

Final Report from the *Task Force on the Future of U-M's Engagement in Detroit*

The University of Michigan

Submitted to President Mark Schlissel and Provost Martin Philbert

October 8, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Executive Summary	3
II.	Background	6
III.	Principles of Engagement	10
IV.	Provision of Other Infrastructure Needs	15
V.	Assessment of Space Needs	19
VI.	Transportation	26
VII.	Proposed Next Steps	27
VIII.	Concluding Statement	28
IX.	Appendices	29

I. Executive Summary

The University of Michigan's (U-M) multi-tiered involvement with the people, and organizations across Detroit is robust and growing. Faculty at all three U-M campuses are increasingly drawn to research, teaching, and service in Detroit, while U-M students, too, feel the attraction of a dynamic city reflecting the paradoxes of rapid economic growth and wealth alongside economic stagnation and poverty. With more U-M activity and interest in Detroit, the need has arisen for a larger, well-supported infrastructure grounded in principles of engagement that emphasize mutual benefit and partnership with the people, community leaders, and organizations in Detroit.

This report focuses its attention on the U-M's current and future engagement with the City of Detroit and all its residents and institutions. The original Task Force name in the president's and provost's charge focused on a single physical entity – the Detroit Center, founded in 2005 to help support and coordinate multiple faculty activities in the city. After discussion with the President, the scope of the charge was broadened to focus on the future of the University's engagement with Detroit. This broadening of scope recognizes that the University's engagement in Detroit has been and will continue in the future to be greater than a single physical space in the city.

The Task Force heard from a wide-array of individuals within U-M who currently partner with a variety of Detroit-based organizations as well as from a number of community-based organization leaders from Detroit. The Task Force also engaged in significant discussion and deliberation among its members in developing this report.

The Task Force proposes the concept of a hub as a framework for thinking about the University's approach to engagement in Detroit. Specifically, the idea of a hub recognizes that each engagement activity involving any U-M entity with any Detroit entity must have properties that are unique to that activity. At the same time, there are core principles, resources, and spaces that can be provided to enhance the quality of most (if not all) partnerships. These core principles, resources, and spaces represent core hubs of support. Core hubs are conceptual and in some cases physical entities that represent a massing of University resources that are designed to provide support to individual engagement activities occurring between a myriad of entities within U-M who are engaging with Detroit in a variety of ways. These hubs help to provide coherence to the University's many efforts in Detroit, while at the same time are nimble enough to address the unique challenges that most engagement activities face.

Specifically, the Task Force is recommending three specific core hubs that will: 1) promote a core set of principles to guide U-M partnerships with Detroit; 2) provide key infrastructure to help coordinate and support the myriad Detroit engagement activities that exist within U-M; and 3) propose a central location within Detroit that will maximize U-M's physical presence in Detroit. The Task Force also recognizes the significant challenge of transportation between Detroit and U-M campus as well as transportation within the City of Detroit.

The report is organized into major sections to address the needs and possibilities of these three conceptual hubs.

1. U-M Principles for Engagement in Detroit

- The Task Force recommends that principles of engagement for U-M involvement in Detroit are more clearly defined, and align with the following (see *Section III* below for detailed discussion):
 - Principle of Recognition for the expertise and knowledge within the community;
 - Principle of Respect for individuals, communities, and their resources;
 - Principle of Equitable Partnership focused on reciprocal relationships, transparency and accountability.

2. Strongly Coordinated Resources and Infrastructure

- Through its deliberations, the Task Force recognized the need for more coordinated resources and infrastructure to foster and support greater engagement in Detroit. The group identified three aims that guided the development of this area of need (see *Section IV* for detailed discussion):
 - To coordinate efforts, including the tracking of research, service, curricular, and co-curricular activity, and the sharing of best practices across U-M units with regular engagement in Detroit;
 - To facilitate and support activities that reflect the principles and guidelines for engagement in Detroit by, for example, facilitating and coordinating linkages between faculty and community entities in Detroit, providing pilot funds for partnership and project development, and educating and mentoring participating faculty, staff, and students;
 - To develop a plan that makes the new *Detroit Engagement Center* the hub for the physical and logistical involvement between U-M's three campuses and the Detroit community.

3. Enhanced Central Physical Space in Detroit

- As part of its work, the Task Force has met with many constituents of the current Detroit Center and other U-M sponsored spaces and activities around Detroit (see *Appendix A* for list of names and associations). The Task Force also visited the current Detroit Center to gain a perspective of the existing space. Based on these experiences, as well as the extensive history of its individual members, the Task Force came to the following conclusions regarding future space needs and other opportunities with respect to the University's partnerships with Detroit (see *Section V* for detailed discussion):
 - The current space within the Detroit Center is inadequate for the current needs of its users;
 - A move to the Rackham Building would provide an opportunity to consolidate much of (but not all of) our existing physical presence in Detroit;

- A move to the Rackham Building could stimulate new and expanded activities that fit within the University's core mission of scholarship and teaching. It could also serve as a catalyst for new creative partnerships with community-based organizations, foundations, NGOs, government authorities, businesses, corporate partners, museums, arts organizations, k-12 schools and more.

4. Robust Transportation Options

- A key challenge in planning for a future Detroit Center is to provide adequate transportation between the campuses of the University of Michigan and Detroit, as well as to provide adequate transportation within the City of Detroit (see *Section VI* for detailed discussion).

The Task Force offers up a process to implement the recommendations put forth in this report as well as the formation of a new committee to oversee the process. The possible transition to the Rackham Building as a physical hub should be used as a catalyst for the process. The plan process should model the Principles for Engagement in that it should include meaningful input from all relevant constituents both within U-M and the broader Detroit community. Given the current zeitgeist, now is an opportune time for the University of Michigan to renew its historic partnership with the City of Detroit in a more coordinated, impactful, and mutually-beneficial way.

II. Background

The City of Detroit has a special place in the history of the University of Michigan (U-M). It is the city of our birth as an institution, it remains the major metropolitan region of the state we serve, and today it is a city with unique opportunities, capacities, and challenges. U-M's long, shared history with Detroit includes scholarly study both about Detroit, and in Detroit. We owe Detroit much, not just as the city of our birth, but also for the city's generosity in helping our students learn, and in helping our scholars develop new knowledge, ideas, processes and policies. We have not always been clear to repay our debt, not because of ill will, but because of our very nature as a community of independent scholars who are not always able to see the cumulative impact of their engagement, for good or ill.

We have been engaged in Detroit for decades, with highly successful partnerships such as the Detroit Urban Research Center having just celebrated its 22nd year. Today there is a rapidly growing body of work in Detroit. This is occurring because we see the promise of Detroit as a city of many communities where we can learn and grow and contribute. But this very growth of U-M engagement presents a challenge: our overlapping, disconnected, sometimes extractive activity causes a drain on resources and even a diminution of good-will towards the U-M. We may inadvertently do harm to the very communities we seek to engage, and we may harm our own future opportunities to contribute and learn.

President Schlissel, since the beginning of his tenure, has been deeply invested in U-M's relationship with and involvement in the City of Detroit. We see new and positive opportunities emerging. We are making major investments in infrastructure to be part of Detroit. To make good on our mission to serve the people of Detroit through the generation of knowledge, ideas, and action – in partnership with city leaders and community members – we must hold ourselves accountable, be transparent, develop long-term, equitable relationships, and respect the communities with which we would partner. The principles of civic engagement outlined here will help us do this.

