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MAKING RICHMOND GREATER

A Study of the Greater Richmond Community Corps

INTRODUCTION: In the United States, crime and violence has reached unprecedented levels in the last several years. Richmond, like many other cities in the country, is experiencing the effects of this surge in crime and violence and is now finding the economic and human costs intolerable. Just this fall, Richmond was ranked number two in the nation for their murder rate. However, each year, the 150 homicides in Richmond represents only a small portion of the other violent crimes committed against men, women, and children in this area. People in Richmond have found that these types of crimes are robbing their communities of the spirit and the substance that they have enjoyed in the past.

In September 1994, the Mayor of Richmond, Rev. Leonidas B. Young, challenged the Greater Richmond area to mobilize resources and join together toward the prevention of the "moral and social ills" that plague Virginia. He set out this challenge in response to the rising crime and violence in Richmond and in response to recommendations made by the Richmond Regional Crime Commission. Mayor Young, a pastor in one of Richmond's most crime ridden areas, believes that crime and violence in the community can be affected if "greater numbers of citizens get involved in making their

1Leonidas Young, "Letter to William Goodwin, Jr.", October 5, 1994. See Appendix C.
Mayor Young has called for citizens to volunteer their time and talents to serve the community and solve the tough problems facing Richmond. He and a small committee established the Board of Directors for what he calls the Greater Richmond Community Corps that includes business leaders, political leaders, religious leaders, and community activists. The Board, which was originally composed of 35 members met for the first time on November 7, 1994. At that meeting the Honorable Judge James Sheffield and William H. Goodwin, Jr. were elected Co-chairman. From ideas discussed in the early stages, The Mayor and the members of the board have decided that the Greater Richmond Community Corps will develop a partnership between service agencies, the business community, governmental agencies, and the volunteer corps itself. It will place volunteers into service organizations by matching the needs of these volunteers to the needs of the service organizations.

**OBJECTIVE:** The impetus or need for a study of the evolution of a group like the Greater Richmond Community Corps relates to the need for community leadership throughout the country. Many urban areas are facing the same crisis-like problems as Richmond. As a result, this study could provide them with a model in addressing these problems and an in-depth look at Richmond's response. Also, it

\(^2\)History of the Greater Richmond Community Corps: Appendix A.

2
was announced that the Greater Richmond Community Corps would serve as a model to be replicated across the state of Virginia. The study of the group would show these other areas the history of the organization, how it was created and how it was designed to meet Richmond's needs.

My objective in studying the Greater Richmond Community Corps is to study the evolution of this group and organization as a leadership mechanism created in response to a crisis situation in the Greater Richmond area. My study of the Greater Richmond Community Corps will enable me to study leadership in terms of the ability to solve the tough and pressing issues facing our society—violence and crime. I will look at the Board of Directors of this group as individual leaders and as part of a leadership mechanism. I will accomplish this task by looking at the historical perspective, empowerment, organizational development, and group formation of the Board of Directors of the Greater Richmond Community Corps.

**HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE:** On October 14, 1994, Mayor Young sadly remarked that "Today, Friday October 14, 1994, will forever be remembered as one of the darkest days in the modern history of the city of Richmond". On that day, five family members were murdered in the Gilpin Court housing project, the oldest public housing

---

project in the city and the largest one from Baltimore to Atlanta. Gunfire left two adults, and three children dead in the worst mass murder in Richmond's history. The children killed in this murder were ages three, four, and nine. In addition to these murders, a toddler was wounded and a teenager, seven months pregnant, was critically injured and later lost her fetus. Police Chief Marty Tapscott said that "This is my worst scene. I've had six deaths at one time, but I've never had this many children killed at one time...They never had a chance to do anything in life".

The Greater Richmond Community Corps is not responding to a new problem facing the Greater Richmond community. Rather, it is addressing a problem that has plagued Richmond and other cities across the country for many years. The president of the Richmond chapter of NAACP believes that deterioration of Richmond, a city with a majority of African-Americans, began when the military was downsized in the seventies. Military service offered an opportunity for African-Americans to learn skills, gain entry into a career, and rise in American society. When the military was cut back, many African American youth could not gain these advantages and got lost in the system. In this way, inner-city populations no longer had the resources needed "to make something of their

5Remarks from the President of the Richmond Chapter of the NAACP at the Site Visit by the National Funding Collaborative, Feb. 27, 1995.
lives”.

Also, much of the problems have resulted from the change in the family structure and the importance of the family in influencing the lives of young people. In a speech on March 5 at the University of Richmond, Mayor Young cited a study that found that children are most affected by peer pressure and media. In this study, the family fell third on the list after those two influences. It is no longer possible to say that the solutions of Richmond’s problems must come from the family. Today, the family is very different from what is used to be. Currently, in pockets of poverty, there is an increase of households run by single women. For example, in Gilpin Court, “85% of the households are run by single mothers.” In places like these, young boys lack male role models and women have to choose between their family and jobs. If the women do not get jobs, their family will continue to be on welfare and their children will not learn the work ethic. But, if these mothers work, their children will have not have the constant support of a full time parent in a place where it is needed most.

Finally, many of the current problems relate to the construction of public housing projects. By putting all low-income people in one place, these areas have become “pockets of poverty”

6 Leonidas Young, "Speech at the University of Richmond," March 5, 1995.

7 Dennis Cauchon, "Violence-plagued Richmond on 'full alert'/With citizens living in fear, Va. city plans all-out attack," USA Today, December 5, 1994, p. 8A.
devoid of hope, success, and dreams. The Mayor of Richmond says that "a young kid living in these neighborhoods sees two alternatives: 1) take a minimum wage job and barely make ends meet, 2) sell drugs and buy a Lexus"\(^8\). In these communities, the latter alternative usually appears more attractive. Also, many of these areas have become crime targets. Often, illegal drug markets move from one housing project to the next. These drug markets come from cities like New York City, Miami, and Boston. Drug dealers target these areas because they know that people living there do not have many other alternatives.

If the situation in Richmond is not new, then why are leaders starting to attack them now instead of decades ago? Recently, the situation in cities like Richmond have become so intolerable that people are shocked about the climate that young people live in and endure. Officer Daniel S. Niedhammer reiterated this idea when he said, "It's out of control. What we're seeing in the street is a combination of 30 years of society that has no values—has no moral values, has no family values, has no community values"\(^9\). Also, people have begun to react to this situation because it directly affects Richmond's economic climate. According to Clarence L.

\(^8\)Leonidas Young, "Speech at the University of Richmond", March 5, 1995.

\(^9\)Peter Baker, "In Richmond, Politicians Scramble as Slayings Reach New High; City Officials Endorse Governor's Crime Plan; Some Community Leaders Disagree," The Washington Post, September 13, 1994, pl. B1.
Townes Jr., executive director of Richmond Renaissance, a downtown development group, "Certainly, it [violence and crime] has created great alarm among the business leadership". Recently, the US Postal Service and the phone companies have stopped sending representatives to high crime areas in Richmond.

In response to situations similar to the five murders in Gilpin Court on October 14, the citizens of Richmond have felt the need to invest more time and energy into thinking of new solutions to combat crime and violence directed at youth. After being ranked second in 1994 for its per capita homicide rate with 150 deaths, Richmond has received national attention for the city's problems with crime and violence. It is obvious that this recent escalation of violence and national attention has affected the urgency of this problem. Amongst civic leaders, there is a common feeling that "something must be done now!" and that inaction could cost Richmond in the end. As a result of this increasing problem, the city and the state are currently striking back and reclaiming their city with an aggressive anti-crime effort in order to reduce crime by 25% over three years. The program includes a police offensive called Operation Full Alert which utilizes community policing, strike forces, roadblocks, police on bicycles, citizen patrols, curfews, pay phone restrictions, midnight basketball, arresting truants, mentoring, boot camps, special courts, and a volunteer

The creation of the volunteer corps also responds to a trend in state and national politics. Currently, there is talk in government to cut funding for social services and welfare. The fact is that organizations can no longer rely on government funding or financial support for their endeavors. As a result, people have begun to look beyond financial resources to the one thing that could continue to help solve these problems: human resources. A volunteer corps puts citizens, who are willing to give their time for free, in organizations that need staff support, consulting, and technical assistance. It also coordinates resources so that individual citizens can help these organizations meet their survival needs without government funding. Finally, a volunteer corps creates a leadership base in the community of people who are committed to solve society's problems and who feel that it is their civic responsibility to be part of the solutions. This last characteristic almost lightens the load of the community organizations because it spreads the problem out to the greater community and the people who are affected by the situation.

_LITERATURE REVIEW:_ The unique aspect about the Greater Richmond Community Corps is that no other crime and violence initiative has dealt with the issues that this organization will address in the manner in which it hopes to tackle them. It would be easy to find

a model and implement it in Richmond. But, Richmond's problems are so unique that the Greater Richmond Community Corps success is dependent on their ability to find a "Greater Richmond" solution. The Board of Directors realize that as no two neighborhoods have the same needs, the same is true for cities.

Even though the Greater Richmond Community Corps is not modelling itself after another programs, there are a few initiatives in other cities across the United States that are similar. For example, there is an initiative currently operating in Texas called the Texas Cities Action Plan for Crime Prevention (T-CAP), the Corpus Christi Initiative. The vision statement of this initiative is:

By the year 2000, Corpus Christi will be a community committed, philosophically and financially, to the wellbeing, education, and success of children. Governments, schools, and individuals will work together diligently, interacting and sharing ideas and concerns to improve the quality of life for all citizens. Everyone will be an active participant in promoting a safer and healthier community.

In this case, the Mayor appointed a coalition divided into four task forces--neighborhoods, substance abuse, violent crime, education-youth--to consult experts and research the issues. Then, these goals were created:

- Increase City support and information to neighborhood organizations; empower organizations to access City and other resources to reduce crime.

\[\text{\footnotesize "Literature on the Texas Cities Action Plan," See Appendix E.}\]
• Reduce violent crime on a long-term basis by promoting prevention and intervention strategies with at-risk families.

