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Executive Summary

Twenty years ago, Harvard Business School professor Rosabeth Moss Kanter wrote that Miami’s favorable geographic location and promising role as a connector of global traffic in business and the arts was unparalleled. The city was featured in Kanter’s 1993 book World Class: Thriving in a Global Economy, and from outward appearances Miami appeared to be poised on the edge of greatness as a truly international city at the nexus of the Americas.

Twenty years later, however, Miami has not lived up to that great promise, unable—so far—to move forward into the 21st century as one of the world’s leading global communities. Even with its obvious attractions, Miami struggles with social divisions, deep economic divides between rich and poor, and the isolationism of its various cultural and ethnic groups. Many residents view the community as fragmented and lacking a unified vision and leadership. Miamians have long been disenchanted with local government; charges of corruption and wrong-doing surface repeatedly. Business leaders are wary of entering the public arena.

Two years ago, the Center for Leadership at Florida International University initiated a project to take an in-depth look at Miami’s struggles—how they came to be, and their impact on the community. The Center also wanted to draw community leaders together to come up with a plan for effectively facing these challenges and finding ways to make the city truly world class.

The project, spearheaded by the center’s executive director and FIU’s president emeritus, Mitch Maidique, began with a case study of Miami’s history and the city’s ever-changing social and ethnic divisions, fragmented communities, toxic politics, and rocky economic cycles. A collaborative effort by members of the FIU faculty and Center for Leadership staff—in consultation with Harvard’s Kanter—the study was completed in early 2012 under the title "Miami: Leadership in a Global Community." Almost immediately The Miami Case, as it has come to be known, sparked a community-wide dialogue involving hundreds of civic leaders, all seeking answers to these pressing questions:

What keeps Miami from emerging as a global leader, and will its boundless possibilities ever be realized?

What followed over the next fifteen months was an unprecedented series of community summits hosted by the Center for Leadership, initially to discuss and debate the findings in The Miami Case, and then, in subsequent meetings demanded by participants, to clearly identify the roadblocks inhibiting the city’s potential for growth. In the end, after countless hours of study and soul-searching effort,
Miami’s community leaders found themselves in agreement on three critical issues facing the city, all requiring significant and collective action: **education**, **economic development**, and **civic engagement**. (The process and the list of issues considered are included under the Summit III summary below.)

The first two—education and economic development—most agreed, were obvious, and participants were able to quickly identify a number of initiatives already in place to address them. The third pressing theme, however—Miami’s woeful lack of civic engagement—had long gone unaddressed, and the more community leaders looked into the issue, the more critical they found it to be.

- Voting records show that historically only 15 out of every 100 eligible voters show up to cast their ballots in municipal elections.
- In a recent survey of the level of civic involvement in the 26 communities served by the Knight Foundation, Miami came in dead last.
- A case study titled “A Tale of Two Cities” compared Miami to similar-sized Minneapolis and found glaring differences in levels of civic engagement between the two urban centers, especially among poor and working class citizens, with Miami once again on the failing end.
- Using a composite of U.S. Census indicators measuring volunteering, voting, involvement in community groups, use of news media, and everyday interactions such as talking to neighbors, that same study concluded that Miami was the least civically engaged major metropolitan area in the United States.

The participants at the Leadership summits represented a broad cross-section of the community—entrepreneurs, Fortune 500 executives, politicians, attorneys, journalists, academics, representatives from local nonprofits, social and political activists, members of the military and Miami-Dade County Mayor Carlos Jimenez who attended as an active listener. They nonetheless managed to reach clear consensus in voting to make the problem of civic engagement a top community priority, with a commitment to identify existing engagement opportunities, partner with local businesses to encourage community participation by their employees, and promote Miami as a city with engaged citizens.

They gave the initiative a name—“Engage, Miami!”—and formed a steering committee with a three-year mission to tackle the problem. Since February 2013 that initiative has moved forward with earnest, spurred on by a firm belief that the impact of greater civic engagement on business, human services, arts, culture, and government has the potential to catapult Miami to a level of international prominence.
Miami's position as a global community has long been clear: its geographic location makes the city a gateway to the Americas; the seaport and airport provide transportation for millions of people and cargo tonnage each year; it boasts a solid reputation as an international arts destination that attracts visitors from all over the world. In short, it would appear to be the perfect incubator for innovation and global prominence.