We have a 200-year shared history with the City of Detroit. We must also recognize that with Detroit we have a shared destiny.

Charge of the Committee

The Detroit Center was founded in 2005 to serve as a gateway for U-M campuses to the Detroit area in a manner that was mutually beneficial. It has a specific goal to utilize scholarship and teaching to strengthen bonds between U-M and Detroit. The Center provides space for a number of faculty-led research projects and programs across U-M's three campuses.

In the wake of several possible opportunities to engage more fully with Detroit, President Schlissel and Provost Pollock charged the Task Force to consider the current scope and future potential of U-M's research, teaching, service and engaged learning presence in Detroit and offer advice on how to best support and promote these efforts. Based on this assessment and recommendation, the Task Force reviewed the current operations, structure, and practices of

the Detroit Center and made specific recommendations regarding the University's future physical presence in Detroit. After significant deliberation and in consultation with President Schlissel, the Taskforce expanded the scope of its charge to also include an examination of U-M's engagement with Detroit as a whole.

Committee membership

Robert Sellers, Task Force Chair, Vice Provost and Chief Diversity Officer

Susan Alcock, Special Counsel to the President, Professor of Archaeology and Classics

Stein Brunvend, Associate Professor, College of Education, Health, & Human Services, U-M Dearborn

Rosario Ceballo, Chair and Professor, Department of Women's Studies, Professor of Psychology

Milton Curry, Associate Dean Taubman College

Angela Dillard, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education, LSA

Harley Etienne, Assistant Professor of Urban Planning, Taubman College

Elisabeth Gerber, Associate Dean and Professor, Ford School of Public Policy

James Holloway, Vice Provost for Global Engagement and Interdisciplinary Academic Affairs

Barbara Israel, Professor, School of Public Health

Erica Marsh, Associate Professor, Medical School

Henry Mears, Assistant Dean, School of Education

Brian Noble, Associate Dean, College of Engineering

Stephanie Rowley, Associate Vice President for Research

Trina Shanks, Associate Professor, School of Social Work

Staff Support

Dilip Das, Assistant Vice Provost

Crystal Flynn, Administrative Assistant

Task Force Committee Process

The Task Force was selected for their extensive experience with Detroit initiatives as researchers, mentors, teachers, and administrators. The Task Force began meeting in early March 2017, first discussing the charge then developing an agreed upon framework for moving forward. A list of 12 guests with broad experience in and knowledge about Detroit and U-M's varied engagement within it was invited and scheduled to meet with the Task Force. Task Force members also met with more than 30 community leaders in Detroit who shared valuable background information, cautionary tales, and recommended actions based on their own experiences with U-M initiatives (see *Appendix A for the list of all names*).

Based on its deliberations as a committee of the whole, the Task Force divided into subcommittees to focus attention on four main thrusts of the report: principles and values that should guide U-M involvement; infrastructure needed to support U-M's growing involvement in Detroit; assessment and recommendations for space requirements in Detroit; and transportation challenges and recommendations allowing for greater access to and from Detroit neighborhoods and U-M campuses. These committees wrote sections of their focus reflected herein.

The Hub as an Organizing Framework

As noted above, the University of Michigan has a long, shared history with the City of Detroit. It is clear that there is significant engagement activity presently occurring between U-M and the City of Detroit and Southeast Michigan. A provost office review in 2015 identified over 300 projects, research grants, services, and other U-M activities in Detroit. These activities are occurring across all levels of the university including: individual students, faculty, and staff; student organizations, departments, and administrative units; schools/colleges and executive offices; as well as at the level of the university itself. These various entities of the University are interacting with a variety of different types of organizations in Detroit including community-based organizations, foundations, NGOs, government authorities, businesses, corporate partners, museums, arts organizations, and K-12 schools. Not surprisingly, there is strong agreement within both U-M and the Detroit community that coordination of effort in Detroit is a major problem.

The lack of coordination of U-M engagement activities in Detroit has meant that the nature of the interactions between the representatives of U-M and the Detroit entities have been idiosyncratic with some relationships working well and others not so well. This variation in quality of relationship is due in no small part to variation in the ways in which the various U-M entities have interacted with their Detroit partners. Unfortunately, the poor actors are not viewed as independent agents, but instead as representatives of U-M.

There is a clear need for a standard set of principles and values that guide all individuals and units representing U-M in their engagement activities with Detroit (and other communities) so as to ensure that all of our partnerships are ethically and morally just as well as impactful. The lack of coordination has also meant that there is both duplication of effort in certain areas of Detroit where there is significant U-M presence and a dearth of engagement in areas where there is no U-M presence.

Currently, there is no U-M entity that is able to track the University's current efforts in Detroit, let alone a structure or process that is positioned to make sure that the many individual and unit efforts in Detroit are deployed in a manner that is both strategic and impactful. The many existing collaborations in Detroit are also located all across the city. Many of the locations are appropriately located within the neighborhoods in which the engagement activities occur. However, there are a number of other U-M locations that could benefit from co-location with other programs and initiatives in a manner that could result in serendipitous benefits. Such co-location could also provide a much greater symbolic presence for the University in the city. Transportation is a significant challenge that will need to be addressed if the idea of a central physical presence in Detroit is to be successful.

Each of the myriad existing and future engagement activities between U-M entities and entities in Detroit are likely to be unique in their own ways. These activities differ according to the nature of the organization (e.g. student groups vs. schools; community-based organizations vs. K-12 schools), the nature of the activities themselves (e.g. research vs. service learning), as well as the broader context in which the activities are occurring (e.g. new vs. long-existing). As a

result, much of what is needed to encourage, nourish, and sustain the success of any specific activity must be tailored to the unique needs of each engagement activity. At the same time, there is a strong need for some level of uniformity across activities that is driven by a need to maintain a standard of practice across the university as well as a need to be efficient as possible in our expenditure of effort and resources.

With this in mind, the Task Force proposes the concept of a core hub as a framework for thinking about the University's approach to engagement in Detroit. Core hubs are conceptual and in some cases physical entities that represent a massing of University resources that are designed to provide support to individual engagement activities occurring between a myriad of entities within U-M who are engaging with Detroit in a variety of ways. These hubs help to provide coherence to the University's many efforts in Detroit, while at the same time are nimble enough to address the unique challenges that most of the individual activities face.

In utilizing the concept of a hub approach, the Task Force proposes three core hubs. The first hub is conceptual in nature and refers to the adoption of a set of core principles for engagement that would guide all university activities in Detroit. These core principles provide a standard of ethical behavior that our partners will come to expect from anyone representing the University of Michigan.

The second hub is represented by the investment in new central infrastructure (i.e., a new Detroit Engagement Center) that provides much-needed resources to individual engagement activities. Such an investment allows for the tracking of activities in Detroit which is crucial to the strategic deployment of effort.

The third hub is a physical hub, represented by the investment in an enhanced central location in Detroit in the form of the Horace H. Rackham Educational Memorial Building. The Rackham Building has the capacity to house a significant number of existing and new Detroit-based initiatives giving greater visibility to U-M's presence in Detroit. A central hub could also physically house important infrastructure that could help support engagement efforts that are located in other parts of the city (e.g., Detroit Engagement Center). This massing of U-M based activities into a central location is likely to create new synergies and collaborations among existing partnerships and engagement activities. As a physical hub, the Rackham Building could serve as a central terminus for travel between U-M campuses and Detroit as well as the hub for transportation within Detroit.

