

PREFACE

By Paul Ong and Theresa Cenidoza

The reprinting of *Beyond Asian American Poverty* has provided the contributors with an opportunity to reflect on the changes in community economic development (CED) in the five years since the book's first publication. Four members of the original research team (Dennis Arguelles, Tarry Hum, Chancee Martorell, and Erich Nakano) were asked to share their experiences on the challenges, improvements, and new directions in the field. After graduating from UCLA, these four have become promising and prominent professionals. Dennis, Chancee, and Erich, who completed the Masters degree in Urban Planning in 1993, have moved into leadership positions in Asian Pacific American community-based organizations (CBOs) in Los Angeles. Tarry, who completed her doctorate in Urban Planning in 1997, has started her academic career as an assistant professor in New York City. Despite having extremely busy schedules, each of the contributors was willing to take the time to write about their experiences and thoughts, which are contained in the four subsections following our remarks. Contributing to this postscript chapter is a way for them to continue their commitment to promoting CED within Asian Pacific American communities.

Both of us, Paul Ong and Theresa Cenidoza, have worked on APA CED through applied research. For Paul, the last five years have been largely consumed by administrative duties—first as chair of UCLA's Department of Urban Planning, then as director of the Lewis Center for Regional Policy Studies and acting director of the Institute of Industrial Relations. Despite these obligations, he directed a group project during the 1996-97 academic year focusing on the role of APA entrepreneurship in CED. The project team was comprised of graduate students from Urban Planning and Asian American Studies, who worked collectively for over a year. This new project also entailed recruiting UCLA undergraduates from the Asian American Studies Center to conduct a survey of Asian-owned firms. In keeping with the spirit of community-based university research,

the project team also worked with a Community Advisory Board comprised of members of various APA CBOs in Los Angeles. Not surprisingly, several members of that advisory board were part of the original research team for *Beyond Asian American Poverty*.

One member of the project team for the entrepreneurship study, Theresa Ceridoza, has joined the original research team to revise and reprint *Beyond Asian American Poverty*. Like many in Asian American Studies, Theresa has a strong sense of commitment to community service, and participating in both CED projects has provided a means for her to make a meaningful contribution.

We conducted the entrepreneurial study to provide much needed information on the roles of Asian Americans in inner-city economies and their potential contributions. These issues were identified in *Beyond Asian American Poverty*, which argued that Asian entrepreneurship has positive and negative aspects. *Beyond Asian American Poverty* looked at these issues through the eyes of enclave residents, many of whom work for co-ethnic employers. To provide another critical perspective, the entrepreneurship project examined the issues through the eyes of small business Asian owners, primarily in the restaurant sector, with some attention to the home health care and computer manufacturing sectors. The project attempted to address the question of how to improve the viability of Asian-owned businesses within inner-city economies, while at the same time improving working conditions for the working poor. The entrepreneurship project developed recommendations addressing the unique needs and potential of these businesses. We are planning to publish these recommendations in a forthcoming edited book on Asian Pacific American CED, to be co-sponsored by Leadership Education for Asian Pacifics (LEAP) and UCLA's Asian American Studies Center.

Beyond Asian American Poverty and the entrepreneurial study illustrate the importance of a partnership between those of us in the university and those of us who are practitioners. Both projects were developed with extensive input from APA CBOs. As a consequence of this collaboration, many APA CBOs have used the findings and recommendations in their CED proposals, plans and programs. This commitment to partnership is predicated on the belief that university-based scholars have an opportunity and an obligation to undertake research that addresses the multitude of daily problems facing APA communities. This is the historical struggle to make the university relevant to the needs of our communities.

*Erich Nakano, Little Tokyo Service Center
Community Development Corporation*

Four-and-a-half years ago, *Beyond Asian American Poverty* concluded with three broad recommendations to develop CED strategies in APA communities: encourage organizational capacity-building; promote internal and external linkages; and generate innovative projects. These recommendations were based on the assessment that CED strategies could help low-income APAs. However, as a relatively new strategy, few APA organizations had the capacity to carry out such strategies. Many existing CED policies and programs were ill suited to address the particular needs of low-income APA populations. The ability to impact the conditions faced by these populations was limited by the lack of political strength of the APA community vis-à-vis political institutions, policymakers, government agencies and other ethnic communities.