Two years ago the Center for Leadership at Florida International University commissioned a case study to determine why the city hasn’t lived up to its great promise—and to kick-start a community dialogue to address those challenges and help the city seize on Miami’s considerable opportunities. Through interviews with more than 20 local leaders and extensive research into current and historical economic, political and social issues in the city, the case study, “Miami: Leadership in a Global Community,” provided a thorough review of all relevant issues affecting Miami’s rise to global prominence, which has been dramatic and uneven—and unfinished.

Since the late 1800s, Miami has attracted a broad diversity of residents arriving from the Northeast and the Bahamas including investors and developers, fishermen and farmers. As decades passed and the population grew, government and community leaders struggled to address the burgeoning demands of urban growth and strained resources. They tackled ways to bridge growing socio-economic and cultural barriers and make sufficient progress on issues such as adequate infrastructure, expanding economic development, providing education, and developing successful public-private partnerships in both business and government.

By 1959, the boom years of real estate expansion and population growth had slowed to a crawl for Miami and Dade County. With a new influx of residents, this time Spanish-speaking Cuban immigrants ousted by the Cuban Revolution, the county’s demographic rapidly changed. The decades that followed also brought waves of new residents from Latin America and the Caribbean. This demographic change shifted Miami’s economy from one almost exclusively based on tourism and real estate to one based on services, commerce, and finance with a primary focus on Latin American trade. Within a generation, the new cultural and economic power of the Hispanic resident was evident as more than 25,000 Hispanic-owned businesses were established in the area. With this transfer in economic power, Miami struggled to attract businesses that would provide high-paying corporate jobs and expand entrepreneurial opportunities.

Race and class further widened the divide. The African-American community represented a third of the voters present during the incorporation of the City of Miami in 1896 and participated in the economic rise of the region. As the community became more diverse, many African Americans felt neglected by their civic leaders’ response to the problems in their neighborhoods. Tensions erupted during the 1980s in one of the most violent race riots in the country following the killing of black resident Arthur McDuffie by four Miami-Dade police officers. The violent rioting, looting, and burning of white-owned businesses escalated and 3,000 National Guard troops were deployed to help. In the aftermath, rising discontent from the African American community only worsened feelings of resentment and inequality in the already civically and socially divided city.
Local government was not immune to the pressures of racial and social fragmentation. The decision by a U.S. District Judge in 1992 to shift Miami-Dade County government from at-large to district representation gave African-American and Hispanic citizens, who were often excluded from seats on the county commission in the at-large system, the opportunity to elect their own representatives. Soon, however, this shift in governance only encouraged further political fragmentation as politicians catered to their own constituents instead of working together for the greater good of the county.

Four years later, voters attempted to fill the gap in leadership by voting in favor of an “executive mayor” form of Dade County government. The attempt fell far short of its intent to create unified leadership for Miami-Dade because the county manager remained as chief executive officer of the county. Two years later voters again expanded the powers of the mayor, making the office a “strong” mayor. At the same time, voters also changed the name of the county from Dade to Miami-Dade to acknowledge the international name recognition of Miami and link the identity of the city and the county.

The changes signaled a promising shift for local leadership; the result, however, was checkered. The strong mayor now faced the defection and creation of municipalities that duplicated and rivaled county services and governance. By 2013 there were 34 municipalities, 37 Census-designated places, and 16 unincorporated communities in Miami-Dade County.

Over the years, local leaders attempted to handle the county’s growing issues, such as transportation infrastructure, through public-private partnerships. Cooperation and coordination among special interest groups and municipal governments proved to be a major challenge in South Florida, where sentiments of competition, self-interest and jealousy often prevailed. Although there were some failed collaborations over the years, Miami’s world renowned arts programs are an example of the positive impact public-private partnerships can have when carried out to fruition. According to the Miami-Dade County Department of Cultural Affairs, the arts generated $1 Billion in the past 5 years in local economic impact; attracted international attention with thousands of world-class cultural events; and provided accessible educational programming for thousands of children and families.

