*John I. Gilderbloom and
R. L. Mullins, Jr.*

The University as a Partner:

Rebuilding an Inner City Neighborhood

The University of Louisville's Housing & Neighborhood Development Strategies (HANDS) is a multifaceted program bringing the University's resources to bear on the problems of an impoverished African-American neighborhood. HANDS includes case management, job training, leadership development, education, home ownership, and community design. A mixture of successes and failures was found in each program area. This article focuses on the Community Design Team, composed of graduate students, which provided technical assistance such as conceptual housing designs, small-scale master plans, zoning approval documents, and numerous other services.

The City of Louisville, Kentucky, has a number of poor neighborhoods that have remained in poverty despite many federal assistance programs. This is the story of a university moving out of its academic confines and helping residents to revitalize their neighborhood. It describes the nature of university-community partnerships, presents a case study focusing on physical renewal, and discusses as well, the difference between this locally based approach and past grand-scale approaches to neighborhood revitalization.

How HANDS Got Started

Recent surveys of Louisville's citizens have shown that housing affordability is one of the most important issues confronting the city. Mayor Jerry Abramson, former President of the National Conference of Mayors, made affordable housing/neighborhood revitalization one of the top three priorities of his administration. The city has a substantial housing problem. In several Louisville neighborhoods, 25 percent of housing units are substandard compared to the national average of 5 percent. A majority of low income renters pays more than 50 percent of their income for housing. In the city of Louisville alone, 12 percent of the single family housing units and 13 percent of the multi-

family structures are estimated to be substandard. In 1991, over 12,000 persons requested emergency shelter. The imperative was clear.

The University of Louisville is an urban research institution whose faculty has probed the problems and opportunities confronting our cities. When the U.S. Department of Education announced its Urban Community Service Grant Program in January 1992, university researchers, in conjunction with community leaders, developed a proposal for neighborhood revitalization entitled Housing & Neighborhood Development Strategies (HANDS).

During a six-month period between January and July 1992, over 200 hours of meetings were held with numerous organizations and individuals to examine how an Urban Community Service Grant could build upon previous work. The purposes of the meetings were to establish a clear vision and create the partnership that would enable program execution. The final HANDS program emerged as a holistic approach to neighborhood revitalization addressing both its physical and human sides. Louisville's historic African-American Russell neighborhood was chosen as the focus of the grant because of the extent of need in the area. HANDS was designed to function as part of the Russell Partnership. The U.S. Department of Education (DoE) selected the HANDS program for funding from 1993 through 1995, and DoE recently provided another three years of funding from 1996 through 1998 for the University's Sustainable Urban Neighborhoods (SUN) program. This program will focus on economic development and expand its scope to new neighborhoods and partners.

The Russell Neighborhood

Russell contains approximately 10,000 residents. It is characterized by excessive poverty, unemployment, crime, and homelessness, along with relatively low levels of educational attainment and training.

Land pattern uses are best described as mixed. The neighborhood includes single and multifamily residences, commercial and industrial areas, and public uses such as community services and churches. Many structures have been razed, abandoned, or boarded up. Several blocks are without any viable structures. Pawn shops, liquor stores, and taverns abound, whereas supermarkets and pharmacies are nonexistent.

The Russell neighborhood is among the city's poorest. For example, 1990 census data indicate that in 1989, the poverty rate for households was 56 percent. Median household income in Russell is only 27 percent of that for

Louisville as a whole. Joblessness is particularly high in Russell, with an unemployment rate at 22 percent. Lack of education and training adds to the economic distress in the area, which has a high school dropout rate of 51 percent.

There is also a clear shortage of affordable housing in Russell, where, according to the 1990 census only 31 percent of residents are homeowners. For 34 percent of owned units, residents spend 30 percent or more of their income on owner costs. For renters it is worse: 52 percent of renters spend more than 30 percent of their incomes on gross rent.

