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“There is a call to us, a call of service—that we join with others to try to make things better in this world.”

Dorothy Day, 1955

“There is a call to us, a call of service—that we join with others to try to make things better in this world.”

“None of us are home until all of us are home.” This is the motto of the not-for-profit organization Project H.O.M.E. (Housing, Opportunities for Employment, Medical Care, Education). These words, expressing the organization’s commitment to solidarity in struggle, are permanently inscribed in a beautiful stone mosaic just inside the golden doors at the entrance of 1515 Fairmount, one of Project H.O.M.E.’s eleven residential facilities for formerly homeless men and women and the site of the outreach program and many of the administrative offices. Their motto is emblazoned on a banner raised high between the outstretched arms of a man and woman who stand before the golden doors of 1515 Fairmount. Above them is the skyline of Philadelphia, and below are listed the names of the many organizations—legal and governmental largely—that helped Project H.O.M.E. win its NIMBY (“Not in My Backyard”) legal battle against neighborhood and city opposition to the opening of a residence for the formally homeless at 1515 Fairmount. “In gratitude to the efforts of these people,” read the words at the bottom of the long list of law firms, businesses, and government officials, including “The Honorable Henry Cisneros, Secretary, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.”

The mosaic is a testament to the fight for 1515 Fairmount, one of the many struggles leaders of Project H.O.M.E. have fought and won during their seventeen-year history. “None of us are Home Until All of Us Are Home” serves as a clarion call,
reminding all that the true struggle is to end homeless—to bring all of us, all of humanity, home. Leadership at Project H.O.M.E. is a shared transformative power that arises in the ongoing struggle for social justice—the struggle for equality, for unity in diversity, and for the recognition of the value and dignity of all of humankind, regardless of a person’s circumstances. In a very real sense, it is the centrality of this vision together with the deep commitment to and constant engagement in this struggle that has enabled Project H.O.M.E. to be so successful, both in terms of its history of extraordinary organizational growth and stability, and more profoundly as a catalyst for personal and social transformation.

This ethnographic report explores the process of shared leadership at Project H.O.M.E. (Schall, Ospina, Godsoe, & Dodge 2004). We consider how leadership emerges through struggle and results in transformations, individual as well as social, in the context of personal struggles for recovery and family reunification, collective struggles for fair housing and equality, and administrative struggles to stay true to the vision and pursue appropriate avenues for organizational growth. The continual engagement with struggle has allowed and assisted leadership to flourish at every level of the organization. In this way, leadership at Project H.O.M.E. is truly shared among staff, residents, neighbors, volunteers, Board members, donors, and the many supportive friends of Project H.O.M.E.

The analysis is based on a yearlong participatory ethnographic study (details concerning methods are included in the appendix). In keeping with the aims of the Leadership for a Changing World Program, the ethnographers, Kathleen Hall and Jaskiran Dhillon, together with documentary photographer Harvey Finkle and Laura
Weinbaum, Project H.O.M.E.’s Director of Public Policy, worked with members of the Project H.O.M.E. community to explore how leadership is understood, experienced, and enacted in everyday practice (Ospina & Schall 2001). Our research, in this way, takes an appreciative inquiry stance, one in which we as researchers participated with members of the Project H.O.M.E. community in an effort to explore and learn lessons from the meanings they give to their leadership work (Schall, Ospina, Godsoe, & Dodge 2004). Therefore, our account privileges their stories, weaving them together with an analytic thread that illuminates the lessons the stories provide.

The analysis is founded upon some basic theoretical premises about the nature of leadership in not-for-profit social justice oriented organizations. Most importantly, understanding leadership at Project H.O.M.E. requires that we move beyond the tendency in much of the traditional literature on leadership to view it as an individual capacity or set of traits and behaviors. Leadership at Project H.O.M.E. is a process that is deeply social and cultural; it is co-constructed in ongoing social interactions within the Project H.O.M.E. community, among partnering organizations and leaders in Philadelphia, and increasingly on a national scale (Schall, Ospina, Godsoe, & Dodge 2004).

Project H.O.M.E.’s success story could be framed—and in newspaper accounts often is—in terms of the contributions of its two extremely talented, devoted, and tireless co-founders, Sister Mary Scullion and Joan Dawson McConnon. Accounts of the organization’s success inevitably point to the unique collaboration between these two truly extraordinary women. The organization’s success is attributed to their leadership, or, more precisely, to Sister Mary’s charisma—her incredible spirit, unwavering sense of vision, ability to inspire, and tireless devotion to ending homelessness—and to Joan’s
equally powerful drive, devotion, pragmatic sensibility, and exceptional financial and administrative skills. But as Sister Mary and Joan were the first to argue quite adamantly when we began work on this project, this leadership narrative does not reflect the many dimensions of leadership at Project H.O.M.E.. To begin to capture the nature of leadership at Project H.O.M.E. one must not simply focus on the role of individuals, but consider as well how leadership is shared across the organization. Leadership at Project H.O.M.E. emerges from and is supported by ongoing social relational dynamics that themselves are shaped by organizational norms. Put more simply, leadership at Project H.O.M.E. is deeply relational and is supported by a vision, a set of values, beliefs, and normative expectations that are shared.

Our story of leadership in Project H.O.M.E., then, will frame leadership as a transformational process that gains its power and authority from a shared sense of mission, from a set of values, beliefs, and normative expectations concerning how the battle to end homelessness must be fought. Project H.O.M.E. approaches homelessness not as a problem addressed by providing services to individuals, but rather as a symptom of social injustice. The struggle to end homelessness, then, is necessarily fought on several levels, making use of different resources and strategies—but each emphasizing that the struggle, ultimately, is for equality, justice, human dignity, and cohesion in diversity. This system of shared values, beliefs, and normative expectations is inscribed explicitly in the mission statement of Project H.O.M.E., but embodied much more broadly within people’s everyday social interactions. It provides the foundation upon which forms of leadership at Project H.O.M.E.—such as Sister Mary’s charismatic authority or Joan’s administrative brilliance—flourish and gain support. Yet what gives
these values and beliefs their legitimacy is how they are tied fundamentally to a shared sense of struggle, a struggle fought within the very real recognition of the crisis of homelessness in America. As many have argued, situations of crisis create a unique situation for the emergence of charismatic authority (Weber 1947; Beyer 1999; and House 1999) as well as forms of transformational leadership (Bass 1985; Bass & Avolio 1994; and Stone, Russell, & Patterson 2004). This is certainly evident in the leadership process at Project H.O.M.E.

Before turning to our analysis, we first provide background information about Project H.O.M.E.’s residences and programs. We then begin our analysis by considering its sense of mission and the critical role this vision plays in the process of shared leadership. Our analysis focuses on key elements of the organizational culture at Project H.O.M.E.: values and beliefs, interaction norms and community rituals that nurture the existence and continual emergence of shared leadership. Project H.O.M.E.’s vision in combination with a deeply pragmatic approach to setting goals and achieving ends has been central to its ongoing success. Finally, we end with a discussion of the some of the implications this success, particularly the administrative struggle to remain true to the vision in the face of impressive organizational growth and increased influence locally and nationally.

The Homes of Project H.O.M.E.

Project H.O.M.E. is a large and complex organization with a rich history of struggle and accomplishment. The organization traces it history back to the winter of 1989, when a group of volunteers, including co-founders, Sister Mary Scullion and Joan Dawson McConnon, opened up a short-term emergency shelter for chronically homeless men in
the locker room of a vacant city recreation center. They called this shelter, the Mother Katherine Drexel Residence. As Joan McConnon tells the story of the opening of this first shelter,

The reason why we opened it was because the city wouldn’t allow folks smelling of alcohol in the city shelter system. So there were people dying out on the street, many of whom were older alcoholics, many of whom were veterans. And so the State came and asked Mary if she would be willing to open up a shelter for these guys. The shelter opened at 7 o’clock at night and shut down at 7 o’clock in the morning. It was an overnight shelter in the locker rooms connected to the pool in the Marian Anderson Recreation Center. There’d be a couple of us on and we’d take turns resting for while, but the mice were all scampering around. I joke with Mary that running something like that today, you’d be like, “You’ve got to be kidding me!” It was very very bare bones. If you could imagine there were fifty men in the building—twenty-five and twenty-five in each locker room—with showers in the back. Then there was this little room in the middle where I think they gave out towels in the summer time. We didn’t have a stove—we cooked everything in a microwave. We all learned to cook eggs in a microwave. We had no sink. To wash dishes, we took the hose off the washing machine. And the dining area was also where we had racks of cloths for the guys. We had to pick the guys up in vans because the neighbors didn’t want homeless men walking through their neighborhood. The guys had the same bed every night. We’d save it for them. The guys would create their own little space and it would be theirs.

Our first board meeting included Steve Gold, Sister Mary, Peg Healy, Joe
Ferry, three or four of the guys from the shelter, and myself. That was the first board of Project H.O.M.E. We said to the guys, “You live here, so you’ve got to create the rules.” And so they set, I can’t remember all of the rules, but we came up with this idea of the bottle or your bed. They thought that was fair. It gave people a choice and some guys opted for the bottle and had to leave. The guys would help out and they’d help each other. I watched guys eating what was probably their only meal that day. Somebody would come in late and we’d run out of food, and they’d say, “Take half of mine.” Or somebody was freezing cold and I’d see a guy give him his jacket.

Easter we stayed open. It was the first day that we got the city to let us stay open. I had friends who were caterers and they came in with linen tablecloths, fresh flowers, and the meal. One of the staff brought a guitar and some of the guys played. I remember Chico—if you knew him on the street you’d be scared of him—sitting there playing the guitar and laughing. It was just humanity being expressed in such gentle ways. And that’s what it’s about. In the end, that to me is what this is all about.

In the years that have passed since that first winter, the organization has continued to respond to the needs of the homeless population in Philadelphia. The result of these efforts has been the creation of a comprehensive “continuum of care” consisting of street outreach and a range of supportive residential programs, from entry-level to permanent housing, each providing comprehensive services, including health care, education, and employment. The struggle to end homelessness begins with the work of an outreach staff that spends much of its time each day with people still living on the street. Project
H.O.M.E. is the site of the Outreach Coordination Center, an innovative program coordinating private and public agencies doing outreach with chronically homeless persons in Center City Philadelphia. When people are ready to come off the streets, Project H.O.M.E. provides a range of residential options. The residential programs are designed to assist formally homeless people who face distinctive challenges in their struggle to transform their lives.

