

Teacher Resource Carousel Explanation

Carousel Activity

Explanation:

Tell students that this activity will give them an opportunity to work with a partner as they read through and analyze several case studies. Tell students that they will find copies of each case study and some analysis questions at different stations set up around the room.

Directions to give to students:

1. Working with your partner, you will move to a station, and sign in.
2. You and your partner should read the case study and contribute answers to some or all of the analysis questions.
3. When you complete one station, or when time is called by your teacher, move to another station, sign in, read that case study and work on those questions. (This process will be followed until all pairs have had an opportunity to read and respond to all case studies.)
4. Sometimes, when you get to a station, you will see answers already on the analysis sheet. In that case, you must add to the answers that are already there, by finding more information, supporting details or examples, etc. To make it easy to distinguish your responses from your classmates, each pair will use a unique writing tool (different color ink, different kind of pen or pencil or marker, etc.)
5. You may not repeat anything that is already written, so work carefully.

Teacher Resource
Carousel Station Guide

Carousel Case Study — Example (Page 1 of 5)

Case Study: South Bronx: New York City: Case Study #5

Carousel partners, please, sign in:

- Name of Student
- Name of Student
- Name of Student
- Name of Student

Analysis Questions:

A. Background Information

1. WHAT IS THE SITUATION THAT EXISTED?	2. WHAT WAS THE IMPETUS FOR STARTING THIS INITIATIVE?
<p><i>In the South Bronx community of Melrose Commons, there had/has been a long history of inadequate housing, urban planning and unemployment. The population was primarily African-American and Latino with a median annual household income of less than \$12,000.</i></p>	<p><i>Beginning in 1992, South Bronx residents began to work together in response to New York City's new Urban Renewal program. This program plan had proposed a restructuring of homes, parks and streets. Yet, the plan had not included the input of community residents who felt that issues such as affordable housing, equal access to the proposed park and displacement had not been adequately addressed. So community members held a community meeting to discuss what they thought would be a plan that would benefit everyone with a stake in the community renewal process.</i></p>

Teacher Resource
Carousel Station Guide

Carousel Case Study — Example (Page 2 of 5)

B. Participants

3. WHO ARE THE KEY PEOPLE INVOLVED IN THE INITIATIVE?	4. WHAT ROLES DO THOSE INVOLVED PLAY?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All community residents including: homeowners, tenants, businesses, professionals (planners, architects, lawyers, etc.) and employees. They called themselves “Nos Quedamos” or <i>the We Stay Committee</i>• The Bronx Center Project, a large community-based planning project was also involved• New York City Municipal government officials• <i>Sustainable South Bronx, a collegial colleague of Nos Quedamos</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The community residents played a role by voicing their needs and opinions about the planning process. They also played an important civic role by forming a group “Nos Quedamos” to provide a joint platform for the community’s planning process• The Bronx Center Project’s role in this sustainable community initiative was to provide direction for Nos Quedamos, because of its experience in directing a \$2 billion investment for urban renewal• Municipal government officials in New York City played a role by listening to their constituent’s concerns and working with them in addressing the challenge of organizing a community renewal initiative. Essentially, their role was to show and uphold the democratic participation process and exchange between citizens and their elected officials

Teacher Resource
Carousel Station Guide

Carousel Case Study — Example (Page 3 of 5)

C. Challenges/Strategies

5. WHAT CHALLENGES ARE BEING FACED?	6. WHAT STRATEGIES OR PROCESSES DID THEY USE TO ADDRESS THE CHALLENGES THAT EXIST?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Providing a community redevelopment framework that respected everyone's input into the process• <i>Providing new social services and revising old social services to more accurately meet the community's renewal process</i>• <i>Supporting economic development specifically relative to the Melrose Commons community</i>• Creating a better quality of life for existing and future residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Community residents postponed the certification of the proposed city urban renewal plan and had a six-month extension to develop an alternative proposal• The Melrose Commons community involved community members and public officials to create a plan that meet everyone's needs• Community residents worked with public agencies to look for loans, assistance, etc.; worked with local construction companies that employed local South Bronx residents• Community members voiced their design goals of creating mixed affordable housing, block parks; and establishing community gardens and more alternative transportation options and pedestrian friendly sidewalks• Community members conducted block-by-block surveys; held over 168 meetings in 1993; held update meetings for those who were not involved in initial planning sessions• Community members held voter registration drives to ensure support for the local elected officials that were working with them on the new proposal and worked with professionals who provided expertise in planning, architectural design, law, etc.

Teacher Resource
Carousel Station Guide

Carousel Case Study Analysis Sheet (Page 4 of 5)

D. Sustainability

Characteristics of Sustainable Community Projects

- community consensus building/dialogue;
- community education e.g., skills, knowledge — ecological literacy etc.;
- cultural integrity;
- creative- holistic- solution oriented — not problem-driven (solutions solve more than one problem at a time);
- development of catalytic–servant–participatory leadership;
- documentation of historical and current assets and liabilities;
- ecological/natural systems are protected and/or enhanced;
- ecological design of systems, energy flows and material cycles;
- efficient energy use;
- future-based vision;
- inclusive participation in planning and decision making;
- just and equitable social systems;
- local/regional indicators of sustainability are developed and linked to macro indicators of sustainability;
- solutions, plans and designs draw on citizen’s intuition, memory and wisdom;
- systems approach to planning and decision making; and
- More advanced communities are going for a zero emissions rate, closed loop-no waste material cycles, totally renewable energy sources and buildings that generate energy, clean air and water, and produce food.

7. WHAT MAKES THIS PROJECT A “SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY PROJECT?” USE THE ABOVE LIST TO HELP YOU TO IDENTIFY SPECIFIC CHARACTERISTICS

Future-based vision (of urban renewal incorporating economic, social and environmental development)

Alternative transportation, capture/reuse of rainwater

Local/Regional indicators (like amount of material trucked in from further than 8 miles away)

Inclusive participation (community members AND public official, block-by-block surveys, over 168 meetings in a year!)

Solution-oriented – solve multiple problems (when building new housing, used local workers)

Community education (on-going educational workshops for residents)

Teacher Resource
Carousel Station Guide

Carousel Case Study — Example (Page 5 of 5)

E. Comparison — What similarities and/or differences do you see between this case study and the others you have read so far?