The present report explores each of these three hubs in greater detail and provides specific recommendations regarding the University's current and future engagement in Detroit.

III. Principles of Engagement in Detroit

Because of its importance, Detroit has been for many decades the location of, or focus of, many U-M activities, including research, educational initiatives, outreach, and cultural events. Some of this work has been done well, with high standards of ethical practice and attention to mutual benefit, and some has been extractive and transactional, treating the city only as an object of study. The Task Force recommends that the University acknowledge its shortcomings with respect to its history of engagement with Detroit even as it recognizes the successes. Further, the Task Force recommends that the University more clearly articulate principles for our engagement with Detroit, and indeed with any other community where we seek to deliver on our mission.

U-M culture, which celebrates individual achievement and action within a community of scholars, can sometimes be at odds with the best practices of engaging with other communities. The enthusiasm of the many individuals and units within U-M who seek to engage with entities in Detroit can appear as a competitive cacophony from the perspective of those Detroit based organizations that we seek to partner with and from who we seek to learn.

Therefore, U-M should adopt, state, and widely share a set of principles for civic engagement that represent the values and standards that all members of the U-M are expected to uphold when partnering with and working in Detroit. These principles should be referenced frequently by our university leaders so that all members of the U-M community hear them. We do not expect to police these principles, but do expect that our faculty, students and staff will acknowledge them, discuss them, and consider how they can make these principles explicit in all their civic engagement work, including work in Detroit. University leadership should also adopt these principles, and use them as a guide in making decisions about resources and incentives. In the rare instances that these principles are not upheld, the University should be transparent as to why they were not upheld, be it through mistake or through impracticality in the context of a specific piece of work.

What follows are the recommended overall Principles for Civic Engagement, followed by recommended steps to institutionalize and share these principles. These have been developed by reviewing several existing set of principles for engagement in use at U-M, including those of the Detroit Urban Research Center, the Ginsberg Center, the Center for Engaged Academic Learning (CEAL), Global Engagement, and others. In addition, the Principles for Civic Engagement were reviewed and discussed by the Council for Civic Engagement, the Provost's Office council that serves as a U-M-wide platform for discussion of civic engagement in scholarship and learning. The Principles are broad in scope, and expansive enough to encompass a wide range of implementation and practice. A highly prescriptive set of principles is not appropriate for the broad range of scholarly work at the University of Michigan, or within the highly autonomous community of university faculty and students.

U-M Principles of Civic Engagement

In 2015 the Provost's Council on Civic Engagement adopted the following statement:

Fostering the integration of professional and public concerns into resulting civic impact, systemic change and an equitable and just society requires the integration of active participation in communities and understanding of implicit biases, confronting unequal access to power and privilege, and recognizing the needs and assets of all parties. Civic engagement at the University of Michigan prepares students, faculty and staff to work collaboratively through practice, teaching and research towards these same goals for full participation in a complex, democratic and just society. We engage with communities around the world to build mutual understanding, to improve the quality of life and affect systemic change through developing and integrating the combination of knowledge, skills, values, reflection and motivation to provoke inquiry and affect meaningful change through shared commitment, open communication, partnership and reciprocity.

The U-M is a public institution with a deep public ethos. Its mission to serve the people of Michigan and the world is deeply rooted in its ethos and identity as a public institution. Through our engagement we can directly benefit the society that supports us by combining our expertise with that of people who live in communities, both around us and around the world, to build on their own capacities and to maximize and realize their opportunities. By learning from communities, we develop connections with new ideas that challenge us and confront us with the new questions that allow us to create, communicate, preserve and apply knowledge, art and academic values to the challenges of the world. And through the opportunities that communities provide us to help educate our students, we create the leaders, and community members who will challenge the present and enrich the future.

Principles for U-M Participation in Community and Civic Engagement:

- Principle of Recognition for the expertise and knowledge within the community
- Principle of Respect for individuals, communities, and their resources
- Principle of Equitable Partnership focused on reciprocal relationships, transparency and accountability

Principle of Recognition: The U-M's approach to working with communities begins with acknowledgement of the expertise and knowledge that already exists within any community in which we engage. Our own beliefs and understandings of the opportunities and capacities in that community must be balanced with the real, lived experience of those with whom we would partner.

Implications:

- Community members must be respectfully recognized as experts with deep knowledge of their own communities and ways of life, in the same way that members of the U-M are recognized as experts who bring a different perspective to the community. The knowledge within communities can be and should be viewed as a valid form of knowledge.

- U-M scholars working in a community should be willing to critically examine their own values, beliefs or ideas that emerge from a different context.
- Engaged scholarship and learning in communities should begin with seeking to understand the community, the peoples who comprise it, and the opportunities and capacities they possess, before seeking to apply preconceived ideas or solutions.

Principle of Respect: Communities comprise many individuals, who collectively and individually have unique opportunities and capacities. Community members must be recognized as having agency in their own decisions in their own community. Their resources, not the least of which is time, must be recognized as having value. U-M scholars must be aware of power structures, both hidden and explicit, that might influence community members and U-M scholars.

Implications:

- Seeking opportunity for collective action and synergetic engagement should be the norm, both to respect the opportunity costs to community members collaborating with U-M scholars, and to provide greater return value to the communities in which we engage.
- Equally, long-term partnerships and engagements are encouraged that build benefit and understanding, and prevent the harm to community resources and expectations that come from many disconnected short-term engagements. We recognize that individual efforts are sometimes project based and inherently finite in scope, but even in these cases there may be opportunity to build long term relationships with the partner across multiple projects and multiple U-M faculty and staff engagements; we should be aware of and seeking these opportunities.
- Faculty and students should make it a practice to first learn from others, especially others at U-M, who are already engaged in the same community, and seek first to complement existing efforts rather than create wholly new and disconnected efforts.
- When faculty and students seek institutional support for their work, administrators should make such initial fact-finding and research a requirement for approvals or funding to engage with communities. Faculty and students should invest their own time first, before imposing on partners.
- U-M scholars should recognize that communities are diverse and heterogeneous, with multiple perspectives and needs. Power structures are in place both within the community, between the community and the U-M, and between the

community and other agencies, and these power dynamics can lead to unintended consequences or harms.

Principle of Equitable Partnership: Effective engagement requires true partnership, which must be founded on relationships and mutual benefit. All members of a partnership must see and understand the evolving benefits to themselves, their organizations and their communities, that will emerge from the engagement, and have effective recourse in case of concerns. They must have full visibility to the motives, needs, and concerns of others, and must be mutually accountable to meet these needs and address these concerns.