Project H.O.M.E. has two entry-level “safe havens” with a total of 65 beds. St. Columba’s, which opened in 1992, provides a home for older men who continue to struggle with mental illness or are dually diagnosed. Residents of St. Columba’s are often more frail or resistant to other programs and services. The second entry-level facility, Women of Change, opened in 1995 and provides case management, supportive services, and on-site medical care for chronically homeless mentally ill women.

Project H.O.M.E. also runs two transitional supportive residences for up to 65 individuals. Kairos House, established in 1992, is a progressive-demand residence for men and women with a primary diagnosis of mental illness. St. Elizabeth’s Recovery Residence is a transitional substance abuse facility, which since 1993 has provided counseling, education, and support services to chronically homeless men who are chemically dependent or dually diagnosed.

After residing in a transitional housing situation for approximately one year, residents qualify to move into one of the seven permanent supportive residences at Project H.O.M.E.. These residences offer a more independent living situation by providing affordable single-room-occupancy (SRO) units to individuals and families who require regular, but not around the clock, supportive services and supervision. The seven
permanent supportive residences include: In Community with 29 affordable efficiency apartments, established in 1992; the Diamond Street Residences 1 & 11 with 20 units for men, created in 1993, and the 54 units for men and women at 1515 and 1523 Fairmont, opened in 1994, and just this year Kate’s Place opened, Kate’s Place in the Rittenhouse Square neighborhood, providing 144 single room occupancy apartments for low- to moderate-income individuals.

Rowan Homes, built in 2000, provides one of the few permanent, supportive housing programs in the nation for homeless families with special needs. These homes offer 32 two- and three- and 8 four-bedroom apartments to families, who also receive additional comprehensive services, including case management, adult and youth education, job placement and retention services and access to quality health care. It is envisioned that eventually Rowan Homes will include homeownership opportunities for families who are prepared to take that next step.

October 2005 saw the opening of the latest permanent residence, Kate’s Place Apartments, located in one of the wealthiest neighborhoods in Center City Philadelphia, Rittenhouse Square. Kate’s Place offers affordable housing to 144 low- and moderate-income women and men. All tenants have access to the services offered at Project H.O.M.E.’s other locations, including adult learning, employment counseling, and substance abuse and mental health referrals. A full time Resource Coordinator and part time Social Services Coordinator provide referrals and facilitate access to these opportunities as well as to community organizations and agencies based on the needs and requests of the tenants.

In addition to providing residential programs for formally homeless adults and
families, Project H.O.M.E. has sought to reach out to the neighborhoods surrounding some of its facilities, particularly in the Diamond Street neighborhood in north central Philadelphia. They opened a first after school program, Seeds of Hope, in 1991 in the Diamond Street neighborhood. A second Seeds of Hope program opened at 1515 Fairmount in 1992. Since 1996, Project H.O.M.E. has participated in the Philadelphia Plan, which, with the corporate investment of Crown, Cork & Seal, supports comprehensive community development in the neighborhoods around the St. Elizabeth's and Diamond Street residences. Working in conjunction with block captains and other neighbors, these efforts include development of affordable home-ownership for low-income families, economic development, educational and recreational programs for children and adults, and neighborhood beautification efforts. The educational component of the neighborhood revitalization project has been greatly enhanced by the opening in the neighborhood of the state-of-the-art Honickman Learning Center and Comcast Technology Labs in January 2004.

Over the course of our research, we visited and got to know staff and residents associated with nearly all of the residences. What was striking was the degree to which, across the broad range of programs, members of the Project H.O.M.E. community seemed to speak with single voice when describing their sense of leadership at Project H.O.M.E.. As we explain in the section that follows, people consistently attributed Project H.O.M.E.’s success to its vision and to the way people live this vision everyday.

**Transformational Leadership: Sharing & Living The Vision**

At its core, the qualities that make leadership for social justice effective at Project H.O.M.E. correspond in certain ways to what researchers have defined as a
transformational approach to leadership (Burns 1978; Bass & Avolio 1994; Avolio & Yammarino 2002). Transformational leadership, according to Burns, “occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation” (1978: 20). In this sense, leadership at Project H.O.M.E is found in transformative processes that occur at all levels of the organization. Leadership is about striving for ideals, striving to transform and being transformed in the process. As Sister Mary explains,

The person who is homeless, myself, the donors, the volunteers, whatever names you want to put on people, we’re all kind of being transformed by being part of this transformation. That’s like kind of a catalyst up there. That’s why I think leadership is at every level of our organization. Because no matter what situation you are in, you can be a leader if you strive for these ideals. Whether you’re the poorest person or the richest person, whether you’re the most talented person or whether you know, you’re very limited, in, you know, any kind of academic or intellectual stuff. Or whether you’re the most healthy person or you’re sick. You know that doesn’t, that’s not what leadership is. It’s more a thing where no matter what our situation is we can all have a role in making those ideals happen.

Like many social justice organizations, Project H.O.M.E. is vision-centered. Project H.O.M.E.’s clear and deep sense of mission permeates every aspect of the organization. It is what inspires the emergence of leaders, informs the development of programs and the quality of relations among staff and residents, provides sustenance to a staff and volunteers who work long and hard, and is the basis for community and the transformative power of social relationships.
The official mission of Project H.O.M.E. is “to empower persons to break the cycle of homelessness and poverty, to address structural causes of poverty, and to enable all of us to attain our fullest potential as individuals and as members of the broader society” (http://www.projecthome.org/aboutus/mission.html). This sense of mission is founded upon the belief, in Joan McConnnon’s words,

that everybody has value and everybody should be treated with dignity. And that somebody who is sitting on a grate is of no less value and no less important than anyone else. I think there’s a shared vision that in this society people should not end up so disconnected that their only option is to sleep in a doorway or to sleep on a park bench. So I think there’s a shared vision that we need to call into question our use of resources and the allocation of resources. So I think there are strands of a very shared belief system, like belief in certain things and a vision of a world that is more just and more compassionate and more hospitable. And people come with that and they come with a passion and they come with a commitment that they want to spend their lives trying to make it a better or a more just world.

Creating shared leadership at Project H.O.M.E. has required bringing together a staff that shares the organization’s values and vision. Administrators do their best to hire those who, as one administrator put it, “are about the mission.” Yet the level of cohesiveness among the staff is also enhanced by the fact that those who are not about the mission soon leave to find jobs elsewhere. As Jeannine Lopez, Vice President of Residential Operations and Homeless Programs, explained,
In addition to needing all the skills, we look for somebody who is really connected into that mission, from their history or for one reason or another, and has some good information to back that up. Because we realize that people are not, people who aren’t really about the mission and aren’t linked in are not gonna come here and be willing to deal with some of the struggles, you know, and some of the hard stuff unless they are committed at that level.

Being willing to deal with the struggles, however, involves sharing Project H.O.M.E.’s approach to “dealing,” or its vision for how best to provide support for people who are attempting to transform their lives. Project H.O.M.E. adamantly differentiates their approach from traditional clinical or service oriented methods of “dealing with the problems” of people who become homeless. According to Joan, staff who take a more “clinical” approach to working with residents seldom stay very long, for they find that their approach is completely at odds with Project H.O.M.E.’s vision and practice.

If someone comes with a very clinical background and a background where I am knowledgeable and I need to help you, they don’t survive here very long because it’s just not our culture. Our culture isn’t provider-client. Our culture is we’re all in this together and just because you have circumstances that led you to be homeless, we don’t have the answers for that. The answers are inside of you. We can facilitate and we can share our experience and we can help in any way, but ultimately those decisions are yours to make. And we really respect that, even when they are bad decisions. You know? And so people who come with a client-provider mentality, I think, find it difficult here.
In contrast to the client/provider model, Project H.O.M.E.’s emphasis on transformation through struggle requires more equitable relationships, those in which staff and residents are each involved in a broader struggle involving personal as well as social change. The problem of homelessness, from the perspective taken at Project H.O.M.E., lies not simply within the homeless individual, but in the structural basis of poverty and the marginalization and mistreatment of those who find themselves on the street. Program residents are encouraged to become involved, not only in their own personal recovery, but also in the broader collective struggle for fair housing and equality. For example, Project H.O.M.E. has a specific unit, Education and Advocacy, directed by Jennine Miller, which conducts voter registration drives and sponsors voter education events to discuss political issues in shelters, residences, and programs across Philadelphia. Residents often participate in the work of this unit and have attended trainings, such as the Center for Community Change’s training on the role of media outreach in mobilizing voter registration and education programs. Resident and Board member Hyacinth King, in particular, has come to take a key leadership role in working with Jennine Miller to organize and publicize Project H.O.M.E.’s voter registration and education trainings. In election years, residents also participate in town hall meetings with local candidates. In addition, residents are encouraged, as was Brian Kane, who was living at the time at St. E’s recovery residence, to participate with staff in political activities that draw attention to issues of equitable housing and programs for the homeless. In this way, the personal and the collective come together in the struggle against homelessness.
The City of Philadelphia had given back over 109 million dollars to the State government that was going to help people with behavioral health, mental health, drug, and alcohol treatment and things like that. Without that type of funding available, intensive outpatient, outpatient, treatments for all those types of people were just going to start to shut down or were going to be limited to a certain number of people. And that’s unacceptable. That portion of society has been ignored for so long as it is, including homelessness. We just felt that somebody needed to know that there are people out here and that we’re more than just a statistic—we’re living human breathing bodies.

The idea for the rally was to get as many of us from all walks to go out there and to stand on the front steps of the Capital building in Harrisburg and to show that we are people. We sent busloads. I know I saw twenty-five loads of people that were out there that day. And that doesn’t count the people who drove themselves there and got there by other modes of transportation. People were there from across the whole state. And there was a Representative—she was a recovering alcoholic herself—and she had come out on the front steps and got on the microphone and spoke in support of us about getting money back, about restoring the money that was cut from the budgets. And there were other representatives as well that had come out there. There were union leaders, people from mental health institutions, behavioral health institutions. Everybody was out there. There were thousands and thousands of people. And they were calling for torrential downpours for the whole day. People were keeping in touch with the
weather, and you know we were praying and keeping our fingers crossed. And it didn’t rain until the meeting was dismissed.