8. NAME OF OTHER CASE STUDY	SIMILARITIES	DIFFERENCES
Long Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Both case studies visioning and indicators process involved focusing on alternative transportation options• Both case studies illustrate a visioning process that involves and incorporates all the perspectives and opinions of various community members• Both case studies involved local community groups and government organizations in their community revitalization projects• Both case studies are in the New York City metropolitan area	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Long Island case study faced the challenge of redeveloping environmentally damaged lands and so developed indicators different than the Melrose Commons community• The Long Island case study's emphasized transportation and street redesign more than the housing focus in Melrose Commons• The Long Island case study illustrates the work of a number of communities in Long Island versus the one area of the South Bronx: Melrose Commons• The Long Island case study researched other community initiatives around the country while creating their initial visioning process

Student Handout
Carousel Explanation

Carousel Activity

Explanation:

This activity will give you an opportunity to work with a partner as you read through and analyze several case studies. You will find copies of each case study and some analysis questions at different stations set up around the room.

Directions:

1. Working with your partner, you will move to a station, and sign in.
2. You and your partner should read the case study and contribute answers to some or all of the analysis questions.
3. When you complete one station, or when time is called by your teacher, move to another station, sign in, read that case study and work on those questions. (This process will be followed until all pairs have had an opportunity to read and respond to all case studies.)
4. Sometimes, when you get to a station, you will see answers already on the analysis sheet. In that case, you must add to the answers that are already there, by finding more information, supporting details or examples, etc. To make it easy to distinguish your responses from your classmates, each pair will use a unique writing tool (different color ink, different kind of pen or pencil or marker, etc.)
5. You may not repeat anything that is already written, so work carefully.

Student Handout
Carousel Station Guide

Carousel Case Study (Page 1 of 5)

Case Study: _____

Carousel partners, please, sign in:

- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

Analysis Questions:

A. Background Information

1. WHAT IS THE SITUATION THAT EXISTED?	2. WHAT WAS THE IMPETUS FOR STARTING THIS INITIATIVE?

Student Handout
Carousel Station Guide

Carousel Case Study Analysis Sheet (Page 2 of 5)

B. Participants

3. WHO ARE THE KEY PEOPLE INVOLVED IN THE INITIATIVE?	4. WHAT ROLES DO THOSE INVOLVED PLAY?

Student Handout
Carousel Station Guide

Carousel Case Study Analysis Sheet (Page 3 of 5)

C. Challenges/Strategies

5. WHAT CHALLENGES ARE BEING FACED?	6. WHAT STRATEGIES OR PROCESSES DID THEY USE TO ADDRESS THE CHALLENGES THAT EXIST?

Student Handout
Carousel Station Guide

Carousel Case Study Analysis Sheet (Page 4 of 5)

D. Sustainability

Characteristics of Sustainable Community Projects

- community consensus building/dialogue;
- community education e.g., skills, knowledge — ecological literacy etc.;
- cultural integrity;
- creative- holistic- solution oriented — not problem-driven (solutions solve more than one problem at a time);
- development of catalytic–servant–participatory leadership;
- documentation of historical and current assets and liabilities;
- ecological/natural systems are protected and/or enhanced;
- ecological design of systems, energy flows and material cycles;
- efficient energy use;
- future-based vision;
- inclusive participation in planning and decision making;
- just and equitable social systems;
- local/regional indicators of sustainability are developed and linked to macro indicators of sustainability;
- solutions, plans and designs draw on citizen’s intuition, memory and wisdom;
- systems approach to planning and decision making; and
- More advanced communities are going for a zero emissions rate, closed loop-no waste material cycles, totally renewable energy sources and buildings that generate energy, clean air and water, and produce food.

7. WHAT MAKES THIS PROJECT A “SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY PROJECT?” USE THE ABOVE LIST TO HELP YOU TO IDENTIFY SPECIFIC CHARACTERISTICS

Student Handout
Carousel Station Guide

Carousel Case Study Analysis Sheet (Page 5 of 5)

E. Comparison — What similarities and/or differences do you see between this case study and the others you have read so far?

8. NAME OF OTHER CASE STUDY	SIMILARITIES	DIFFERENCES

Student Handout
Jigsaw Analysis Packet

Jigsaw Analysis (Page 1 of 5)

Directions:

- You and your group will work on only ONE area (Background Information, Participants, Challenges/Strategies, Sustainability or Comparisons).
- Use the section of this analysis sheet that relates to the area you are dealing with.
- Read through the packet of analysis sheets provided and compile/combine the information, noting any similarities and/or differences in the information listed.
- Be prepared to report your findings to the class.
- As other groups report their findings, take notes in the appropriate sections.

A. Background Information

1. What commonalities or patterns emerge for you as you look at the situations that exist in the case studies?

2. What, if any, generalizations can you make about the impetus for starting a community initiative?

Student Handout

Jigsaw Analysis Packet

Jigsaw Analysis (Page 2 of 5)

B. Participants

3. Based on the stories in these case studies, what can you say about the people who seem to become involved in community initiatives?

4. What can you determine about the role(s) taken on by those who become involved in community initiatives?

Student Handout

Jigsaw Analysis Packet

Jigsaw Analysis (Page 3 of 5)

C. Challenges/Strategies

5. What commonalities can you find among the various challenges faced by the communities in the case studies that you read?

6. How would you describe or categorize the strategies and/or processes used to address the challenges presented in the case studies?

Student Handout
Jigsaw Analysis Packet

Jigsaw Analysis (Page 4 of 5)

D. Sustainability

7. Of the characteristics of sustainable communities that are apparent in the case studies, which seem to be shared by the communities?

Which, if any, seem specific to a particular situation?

Student Handout
Jigsaw Analysis Packet

Jigsaw Analysis (Page 5 of 5)

8. What are the most important similarities that you can see among the case studies? (List no more than five) Why do you think they are important?

Which two differences would you consider most striking? What is it about them that make them stand out to you?

Student Handout

Case Study Comparisons

Directions:

Complete this question individually. Be prepared to share with the class.

- 1. What is it we that we can learn from these case studies about how to make effective, sustainable change in our communities?**

Teacher Resource

Case Study Comparisons

Student Directions:

Complete this question individually. Be prepared to share your impressions with the class.

1. What is it we learned about how to make effective change in our communities?

- WE CAN LEARN THE PROCESS THAT OTHER COMMUNITIES HAVE FOLLOWED IN MAKING THEIR COMMUNITIES MORE SUSTAINABLE.