There were also groundbreaking accomplishments in providing communications infrastructure for the hemisphere. Successful ventures eventually lead to Miami’s being ranked as one of the top-five best interconnected cities in the world ahead of San Francisco, Chicago and Washington D.C. in a report by The Brookings Institute published in 2005. One such venture was Terremark’s Network Access Point (NAP) of the Americas, which was established in downtown Miami in 2000 as a data services business, becoming a leader in cloud computing and one of the most significant telecommunications projects in the world.

**What are Miami-Dade’s top 3 strengths?**

- Economic climate
- Strong educational system
- Arts and culture
- International presence
- Diverse residents
- Business climate
- Workforce/talent
- Transportation infrastructure
- Quality of life
- Colleges and universities
- Natural environment
- Local government leadership
- Cost of living
- Other (please specify)

Source: One Community One Goal Resident/Business Survey, August 10, 2011
Several influential leaders provided vision and leadership for the community, at times, transcending the fragmentation. Such leaders included Alvah H. Chapman Jr. who filled the leadership void in the aftermath of Hurricane Andrew’s devastation and also founded the Chapman Partnership for the Homeless; City of Miami Mayor Manny Diaz who revitalized the city’s dormant business community; University of Miami’s first president Bowman Ashe and Florida International University’s Modesto Maidique who championed public and private higher education issues; and David Lawrence Jr. who spearheaded The Children’s Trust coalition, to name a few.

An initiative called One Community, One Goal was launched in the mid-1990s by the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce and other community leaders to identify industry sectors that should be the focus of future development for the county. In an effort to encourage the county’s municipalities to work together and assess local industries and opportunities for the future, Miami-Dade’s leaders revisited the One Community, One Goal initiative in 2010 with a new report aimed to reassess the industries of the future and the opportunities for Miami’s growth. It concluded that Miami’s strengths were unique: its diversity, quality of life and global-brand recognition.

The authors of The Miami Case concluded their study by citing the persistent challenges that continue to detract from Miami’s many assets. Among these: an inadequate transportation infrastructure, high cost of living, lack of effective political leadership, and limited career and job opportunities. The authors also emphasized all that Miami had working in its favor, starting with the opening of global trade, the loosening of financial regulations and Miami’s unique geographic location as the cultural gateway to Latin America, all of which had the potential to propel Miami to global prominence. For Miami to fulfill that potential, however, the community required a collaborative plan around which to rally, and strong leadership to make it happen.
The cities of the future will be centers of connectivity and innovative interchange.
Summit II  (May 2012)

More than 100 community leaders attended the second Miami Leadership Summit on May 8, 2012 to discuss how they could make a difference for Miami.

Representatives from Miami-Dade’s Beacon Council, presented its One Community, One Goal report which offered strategies for economic development in Miami. Alberto Ibarguen, president and CEO of the Knight Foundation and former publisher of The Miami Herald, addressed the role of foundations and nonprofits in the life of the community and in particular, the role of the Knight Foundation in the communities it serves. Dr. Kanter of the Harvard Business School returned as a presenter to expand her ideas on global economies. Professor Honan of the Harvard Graduate School of Education also returned and led a discussion on concrete actions for Miami’s leaders to face the community’s many challenges and to achieve its goals.

The spirited discussion challenged leaders to define what needed attention in the community: how to empower businesses with adequate resources, engage the next generation of leaders, build connections through a strong network of leaders, and encourage governmental transparency in decision-making. Concerned leaders wanted to be connected to one another and to their communities in order to make progress in overcoming the obstacles facing Miami. And they wanted to meet again, in a third Summit, to continue the important conversation.

Summit III  (Oct 2012)

A newly-formed Steering Committee comprised of highly-respected leaders who had been active in the planning and execution of the first two FIU summits wanted to focus the discussion about Miami’s future and pull together the disparate ideas and perspectives that had come out of The Miami Case and the earlier Center for Leadership meetings.

With the Steering Committee’s guidance, in October 2012, participants started that process at Summit III by identifying nine major priorities for Miami’s growth and development, based on five strategic themes. These priorities included social fragmentation, economic development, transportation, good governance, civic engagement, talent retention, education at all levels, integration of emerging leaders into existing networks, and development of more public-private partnerships.