For many of us who worked on this book, our personal goals were to enter work in the community and put our words into action. I was fortunate to come on board with the Little Tokyo Service Center and the LTSC Community Development Corporation (LTSC CDC), which was created by the parent organization (Little Tokyo Service Center) specifically to focus on CED work. Through LTSC CDC, I also chaired the Housing and Economic Development Committee of the Asian Pacific Policy and Planning Council (A3PCON), which has initiated collaborative CED efforts. Much has happened in the world and Los Angeles since the book's publication in 1993: the biggest earthquake in Los Angeles history; years of politics and policies emanating from a split federal government – a moderate Democratic president working with a Republican-controlled Congress; a massive overhaul of the welfare system; strident rollbacks of affirmative action and immigrant rights, including attacks on the rights of legal immigrants; years of steady economic growth, but with unclear benefits to low-income populations. For APA organizations, much time and energy have been devoted to responding to these developments – particularly the impact of attacks on immigrant rights and welfare reform. The downside of this reactive posture is that the ability to launch new CED initiatives has been limited. On the upside, organizations have also tried to strengthen their political capacities, particularly with the re-invention of the Asian Pacific Planning Council into the Asian Pacific *Policy and Planning Council* (A3PCON), with more of an explicit focus on building political visibility and clout.

In 1994-1995, A3PCON secured a significant multi-year grant from the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for a "Technical Assistance" program geared to help APA agencies start CED projects and build their capacity. This program was administered by LTSC. Since that time, five new affordable housing projects totaling over 150 units were launched by APA agencies (other than LTSC), four by agencies that had never done a housing project before. These projects received some assistance from the HUD Technical Assistance program, including helping some of them secure organizational operating support, but the projects were mainly carried out through each group's own efforts. The HUD-funded program was less successful in helping groups with job creation or economic development activities.

We are now concluding that a shift in goals is necessary. Over the past several years, several setbacks have taken place: 1) affordable housing funding has decreased significantly, and competition for funding has dramatically increased; 2) public and private foundation support for housing has waned; 3) "job creation" and "sustainable economic development" are the new catchwords, but are only vaguely defined; 4) welfare reform has resulted in heavy emphasis on immediate job placement, rather than training and job-creation.

This new environment makes it extremely difficult for new and emerging CED organizations to start projects, sustain themselves and build capacity. While the new direction of A3PCON is a positive development, the political strength of APA communities remains marginal. These conditions have called for a strong shift towards collaborative efforts among APA agencies. Collaboratives have a better chance of reaching the scale and scope needed to make an impact. By combining together in a coalition of APA groups, we have a better chance of securing resources and political support.

As a result of this assessment, the HUD Technical Assistance program now focuses on the APA Housing Collaborative and the proposed APA Small Business Development Center. The APA Housing Collaborative is an attempt to centralize necessary technical real estate development expertise in a single organization, which would then partner with less experienced groups to build housing projects in various APA communities. The less-experienced partner would focus on community organizing and service provision to future residents of these projects. Additional HUD funding has been secured for this project.

The APA Small Business Development Center (SBDC) is a proposal developed by A3PCON for a collaborative, but decentralized program to help APA businesses achieve greater viability and create jobs. The goal is for this program to become part of the State-run SBDC system. The idea is for technical assistance to small businesses to be planned out and delivered through community-based APA organizations so services can be better suited to the particular needs of each APA ethnic population. This model is a departure from the way the SBDC system now works. Such assistance, it is hoped, can lead to the creation of jobs in the small enclave businesses where APA welfare recipients now mandated to work would be most likely to find employment.

Here at LTSC CDC, we were fortunate to have a headstart in building CED capacity before resources began to shrink. We have been able to pursue strategies independently in Little Tokyo that could be useful in other communities under the new collaborative models. These include building affordable housing projects such as Casa Heiwa; promoting regional tourism; enhancing the community's appeal to visitors through developing cultural attractions; helping to launch a Business Improvement District to sustain local improvements; starting childcare activities both as a service for working parents and as job opportunities for low-income residents; developing computer training programming to help residents access better jobs in today's technology-dominated workplace; and investigating mixed-income homeownership development opportunities. Many of these efforts are still in the early stages.