The process that these communities have taken all followed a similar process. This included:

- 1) addressing the challenges that their communities are facing;
- 2) bringing community members and other groups together to define the challenge;
- 3) establishing a visioning process for how their community will look;
- 4) defining or listing goals for the community based on their vision;
- 5) implementing strategies to meet their goals/indicators; and
- 6) continuing the community initiative process even after initial strategy implementation.
- 7) In some cases (Chattanooga, TN), the community has even undergone a re-visioning process based on the length of time their initiative has been in place, and reassessing the communities needs.

(Teacher may want to use “[Carousel Case Study — Example](#)” Teacher Resource of the South Bronx case study on p. 9 as an overhead or model to illustrate and revisit the general process of sustainable community initiatives.)

- WE CAN LEARN HOW TO MAKE EFFECTIVE CHANGE IN OUR COMMUNITIES.

Using the case studies, teacher should use a few examples of all the positive and effective changes that have been accomplished.

For example, in the San Francisco Bay Area case study, effective change has been made in bringing private investment into communities that need more economic incentives. This community also succeeded in March 2003 to obtain approval for its’ Smart Growth alternative proposals by the Association of Bay Area governments.

The Phillips Neighborhood case study illustrates how communities can effectively create change by demonstrating how community collaboration and the sustainable community process resulted in the creation of the “ReUse Center” and community gardens. They also succeeded in creating effective change by ensuring that the county did not build a garbage transfer station.

The Curitiba case study illustrates the effective change that citizens can perform in their communities by creating a mass transportation plan that ensures a clean environment and easy access and mobility for all of the city’s residents.

- **WE CAN LEARN FROM OTHER COMMUNITIES’ EXPERIENCES IN ORDER TO MAKE THE ROAD EASIER FOR US TO START ON.**

This lesson is illustrated because they should show students that there is a process for addressing their community challenges that has proven to be very effective in many different types of communities. The Chattanooga and Curitiba case studies illustrate this because they mention how they have been used as models by other communities (national

Teacher Resource

and international). The Long Island case study also illustrates how the community considered other sustainable community initiatives during the beginning of its visioning and community improvement process.

- **WE CAN LEARN HOW PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY IN COMMUNITIES RESULTS IN IMPROVED COMMUNITIES.**

All the case studies illustrate how various citizens, community groups and government officials and agencies at the local and national level collaborated and created a better quality of life for their community’s citizens. They also illustrate the importance of participating in improving your community and working with local and national groups and government to implement effective change. Examples of the various collaborations between these groups can be given to students.

Student Handout
Sustainable Community
Case Studies Packet

The San Francisco Bay Area Alliance —

COMMUNITY CHALLENGES AND A MOVE TOWARDS CHANGE

The San Francisco Bay Area of northern California has a vibrant economy, abundant environmental resources, cultural amenities, educational institutions and a culturally diverse population. However, in the 1990s, the Bay Area's nine counties began experiencing rapid population growth. In 1999, a number of Bay Area leaders began to look ahead into the future and contemplate how predicted increases in the population and job market would affect how everyone lived and worked in the year 2020. They realized that growth problems such as traffic congestion, long commutes, overburdened transit systems, lack of sufficient housing, skyrocketing housing costs, loss of open space, declining neighborhoods, air and water pollution and an inequitable distribution of social benefits would need to be innovatively and integrally addressed in order to ensure a high quality of life for all Bay Area citizens.

Challenged by these conditions and inspired by examples of new styles of development, committed Bay Area citizens and organizations joined with local and regional government agencies to undertake the task of investigating how the Bay Area could “grow smarter.” Beginning in 1999, five Bay Area regional agencies — Association of Bay Area Governments, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Bay Conservation and Development Commission, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board — came together to plan a “smart growth” initiative. In 2000, these regional agencies teamed up with the Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities (Bay Area Alliance), a coalition of public and private organizations and businesses established in 1997 to develop and implement a sustainability action plan for the Bay Area.

The Bay Area Alliance had plans for its own “Regional Livability Footprint Project,” an effort to reach consensus on a preferred land use pattern that could place the region on a more sustainable path. The Alliance’s “e-vision” of the future integrates the “three E’s” of sustainable development: a prosperous *economy*, a quality *environment* and social *equity*. This “e-vision” is embodied in the Alliance’s *Draft Compact for a Sustainable Bay Area* and also provides the context for the **Smart Growth Strategy/Regional Livability Footprint Project**.

The Smart Growth Strategy/Regional Livability Footprint Project was organized around the perception that widespread support was essential. The high level of commitment from the private sector, local and regional government agencies, as well as the involvement of local communities were key ingredients to the project’s viability. The project’s three primary goals are to *create* a smart growth land use vision for the Bay Area; *identify and obtain* regulatory changes and



San Francisco Bay Bridge —
©<http://www.abag.ca.gov/planning/smartgrowth/publicworkshops.html>.
Permission Pending.

Student Handout

Sustainable Community

Case Studies Packet

incentives needed to accomplish these objectives; and *develop* a 20-year land use and transportation projection based on the vision.

ENVISIONING THE FUTURE



Over the next two years, elected officials, business and community leaders, environmentalists, social equity advocates, planners, analysts, mapmakers, agency representatives and interested citizens devoted thousands of hours to the project. More than 2,000 residents from throughout the region attended daylong Saturday workshops held in each of the Bay Area's nine counties during the fall of 2001 and the spring of 2002. Workshop participants conceptualized how future growth should occur in their individual neighborhoods, counties, and in the region as a whole using both geographic information system mapping (GIS) and large county maps. These tools allowed workshop participants to immediately visualize how their ideas would affect the development of their communities. The vision that developed in the public workshops represented a new way of thinking about the region's course of growth.

Residents designed “smart growth” alternatives that focused on revitalizing central cities and older suburbs, supporting and enhancing public transit, promoting walking and bicycling, and preserving open spaces and agricultural lands. They saw smart growth alternatives as revitalizing the already-built environment and fostering efficient development with the goal of creating more livable communities with sufficient housing for the region’s workforce.



A project team then incorporated all the workshop proposals into three thematic smart growth alternatives for the Bay Area region. These three smart growth alternatives differed according to their emphasis on either urban or suburban economic and transportation development.

©<http://www.abag.ca.gov/planning/smartgrowth/publicworkshops.html>. Permission Pending.