The HANDS Program

What is the Russell Partnership? It is a multitude of programs, services, and activities working for residents of the Russell neighborhood. It is the programs of dozens of churches, activities of the city of Louisville, neighborhood schools, private development and rehabilitation, local businesses, and thousands of residents striving to achieve a better life. It is also the University of Louisville and HANDS. HANDS is only one member of the Russell Partnership. The partnership demonstrates that community organizations can work together with a university to help revitalize impoverished inner city neighborhoods.

The HANDS program includes a comprehensive case management system, educational assistance, job, minority contractor, and leadership opportunities and homeownership training, community design assistance, and evaluation. A mixture of successes and failures was found in many of these program areas.

Figure 1 illustrates some of the possibilities in our assessment of potential value-added activities from the HANDS program. The assessment is a subjective one based on the need for faculty and student involvement and the potential benefits, if any, each of these groups will receive as a result of their participation. A + indicates a positive impact, A - indicates a negative impact, and a 0 is neutral.

Using case management as an example, having teachers guide social service students through case management situations in the community can be an invaluable teaching tool. But taking theory into the streets may or may not have value for research: much depends on the quality of the data and the controls on the students—some data collected by the HANDS student case managers proved not useful or suspect. If the work is more than an educa-

tional experience and supports, for example, a non-profit service group try-
ing to improve service delivery to their customers, may also act as an excel-
lent service function for the university.

Job training was a notable failure, and computer training class failed to
generate needed enrollment and placement of those few who graduated. An
apprenticeship program, sponsored by local unions only graduated five indi-
viduals with one getting a job. Even though one of every four Russell resi-
dents was unemployed, a job readiness program had to be abandoned and
replaced with a program to train African American Kentucky Fried Chicken
employees to seek job advancement in the fast food franchise. We believe a
key reason these programs failed was a lack of faculty involvement: the
programs were either run by community organizations or staff.

Educational programs had mixed results. A separate $25,000 program to
support child care services while its few participants pursued their GED was
also unsuccessful. Programs to raise self-esteem among children seemed to
be somewhat successful, but other education-related programs were aborted
and residents were referred to existing programs with better track records.
The best return on investment was to provide scholarships for residents to
attend the local trade school, junior college, or university. Providing scholar-
ships for higher education institutions was far less expensive than a conven-
tional job training program. For example, a job training class ended up cost-
ing $5,000 per student, whereas the cost of attending the local junior college
for one semester would cost approximately $500, plus a little more if trans-
portation and child care were needed.

For a number of reasons the HANDS leadership training program was
also problematic. Attendance for the first year was strong with full classes,
but in the second year attendance fell, and the program was finally aban-
doned in the third year. One explanation was that the approximately 30 per-
sons enrolled represented the only persons interested in the program. But
more probable was the almost total lack of university faculty and student
participation in teaching leadership skills. Perhaps members of the University's
faculty (e.g., political science, law, sociology, and business) who do research
in leadership issues could have added more inspiring presentations or in-
creased the scope or breadth of training, thus bringing in a larger number of
students.

In responding to the challenges confronting their host communities, one
of the fundamental questions faculty and administrators must ask concerns

the scope of the university's involvement. The original HANDS proposal did not include the medical, dental, law, or engineering schools. These schools could easily have developed programs to meet community service needs. Even though there were extensive community meetings to define the scope of the University's grant participation, University participants were not fully knowledgeable about the range of support that all academic units could bring to help solve community problems.

We have stressed the notion of "value added" as one measure of whether the university is providing unique resources, talent, and capacity building to its community endeavors. Will the university be adding value to the project or process as a result of its participation in a community partnership? If not, can it provide technical assistance in obtaining grants or some other effort?