Anthony Gindraw, also a graduate of St. Elizabeth’s recovery program recently worked nearly 80-hour weeks at the Wanamaker School, helping Katrina evacuees get back on their feet. He has also joined the Board of the Homeless Advocacy Project to help the Board (made up mostly of lawyers) gain a better understanding of the issues from the point of view of consumers.

But most directly, perhaps, residents are actively involved in the ongoing work at Project H.O.M.E.. In 2005, eighty-three residents or former residents were either employed at Project H.O.M.E. or had volunteer or held stipend positions. Former resident, Mike McGee, for many years was the manager of Project H.O.M.E.’s Our Daily Threads Thrift Store, and many residents have worked in the cafeteria and in a wide range of positions throughout the organization. Residents regularly volunteer to go out on outreach with staff. Over the years, they have also often accompanied staff from Project H.O.M.E. to testify before various commissions on issues related to homelessness. And from the beginning residents have served as members of the Project H.O.M.E. Board of Directors. Currently there are three long-term residents on the Board, Dennis Griffin, Almeda Smith, and Hyacinth King.

A key aspect of this active approach to transformational leadership—of this vision of being transformed in acts of struggle—is a fundamental respect for the dignity of those who are struggling and their power to transform themselves. Project H.O.M.E. provides relational supports that enable people to make changes in their own lives, largely on their
own terms. It is from within the relationships at Project H.O.M.E. that transformative power emerges, as former resident Gabrielle Howee describes in telling her story.

I’d like to talk about a person here at Project H.O.M.E. who has had an impact on my life. His name is Robert Bullock. He’s an art teacher here. In high school I was a pretty good artist. I won some awards. And I didn’t do it for a while for different reasons. I was just too busy in college and then after college I was just not into it. And when I came to Project H.O.M.E. I still wasn’t actively doing any artwork. But one of the activities coordinators introduced me to Robert Bullock and said, “You’ve gotta come to his class.” So I thought, well they want you to do activities, so I came. And my first experience was that he would come by and comment on your work. And then my pictures were put in a show and a couple of them sold. I was completely amazed that anybody would want to buy my work. So it got me a bit more serious about my art work. And later on Robert started coming to Kairos House where I lived. We would just talk, probably more talk than artwork. But I’d do art on my own anyway at that time because of him. He got me back to my art, just sharing himself. And that’s what I think Project H.O.M.E.’s all about. It’s about people. It’s really about people. So now I’m doing some pretty good artwork. I’m putting it out there and I’m still amazed that people buy my work. But what I’ve come away with from my experience is that I have something that I can share with people. I’m not alone. With your battles with life sometimes you feel alone and that nobody is with you. But people are with you. And just having him in my life has really impacted positive feelings in me. And it’s just gotten me back in the world.
As many described, and we witnessed again and again, Project H.O.M.E.’s perspective on homelessness and commitment to treating people with compassion, respect, and dignity is readily apparent in the character of the programs and the quality of relationships within these programs. At Project H.O.M.E. people are treated with dignity, beginning with the relationships outreach workers form with people who are still on the streets. As Ginny O’Donnell, former Director of the Outreach Coordination Center, explained,

Outreach itself, is still very much grassroots and pretty much embodies the entire heart of Project H.O.M.E.—the entire mission, the entire heart of it, you know. And because we are working on the street level, it stays there. We’re not into looking at people and what kind of illness they have and what their addiction is. And because we’re not a hospital we don’t have to, you know, classify anybody by their “diagnostic code,” you know, or anything like that. Everybody has the potential to turn their life around and our role basically is to help them to do that and to explore the possibilities and the options they have to do that. And we get to do that by treating them nice. By getting to know them, by hanging out with them on the street, by taking them to the hospital when they need it, by not getting mad when they, you know, do something like spit on us or whatever, you know. And I think all the entry level sites at Project H.O.M.E. are great as well because we can take people from the street there and pretty much know that the relationship that we have started is going to continue—that people are going to continue to be treated properly and respectfully.
Staff members at Project H.O.M.E. are able to create respectful and supportive relationships with homeless and formally homeless individuals because they do not differentiate between themselves and those who may face different struggles in life. A deep sense of equality based in a recognition of common humanity permeates the relationships at Project H.O.M.E., as is evident in this story Ed Speedling, Community Liaison with the Outreach Coordination Center, shared about how he experiences spending his days on the street and in shelters.

Yesterday took me into two very large shelters in the city. Early in the morning I was at Ridge Avenue shelter across the street, a big city shelter. Going into Ridge Avenue shelter I see many many people that I’ve met over the years. And then from the Ridge Avenue shelter I went over to the new shelter that used to be called Gateway Shelter and is now called Our Brother’s Place. Both of the shelters are places that have men who have great difficulty in dealing with their issues and great difficulties in getting stable. So walking into these shelters is really an incredibly emotional experience, because you run into someone who I knew when I first started in this work now five years ago and he still seems to be in the same place. But always the greeting that I get is phenomenal. The greeting is like two friends meeting. Then on the other hand I’ll run into someone who is now a staff member at the shelter. And this person used to be pretty much down and out, and here he is. And then I meet people who are kind of transitioning. There’s a guy that I met at the Ridge shelter who came up to me and said, “Hey, I just got a job. Now I am working at this restaurant and I’m really about ready to leave the Ridge shelter. And, by the way, do you remember that softball game we
played at?” ‘Cause he reminded me that we had that little softball league going, he connects me back to when we were playing softball together. But as I left the day yesterday, I was thinking about all this. And I thought that in some ways there’s a huge difference between me and them, but then again there’s no difference. And that reality is really awesome.

Relationships founded upon respect and a sense of common humanity can be powerfully transformative. They create the opportunity for staff members to listen and to learn from those they are there to support. As they listen, Project H.O.M.E. staff members come to understand the struggles people face in terms of the meanings these people give to their experiences. This understanding allows them to provide much more effective support. This is illustrated well in a story Genny O’Donnell, then Director of the Outreach Coordination Center, told about an interaction between a staff person from a different organization and a man who had been on the street for years:

There was a worker from another organization working with a man who had been on the streets for years and always felt that he had aliens invading his brain. And the worker, without a lot of experience, kept trying to tell this person that they were mentally ill, and the person didn’t want to hear it. So, the person ended up getting treatment, getting medication. Then he saw that same worker again. And the worker looked at the medication and said, “See I told you you were mentally ill. That is what this medication is for.” Well the person went right off the meds, didn’t take them any more. And it was like, you know what? They’re to quiet aliens, it is okay that we quiet aliens. It’s okay that we do that. And we get to do that. And sometimes people have a problem with that, they’re like, “Well you’re
playing into their delusion,” And we’re like, “So what?” There’s a method to the madness. Let’s learn the patterns. There’s a pattern here. There’s something that someone is trying to say, and sometimes people’s lives have been so traumatized they make their own little worlds where it all makes sense to them. And we just don’t, it doesn’t make sense to us. It’s okay, people put things in terms they can live with. So let’s not take anything away from any of that. And I keep telling the staff here, it’s like there’s a method to the madness. You know what, you learn the method and your madness isn’t so bad, it all makes sense. You get to the point where you start to notice that there’s actually a story here, there’s actually a pattern here.

Listening, understanding, compassion, and respect permeate the relationships and interactions we witnessed in all the programs at Project H.O.M.E.. From Sister Mary and Joan down throughout the organization listening is a central component of transformative leadership. While the organization has clearly grown immensely in size and complexity, Sister Mary and Joan and other senior staff do their best to stay connected to the residents through regular visits to the various programs. In a more formal sense, Project H.O.M.E. has developed procedures that ensure that residents have regular opportunities to participate in leadership, to contribute their perspectives and express their needs. This is achieved through several mechanisms structured into the functioning of the various programs and the institution itself. We turn next to consider how leadership is distributed throughout the organizational structure of Project H.O.M.E..

An Organization Structured to Listen and Learn
As Joan described above in her story of the creation of the first shelter, the staff at Project H.O.M.E. from the beginning has sought to involve residents not simply in providing feedback, but in setting organizational policy and particularly residential rules. Yet, with Project H.O.M.E.’s expansion has come the need for a more hierarchical and bureaucratic organizational structure. While residents have always been members of the Project H.O.M.E. Board of Directors, there is now a Senior Management Team that does not include residents, but only the senior staff. Today this team could be described as the final decision making body. But focusing only on higher level decision making misses the ways that Project H.O.M.E. puts great emphasis on and provides clear channels for listening to, learning from, and responding to residents, and, moreover, the importance of these processes to the shaping of the organization.

In addition to having residents serve on the Board of Directors, Project H.O.M.E. has developed several other vehicles for residents to express their views and influence program development and change. As Jeannine Lopez, Vice President of Residential Operations and Homeless Progress, explains, this emphasis on communication with residents is not only valued in principle, but it is realized in practice.

We have many ways to listen to our residents. The Program Coordinators (at each residence) have regular meetings with residents, and then the Directors meet at least quarterly with every resident group, and talk about things and get input. Every year we do annual interviews with twenty percent of our residents. Our Board members (Claire Reichlin, in particular) interview a random sample of twenty percent of the residents. We then use the information we get to create our annual program goals. The Program Coordinator will sit with the staff and take
that feedback plus all their experience from the year, where they need to move and the barriers. We do so much reporting and looking at all our outcomes. So they have all that feedback. And then they take that and create the goals for the next year, so the residential programs each have a whole set of strategic goals. Each residential program does this internally together, and then they meet with the Director of Residential Services and then they meet with me. I meet with the Director of Residential Services and the Program Coordinators on a quarterly basis, then, to talk about those goals and see how things are going and try to help them with the barriers and just keep the focus on that so we can make progress.

Staff at Project H.O.M.E. continue to find ways to involve residents in ongoing planning and in assessing program implementation and development. During a recent strategic planning process, for instance, residents were asked to participate in all of the work groups and are serving now on the implementation teams.

While Project H.O.M.E. can never be run completely democratically, formal and informal communication has always been central to how decisions are made and conflicting views are respected and addressed. These open channels of communication allow leaders to emerge, as this story shared by Carolyn Crouch, the Project Coordinator at Kairos House clearly illustrates.