• Develop active partnerships between governments and citizens to work with other agencies in identifying strategies for crime intervention and prevention.

• Promote more user-friendly government by consolidating and networking the public and private sectors.

• Reduce juvenile crime through innovative youth-oriented projects and services, offering positive opportunities for youth during both school and non-school hours.

• Fully utilize and enhance existing community resources through collaborative planning and funding efforts.

Another example of a similar initiative is the Community Action to Prevent Violence that was initiated by the United Way in St. Louis and is named Community action to Prevent Violence. This initiative was created in response to violence and would "convene leaders from all sectors of the Greater St. Louis area in a community wide collaboration that will develop goals and implementation steps to prevent or reduce violence". The vision of this initiative is:

Desired outcomes of this collaborative effort include an overall reduction in violence in the community, and an increase in effective prevention programs for areas that currently have high crime rates. Included in this prevention programming is the provision for healthy alternatives to negative behaviors and opportunities for positive behaviors. An intended result of this vision is an increase in hopefulness and a sense of security for residents in Greater St. Louis.

This initiative will accomplish this vision by "developing and

13"Literature on the St. Louis Violence Initiative," See Appendix E.
strengthening heather and human service programs which address violence in the St. Louis community". Much of this work will be accomplished with financial resources.

FORMATION OF THE GREATER RICHMOND COMMUNITY CORPS: In September 1994, Mayor Young and a small committee established the Board of Directors for the Community Corps by choosing individuals from diverse backgrounds and professions, and outlined some preliminary ideas of what they envisioned. The Board of Directors of the Community Corps held its first meeting on November 7, 1994. At that meeting, the Board, which originally had 35 members, elected the Honorable Judge James E. Sheffield and William H. Goodwin Jr. as Co-chairman. Also, the members of the executive committee, or the leadership body of the Community Corps were chosen. The members of this committee included James E. Sheffield, Chair, William H. Goodwin, Jr., Co Chair, Finance and Administration, Stuart Shumate, Treasurer, Carol Fox, Secretary, Julious P. Smith, Jr., Counselor, Charles Kouns, Organizational Cooperation and Communications, James E. Ukrop, Government Cooperation, Larry Walton, Volunteer Recruitment and Training, and at-large executive committee members, Dr. Terrie Griffin-Price, Mary Jo Joseph, and August Moon. At that meeting, the Board also decided to expand the Community Corps scope to include the entire Richmond metropolitan area.

Since then, the group has been meeting regularly for the last
fifteen weeks to build an organization to prevent the increase of violence and crime in the Greater Richmond area. Here is the group's chronology:

- November 7, 1994--Board of Directors identified and held first meeting.
- November 29, 1994--First Executive Committee meeting.
- December 5, 1994--Facilitated retreat to establish mission, goals, and objectives.
- January 5, 1995--Tour of public housing and interview with tenants.
- January 9, 1995--Board of Directors meeting, review of sample programs in the community.
- January 16, 1995--Closing date for applying for Executive Director (Advertised in The Richmond Times Dispatch, Norfolk-Pilot, The Washington Post, National Association of Association Directors)--over 185 applications were received.
- January 18, 1995--Executive Committee meeting.
- January 27, 1995--Board of Directors meeting, Henrico Courthouse.
- February 2, 1995--Executive Director interviews.
- February 3, 1995--Executive Director interviews.
- February 6, 1995--Program Committee meeting--set criteria for designating sponsorship.
- February 7, 1995--Executive Committee meeting, review program work.
- February 9, 1995--Final interviews, Executive Director.
- February 15, 1995--Tour of public housing.
- February 17, 1995--Executive Committee meeting, review for
site visit and discuss executive director and press.

- February 27, 1995--Site visit for National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention, finalist in grant competition.
- March 17, 1995--Selection of the First Executive Director.
- March 22, 1995--Installation of the First Executive Director.
- March 27, 1995--Corps members participated in the City Council's Public Safety meeting.
- April 1, 1995--Executive Director moderated the Neighborhood Team Process Conference.
- April 3, 1995--The offices of the Greater Richmond Community Corps officially began operating.¹⁴

Rather than just looking at the development of this the Corps from a chronological perspective, the Board of Directors has chosen to examine their development in terms of four phases: Phase One--Thought Becomes Reality, Phase Two--Getting to Know You, Phase Three--What Else Do We Need?, and Phase Four--When the Volunteers Come Marching In¹⁵.

**PHASE ONE--THOUGHT BECOMES REALITY**

This first meeting also marks what the Board of Directors considers Phase One--Thought Becomes Reality of the organization's development. During this phase, board formation and strategic planning (mission, goals, bylaws, operating structure) occurred, the Board began the search for an executive director, and

¹⁴"Chronology of the Greater Richmond Community Corps," See Appendix A.

¹⁵"Greater Richmond Community Corps Recent Developments," See Appendix A.
fundraising efforts began. Since then, the board has met for fifteen weeks and the leaders have averaged about five hours a week in meetings. One of the key stepping stones in defining the Community Corps was the retreat in December in which the Board established its mission, goals, and operating structure. At this meeting, the name of the organization was formally changed to the Greater Richmond Community Corps to encompass the entire metropolitan area and the strive to make Richmond "greater".

Board Formation And Strategic Planning
1. Mission and Goals

The mission, which actually will serve as the vision for the Greater Richmond Community Corps, "gives direction and purpose to an enterprise". The retreat was held on December 5, 1994 in the United Way building from 9 am. to 5 pm. and was facilitated by Sam Davis, a professor at J. Sargeant Reynolds. At that point, members of the board were still meeting one another and defining the organization they were going to create. They began by outlining issues that they felt needed to be considered by the organization and by the Board of Directors in order to later form the mission and goals. In September when a committee met to establish this organization, a preliminary mission and goals were drawn up by Charles Kouns, one of the current Board members and Executive

Committee members. However, the facilitator wanted the entire group to have input in the creation of the organization's foundation.

When Mr. Davis began the discussion that generated ideas for the mission and goals, he started out by advising the group to look at the mission of goals of other organizations (like Ukrop's) and that "they [the mission of goals for the organization] need to be yours". The list of issues generated by the group included over 20 ideas. However, the facilitator narrowed them down to 6 key issues generated by the group included:

A. The organization must play a broker role. It does not run programs, but rather serves existing organizations. It also forms partnerships and linkages with other organizations, and with businesses and public agencies.

B. The organization would be a model for reducing crime and youth violence. It would be best to start small and produce early successes. It also needs to build trust in the community.

C. The organization needed to focus on communications issues. It needs to "cradle" the voices of the community and focus on the difference between perception and reality. It also needs to have good media relations.

D. The organization needs to focus on programs and services. It must identify services needed, service providers, and inventory the existing programs. It also needs to identify talents in the community and serve the community organizations.

E. Examine Board composition. The Board needs to look at its membership and make sure everyone is being represented and active (elected officials, grassroots leaders, leaders of effective neighborhood programs, etc.)

F. The organization needs to get all of the Board members to
the same level of awareness.\(^\text{17}\)

After defining the key issues, the facilitator had the members of the Board break down into three groups that represented these key issues and had them brainstorm ideas on how to address these issues. The groups formed were: Program Areas Group, Communication Group, and Board Structure and Composition.

Also, in the late morning, the Board broke down into small groups to analyze the strengths and weaknesses facing them as a group and an organization. Many people felt that strengths for the organization were: new organization, the community is ready, members of Board had high visibility, and commitment. Some of the weaknesses generated by these small groups were: no model, time, need to add diversity to the Board, lack of clarity, failure to act, and impatience. By analyzing the group internally, the members of the Board were able to clarify the strengths and obstacles they would face as an organization. Combined with the key issues, these concerns helped formulate the mission and goals. The retreat ended before the mission and goals were defined, so, a committee of interested Board members were assigned the task of creating a proposal for the next Board meeting. Even though, the mission and goals were drawn up by a committee, the entire Board participated in the process by generating the key issues and the internal analysis.

\(^{17}\)"Minutes from Retreat," See Appendix D.
The first area of business at the next Board meeting which was held on January 9, 1995 was the "Review of the retreat, mission statements". The committee that created the mission and goals presented their proposal:

Mission Statement

To reduce crime and improve the quality of life in the Greater Richmond community by coordinating and mobilizing public, private, non-profit, volunteer resources, and communities of faith in a unified long-term prevention effort.

Goals

• To develop an on-going community-based program that identifies and facilitates the coordination of current and potential community resources.

• To create and maintain partnerships and linkages between agencies currently providing services, the business community, governmental agencies, and the volunteer corps.

• To foster unity and commitment among all participants in a shared sense of purpose in the prevention and the intervention of crime and violence in the Greater Richmond Community.

The Board of Directors had virtually no problems with the proposed mission and goals. The only changes they made were with the wording of the first two goals. The group decided to substitute the word "corps" for the word "program" in the first goal and the word "promote" for the word "maintain" in the second goal.

The mission and goals remained the same until the Program Committee meeting that occurred on February 6, 1995. The Program Committee, a committee that was added when the structure was revised and which was led by Dr. Terrie Griffin-Price, began the meeting by looking at the mission and goals in relation to the
committee's description. The committee felt that the current mission and goals were not focused enough to find specific programs that fulfilled the needs of the community and that it did not guide the organization appropriately. At the retreat in December, the members of the board had mentioned that they wanted the organization's focus to be aimed at youth and children. So, the Program Committee suggested that the phrase "aimed at children and youth" be added to the mission statement. This proposal was approved by the Executive Committee on February 7, 1995 and the current mission and goals are:

**Mission Statement**

To reduce crime and improve the quality of life in the Greater Richmond community by coordinating and mobilizing public, private, non-profit, and volunteer resources, and communities of faith in a unified long-term prevention effort aimed at children and youth.

**Goals**

- To develop an on-going community-based corps that identifies and facilitates the coordination of current and potential community resources.
- To create and promote partnerships and linkages between agencies currently providing services, the business community, governmental agencies, and the volunteer corps.
- To promote unity and commitment among all participants in a shared sense of purpose in the prevention and intervention of crime and violence in the Greater Richmond community.

