



Enlisting Leaders in Community Change: The UHI Fellows Program

The UHI created the Fellows Program to enlist the tactical and strategic assistance of influential policy makers and community leaders to the cause of improving the health and safety of children. In what ways were the Fellows involved in the local UHI efforts? Did the Fellows Program create a lasting cadre of influential supporters for the UHI sites? What were the challenges to engaging senior-level volunteers in meaningful ways?

Updated July 2005

About the Urban Health Initiative

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) established the Urban Health Initiative (UHI) in 1995 to determine whether a concerted, collaborative effort can bring about region-wide improvements in multiple measures of child health and safety. Five cities were chosen to implement UHI. These cities and their respective UHI campaigns are:

- Baltimore's Safe and Sound Campaign
- Mayor's Time (Detroit)
- Safe Passages (Oakland)
- Philadelphia Safe and Sound
- Youth Matters (Richmond)

UHI campaigns work to implement proven programmatic strategies at such a large scale that citywide statistics will improve significantly. To do that, UHI campaigns must be change agents to secure systemic policy and fiscal changes necessary to get strategies to that scale.

The UHI was designed to be non-prescriptive, allowing communities to craft implementation plans based on local conditions without assumptions, mandates or imperatives set forward by RWJF, which made a ten-year funding commitment.

The National Program Office (NPO) based in Seattle provides guidance, technical assistance and oversight to the local UHI campaigns in a number of areas including research, management, systems change and communications. The NPO also helps campaigns attract and develop the local leaders essential to bring about and sustain change in their cities. Former Seattle Mayor Charles Royer is national program director.

About the UHI's Lessons Learned Project

The UHI has learned a great deal with regard to developing change agent organizations and securing change in large cities. The NPO is working to catalogue these lessons so they can benefit future change agent organizations and their funders. As of July 2005, these papers had been written (and more are in the works):

- Political Strategizing in a Constantly Changing Environment
- Sustainable Funding for Program Strategies
- Developing Local Infrastructure: The Salience of Muddling Through
- Using Data in the Decision-Making Process
- The Experience of an Intermediary in a Complex Systems-Change Initiative:
The Urban Health Initiative's National Program Office
- Reflections on the Start-Up of the Urban Health Initiative
- The Origins of the Urban Health Initiative
- Communications Planning by Change Agents

All papers can be found on the UHI's website, www.urbanhealth.org. Comments, suggestions and questions about the UHI Lessons Learned Project are welcome. Contact Jerry VanderWood, UHI Director of Communications, at 206-616-3692 or jerryvw@u.washington.edu.

Enlisting Leaders in Community Change: The UHI's Fellows Program

By Jack Kresnak and Jerry VanderWood¹

Introduction

According to Philadelphia City Councilwoman Blondell Reynolds Brown, proponents of large-scale public policy initiatives must engage key champions—or “possibility thinkers”—in diverse arenas who can help spearhead reform. As a Fellow of the Urban Health Initiative (UHI), Robert Wood Johnson Foundation’s 10-year effort to spur measurable improvements in children’s health and safety in five U.S. cities, Brown is just such a thinker.

A community activist with a master’s degree in education, Brown vowed to make children and youth a centerpiece of her work as a councilwoman. Leaders of the UHI and its local site, Philadelphia Safe and Sound, approached her about becoming a Fellow after she had held office for just 12 months. According to Brown, her affiliation with Safe and Sound gave her “strategies and tools to honor my pledge.” As a UHI Fellow, she has traveled to observe successful examples of fundamental reform in cities such as San Diego and Chicago, and has applied the resulting insights as both a councilwoman and a strategic ally of policies championed by Philadelphia Safe and Sound.

“Safe and Sound had clearly defined and distinguished itself as a laser-beam, big-picture entity,” Brown asserts. But the second step was to “build a network of believers” who would help Safe and Sound redirect public policy and funding to improve the lives of children.

Building that network is one of the goals of the UHI’s Fellows Program.