I really like how Project H.O.M.E. listens to people. At Kairos House we have monthly resident meetings. We give announcements for the month. We talk about things that are going on, things that might be implemented. And then we have a discussion time where people can bring up any concerns, any issues. We also has a suggestion box and residents can actually put suggestions in the box and at the
beginning of each resident meeting we go through that suggestion box and take a look at it and have open discussion about how we can solve the problems and/or have open discussion about the suggestions or problems or issues. There are a couple of residents who are leaders and they voice residents’ concerns.

I can give you our most recent example. We cut out smoking in the building. We have a smoke room that was open 21 hours a day and was closed from midnight to 3am everyday. Well, we decided to close it from 8am to 9pm so people could just smoke outside. And the concern came from this leader who was voicing the concern of the smokers. She had come in on behalf of the smokers. Eventually she wrote a letter to Sister Mary and Sister Mary has actually called her and told her that she is going to come over to spend the day with the residents here and they could talk then about it. She is coming to sub for the day because we are going on a staff luncheon. This particular person was also on Sister Mary’s caseload back when Sister Mary was a case manager at Women of Hope before Project H.O.M.E. was even started. There are certain people here that Sister Mary has known for a long, long time. They have that kind of connection with her, and they don’t have to talk to her on a regular basis, but if they call her they know that she is going to look out for them, and that is a great thing.

Leadership among the residents is sometimes supported by long-term ties with Sister Mary and other staff. But it also continues to emerge in the contributions of people new to the organization. Not long ago, residents of the Hope Haven development in the Diamond Street neighborhood, for example, expressed their wish to allow visitors and were successful in overturning a longstanding policy. The residents came up with their
own parameters around visitors through a process very similar to that enacted by the first group of residents in the shelter now long ago. Residents are able to participate in shaping policy, making rules, and evaluating programs because there continues to be a deep commitment to and an organizational structure in place to support and maintain this shared participation in organizational life.

Shared leadership in the neighborhood revitalization and education programs at Project H.O.M.E. has been approached in a similar manner, yet has involved distinctive challenges. Project H.O.M.E. initially became involved in the Diamond Street neighborhood when it sought to open St. Elizabeth’s recovery program for homeless men in what had been St. Elizabeth’s convent on Croskey Street. At first they encountered neighborhood resistance to opening the facility; but when Sister Mary agreed to move into the residence, opposition cooled and relationship building began. Sister Mary listened to neighborhood residents talk about their needs, and this led to the development of a partnership between Project H.O.M.E. and existing local leaders.

Project H.O.M.E.’s success in building neighborhood partnerships is due to the fact that they did not come into the neighborhood and tell residents what was good for them. Project H.O.M.E. staff members listened, and set about developing relationships and channels of communication with existing block captains as well as other leaders, including in particular Chris Whaley, former Community Organizer and now Restorative Practices Manager at Project H.O.M.E., who originally moved into the neighborhood to work with Project H.O.M.E. The organization has nurtured ongoing partnerships supporting local leaders as agents of change, leaders who were already engaged in the struggle to transform their own neighborhood.
Long-term resident and Community Organizer Miss Helen Brown is one of these key leaders. As a block captain, she has been a central force in this partnership. In discussing what contributed to the success of their collaboration with Project H.O.M.E., she often traces this success back to way relationships were first initiated.

People came into our neighborhood and they offered us things. Everyone promised to do something but nothing ever happened. But when Sister Mary came she didn’t say well Project H.O.M.E. can do X, Y, and Z. She asked, “What can Project H.O.M.E. do to help you?”

Yet, even working with, rather than imposing programs on the neighborhood, it took a great deal of effort on the part of people like Miss Helen, Chris Whaley and Priscilla Bennett (who is known as Miss Tee and is the Lead Teacher for grades 1-3 at the Learning Center) to gain the trust of local residents and find ways to work together.

**Miss Chris:** We did a lot in the early days. I mean we do a lot now but it was different. It was just different—implementing things. You have to get everyone’s vision and then plan it and then implement it. Everyone has a vision and everyone wants to be part of it. And the plans are like this (motions ‘large’ with her hands) and you know you have to make it like this (motions ‘small’). What is amazing though is what we have done.

**Miss Tee:** It’s building relationships and being consistent too. That was a major component, consistency. There are always people in and out of the neighborhood, you know, and the community is highly suspicious.

**Miss Chris:** With all of the false promises, that’s why it seemed harder, because we had to keep proving ourselves. I am not saying that we aren’t proving now,
but we had to keep proving. It is easier to prove now because of the successes of things that happened ten years ago, eight years ago. We have a track record. And Project H.O.M.E. has a track record within the city of getting people off the streets. They were downtown getting people off the street and helping people get their lives back together, but here it was a new thing.

The hardest thing was to convince people that yes, we are moving formerly homeless people into the neighborhood—but they are from the neighborhood originally. Or they are people who came in here and helped to destroy the neighborhood—so let them come in and help to rebuild the neighborhood. That is the hard part, getting people to believe in you, that you are going to keep your word. Once you convinced people you had to keep doing what you said you would do, because now you have to keep that trust because of other things that would come up—you needed them for hearings, you needed the community to sign petitions, you needed them to show up when we had functions, or when we had to talk to people to release property or to put up stop signs? You have to keep doing and making sure that what you had in place was running smoothly, because every time you need the community to do something they remember that you did what you said you were going to do last time and things have been getting better. It’s a lot of work.

Maintaining trust and openness within a working partnership continues to require hard work. But as Jacqueline Lipson, Teen Program Counselor/Liaison, describes, open channels of communication provide a vehicle for leadership.
Project H.O.M.E. is very dedicated to making sure that any project they seek out or take on, you know, to assist the community or enable the community to revitalize itself, to create more opportunities for members of the community, they make sure that the community is the main part of the decision making process. The way that it works here is block captains, folks on each block that represent all of the people on that block, and those block captains meet. So the block captains communicate with Project H.O.M.E. to make sure that the things we are working towards are the same. So it is very organic. It just seems to just work. You know people talk. It doesn’t always necessarily have to be a formal, you know, meeting. A lot of times people just talk to each other and there are a lot of discussions. How we do things around here is just that we have really open lines of communication, which is very nice, you know. It is a non-profit, but it really feels grass roots still, even though we are so huge. It really feels grass roots and natural so that when something is happening we all know about it. And when something needs to happen, we all know about it, and the lines of communication are just so open and naturally flowing from one program manager to the Director of Neighborhood Services to a block captain.

Leadership at Project H.O.M.E. is founded upon a shared sense of mission, enacted within respectful and compassionate relationships and supported by open channels of communication and trust. Yet shared leadership also requires a great deal of devotion and hard work on the part of staff and residents, volunteers and Board members. Devotion and dedication to leadership in struggle permeates the organization, yet it starts fundamentally at the top, in the way Sister Mary and Joan live and are seen to live the
mission every day of their lives. While the story of leadership at Project H.O.M.E. is not simply a story of the contributions of these two amazing women, their actions provide the inspiration and a model leadership practiced and nurtured throughout the organization. The presence and practice of Sister Mary and Joan are an inspiration for people at every level of Project H.O.M.E., for as Jacqueline Lipson also shared,

Project H.O.M.E. is a great example of how a large non-profit can remain grassroots at heart and stay true to the mission. Sister Mary and Joan are very much a part of the everyday goings on. So what the program managers are up to and what they are doing, the issues and challenges, you know, they are really aware of those things. So you don’t feel so separated from either of them. You know I feel very comfortable calling either one of them for their guidance or leadership at any point. When you have two such dynamic personalities, it can’t help but trickle down to the organization. And, I think there is a kind of, there is a realism, you know, in the organization that people understand the issues they are dealing with and trying to create opportunities. But at the same time there is kind of like a no excuses sense as well. Like even though we are faced with these things it doesn’t mean we are going to stop the process we are working on. We are going to push through it. And again with two people who are so dedicated to the mission, you know, 40 hours a week doesn’t, you know, doesn’t necessarily mean anything. So, I think that also trickles down. You know you have a lot of over-achievers, you know who have ended up being drawn to this organization. So you know people that really push beyond the boundaries or the box, and really
give it that extra, you know push, and I think that that really trickles down from our leaders.

Or, in the words of Ben Harris, who was then working as a neighborhood youth program staff member,

Sister Mary is so passionate about what she wants. She knows what she wants, even if she doesn’t know how we are going to get there. She just wills it into being—we need ‘this’—and figures out how we are going to do it and makes it happen. And she really pushes people to give their all, and to their fullest potential. She lets people know, “You are doing this, it is not just your job, but we are doing something here that is very vital and important and is really going to have a profound affect on, not just the lives of the people who are being served by us, but your life as well.” And she has a great touch with people. She can talk to anybody. And you can talk to her about, you know, she is a nun, but, you know, you can have discussions with her—the way she can deal with conversations about drugs and drug abuse, and, you know, like poverty and mental illness. She has talked to me about all sorts of things. And the way I see her to talk to everyone on the street that knows her—people that just call her out when they see her, half the homeless people in Philly at least know her by name and sight and she knows half of their names, you know? It’s like she can make people feel very at ease and not feel like she is a stranger coming in to invade their lives and perform a service that they really don’t need or may not even want, you know? I guess it stems from her work in Center City with the homeless. Most of those people they don’t want to go to a shelter and they don’t want this or that from
you, especially if they are dealing with addiction, they just want money. And she has a way of, like, you know, building rapport with people where they can actually get beyond like those immediate needs and, you know, like, relate to them on a more personal level. As far as the leadership thing, you know, she just has so much experience in this and she is so committed, you know? She lives it. You know what I mean? She eats it, she sleeps it, she lives it. She lives over in Rowan Houses right around the corner, and so she comes back to this neighborhood at the end of the day to go to sleep, you know? Even though she does half of her work in other parts of the city, you know. she might be working at Rittenhouse Square and then she comes back here to go to sleep.