With my involvement in these efforts, it is always easier for me to see shortcomings than to have an accurate assessment of progress from the past. For instance, capacity to do CED is still very unevenly distributed in APA communities, with older, more established organizations able to go further than those in newer and smaller communities. Closing this gap is a complex challenge. The need to work on building political clout and linkages is clear. But how to extract time and energy to do such work from leadership and staff who are strapped just running existing programs is a challenge. The necessity for innovations to create new initiatives that better address needs is evident. But nonprofits typically have little "working capital" available to fund staff time and energy to do the research, analysis, and program pilot-testing and start-up for something new (and, by definition, an innovation doesn't have access to funding).

At the same time, there has been movement. Capacity among APA organizations to carry out CED has increased, and future progress, at least in the medium-term, will come from collaborative efforts. Through these collaborative efforts, "internal" linkages among APA organizations have increased, and there is potential for external and political linkages to be strengthened. The fact that such a level of collaboration has been built is, in itself, a major accomplishment and "innovation," given varying organizational styles and needs.

Ultimately, only larger changes in the political and policy-making arena can achieve broader impact on low-income communities. While the bottom line in making such changes is increased political power, policy changes must be rooted both in research which draws attention to issues and properly analyzes them, and community work which offers new models to address those issues. I hope both this book and the work it helped to guide can contribute to this process.

Chanchanit Martorell, Thai Community Development Center

Almost five years after we published *Beyond Asian American Poverty* in 1993, I still find myself engaged in CED work. In 1994, I founded the Thai Community Development Center (Thai CDC), a private, non-profit CBO serving economically disadvantaged Thai immigrants.

Although Thais constitute only a small fraction (an estimated 50,000 in Southern California) of the larger Asian community, their increase in the last thirty years has been significant. Low-income Thais are part of the working poor, with many working full-time and year-round for poverty wages. They often lack transferable and marketable skills, English proficiency, and knowledge of their rights, labor laws, job training opportunities and transportation options. Their working conditions are often deplorable, unhealthy and unsafe. Among the jobless, those on public assistance face innumerable barriers to secure better employment. For many low-income Thai immigrants, economic survival takes precedence over long-term concerns.

As a result of these realities, the primary focus of our organization has been, from the very beginning, helping Thais meet their basic survival needs, overcome the stress and tension of cultural adjustment, and successfully integrate into mainstream society.

Thai CDC provides a range of social services which include English as a Second Language (ESL) classes, crisis intervention, counseling, parent education, health education, job search assistance, case management, and youth mentoring. We also provide legal consultation in the areas of housing, immigration, government benefits and employment.

With the growth of anti-immigrant sentiment, Thai CDC has become a defender of the rights of immigrants and the poor. We find ourselves constantly waging a battle to protect our community and constituents from being used as scapegoats and being blamed for a host of social ills that plague our society. We find ourselves responding to racist and vicious attacks on our community. Welfare reform especially took a toll on our community. Many Thai legal residents were cut off from welfare and other forms of public assistance. Greater hardships will fall on the working poor and welfare-dependent Asians, creating an even larger underclass. Our immediate task turned to fighting for reinstatement of their benefits while helping them become naturalized U.S. citizens as a way to maintain their eligibility for benefits.

With Southern California's growing underground economy, undocumented immigrants are becoming victims of worker exploitation. The most publicized case involved the enslavement of over 70 Thai garment workers in a makeshift garment factory in El Monte, California. Forced to work behind barbed wire and under twenty-four hour surveillance by armed guards, the workers were denied their freedom and any contact with the outside world. Under constant threats and pressure, the workers were forced to labor over the sewing machines twenty hours a day, seven days a week, for as little as sixty cents an hour. Participating in a multi-government agency task force raid, Thai CDC helped liberate the workers from slavery in 1995.