A second criterion is whether the university-community service fits into the traditional faculty assessment providing service, teaching, and research opportunities. Will the program involve students and faculty? University programs that simply fund community programs without involving faculty and students cannot be justified. Another measure concerns the chances of a program being successful. We chose to work, for the most part, with non-profit organizations that had a track record of success and demonstrated a cooperative attitude. Of the 40 different programs provided by HANDS, we were bound to find a mixture of failures, successes, and so-sos. While success is important, failure also provides an opportunity for the university and the community to learn from the experience. Osborne and Gabler (1992) have pointed out that documenting the problems and failures is another dimension to the value added by the university that is often absent from a majority of community programs. In addition, universities are in a much better position to take risks than their counterparts in business, government, and the community.

Some of the HANDS programs duplicated successful, established programs. This created a certain amount of tension among community, government, and business leaders. In addition, it introduced inefficiency into the system, because the HANDS staff had a learning curve while the established programs did not. As part of the ongoing evaluation process, grant resources were reallocated to take advantage of existing programs rather than "reinventing the wheel."

The most successful program areas have been homeownership training and community design. These are complementary programs, and this article

now focuses on the Community Design Team's (Team) efforts.

One of the Russell Partnership's primary goals is to attract moderate income families to live in the neighborhood by providing homeownership opportunities. "To break the cycle of poverty, we need to address housing first. And if we use housing as an entree, it's the nonprofit sector that has the desire to make it work..." (Garr, 1995).

Home ownership provides stability to the neighborhood population. It has a number of positive impacts on the neighborhood including creation of wealth. The psychic impacts of home ownership, while not unimportant, are difficult to quantify. For example, Rohe and Stegman (1994) indicate that home ownership does not, in itself, increase self-esteem, but can lead to increased life satisfaction and greater community involvement. Gilderbloom and Markham (1995) find that home owners are more likely to be better citizens because they vote more often in elections. We believe that if the community can attract family-owned rather than rental housing, businesses and other commercial enterprises will locate in the community. To borrow a line from the movie, *Field of Dreams*, "If you build it, they will come."

The team's mission is to help neighborhood leaders implement their vision of the future environment of Russell. Secondary goals are related to the university's urban mission. Students on the team are gaining practical planning experience, learning the value and problems associated with teamwork, learning more about the issues and politics of neighborhoods and local government, and helping raise the university's profile in the African-American community.

How the Community Design Team Works

The team is interdisciplinary in nature. It brings together individuals with diverse backgrounds in architecture, engineering, urban planning, sociology, and law. Its many perspectives allow the team to see the multiple facets of neighborhood problems and to bring cross-functional skills to bear on them.

Team members have adopted a consultant/client attitude toward helping neighborhood leaders. The focus is on what the client wants, not what team members believe is best. The team provides planning and related services that lower entry barriers to small and nonprofit developer participation in the local construction market. This approach allows them to compete with more established developers and builders.

Each project is approached in a similar manner: What does the client

want? The team reaches out to individuals, agencies, and other organizations and draws them into a partnership to flesh out the vision and develop options and assess impacts for the customer to consider. Once the client has chosen a course of action, team members help them open the partnership to draw in those parties with the resources to turn the vision into reality. Finally, all this is happening at the lowest possible organizational level, whether neighborhood or block.

Team members demonstrate that cooperation rather than confrontation is the key to success. Many people look at government agencies and regulatory bodies as obstacles to be overcome rather than as partners in action. Members of these organizations have been very willing to share their wisdom, advice, and resources, when asked.

The team, through innovative thinking and imaginative action, provides planning services and an integrative function that span the gaps among the professional world, developers, nonprofit corporations, government funding and regulatory agencies, academia, and neighborhood organizations.

Community Design Team Accomplishments

Community design activities have moved the university from the sidelines to the field a nontraditional role as a player-coach in the neighborhood. In its two years of operation, the team has accomplished a number of things. Some of the more notable achievements are described below.

Many improvements made in the name of efficiency have injured inner city neighborhoods. Examples include elimination of two-way streets with tree-lined sidewalks into broader, one-way thoroughfares, thereby turning a quiet neighborhood into the Indianapolis Motor Speedway at rush hour. Another example is routing expressways through vibrant, often poor, neighborhoods, carving them up, and leaving them to decay and die. Planning that is sensitive to the needs and circumstances of individual neighborhoods is essential if real change is to be achieved.