While each of the exceptionally talented co-founders humbly downplays their own contribution to leadership in Project H.O.M.E., each speaks highly of what the other has contributed to the organization’s success. Sister Mary, along with so many others, continually recognizes Joan’s contributions particularly but not exclusively to the growth and management of the organization. Joan is a brilliant fiscal planner and administrative leader. Sister Mary Scullion, by all accounts—except possibly her own—possesses many of the qualities of a charismatic leader (Howell 1988; Fiol et al. 1992; and Conger et al 1998). As Joan describes, Sister Mary inspires. She also provides the backbone of the organization with her unwavering determination, fighting spirit, and tenacity. “I watch Mary,” Joan told us,

and I see her ability to bring people to Project H.O.M.E. and engage them and stir something in them. I see her tenacity and I see her perseverance. So I can see it, I see it very clearly in her ability to never say die. It is just amazing to me. And I
just watch her, where something that seems insurmountable to me, she just chips away at it. And eventually it’s done. So I watch that and I say well that is definitely a unique characteristic of Mary and I would imagine many leaders. Because I think it just takes that belief that we are going to do this and the ability to just keep pushing and not giving up. And also what I watch with her is it’s okay if we don’t make it. You know? It’s almost like there is no fear of failure. But at the same time probably a terrible fear of failure, but it doesn’t, it doesn’t paralyze her, it doesn’t stop her from trying. And so I watch that, so I can see qualities through Mary, the way she works that I would say I see leadership in her very clearly.

Everyone with whom we spoke gave a great deal of the credit for the realization of transformative and shared leadership at Project H.O.M.E. to the hard work and talents of both its leaders. For as Founding Board member, Steve Gold expressed,

They are both extraordinarily, extraordinarily competent women. . . . They are bright beyond belief. They are both incredibly bright. … These are incredibly well read bright women who just cut the crap away and figure out what has to be done and what are the steps to do it and do it, period.

Yet, possibly in part due to her stature as a nun, it is Sister Mary’s devotion and determination to the struggle to end homelessness that has become a powerful symbol in this city of brotherly love. Over the years, she has won the respect of many local politicians, in relation to whom Mary has proven to be both a powerful adversary and a wise and trusted collaborator in the development of more equitable city policies on homelessness and affordable housing. Sister Mary touches the hearts and minds of
everyone she meets, corporate executives and homeless people alike, for she sees beyond superficial social differences to the dignity of all human beings and she responds accordingly with great respect, compassion, and empathy.

Our interviews are filled with “Sister Mary stories.” Nearly everyone we spoke with shared at least one, completely unprompted by us. Her spirit and devotion are inspirational to the homeless people she befriends, her staff, the volunteers, Board members, donors, and her long-time compatriots in the fight against homelessness. Mike McGee, a graduate of St. Elizabeth’s Recovery Residence and former Manager of Our Daily Threads Thrift Store, shared this story about Sister Mary.

I’ve always told this story about living at St. Elizabeth’s with Sister Mary. It was the winter I think of ’96. She lived with the men, there were 10 men on the floor. Of course these were guys who had been in the program and who had achieved, who had been successful in the program. They had moved to the fourth level. There were four levels of growth. And once you were at the fourth level, what that meant was that you had become independent, now you needed to be a role model to the people who were coming in. So once I got to the fourth floor I was living actually right across the hall from Sister Mary. Our rooms faced one another, like a dormitory setting almost. And she lived up there with me. . . . And she drives a very modest car, one that might break down. So here it is, thirty inches of snow on the ground and she’s not able to move around. And she takes off at ten thirty or eleven o’clock at night to walk from here to 23rd and Columbia Avenue. Columbia Avenue is Cecil B. Moore as we know it today. That’s a good little walk up Ridge Avenue. And this is an environment around here that can be
very very dangerous. And she’s a white woman walking up Ridge Avenue at 11:30 or 10:30 at night. Some people would be vulnerable. I would say that if you had done that, you would be vulnerable. No one would know you. They would approach you and ask you what you’re doing here and where you’re going, can I help ya. But they’re approaching her in a way of saying, “Sister Mary, why are you out here? Who are you looking for and hey, I’m not letting you out of my sight. I’m going with you” And they would, they actually, by the time she got home she had a group of people with her to protect her. And these were not church preachers, these were drug addicts, drug addicts that she had fed, or given a blanket to, or taken to one of the shelters in Philadelphia. These were all drug addicts. They were not professional people. These were street people who were approaching her saying, “Are you alright? Can I get you a cab?” They were trying to help her, you know.

Sharing stories plays a significant role in community building at Project H.O.M.E. Stories, when told, affirm what has been achieved, personally or collectively, and the shared experience of reliving these stories binds the community together. Stories of transformation are shared formally at ritual events—at memorials for those who have passed on as well as the yearly service held on Thanksgiving Day—and informally in everyday conversations. The powerful presence of Sister Mary in these stories, however, cannot be denied. She has played a fundamental role in the transformation of many who like Brian Kane, graduate of St. Elizabeth’s recovery program, continue to fight a hard battle.
There are very few ends of the road for an addict: jails, institutions, and death. I didn’t want to end my life like that, but I had nowhere to go. I was homeless. One night I was sitting on 2nd Street between Chestnut and Market, in a storefront, just sittin’ on the steps playin’ my guitar, pan-handling for money to eat—and to be honest, for something to drink and some crack to smoke—when up comes Sister Mary Scullion with Wes from Christ Church and Ed Speedling. They were doing outreach. I look up and there’s Sister Mary and she’s smiling at me and she says, “You need help. I want to help.” And ever since that moment—it may embarrass her and I don’t intend it that way—but I look at her as an angel who was sent to save me.

Stories of personal transformation, however, are not told only by residents. Volunteers and staff share powerful narratives expressing how their lives have been changed within relationships they have formed with members of the Project H.O.M.E. community. Bonnie Hahn, a long-time volunteer, shared this story about her friend Rosie, who had been a resident of Kairos House.

It’s been five years since Rosie’s been gone. She lived at Kairos House and everyone loved her. She would make you laugh. She had a tough spirit. And she just brightened my life. Rosie is a story and a half. We had many cups of coffee and she’d tell me stories with a sense of humor that was unparalleled. She grew up in Virginia on a horse ranch with well to do parents. Her parents sent her to the University of Pennsylvania to study dental hygiene. They left her an inheritance, but her husband absconded with the money and she was left with nothing. She went through very hard times. But she got a job during the war at the Colt Gun
Factory as a foreman. The men were off serving and the women were called to service and her service was in Hartford Connecticut at Colt. And she was a very tough supervisor. She made sure everything was done right. Later she came to Philly, I don’t know how. She was hit by a bus—she was a tiny lady, bent over with a cane, in pain much of the time, but with a sense of humor you wouldn’t believe. An amazing woman and I just loved her to pieces.

Stories of Project H.O.M.E.’s early political battles play a unique role in rejuvenating the spirit of Project H.O.M.E.. Looking back to the early political struggles reminds community members that what they are part of today was won because the early leaders dared to risk it all for what they knew was right—for the vision of Project H.O.M.E.. Harvey Finkle’s powerful black and white photographs capturing pivotal moments in these struggles hang on the walls throughout the facilities. Stories of these events, and just as importantly of the people who made them happen, circulate as they are published in Project H.O.M.E.’s monthly newsletter, The Dwelling Place, and are retold nostalgically both by those who were a part of the story and by relative new-comers in causal conversation and at public events and social gatherings.

One of Harvey’s photographs in particular, of former resident Georgianna Simmons giving a speech from a podium, has become an iconic representation of the activist beginnings of Project H.O.M.E. We brought together former residents, Board members, volunteers, and staff from the early years of Project H.O.M.E. for a focus group of sorts where we looked together at Harvey’s photos and revisited the stories behind them. At one of these events, old timers Will O’Brien, Project H.O.M.E. Special Projects Coordinator, Peter Gonzales, former Coordinator of Education and Advocacy,
and Bill Maroon, former Director of St. Columba’s residence, shared these memories, brought back to life as they looked at the photo of Georgianna at the podium.

**Will O’Brien:** That’s Georgianna Simmons during a speak-out. Georgianna was one of the original residents. She died two years ago [in November 2002]. She was just a real character. She lost all of her toes to frostbite, which she was probably describing to people at that very moment.

**Bill Maroon:** I remember at her funeral somebody said, “People think that Mary and Joan started this organization, but they really forget that the residents were also founding mothers and fathers.”

**Peter Gonzales:** Residents were always part of the protests. Mary would organize whoever was willing to come. But Georgianna, I remember Georgianna going to Washington with Mary to one of the national forums to talk about the homeless and their needs and what kind of response cities had to them, good and bad.

**Bill Maroon:** Georgianna was involved in so many demonstrations. I don’t think she was ever arrested, but she was always there.

The power of struggle and transformation lives on in the stories circulated within the Project H.O.M.E. community. These stories give voice to the solidarity felt among members of the community, describing personal connections and therein reinforcing the bonds forged in the crucible of struggle. Shared leadership at Project H.O.M.E. emerges and is nurtured in the way leaders at all levels of the organization identify with, are inspired by, and live the organization’s social justice mission. This creates the social fabric that holds the organization together and the energy that is a catalyst for ongoing processes of transformation. The rituals and stories the community shares reinforce the
social fabric, as past victories and present struggles merge in an overarching sense of the ongoing mission of Project H.O.M.E.

This visionary foundation, however, while fundamental, does not completely explain the success of shared leadership at Project H.O.M.E. Success has also required putting the vision into practice, not only in relationship building, but also in developing strategies to achieve organizational goals. We turn now to consider the pragmatism that lies at the center of Project H.O.M.E.’s approach, not only to envisioning, but to achieving its ends.

**Leadership Is Seeing A Problem And Developing A Way To Address It**

Sister Mary has found over the years that the issue of homelessness brings out a sense of mission in people across all sectors of society. The homeless person is a prophet for our age, a sign that something is very wrong in our society, sending a clear message about what needs to change if our society is to become more humane and just. There is a simple truth in this, and Project H.O.M.E.’s success, Sister Mary believes, is based in its ability to respond to crisis and genuine need.

Well, I think that what works is really responding to a genuine need or some kind of suffering or pain that people are in. I find that a lot of people really sincerely do want to help and be part of a society that’s healing and whole, and compassionate and just and all those wonderful things. And people will do what they can and contribute what they can. And, the people who are actually homeless, I think they’re like a prophetic sign in our society—I say this a lot—that something’s radically wrong. So that I see that, actually, their plight is kind of what transforms so many in our society to be more human. So it’s not just like,
it’s definitely a very reciprocal process of transformation where everyone has a role to play in making this a more just and compassionate society [emphasis added].