Thai CDC played a key role in providing the workers with housing, food, clothing, and emergency relief to help them adjust to life as free individuals and placing them in jobs. Thai CDC also sought redress and restitution for the workers in the form of back wages and damages from their employers and the major manufacturers and retailers who reaped exorbitant profits from the garments sewn in the El Monte factory.

The El Monte case brought to light not only the exploitative nature of the garment industry but the vulnerability of many poor, low and unskilled immigrants. They are subjected to slavery-like conditions in the workplace, usually at the hands of their co-ethnic

employers. Where one finds an ethnic enclave economy, one often finds abuse and exploitation of immigrant workers; however, they serve as the main and crucial source of employment for many newly arrived immigrants who, because of language and cultural barriers, are unable to find employment elsewhere. Businesses in an ethnic enclave economy operate at low-profit margins and hyper-competitive conditions. These businesses serve as a secondary labor market where the co-ethnic employers' kinship with the employees and paternalism can sometimes undermine the workers' rights to express their grievances.

Although our organization may be overwhelmed at times by the pressing need to provide basic services, we continue to make CED strategies part of our overall mission. We believe that only through CED strategies can we meet long-term needs of low-income Thais for economic mobility, such as decent paying jobs, quality and affordable childcare and affordable housing. An example of our CED efforts is our first affordable housing project in 1997. Partnering with a private, for-profit developer, the Opportunities for Neighborhood Empowerment (ONE Co.), Thai CDC completed the historic rehabilitation of the Halifax Apartments located in Hollywood, California, the heart of the Thai community. This multi-family housing project provides 46 units of affordable housing to low and very low-income residents. Amenities and services are provided and coordinated by Thai CDC. They include a community garden, family room, multi-purpose room, library, consultation room, case management, after-school tutoring, cooperative child care, information and referral, and youth recreation.

Another CED goal is making Asian-owned small businesses more viable and sustainable over time. Thai CDC believes that Asian immigrant entrepreneurs can contribute to the quality of life in the community by providing better pay and benefits to their workers and improving and diversifying their services. Small businesses are key to enriching the business climate and expanding the economic base. For this reason, Thai CDC has collaborated with the Pacific Asian Consortium in Employment (PACE) to offer a Business Assistance Center (BAC) which provides technical assistance and loan counseling to small businesses. Workshops are conducted on such topics as marketing, developing a business plan, and proper record keeping. In keeping with our CED strategy, the goal of BAC is not to help new businesses start up, but to improve existing businesses and help them become more competitive and socially responsible to their employees and communities.

Currently, Thai CDC is mobilizing the community around the designation of a Thai Town in Hollywood. We believe that a Thai Town will address our perceived invisibility, serve as a cultural and economic center for the Thai community, and revitalize an economically depressed section of the inner city.

Thai CDC can attribute much of its success to the external linkages with other organizations in the APA community. Organizations that offered mentoring and contributions to help build our internal capacity include the Little Tokyo Service Center, Chinatown Service Center, Korean Immigrants Workers' Advocates, and the Asian American Drug Abuse Program. Were it not for the fact that these organizations paved the way by achieving successes and significantly impacting their communities, it would not be possible for Thai CDC to be here today.

The lessons I have learned from the last few years have reinforced and refined several of our recommendations in *Beyond Asian American Poverty*. First, although the concentration of Asian immigrants in ethnic enclaves can intensify competition for low-wage jobs and affordable housing, these geographic concentrations can also offer opportunities to organize ethnic communities and develop a common agenda to improve living conditions. Second, if the institutional framework to protect workers is rebuilt, such as demanding that government support the rights of workers to organize while regulating the work environment to eliminate sweatshop conditions and other exploitative employer practices, workers can actually gain a measure of justice. Third, low-income Asian immigrants can have a meaningful role in shaping economic development. Fourth, when advocacy and external political linkages complement community-based efforts, they will enable Asian communities to influence policy-makers, government agencies, private foundations and other institutions.

