participation by clergy members. These outcomes may be long term and necessitate the commitment of additional staff and resources to be allocated to this effort. FACES believes that while this project required a tremendous amount of communication to implement; however, given adequate resources and the support of our host organization FACES will continue to strive for attaining the intermediate and long-term outcomes.

Personal Thoughts

Viewing this project from the perspective of a pastor, this author understands the real need for an increased involvement of clergy members in the community. The minister wants to lead and sometimes does not have the necessary skills in crime prevention or economic development to take on these issues. He or she is the one the community comes to for spiritual advice and direction; however, because they are not versed in CED or crime prevention this leaves him somewhat embarrassed for lack of knowledge and skills. This is found to be one reason why ministers are not engaged within the community. The FACES project is somewhat different from the view of traditional CED projects because the focus is on leaders of local churches rather than a local neighborhood. Clergy members have their own associations, conferences and conventions; most if not all of their gatherings don’t always address community economic development or crime prevention. As communities organize to impact change for their neighborhood in community development and crime prevention, the same approach is needed to engage the clergy. This
The author recognizes the influence and ability possessed by clergy members to change the moral direction of an individual’s life. The influences of clergy members have the potential to move a neighborhood out of poverty into a better quality of life. Rev. Leon Sullivan exemplifies this success as he organized in the sixties to train black kids in his church to achieve and later the organization became a premiere CDC that trained a large number of minority workers and developed their own manufacturing enterprise. Another way clergy could utilize the church would be a place for job training and resume preparation, among other things. Even with the success of Rev. Sullivan, Halpern’s writing makes a powerful reference point when he writes, "....different groups in society should not be forced to live together, support, or relate to each other against their will" [Suttles 1972]. With this in mind, FACES would be used to specifically encourage ministers to share power with female pastors, clergy members from smaller congregations, and different denominations in an effort to build a “clergy coalition” to advocate community building, economic development and crime prevention. However, this would not be forced upon the clergy.

Just as progressives sought explanations and responses to poverty in local communities, clergy members can be organized, educated and empowered to advocate against deteriorating housing, poverty, economic development and crime prevention as well. FACES organize clergy members for the expansion of their ministries through community development and crime prevention education. The task has not been easy; however, the benefit to congregations will be beyond measure. The FACES project will result in increased assets, a reduction in crime, and a restoration of pride in the neighborhood where these churches are located. Clergy promoting neighborhood building, new homes through CDCs can create neighborhood jobs and help people escape poverty as a result of clergy and church initiatives. Thus, coming together as clergy and using their influence to focus on economic development and crime prevention create businesses that can sustain the community, provide employment and reduce crime. Furthermore, it has become apparent that additional tools are needed to organized, plan and educate the Faith Community regarding the power of clergy to influence economic development and neighborhood crime.

There is a number of things clergy members can do to help reduce crime, e.g., encourage other pastors in their associations and alliances to develop and deliver sermons on respect for life, the impact homicides have on family, friends and community, hold special public prayer meetings to
voice opposition against crime and violence, organize and host three or four major town hall meetings to discuss crime and violence in the community and economic development. Pastors should meet with law enforcement officials on a regular basis for updates and general information. These meetings can be held at different churches to allow each pastor an opportunity to host a crime prevention session. Law enforcement and clergy should establish a “Citizens on Patrol Academy” to train clergy members to become (POPs) Pastors on Patrols and ride along with officers. Clergy can assist officers with domestic violence and other volatile family situations as needed. Establishing and placing crime boxes in rear of churches for individuals to write and submit “privately” suspicious and criminal activity within their neighborhood engages clergy as proactive members in reducing crime. Community economic development impacts the neighborhood by stabilizing and stimulating job creation that ultimately reduces crime.
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XI. Appendix B

Monitoring Reports
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Timeliness</th>
<th>Explanation for Delay</th>
<th>Alternative Action</th>
<th>Attainment of Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/Training in crime prevention and economic development awareness</td>
<td>Start: July 2009, End: August 2009</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group scheduling</td>
<td>One on one meetings</td>
<td>Eight pastors become aware of the community’s crime and economic condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TO DATE: October 31, 2009 Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops and Training in CED and crime prevention</td>
<td>Start: August 2009, End: August 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eight pastors trained in CED based approaches and crime prevention strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TO DATE: October 31, 2009 Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert in CED and crime prevention presents workshop and training sessions</td>
<td>Start: October 2009, End: October 2009</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expert presents workshop on CED</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eight pastors improve skills in managing CED and crime prevention initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>To Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Neighborhood Meeting</td>
<td>August 2009</td>
<td>February 2010</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>10/31/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop web site and newsletter</td>
<td>July 2009</td>
<td>Sept 2009</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>Website and Newsletter Completed</td>
<td>Website and Newsletter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant writing workshops and proposal writing</td>
<td>December 2009</td>
<td>December 2009</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Eight pastors attend workshop to become familiar with grants and foundations</td>
<td>December 04, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Explanation for Delay</td>
<td>Alternative Action</td>
<td>Attainment of Output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTO 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Decreased incidents of crime in University Park | Start: November 2009  
End: December 2009 |        |            |                       |                    | The percentage crime decreased during a one year period in University Park  
To Date: |
| LTO 2      |       |        |            |                       |                    |                     |
| Greater economic opportunity | Start: 02Feb2009  
End: 02Feb2009 |        |            |                       |                    | The number of new homes built and rehabilitated through Faith based housing development initiatives new and expanding businesses in University Park  
To Date: |
<p>| LTO 3      | Start: |        |            |                       |                    | The number of churches within |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased Church influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Park becoming engaged in CED and crime prevention as a result having an impact on quality of life issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMMEDIATE OUTCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased involvement in crime prevention and economic development in the University Park Weed and Seed site</td>
<td>Start: October 2009</td>
<td>End: October</td>
<td>One church offering grant writing workshop</td>
<td>The number of churches starting neighborhood watch groups hosting crime and economic development workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STO1</td>
<td>Start: October 2009</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>On Time</td>
<td>The number of pastors trained in crime prevention and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and economic development condition in the neighborhood</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To Date: 11/01, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Explanation for Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STO 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved knowledge of CED-based approaches and crime prevention strategies</td>
<td>Start: February 06, 2010</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Five clergy members replied by February 10, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STO 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved skills in managing CED and crime prevention initiatives</td>
<td>Start: February 06, 2010</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Five clergy members replied by February 10, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STO 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend community meetings improving access to organizational</td>
<td>Start:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure and network</td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STO 5**
Improved venues(s) for communication (website, newsletter, etc.)

**STO 6**
Increased access to financial resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>