And, so I feel like leadership is somewhere, like I know this sounds, but this is like my visual of it. Like leadership is somewhere up there, like it’s truth, it’s justice, it’s equality, it’s respect, it’s dignity. And somehow all of us down here kind of band together to try to achieve those ideals.

Shared leadership at Project H.O.M.E. emerges from this sense of a higher purpose. At the most fundamental level, organizational development at Project H.O.M.E. has resulted from people banding together to achieve these ideals. As Sister Mary describes it, leadership and direction over the years at Project H.O.M.E. has arisen through a process of continually searching for what is required to uphold the dignity and respect of all people as you struggle to find practical ways to affect change.

I’d say leadership is a search for what is true, more about the common good. And I guess in our case it started out with the people that we were working with that were living on the street. And then what we saw that what they needed was housing. So it’s more like what’s required to uphold the dignity and respect and social and economic justice of people, what’s required of us to do that. [emphasis her own] And you have to take it like one step at a time. And it’s always evolving and changing depending on the environment and what’s happening. So when we first started, you know, we were literally creating a safe place for people so they wouldn’t freeze to death that winter. And I think leadership is seeing a problem
or an injustice and developing a way to address it, that’s, in our case at least, practical or that makes change. Results in an action—a change.

The generative force behind organizational growth at Project H.O.M.E., historically, has been this commitment to responding to pressing needs. Their approach to change has always been deeply pragmatic, each step directed toward accomplishing a particular end. As Mary describes,

We’d always ask, “Well what’s the next step that needs to be done?” So for 1515, we needed a place for the women to have a room of their own. But they wanted to live together, they didn’t want to be all separated out into individual places. And the men in the Katherine Drexel Shelter needed a place to stay while they began to get back on their feet. So that was how 1515 was conceived. And we wanted a restaurant so that people could work, and the arts space, so it would be more than simply a place to live—there’d be quality of life. And then we needed a place for men from the street who wanted to begin their recovery, so then, Kairos House actually started out as a winter emergency shelter. It was a total pit. The place was so decrepit people used to say, “You’ve got to be out of your mind? You’re not serious about this?” We actually used it in the winter in its very decrepit state and then we moved everybody to a different site, did renovations to Kairos House and moved everybody back.

So [the development of programs] all depended on who we knew and what the need was. A lot of it has been generated from the heart of the project, which is the outreach center—people would be out on the street wanting to place people, people who’d want to come in, and what were the barriers? Who wasn’t able to
access a place to stay? These concerns dictated our next move.

Over the years, building the organization has required Sister Mary and others to take on roles, such as fund raising that did not always come naturally. But the Project H.O.M.E. community has consistently included leaders who brought a range of talents and expertise to the effort to build this organization. According to Peg Healy, Founding Board Member and President Emeritus of Rosemont College,

If you want the untold story of Project H.O.M.E.’s beginning, it’s in the contributions of the lawyers, like Steve Gold, Mark Schwartz and others, who were willing to give their services, to be here strategizing for the 1515 Fairmount lawsuit, and to set up the incorporation.

Peg Healy also played a particularly crucial role in Project H.O.M.E.’s early success. She shared these recollections about some of the ways Project H.O.M.E. began to gain credibility and financial backing in the early years.

I remember in those early days when it was clear that we had to do some fund-raising, I said to Mary, from the start—since I was a college administrator and knew all about fund-raising—I said, “Mary, you’re going to have to be the chief fund-raiser, I mean we can set it up, but they’re all going to talk to the person in charge.” “No,” she said, She couldn’t do that. Few people enjoy asking people for money. But of course, you meet people and some of those people are connected to people of wealth and that helps a lot in raising big dollars. And Mary loves talking about Project H.O.M.E and about the plight of the homeless.

Then of course the other thing that happened for Mary was that people recommended her for big city prizes. She got the Gimble Award, she got the
Philadelphia Award, she got several awards, and suddenly she was a figure in town who had the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval—all this is important in terms of getting money. So when she went, people listened, it wasn’t just another fly-by-night organization wanting to do good that was not going to be there in two years.

Then there were people like Harris Wofford who helped and got Cisneros to come and Cuomo [while each were Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in the Clinton Administration]. They knew she was honest and they knew she was successful, so it was a sure bet if you’re going to give big Federal money. I knew Harris very well and so I kept bugging him to come down and see the place and to do what he could do. Mary also had independently met him. And when he went to Washington he made sure that Project H.O.M.E. was mentioned at HUD. So when Cisneros wanted to do something in Philadelphia, it was easy to come and see Project H.O.M.E. Because you know politicians don’t want to be caught out in any kind of a scandal or a badly run place, and I think we were known to be well run and honest and all these other things.

Over the years, the Project H.O.M.E. Board of Directors has added a number of powerful Philadelphia civic, philanthropic, and business leaders to the list of long-term supporters and active resident leaders. Lynne Honickman, President and Founder of the Honickman Foundation, has become a tireless and deeply committed supporter of Project H.O.M.E. and gave substantially in terms of her vision, time, enthusiasm and financial support to the creation of the Honickman Learning Center and Comcast Technology Labs among other things.
The struggle to respond to the needs of Philadelphia’s homeless population has required a good deal more than financial backing. The early leaders at Project H.O.M.E. had to fight intense political battles in order to both bring attention to and gain support for their vision for addressing homelessness. The early leaders in the Project H.O.M.E. community were engaged in a number of activist political campaigns, such as the fight to open 1515 Fairmount. Looking back, old timers at Project H.O.M.E. often refer to this early period as the activist years. While advocacy is still a core component of Project H.O.M.E.’s social justice approach, the political battles Project H.O.M.E. has fought and won has shifted the politics of homelessness in Philadelphia and made it less necessary to use aggressive activist actions to achieve current aims. Yet in terms of Project H.O.M.E.’s leadership, victories in early battles like the fight for 1515 Fairmount gave the organization visibility, legitimacy, and respect—political capital, of a sort, which Project H.O.M.E. continues to leverage locally and nationally to this day. Evidence of the impact of this event is found in the January 2004 report, “Strategies for Reducing Chronic Street Homelessness,” prepared for the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research. In this report, which includes case studies of seven cities in the United States including Philadelphia, the “Struggle for 1515 Fairmount” figures centrally as a key turning point in Philadelphia’s fight against homelessness.

The fight to “Free 1515” began in 1990, when the plan to develop the permanent housing facility at 1515 Fairmount Avenue was blocked by NIMBY (Not in My Back Yard) opposition from groups in the surrounding neighborhood and backed by local elected officials, including then Mayor Rendell. The injustice of the block was clear, for
the obstacle to creating homes for the homeless came at the height of the crisis in homelessness when the number of homeless people on the streets and living in the subways was growing substantially.

The fight for 1515 evolved into a four-year legal and political struggle to uphold fair housing and the basic civil rights of persons with disabilities. The case gained national attention as it eventually involved the U.S. Department of Justice and Federal Courts. Mayor Rendell was ordered by the federal courts to enforce fair housing laws and permit the development of the residence at 1515 Fairmount, but the political resistance continued. A story describing the campaign that arose in the face of the Mayor’s inaction was retold in a recent edition of Project H.O.M.E.’s newsletter, The Dwelling Place, in celebration of the tenth anniversary of the event.

We recognized that this struggle was about more than a single building. Evoking the religious traditions of Passover and Holy Week, we declared a “Week of Liberation.” For five days, with hundreds of supporters, we vigiled in front of Mayor Rendell’s office in City Hall, praying, singing, and expressing our concerns. Dozens of supporters undertook a hunger fast throughout the week. Our message was that the struggle to “Free 1515” was about basic human and civil rights. (March 1995: 3)

Bill Maroon, who was a part of the movement, remembers that,

People were following around the Mayor to public appearances wearing 1515 shirts, chanting. There was a march from 1515 Fairmount to City Hall. They were actually enough people to hold hands and circle City Hall. There were a lot of little actions. Then people finally came to the point where they said, “We’ve gotta
do this.” . . . We decided that business couldn’t go on as usual in the Mayor’s office. The streets were filled with homeless people. So about twenty of us decided to sit outside the Mayor’s office. And I remember, it’s so funny, we were getting ready to do this, and someone from the Mayor’s office came up to Mary and says, “Listen Mary if you guys do this today, it’s a holiday weekend. You guys are going to be in jail until Monday.” It was a really professional guy, young. And Mary said, “We don’t give a s***.” It was so funny, ‘cause that response was not what that guy expected. He said, “The judges are going to be off.” And Mary actually said, “I’m sure somebody will go wake up a judge and tell him.” . . . And I just remember that I’d never been arrested before so I was told, “Make sure you relax when you are carried out.” In the end, we were in jail probably four or five hours at the most.

It took three more months and a second federal court ruling before Mayor Rendell used his authority to end the dispute. The city lost the legal suit, and thanks to the hard work of Philadelphia lawyers such as Steve Gold and Mark Schwartz, the case set a legal precedent that continues to be key in the struggle for fair housing and civil rights nationally.

Across the varying stages in Project H.O.M.E.’s seventeen-year history, different means have been required to achieve its primary goal, from aggressive activism to society fund-raisers. While the strategies over the years have multiplied, the ultimate end for Project H.O.M.E. always remains the same: ending homelessness. As Joan explains, leadership always was and remains deeply pragmatic and responsive in its approach to achieving this goal.
Leadership is all about accomplishing something. It’s not, I mean I don’t think anybody sat there and said, “Geez, let’s go get arrested because it will be fun.” I mean, if you’ve got no alternative to accomplishing an end. The means to an end. It’s one means to an end. If you don’t have to use that means because it’s either not going to get you to the end or it’s not necessary to get you to the end because you’ve either matured or you’ve developed relationships that enable you to get to the end without having to get arrested, that’s what it’s about. If there was a big uproar again over us going into Kate’s Place in Rittenhouse Square with the same prejudice that we experienced at 1515, we would be using the same means that we used ten or however many years ago to bring light to it and call it into question. I think if we got the same resistance from somebody about our children being educated, we’d be out there. I never got arrested, but thank god people were willing to get arrested, because it had to happen back then. You know. But it may not need to happen now. But it could.