*Tarry Hum, Department of Urban Studies, Queens College
Asian Pacific American Studies Program*

Since working on *Beyond Asian American Poverty*, I have completed the Ph.D. program in Urban Planning at UCLA and moved back to the East Coast, where I continue to work on many of the issues raised in our book. I am currently an assistant professor in the Department of Urban Studies at Queens College and a research fellow at the Asian/Pacific/American Studies Program at New York

University. In addition to teaching, I am involved in several research projects on community economic development. Through an in-depth study of two organizations—New Community Corporation in Newark, New Jersey, and Chinatown Manpower Project, Inc. in Manhattan, New York—I am investigating how CBOs build partnerships or alliances with corporate sector employers, institutions (including universities, unions, and government agencies), and other non-profit organizations to provide employment training and placement for disadvantaged workers. In addition to CBO networks and partnerships, this study documents record-keeping and information management systems to track workers and partnership agreements and obligations. I am also conducting a community study of Sunset Park, an immigrant working-class Asian and Latino neighborhood in Brooklyn, New York, where I grew up and where my father continues to reside. Defying simplistic characterizations of an enclave neighborhood, Sunset Park offers an important venue to study the social, institutional, and economic organization of multiethnic immigrant communities, their integral role in advanced urban economies, and the need for new epistemological approaches to immigrant community studies and planning.

One of the goals of *Beyond Asian American Poverty* is to inform readers about the realities of APA communities because, unfortunately, the public still holds simple and distorted views of this population.

The 1965 Immigration Act initiated the influx of unprecedented numbers of Asians from East, Southeast, and South Asia. These newcomers represent a broad spectrum of national origins, ethnicity, education and skill levels, class positions, languages, cultural practices, and political experiences and orientations. Despite this rich heterogeneity, APAs are typically portrayed as a self-sufficient “model minority.” Some scholars contend that APAs prefer to reside and work in ethnically segregated environments to access the “socioeconomic potential” of ethnic labor and housing markets. This view that APAs engage in voluntary segregation is pervasive even among liberal scholars and public policymakers. The premise of APA exceptionalism is not only that APA segregation is voluntary, but that Asian enclaves promote improved and positive outcomes such as employment, a social safety net, cultural continuity, and protection from racial discrimination.

APA exceptionalism reinforces a public policy discourse that emphasizes individual attributes and attitudes as the source for economic success or failure, and endorses ethnically segregated

strategies as viable approaches to community development. Increasingly, it is imperative for Asian Americanists to document and analyze local patterns of uneven development in human capital, social networks, neighborhood assets, and political resources. Moreover, a theoretical and methodological (re)engagement in community studies is necessary to counter the dominant discourse on Asian Pacific Americans. A few issues that could be part of a community studies research agenda include: ethnographic fieldwork on enclave formation and the construction of spatial boundaries; informal social networks which link immigrants to ethnic labor and housing markets, and may or may not reinforce segregated and isolated enclaves; and finally, obstacles to mobilizing APA political involvement and representation.

The disjuncture in the perceptions and realities of the APA American experience is evident in Sunset Park, Brooklyn. Sunset Park is commonly referred to as the third largest Chinatown in the New York metropolitan area following Manhattan Chinatown and Flushing, Queens. Through an extensive immigrant economy based on garment shops, restaurants, and small retail businesses, Asian immigration is revitalizing Sunset Park's neighborhood economy. While immigrant-owned retail and manufacturing businesses are central to the reversal of economic decline, Sunset Park's new prosperity, however, is countered by working poverty and the expansion of an informal and sweatshop economy. My research investigates the limitations of traditional community planning and development strategies, and points to the need for new economic development paradigms that address sustainability and equitable asset building in immigrant neighborhoods.

A growing segment of Sunset Park's neighborhood economy is fueled by small Asian and Latino immigrant-owned garment subcontracting firms and their co-ethnic labor force comprised primarily of immigrant women. Although the garment industry is still centralized in Manhattan, a recent study conducted by the Brooklyn Borough president's office affirmed the importance of Brooklyn and in particular, two local neighborhoods—Sunset Park and Williamsburg—as production sites in New York City's garment industry. The objective of the Borough President's study was to determine which of the two neighborhoods is better suited for an investment of \$300,000 to develop a garment manufacturers business incubator which includes a "quick response" technology center. The proposed benefits of a manufacturing incubator are reduced operating costs through shared space, energy, and administrative costs

such as secretarial and bookkeeping, and most importantly, access to new technology, technical assistance, and subsidies.