To achieve the systems change necessary to get their programmatic strategies to scale, originators of the UHI knew the work could not be completed solely by paid staff at local sites. What was needed was a way to enlist the tactical and strategic assistance of influential policy makers and community leaders who had either an expertise in certain program areas or an enthusiasm for changing how and through whom services for children are delivered. The UHI’s National Program Office (NPO) created the Fellows Program to enlist knowledgeable partners in the cause of improving the health and safety of urban children. In particular, the NPO sought to enlist partners who would expand the local sites’ network.

Historically, fellowships have been awarded either to young people - grad students or people just beginning their careers - or to mid-career professionals seeking to re-think their choices or reinvigorate their vocations. What the UHI sought for its Fellows Program were seasoned leaders with significant experience in fields related to the initiative’s goals, professionals who could be counted on for good, honest advice and advocacy for the initiative.

The result is a “network of believers” that has helped UHI sites achieve vital policy and funding goals and propelled children’s issues to a higher priority within their cities. This

¹ About the authors: Jack Kresnak is an award-winning journalist with the Detroit Free Press and a UHI Fellow. Jerry VanderWood is Director of Communications for the UHI’s National Program Office. Sandra Hackman also contributed to this report.

paper describes some of the ways the Fellows Program advanced the UHI's agenda, and the factors that seemed to facilitate a meaningful relationship between individual Fellows and the local UHI site. It also discusses ways in which the program didn't work, as not every Fellow had a positive experience or contributed in a significant way, and not every UHI site was able to mine the talents and expertise of the Fellows.

Comparison of Fellows programs

The UHI Fellows Program and other fellowships, such as the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Children and Family Fellowship, have similar overall purposes:

- UHI Fellows Program: "...to expand the involvement and support of a broad group of leaders in the work of the UHI..."²
- Casey Children and Family Fellowship: "...to increase the pool of leaders with the vision and ability to frame and sustain major system reforms..."³

However, the UHI Fellows Program differs in many ways from those that may be considered more traditional fellowships. Perhaps the most obvious difference is that the UHI Fellowship is unpaid. In contrast, Casey's Children and Family Fellowship pays a stipend of up to \$95,000 per year. The Casey stipend pays the salary of a Fellow who takes a sabbatical to serve in a new policy-related position. UHI Fellows do not leave their current positions.

The contrasts in stipends and sabbaticals are a reflection of a fundamental difference between the UHI Fellows Program and others: The Casey Fellowship seeks to develop leaders for the future; the UHI program seeks to engage current leaders in the work of its sites now. Other distinctions between the two programs are:

- The Fellows and their leadership development are the focus of the Casey program. With the UHI program, the focus is the work of the UHI sites and how Fellows could help the sites achieve their systems change goals.
- Although the Casey Fellows have much professional experience, the Fellowship is to "foster the capacity of individuals to lead institutions and systems." But the UHI program is for individuals who already lead institutions and systems, or have the ability to influence them. In other words, the Casey program is geared toward emerging leaders whereas the UHI program is primarily for current leaders, although some emerging leaders have roles as well in the UHI effort.
- The Casey Fellowship is structured so that the Fellows are placed in specific human services policy jobs. The UHI Fellowship is unstructured. In cooperation with the local UHI site, UHI Fellows have to be actively involved in creating their own paths for involvement.

Program structure

The NPO, with advice from the executive directors, Boards and other civic leaders within the site cities, identified potential fellows every two years. The NPO then interviewed and selected the Fellows. In some cases the selected Fellows were unknown by the site executive directors; in other cases the Fellows were nominated by the executive director.

² Urban Health Initiative, Fellows' nomination documents

³ <http://www.aecf.org/fellowship/>

The selection of the Fellows by the NPO helped establish a sense of independence among the Fellows, and helped assure that the Fellows included some individuals from different spheres of influence than the site executive directors and boards.

“We hoped to attract people in the Fellows program who moved in different circles from the executive director and board chair; people who could represent the thinking of people who weren’t in this kind of field or who could open doors that site staff and boards could not.”

-Cindy Curreri, UHI National Program Deputy Director

Fellows came from diverse fields - law, child welfare, education, politics, business, communications/marketing, health and others. The NPO also worked to diversify the group of fellows to reflect the ethnic populations in the five site cities. Three Fellows classes were selected in 1999, 2001 and 2003. About four Fellows per site per class were selected.