Implications:

- Faculty and students engaged with community partners should be able to articulate the value of their work or project in accessible language, free from academic jargon. Similarly, faculty and students should help community members to articulate the value of the work to the U-M. And all should be able to articulate how these value propositions are complementary and balanced.
- Faculty and U-M affiliates should, where appropriate, pursue ways to facilitate community-academic partnerships when pursuing grant funding. When possible and appropriate, faculty should identify ways to provide funds to cover community partners' time. This can be achieved by creating subcontracts involving community partners as key personnel in grant proposals, and identifying the lead organization/fiduciary for the funding.
- U-M faculty and students working with communities should provide those communities with systems to address concerns, including clear expectations for raising concerns, methods to do so, and pathways to higher authorities if concerns are not being addressed. U-M administrators should be prepared to engage and act when concerns are raised to them.
- We recognize that when we engage with communities, we are part of those communities. We should contribute ideas and knowledge, and support local partner-based businesses, for example by renting from community partners or purchasing from them when appropriate. We should work to make long-term partners preferred vendors for purchasing. When possible, we should hire local community residents for project-related positions (e.g., survey interviewers, project managers, field coordinators, community health workers).
- In U-M communications about community engaged work, we should be sensitive to presenting the community partner equally alongside the U-M faculty, students and staff, recognizing that all are contributing and that often the community partner has been engaged far longer in ensuring a successful outcome.

Recommended steps to institutionalize and share these principles

1. The President and Provost should refer to these principles when appropriate in their own remarks about civic engagement work.
2. Internal RFP's for funding for community-engaged scholarship or community-engaged learning should include reference to these principles.
3. University leaders and administrators should be prepared to receive and act on expressions of concern from community members regarding their student's or faculty's work in communities.
4. Work with IRB's to ensure that these principles are considered when the IRB either grants exceptions to IRB review, or conducts reviews.
5. Include a "Civic engaged scholarship/research" checkbox on Proposal Approval Forms (PAFs).
6. Develop a simple training module about these principles and community engagement for PI's, similar to training required for human subjects or working with animals, and require this training for PI's on funded projects. This module should be deployed in Program for Education and Evaluation in Responsible Research and Scholarship (PEERRS) [Note: a MOOC on this process is currently under development led by faculty and staff across campus and funded by the provost's office. Material can be drawn from this to create the module.]
7. A workshop to discuss and propagate these principles should be hosted by the Council on Civic Engagement.
8. Workshops that explore these principles and provide skill building to prepare faculty and students for civic engagement should be encouraged. [Note: many units, including Center for Engaged Academic Learning, Center for Socially Engaged Design, The Ginsberg Center, Detroit Urban Research Center, Center for Educational Outreach already provide such workshops. A new MOOC is also being developed.]
9. A card or sheet from the U-M that expresses these principles should be produced, to be shared by U-M personnel with community partners. This should include contact information for a higher university authority who can receive expressions of concern from the community partner, and share these with the appropriate administrative authority within U-M.
10. Units should explore ways to support our community partners more broadly, e.g., by preferring to rent space from community partners, or purchasing from them when appropriate.

IV. Provision of Infrastructure Needs

Detroit Engagement Center: Organizational Structure/Infrastructure

The Task Force envisions the Detroit Engagement Center as the hub of U-M Detroit-based activity. This view reflects several issues. First, it recognizes the need for U-M faculty, staff, and students to have a landing point from which to work and engage with the Detroit community.

Second, while it reflects the need for a centralized operation in Detroit, it also acknowledges that the U-M needs to be in numerous places in the city reflecting the multiple relationships that exist. Thus, for example, the U-M may also need to support “pop-up” space for time-limited activities, and engagement in different partners’ locations throughout the city.

Third, as described above, it acknowledges that the Midtown area is not residential and may contribute to a sense that Michigan’s presence in Detroit is distant. Hence, satellite locations that may draw on the Detroit Engagement Center’s resources could be valuable. Therefore, it was acknowledged that there is a need for both a physical hub and an infrastructure hub to support the U-M’s efforts in Detroit.

More specifically, through its deliberations, the Task Force recognized the need for more coordinated resources and infrastructure to foster and support greater engagement in Detroit. The group identified three aims that guided the development of this area of need.

- A. To coordinate efforts, including the tracking of research, service, curricular, and co-curricular activity, and the sharing of best practices across U-M units with regular engagement in Detroit.
- B. To facilitate and support activities that reflect the principles and guidelines for engagement in Detroit by, for example, facilitating and coordinating linkages between faculty and community entities in Detroit, providing pilot funds for partnership and project development, and educating and mentoring participating faculty, staff, and students.
- C. To develop a plan that makes the Detroit Engagement Center the hub for the physical and logistical involvement between U-M’s three campuses and the Detroit community.

Effort Coordination

As noted above, there is considerable U-M activity in Detroit with little central coordination of those activities. There are many units on all three U-M campuses who do work in the city; track Detroit activity; train faculty, staff, and students to engage in Detroit; and broker relationships between U-M and Detroit partners. Notably, these units do not share common reporting lines, leading to little coordination or mutual awareness of activity. Additionally, community partners have noted that some neighborhoods have received considerable attention from U-M and others relatively little. Moreover, community partners do not often distinguish among U-M

partners and having many projects in one location can lead to confusion, inefficiency, and working at cross-purposes.

Considerable knowledge resides in the units with longstanding presence in Detroit and the Task Force believes that greater coordination among these units might generate a repository of best practices and training materials. Equally important, coordination and synergistic activity could lead to greater collective impact than we currently achieve. The minimum requirement to achieve this is to create greater internal visibility within the U-M.

The Task Force recommends the development of a *Detroit Coordinating Council*. The Council should include groups engaged in partnerships with Detroit (e.g., the Detroit Urban Research Center; Ginsberg Center, others), relevant associate deans, and other faculty with expertise and interest. The Council would be large, and to ensure full transparency, open to any U-M personnel who engage with Detroit. The primary aims of the Council are to improve efficiency in Detroit-centered activities, including research; to maintain open communication among U-M participating units; to collaboratively address concerns or challenges; and to increase the collective impact of our Detroit based work. The Detroit Coordinating Council would meet regularly to discuss current projects and activities in Detroit, to share training practices, and to discuss emergent needs related to activities in Detroit. This Council would ideally span all three U-M campuses.

Models for such groups include the Council on Global Engagement (CGE) and the Council on Civic Engagement (CCE). The Detroit Coordinating Council should have some formal connection to this latter group.

The Task Force also observes that U-M has many staff whose job duties include some aspect of relationship management in Detroit; this includes also staff from the Business Engagement Center. A community of practice can be built around meetings of these relationship managers. Such a group might meet to discuss the territories that they cover and activities they support, to identify areas of the city and opportunities that are less engaged, and to share best practices. A model for this is the U-M International Education Network.

These councils and communities of practice represent a minimum needed to create greater visibility and coordination. Like CGE and CCE the Detroit Coordinating Council would need a sponsor from university leadership, and some staff and modest financial resources to support its work.

An alternative, more robust, recommended model for effort coordination in Detroit would be to staff an *Office of Detroit Engagement*, with a mission somewhat like (and overlapping with) the Business Engagement Center. This office would provide a central home for relationship managers who engage with Detroit communities, companies, NGOs, and government. Providing a central home for staff who can help coordinate relationships in the city would allow them to learn from each other, hand off relationships effectively, provide back up for continuing relationships in the face of changing staff, and provide maximum visibility both internally for

faculty and students who seek to work in Detroit, and externally for Detroit partners who seek to engage with U-M. Ideally this office could be partially funded with central resources, and partially by schools, colleges and units buying in to more efficiently support shared resources, rather than the somewhat haphazard collection of random staff scattered around the U-M who currently do this work.