2. **By-laws**

The By-laws were presented to the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors by Joey Smith, counsel to the Greater Richmond
Community Corps. The by-laws were presented first to the Executive Committee at its meeting on January 18, 1995. At that point, the Executive Committee members voice concerns over some of the provisions. The Executive Committee members had concerns over voting by proxy, the language used on the section on the removal of Directors, the attendance requirement, and the issues of having a "conflict of interest". The group decided that consensus on the by-laws was not needed immediately because the Corps had just applied for 501(c)(3) non-profit status and that they could be developed over the next few meetings.

The by-laws were reviewed again by the Corps Board members on two other occasions. First, they were presented to the Board of Directors at their meeting on January 27, 1995. The Board Members were told to read the by-laws over and give suggestions for changes to Executive Committee members. The by-laws were also discussed at the Executive Committee meeting on February 7, 1995. A recommendation was made to delete a number needed to form a committee and quorum was changed to 12. After that discussion, the Executive Committee passed the by-laws and a new copy with the changes was given to Board members.

3. Operating Structure

Organizational Structure is a key component in the formation of an organization. According to Richard L. Daft, three components of structure are:
structure designates formal reporting relationships, identifies the grouping together of individuals into departments [committees], includes the design of systems to ensure effective communication, coordination, and integration of effort across all departments.

From the retreat on December 5, 1994, the people involved with the Board Composition decided to change the organizational structure by proposing that a Board Resource committee should be included in the Board of Directors to keep track of Board members, recruit and educate new ones, and evaluate the Board's diversity.

Also, one the major functions of this group was to evaluate the rest of the structure. They restructured the committees so that they covered all issues and did not overlap one another. When the Board first came together, the original committees were: Volunteer Recruitment and Training (Larry Walton), Organizational Cooperation (Charles Kouns), Finance and Administration (William Goodwin), Government Cooperation (Jim Ukrop), and Communications (Charles Kouns), and Executive. The Board Resources committee proposed that the committees be changed to: Volunteer Recruitment and Training (Larry Walton), Community Relations (Charles Kouns), Board Resources (Jim Ukrop), Finance and Development (William Goodwin), Program (Dr. Terrie Griffin-Price), and Executive. In addition to creating this new structure, they created definitions or guidelines for these committees and recruited members for each.

committee. After clarifying the structure and recruiting members, the committees were able to meet and get work accomplished.

Executive Director Search

In order to manage the process of hiring an Executive Director, the Executive Committee acted as an Executive Director Search committee with Larry Walton as its leader. The goal of this committee was to hire someone by March 1, 1995. The search for the Executive Director began when an ad was placed in The Richmond Times Dispatch, Norfolk-Pilot, The Washington Post, and National Association of Association Directors for this position. The ad that appeared in these papers said that the salary range was $50,000 to $70,000. At this time, the Executive committee outlined the qualifications for the Executive Director. The Executive Director would provide for the management and direction of the agency's affairs in accordance with the by-laws. This person would have a degree in Human Services or a related field and must have management training and knowledge of basic accounting skills. The person also had to have least five to seven years of experience in a similar capacity and the ability to work with diverse populations. The duties and responsibilities of this position that were outlined by the Board of Directors are:

A. Administration of the programs adopted by the Board of Directors.

B. Recommendations of new programs and policies.

C. Development and implementation of personnel services and
policies for the employees.

D. Development of public recognition and understanding of the Greater Richmond Community Corps' programs in order to gain adequate support for those programs.

E. Supervision of the handling, processing, and storage of all materials to assure maximum utilization of resources within budgetary limits.

F. Promote strong working relationship with governmental jurisdictions.

G. Maintenance of adequate financial records, controls, and preparing necessary reports.

H. Development and implementation of long-range and short-range planning.

I. Ability to work in partnership with volunteer and other organizations.

J. Knowledge of Urban Issues.\textsuperscript{19}

After the ads ran in the newspapers for two weeks, the Board of Directors had received over 185 resumes. From this point, they gave each person of the Executive Committee 40 resumes to evaluate and over half of the prospectives were eliminated because they lacked the qualifications for the job. The group went through the remaining contenders and singled out ten individuals that they thought were the best candidates. They decided to interview five of those ten candidates after scrutinizing their resumes for the third time and met with the five on February 2 and 3 for a first interview with the Executive Committee. From the beginning of the

\textsuperscript{19}"Description of the Position of Executive Director," See Appendix I.
process, the Board relied heavily on recommendations or comments from people outside of the Board that knew the final applicants. This outside information allowed the Board to single in on certain individuals and to eliminate others.

At the Board of Directors meeting on January 27, a Board member requested that all members be able to attend the final interviews of the last three prospectives. After the interviews on February 2 and 3, the Executive Committee narrowed their scope down to three individuals: Jim Bechner, Nicky Nickolai, and Wayne Thornhill. These three people were interviewed for a second time on February 9. This interview included the entire Board (only 12 people attended) and was structured as a question and answer period. Larry Walton began each interview by asking the contenders to answer this question:

"The Community Corp's mission involves targeting high crime neighborhoods especially as it relates to children and youth. We want to empower local residents to solve their own problems and take back control of their lives. We also hope to coordinate service provision and volunteers to assist this effort. Take a few minutes and give us your ideas as to how we could accomplish this mission."

After each individual answered that question, the members of the Board were able to ask whatever questions they thought were needed and appropriate. Mr. Walton gave each member of the Board a suggested list of questions, but did not limit them in their inquiries. Some of the questions asked by the Board members were, "If you were selected for this position, what would be your top
priorities for the first few months?" "What are your strengths and weaknesses?" "How would you relate to people from other cultures and socioeconomic groups?" "How do you view the relationship between an Executive Director and their Board?", etc. After each interview the Board had about 15 minutes to share their impressions and discuss issues that arose during the interview.

After the three interviews, the Board members that attended the interviews met to nominate someone to hire to the rest of the Board of Directors. They hoped to vote on this nomination at a Board meeting that was scheduled in the next hour. A motion was made to interview a Board member to ask for a confidential evaluation of one of the candidates, but it was not passed. Then, it was moved that a "straw vote" be taken to determine the overall attitude of the Board toward the candidates. This motion was passed and the vote was taken. From this vote, one person was eliminated from consideration of the position. Discussion continued about the candidates and a motion was made to hire one of the candidates. This motion did not pass. At this point, the Board realized that they may have to reopen the search for an Executive Director. For the first time, they saw that their search was not complete, they only looked at people who had responded to the ad instead of also actively recruiting strong candidates themselves. At the end of the meeting a motion was made to hire one of the other candidates, but that motion was tabled until a
later date. An Executive Director was not nominated by the committee and the search was reopened to enable Board members to suggest individuals appropriate for the position. The two remaining candidates were contacted and told a decision had not been made yet.

Before the interviews started one of the Board member, Carol Fox, recounted a discussion her and her husband had about selecting an Executive Director. She told him that she hoped that the Corps did not make a mistake and hire the wrong person. He told her that it would be more of a mistake to hire someone who was mediocre. During one of the interviews an interesting discussion occurred between the Board members about what they were looking for in an Executive Director. The discussion focused on the one issue the Board had never reached consensus on: whether it was better to have an Executive Director with close contacts with the community or one that could relate to politicians or funders. The Board realized when they were talking to the candidates that none of the candidates were strong on both positions. This disparity affected the Board in making the decision of who to hire because they were not completely satisfied with their options. In the ideal situation they wanted someone who could do it all, like Superman, and they did not want to settle for mediocre.

So, the Board of Directors decided to seek out people that would fit the position instead of waiting for people to come to
them. In the next few weeks, Board members solicited names and got resumes of people interested in position. At the same time, one of the Board members, Dr. Terrie Griffin-Price, the chair of the Program committee, was also told to consider the position. Members of the Board of Directors felt that she possessed the qualities that they were looking for in an Executive Director. After weighing her options, Terrie Griffin-Price decided to submit her resume in consideration for this position. Two sets of interviews were held for the position in the middle of March and a meeting was held on March 17, 1995 for the full Board to vote on the suggestion of the Executive Director Search Committee. At that time, the Executive Director Search Committee proposed to hire Dr. Terrie Griffin-Price as its Executive Director. She would then hire an Assistant Director and an Administrative Assistant. Shortly after, her salary was negotiated and she would start as the Greater Richmond Community Corps' Executive Director on April 1, 1995.

Fundraising

1. National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention

The Fundraising efforts for the Greater Richmond Community Corps actually began at their first meeting on November 7. The Community Foundation approached the Corps about applying for a grant from the National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention. The goals of the National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention are to:
• Generate increased philanthropic support for the prevention of violence, both nationally and locally;

• Encourage communities to undertake local violence prevention initiatives as well as to participate in a national violence prevention effort;

• Model and stimulate effective collaborations involving public, private, and nonprofit sectors;

• Develop coordinated, interdisciplinary plans and programs to prevent and reduce violence in selected communities or neighborhoods where the evidence of violence is widespread;

• Build local capacity for leadership and collaboration on violence prevention;

• Improve effectiveness of philanthropic efforts to prevent violence through sharing resources, best practices, and evaluation strategies; and

• Increase grantmakers' awareness of the crisis of violence, the importance of violence prevention initiatives, and the prospects for establishing effective national advocacy.20

In the beginning of January 1995, the Community Foundation received notice that the Greater Richmond Community Corps made the first cut of this grant. A two day site visit by the Collaborative was scheduled for February 28, 1995. During this visit, the representative would talk to people on the Board of Directors, local funders, David Hicks, the Commonwealth's Attorney, Ed Peeples, from the VCU/Violence Prevention Project, Richard Gentry, from the Richmond Redevelopment and Housing Authority, and local clients from tenant councils and neighborhood teams.