The NPO hired a Leadership Programs Director who was to keep lines of communication open with each group of fellows. The leadership director also organized programs for the Fellows when they were invited to national meetings or UHI site visits, and tracked the involvement of the Fellows on behalf of the NPO. Costs of the Fellows Program (primarily Fellows’ travel) were covered by the NPO out of its operating budget.

Fellows were not paid a stipend, but the NPO thanked them by paying for travel and lodging to the annual meeting usually held in resort locations, often in sunny and warm climates. Other national events Fellows were invited to included an annual leadership retreat and an annual Inter-City Leadership Visit (ICLV), during which contingents from each site visited a non-UHI city to explore its systems change efforts. Fellows were paid honorariums if they participated as presenters during these events.

These national meetings were designed to deepen the Fellows’ understanding of the goals and strategies of the UHI and its local sites, expose the Fellows to a national network of similarly-minded leaders, strengthen their relationships with their home city’s civic leadership, and broaden their knowledge of the ways in which communities and systems can change.

One of these national meetings involved orientation to the UHI for new Fellows. The first of these orientations still stands out in the minds of many who attended it. What Fellows said they remembered most about the initial meeting was a get-acquainted session before dinner at which NPO Director Charles Royer asked each of them to describe themselves in terms unrelated to professional or career achievements.

“Charley asked everyone to stand up and not give a traditional introduction to who they are but to challenge people to speak from the heart about why this is so important to them. The first couple of people who spoke were just very moving and all the dominoes fell. It was one of the most moving nights I’ve been through.”

-Jeff Gallagher, UHI Fellow (Richmond), Vice President and General Counsel, Lyotropic Therapeutical, Inc.

In addition to the national meetings, some Fellows also attended site visits (to cities other than their home city) with NPO and RWJF leadership. The Fellows provided candid feedback on the progress of the visited site, and advice on overcoming challenges the site faced. They were paid modest honorariums for this work.

While the NPO managed the leadership development aspect of the program, the local executive directors were responsible for working with the Fellows to create ongoing or ad hoc involvement in the activities of the sites. How this involvement worked depended greatly on the sites' executive directors. The involvement of the Fellows at the local level and the challenges of the two-tiered (NPO and local site) administration of the program will be discussed later in this document.

Roles of Fellows

Because the UHI Fellowship is a generally unstructured program, Fellows had to work with the local site or the NPO to carve out their particular role. Fellows made significant contributions in the following areas:

Political networking: Several local elected officials, such as Philadelphia's Blondell Reynolds Brown mentioned above, were selected as UHI Fellows. These Fellows helped sites achieve major legislative goals. For example, Sheila Dixon, UHI Fellow and president of the Baltimore City Council, promoted a number of policy issues important to Baltimore Safe and Sound, such as a successful 2005 measure to earmark a significant amount of the City government's budget surplus to youth development programs.

It is important to note that elected officials are a "target audience" of policy-based efforts such as the UHI sites, and that many of these officials came to office with youth issues as a top priority. Therefore, some relationship between the site and the officials may have naturally existed. However, the fellowship deepened the site's relationship with these policymakers. The sites gained legislative "champions", and the policymakers gained new knowledge and ideas with which to pursue a child-friendly legislative agenda that matched the site's policy goals.

Systems access: Among the UHI Fellows were leaders from the large systems and agencies with whom the sites seek to collaborate, including school superintendents, directors of local and state health and human service agencies, United Way directors and more. As with the policymakers, the Fellowship deepened a relationship that might have naturally existed between the site and the agency leader – but the Fellowship facilitated a more robust and mutually beneficial flow of ideas and information between the site and the agency.

For example, Alba Martinez became a Fellow in Philadelphia when she was executive director of Congreso de Latinos Unidos, a social service agency. She subsequently became Philadelphia's Commissioner of Human Services, and now is the president of the Southeastern Pennsylvania United Way. During her tenure as commissioner, the department significantly increased its emphasis on prevention of social problems, rather than remediation.