The team has proposed numerous planning reports in addition to providing various technical services to neighborhood agencies and organizations. The team has also worked to integrate the efforts of many agencies (see Figure 1) in the neighborhood redevelopment strategy.

Table 1
Assessment of Value-Added Activities by the HANDS Teams

Category	Teaching	Research	Service
Case Management	+	0	+
Education Assistance	+	0	+
Job Training	-	-	0
Leadership Training	-	-	0
Home ownership	+	+	+
Planning/Design Assistance	+	+	+

The first project completed by the team was a Phase I Development Plan for part of the Russell neighborhood. The plan includes residential, commercial, light industrial, and recreational components. The client was a new nonprofit developer, the Louisville Central Development Corporation (LCDC). The team worked extensively with the staff of the Urban Renewal Commission to ascertain requirements of the agency, and the LCDC obtained preferred developer designation from the commission on the strength of the plan the team prepared. This gives LCDC exclusive development rights in the area. An additional product in this phase was an AutoCAD database containing existing and projected future conditions. Approval by the Urban Renewal Commission was the first of many administrative and regulatory requirements.

In addition, approval is also required from the local Landmarks Commission and the State Historic Preservation Officer because there is an historic district in the neighborhood. The team prepared a separate report to obtain approvals from these bodies, a process that took several months. There were also several other required approvals from various boards, commissions, and agencies.

Another achievement involved housing construction. Ten houses were built with the team's planning assistance, and all were sold before construction was complete. Eight more houses are about to go under construction, and more are expected to be built. The team developed additional conceptual housing designs for use by developers. All designs were coordinated and approved by appropriate regulatory agencies. Small-scale developers and builders can add details, such as foundation plans and typical wall sections, to these plans and then use them for construction purposes, thus mini-

mizing the front-end costs of development. This lowers entry costs into the local construction market. The team also revised plans to make housing accessible to the elderly and disabled, and provided a variety of other services to help spur development.

All of the team's efforts have been guided by the comprehensive plan for Louisville and Jefferson County, as well as the neighborhood urban renewal plan. Using these as source documents, the team is better able to offer solutions for the neighborhood.

Hidden HANDS

HANDS has also been a catalyst for several other significant housing developments in Russell and adjacent neighborhoods. HANDS's work in this area has been largely hidden from the public eye which is, in certain cases, a political or bureaucratic necessity. The goal is not necessarily to get the credit but to get affordable, accessible, and attractive housing built in the most pragmatic and responsive manner. The lack of public credit hurts a project in the eye of local funders who want to see their groups acknowledged, and this is what Capek and Gilderbloom (1994) call the "backstage" of politics, often more important than the "frontstage."

HANDS has played a key role in working to save the 600-unit HUD Section 8 Village West Apartments in the Russell neighborhood from foreclosure and eventual demolition. This boarded up complex was not only an eyesore, but attracted crack cocaine addicts. Village West was the "gateway" to the Russell neighborhood, and other development efforts were hampered by the presence of the eyesore. HANDS worked with an ad hoc coalition of groups from the Legal Aid Society, Village West Residents Council, the Mayor, American Housing Communities, Louisville Central Development Corporation, Louisville Community Design Center, U.S. and City HUD, a major bank, and a well known nonprofit housing developer to revitalize the complex. If the complex is revitalized, each of these groups played a critical role in helping to save and renovate the development. For example, without the mayor's support or the organizing efforts of Village West residents, the project would long ago have been foreclosed. In addition, a nationally known nonprofit housing developer stepped in to save the tax credits and acquire the necessary funds for renovation. HANDS was a key interface between the community and government, along with the newly funded Sustainable Urban Neighborhood (SUN) program, which will continue to work on the project

by conducting surveys, coordinating environmental impact reviews, designing assistance, providing much needed job and educational programs, and helping with management. Hopefully, the Village West "business deal" will close in early 1996; it represents the most important accomplishment of HANDS.