According to New York State Department of Labor 1996 statistics, approximately 302 registered garment shops are located in Sunset Park. Sunset Park's garment industry also includes approximately 200-300 "sweatshops," or shops that operate outside of the labor and business regulatory structures including location in residentially zoned areas. The workforce in Sunset Park's garment industry is comprised of Asian and Latino women. In fact, of the 50,811 sewing machine operators who make up NYC's garment production workforce, 42 percent are Latino and 38 percent are APA women. Last summer, Sunset Park successfully received designation for the manufacturing incubator to be located at the underutilized Bush Terminal.

Although the planning for the garment manufacturing incubator is preliminary, it remains unclear if Sunset Park's community board or any community representative will participate in the development process or the selection of tenants. The garment manufacturers' incubator raises several fundamental questions. Does this economic development strategy represent the best public investment for Sunset Park? Is a business incubator a viable strategy to address the hyper-competition and downgraded work conditions that dominate Sunset Park's immigrant-based garment industry? Will the planning process exclude immigrant garment shop employers and workers? These questions suggest the need for alternative and comprehensive strategies that will address working poverty in sweatshop economies, and create sustainable manufacturing employment opportunities.

One element of a viable strategy is to use the resources of the university. A guiding mission of programs such as A/P/A Studies Program at NYU should be centered on community studies. For the past year or so, my colleagues and I have engaged in a series of working sessions with distinguished scholars and practitioners to discuss developing a curriculum and programmatic activities that promote the theorization and practice of community studies. This explicit objective to build a community-centered program provides an opportunity to revisit the founding principles of Asian American studies, address the challenges of community empowerment in a restructuring and globalizing urban economy, and develop an interdisciplinary curriculum to train and actively engage faculty and students in social change. *Beyond Asian American Poverty* has served and will continue to serve as a model of how this can be done.

Dennis Arguelles, Pacific Asian Consortium in Employment

Beyond Asian American Poverty helped me develop the vision that guides my work as a CED professional in the APA community. Almost five years later, I still find myself turning to the book as a guide and source of inspiration. Many of its themes and findings continue to be relevant to me today, in some cases more so. I also find comfort continuing to work with its authors to turn theory into practice and to make real many of the strategies and goals we developed.

However, the last five years have given me insight into the social service delivery systems in Los Angeles' APA community as well as practical experience in implementing CED programs. This experience has helped me identify some significant challenges facing CED professionals—challenges I continue to struggle with on a daily basis and which I hope to illuminate in this essay.

I believe the environment in which CED professionals must operate has changed little since 1993. Despite the nation's current economic growth, the gap between the rich and poor, and the lack of economic opportunities for inner-city residents remain unchanged. The need for CED programs continues to outpace the availability of resources. Job growth and a decrease in unemployment have simply meant an increase in the population of working poor. This is a particularly salient issue in the APA community and one that takes on greater significance in the face of welfare reform.

In this context, I have chosen to focus on two issues significantly impacting my work as a director of various community development programs. The first is the challenge of getting APAs to participate in CED programs. The second is the issue of public policy that limits the ability of non-profits and CBOs to effectively deliver services in an environment of reduced government funding, intensified competition and greater emphasis on outcomes and efficiency.

One of my first ventures as a CED professional was to launch PACE/SIPA YouthBuild. YouthBuild is an employment training program funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and operated in partnership by the Pacific Asian Consortium in Employment (PACE) and Search to Involve Pilipino Americans (SIPA), both based in Los Angeles. We have enjoyed much success operating YouthBuild, however, involving APA youth in the program has remained an elusive goal.

One of three such programs in Los Angeles (over 70 exist nationally), PACE/SIPA YouthBuild provides comprehensive education, job training and "life skills" development to disadvantaged youth. Specifically targeted are those youth who have not finished high school and who are particularly at-risk because of poverty, gang involvement, criminal or substance abuse history and other factors. YouthBuild participants attend GED preparation classes and receive counseling, career planning and leadership training while learning construction trade skills through on-the-job training on low-income housing projects.