In order to prepare for this site visit, the Executive

20"National Funding Collaborative Information," See Appendix J.
Committee needed to organize their information and pull together their experiences as a group and an organization. The staff liaison from City Hall, Cricket White, created a packet of information that included the organization's history, chronology, and accomplishments. This summary enabled the group to focus on the work they had done and why their site should be funded. Later, the group was given a more formal packet that included the history, the mission and goals, the organizational structure, the phases in group formation, and the list of Board members.

One representative from the National Funding Collaborative, (the second person got sick), came for a site visit of the city of Richmond and the Greater Richmond Community Corps. The members of the Greater Richmond Community Corps participated in a discussion with the representative in which members of the Community Foundation were present. After the visit was concluded, the participants felt as if the representative did not get a positive view of Richmond and Corps' purpose in addressing issues of violence and crime. At the request of the Corps and the other participants, the second representative came to Richmond for a site visit. At the end of March, the Greater Richmond Community Corps was notified that they did not receive the funding.

2. The Budget\(^{21}\)

At the Executive Committee meeting on February 17, 1995, the

\(^{21}\)"Greater Richmond Community Corps' Budget," See Appendix J.
Greater Richmond Community Corps' initial 12 month budget was presented to all of the members by Stuart Shumate the Board's treasurer. It included income which would come from $30,000 from each municipality to total $120,000 and matching funds from the private sector. The money from the municipalities has been introduced at local government meetings and all three municipalities have pledged support to the Corps. At the end of March, the city of Richmond voted to fund the Corps and on April 6 Henrico County held a press conference in which they gave their check to the Corps. The United Way has offered to provide office space and local phone service. The remaining $240,000 will be allocated to staff salaries, benefits, office supplies and equipment, telephone and postage, training, travel, board development, program costs, research, start-up funding, additional program staff, and consulting.

Board Development

After the retreat on December 5, a group formed to examine the resources on the Board and later became the Board Resources committee which is currently led by Jim Ukrop. This group began by sending all Board members a "who are you?" type questionnaire that they took from Leadership Metro Richmond to assess the people they had on the Board and to see what they were missing. This group also decided that they needed representation from all four jurisdictions, from superintendents, police, and human service
agencies, and youth. At the Board of Directors meeting on January 27, this group proposed the addition of 5 new Board members: Thomas R. Fulghum, Superintendent of Schools, Chesterfield County, Richard Angels, Chief of Police, Henrico County, Marty Tapscott, Chief of Police, City of Richmond, George Musgrove, Assistant City Manager for Health and Human Services, City of Richmond, and Jackie Brown and Jonathon Massenburg, two Youth Service Commission representatives. At this meeting, the five new additions were approved by the Board of Directors.

PHASE TWO--GETTING TO KNOW YOU

The second phase of the Greater Richmond Community Corps is called Phase Two--Getting to Know You, in which community organizations were catalogued and the Board was educated on programs and the community's needs. This phase does not fall chronologically after Phase One, but rather it occurs simultaneously. It began with a bus tour that many of the Board members had gone on to "raise their consciousness on the issues" on January 5, 1995 and the process is still continuing. The bus tour was conducted by Rick Gentry, a Board member and the Executive Director of the Richmond Redevelopment Housing Association. It covered neighborhoods in Richmond that had public housing in them. These neighborhoods include housing projects, like Gilpin Court, and scattered housing (public housing within non-public housing neighborhoods). The tour ended at the Sacred
Heart Center and the William Byrd Community House. At these sites, the Board members were able to observe some programs and talk to some of the clients to determine their situation and their needs. The members of the Board who attended the bus tour called it an eye opening experience and were grateful for the opportunity to participate in it. This tour also enabled the group to interact with one another and broaden their knowledge on the issues that are central to the Greater Richmond Community Corps.

Following in the same spirit, at the Board meeting on January 9, individuals in the community came to present programs directed at violence and crime in order to educate Board member about existing programs. Presentations were made by One-on-One Mentorship Program by Jim Starnes, Cities in Schools Program by Mark Embledge, Spectrum by Jane Talley, Community Economic Enhancement by Wayne Thornhill, Daily Planet by Jane Carlson, and United Struggle Movement by Board member August Moon. These presentations enabled the Board members to preview the resources in the community and ask the program leaders questions about their needs and their successes in the Greater Richmond community.

The Board members of the Greater Richmond Community Corps realize that this type of education about community issues and programming must continue if they want to be successful. The bus tour of Richmond that happened on January 5 was held again on February 15 so that members that missed the first tour could
still have the experience and really learn about the problems and issues facing Richmond today. Also, presentations of successful programs or initiatives aimed at violence and crime are continuing at meetings. For example, at the Executive Committee meeting on February 17, a local police officer discussed how police officers have had to reconsider the way in which they solve community problems. He highlighted the Lakeside Community Action Team and talked about the success it has enjoyed in one of Greater Richmond's communities.

Finally, as an intern with the organization, my task has been to work in assessing the resources and programs available in the greater Richmond area. This task is critical because one of the objectives of the Corps is to match up the interests and talents of volunteers with areas of need in the community. Also, many of the community organizations are not coordinated in the greater Richmond area. Many of them are running the same programs, but do not realize it. By cataloging and organizing this information, they may be able to exchange ideas and share resources. The staff liaison from City Hall has been cataloging information about other programs in the community. To date, more than 1,100 organizations providing services in the area have been compiled and will be evaluated. I began my search by going to LINCS, Learning In Community Settings, a resource the University of Richmond that sets up students with learning experiences at community organizations.
PHASE THREE--WHAT ELSE DO WE NEED?

The task of the Greater Richmond Community Corps is to target high risk communities, identify natural community leadership, train the leaders, and use the expertise of those leaders in determining the needs of the area. Even though many services currently exist in the communities, the Corps realizes that they may need to fill a gap that is not being addressed. In the case that a gap is found, the Corps will look to support or develop appropriate programs to meet the needs of the community. One such program that the Corps has supported is the Cities in Schools program. The Cities of Schools program puts all the resources needed to address societal problems within the school system. For example, each participating school will have a team of psychologists and each student will receive a mentor. This type of program addresses problems in the school system and enables youth to continue their education and receive help.

PHASE FOUR--WHEN THE VOLUNTEERS COME MARCHING IN

After Mayor Young's call for volunteers in September, 800 people filled out cards expressing an interest in serving in that capacity. Since then, the Corps has sent out a questionnaire to determine the interests and abilities of those people. More than 130 people responded to that follow-up questionnaire and the Corps has actively placed more than 50 in community organizations. The Corps will continue to create a data base of volunteers and
programs in the community. Unfortunately, right now, the Corps is not prepared to utilize the volunteers. However, in a month the Corps will be able to use the volunteers talents and abilities to match them up individually to programs aimed at violence and crime. Also, in the future, the Corps will probably have to recruit more volunteers to meet the needs of the community.

LEADERSHIP ISSUES ANALYSIS: The Greater Richmond Community Corps was envisioned to be a leadership mechanism in response to crime and violence in the Greater Richmond area. The Board of Directors is both a leadership body and a group of leaders working for societal change. In order to gain a leadership perspective on this organization, it will be necessary to look at issues like formal leadership, individual leadership, group development, group decision making/participation, leadership emergence, community empowerment, and strengths and obstacles affecting the leadership of the Board and the organization.

FORMAL LEADERSHIP

Mayor Leonidas B. Young

After the regional crime summit, Mayor Young decided that one way to address the problems of crime and violence in the Richmond area was to create a volunteer corps. So, he created a preliminary planning group which consisted of Viola Baskerville, John Conrad, Suzanne Crump, Jim Dunn, Rev. Suzanne Fisher, Joel Harris, Timothy Kaine, Charlie Kouns, August Moon, Carol Stoddard, and Larry
Together he and this group created the concept of the Community Corps and recruited people to the Board of Directors. Even though the initial Community Corps concept has changed dramatically since this group met, the Corps would not be the same organization if it did not have this foundation to start.

In the creation of the Greater Richmond Community Corps, the Mayor of Richmond has played a few distinct leadership roles. The first role he played was to envision the Corps and to begin the process of creating it. In many this way he followed Kouzes and Posner's advice and "challenged the process" by "stepping out into the unknown and taking risks". Also, by "challenging the process", the Mayor has been the main leader that acted as a change agent. He identified a problem in the community and found a creative and innovative way to address it. Change agents are leaders who are able to respond quickly and effectively to uncertain or changing situations. In this case, the Mayor was reacting to a crisis situation in the Greater Richmond area. He also acted as a change agent by pulling together a committee to build on his idea. Instead of just creating good ideas, he put this concept into action by recruiting individuals who were ready to see change occur with this situation and issue.

The Mayor's leadership can also be seen in terms of status in the community. As the Mayor of the City of Richmond, his contacts

\[22\text{Kouzes and Posner, p. 8.}\]
and his name benefits him in many ways. Over the years, he has made valuable contacts in the community with people like August Moon, a respected community leader, and Bill Goodwin, a wealthy business leader. These contacts allowed the Corps to gain more legitimacy in the Community and to get the resources needed to become a functioning organization. Also, the Mayor's name added legitimacy to this project. When Mayor Young put out a call for volunteers in the fall, people responded not only to the issue, but also to the fact that the Mayor of Richmond has stood behind this project and sees the need for volunteers. In these ways, the Mayor's prestige within the community has led to the Corps' creation, resources, and success.

The Greater Richmond Community Corps Executive Director

On April 1, 1995, Dr. Terrie Griffin-Price led the Greater Richmond Community Corps as its first Executive Director. Even though this was her first official day of work, she had spent much time with the organization before as a member of the Board of Directors and as the chair of the Program Committee. Even though Dr. Griffin-Price had a history with the organization, she knew that her presence in the position of Executive Director would determine the organization's history and success in the Greater Richmond area.

Dr. Terrie Griffin-Price came to the Corps as a minister from the Bainbridge-Blackwell Church and the Executive Director of a
church-based AIDS organization named HEAL (Help Educate African-Americans for Life). Initially, she claims that she had no intentions of seeking the position of Executive Director. However, she changed her mind after being approached by some members of the Board of Directors and after hearing this advice from her mother, "You're finally going to get paid for what you love to do."^23.