This pragmatic orientation is profoundly functional in terms of responding to the immediate needs of the homeless population in Philadelphia. This is particularly true in the winter months in Philadelphia when drastic measures are required to combat what for people on the street becomes a life or death situation. When the temperature drops, leadership involves responding immediately to do whatever it takes to get homeless people off the streets. Staff must not only share the mission, but they too must be flexible and pragmatic to demonstrate leadership in the chaos of the moment. This is illustrated well in the story Jennine Miller, Coordinator of Education and Advocacy, told about taking a new role in a crisis situation.
What I have been thinking about a lot lately with all the snow coming this week is an emergency shelter that we ran in this very space [Backspace at 1515 Fairmount] during the snowstorms in January 2000. Similar to what is happening right now, there were code blues going for a long time and the city ran out of shelter beds. The city used their limited resources to open a warehouse for men who were on the streets, but there were still women who had no place to go. What Project H.O.M.E. decided to do temporarily was convert this space into a kind of safe haven for women. The week before all of this happened two men on the streets died from exposure and, I realized how disconnected I felt in the advocacy department. But, low and behold, things changed very quickly. Sister Mary came to me one afternoon and said, “You know we are thinking about opening this emergency shelter in the back for women. Do you think you might be able to help out?” And I said, “Oh sure.” She came back later that day with a to-do list. She told me, “We need pillows, volunteers, meals, cots.” She had a whole list. And I said to her, “You know Mary I need to know who’s in charge.” And she said, “Well, you are.” And then she continued on with her list. Outreach started bringing in women—some of the most vulnerable who hadn’t been in for years. At our peak we had 25 women living on cots in the Backspace.

There was a creative kind of chaos that went along with trying to turn our makeshift space into a safe and dignified place for the women. There aren’t showers on this floor and two bathrooms are not enough for 25 women plus Back Home Cafe customers. And so, we were just really being there, being present for the women who were coming in, and watching people go through different detox
processes, both mental and physical. And the thing that struck me the most about that experience was the acceptance that the women had for each other, the community that was formed so quickly among the women, and the way people really looked out for each other.

Shared leadership emerges in its purest form in the many moments of crisis staff members face in their struggle to respond to immediate needs. What many staff members come to recognize is that regardless of one’s position, leadership is doing whatever it takes to respond to immediate needs. As Amanda David, Project Coordinator at Woman of Change shared,

I’m relatively new to Women of Change, which is an entry-level safe haven for women. I started out in September 2003 as a case manager and was promoted to Program Director about a month later. So I was struggling with trying to figure out what the heck my role was at Women of Change—first starting out as case manager and now having this new position. This week has shown me that there is no role at all. What it all boils down to is trying to make sure that everybody is okay. It’s been a really crazy couple of weeks with people moving out and code blue, so people are moving in and a lot of emergencies and things. So we really just had to take care of one another and I think our team finally formed because case-workers may be out at meetings, or the kitchen coordinator is trying to help someone clean out a locker, but somebody’s hungry, so I have to go and heat up somebody’s lunch while I’m in the middle of a report, which is part of my “PC role.” But this person really needs to eat, or this person really needs their medication. And so it was really nice, sort of swapping roles and doing things for
one another and really having the team come together and support one another.

We grew a lot closer over the last couple of weeks.

**The Administrative Struggle**

As Project H.O.M.E. has continued to expand in size and complexity, it has worked hard to maintain its vision and a “grass-roots” orientation across its programs. Yet, Project H.O.M.E.’s success has brought many new challenges. First, in a large organization, staffing issues obviously multiply; and Project H.O.M.E.—like most non-profit organizations—continues to face issues related to staff turnover. The Project H.O.M.E. community includes any number of long-term supporters, those who continue to work within the organization as well as those who have moved on and maintain close ties. Still staff turnover in an organization founded upon the quality of relationships is a critical challenge, one that was identified in the recent strategic plan and that Senior Management and Human Resources are working hard to address.

Project H.O.M.E. also continues to struggle with ways to increase the racial, ethnic, and religious diversity among its staff. Unity in diversity is a central component of its mission, and so efforts to add diversity to the staff as well as to the content of Project H.O.M.E.’s programming has received a good deal of serious attention. Increasing staff diversity, leadership development, and retention are all identified as key targets for new strategies in the recent strategic plan. Goal 6, “Build and maintain the organizational strength and capacity to operate current and future programs and services,” states the following objective:
Objective: Recruit and retain a diverse, motivated, highly qualified staff who are supportive of Project H.O.M.E. goals and reflect the experience of the communities we serve.

Targeted outcomes stated in the report include increasing the percentage of neighborhood and resident hires by 10% to achieve at least a 25% total by the end of the plan and increasing the percentage of minority and overall diversity. Another outcome of the strategic planning process was the creation of a leadership development program “to grow the depth and capacity within the organization among existing staff” as well as enhancements to Project H.O.M.E.’s new employee orientation programming aimed to insure that “all new hires will better understand the mission, values, and array of programs of Project H.O.M.E. as demonstrated by an orientation survey” (Strategic Plan).

In terms of programming, introducing more “diversity” raises its own unique dilemmas, dilemmas that were discussed at each of the Senior Management meetings we attended. It is not self-evident how to introduce diverse cultural traditions and religious observances within a single organization, genuinely and respectfully. But the staff is sincerely grappling with these dilemmas and is creating ways to be more inclusive, such as observing Jewish and Islamic religious holidays in addition to the Christian celebrations.

The increasing size of the Project H.O.M.E. community has had significant implications for relational ties among staff and between staff and residents. As Mike McGee reflected, the kind of organizational growth and enhanced professionalism that has enabled Project H.O.M.E. to build the Honickman Learning Center and Comcast Technology Labs (the state-of-the-art technology education facility in the neighborhood),
or Kate’s Place (the new residential facility in the heart of Philadelphia’s Center City), has inevitably affected the nature of relationships.

Of course when I came here whoever came through the door and if I was there we’d grab and hug, “Oh how you doin’?” Man or woman, it didn’t matter. We were more of a family in that sense. That’s nonexistent today. . . . You know, it’s just a more diverse group of people, it’s a larger group of people. It has grown maybe 8 to 10 times. As we have what 12 to 13 building sites now? So it’s grown tremendously. There’s no way we can be that little small family unit we once were. We would have a lot of picnics, we had ball teams, just anything that would bring us together. Today it’s more of a business, but it has to be. You don’t get a Honickman Learning Center and a Kate’s Place and all of that just standing in the backyard singing Kumbaya. You don’t get it that way. You gotta really do some strong business, you know.

Project H.O.M.E., over the past few years, has devoted a great deal of attention to developing its professional management capacity. Senior staff members have worked with consultants to develop strategic plans based upon outcome data as well as the input carefully gathered from people across the organization—residents, staff, Board members, donors, and volunteers. Yet, in the midst of these efforts to create a more efficient and effective organization, the central focus of Project H.O.M.E.’s leaders is the needs of the people on the street and living in the residences. As Joan describes, the most important struggle is to stay rooted and connected:

I want the brightest, most energetic, most aggressive, most talented people here because we need that. So I never, like I think, and you can look at the after-
school program, you know it started out in a garden with little photocopies of
little booklets from Borders. I had no idea what I was doing, you know none of
us were educators. So we responded in a capacity that we were able to respond
and it made the connection with the kids, but it’s not enough. They deserve people
who know what they are doing. The people on the street, its nice to hand a blanket
and a cup of coffee, but they deserve a place to live. So you can’t stay in a
position that isn’t the absolute best resource, best talent. It drives you to find it
because you don’t have it within yourself.

So the better we become, I don’t see that as somehow taking away from
what drives you. It’s the how that you do that. And in my mind what the
challenge is that you have to, as we grow and some of us move away from the
direct relationships, the struggle of staying connected, I think, is the greatest
challenge. Because the more you become disconnected, that’s where I think it
begins to erode. And so if you were fortunate enough to have the job where
you’re every single day being with the residents, there’s an energy there a, there’s
just, it’s why you’re here, I think it’s why a lot of people are here. So I think the
challenge for those of us who are one or two steps removed from that is to stay
rooted. If those folks become disconnected or un-rooted it can change the
dynamic.

As Project H.O.M.E. grows in size and in its local and national influence, the
organization has vastly enhanced resources to do whatever it takes to achieve its ends.
Yet while the buildings become bigger, the supporters more generous, and the staff more
numerous, the end remains social justice. When Sister Mary was asked how recent
projects, notably the 13.5 million dollar, 38,000-square foot Honickman Learning Center and Comcast Technology Labs and Kate’s Place in upscale Rittenhouse Square fit within Project H.O.M.E.’s social justice mission, without missing a beat she described the need they addressed.

People look at people that are homeless, or people look at the neighborhood in North Philly and have written either homeless people off or that neighborhood off. And I think that what the big we, the community of Project H.O.M.E.’s mission is, don’t write us off so easily. Because we’re really an important part of the fabric of this city. And that with the right kind of resources or opportunities, like anybody else has, we can make it too. We’ll be just as good as anybody else will be. And so, I don’t know how to explain it any better. It’s like not that we set out to create a new model or a new program because that’s kind of boring to be honest with you. I think it’s more like looking at the needs, like the political activism, like the respect or the dignity that Joan was talking about. Like in the political activism you stand up by like going to jail saying people are more important than side-walks, or whatever we said. In doing like Kate’s Place, the people that will live there are just as important as the people who live in the Rittenhouse. And in our society or culture, that’s a political statement, in my opinion. To put a technology center in North Central Philadelphia that’s as good or better than Penn Charter, Germantown Academy, any of those other fancy schools, Episcopal, that’s a political statement, in my opinion. And it’s not talking about it, or philosophizing about it, it’s being more practical about it, and making it happen. It’s a little understated in some ways. But the point is still
there in my opinion. And to me that’s political too. But I don’t know, I might just be, you know.