The Task Force strongly recommends that we take at least the minimum step of creating a Detroit Coordinating Council; this requires some but only modest resources and if done well can have a positive impact on our coordination in Detroit.

The creation of a more robust and centralized office of engagement (Office of Detroit Engagement) should be studied further in consultation with the appropriate stakeholders.

Facilitate and Support Activities

U-M has the intellectual resources to provide world-class assistance to Detroit area community-based organizations, area governments, non-profit organizations, small businesses, as well as to other U-M affiliated units. A central feature of U-M's current and future work in Detroit, should be the diffusion of research and expertise to support the increased capaCity of Detroit area organizations and government agencies, boost economic development and support the city's development and revitalization. This report presents an opportunity to formalize the channels and context through which that happens.

The following briefly describes a number of facilitation and support activities that are recommended to be incorporated as part of the infrastructure of the Detroit Engagement Center. An example of what each of these might entail is provided.

- *Expand and maintain networks of U-M faculty and Detroit community entities* (e.g., CBOs, health and human service agencies, schools, governmental institutions, businesses, elected officials) interested in research and teaching collaborations. For example, the Community-Academic Research Network organized by the Detroit Urban Research Center, involves over 100 faculty and 50 Detroit-based community entities that have explicitly expressed interest in collaborating on different research topics. (See <http://www.detroiturc.org/expertise-programs/community-academic-research-network.html> for list of members and their collaborative research profiles.)
- *Foster linkages between U-M faculty, students and community entities.* For example, a number of units and Centers across campus (e.g., Ginsberg Center, Detroit URC, Poverty Solutions, CEAL), have been involved in matching faculty and students with community entities resulting in numerous collaborative teaching and research partnerships. Mechanisms need to be put in place to coordinate these efforts in order to increase efficiencies, and reduce confusion that results in the community due to the multiple activities going on, often in the same communities.

- *Provide funding for partnership development and project development planning grants.* Building off the work of existing planning grant programs (e.g., Poverty Solutions and the Detroit URC, the Ginsberg Center, MICHR), offer regular cycles of planning grants, for example, on an annual basis, to U-M faculty working in partnership with Detroit-based community entities. Strategies for documenting and evaluating the short-term impact and long-term outcomes of these funding opportunities needs to be carried out.
- *Facilitate capacity building activities,* such as workshops and mentoring, for academic researchers, students and staff, and community entities (as spelled out above), involving university and Detroit-based trainers and mentors. For example, training activities might include full-day and half-day workshops, panel presentations, and lecture series, on topics such as, grant proposal preparation, research design, community-based participatory research, dissemination of research findings to inform policy makers, community rights in doing research, and policy advocacy. Mentoring activities might include matching researchers interested in conducting collaborative research with academic and Detroit-based partners, who provide ongoing support and practice-based knowledge on how to establish and conduct effective, equitable partnerships.
- *Educate the IRB on how to read and evaluate protocols for use with marginalized communities.* Several members of the Task Force recounted challenges with interacting with the U-M IRB around engaged, community-based research in low-income communities. Other modifications to the IRB process might further support healthy community partnerships. PEERRS certification is a significant barrier to community partners. Developing a more targeted, less jargon-laden version of PEERRS would allow community partners to become certified more easily.

Detroit Engagement Center Hub

The Detroit Engagement Center will set a welcoming and inviting tone for U-M and Detroit partners; it will be the clearinghouse for information about community engagement in Detroit; it will support U-M faculty, staff, and student activities and research; it will sponsor or co-sponsor community events; it will manage transportation between Detroit and U-M campuses, and within the City of Detroit; and it will be the hub for the preponderance of all U-M activity in Detroit.

V. Assessment of Space Needs

Descriptions of the current space utilization in Detroit

The current U-M Detroit Center occupies 19,789 square feet in the Orchestra Place Building located on the corner of Woodward and Martin Luther King Boulevard in Midtown. Attached to the building is a three-story parking structure providing ample space for event parking.

The Detroit Center provides planning, administrative, and event space for faculty, students, and staff from dozens of departments across the Ann Arbor and Dearborn campuses. In addition, two other Ann Arbor campus units are also a part of the Orchestra Place footprint along with the Detroit Center: Office of Undergraduate Admissions (OUA) Detroit Office, and the College of Engineering's Michigan Engineering Zone (the MEZ). OUA's Detroit Office is a major hub for recruitment of high school seniors throughout the City of Detroit and many of its surrounding suburbs. The MEZ provides no cost space, equipment, training, and mentoring for over 275 Detroit high school students and their teachers to design, build, and test robots for FIRST Robotics competitions. The MEZ recently won a grant from Google to expand their operations. Both OUA and the MEZ utilize space within the Detroit Center to enhance the capabilities of their current spaces.

Currently, the Detroit Center hosts permanent office space for the administration of 12 programs comprised of numerous U-M Ann Arbor and Dearborn campus units. These programs include, for example: the Michigan Alzheimer's Disease Center's longitudinal memory and aging study; the U-M Law/Community and Economic Development Clinic; and the U-M Dearborn's Public Allies Metro Detroit program. Each year, the Detroit Center staff field requests for permanent office space and works with the units to provide offices and cubicles based on the unit's needs and previous utilization of office space.

In addition to the permanent space holders, many other U-M programs, schools and colleges, along with their Detroit-based partners, regularly rely on the Detroit Center space for critical planning meetings and periodic events taking place in the large conference room and adjacent gallery space. Examples of units regularly utilizing space but not occupying space at the Detroit Center include The Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program (LSA); the College of Engineering's M-STEM program; and the U-M Sustainable Food Program (Planet Blue). On occasion, the use of the two larger meeting rooms are rented to both individual U-M faculty as well as other U-M affiliated units (e.g., Detroit Alumni Chapter).

Discussion of Inadequacies of Current Space

Not Visible, Not Welcoming

A major inadequacy is the almost universal feeling that the current space is not welcoming to the Detroit community given the fact that it is inaccessible to walk-in traffic. The Task Force constantly heard unfavorable comparisons to the Michigan State University facility down the street where street-facing doors are open and Spartan banners on lampposts welcome visitors. There was a strong feeling that the current space undermines the University's efforts to

connect with the Detroit community. This is especially problematic given the University's reputation within some areas of Detroit as being standoffish, elite, and aloof. Related to this, considerable concern was raised that the lack of signage and branding on the exterior of the building has meant that the University is less visible to the community than other institutions.

No Classroom Teaching Space

Another major limitation of the space is that the center is unable to hold formal classes because it does not meet the codes for classroom utilization set by the State Fire Marshall. This has meant that several Schools and Colleges that would like to hold classes within the center have had to find alternative space in Detroit. It has also severely stifled the prospect of new courses being developed that could specifically take advantage of the proximity of Detroit to the Ann Arbor campus.

Not Enough Office/Meeting Space

Still another issue is the fact that there is not enough office and meeting space for the current users. Several users have chosen to rent other space in Detroit to serve their need for meeting space because the Detroit Center is no longer able to accommodate their needs (e.g., Office of Admissions, Semester in Detroit). Reasons for these choices include: the lack of space large enough (and nice enough) to host important events; the lack of hosting facilities (kitchen, etc.) and AV equipment; and availability of storage for events lasting multiple days or occurring on a regular basis.