As the leader of a brand new organization whose goal is to fight against some of the toughest problems facing our society, Dr. Griffin-Price realizes that she is in for a challenge. In an interview with *The Free Press* she remarked, "I don't wear an 'S'. I am not superwoman."^24 Her leadership strength is in her compassion and her ability to speak. In assessing Dr. Griffin-Price's leadership behavior, it is obvious that she is relationship-oriented, meaning that as a leader she tends to "act in a friendly and supportive manner, shows concern for subordinates, and looks out for their welfare."^25

She believes that one of her weaknesses is that she is "not realistic about what she can accomplish in a specific time frame"^26. In many cases she commits to more than she can handle. However,

---


^26"Interview with Dr. Terrie Griffin-Price."
Dr. Griffin-Price feels that she is still the best candidate for the position. She believes this because she feels that she represents all sectors and aspects of the community. She says that she has experience in the "business sector, political sector, community level, the religious community, and the grass roots level." This diverse experience enables her to relate and represent all members of her public.

The Board of Directors

1. Co Chairs of the Board of Directors

On October 5, 1994, William H. Goodwin, Jr. received a memorandum from the Mayor of Richmond discussing the idea of the Corps and the proposed goals and objectives. At that time, the Mayor also stated that he was going to announce to the Corps' organizing committee that Mr. Goodwin serve as a Co Chair with himself for the Board of Directors of this organization. Mr. Goodwin is Chairman of CCA Industries, a holding company for about 17 organizations including AMF Sports Goods and the Jefferson. On the local level, Mr. Goodwin has been active in funding programs like the Cities in Schools Program and is a respected business leader in the Greater Richmond community.

At the first Board of Directors meeting on November 7, 1994, the Honorable Judge James E. Sheffield was chosen as Chair of the Board of Directors along side with William Goodwin. Judge

27"Interview with Dr. Terrie Griffin-Price."
Sheffield is retired judge and currently a practicing attorney in the city of Richmond. He basically entered the room that November as an ordinary member of the Board of Directors and left as the Chair of the Board. Since then, he has served as the Board's formal leader and representative to the community.

Even though both Mr. Goodwin and Judge Sheffield are the formal leaders of the Greater Richmond Community Corps, they both play very different roles in the organization. Mr. Goodwin has kept a very low profile since the Greater Richmond Community Corps has begun meeting in November. He detests politics and does not want to be caught in a political struggle. Instead, he would rather focus on his area of expertise--the fundraising aspects of the Corps. He has given the Corps the resources it needs until they can find outside sources to generate revenue and he has spent much time steering the fundraising efforts. He wants quick action and wants to see something happen in Richmond immediately. He has attended meetings of critical importance like the Executive Director Search meetings, filled in as the leader when the Judge could not attend meetings, and has given the Board valuable insight. August Moon believes that Bill Goodwin "is 100% dedicated to making Richmond the best area in the United States"\textsuperscript{28}. However, as a leader on the Board of Directors, he prefers to be behind the scenes and almost invisible.

\textsuperscript{28}"Interview with August Moon."
On the other hand, Judge Sheffield is the visible leader. He runs and begins all of the Board of Directors and Executive Committee meetings. His main strength is his ability to stay on task and on focus during the meetings. Cricket White, the staff liaison feels that his leadership style can be understood by his profession. As a judge, he establishes precedent, moderates conversation, and makes rulings. Similarly, with the Board of Directors, Judge Sheffield moderates discussion and keeps everybody on the issue. As a leader, he often sits back and contributes only when people get off task and stray from the discussion. In evaluating his leadership behavior, it is obvious that he is a task-oriented leader, or a leader that "defines and structures his or her own role and the roles of subordinates toward attainment of the group's goals." He is easy to talk to and processes information very quickly. As the formal and visible leader of the Greater Richmond Community Corps, Judge Sheffield signs all official documents and is the individual that all of the Board members look to as the Board's leader.

2. The Executive Committee

The Executive Committee is the formal leadership body of the Board of Directors. It is composed of the Board's Co Chairs, William Goodwin and Judge Sheffield, Board officers, all the

29"Interview with Cricket White."
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committee chairs, and members-at-large. This leadership body meets regularly and provides the leadership for the five committees: Finance and Development, Program, Community Relations, Board Resources, and Volunteer and Recruitment. The Executive Committee makes most major decisions and invests much time and energy into creating an effective organization. It has also acted as the Executive Director Search Committee and has prepared for the National Collaborative site visit. This committee is so effective because of the diverse mix of individual leaders that make up this group.

INDIVIDUAL LEADERS

In this section, individual leaders from the Executive Committee will be examined. The Judge and William Goodwin will be excluded because they were discussed in the previous section. Dr. Terrie Griffin-Price will be examined in this section in her previous role a member of the Executive Committee and the chair of the Program Committee.

* Carol Fox: Secretary of the Greater Richmond Community Corps Board of Directors. She comes to the Corps as a professional volunteer and the president of the political organization Make Women Count. Also, next year she will plans to lead the United Way Campaign in Richmond. Unlike typical secretaries, Mrs. Fox is not responsible for taking minutes at every meeting and she claims that she has no secretarial skills. It was decided that her
contributions to group discussion were too valuable to allow her just to sit by and take notes. She is extremely well organized, clear, and concise. As a leader, her strength is in her level of commitment and dedication. She put 100% into all that she does and takes on the Greater Richmond Community Corps as a challenge. She has dedicated her life to volunteering and feels that "concentrating on human resources is the way to go."31

* Dr. Terrie Griffin-Price: Chair of the Program Committee before she applied for the position of Executive Director. Serves as the Minister of the Bainbridge-Blackwell Unity Baptist Church and has founded an AIDS organization named HEAL. From her background, she has knowledge about the needs of the community and the individual clients. She is well spoken, highly articulate, and extremely compassionate. The Greater Richmond Community Corps is the only other organization with which she is involved. Like Carol Fox, she has a high amount of commitment and dedication to achieving success with the Corps. She believes in processing all information and would prefer to take small steps that would later produce large gains.

* Mary Jo Joseph: Member-at-large on the Executive Committee. She is currently retired, but served as the Special Assistant to the V.P. at the University of D.C. She is a quiet woman who processes her thoughts and reflects much on the issues discussed.

31"Interview with Carol Fox."
She has been a constant participant in the process and is currently volunteering at the office of the Greater Richmond Community Corps.

* Charles Kouns: Chair of the Community Relations Committee. Works for Arnold Finnegan Martin, a public relations organization, and was involved with the Corps in the early stages of development. Missed much of the meetings in January and February which resulted in no press during that time. Became valuable in talking to The Richmond Times Dispatch and in planning press conferences.

* August Moon: Member-at-large on the Executive Committee. Involved with the United Struggle Movement, active in the music industry, and hosts a late night show on Richmond public television called "Tell It Like It Is". Grass roots leader that brings the "street" perspective to the Board of Directors. He claims that he is "an adamant fighter for his people" and that "he talks the talk and walks the walk". He has a very confident and confrontational attitude. Mr. Moon has amassed a great deal of support by appealing to the masses in Richmond and working to solve the problems facing the communities. He does not employ traditional means in tackling problems because, because like many people in the city of Richmond, he lives with them every hour of every day. Like Mr. Goodwin, he thinks that this organization should have happened yesterday and is pressing the Board to act quickly.

* Stuart Shumate: Treasurer of the Board of Directors. He is

"Interview with August Moon."
retired and used to chair RF&P Railroad. He is introverted and created the financial plan for the Greater Richmond Community Corps.

* Julious Smith: Counselor for the Greater Richmond Community Corps. He works as a partner at Williams, Mullen, Christian, & Dobbs. He created the by-laws of the Corps.

* James Ukrop: Chair of the Board Resources Committee. Vice-president and CEO of Ukrop's supermarkets, a local, family owned business. Gives the Board a business perspective with a community activist twist. He is not shy to make suggestions or voice concerns over the decisions made by the board. Like Dr. Griffin-Price, he wants the organization to take its time and "do the job right". He feels that quick action could kill the organization by setting it off on the wrong foot.

* Larry Walton: Chair of the Volunteer Recruitment and Training Committee. President of the United Way Services in Richmond. He was involved with the early planning of this concept and has been a constant and active participant since then. Even though it seems like the Greater Richmond Community Corps would overlap with the United Way, Mr. Walton has embraced this concept and really played a key role in defining it. He has also provided expertise in non-profit administration and assistance with issues like volunteer recruitment, volunteer training, and program issues. He has also offered to house the Corps in the United Way building and give it
access to local phone service.

GROUP DEVELOPMENT

Bruce W. Tuckman outlines five stages of group development: forming, storming, norming, performing, and adjourning. In order to understand the Board of Directors of the Greater Richmond Community Corps as a group, it is necessary to see their group development in relation to these stages.

Forming

The "forming" stage or the orientation stage of group development occurs when the group initially forms. For the Board of Directors, the formation stage began with the Mayor's idea of creating a volunteer corps in the Richmond area. He began by recruiting some influential members of the Richmond community as a preliminary planning committee. From there, the Mayor and this committee suggested potential Board members and other interested people from the community contacted the Mayor about joining the Board. The full Board of Directors for the Greater Richmond Community Corps met on November 7, 1995 for the first time and elected officers to the Executive Committee.

The formation of this Board of Directors is unique for many reasons. First, many of the Board members knew each other from previous contact with other organizations in Richmond or because of

their status and name recognition in the community. For example, Larry Walton, the President of the United Way, knew Carol Fox because she has worked with the United Way on many volunteer projects and she will lead the United Way campaign next year. This prior contact enabled the Board to move past the "who are you" stage and focus more on their task. Also, the Board of Directors was formed with the intentions of attaining Board diversity. As a result, there a people on the Board that represent all different sectors: business, community, religious, and political. Basically, these people come from very different backgrounds and perspectives on live and the problems of the Richmond area. Even though these people may have known each other before coming to the Board, few individuals have worked with a group of such diversity.