1 Social Fragmentation: Miami is a deeply fragmented community with distinct divides between the rich and poor and the many different cultures and ethnicities. With no overall vision or unifying leadership, feelings of isolation and suspicion abound. How can Miami bridge the fragmented communities for a common goal?

2 Economic Development/Strategic Focus: There are many community initiatives providing opportunities for businesses and entrepreneurs to thrive, but some of these initiatives overlap and others are working in isolation with little collaboration of cohesion. Is there one economic initiative that can take center stage and provide a rallying point for Miami?

3 Transportation: Whether it is in the public or private transportation sectors, Miami has problems moving people. Because there is no central public transportation system but rather, a multiplicity of transportation systems, stalemates and inefficiencies abound. How can the transportation infrastructure be improved?

The Miami Leadership Summit Steering Committee

• Ricardo Forbes, Vice President for Baptist Health
• Adolfo Henriques, Vice Chairman, President and COO, Gibraltar Private Bank
• Saif Ishoof, Executive Director, City Year Miami
• Modesto A. Maidique, Executive Director, FIU Center for Leadership and FIU’s President Emeritus
• Alberto Maury, President, Leon Medical Centers
• Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Harvard Professor
• Javier Alberto Soto, President and CEO, The Miami Foundation
• Alex Villoch, Senior Vice President of Advertising and Marketing, The Miami Herald

Dr. James Honan, Harvard Kennedy School, facilitating open discussions.
4 Good Governance/Corruption: Miamians have long been disillusioned, and even embittered, with local government, as charges of corruption and wrong-doing surface repeatedly. The uncertain political climate makes business leaders wary of entering the public arena and becoming involved in debates of public issues. How can Miami renew the public’s confidence in elected officials and ensure that those who are elected abide by the law?

5 Civic Engagement: In part stemming from a lack of good governance, many members of the community are indifferent about community-wide initiatives such as philanthropy, volunteering and even voting. On average, only about 15 percent of voters participate in Miami’s municipal elections. How can Miami encourage people to be more invested in the community and instill a sense of civic responsibility in residents?

6 Talent Retention: Miami needs bright young people to invest their talents in the community and view Miami as their long-term homes. If local leaders can find a way to incubate and retain post-collegiate talent, there will be qualified young people to fill local leadership opportunities. How can Miami retain top young talent and provide incentives for them to invest in their community?

7 Education: Education is the foundation for building a globally competitive city. While graduation rates have improved, many local jobs are going unfilled and the unemployment rate remains high. How can the quality of the educational system be improved at all levels to ensure the next generation of leaders is prepared for the job opportunities they will have and the issues they will face?

8 Integrating emerging leaders into existing networks: The absence of young leadership at many companies and organizations is a significant challenge in our community. Innovation and longevity are critical for building successful institutions. How can Miami create leadership and mentoring opportunities for emerging leaders?

9 Development of more public/private partnerships: Local initiatives in infrastructure and economic development have the greatest impact when the public and private sectors collaborate. One of Miami’s most pressing challenges is in building the collaboration between public institutions and private companies to create opportunities for growth and to counter fragmentation. How can the barriers between public and private institutions be broken down and more cross-functional partnerships created?

Through a three-step voting process, participants at Miami Leadership Summit III selected what they considered to be the top three issues for Miami’s leaders to address, and those were education, civic engagement, and economic development. Summit participants next formed work groups, each charged with focusing on one of the three issues and proposing a plan of action. During these group discussions consensus emerged that initiatives addressing economic development and educational issues were already in progress through various community umbrella groups. Civic Engagement, however, was the only one of the top three issues that was not being addressed on a community-wide scale.

A breakout group focused on the topic of civic engagement and what prevents residents from participating in community-wide initiatives and, more importantly, how to eliminate these barriers. One key barrier that surfaced during group discussion was a perceived lack of political leadership. The fragmentation of the community along economic, social, and cultural lines, and a lack of cohesion and collaboration between civic and social groups were other barriers identified.

Some of the options discussed for building greater civic engagement were using more effective means of
communicating. To build cohesion between grassroots organizations and larger-scale policy groups, for example, would require better communication among all civic groups, big and small. The key would be to find these organizations and individuals and bring them together. Education was a second key to building greater engagement. If Miami’s children were taught about community engagement at a young age, they may mature into a new generation of civically engaged adults. Participants suggested the development of a civic engagement school curriculum giving students a hands-on experience so that they would become excited about participating and serving in their community. Students would be taught how civic engagement activities such as voting and volunteering relate to larger societal issues.