Of the 39 trainees enrolled in our first cycle, four, or about 10%, were of Pilipino descent. Considering that we operated near some of the highest residential concentrations of APAs in Los Angeles, specifically targeted APA institutions for recruitment and that the program itself was operated by two APA agencies, this percentage fell far below our goals. APA recruitment in our second cycle produced similar results. YouthBuild staff speculates that this phenomenon exists for many reasons, with two being the most salient.

First, APA and other immigrant communities have far less familiarity with government-funded programs and non-profit organizations than other disadvantaged communities. The political authority in many homelands was often viewed with suspicion—even avoided—particularly in those countries ruled by oppressive regimes. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) often lacked political/legal legitimacy, financial support and the technical capacity of non-profit institutions in the U.S. Thus people do not see their NGOs as sources of housing, employment or other services. We speculate that these homeland conditions translate into reluctance by many APA immigrants to become involved in government or CBO-sponsored programs. This is in marked contrast to other immigrant and ethnic groups who may have had more contact with state-operated institutions and programs and who, in general, appear to be more willing to make use of such services.

Second, in this period of economic growth, CED programs like YouthBuild seem to be competing for clients against the proliferation of low-paying jobs. The dilemma faced by YouthBuild is convincing disadvantaged individuals to invest time in a training program that provides a monthly training stipend of only \$400, when a full-time minimum-wage job is immediately available to them.

It is important to understand that the problem is the lack of utilization of social services by APAs rather than the lack of *need* for such services. These problems have no easy solutions. Diligent and sustained community outreach, education, recruitment, and experimentation with new and different marketing techniques are ways these problems must be addressed.

Finally, in this era of reduced government funding and little additional support from the corporate and private sectors, non-profits and CBOs are being asked to do "more with less." The call for increased social spending has, thus far, fallen on deaf ears despite recent budget surpluses. If more resources for social programs are not forthcoming in the near future, public policy should at least address conditions limiting the effectiveness of CBOs and non-profits in this era of fiscal retreat. I offer three recommendations:

First, public policy must recognize the need for non-profits to be more creative and entrepreneurial in generating the resources they need to sustain their operations. They must be given greater flexibility to operate revenue-generating projects and for-profit ventures.

Second, policies on program administrative costs must be changed. The increased emphasis by funders on outcomes as a measure of performance has been coupled with reduced resources for non-profits' administrative operations. The logic behind this is that services are best provided when more money is spent directly on program activities. However, this is counter-intuitive to outcome-based evaluation. Better performance is not completely a product of resource allocation. Whereas the 15-20 percent used to be the average for administrative costs, some funders limit these costs to as little as 5 percent, hindering all but the largest and most established non-profits and particularly hurting smaller, ethnic-based CBOs such as those in the APA community.

Finally, funders are also calling for projects to be operated by collaborations of agencies and institutions. In fact, participation by a range of partnering agencies has become one of the primary criteria by which proposals are evaluated. The reasoning behind this is that more participants should mean greater public support, a wider range of available expertise and, thus, greater efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of services. On the surface, this principle appears to serve funders, services providers and service recipients well. Unfortunately, funders often do not thoroughly analyze the appropriateness of collaborations when making funding available. Their call for "collaboration" often results in a scramble amongst agencies to form

partnerships for the sole purpose of accessing funding. Upon being awarded funding, partners often divide the proceeds and deliver their specialized share of the services. In the end, little efficiency is gained and in some cases, greater inefficiency is created. Thus, the connection between collaboration and efficiency should not be assumed by funders and only implemented after careful analysis of the needs of a specific area or population, types of services to be delivered and the service delivery systems already in existence.

These are just a few of the challenges I have encountered in my efforts to put into practice the strategies and policies that my colleagues and I developed in our book. Much more needs to be done, but I remain hopeful that our CED work will have lasting impacts on Los Angeles' APA and other disadvantaged communities.