Storming

The second stage of group development, the "storming" stage, occurs when group members begin to have conflicts over norms and procedures. The storming stage of the Greater Richmond Community Corps became apparent at the January 27 meeting at the Henrico government center. At this meeting, the conflict began when August Moon questioned when the Corps was going to react to the problems in Richmond and "get something done". In his comments he referred to the recent violence that had plagued the city in the last week and asked the Board of Directors "where were we?" These comments signified a rift between two groups on the Board of Directors:
people who wanted to take their time and do things "the right way" and people who wanted action to happen yesterday and who want the Corps "to act now".

This conflict began to draw lines between some of the key players on the Executive Committee and created a tension that was apparent at following meetings. Jim Ukrop and Dr. Terrie Griffin-Price were probably the biggest advocates about the Board "taking their time". In meetings in which members discussed the accomplishments of the Board, Jim Ukrop always mentioned that the fact that the Corps had not acted yet was a very positive accomplishment. These people felt that to act quickly could mean that mistakes would be made and that the organization would receive a bad reputation in the community. This group felt that careful planning was the key to creating a successful organization to fight violence and crime in the Richmond area.

On the other side of this conflict was people who felt that the issues and the situation rendered action immediately from the Greater Richmond Community Corps. This side was led by August Moon, a community leader who lives on the streets and who deals with violence and crime issues on a daily basis. There were other people on the Board who shared his sentiments like Bill Goodwin and Teddy Gottwald, but he was the most vocal and persistent champion of this idea. The people who wanted immediate action believed that the Corps needed to be responsive in the Community in order to
attain success in fighting violence and crime. They felt that the issues would not stop and wait for the Corps to form and that they needed to be addressed immediately, not five months down the line. By waiting that long, they felt that the Corps was sitting by and watching violence and crime continue in Richmond. This group felt that the key to a successful organization committed to fighting these issues was to be responsive and active as soon as possible.

Another issue that lead to conflict with this group was the aim of the organization. Many people had misinterpreted the mission of the organization because it was so undefined and unclear. The main problems rested in the question, "what will the Corps actually do?" One of the purposes of the Corps was to coordinate resources in the Greater Richmond community. The question that arose at the Program committee meeting was "what would you define as resources?" Many people on the Board felt that one of the organization's roles was to provide local organizations with financial resources. However, this function would almost replicate the services of the United Way. At the Program committee meeting it was decided that the organization would provide human resources, donated goods, and technical assistance.

Another issue that led the group to storming was the press. The group realized that it would need to make a press statement or address the press in some way to show them what has the Corps has been doing. However, many of the people in Corps did not feel that
the Corps' accomplishments were pressworthy. Also, the members of the Board could not come to a decision on how to address the press. At one point, the Executive Committee had decided to send the press a score card. But, then Charlie Kouns, the head of the Communications committee thought it would be more effective to have a press luncheon. August Moon suggested that they tie in the Corps' press with the arrival of one of his relatives, a member of the Miami Dolphins football team, who had set press engagements. The Board never came to a conclusion on this issue which led to the negative "where is the Corps?" editorial in The Richmond Times Dispatch.

Finally, one of the last major conflicts arose during the Executive Director search. Even though the Board had a description of the qualifications for the Executive Director, they still did not agree on what they were looking for in a candidate. They initially felt that they could find the perfect person: in touch with the community, responsible, able to interact with business leaders and political official, etc. However, they soon learned that finding the perfect candidate would be tough and that they needed to redefine their idea on the best possible Executive Director candidate. Unfortunately, this debate surfaced in the middle of one of the second interviews from the first round of interviews and continued into the Executive Committee meeting. So, the conflict became, what is more important, community or
business/political? From these discussions, it was decided that when it came to hiring an Executive Director, they could not give on any of their expectations. Instead of settling for someone mediocre, the group would need to recruit people that they thought would fit the bid.

Norming

Forsyth writes that in the "norming" stage of group development, "intermember conflict is replaced by cohesiveness: a feeling of group unity, comrarderie, and espirit de corps". This stage for the development of the Greater Richmond Community Corps began to occur when the group prepared for the National Funding Collaborative site visit. In order to prepare for the visit, the group needed to assess the work they had done and their direction for the future. At the February 17, 1995 Executive Committee meeting at the Jefferson, the group began to assess their accomplishments and answer the question "how far have we come?". From this meeting, the group began to realize that in less than 12 weeks they created a brand new, non-profit organization with a strong foundation laid down by its mission and goals. Also, the group realized that each member would be needed to make the Greater Richmond Community Corps a reality.

This meeting represented the norming stage for the Board of

---

Directors for the Greater Richmond Community Corps because it was the first time since the group's formation that all of the member reached a consensus on the direction of the organization. They all agreed that the group had accomplished a great deal in a very short amount of time. Before, many people did not think that the Board of Directors was moving fast enough in creating the Corps. At that meeting, the members also began to truly listen to one another and work with one another to correct some to of the mistakes in the past. For example, they discussed the negative editorial about the Corps in *The Richmond Times Dispatch* and they came up with a group solution to this issue. Instead of blaming the Communications Chair for the negative press, the group worked together to find a solution. At this meeting, the Board of Directors finally distinguished norms about who they really are and what they were to accomplish, as a group, in the future.

Performing

The performing stage of group development is the task-performing stage. For the Greater Richmond Community Corps, this stage began on April 1, 1995 when Dr. Terrie Griffin-Price took the lead as the organization's first Executive Director. Dr. Terrie Griffin-Price entered this organization with a time line that by the end of the month she would:

- Office organization. Move into the offices at the United Way building and set up a workable location for a new organization.
Volunteer Resources. Organize the volunteer information. Contact the volunteers and see if they are still interested in serving with the Greater Richmond Community Corps. Answer the question, "how many volunteers are there?"

Set up the first volunteer training for the volunteers.

Continue to catalogue information about local organizations and initiatives committed to fighting violence and crime in the Greater Richmond area.

Begin to break down volunteers by zip code and plan community meeting in each area.

Attend all press conferences and meetings with local leaders that relate to the Corps.

Create personnel guidelines needed to hire additional staff.

Prepare for the Executive Committee meeting on April 21 and the Board of Directors meeting on April 28.

Even the performing stage has begun with the operation of the Greater Richmond Community Corps, much still has to occur with the Board of Directors. According to Carol Fox, the secretary of the Board, the Board is "missing some of the components that makes a board operative". For example, none of the committees are functioning yet and a good system of communication has not developed.

Adjourning

The last stage of group development is the "adjourning" stage which occurs when the group terminates or stops functioning as a group. With the Greater Richmond Community Corps, the adjourning stage of group development has not occurred. This stage will begin
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to occur in the next year when Board members begin to rotate off the Board. Also, it would occur if the organization fails to meet its mission or if the community is not ready to buy into this type of an organization.

GROUP DECISION MAKING AND PARTICIPATION

The Board of Directors acted as a planning team for the creation of the Greater Richmond Community Corps. Instead of having the Co Chairs of the Board make all the decisions, the members stressed the need for group decision making and for active participation of all members. According to Hedley Dimock, "Participative leadership by sharing decision making and other responsibilities enables a group to make full use of its members' potentials and increases self-esteem in the process".36

This group decision making and participation was evident at the retreat in December. In the preliminary planning sessions before the Board had met, a mission statement and goals had been created. However, instead of keeping that early work, the Board proceeded to create a new mission and goals. This type of work was done so that the entire Board could participate in the process. The leaders of the Corps understood that group decision making and participation empowered individuals and gave them ownership of the project.

This group decision making and participation continued with throughout the fifteen weeks that the group met to create the organization. Members had input into decisions like the hiring of the Executive Director, the press issues, and the by-laws. This type of decision making was effective in that by listening to many different perspectives, people considered all options before choosing a plan of action. However, this type of process also led to inaction in many cases. For example, with the press issue, the Executive Committee had made one decision, then the chair of the Communications committee gave a different suggestion. The two ideas were brought to the Board and no decision was ever reached about the issue. This inaction resulted in no press and a negative editorial in The Richmond Times Dispatch.

LEADERSHIP EMERGENCE AND STATUS CHARACTERISTICS

Even though there are formal leadership position on the Board of Directors of the Greater Richmond Community Corps, leadership was shared among many people. This shared leadership occurred because the societal problems that the Board was addressing were tough issues that affected every sector of society and called on every aspect of expertise. Also, the leaders on the Board of Directors seemed to understand that no one person had all of the answers. According to Forsyth, when examining leader emergence one "must examine two interrelated processes: why a group needs a
leader and who will fill the role of the leader". In order to find a Greater Richmond solution to a Greater Richmond problem, they needed to listen and learn from one another. Carol Fox says that in many cases some of the leaders "that have evolved have surprised her". She believes that one of the most exciting things about the Corps is that people "from different experiences and walks of life have come together and learned from one another".

This shared or emerging leadership was evident in the beginning meeting of the Greater Richmond Community Corps. For example, the entire Corps applauded Rick Gentry for the bus tour of housing in Richmond and claimed that "their eyes were opened by the experience". Also, Board members learned much from the on-the-street experience of August Moon. His community experience taught many of them lessons that they would have never known. In order to understand how different leaders evolved and emerged during different times, it will be beneficial to look at both specific and diffuse-status characteristics and the role they played in the group's leadership.

1. Specific-Status Characteristics

In the case of the Board of Directors, profession is a specific-status characteristic which is a "quality that attests to
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each individual's ability at the task to be performed in the context." With the Corps, this status characteristic played a key role in leadership emergence for the Board of Directors because it has affected the expertise of the Board of Directors. In the book *Leadership In Organizations* Gary Yukl writes that "A major source of power in organizations is expertise in solving problems and performing important tasks." With the Corps, at some points, the business leaders in the group, Bill Goodwin and Jim Ukrop, take the leadership role when business issues like hiring and fundraising are discussed. Their experience as business leaders gives the rest of the group a perspective they may not be aware of, but one that they need to take into account.