DEFINING GOALS AND MEASURING PROGRESS (INDICATORS)

In August 2002, the Regional Livability Footprint Project’s steering committee adopted an illustrative, written description of the smart growth vision of workshop participants. They also accepted the specific patterns of growth that the workshop participants had identified for each county as a starting point to guide the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) in setting their 20-year job and housing projections for the region. For the first time, these job and housing projections would be based on community-based alternative visions to guide future growth.

ABAG researchers work with hundreds of variables in their projections of possible outcomes in employment and housing. Once the Regional Livability Footprint Project’s alternative growth

Student Handout

Sustainable Community

Case Studies Packet

scenario begins to be implemented, progress will be measured against the Bay Area Alliance's e-vision goals using the initial set of indicators first identified in the organization's *Draft Compact*. The indicators chosen vary from measuring a sustainable economy, housing supply, transportation, natural assets, resource use and civic engagement. Specific indicators measuring civic engagement included rates of voter participation and the diversity of local government officials. Some examples of indicators used to measure the Bay Area's natural assets included the amount of protected land and water use per capita. A full summary of the Bay Area Alliance's first indicators report is available at <http://www.bayareaalliance.org/indicators.html>.

STRATEGIES AND IMPLEMENTATION

In March 2003, the ABAG executive board adopted the alternative projections. These projections are now being used by a number of agencies — the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and other agencies — for the purposes of planning for the year 2004. The biggest challenge now is to enact the fiscal incentives and regulatory changes necessary to make smart growth a reality.

ABAG and the Bay Area Alliance are working with other regional agencies and local governments throughout the region to develop and pursue policy changes and funding. A Smart Growth Caucus already exists in Sacramento, California's state capital.

A MAP OF THE COMMUNITY TODAY

Today, the Bay Area Alliance is continuing with an ongoing education and engagement campaign to “reach consensus region wide among a critical mass of stakeholder organizations and civic leaders regarding a new shared vision rooted in common values about how the region can grow in a more sustainable manner.” The Alliance has resurrected the Sustainability Programs Roundtable, a gathering of sustainable city representatives and organizations from the entire region, to generate ideas about policy and implementation.

An additional implementation program that has the potential to significantly change the map of the Bay Area is the Community Capital Investment Initiative (CCII). CCII is an innovative effort to bring private capital investments into the Bay Area's most economically disadvantaged communities by mobilizing Bay Area business, community and government leaders to facilitate large-scale market-based investments in impoverished Bay Area neighborhoods. Through CCII, these leaders meet on various advisory councils to develop mechanisms for achieving community benefits from investments made by the Bay Area Family of Funds, a separate organization working with CCII. The Bay Area Family of Funds has raised nearly \$150 million in private equity for community investment.

The Alliance's website profiles encouraging examples of efforts undertaken by residents, businesses, schools, and government agencies working towards a sustainable future. Today, the

Student Handout
Sustainable Community
Case Studies Packet

Bay Area Alliance is considering the creation of a Speakers Bureau to expand into more of the Bay Area community.

Adapted from: The Association of Bay Area Governments. "The Smart Growth Strategy/Regional Livability Footprint Project Final Report." October, 2002.

http://www.abag.ca.gov/planning/smartgrowth/Publications/Final%20Report/SmartGrowthRpt_final.pdf; Bay Area Alliance. "Compact for a Sustainable Bay Area: Economy, Environment, Equity." 1997. <http://www.bayareaalliance.org/compact.pdf>; The Association of Bay Area Governments: Smart Growth Strategy.

<http://www.abag.ca.gov/planning/smartgrowth/publicworkshops.html>. Special thanks to Ceil Scandone at ABAG, for assisting in the information gathering and preparation of this case study.

Student Handout
Sustainable Community
Case Studies Packet

**Nos Quedamos for a Sustainable South Bronx:
South Bronx, New York City**

COMMUNITY CHALLENGES AND A MOVE TOWARD CHANGE

Melrose Commons is a 35 block area east of Yankee Stadium in the South Bronx. The community suffers from the traditional housing, infrastructure and unemployment problems associated with urban decay. In 1990, the population of Melrose Commons was primarily Latino and African-American residents, whose median annual household income was less than \$12,000. The city owned 65 percent of the land and 30 percent of the total housing stock. Approximately ten percent of this land was abandoned during the 1960s and 1970s.

In 1992, a number of community residents came together to respond to the city's proposed Urban Renewal Plan. The plan proposed the creation of new housing, new commercial space, a centrally located park, and a realignment of the street system. Community residents, who had never been consulted in the development of the plan began to question the changes that this plan proposed. Would these new homes be affordable? Would one large park in the center of Melrose be attractive and accessible to everyone, or would it serve as an enticement for more criminal activity? Would the existing homeowners, tenants, businesses and employees be displaced by development? The community members who attended the meeting that day stated that as long-term residents of the community, their input was vital to the plan's understanding of what transportation routes were actually needed, what type of buildings were needed, the kind of employment residents desired, and how community parks could be revitalized or created to generate more green space for community residents.

ENVISIONING THE FUTURE

Following the initial meeting, homeowners, tenants and business owners came together to share ideas and information. They called themselves “Nos Quedamos” or the We Stay Committee. Nos Quedamos worked with the Bronx Center Project, a large community based planning project, to help direct a \$2 billion investment of anticipated public and private funds for urban renewal. With the assistance of the Bronx Center, Nos Quedamos quickly became a diverse, inclusive group of community residents, as well as municipal government representatives.

A combination of working sessions and community meetings allowed residents to communicate and express their opinions on neighborhood planning. A number of key principles were established that still guide Nos Quedamos today. These principles are summarized in the organization's goals and vision for the community's future. The community vision was for an urban renewal process that incorporated economical, social and environmental development to create a productive sustainable community.

Student Handout

Sustainable Community

Case Studies Packet

DEFINING GOALS AND MEASURING PROGRESS (INDICATORS)

Participants in the working sessions outlined several broad goals for the Melrose Commons neighborhood:

- To provide a framework for the redevelopment of the area that respected the existing community by bringing community members in as development plans;
- To provide services — health, cultural and educational, recreational and commercial opportunities that were currently not available and to reinforce those that currently existed and were desirable;
- To support economic development anchored on the existing strengths and successes that community residents, businesses and institutions had achieved; and
- To become a desirable place to live and conduct business for individuals from outside the community who wished to relocate there.