"The fellowship helped prepare me for the job of running the child welfare system for the city. It was instrumental in helping me understand some of the architecture of the system that I was going to run."

-Alba Martinez, UHI Fellow (Philadelphia), President, Southeastern Pennsylvania United Way

Not only did Fellows help the sites gain access within individual bureaucracies, they also helped the sites bring systems together in new ways. It was their connections with each other - made possible by their participation as Fellows - that helped the initiative accomplish changes in ways that could not have been proscribed by either NPO or site leaders. For example, the Alameda County Social Services Agency and the Oakland Police Department

are now working together in a coordinated way, and the local school district, health care institutions and the City are overcoming somewhat testy relations to break through the inertia that prevents significant change.

The Fellows played key roles in simply bringing together people from different systems who were unfamiliar with each other.

“I, literally, introduced for the first time the director of Head Start and the director of early childhood pre-school in the district. It was crazy that they didn’t know each other, but now they get together all the time.”

-Kate Dowling, UHI Fellow (Oakland), former executive director of the Marcus A. Foster Educational Institute, Oakland

Site advocacy: Some Fellows helped introduce the local sites and their goals and strategies to key audiences. For example, Fellows in Richmond came from the business community, the education system, the legal community and philanthropic organizations. They helped steer the Richmond site (Youth Matters) toward its goal of getting kids reading at grade level by third grade. Corporate partnerships were seen as critical to the success of Youth Matters and Fellows from the business community helped convince corporate leaders that the economic future of the area was at stake if urban children were not educated well enough to become employees when they grow up.

“It really rallied the business community in recognizing early childhood education and preparedness as something that’s going to be a vital component to our community success long-term. It really drove home the fact that data are crucial and we need to move away from anecdotal analyses to more quantifiable facts that can drive better planning and policy development.”

-Greta Harris, UHI Fellow (Richmond), Senior Program Director, Local Initiatives Support Corporation

Site leadership: In some cases Fellows took on other leadership positions at the sites – as site staff, Board members or Board chairs. The Fellowship was the learning curve that made these transitions effective. In Richmond, for example, all the Fellows became part of the site’s Executive Committee.

When I came on as a Fellow there was a tremendous number of activities going on. I came to a meeting once a month, sometimes twice a month and there was so much stuff to be talked about that I just didn’t put it together. But now, the Fellows meet with and serve as part of the Youth Matters executive committee. That made sense to me, as the people who serve in the role of Fellow tend to be well known people who bring to the table some benefit of who they are and/or what their position is.

-Jon King, UHI Fellow (Richmond) and Advisory Board Chair for Youth Matters, President and CEO, Exclusive Staffing Companies

Advice and tactical support: Fellows served in myriad ways as implementers of ad hoc strategies. For example, when Detroit was electing a new mayor in 2002, UHI Fellows took the lead in holding a Mayoral Forum for candidates that was co-sponsored by The Youth Connection (the UHI campaign that was later renamed Mayor’s Time). Fellows

Mike Tenbusch, executive director of Think Detroit, Elizabeth Barton, associate director of the Center for Peace and Conflict Studies at Wayne State University, and Jack Kresnak, journalist with the Detroit Free Press, played instrumental roles in creating the event that helped the Detroit site establish a valuable relationship with the winner of the election, Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick.

The Fellows often served as advisors for the site executive director, outside of the more formal decision-making process of the site board of directors.

“As a Fellow you get to help to be the brains. Being on the board meant you actually had to do the work. I found being a Fellow much more fulfilling than most board experiences. When Grenaé (Dudley, Mayor’s Time executive director) had us meeting monthly, I really felt we were a group of smart, passionate people helping to guide her in making good decisions.”

-Mike Tenbusch, UHI Fellow (Detroit), CEO, Think Detroit

Advice and counsel for NPO: The Fellows’ activities were largely for the benefit of the local site. But some Fellows also assisted the national program office, particularly as participants in annual site visits. Because of their familiarity with the goals and approaches of the UHI, these Fellows were able to help the NPO assess, and make recommendations regarding, the progress of sites.