In situations in which community issues are being discussed, the community leaders emerge as the leaders of the group. A community leader like August Moon who fights violence and crime every single day of his life and who lives in the targeted areas, has knowledge about the community that few other Board members possess. He understands the clientele of the services that Corps wants to support and has a keen understanding of the root causes of violence and crime in Richmond. Differences in profession gives some individuals high status in some cases and other leaders high status in other situations. Basically, leadership within the Board

---
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emerged based on the context or the situation.

2. Diffuse-Status Characteristics

Diffuse-Status characteristics are "any general quality of the person that members think is relevant to the ability and evaluation"\(^{42}\). Similar to the specific-status characteristics, the leadership that emerged as a result of the diffuse-status characteristics was situational or dependent on the context or the topic of discussion. With the Board of Directors, three diffuse-status characteristics played a role in determining the leadership: age, race, and gender.

Age was an interesting variable to examine in terms of leadership emergence with this group. Almost all of the members of the Board of Directors were middle aged or older. The individuals on this Board of Directors were selected for their leadership experience in the community. By looking at this group, it would appear that all of the leaders are older individuals. There was one younger man on the Board, Teddy Gottwald, who works for Ethyl Corporation. Even though his status in the business sector enabled him to be selected for this Board, his age was noticed by all members. At one meeting, he supported August Moon and challenged the Board to move quickly and be responsive. The feeling amongst the other members about this stance was "he's young...he doesn't know." In this way, age has been equated with expertise and
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credibility and enables some people to emerge as leaders over others.

Race is also a characteristic that gave some members high status in some situations and others high status in others. Richmond is a city in which African-Americans are the majority and issues of violence and crime are focused on these communities. When discussion with the Board turned to community issues and the clients of the services, the African-Americans rose to leadership roles because their race seemed to enable them to understand these issues better and gave them almost an expert power. In other issues, like business issues, the white people in the room seemed to have a higher status. This difference may be attributed to the idea that the business world is still dominated by white men.

Finally, gender became a way in which status was differentiated on the Board of Directors. The two highest leadership positions, the Co Chairs, were occupied by men and women were only represented 25% of the Executive Committee. Of the women on the Executive Committee, one of them served the traditional female role as secretary, even though she had no secretarial skills, and the others were initially put on the Board as members-at-large. Also, at some meetings, an "old boys network" appeared in the beginning when all of the male business and political leaders exchanged pleasantries.

Even though this differentiation occurred in the Corps, the
members were blind to gender in the interviews for Executive Director and hired a woman to lead the organization. In many way, Dr. Griffin-Price's gender helped her attain this position because she was viewed as compassionate and caring, characteristics needed for someone to cradle a community and help it solve its problems. Also, Terrie was viewed as a nurturer and someone who is able to process information well and act carefully and wisely. In this case, gender turned out to be a high status characteristic for the Corps.

COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT

Even though the Board of Directors put a great deal of time and energy into the creation of the Greater Richmond Community Corps, it knows that it will not be successful without community empowerment. In the book The Leadership Challenge, Kouzes and Posner address this issue by writing that "exemplary leaders enlist the support and assistance of all those who must make the project work...They encourage collaboration, build teams, and empower others. They enable others to act". This idea ties into the idea that a community's problems will not be solved unless both the people living in the community and the ones affected by the problem feel a certain sense of ownership or tie to the solution.

The Board has begun to address this issue by their vision of how the Corps will work and how the services will be delivered. At
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the Program Committee meeting, it was discussed that the way the Corps should operate in fighting violence and crime is to go to the communities, find natural leadership and leadership mechanisms (community centers, churches, etc.). Find the community leaders and train them with problem solving, conflict resolution, and decision making skills. Then, place them back in the community as volunteers who also act as the eyes and ears of their area.

By working with people from the community rather than outsiders, the Corps will empower the community to make the changes needed to address violence and crime. One step of empowerment is to give the people "without" the resources needed to become people who are responsible for their futures. Also, by targeting people in the community, the Corps will be able to address the "real" problems in each area. One of the keys to community empowerment is the realization that problems differ from one area to another. Violence and crime cannot be addressed in all neighborhoods with the same prescription. In one neighborhood, the problem could be that the parents do not have transportation to attend meetings at schools. In another neighborhood, the amount of trash in the streets could be the major issue. The way that the Corps hopes to empower communities is to work with community leadership and develop community leadership.

STRENGTHS FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Timing
One of the greatest strengths for the Board of Directors of the Greater Richmond Community Corps is their timing. The people in the Greater Richmond area have hit a breaking point with the violence and crime in their community. Right now, many people have come to the realization that something has to happen now and that the problems are not just inner city problems, they are societal problems that affect everyone and that the solution must come from all sectors of society. Also, the political climate has turned so that community organizations fear the loss of government funding and financial resources. With this loss of resources, the human resources that the Corps could generate could enable these organizations to continue operating in Richmond and targeting issues of crime and violence.

Diversity

The Board of Directors of the Greater Richmond Community Corps has an amazing amount of diversity for a board of an organization. At the meetings, a grass roots community leader like August Moon interacts freely with a multi-million, business leader like Bill Goodwin. In very few instances do leaders from such diverse backgrounds interact with one another on a relatively equal level. This diversity adds to Board of Directors because the problems facing the Greater Richmond area are diverse and they affect everyone. A group of community leaders could not solve these problems on their own. They need the support of the political
community, the business sector, and the religious leaders. Also, the business community could not tackle this project alone. The diversity of the Greater Richmond Community Corps Board of Directors reflects the linkages needed in the community in order to address these problems.

Resource Mobilization

When a group of leaders as diverse and as prominent as those on the Board of Directors work together, they are able to mobilize a variety of resources needed for success. For example, because Larry Walton, the President of the United Way is on the Board of Directors, the Corps was able to use the United Way meeting rooms for their meetings. Also, Larry Walton has given the Greater Richmond Community Corps office space, phone service, their volunteer center for trainings and other organizational benefits. Without a Board member with Larry Walton's resources, the Corps would not have a place to meet or office space. Resources like the ones mentioned above have enabled the Corps to attain success and make their organization a reality.

One of the key issues from the retreat in December was that the Board members wanted to be educated about the issues of violence and crime in the community. This education occurred as a result of the resources of four Board members. Rick Gentry, the Executive Director of the Richmond Redevelopment and Housing Association was able to give the tour of public housing from his
professional experience. Jody Mc Williams recruited some people from that use the services of his organization, the William Byrd Community Center, to talk to Board members about the issues. Finally, Barbara Perrins offered the use of a bus that is owned by her organization Stargate and Jim Ukrop provided Ukrop's box lunches from his grocery store, Ukrop's. Without Board members with these types of resources, this educational opportunity would have never occurred. The resources of the members of the Board have added to this group's success in creating the Corps.

OBSTACLES FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

In almost every situation, leaders are faced with obstacles that affect their performance and their success. The same can be said for the Board of Directors of the Greater Richmond Community Corps. Some of the issues that the leaders on the Board of Directors faced include:

Political Pressures

The Greater Richmond Community has and probably always will have to deal with the issue of political pressure. This type of pressure became associated with the Corps because the Mayor initiated this project and announced the idea of a volunteer corps in the fall. As a political official who hopes to get re-elected, Mayor Young has a lot of personal stake invested in the success of the Corps. He put his name with the Corps and used his political clout to make it a reality. If the Corps does not respond to the
issues or it fails in meeting its mission, the blame will fall directly on the Mayor.

The Board of Directors of the Greater Richmond Community Corps felt political pressure continuously as they worked to create this organization. For example, when the Board of Directors asked the four municipalities for $30,000 a piece, the counties were reluctant to contribute their share until the City committed to the amount. In other political dealings, the City had not contributed to regional initiatives that the counties committed to funding. So, for political reasons, the counties held off on making their contributions. This political issue made the Board of Directors task even harder because they were dealing with issues in which they had no control. Also, the Mayor's office has kept constant checks on the Corps to evaluate in progression. These constant checks kept pressure on the Board members to get something accomplished. The leadership felt as if they were being held accountable by the Mayor's office and that they must act quickly.

Press

The press was another obstacle that affected the Corps performance. In January, the Board realized that if they did not address the press, they may fall victim to bad press. The members of the Board of Directors debated over the best way to approach the press, but unfortunately never came to a conclusion. This lack of action in the press resulted in an editorial in The Richmond Times
Dispatch that basically said that they felt the Corps was a great idea, but they wondered where it was because they had not heard anything about its progress since November.

This negative editorial gave the members of the Greater Richmond Community Corps a shock. One of their biggest fears is that they would receive a bad reputation in the community before they began to operate. At the February 17, 1995 Executive Committee meeting, the group needed to figure out a way to combat this negative press and repair the damage it had done. The group planned a meeting with representatives from The Richmond Times Dispatch and a more positive editorial appeared in the paper soon after that meeting. Also, the Corps held a press conference when they hired Dr. Griffin-Price as their Executive Director. The press put a great deal of pressure on the Corps because they had the power of reaching many people. After the negative editorial was printed, the members of the Board spent much time correcting the damage it had on the organization. This obstacle affected the performance of the Corps' leaders and could have potentially hurt the organization's success.

Financial Resources

Finally, the financial situation of the Greater Richmond Community Corps affected the leadership of the Board of Directors. When the Board put out the advertisement for the Executive Director with a salary range of $50,000 to $70,000 a year, the organization
had no financial resources. The Board members felt obligated to alert the candidates for this position that they were dealing with "soft money" and they were advertising money that they did not have yet. The Board members felt that disclosing this information could potentially mislead some of the candidates and misrepresent the facts.

In order to obtain the needed financial resources, the Board members needed to act quickly. Bill Goodwin drafted a letter that was sent to the four municipalities requesting $30,000 a piece and time was spent in determining when that issue would be voted on by the local government bodies. When the counties requested that Richmond commit the funds first, the Board began to worry about the financial livelihood of this organization. For example, at the February 17 Executive Committee meeting, Cricket White mentioned that she thought that the funding requests by the municipalities would not be successful. The pressure that the members felt from not having these resources made them act quicker in targeting the counties and made them wary of the organization's future.