At the same time, participants began to formulate specific goals that would later be incorporated into the alternative plans for the neighborhood. Community members wanted to see a mix of buildings — some six-to-eight story buildings with businesses on the ground floor, and other smaller ones, such as town houses and single family houses, that were affordable and built with environmentally-sound materials. They wanted to see discrete, block parks designed for a range of age groups and activities. They also wanted to explore the possibilities of increasing alternative transportation links, mass transit and pedestrian friendly sidewalks. Residents were also interested in finding ways to capture and recycle rainwater for use in community gardens.

Later in the planning process, Nos Quedamos identified specific indicators to help them track progress toward their goals. These indicators measured:

- amount of recyclable materials used in housing construction;
- number of trees and shrubs;
- population density of the area;
- percentage of electrical and telephone lines buried underground;
- number of people employed directly in building construction or in quarries; and
- amount of material trucked in from further than eight miles away.

STRATEGY AND IMPLEMENTATION

By 1993, Nos Quedamos had succeeded in postponing the certification of the proposed city urban renewal plan and had obtained a six-month extension granted by the Borough president to continue to develop an alternative proposal, the new Melrose Commons Urban Renewal Plan. The Bronx Borough President, representatives from the Department of Housing, Preservation and Development, and other public officials all agreed to sit down with the community on a weekly basis to develop a new plan.

Student Handout

Sustainable Community

Case Studies Packet

Nos Quedamos' strategy was to involve both community members and public officials in the planning of a new urban renewal plan that would be truly responsive to the needs and concerns of the community. Residents conducted block-by-block surveys and held over 168 meetings that year. Meetings at a local church were used to update those who could not attend the planning sessions and voter registration drives ensured support for local elected officials.

Nos Quedamos and the community renewal effort attracted the assistance of many professionals — planners, architects, lawyers and others — who contributed their expertise during the developmental stage. Nos Quedamos worked collaboratively with public agencies to plan and implement their goals. It identified funding sources for low-cost loans and assistance at the federal, state and local government levels. Over seventeen hundred new units of housing were planned for specific groups — some for seniors, occupants of shelters, residents living 60% below the median income level and potential homeowners.

Throughout the process Nos Quedamos emphasized the importance of using local contractors to implement the plan. A 1995 joint venture project between a local contracting company and a large construction company employed over 80% of its workforce from the local South Bronx population.

A Closer Look at Sustainable South Bronx

Nos Quedamos's work in the South Bronx has been joined by several other organizations promoting community change. In 2001, Sustainable South Bronx was founded by Majora Carter, a life long resident and community activist of Hunts Point in the South Bronx.

Sustainable South Bronx is an emerging community organization committed to environmental justice. The organization's mission is to reintegrate disenfranchised community members into the community through social capital investment.

Sustainable South Bronx is dedicated to ensuring that the local community has a voice in policy making and the development of appropriate economic and environmental policies. The organization addresses and implements policy and planning issues in the areas of energy, water, land use and waste in the South Bronx. Its programs are designed to provide projected and policy advocacy to advance the South Bronx community — environmentally, socially and economically. For more information, see Sustainable South Bronx's website at <http://www.ssbx.org>.



Majora Carter,
Executive Director and
Founder, Sustainable
South Bronx
<http://www.ssbx.org>

Student Handout **Sustainable Community** **Case Studies Packet**

A MAP OF THE COMMUNITY TODAY

Today, with over 700 new units constructed, Nos Quedamos continues to plan and implement the Melrose Commons Urban Renewal Plan. Among these are three-family townhouses available for purchase. *Plaza de Los Angeles*, consisting of 35 three-family homes, was the first development to be built and occupied. *Via Jirasol II (Sunflower Way)*, which consists of 30 three-family homes, was finished and fully occupied by early 2003. *Via Jirasol III*, with 40 three-family homes, will be ready for occupation by the beginning of 2004.

In October 2002, Nos Quedamos celebrated the opening of a 61-unit apartment building named “La Puerta de Vitalidad.” The building provides permanent housing for formerly homeless and lower-income households with rents range from \$545 to \$759. The building was a \$14 million joint venture between Nos Quedamos and Phipps Houses, a housing development agency. Three more housing projects are being completed in Melrose Commons that will provide low-cost rentals to the community.

Nos Quedamos and the community continue to value open spaces. Parks have been placed throughout the Melrose Commons and several older park spaces have been rehabilitated, despite a difficulty in funding. Although there are currently 16 different community gardens, the soaring need for housing may limit future garden growth.

Nos Quedamos continues to work to ensure the future health of the community’s residents by studying and remediating current adverse environmental health conditions. Projects range from water quality monitoring and pollution studies to community health and environmental outreach and education. Nos Quedamos provides literature, workshops and conferences to raise public awareness. In addition, Nos Quedamos continues to advocate for a city recycling program that is local, self-sufficient and encourages reduced consumption and waste.

Community participation in the revitalization of Melrose Commons did not end in 1994. Nos Quedamos provides regular bulletins and information to the community. Nos Quedamos’ outreach includes on-going educational workshops for residents on everything from applying for mortgages to creating household savings. Over the course of four years, workshops were run to elicit community input on the design of the new housing units. Planning sessions are still well attended by residents and public officials. Nos Quedamos continues to encourage community

Student Handout



“Nos Quedamos” ribbon-cutting ceremony was held October 8 for a new 61-unit apartment building in Melrose called La Puerta de Vitalidad. Pictured are Borough President Adolfo Carrion, Jr., Yolanda Garcia, the executive director of Nos Quedamos, as well as other state and city economic leaders and officials — Photo by Walter Pofeldt.
©http://www.bxtimes.com/News/2002/1031/Boroughwide_News/024.html. Permission Pending.

Sustainable Community Case Studies Packet

input in the on-going process of putting Melrose Commons on the path to a sustainable future. It has relied on the cooperation and collaboration of residents, government agencies and officials, not-for-profit organizations, and educational institutions in the realization of the community's initial vision.

Adapted from: Nos Quedamos, <http://members.bellatlantic.net/~vze2m4xn>; Sustainable South Bronx website <http://www.ssbx.org>; Concern, Inc. “Nos Quedamos” Sustainable Communities Network. http://www.sustainable.org/casestudies/SIA_PDFs/SIA_New_York.pdf; Levin, Sondra. “Nos Quedamos celebrates the opening of 61-unit La Puerta de Vitalidad.” Bronx Times, October 31, 2002. http://www.bxtimes.com/News/2002/103-1/Boroughwide_News/024.html.

Special thanks to Yolanda Garcia for supplying information and assistance in the completion of this case study.