In addition to the programs housed in the current Detroit Center there are several existing U-M programs in Detroit, listed below, that could benefit by being relocated into a single larger facility such as the Rackham Building.

Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning's ArcPrep pre-college program occupies 3,715 square feet of industrial space at 3901 Woodward Ave. The space is configured as flexible studio space in order to provide the program's high school juniors an immersive, semester-long college preparatory course on architecture, urbanism, and integrated design studio practices.

The University of Michigan Law School leases approximately 2,700 square feet of office space to support their Detroit Clinical Program. The U-M Law clinics are located at 3031 West Grand Boulevard.

The *Wolverine Pathways* pre-college prep program for 7th – 12th grade students who live in Detroit continues to expand and will require a base of operations for their Saturday and summer academic programs throughout the year. The new consolidated space could serve as the home for the program, including administrative offices, and as one of two program sites within the city that serve up to 300 middle and high school students.

The Semester in Detroit Program within the Residential College has been utilizing rental space for classroom teaching in the Cass Corridor Commons for the past two years since, again, the current Detroit Center is not rated for use as a classroom.

The Office of Undergraduate Admissions routinely rents entertainment space from local hotels in order to host large recruitment and informational sessions for admitted students and their families.

The Rackham Building

The Horace H. Rackham Educational Memorial Building was built in 1941. The building is comprised of approximately 121,000 gross square feet of space and until recently was jointly owned by U-M and the Rackham Engineering Foundation. Since 1994, the University has leased its interest in the building, personal property, and adjoining land to Wayne State University. The University recently purchased the east wing and a portion of the parking structure from the Rackham Engineering Foundation, and now owns the entire building. It is located in a noteworthy location in the Detroit Cultural Center Historic District at 100 Farnsworth Street. It is directly adjacent to the Detroit Institute of Arts, the Michigan Science Center, the Detroit Public Library, Wayne State University, Charles H. Wright Museum of African American History, Detroit Historical Museum and other prominent mid-town destinations. It is also located on the new M-1 line and is easy access to several interstate highways. The building is on both the Michigan and National Registry of Historic Sites. The property has its own attached parking garage.

Consolidation of existing Detroit Center programs into the Rackham Building could provide a number of synergies and efficiencies with regard to issues of security, branding, parking, space utilization, as well as transportation back and forth from the Ann Arbor and Dearborn campuses. The consolidation of these spaces would also result in greater foot traffic creating a greater sense of activity and community within the building. The close physical proximity among programs is also likely to encourage greater collaboration among the programs. The consolidation of the programs in the Rackham Building could also provide a “one-stop shopping” experience for community members who may participate in more than one of the activities sponsored by the programs in the building. The fact that the Rackham Building has its own parking would also be a benefit to each of the programs and its location on the new M-1 line will make the programs more accessible to a broader sub-section of the Detroit community. In addition, given the size of the Rackham building, it also provides numerous possibilities for expanding the presence of the University in the City of Detroit (see below for more details).

While the Rackham Building provides many advantages and opportunities, the Task Force was not unanimous in their belief that the Rackham building would be the ideal location for U-M’s primary residence in Detroit. Some concerns were raised that locating in Midtown may send the unintended messages to the larger Detroit communities that U-M is most interested in the more affluent forces in the city’s renaissance in select parts of the city, and less interested in working with the resourced residents and organizations that reside in the city’s neighborhoods.

Some believed that a location closer to the New Center area would place our efforts closer, physically and symbolically, to the city's more residential neighborhoods. Another concern was that the location and structure of the Rackham building may not be welcoming to the public, in general, especially to those living further away from the city's center.

It is clear that the Rackham Building will not address all of the space requirements for U-M activity in Detroit. Detroit is a city of more than 140 square miles and is comprised of scores of different communities and neighborhoods with their distinct issues and relationships with the University of Michigan. It is imperative that U-M establish a physical presence in neighborhoods within Detroit. At present, there are several U-M/Detroit partnerships that are neighborhood-based for which physical presence in the neighborhood is a vital component of the relationships. In those instances, the U-M unit and programs will need to lease project-specific space within those communities to be effective. (*See earlier sections of the report regarding the need for potential funding for such activities.*) Even in those instances, the Rackham Building could serve as a secondary resource by providing much needed meeting space and a transportation link to the Ann Arbor and Dearborn campuses for such neighborhood efforts. It is also imperative that the Rackham Building be designed to be as welcoming as possible to the general public. The building needs to have clear points of entry and designed in such a way that it is clear that it is open and amenable to walk-up traffic.

In summary, the Rackham Building (or whatever physical space is chosen) cannot be the sum of U-M's commitment in Detroit but an effective hub remains highly desirable.

Visioning of Future Possibilities With Respect to Space

A Catalyst for New Engagement and Community Partnerships

Utilizing the Rackham Building (if properly configured) as a new site for the Detroit Engagement Center could serve as a catalyst for the development of new engagement activities between the University of Michigan and the Detroit community.

As part of the deliberation process, the Task Force, following their numerous conversations with others, suggested many new and expanded program ideas that could be relatively quickly realized if the Rackham Building became the new physical hub for outreach activity in Detroit. The suggestions for new programs and activities would need significant vetting before coming to fruition and some of these ideas are likely not to be realized for a variety of reasons. Nonetheless, the following are illustrative of possible new opportunities that could occur with the right facility in Detroit.

A Welcoming, Inclusive Space

One consistent theme that resonates throughout was the need for a more publically welcoming space in which community members could easily drop in, learn about U-M's activities in Detroit, and have a better sense that they are an important constituent of the University. This publically welcoming space could include exhibit space, showcasing regularly updated U-M

scholarly and creative products as well as information about other U-M programs, scholarships, and curricula that enrich the lives of people specifically in Detroit and in the world. The Rackham Building is potentially well-suited to create such an open and welcome environment. The Rackham Building's current main entrance way could easily be configured to be both a grand exhibit space as well as provide a welcoming and safe public space.

Expanded Classroom & Scholarly Project Space

As noted above, a major requirement for the Rackham Building would be the creation of adequate meeting space that is rated for use as classrooms by the State Fire Marshall. The meeting space needs to be flexible enough to house existing pre-college programs as well as graduate and professional school courses. It is important that the meeting space be equipped with the latest technology to allow for remote learning and communication opportunities.