The existence of the HANDS human service programs of educational opportunities, job training, leadership development, and case management also helped to satisfy government concerns that proper human services would be available to help the needy. This proved critical for the tax credit program operated by the Kentucky Housing Corporation. In addition, HANDS arranged the conversion of a separate 150-unit public housing project into condominiums. The U.S. Department of Education grant was used as leverage to successfully convince federal HUD to approve funds to convert a public housing project into affordable condominiums. Residents of the La Salle Place condominiums, two miles south of Russell were also given the HANDS home ownership counseling program, home repair program, and opportunities for job, education, and leadership training. This conversion offered public housing tenants the opportunity to purchase one-bedroom condominiums priced at $18,000 for mortgage payments of less than $200 a month for 30 years.

Another positive function of HANDS has been the public availability of its "approved" housing designs which have been used by other non-profit housing groups. In one case a former member of the Community Design team recycled a team report and design, and was the lead person in getting a 10-unit housing development approved for a church-based nonprofit community development corporation.

Finally, three members of the HANDS Community Design Team have helped resurrect a formerly defunct, nonprofit development corporation and are obtaining city approval to rehabilitate up to 45 housing units in the Russell neighborhood. The nonprofit housing developer has teamed up with a minority developer and real estate salesman to make the project a success. Their hope is to bring in more single family housing developments to Russell and adjacent neighborhoods. Without HANDS' exposure to the Russell neighborhood and its knowledge of government programs, this effort would not have been possible.

The team's efforts are a small part of the overall renaissance in Russell. Today millions of dollars in public and private funds are being invested in the Russell area. The city of Louisville has budgeted roughly $10 million for

Russell, $1.1 million in public improvements, and $8,900,000 in rehabilitation programs. Another $10 million has been spent on the development of the 150-rental unit Hampton Place. In addition, the city has designated Russell and two other neighborhoods as eligible for up to $600,000 from a community housing development corporation to build new single family housing for households earning up to $27,000 per year. The city is also funding a city-wide homestead program, repairs for elderly and disabled persons' homes, and a rehabilitation investor program. Because the neighborhood has organized, Russell is taking advantage of these city-wide programs.

In a neighborhood that has had little building activity in the past 30 years, Russell recently witnessed a 150-unit middle income rental housing apartment complex, 24 houses built by Habitat for Humanity, ten houses built by the Louisville Central Development Corporation, another eight houses under construction, ten houses completed by the Louisville Urban League's REBOUND program, and more than 40 housing units being rehabilitated by other developers. The University's Community Design Team has been a vital part of many of these efforts.

Reaction to HANDS

Reaction to the overall HANDS program has been mixed. Several leading "majority-controlled" housing organizations have been particularly hostile. They tried to prevent the grant from being submitted. After it was funded they carried on a campaign to discredit the viability and accomplishments of the program. These groups believed their power to broker resources was being challenged. Moreover, they feared competition for scarce resources from local foundations that are needed for matching funds on many grants. On the other hand, minority housing organizations have been generally receptive to the program.

Others believe that white planners, developers, and contractors should not be involved in African-American economic development efforts. Still others worry that the market demand for housing is not large and HANDS-assisted housing development might absorb the demand and leave other housing developments without buyers. Finally, there is the pessimistic view of writers such as Rusk (1993) that it is a waste of resources to try to renew an inner city neighborhood and that African-Americans should be encouraged to move to white suburban areas.

Local government agencies have been positive about the focus the Com-

munity Design Team brought to development efforts in the neighborhood. Because team members, although graduate students, are licensed professionals working in the community, they bring a breadth of development knowledge and a cooperative approach to various projects that eases the administrative burden on government staff elements.