“One thing you don’t get out of the foundation world is a lot of candor. When you’re making grants to people, they’re telling you pretty much what they think you want to hear. It really helps to have a number of eyes and ears in these communities. People who kind of know what you’re trying to do. They can give you honest feedback and honest feedback from knowledgeable people is just priceless in this business.”

-Charles Royer, UHI National Program Director

Lessons Learned

Although many Fellows made valuable contributions to the work of the local UHI sites and benefited from leadership development activities, the experience was not positive for every Fellow. And, local site directors differed with regard to the amount of value they placed on the Fellows Program. This is perhaps not surprising, given the voluntary and unstructured nature of the fellowship. However, there are some aspects of the program that, if tweaked, could improve the odds that a Fellow and local site find mutual benefit.

Fellows’ leadership development. Although it was unpaid, the Fellowship provided participants with significant opportunities for leadership development. Plus, they had the opportunity to participate in an ambitious and innovative effort to improve the conditions of kids in their cities.

By and large, Fellows interviewed for this report said they were honored to be a part of the initiative and excited about making positive changes in their communities. They admired the wisdom of RWJF’s remarkable and unprecedented 10-year commitment to the five cities.

They noted successes in their cities and gave credit to the UHI vision of how to initiate changes in systems serving children. And, they felt personally enriched and empowered by the UHI's national meetings where they could network with other professionals committed to similar causes and learn how other communities succeeded or what strategies worked or didn't work.

“Another thing is the emphasis that the NPO put on best practices and data-driven strategies, which I think has really raised the bar in Oakland, thinking through how things get funded and why people take the approaches they do.”

-Andrea Youngdahl, UHI Fellow (Oakland), Director,
Department of Human Services, City of Oakland

Selection process. The process to select Fellows would have benefited from greater interaction between the NPO and the local sites. One of the NPO's goals in being the selector was to assure that many Fellows were from outside the existing network of the local site directors. Although a valid goal, it sometimes created situations in which Fellows and local directors had no common frame of reference, and lasting relationships and avenues for involvement did not develop.

Consultation between the NPO and sites increased during the selection of the second and third Fellows classes; the selection process became more strategic and based on the specific needs of a site. As a result, the second and third Fellows classes included more senior/executive level individuals. Although this was generally considered a positive evolution of the selection process, some site directors maintained a preference for selecting individuals they were familiar with, and resisted expanding their networks.

More collaboration between the NPO and site directors might have been made, with greater joint consideration of those sectors that the site still needed to get on its “team”. This could fulfill the goal of expanding the site director's network, while avoiding difficulties associated with local executive directors having a slate of Fellows “dropped on their laps” whom they then had to engage in the initiative.

Program structure and leadership. The activities of the UHI Fellowship were not prescribed. For the most part, this was a positive aspect of the program. It made it possible for Fellows and site directors to create unique engagement opportunities that were both valuable to the sites and of interest to the Fellows. But this lack of formal structure hindered the full involvement of other Fellows. Some Fellows felt the expectation that they would have to be proactive in developing their own role was not made clear at the outset, and they would have liked more guidance from the NPO and/or site directors. Some Fellows may not have had the time or inclination to thrive in a help-carve-your-own-role Fellowship program.

An alternative might be a revised version of the unstructured Fellowship program. In addition to relying on people's ability to create unique opportunities for engagement, the Fellowship program could prescribe some minimal level of involvement. Perhaps a specific task could be required of all Fellows. Such a prescribed minimal level of involvement could deepen the Fellows' understanding of the nuances of the initiative. It could also increase the interaction between a Fellow and site director, helping them get to know each other better and see more clearly the possibilities for mutual benefit.

“A little more structure may have been good. I don’t think the NPO wanted the Fellows to actually pick a project and be rigid. They wanted it to sort of be free-flowing. But, as one of the Fellows, I think a little bit more responsibility placed on the Fellows would have been a good idea.”