Student Handout
Sustainable Community
Case Studies Packet

Phillips Neighborhood:
Minneapolis, Minnesota

COMMUNITY CHALLENGES AND A MOVE TOWARD CHANGE

The Phillips Neighborhood is the largest geographic community in Minneapolis, and is also the most culturally diverse community in Minnesota. Over half of its residents are minorities —, 24% are Native American, and there are over 100 ethnic groups in the area. While rich in cultural diversity, the community has consistently struggled with high unemployment, poverty and the detrimental social effects brought on by these conditions.

In the early 1980s, a struggle began with the city and county over the construction of a large county garbage transfer station in Phillips. Neighborhood residents recognized that the station would bring heavy traffic, toxic fumes and other air pollutants, as well as a large, obtrusive building in their community. The proposed site was already part of an over-industrialized “dumping ground,” and was five blocks from the only Native American owned public housing in the United States, and a multitude of schools and restaurants. Many people in the neighborhood viewed the project as a case of “environmental racism” — that the transfer station was purposely placed in a predominantly minority neighborhood. During the spring of 1992, Phillips residents, lead by their community group called *District-4 People of Phillips*, discussed strategies to stop the building.

ENVISIONING THE FUTURE

Within a few weeks, Annie Young, a member of the group against the construction of the transfer station, had a dream. She envisioned windmills, trees and wildlife surrounding a glass building with solar roof panels. Annie shared her dream with other community members by word of mouth and at community meetings. She quickly won their support, and together they set to work expanding and identifying common visions and goals. The residents of Phillips visualized a dynamic initiative that would prevent the construction of the transfer station, and redirect community energy into creating a sustainable community that would address economic, environmental and social needs. They called this initiative the *Green Institute*.

DEFINING GOALS AND MEASURING PROGRESS (INDICATORS)

In June 1993, the Green Institute, with broad community support, rented a small space in the offices of the community organization *People of Phillips*. The community members’ vision was translated into a set of goals: The Green Institute would be a multifunctional environmental park complex. It would house 15-20 environmental businesses, a job training site, a research and development center for sustainable technologies, an environmental learning center, a community services center, a landscaping and garden demonstration area, and a place where new ideas for

Student Handout

Sustainable Community

Case Studies Packet

recycling and public-private partnerships for businesses and jobs in the Phillips community could be generated.

This eco-industrial park would create a variety of jobs for Phillips community residents ranging from environmental technology and eco-consumerism to community recycling and reuse fields businesses. All of the businesses would subscribe to, and follow, a broad environmental ethic that would incorporate environmental design principles. These principles included energy conservation systems, solar technology, wind turbines and environmentally friendly materials.

From its inception, the Green Institute established indicators as a means of measuring progress toward their goals. The indicators have grown progressively better with each new cycle. A few examples of their indicators included:

- tracking revenues to measure the ReUse Center’s success in recycling materials. The Institute well surpassed its’ goal of using 25% recycled material in the recent building of the eco-enterprise center. To measure their process they used such indicators as numbers of bricks and tons of steel; and
- measuring the amount of energy it used. The institute set a goal of using 50% less energy than the building code standard. Through its measurement process of its actual energy use, the Institute found it was using 45% less energy than its chosen baseline.

STRATEGIES AND IMPLEMENTATION

Six months after the Green Institute opened its office, the county dissolved its plans for the garbage transfer station. Instead, the county decided to add on to the existing garbage incinerator located in downtown Minneapolis. The Green Institute became a 501 (c)(3) non-profit organization and had a staff of three people, including Annie Young. The Institute’s Board of Directors, 51% of whom were required to live or work in the Phillips neighborhood, helped to acquire both private and public funding.

The Green Institute began a project to develop a building materials exchange and reuse center, and the Reuse Center was constructed with the help of county funds. In 1995, the ReUse Center opened offering a retail store that sold quality, salvaged building materials.

Under the city’s Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP), over 200 projects were approved and funded in the Phillips neighborhood. Funds were primarily spent on expanding the Institute’s staff; obtaining land titles; remediating industry pollution; starting up the ReUse Center, and planning the development of the Green Institute and its programs.



© <http://www.greeninstitute.org/PEEC.htm>.
Permission Pending.

Student Handout

Sustainable Community Case Studies Packet

A MAP OF THE COMMUNITY TODAY

Today, the Green Institute employs 40 staff members and has an annual budget of \$4.5 million. It, among many other organizations and businesses, is housed in the newly developed Phillips Eco-Enterprise Center (PEEC).

PEEC is one of the nation's first comprehensive green office and manufacturing facilities. The \$5.3 million, 64,000-square foot commercial facility opened in the fall of 1999. It houses light industrial and office tenants. The majority of PEEC firms are businesses in the environmental or energy efficiency sector businesses. The facility uses a combination of natural lighting, a solar-tracking daylighting system, high-quality salvaged and recycled-content materials including reused steel, bricks and wood. Additionally, the use of low- and no-emission coatings, adhesives and other finishes in the facility's construction has resulted in healthier indoor air qualities. The tenant companies have been a valuable source of local employment.



Phillips Eco-Enterprise Institute©
<http://www.greeninstitute.org/PEEC.htm>.
Permission Pending.

The Institute's ReUse Center continues to sell salvaged, reusable building materials such as doors, windows, cabinets, plumbing fixtures, lumber, millwork, metals, flooring and every variety of hardware. Its revenues currently exceed \$1 million a year. This equates to hundreds of thousands of tons of reusable construction materials that are kept out of neighborhood alleys and streets, and ultimately out of landfills.

GreenSpace Partners, now a program of the Green Institute, began as a community gardening and greening effort. GreenSpace is now expanding its efforts to include a city wide Natural Storm Water Management and Green Space Initiative.

Through this initiative, Greenspace Partners will work with the city to explore how rooftop gardens, rain gardens, parking lot strips and restoration areas can be used to find more sustainable and cheaper solutions to sewer overflow and river pollution. Some additional projects that have been completed by Greenspace Partners include retrofitting Little Earth, a non profit owned American Indian housing development with energy efficient measures; overseeing a \$1.5 million renovation of Stewart Park;



American Indian Center, Franklin & Bloomington (Community Garden) - Participants in the American Indian Center's Golden Eagles program transplant sage outside the center.
<http://www.greeninstitute.org/GSP/Meetevnt/directors%20reports/dr%202002.07/aic.01.html>. Permission Pending.