HANDS has become an important partner in the Russell renewal effort and has received national recognition. The editors of the Harvard Journal of African-American Public Policy said that HANDS provides an "innovative approach" to solving inner city problems. HANDS has also been the subject of a video documentary prepared by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. President Clinton and HUD Secretary Cisneros have recognized HANDS as a potential national model for neighborhood revitalization. HANDS was also recently featured in the American Planning Association's *Planning* magazine and in a HUD video and book that promote bottom-up planning. Despite these accolades, not all media coverage has been positive. The local newspaper, while generally running favorable articles, did a story on the shortcomings of the first year of HANDS. They highlighted the fact that many of the three year goals in the jobs and education programs could not be realistically achieved. This was accounted for in the ongoing evaluation program that resulted in the refocusing or termination of these programs.

Ongoing Evaluation of the HANDS Program

Ongoing evaluation plays a crucial function in the HANDS program, helping the HANDS project, in general, and the Community Design Team, in particular, to stay focused on project and customer goals. Two groups have been established to provide ongoing advice to the HANDS program, a Community Advisory Team and a National Advisory Team. The Community Advisory Team is composed of neighborhood residents, community leaders, and former HANDS clients who work with HANDS staff to identify the needs and problems of residents and assess planned program strategies and directions. Derek Bok, former President of Harvard University, Vincent Lane, former Chairman of the Chicago Housing Authority, Roger Hamlin of Michigan State University, Marilyn Melkonian, President of Telesis Corporation, national investigative reporter Mark Dowie, and Don Terner, President of BRIDGE Housing Corporation, are the members of the National Advisory

Team.

We have prepared an initial assessment of the existing types and conditions of structures in the target area of the Russell neighborhood, including measures of housing quality and condition based on census and physical survey data. Periodic assessments of the growth of new business, new housing construction, and related economic development measures will be made throughout the duration of the project. These measures will establish changes in important quality of life indices within the target community. Because important baseline information has been established at the outset of the program, we can accurately estimate program impacts within the community.

Distinguishing HANDS from Previous Efforts

The HANDS program cannot at this time be examined in exhaustive detail because it is still under way. Its long-term accomplishments are still unknown. But it is possible to idenify what makes HANDS different from top-down programs that have failed in the past. Such efforts seemed to fail because of some combination of the following factors: (1) inappropriate planning leadership to unrealistic program expectations, (2) failure to involve program recipients in a true partnership in the planning and execution phases, and (3) lack of foresight to plan for and an inability to contend with politics during implementation. The last factor may be the most important.

The expectations for HANDS were determined by community leaders, residents, local government officials, and members of the private and nonprofit sectors. While goals were high, they were established by the people charged with achieving them: neighborhood residents and leaders. By contrast, the goals of past endeavors such as the Community Action Program (CAP) and Model Cities were originally determined by presidential task forces. Their vision was for a nation, and the programs used large sums of federal money and minimal local investment. They covered large sections of cities or regions, and tried to be flexible enough to suit every need, while remaining structured enough to ensure accountability. This is impossible because of the varied needs of communities and levels of sophistication in governance across the country. Nor were HUD officials in Washington able to integrate the programs and functions of various agencies into a single coherent program. In its new programs HUD is now advocating a local focus, planning from the bottom and working up through the system as opposed to imposing plans

from the top down; this is the approach HANDS has taken. As a result goals can be realized and success can be more readily defined for a single neighborhood than for a national program.

Such planning is vital to the success of an undertaking like the Russell Partnership. Too often individuals or small organizations have a desire to accomplish a worthy goal such as revitalizing their neighborhood, but they lack the skills to put together a plan, and the expertise to make it happen. HANDS was able to provide the necessary expertise.

A second factor that has led to the failure of past programs is the lack of true partnerships that involve program recipients in the planning and execution phases. Many grassroots organizations have difficulty determining the stakeholders in the process. Partnership consists of pulling together all of those with a stake in the enterprise and the resources to effect positive change.