**Leadership in The Broader Battle Against Homelessness**

With Project H.O.M.E.’s success has come not only organizational growth and increased professionalism, but increased authority as well—new opportunities to shape how the city of Philadelphia as well as other cities across the nation meet the challenges of homelessness and the need for more affordable housing. With greater authority, Project H.O.M.E.’s approach to advocacy and activism has taken on new dimensions. While Sister Mary and the Project H.O.M.E. community are still deeply committed to activism, such as leading demonstrations and supporting political action when needed, they now influence public policy through a wider range of interventions. Project H.O.M.E., as noted above, has created a unit, the Public Policy/Education & Advocacy Department, that works specifically on efforts “to increase our leverage in the local, state, and federal policy arenas; to identify and address barriers to serving our population; and to mobilize and educate residents, neighbors, staff, Board, and public about policy matters that affect us all” ([http://www.projecthome.org/advocacy/overview.html](http://www.projecthome.org/advocacy/overview.html)).

Education is a critical component of Project H.O.M.E.’s advocacy role. Members of the outreach team bring people from the street and current residents into classrooms (middle school, high school and college) to discuss homelessness and dispel deeply entrenched stereotypes. In 1998, Project H.O.M.E. with other members of the Open Door Coalition led the fight against the Sidewalk Behavior Ordinance, which, if passed, would have banned lying on public sidewalks and criminalized the homeless. The Coalition urged the City instead to fund solutions to help homeless people get off the
street and into services and treatment. This action, together with other initiatives, directed increased attention to community relations, which has since become a central component of street outreach. As Ginny O’Donnell, past Director of the Outreach Coordination Center explained,

[Community relations is] part of the outreach. That came in as part of the sidewalk ordinance back in ’99. The idea was to educate the community, mostly business community, neighborhood town-watches, stuff like that, and try to illicit their support in some of what we are doing. It’s been really good. It started with Peter and then it went to Alex, and now Ed has the position and Ed’s really great because he can really just, really sit down and talk to people and draw out of them what it is that they’re, what their concerns are. And then to have them turn that around to something more positive if it is something more negative that they are experiencing.

Ignorance and stereotypes perpetuate the discrimination homeless people encounter everyday on the street. The outreach team views education as a key strategy for overcoming prejudice and are working with police, businesses, and citizens more generally to deepen understanding about the lives and needs of homeless people. Ginny O’Donnell shared a story that illustrates one way the struggle to overcome stereotyping is fought.

We have another guy in the hospital, absolutely no family. He was hit by a car November 21st. We went up a couple of days before Christmas and we brought him a Christmas tree and some juice, you know all the stuff that he wanted. And then Christmas day I went with my sister and we went to go visit him again and
we brought him a picture of the outreach team in a frame. And we’re like, it is rather presumptuous of us, but you know, here’s a picture of us for you.

But I just called the police now and we’re trying to track down, he’s in the hospital on a hit and run and there’s no report anywhere of a hit and run accident taking place. So I called the police and the sergeant I talked to said, I hear there’s somebody in the hospital stating that…” I said, “Wait a minute. Let’s get on the right foot.” I said, “nobody’s stating anything. He’s been in ICU since it happened.” Sergeant was like, “Oh.” I was like, “Oh yeah.” I said don’t sit here and turn around because he’s some homeless guy and tell me that he’s just making up some tale. He’s not making anything up because he hasn’t talked since November 21st. He will be talking soon and when he does a lot of people are going to be sorry (laughs), because he won’t shut up.

But, yeah, it was just really rude that some people still have that attitude. They just like assume that, oh, it’s some homeless guy trying to get some money out of something and, here he is broken ribs and broken leg, bad infections, somebody whose had a ventilator, tubes, the whole bit since November 21st. He doesn’t even know what day it is. And that’s why the education is important as well, so that people don’t just throw homeless people into some stereotype or category that’s just not true and really hurtful.

Education at Project H.O.M.E. is a form of activism. It is a struggle to change mindsets through transforming how the city and its citizens respond to homelessness and poverty.

Project H.O.M.E. has not simply created successful programs, it is slowly changing the face of Philadelphia, the urban fabric, and how the homeless and the
formally homeless are positioned within it. Yet Project H.O.M.E. has not accomplished this through its leadership authority alone. In keeping with a collaborative approach to shared leadership, it has partnered with other city service organizations, politicians, and advocacy groups in a collective approach to the struggle. According to findings in a recent HUD report, a critical component of Philadelphia’s approach to ending chronic homelessness is shared leadership. Project H.O.M.E. has always been and remains committed to working within a city-wide network of people and organizations devoted to ending homelessness.

People involved with homeless services, planning, and advocacy in Philadelphia have long (emphasis in text) histories in the city, in services and with each other. There have been some extremely adversarial moments, but basically people have learned to work with each other. (2004: E.3)

Sister Mary and the work of Project H.O.M.E. have also increasingly garnered more national attention. In addition to the honor of receiving the Leadership for a Changing World Award, Project H.O.M.E. just recently was awarded the National Alliance to End Homelessness Nonprofit Sector Achievement Award. The award was accepted at the Kennedy Center in Washington DC on March 30, 2005. A third national award came from Solutions Through Alternative Remedies (STAR), an award which recognizes programs throughout the country that are working to address the root causes of homelessness with constructive, creative, innovative, and replicable approaches. In June of last year, Project H.O.M.E. and Sister Mary also figured prominently in a piece in the Sunday San Francisco Chronicle, entitled, “Success in the City of Brotherly Love.” In his piece, Project H.O.M.E. and Philadelphia were acclaimed as a national model for
ending homelessness. “Philadelphia,” the article begins, “has figured out how to truly help its chronically homeless people. And how did this happen?”

Most folks point to Sister Mary Scullion, a nun who owns no home and lives with homeless people she rescues from the sidewalk—but who can pick up the phone and get a quick return call from everyone from the mayor on up to President Bush’s homelessness czar. She spent the past two decades walking every Philadelphia part, alleyway and street corner where the down-and-out held out their hands or hid in a haze of mental illness, and she asked them again and again if they wanted to come inside. She built or badgered local leaders to build hundreds of supportive housing units and launched outreach teams to emulate her street skills—and she did these things in such a famously relentless but caring way that she was called “Mother Teresa of the Homeless.”

Today, the city’s homeless programs director, Rob Hess, uses her techniques as his guideline and has spent several years expanding them. Along with Scullion’s ever-forceful assistance, Hess has launched cutting-edge programs that team up police with outreach counselors; created “Safe Haven” housing where drug-addicted and mentally troubled can move in before they are stabilized; and coordinated all city services through a central office so counselors can keep track of which homeless person needs what and how much.

Hess says there is much more work to be done. The modest Scullion, a member of the Sisters of Mercy Catholic order and someone who loathes being called a saint, agrees.

(June 13, 2004; http://www.projecthome.org/aboutus/inthenews.html)
In the January 12, 2005 edition of the Philadelphia Magazine, Sister Mary was referred to as “this city’s least likely power player.” Yet, while Sister Mary’s unquestionably impressive qualities as a leader continue to capture the imagination of the press, Sister Mary continues to explain successful leadership at Project H.O.M.E. in terms of strengths that are not as tangible, but in her view are far more profound. Leadership emerges in the quality of relationships and from the transformative power of these relations. In her words,

I think that there’s a lot of strength here that isn’t tangible, but yet very precious, very important and really a catalyst for what has happened and hopefully for what will happen, you know, in the future. It’s not only what we’ve achieved in terms of what we can concretely see, but also the relationships that have been formed and developed that have, that are really a very very important part of life. And, I guess being able to be a part of a community where we all are transformed though our experience and through our passions and loves and desires for social and economic justice. And that’s a good thing. I mean as best as we can, you know what I mean? Like, we still have a long way to go.

Leadership, truly shared, exists in communal relationships where people are transformed in the struggle for social justice. This is the mission of and the message to be learned from leadership at Project H.O.M.E.
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APPENDIX 1

Research Activities
July 2003-November 2004

Participant Observation & Meetings

July 8, 2003   Research Team Meeting
August 20    Meet to view Harvey’s photographs of past PH activities
August 23    Annual Day: Community celebration in the neighborhood
September 4  Parent’s Night for Teen Program at St. Elizabeth’s
September 10 Volunteer Training at Community Center
September 24 After-school Program at Community Center
September 29 Tour of Project H.O.M.E. residences
October 7    After-school Program observation
October 10   After-school Program observation
October 28   Halloween Party, In-Community
November 3   Project H.O.M.E. Senior Management Meeting
November 12  Community Center Visit
November 20  Community Center Visit
December 4   Community Center Visit
December 9   Community Center Visit
December 10  Residents’ Meeting, 1515 Fairmount
December 16  Street Outreach for the day with Sam
December 17  Project H.O.M.E. Holiday Party, Girard College
December 18  Meeting to review photographs and research progress
December 22  My Daily Threads & Back Home Café observations
            Homeless Memorial, City Hall
            Holiday Gift Party at Rowan Judson Homes
December 25  Christmas Mass at 1515 Fairmont
            Visited Kairos House
            Dinner w/ residents at St. Elizabeth’s Recovery Residence
December 29  Spent day at 1515 Fairmont Offices & Residence
January 5, 2004 Project H.O.M.E. Senior Management Meeting
January 12  Project H.O.M.E. Board Meeting
January 14-15 Story Circles with JuneBug
January 26   Research Team Meeting
February 23  Meeting w/ Sister Mary & Joan: discussed findings
April 7      Opening of the Learning Center (Harvey took Photos)
April 19     Research Team Meeting
April 26     Research Team Meeting
May 3        Spent morning at 1515 Fairmont
May          Transcribed interviews
July 7-8     Focus Groups: Reviewed photos w/ former staff, residents, Board, staff, volunteers.
Aug/Sept  | Transcribed tapes from Junebug, focus groups
September | Selected and produced photos
October   | Selected quotes and prepared them for display; designed & hung exhibit
May 16, 2005 | Submitted Final Report

### Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PH Community Members</th>
<th>Total # Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residents &amp; Former Residents:</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 individuals interviewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 story circle participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 focus group participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Residents/Learning Center Community:</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 individuals interviewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 story circle participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Founders/Early Leaders (includes Sister Mary &amp; Joan):</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 individuals interviewed (Sister Mary &amp; Joan twice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 focus group participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff:</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 individuals interviewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 story circle participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 focus group participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volunteers:</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 story circle participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 focus group participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Individuals Interviewed</strong></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>