As a result of these discussions, a Civic Engagement Task Force was organized to develop a strategy for how to address civic engagement on a community-wide scale. Their task was to find ways to bring together the diverse ethnic and social groups in Miami and enable cross-cultural collaboration that would lead to more civic involvement by the citizens of the community.

**Summit IV (Feb 2013)**

The Civic Engagement Task Force continued to meet after Miami Leadership Summit III under the leadership of Mitch Maidique and Katy Sorenson, president and CEO of The Good Government Initiative. The group focused on developing a strategy to increase civic engagement and came up with more ideas on how to address the issue, centered on an initiative named, *Engage, Miami!*, which was announced on February 12, 2013 at Miami Leadership Summit IV.

A new steering committee was formed at that time and tasked with organizing and executing the effort. Members of the steering committee include Katy Sorenson (co-chair); Dr. Modesto (Mitch) Maidique (co-chair); Jose Aldrich, managing partner of Iberocanarica Tax Services at KPMG; Robin Bachin, Charlton W. Tebeau Associate Professor of History and Assistant Provost for Civic and Community Engagement at the University of Miami; Jeff Bartel, managing director at Hamptons Group LLC; Jesse Brooks, president of J. L. Brooks and Associates Inc.; Daniella Levine, founder, president and CEO of Catalyst Miami, Lisa Martinez, senior advisor to Miami-Dade County Mayor Carlos A. Gimenez; Roberto Munoz, South Florida Market President at BBVA Compass Bank; Estrellita Sibila, executive director of PhilanthroFest LLC; Javier Soto, president and CEO of the Miami Foundation; and Aviv Tzur, CEO of AVbiz LLC.

At the fourth and final summit, Sorenson provided an overview of the importance of civic engagement in Miami and the need to redefine it in terms that reflect the diversity and uniqueness of the community. While studies consistently find that community engagement is linked to economic growth, and residents’ satisfaction with their community depends more on their level of civic attachment than other identifying factors, Sorenson emphasized that getting Miamians involved in their community would not be a small feat. On the one hand an increase in civic engagement could have a positive effect on a number of the other challenges the county faced. On the other hand, multiple studies had confirmed that civic engagement was not a priority for many people in the Miami community. Miami was the least civically engaged area of all the 26 communities served by the Knight Foundation, as noted earlier. Only about 15 percent of voters participate in municipal elections, and volunteering and charitable donations are minimal when compared to other urban centers across the United States.

Summit IV participants offered a number of new ideas for generating participation and drawing in more community leaders to become involved with the *Engage, Miami!* initiative. As a starting point, participants suggested a civic-mapping project powered by Catalyst Miami as a possible platform for recording what Miami already is doing in the area of civic involvement. The project could serve as a baseline for identifying additional opportunities to launch the *Engage, Miami!* project, which will be a three-year initiative that will focus on increasing civic engagement levels in Miami-Dade through “doable deeds,” such as volunteering, voting, and donating.
The culture of civic empowerment generates a widespread sense of optimism around which people can shape their common future.

* A Tale of Two Cities

**Why Civic Engagement?**

When it comes to civic affairs, most Miamians’ civic involvement is limited to their neighborhoods or immediate communities. Each of these neighborhoods has its own hierarchy of needs and goals separate from the overarching goals of the overall community. As a result, social infrastructure is duplicated and there is little, if any, collaboration among neighborhoods. This issue was repeatedly raised over the course of the Miami Leadership Summits.

For decades, the lack of a countywide-shared identity among residents has been an ongoing problem. Numerous civic and social divides resulted in a fragmented community vision. The population also was extraordinarily mobile, with only 27 percent of Miamians born in the state of Florida, according to the 2000 U.S. Census. This combined with the fragmented culture prompted a lack of civic commitment to the city and county.