Moving to the Rackham Building would also provide an opportunity to significantly expand the University's available office and work space in Detroit. There is a need for additional office and work space for those units that will be permanently housed within the building as well as the opportunity for significant flexible space to house University units and community partners who need space on a more temporary 'hoteling' basis. It is important that the center also have meeting rooms of various sizes to host a variety of activities from small group meetings to larger conferences

Teaching and Learning in Detroit

The lack of teaching and learning space in Detroit has severely restricted educational programs such as the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts' Semester in Detroit and the Community-Based Summer Research program run by UROP. Both programs bring U-M Ann Arbor students to the city; both work closely with Detroit-based organizations as part of their experiential education components. The same is true for the increasingly expansive "Food Literacy for All" course that sits at the center of the multidisciplinary, cross-school Sustainable Food Systems Initiative. This academic-community partnership is co-taught and co-located in Detroit and Ann Arbor and relies on distance learning technologies. Like the "Detroiters Speak" series and course run by Semester in Detroit it offers a multigenerational approach to teaching and learning that combines undergraduate, graduate students and community members in the city. The creation of spaces designed for active learning, collaborative group work and high-quality video conferencing work would provide a platform for more opportunities for innovative teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Continuing/Adult Education, Certificate, and Professional Masters Programs

The renovation of the Rackham Building could spur the creation of several programs geared towards Detroit area residents, working adults and professionals, and even Detroit-based U-M students. Several of our schools already maintain curricula and programs that specifically engage the needs and opportunities of urban settings such as Detroit. For instance, schools such as Art and Design, Architecture and Urban Planning, Business, Education, Engineering, Environment and Sustainability, Information, Public Health, Public Policy, and Social Work could provide courses and certificates in areas such as proposal writing, small business development,

real estate, geographic information systems, research design and methods, information technology certifications, coding, community development organization management, urban farming and agriculture, program evaluation, teacher credentialing, and continuing medical and legal education, etc.

Some schools may even consider playing a more significant role in the credentialing for the myriad of professionals in Detroit. (For example, recently, Michigan State started an MBA program in Detroit). Such master programs could increase the visibility and influence of the University within the city as well as help foster new scholarly collaborations. Such programs could also, when appropriate, be significant revenue generators.

The proximity to the Detroit Institutes of Arts also provides an opportunity for several collaborative partnerships with the Stamps School of Art and Design. These partnerships could include internships and the co-production of exhibits. Such partnerships could also leverage many of our donors' interests in both U-M and the arts into new development opportunities. Similarly, the proximity of the Rackham building to the Detroit School for the Performing Arts also opens up more possibilities with respect to collaborations with our School of Music, Theatre, and Dance.

Entrepreneurial and Business Incubation Space

Along with formal courses and academic programs, the Rackham Building may also meet a critical need in the Midtown area for Detroit area startups and entrepreneurs. As the Center for Entrepreneurship does in Ann Arbor for current students and recent graduates, the Rackham Building could accommodate a maker space for small, Detroit-based startup companies that would benefit from co-locating with the resources of potential continuing and adult education programs. This expansion of the Ann Arbor entrepreneurship ecosystem would also facilitate Detroit-based work and projects launched by students in programs sponsored by Ross, LSA's optiMize program, and social innovation initiatives in the School of Public Health and the School of Information.

Clinical Research Facilities

The Rackham building could also serve as an important research facility. Social science lab space that is capable of collecting minimally-invasive medical samples (e.g., saliva, blood) could greatly enhance the University's capacity to conduct research in Detroit. There are already a number of individual faculty members with various research programs in Detroit. Such a facility could stimulate even more research in the area. The Michigan Institute for Clinical Health Research (MICHHR) already runs such facilities in the Cardiovascular Center (CVC) within Michigan Medicine as well as at Domino Farms. A similar facility in Detroit could diversify our study populations as well as the types of research questions that we currently pose.

University Administrative Offices in Detroit

At present, there are a number of University units that engage in significant activity within Detroit that could potentially have office space within the Rackham Building. Examples of such units include: Office of University Development; Government Relations; University of Michigan

Office of Research; and the U-M Alumni Association. The office space that they would use could be either permanent or semi-permanent space depending on the need. Such a regular physical presence in Detroit can only increase the likelihood of increased engagement between these units and the City of Detroit. In addition, relevant university initiatives such as Poverty Solutions and the Graham Institute are also likely to want and need space in the Rackham Building.

Arts & Performance Destination

The Rackham Building has several large entertainment and performance spaces (including 1,000 and 300 seat auditoriums, a large ball room, and several kitchen spaces). These spaces could host a number of University and Detroit community events. One could imagine that the School of Music, Theatre, and Dance as well as the University Musical Society might want to utilize the space to host performances and concerts on a regular basis. The space could also be used to showcase a series of public lectures in Detroit to showcase the scholarly activity at the University. This entertainment space could also be open to the entire Detroit community for rent, which would forge greater connections to the Detroit area while also providing a modest income source to help offset maintenance cost. The combination of meeting space and large auditorium space could also make the Rackham facility an ideal conference location for larger groups.

Detroit Research Center

One idea that moving to the Rackham Building may also facilitate is the development of a multidisciplinary research center focused on Detroit. Such a center could work with leaders in Detroit to address many of the issues that the city faces utilizing the scholarly capacity of U-M faculty. The center could address such issues as education, poverty, economic development, criminal justice, sustainability, health, and substance abuse. There are numerous faculty who are already doing research in such areas within Detroit, for example, through the Detroit Urban Research Center and affiliated partnerships, the Detroit School Rackham Interdisciplinary Workshop has generated a growing community of graduate students working on Detroit-based dissertation research. The research center could potentially build upon and leverage these existing activities and provide a structure to enhance the impact of such scholarship on the lived experiences of the Detroit community. The research center could also stimulate more interdisciplinary collaborations and help identify and obtain more external support for such research.

In summary, these are only a few examples of the possible new opportunities for engagement in Detroit that could occur as a result of moving into the Rackham Building. Further discussions with the appropriate University constituents and stakeholders, (deans, executive officers, regents, faculty, staff, and students), is likely to lead to the generation of other opportunities as well. The Task Force strongly recommends that such a process be put into place before any final decisions are made with respect to the use of the Rackham Building. Such a process should also include significant and meaningful input from appropriate constituents and stakeholders from Detroit (in keeping with the principles of engagement). It is imperative that

the design and use of the Rackham Building model our commitment to effective, mutually-beneficial partnerships with Detroit.

VI. Transportation

Transportation Considerations

A key challenge in planning for a physical hub (the Rackham Building) is how to provide adequate transportation between U-M campuses and Detroit. U-M currently contracts with a private bus company to provide the Detroit Connector service, with recently expanded, seven-day service between U-M Ann Arbor, U-M Dearborn, and the current Detroit Center (beginning November 2017). The Task Force recognizes that to support robust engagement in Detroit, U-M must commit to maintaining a comparable level of transportation service to allow people to travel regularly and reliably between the campuses and within the City of Detroit.

The Task Force envisions the Rackham Building as the hub of U-M Detroit-based activity. This view reflects several issues. First, it reflects the need for a centralized operation in Detroit, but also for “pop-up” space for time-limited activities, engagement in specific locations. Second, it acknowledges that the Midtown area is not residential and may contribute to a sense that Michigan’s presence in Detroit is distant. Thus, satellite locations that may draw on Detroit Engagement Center resources could be valuable. Finally, it recognizes the need for U-M faculty, staff, and students to have a landing point from which to work.

This hub concept is severely limited by the lack of safe, accessible, and reliable transportation options to allow people to travel in and around the City. The Task Force acknowledges recent improvements in public transportation service, including via the Detroit Department of Transportation, SMART, and the Q-Line, that provide some better options for traveling between the Rackham Building and other locations. However, these existing public transportation options remain limited in their reach and convenience, and many U-M personnel are likely to find them inadequate in supporting their mobility needs while working in Detroit.

The Task Force recommends exploration of additional transportation options, including car-sharing, ride-sharing (e.g., SPLT, see Appendix B), bike-sharing, and shuttle/van service, commercial car rental services (e.g., ZipCar) to support travel to locations in and around Detroit from the Rackham Building. Detroit access to the U-M car fleet is another option. Opportunities may exist to partner with Wayne State University to provide this transportation service. The issues around transportation cuts both ways. Detroit community partners also need effective transportation and accessible parking options for getting to U-M campuses.