However, the partnership that is one of the greatest strengths of the HANDS program may also be its most serious problem. HANDS relies on a fragile coalition for continuity and accomplishment—if the coalition falters, then the program may falter as well. Constant nurturing is needed by the parties to keep the partnership vital, active, and responsive to the needs of the neighborhood and its residents. The Russell Partnership is evolving so that it can continue to be responsive to the needs of the neighborhood. New partners come and old ones go: it is a process that ebbs and flows as needed. It is easier to integrate this program at the local level because most planners know each other. The university minimizes bureaucratic in-fighting among agencies by constantly attending to the needs of the various partnership groups.

The third factor contributing to past failures has been the lack of foresight to plan for and an inability to contend with the local political process during implementation.

The 5 "Ps" of Success

To the two "Ps" of success, planning and partnership, three more can be added: perseverance, perspiration, and passion.

Perseverance is the ability to see an enterprise through to its logical, and hopefully successful, conclusion. It requires an empowered group to make things happen and to stay with the effort. The process of getting through the grants business is long and arduous, and many nonprofit organizations do not have the patience or believe they have the power required to see these efforts through to completion. In many cases, they must seize the power them-

selves, and HANDS charted a number of processes for Partnership members to show them that all things take time.

Perspiration is often a forgotten ingredient. It is a willingness to do the tedious, mundane, little things yourself that make a project successful. It is a willingness to work late nights, weekends, and holidays. Planning documents, house plans, planning and zoning approvals, and permits don't just magically appear. It requires a sustained and determined effort on the part of many people, some paid, some volunteers, to make it happen.

Passion is woven through each of the other "Ps" and binds them together. It is that intense, burning belief that what you are doing is important. Without it, the revitalization effort is sure to die. Passion permeates and inspires the plan. Passion draws together groups of people and organizations into a partnership that has little prospect for a large profit, but the chance for a better life for residents. Passion gives one the energy to persevere when a key backer leaves the partnership or a promise is not kept. Passion gives the energy to continue to work and sweat, knowing that the cause is just and that the effort is what will make it succeed.

HANDS is more than a cute acronym; it has a much deeper meaning. HANDS symbolizes partnerships of people (black and white, old and young, rich and poor) coming together and cooperating to serve the community good. When a partnership unites under a singular vision, lives and communities can be rebuilt. The goals, objectives, and dreams belong to the community. Goals are set to more realistic budgets established at the local level. Changes to programs can be made quickly by local decision makers. HANDS demonstrates that incremental strategies are feasible and have the potential to make a real difference in the lives of neighborhood residents.

HANDS is having a small but positive effect on housing supply by helping developers selectively add to the housing stock rather than endorsing wholesale clearance of land and plowing under neighborhoods. Design and construction are being accomplished by pooling the assets and wisdom of many actors, both inside and outside government. Because of the nature of funding (a heavy reliance on private sector capital for construction) and the partnership, the HANDS program uses the discipline of the market to propel it forward. It also reduces adverse environmental impacts by using the existing infrastructure of roads, sewers, electricity, water and gas lines, and inhibits ecologically unsound urban sprawl.

What can the Russell neighborhood become? Its destiny is limited only by the imagination and energy of its residents and the resources available to its leaders. The success of the Russell Partnership depends on maintaining a fragile coalition of public, private, nonprofit, and university players who must remain focused on serving their customers in the neighborhood. The University of Louisville has a continuing role as facilitator to ensure that all actors are focused on the shared vision, derive some benefit from their participation in the partnership, empower the residents, and keep bureaucracy to a minimum. It demonstrates that urban universities with planning programs can bring their creative and technical resources to community leaders. Urban research universities with planning programs should take active roles in helping their communities by supplying the knowledge and assistance that so many small organizations desperately need.

NOTE: We wish to thank Russ N. Sims for providing background information for this article. Dr. Thomas S. Lyons, AICP, provided helpful comments on an earlier draft.

Suggested Readings

Capek, S., and Gilderbloom, J. I. *Community Versus Commodity: Tenants and the American City*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.

Frieden, B. J., and Kaplan, M. . *The Politics of Neglect: Urban Aid from Model Cities to Revenue Sharing*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1975.