Student Handout
Sustainable Community
Case Studies Packet

and planting 167 neighborhood trees on National Arbor Day and receiving a "Arbor Day 2000" award for its efforts. The Institute supports as many as 32 community gardens in the neighborhood, and has planted hundreds of trees in the Phillips Community.

The Green Resource Center, located in the Phillips Eco-Enterprise Center, is working to build greater awareness about the principles of green landscaping, green design and construction by providing information and design tools to the public, construction professionals and PEEC tenants. It strives to be a catalyst for sustainable activity within and outside the Phillips community.

Future projects include the Phillips Community Energy Cooperative (PCEC). With the PCEC, the Green Institute hopes to create a cooperative that effectively delivers energy-related services and conservation to the community. At the same time, it has received federal funds to research the feasibility of a renewable biomass cogeneration facility designed to produce district heating and renewable electricity in the Phillips neighborhood. The Phillips area hopes to have the facility up and running by 2006.

Today, the Green Institute is a source of pride and empowerment in the Phillips community. It has increased land value, the level of education and employment rates. Community members remain an important part of envisioning and planning for their community's future. Forty to fifty residents were recently invited to a dinner meeting where they were encouraged to communicate their visions and provide feedback to Green Institute representatives. And with many neighborhood organizations housed in the Phillips Eco-Enterprise, informal dialoguing with community members occurs on an on-going basis.

On-going challenges and obstacles to the Institute include insufficient financial capital access, and ensuring that the community board remains locally based. The Institute is involved in a network of communities and organizations across the Phillips neighborhood, and serves as a national and international model of successful sustainable community development.

Adapted from: Green Institute, <http://www.greeninstitute.org/peec/peec.htm>; Minnesota Office of Environmental Assistance. "Phillips Eco-Enterprise Center: Minneapolis, Minnesota." October, 2000. Special thanks to Michael Krause, Green Institute, for supplying information and assistance in the preparation of this case study.

Student Handout

Sustainable Community Case Studies Packet

Curitiba, Brazil — Case Study #7

COMMUNITY CHALLENGES AND A MOVE TOWARD CHANGE



© <http://www.lonelyplanet.com>. Permission Pending.

Curitiba is a city located on the southeast coast of Brazil, in the State of Paraná. In the local language native to Curitiba, curitiba means “an abundance of pine trees” — a definition that has undoubtedly forged the city’s connection between the environment and daily life.

Forty years ago, this connection began to evolve, when Curitiba began implementing a design for development entitled the “Curitiba Master Plan.” Recognizing the communal threats of a growing population, the Mayor of Curitiba in the 1960s, Ivo Aruza Prereira, sponsored a contest for architects and concerned citizens to address pressing social, economic and environmental concerns. This contest was called the Curitiba Master Plan.

ENVISIONING THE FUTURE

When Mayor Prereira announced the contest for the Curitiba Master Plan, architects had certain foundations to work with. In 1943, Curitiba commissioned a French planner named Alfredo Agache to create a plan to develop Curitiba. Though the government did not implement this plan, central aspects of Agache’s urban planning theories including an emphasis on transportation, afforded Curitiba an awareness of development possibilities. The Agache Plan’s focus on transportation remained attractive to architects concerned with Curitiba’s escalating population.

When Mayor Prereira sponsored the Curitiba Master Plan contest in 1964, it was in response to population growth that was threatening Curitiba’s limited resources and space. Fearing paralyzing traffic congestion and unsanitary crowded living arrangements, Mayor Prereira began to push for a revival and revision of the original Agache transportation centered plan. Through sponsoring the Curitiba Master Plan contest, Preriera was able to encourage architects to be creative and innovative in their visions for the improved development of Curitiba.

Architects submitting proposals for the development of Curitiba were required to incorporate architectural solutions that would aid in solving an array of societal problems in the city. The primary societal problems included high unemployment, insufficient transportation, flooding, poor sanitation, and an ever-increasing population of orphans and street kids.

Student Handout

Sustainable Community

Case Studies Packet

Entries submitted by architects were presented to the citizens of Curitiba in various community meetings and debates. This opened a direct dialogue between the citizens and the government of Curitiba. The local government of Curitiba was listening and including the needs, ideas and opinions of its constituents into the economic and social development of the community.

Together the architects, government and citizens developed a plan of action by choosing what they wanted to work on, and illustrated a commitment to social justice, the environment and the economy that promoted an improvement in overall development. As a previous study of the Curitiba community has stated: Curitiba’s “commitment to local values such as accessibility, transparency, social justice and poverty reduction and efficient resource management are what resulted in Curitiba’s sustainable development, which is more than simply ‘environmental’” (www3.iclei.org/localstrategies/summary/curitiba2.html).

DEFINING GOALS AND MEASURING PROGRESS (INDICATORS)

Architect Jaime Lerner’s plan was chosen as the Curitiba Master Plan. The Curitiba Master Plan focused its efforts on creating an affordable and efficient transportation system, and a means to track the plan’s success and evolution over time.

He envisioned a transportation system that would not only keep Curitiba moving, but one that would also regulate and dictate population growth, minimize auto-pollution, increase social mobility and beautify Curitiba.

The goals envisioned by Curitiba residents based on this master plan, began to take shape, and the community focused on certain aspects about the community that could meet the goals of minimizing automobile pollution, increasing social mobility and beautifying Curitiba. The areas (or indicators) they chose to focus on included:

- * Public transportation use * Green space * Bus routes * Bike Paths * Jobs *
- * Number of homeless people and street children * Air Pollution * Gas Usage *
- *Amount of Trash * Car Usage * and others.



Curitiba's eco-efficient, bus-only transportation system — a model for cities around the world. The "speedy bus" runs along a direct line and stops only at tubular stations specially designed to move passengers quickly. (Photo courtesy of Ricardo Almeida, Municipal Secretariat of Social Communications.)
©<http://www3.iclei.org/localstrategies/summary/curitiba2.html>. Permission Pending.

Student Handout

Sustainable Community

Case Studies Packet

STRATEGIES AND IMPLEMENTATION

Almost as important as the Master Plan itself, which passed in 1965, has been The Research and Urban Planning Institute of Curitiba (IPPUC). The IPPUC was founded at the end of 1965 by Jaime Lerner in order to maintain communication between citizens and government officials, monitor and ensure long term implementation of development plans and create a forum for continuous dialogue regarding sustainable development. The IPPUC is composed of architects, engineers, economists, sociologists and public administrators.