STRENGTHS FOR THE GREATER RICHMOND COMMUNITY CORPS

New organization

From the very beginning the Board of Directors has felt that the fact that the Corps is a brand new organization, is one of its greatest strengths. As a new organization committed to addressing violence and crime in Richmond, it does not have to contend with a
history or a reputation that it would proceed it. Instead, it has
the power to really create change in the community because its
success is unknown and unforeseeable. The leaders involved with
the Corps feel as if they have been given the power to create a
leadership mechanism from scratch.

Also, the newness of the organization has brought a lot of
enthusiasm to it. People are excited about the idea that someone
is trying a new and creative approach in solving these societal
problems. When the Mayor called for citizens to volunteer, he only
expected 50 people to respond. Instead, he received 800 pledges
from the community. This response reflects the enthusiasm that
people have for this type of organization. The mission and the
goals are very cutting edge and people feel that it can make a
difference in solving some of the toughest problems facing leaders
today.

Mission

Larry Walton believes that one of the biggest strengths of the
Corps is its mission. The purpose of a mission statement is to
guide the focus of the entire organization and motivate the
employees to work to their potential. In reference to the Corps'
mission, Larry Walton says, "who can argue with this mission".
Unlike other volunteer centers in cities across the United States,
the mission statement says that the Greater Richmond Community
Corps is focusing its efforts on violence and crime prevention
programs aimed at children and youth. This differentiation is critical because the Corps is addressing a specific societal problem and wants to show solid results.

OBSTACLES FACING THE GREATER RICHMOND COMMUNITY CORPS

Staff Support

Currently, the key obstacle facing the Corps is the lack of staff support in the office. Right now, Dr. Griffin-Price is running the office by herself with the help of a few volunteers. She is supposed to be able to hire an Assistant, but the Board has delayed that move for six months (they do not want the organization to look too top heavy). This lack of staff support is an obstacle because it limits what the Corps can get accomplished in the first few months. How is Terrie supposed to hold community meetings or hire an Administrative Assistant if she is busy answering the phones, running to the post office, and setting up the phone system. The problem is that their are high expectations for the Corps in its first few months from the Board, the press, and the political leadership. The question that has to be addressed is, how can anything get accomplished if their is no office support?

Community Empowerment

Carol Fox mentioned that one of the obstacles she foresees for the Corps is their ability to empower the community. Community empowerment is a necessity if the Corps is to attain success in this area because the key is to get the people affected the
resources needed to impact the future. Carol Fox fears that the community may not be ready for the mission of the Corps and they may not embrace this concept like the Board has. What happens if the citizens in Richmond really do not have an interest in volunteering in these agencies for the long-run? What if the people in the community do not trust the Corps or feel the need to create change in their world? Unfortunately, the answers to these questions cannot be answered now. If the Corps works hard at listening to people and meeting their needs, hopefully this potential obstacle will not turn into a reality.

Measuring the Impact

When examining the issue of violence and crime, one can look at numbers and statistics to measure the impact in the community. One of the obstacles that the Corps may face is the inability to measure its successes in decreasing violence and crime in the Greater Richmond area. There are two basic way that this impact can be measured: qualitatively and quantitatively. The first method is much easier than the latter. All you need to do is get narrative from people who have been affected by the Corps' work. However, getting the quantitative evidence may be difficult because it may not be possible to measure the change in numbers and statistics. Unfortunately, this quantitative information is important because people rely so heavily on those indicators. If the Corps worked for two years and Richmond was still ranked number
two in the nation for their homicide rate, how would that reflect on the effectiveness of the Corps?

PERSONAL LEADERSHIP REFLECTIONS:

In this portion of the paper, I am going to reflect on my role with the Greater Richmond Community Corps and my leadership impressions.

MY ROLE WITH THE CORPS

First, the role I played in this project with the Greater Richmond Community Corps was that of a field observer. Instead of this project being a straight internship, it took the shape of an active research project. This idea means that I researched this topic by observing and tracing an active process which was the evolution of the Corps. I accomplished this task by attending all Board and Executive Committee meetings and by observing all of the interactions and decisions made by this group. I also interviewed five participants in this process: Carol Fox, Terrie Griffin-Price, August Moon, Larry Walton, and Cricket White, for their reflections and thoughts on the creation of the Corps. By doing all this research, I hoped to leave the Corps an extensive piece on their evolution so that it could be used for reference by the organization and by other cities hoping to make the same type of change.

I also contributed to the evolution of this group by serving them with my time. In the formative stages, I worked with Cricket
White, the staff liaison from the Mayor's office who was swamped by her numerous projects and responsibilities. At that time, I assisted her with Board communication issues like notifying people of meetings (they were called with a weeks notice) and by assembling the information generated by the Board from all of the meetings. With this type of work, I learned the lessons of "grunt work" in an organization. Someone needs to fax meeting announcements if a Board of over forty members is expected to attend in a weeks notice. Also, because the Board was so large and meetings were called so suddenly, few people attended all of the meetings. So, organization of materials was needed to educate the Board members of information and decisions they missed at the previous meetings.

After Dr. Griffin-Price was hired as the Executive Director, I began to work with her in the offices of the Greater Richmond Community Corps. The first day I assisted her with basic office set up. Then, in the proceeding days I contacted the people who had filled out the volunteer forms to see if they were still interested in volunteering, and if so, if they could attend a volunteer training at the end of April. Earlier in the semester, I had contacted LINCS to obtain a copy of their information about community organizations in the Greater Richmond area. I received this information in the beginning of April and began weeding through the different agencies and developed a form that will be
used in interviewing other programs.

As my role changed to a more "internship-like" position, I began to make a few observations about new organizations. First, setting up an office takes a great deal of work. For the Corps, it took a week to get all of the furniture set up, the phones connected, and the computers operating. However, while all of this maintenance work had to be done, the Corps was expected to make progress in reaching its mission and goals. How can an organization operate when the phones are barely working? What can a leader do if he/she does not even have paper, pens, or envelopes? I was amazed by the pressures being put on Terrie by the Board and the political figures to "get something done" when she barely had the tools to start. I have learned that in setting up an organization, it is easy to overlook the set up period.

I was also shocked by the immense amounts of projects needed to be addressed in the first few months. Volunteers needed to be contacted, trained, and matched up with agencies. Also, the programs in the area needed to be catalogued and targeted in order to complete these linkages. Finally, Terrie had to meet with countless business, political, and community leaders. It seemed like an endless amount of urgent work for one person. Currently, the one major weakness of the organization is that it is understaffed. There is no possible way that one person can handle the task that Terrie has before her.
LEADERSHIP IMPRESSIONS

From my study of the Greater Richmond Community Corps, I learned countless lessons that have enhanced my knowledge and understanding of leadership. The first lesson that I learned is that leaders need to listen to others and learn from their experiences. One of the most amazing stories I heard from Larry Walton related to an incident that happened on the bus tour. Bill Goodwin, a wealthy business leader, went on the bus tour with the Board as someone who is generally uneducated about urban issues. Larry says that he was amazed to see how much Bill's eyes were opened by the experience. He recounts that at one point, Bill remarked on how shocked he was by what he saw. He claimed that he had never seen these neighborhoods before and never knew these conditions existed. At one point he turned to Rick Gentry, the Executive Director of the Richmond Redevelopment and Housing Association and asked, "do these people have air conditioning?" Rick answered that they did not. Bill followed up this answer by asking, "If my company bought air conditioning units for all these people, do think this will help solve some of the problems in this community?"

Even though air conditioning is not the solution to inner city problems, Bill Goodwin demonstrated an attribute that is needed--an open mind and the willingness to learn. Each person on the Board of Directors left this experience as a better person because they
learned about issues in which had no expertise. For example, the community leaders learned about the necessity for relationships with the business community and the political sector. They learned about the importance of these two groups in fighting issues like violence and crime and how the associated issues could affect an organization like the Corps. Also, business and community leaders learned about the politics associated with this type of an organization. The political leaders told them when was the best time to approach the municipalities for funding and the political situations between the four localities. This information proved useful when funding issues arose.

I was surprised to see how necessary the participation was on the Board of Directors. Without the input of all of the members on many of the issues, the best decisions would not have been reached. Instead of letting one leader answer all the questions and make all the decisions, the Corps needed to utilize the skills and talents of many of the members. For example, Larry Walton played a key role in setting up this organization because he had experience in non-profit administration as the president of the United Way. As a result, he knew how to apply for 501(c)3 status and he understood the need for the Board to take its time. Also, August Moon's expertise was in his knowledge of the community and in community problem solving. This focus gave the Corps the "street perspective" needed in addressing issues like community empowerment.
and organizational impact.

I was also impressed with the level of commitment of the Board members. Many members of the Board attended up to four meetings a week and spent countless hours in the creation of the Corps. Most of these active members have shared that they have not committed so much time and energy to any other project they have undertaken in the past. This type of time commitment is rare for people in the leadership positions represented on the Board. Often, high profile leaders will be nominated to Boards and rarely show up for the meetings. However, in this case, business leaders, like Jim Ukrop, attended most of the meetings and really put in all of their time and energy into this project. Also, the Judge, who is now working as a lawyer, provided the links between the Board, the Executive Committee, the Mayor's office, and the public.

**CONCLUSION:** Over the semester, I have watched the Greater Richmond Community Corps move from a mission statement to an organization that just opened it doors in the last two weeks. By studying the evolution of the Greater Richmond Community Corps, I have examined leadership from many different perspectives and gained much insight from my observations that have changed the way I think about leadership. From this study, I have seen individual leaders from different backgrounds and expertise come together and form a leadership mechanism constructed to fight some of the toughest issues facing society. These leaders all participated in the
process and enabled the Greater Richmond Community Corps to become a true regional, collaborative effort. This study will allow other areas and future generations to learn from this type of leadership to solve problems facing our society.
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