Garr, R. *Reinvesting in America: The Grassroots Movements that are Feeding the Hungry, Housing the Homeless, and Putting Americans Back to Work*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1995.

Gilderbloom, J. I., and Markham, J. P. "The Impact of Homeownership on Political Beliefs. *Social Forces*. 18(3), 1995: 350-364.

Gilderbloom, J. I., and Wright, M. T. "Empowerment Strategies for Low-Income African American Neighborhoods." *Harvard Journal of African American Public Policy*, 2, 1995: 77-95.

Lindblom, C. E. "The Science of 'Muddling Through.'" In A. Faludi (Ed.), *A Reader in Planning Theory*, Oxford: Pergamon Press. 1959: 151-169.

Osborne, D., and Gaebler, T. *Reinventing Government*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co. , 1992.

Peirce, N. R., and Guskind, R. *Breakthroughs: Re-creating the American City*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research., 1993.

Rohe, W., and Stegman, M.A. The effects of homeownership on the self-esteem perceived control and life satisfaction of low-income people. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 60(2), 1994: 173-184.

Rusk, D. *Cities Without Suburbs*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 1993.

Stone, C. N., and Sanders, H. T. *The Politics of Urban Development*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1987.

Publisher's Advice to Contributors . . .

Our Editor is pleased to provide a detailed guide to the style and preparation of *MU* articles. This condensation is based on his *Guidelines for Contributors*.

Content. *MU* articles should be provocative and challenging, but above all useful. Readers – mostly university administrators and faculty – want to know what works, so they can apply it at their institutions. *MU* is a forum for discussion, not a place to publish original research. Be rigorous but engaging. Write in the first person and include personal experiences and anecdotes. Footnotes are discouraged; if you need to cite references, do so in the text. Please include a short bio and list of readings.

Stylistics. Manuscripts should be about 4,000 words, typed double-spaced on 8.5 x 11 paper, flush left and unjustified, with no hyphenation. Two copies of the manuscript should be submitted with a diskette using WordPerfect 5.0 or higher for IBM PCs. (Please see *Call for Contributions* on p. 4.)

We are guided by *The Chicago Manual of Style*, but flexible. Our goal is readability and consistency, but copy editing is light. If you use British spellings, for instance, we'll leave them that way. Some authors may sprinkle commas more liberally than others. So be it. However, if you can observe the following conventions, it will greatly reduce the number of changes we have to make to set your article in type.

- Place the author's name first, with no "by." Place the title second, followed by subtitle, if any. We cannot handle long main titles, so use a subtitle if you need to.
- Always use upper and lower case titles, not all caps. Use intital caps for key words in each title.
- Center main subheads ("A-Heads"), but do not underscore them, bold them, or italicize them. Just center them. Our program takes care of the rest.
- Place secondary subheads ("B-Heads") flush left on a line by themselves. Again, don't underscore, bold, italicize, or use all caps – just initial caps for key words.
- Don't leave a space between paragraphs. Use the tab key to indent new paragraphs. Never use the space bar to indent paragraphs.
- It's difficult to italicize text in WordPerfect. If you do, thanks, but if you just underscore words to be italicized, we'll take it from there.
- Use the spell-checker before saving copy. Its vocabulary is limited, but it avoids some needless errors.
- Use bullets (like these) when making a list, rather than numbers, dashes, or whatever. If you are not bullet-literate, use asterisks.
- Here, at the Publisher's Office, we do Windows, but not research. If you cite publications but leave pages or dates for us to fill in, we omit them.
- Please have any tables or diagrams set up camera-ready.

A few grammaticisms. We prefer to see a comma before the final "and" in a series, but accept consistent anomalies. Please spell out in full the first use of any person or institution before using acronyms or last names. Don't use Dr. or Ph.D. Read up on the juxtaposition of periods, commas, colons, semi-colons, quotes, parentheses. Also on numbers, arabic and spelled-out; capitalization; gerunds; split infinitives. . . .

Cavils notwithstanding,

We welcome your contribution!