Central to the IPPUC is a belief in the importance of maintaining population density along the mass transportation lines. To this end, in the early 1970s the IPPUC introduced zoning laws accompanying their design for “mass transportation lanes,” called Structural Avenues, that have enabled Curitiba the ability to mold its population growth to areas and locations that reinforce — not hamper — the original plans.

The IPPUC has also been active in advising and offering plans to the governing leaders of Curitiba regarding bus fares, speeding up the loading and disembarking process, creation of pedestrian zones and parks, and construction of feeder bus-lines, inter-district bus lines, express bus lines and transfer terminals.

A MAP OF THE COMMUNITY TODAY



Bus and Waiting/Departure Tube —
©<http://sustainable.state.fl.us/fdi/fscc/news/world/0003/curitiba.htm>. Permission Pending.

Instead of being at the mercy of problems associated with concentrated population growth, the Master Plan and IPPUC have created a city with very little rampant population growth problems. This type of root-problem solving has and will continue to be the key to Curitiba’s success.

Today, Curitiba’s original vision for improved transportation linkages, promotion of social mobility and creating a more pleasant and aesthetic Curitiba has and continues to expand and promote initiatives that promote the entire community’s well-being. Lerner

once said, “There is no endeavour more noble than the attempt to achieve a collective dream. When a city accepts as a mandate its quality of life; when it respects the people who live in it; when it respects the environment; when it prepares for future generations, the people share the responsibility for that mandate, and this shared cause is the only way to achieve that collective dream.” www.globalideasbank.org/BI/BI-262/HTML. The indicators chosen by Curitiba to meet its original goals have achieved increased public transportation usage, the amount of green space, the number of bus routes, bike paths, jobs, etc.

Student Handout

Sustainable Community

Case Studies Packet

Several indicators have also produced an enhanced community by illustrating a reduction in the amount of trash in garbage dumps, the amount of people who use cars, air pollution, and the number of homeless people and street children who have no social or economic resources. The indicators have produced a transit system that has shaped and molded Curitiba environmentally, socially and economically. It has created:

A TRANSIT SYSTEM TO:

KEEP CURITIBA MOVING: Curitiba’s transportation system, known as the Integrated Transport System, is composed of over 340 bus routes and over 1900 buses. More than 75% of commuters travel by bus.

REGULATE POPULATION GROWTH AND SPRAWL: Jaime Lerner’s plan rezoned areas in order to create high population density areas near the major bus lines, thereby, concentrating Curitiba’s population in the most economically flourishing, transportation accessible areas. As the distance from main transportation lines increases, the size of residential and commercial buildings decreases.

MINIMIZE AUTO POLLUTION: In creating a popular transportation system, Curitiba has succeeded in minimizing car usage. This has caused automobile pollution and congestion to decrease. Around 2.14 million passengers utilize Curitiba’s Mass Transit System daily, which makes Curitiba’s public transportation the most used of all Brazilian cities. Curitiba discourages personal car usage by building and maintaining bike paths and pedestrian friendly zones. Curitiba now has some of the lowest pollution and per capita gas consumption rates in the country.

INCREASE SOCIAL MOBILITY: In order to ensure access to commercial areas of the city — areas of employment opportunity as well as purchasing opportunities — three types of buses bring people into and out of commercial neighborhoods. There are feeder buses that pick people up in rural neighborhoods, express buses running along the main commercial drag, and inter-district buses. Terminals throughout the city allow for free transfers. An additional measure to build friendly streets was the organization of street vendors across the city for easier access by pedestrians, commuters and workers.

RECYCLE: Once Curitiba’s buses have been in use for ten years, they are re-used as mobile training centers where trade skills instruction is offered. Since 1991, these mobile training centers have produced over 17,000 students and traveled primarily through low-income neighborhoods.

BEAUTIFY: Part of Curitiba’s Mass Transit System includes “pro-park routes.” Buses that run on the pro-park routes take riders to and from the various parks within Curitiba. In order to solve a persistent flooding problem, Lerner created a myriad of parks in strategic places with ponds to collect water which had historically caused flooding. With the expansion of these parks, Curitiba now has almost 52 square meters of green space per person, compared to the 1 square meter per person in 1970! Garbage pickup and transport has also been made more efficient. Communities that are unreachable by garbage trucks can bring their garbage to collection facilities where they are given eggs, fruits and vegetables in exchange for their garbage.

Student Handout
Sustainable Community
Case Studies Packet

Adapted from: The International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives. "Orienting Urban Planning to Sustainability in Curitiba, Brazil."

<http://www3.iclei.org/localstrategies/summary/curitiba2.html>; The Global Ideas Bank. "Curitiba and its Visionary Mayor." <http://www.globalideasbank.org/BI/BI-262.HTML>; BBC News. "A Tale of Two Cities."

http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/static/in_depth/world/2002/disposable_planet/cities/tale/default.stm; Horizon Solutions Site. "Efficient Transportation for successful urban planning in Curitiba." April 28, 2003. http://www.solutions-site.org/artman/publish/printer_62.shtml.

MODULE TWO:	CREATING SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES
Chapter 2:	Creating a vision of sustainable communities and citizenship
Essential Question:	What kind of future will we invent?
Guiding Questions:	What future do I envision for my community? What is the big plan? What role can I play in making this vision a reality?
Duration:	7 days

Objective

- Students will be able to articulate a vision for their community as modeled by the case studies just analyzed, including a description of their role and the results of interviews with community members, as well as a plan for incorporating community members into the vision.

Methods Used

- Discussion, Journal Writing

New Vocabulary

- interview, values, visioning

Description

- Students return to the goal that they described in the post program survey of the Case Study Analysis in Module 2, Chapter 1. Prompted by three excerpts about visioning, they further develop this goal into a vision. Students perform interviews within their communities as a way of testing the degree to which their vision is shared and/or considered important to a wider audience. They revise their vision, if necessary, based on feedback from the survey. These visions are then shared with the class and discussed, with aspects they can agree on synthesized into a shared vision that they will develop further as a class. A display is created by the class to help articulate their shared vision and to communicate it to others. In a Post-test, students again respond to the prompt: “What future do I envision for my community?” and “What role do I see myself playing in this future?” As an end-of-unit reflection, they discuss how the vision they described in the previous lesson’s post-test is different from their goal and their original vision and how it is the same. Students are also asked to discuss how their perception of their own role in the vision has changed.