The Task Force recommends that the U-M Parking and Transportation Services take this up as a new initiative. Funds for transportation cost-sharing could encourage faculty to conduct more research in Detroit.

VII. Proposed Next Steps

The Task Force recommends the development of a 5-year, Strategic Planning and Implementation process for the transition from the current limited structure of operations in Detroit to the more robust infrastructure and coordination described herein, buttressed by the recommended principles of engagement. This strategic process should begin immediately with the formation of the recommended *Detroit Coordinating Council* (see page 16). The Council's early work should include the following:

- a. *Rackham Building Determination and Planning* – If the Rackham Building becomes the infrastructure hub of U-M activity in Detroit, the Detroit Coordinating Council (DCC) will advise building renovation designers and architects about building needs to accommodate recommendations of this report, from classroom design to transportation hub needs.
- b. *Engagement of Deans and other Stakeholders* – U-M deans at all campuses must be engaged by the DCC on recommendations and subsequent plans. Dean buy-in is critical to long-term success of expanded Detroit operations.
- c. *Engagement of Long-Term Community Partners* – This report emphasizes the necessity of partnership with Detroit Community-Based Organizations, city government, and other leaders in the city. Like engagement and buy-in from the deans, buy-in from selected community leaders is also key to long-term success.
- d. *Incorporation of Principles for Engagement Into Existing Structures and Processes* – Upon formation, the DCC should immediately begin articulating processes for embedding the recommended principles of engagement in Detroit and develop a communications plan to distribute and reinforce these principles with current U-M faculty, staff, and students involved in Detroit-based work.
- e. *Greater engagement among existing structures* (e.g. Ginsburg Center, CEAL, Center for Educational Outreach, etc.) should commence immediately to contribute to the DCC plan for creating new infrastructure in Detroit.
- f. *U-M/Detroit Engagement Governance Determination* – U-M Ann Arbor's Office of the Provost has, till now, acted as the administrative home of the current Detroit Center. With expanded operations in Detroit, the DCC should recommend a governance structure that is inclusive of all U-M campuses and constituencies in Detroit.

VIII. Concluding Statement

The City of Detroit is in a period of rapid transition. In many ways, there are reasons for optimism and grave concerns regarding the future of the city. While U-M and the city have been long-term partners, that shared history is marked with both successes and disappointments. Given the dynamic times, it is not surprising that faculty, staff, and students at the University of Michigan campuses are increasingly interested and involved in research, coursework, internships, and project partnerships in Detroit.

Now is an opportune time for the University of Michigan to renew its historic partnership with the City of Detroit in a more coordinated and impactful manner. The present report provides a framework forward – one that focuses on the adoption of a core set of principles for engagement, the creation of core infrastructure to support individual engagement efforts, and an investment in an enhanced central physical location to maximize our presence in Detroit. The Task Force believes that such a framework can be instrumental in a more fruitful and mutually-beneficial relationship between the city and the University.

VIII. Appendices

APPENDIX A

List of faculty, administrators, staff, and community partners who met with the Task Force on the Future of the Detroit Center

U-M faculty and administrator discussion guests at Task Force meetings

1. Mary Jo Callan, Director, Ginsberg Center
2. John Callewaert, Emerging Opportunities Director, Graham Sustainability Institute
3. Margi Dewar, Professor Emerita of Urban and Regional Planning
4. Lorraine Gutierrez, Professor of Social Work and Professor of Psychology
5. Jack Hu, Vice President for Research
6. Kedra Ishop, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management
7. Gary Krenz, Executive Director, U-M Bicentennial Office
8. Dan Little, Chancellor, U-M Dearborn
9. Maureen Martin, Foundations Relations Director
10. Luke Shaefer, Associate Professor of Social Work and Public Policy
11. Nick Tobier, Professor of Art and Design
12. Cynthia Wilbanks, Vice President for Government Relations

Detroit Urban Research Center Board Meeting Participants June 22, 2017 Meeting with Task Force on the Future of the Detroit Center

Detroit Partners

1. Angela Reyes, Executive Director, Detroit Hispanic Development Corporation
2. Guy Williams, President and CEO, Detroiters Working for Environmental Justice
3. Gwendolyn Daniels, Interim CEO, Institute for Population Health
4. Joneigh Khaldun, Executive Director and Health Officer, Detroit Health Department
5. Kim Rustem, Special Associate to the Director, Detroit Health Department
6. Lidia Reyes Flores, Executive Director, Latino Family Services
7. Richard Bryce, Chief Medical Officer, Community Health and Social Services, Inc. (CHASS)
8. Sheilah Clay, President and CEO, Neighborhood Service Organization
9. Sherita Smith, Executive Director, Grandmont Rosedale Development Corporation
10. Suzanne Cleage, Director of Neighborhood Growth, Eastside Community Network
11. Zachary Rowe, Executive Director, Friends of Parkside

University of Michigan Faculty

1. Amy Schulz, Professor, Health Behavior and Health Education, School of Public Health
2. Barb Brush, Professor, School of Nursing
3. Barbara Israel, Professor, Health Behavior and Health Education, School of Public Health
4. Marie O'Neill, Professor, Epidemiology, Environmental Health Sciences, School of Public Health
5. Michael Muhammad, Post-Doctoral Fellow, School of Public Health
6. Richard Lichtenstein, Emeritus faculty, Health Management and Policy, School of Public Health
7. Rogerio Pinto, Associate Professor, School of Social Work

Staff

1. Carol Gray, Center Manager, Detroit URC
2. Austin Fobar, Student intern, Health Behavior and Health Education, School of Public Health
3. Lello Guluma, Student intern, Health Behavior and Health Education, School of Public Health

March 30, 2017 Meeting of Detroit Center Users

1. Alexandra Rivera, Senior Associate Librarian, Learning and Teaching, University Library
2. Alicia Alvarez, Clinical Professor of Law, Law School
3. Craig Regester, Associate Director, Semester in Detroit, and Adjunct Lecturer, LSA
4. Eric Dueweke, Lecturer in Urban Planning and Outreach Coordinator, Taubman College
5. Eva Tabares (Greening of Detroit)
6. London J. Bell (Bell Global Justice)
7. Shiela White (Detroit MTSS PBIS Staff Training) Email
8. LaSonia Patterson (NBMBAA Leaders of Tomorrow)
9. Tayler Thurman (Next Generation Gems)
10. Tashawna Gill (U-M Alumni/ D4 Delegates)
11. Rachel Orłowski (Miles Project)
12. Tracy Hall (MNA Council Executive Meeting)
13. Triana Kazaleh Sirdenis (MFIERCE) Email:
14. Steve Grigorian from the Detroit Economic Club
15. Clarinda Barnett-Harrison U-M Dearborn Business Engagement

APPENDIX B

SPLT is a ride share company partnering with Lyft to enable healthcare providers to use on demand tools to quickly and efficiently summon rides for patients to and from medical centers. A proposed partnership with U-M is described below. For more information, see <http://splt.io/home>.

SPLT Adds Environmental Responsibility, Inclusion, and Mobility to the University of Michigan