-Krishen Laetsch, UHI Fellow (Oakland), Senior Field Representative,
Assemblywoman Wilma Chan

How well the Fellows program worked for both the sites and the Fellows depended greatly on the site executive directors. And, site executive directors differed with regard to interest in and acumen for mining the talents and expertise of high-level, busy volunteers. Some executive directors established regular opportunities for interacting with their local Fellows, although scheduled interaction, like monthly breakfasts, tended to wane in the later years of the UHI. Other executive directors developed “as-needed” relationships with Fellows and called on them for help at critical points. But sometimes Fellows were not engaged in a significant way by the site executive director, resulting in missed opportunities to benefit from the involvement of some talented Fellows. In these cases the essential cultivation is not of the Fellows, but of the executive director. In addition to prescribing more specific involvement by the Fellows, the NPO could step in and provide training to the local site directors with regard to engaging and benefiting from the work of Fellows.

Orientation. In the early years of the UHI, nearly everyone associated with it, including Fellows, struggled with understanding the change-agent nature of its work and distinguishing it from service delivery or traditional advocacy efforts. Because the Fellows were not as intimately involved in the UHI as, say, local site board members, the NPO could have provided extra attention to ensure that Fellows were adequately oriented to the UHI and its mission.

“The Oakland Fellows were a pretty good team. Certainly we were very much involved. We helped strategize some of the challenges. But, the first year, it really took us a while to figure out what our role was. We had to search among ourselves, ‘what could we do that would help but not interfere with the function of the site?’”

-Mildred Thompson, UHI Fellow (Oakland), Senior Program Associate, PolicyLink

A particular challenge to engaging Fellows over the long term was changes in the leadership of the UHI sites. Four of the five sites changed executive directors over the course of the initiative, some sites more than once. The new executive directors were not necessarily acquainted with incumbent Fellows, and the lack of a relationship led to a tapering off of some Fellows’ involvement. The NPO could have been more active in assuring that the Fellows and new directors were oriented with each other and established effective working relationships.

Conclusion

Has the UHI Fellowship program engaged a cadre of “possibility thinkers” as described by Councilwoman Brown? It has, as can be attested to by the number of Fellows who are now in leadership positions at the local UHI sites, or who continue to work in partnership with the sites from their positions as political and agency leaders, or who continue to provide advice and tactical support to the sites even as their own careers advance and change.

But the fact remains that the Fellowship did not meet everyone’s expectations, and this paper discusses some of the challenges the UHI experienced in engaging all Fellows.

The Fellowship worked best when it was a win-win situation in which a site engaged Fellows in ways meaningful and valuable to the site, and the Fellows grew personally and professionally.

“I think the Fellows program provided a level of exposure for the Fellows that really helped them to understand the broader initiative and the possibilities for reforming systems. I think it helped the sites gain respectability and access to political and fiscal resources that otherwise would’ve been unavailable or difficult to access.”

-Naomi Post, UHI Fellow (Philadelphia) and former Executive Director,
Philadelphia Safe and Sound

Summary Points

1. The primary goals of the UHI Fellows Program were to:
 - a. To enlist the tactical and strategic assistance of influential policy makers and community leaders into the work of local UHI sites.
 - b. To expand the network of local UHI by assuring the involvement of leaders who come from different sectors and/or run in different circles than the site executive director and board chair.
 - c. To engage knowledgeable leaders who could provide candid assessments and advice to local sites and the National Program Office.
2. Key aspects of the UHI Fellows Program:
 - a. With other Fellowships the focus is on the Fellows and their leadership development. With the UHI Fellowship, the focus is on the local UHI sites and how Fellows can help them achieve their goals.
 - b. Many other Fellowships seek to develop future leaders. The UHI Fellowship sought to engage current leaders in the work of the UHI.
 - c. Fellows were generally not paid (other than for the cost of travel or honorariums, as necessary), and did not take sabbaticals.
 - d. The Fellowship was not structured; for the most part, Fellows and local site directors worked together to create unique ad hoc or ongoing engagement opportunities.

3. Fellows assisted the UHI in a variety of ways, including:
 - a. Political networking: Some Fellows championed the policy and fiscal goals of UHI sites in their service as elected or appointed officials.
 - b. Systems access: Some Fellows, as leaders of large systems that serve children, helped UHI sites develop and implement change strategies within those systems. Other Fellows helped UHI sites integrate the work of different bureaucracies in more effective ways.
 - c. Site advocacy: Some Fellows helped introduce local sites to, and gain the support of, key constituencies, such as the business community.
 - d. Site leadership: The Fellowship served as a “learning curve” for several Fellows who later became valuable members of sites’ staff or Boards.
 - e. Advice and tactical support: Many Fellows were informal and useful sounding boards for site executive directors. Others contributed to important ad hoc events, such as a mayoral candidates forum.
 - f. Advice and counsel to the NPO: Some Fellows helped the NPO by serving on site visit teams to assess and make recommendations regarding the progress of local sites other than their own.
4. Lessons learned
 - a. By and large Fellows valued highly the leadership development opportunities they received, such as inter-city leadership visits, and exposure to national leaders and best practice research.
 - b. Greater consultation between the NPO and site directors with regard to the selection of Fellows could have more effectively fulfilled the goal of expanding the site director’s network.
 - c. The unstructured nature of the program allowed for the creation of unique and valuable engagement opportunities. However, it also made it difficult for some Fellows and executive directors to carve out meaningful roles for the Fellows. An alternative could be a largely unstructured program with some minimal prescribed activities to help site directors and Fellows see more clearly the possibilities for mutual benefit.
 - d. More efforts to orient Fellows to the UHI’s unusual change agent strategies, and to bridge transitions to new local executive directors, would have been helpful.

The following individuals were interviewed for this UHI lessons learned paper.
The authors wish to thank all interviewees for their time and insights.

- Lisa D. Benton**, MD, physician, California state Department of Health Services
- Penny Borenstein**, MD, Health Officer, Howard County (MD) Health Department
- Joseph Brooks**, Vice President for Civic Engagement, PolicyLink
- Jacquelyn Campbell**, Associate Dean for Doctoral Education, Johns Hopkins University
- Cynthia Curreri**, UHI National Program Deputy Director
- Colene Y. Daniel**, President and CEO, Maryland General Hospital
- Paul DiLorenzo**, Research Associate, Jim Casey Youth Opportunities Initiative
- Kathleen J. Dowling**, former Executive Director of the Marcus A. Foster Educational Institute
- Grenaé Dudley**, Executive Director, Mayor's Time
- Mark Emblidge**, Virginia State Board of Education
- Hathaway Ferebee**, Executive Director, Baltimore's Safe & Sound Campaign
- Bailey Fine**, District Director, Office of Congressman Benjamin Cardin
- Andrew Freeman**, Partner, Brown, Goldstein and Levy
- Jeffrey M. Gallagher**, Vice President and General Counsel, Lyotropic Therapeutics
- Greta Harris**, Senior Program Director, Local Initiatives Support Corporation
- James H. Hill**, President, Hill & Company Communications
- Jon C. King**, President and CEO, Exclusive Staffing Companies
- Krishen Laetsch**, Senior Field Representative, California Assemblywoman Wilma Chan
- William Marsh**, President, Renaissance Investment Co.
- Alba Martinez**, President and CEO, United Way Southeastern Pennsylvania
- Darcy Oman**, President, the Community Foundation Serving Richmond and Central Virginia
- Naomi Post**, Consultant, Philadelphia
- The Honorable Lillian Harris Ransom**, Judge of Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas
- Lisa Ross**, LJR Group, former UHI Leadership Director
- Charles Royer**, UHI National Program Director
- Samuel Stringfield**, Senior Researcher, College of Education and Human Development, University of Louisville
- Michael Tenbusch**, CEO, Think Detroit
- Mildred Thompson**, Senior Associate, PolicyLink
- T.C. Wallace, Jr.**, Superintendent of Schools, Mt. Clemens, Michigan
- Patricia Welch**, Dean of School of Education and Urban Studies, Morgan State University
- Phil Wells**, Deputy Director, Mayor's Time
- Andrea Youngdahl**, Director, Department of Human Services, Oakland



Urban Health Initiative
National Program Office
7900 East Greenlake Drive North
Suite 302
Seattle, WA 98103

Phone:

206-616-3637

Fax:

206-616-7541

Email:

uhi@u.washington.edu

www.urbanhealth.org