Miami’s low levels of civic engagement have not gone unnoticed. “A Tale of Two Cities: Civic Engagement in Minneapolis and Miami,” released in 2011, compared the levels of civic engagement in Miami with that of Minneapolis. It found that in both communities, individuals with a higher level of education and income engage more in civic affairs. People in Minneapolis-St. Paul who were in the lowest income bracket were more likely to be civically involved than the wealthiest people in Miami. Similarly, an individual with a high school education in Minneapolis-St. Paul was about as likely to be civically engaged as a Miamian with a college education. The report noted that “the civic culture of cities is oriented toward enlisting and empowering diverse people in the common work of shaping the area’s future without abandoning their own cultural backgrounds and values. The culture of civic empowerment generates a widespread sense of optimism around which people can shape their common future.”

The study also found, however, that “those norms are less evident in the Miami area, which appears to be more balkanized and less reliant on citizens to create [that] common future.” It determined that the younger population—ages 18-29 years of age—were the least engaged. This is a troublesome statistic given that the future of Miami’s leadership depends on its residents in this age group. Using a composite of indicators used by the U.S. Census to measure things such as volunteering, voting, involvement in community groups, use of the news media, and everyday interactions such as talking
to neighbors, the report noted that Miami is the least civically engaged metropolitan area in the country.

In the past, groups have attempted to encourage community engagement through collaboration among communities, businesses and residents. One such group was Hands on Miami—a volunteer service organization that was founded in 1993 and connected working individuals and students with volunteer opportunities at nonprofit agencies. That organization, however, was closed in 2011. Another community engagement effort was the I Am Miami campaign, which was aimed at instilling pride in Miami’s collective identity as a global community. Support for this initiative was spotty and communities and municipalities failed to rally behind the I Am Miami movement perhaps because of conflicting priorities in addressing their own hierarchy of needs.

For Miami to thrive in economic, innovative, and cultural spheres, its residents must be engaged in the larger community beyond their immediate neighborhoods. If Miami’s residents were more civically engaged, Leadership Summit participants speculated that perhaps there would be higher voter turnout generating more government accountability.

The development of more public-private partnerships stemming from civically engaged organizations could bring about collaborative solutions to the transportation challenges for the community.

The challenges are clearly great for the Engage, Miami! Project, but the benefits of raising the level of civic involvement are seemingly endless, and could go a long way toward determining the future of Miami as that long-promised global city of the future.

---

1 For this report, the terms Miami and Miami-Dade are used interchangeably and refer to the 35 municipalities that comprise Miami-Dade County.

2 This summary is based on “Miami: Leadership in a Global Community” (The Miami Case), January 2012. A full-length version of the Miami case may be accessed at http://lead.fiu.edu/research/currentresearch or by contacting the FIU Center for Leadership at lead@fiu.edu


5 “Tale of Two Cities: Civic Engagement in Minneapolis and Miami,” http://www.bobgrahamcenter.ufl.edu/event/tale-two-citiescivic-engagement-miami-and-minneapolis by the Florida Joint Center for Citizenship, the Center for Citizenship and Democracy, the National Conference on Citizenship, and the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE)

Credits: This report was developed and produced by the Center for Leadership, FIU. We would like to thank its authors, Dr. Mayra Beers and Candace Atamanik; editors, Rachel Druin and Steve Watkins; research assistant, Julie Lanz. For more information please contact the center directly at 305-348-LEAD.
Few cities in the nation seem to evoke both awe and disbelief as frequently as Miami. In 2011 we were ranked the eighth “most walkable” city in America and the following year among its “most dangerous.” We have been among the “most optimistic,” the “most overpriced” and our skyline was named “most impressive.” Groups have ranked our citizens as “most attractive,” “most vain,” and “most unhealthy.” Our community’s potential and challenges long have been the topic of discussion over a cafecito at Versailles or lunch at the Capitol Grille.

In late 2011 I spoke about the Miami conundrum with Harvard Business School professor Rosabeth Moss Kanter. In her 1990s book World Class, Rosabeth noted that Miami’s location and promising role as a connector for global traffic in business and the arts was unparalleled. For Miami, however, the challenges to achieving greatness remained as big as its opportunities; it seemed the dazzling possibilities were seldom fully realized.

So with Rosabeth’s help, we developed a case study about Miami-Dade. We looked at Miami’s history: its social and ethnic adaptation, its diversity and fragmentation, political scandals, boom-bust economic cycles — and its resiliency. The outcome was Miami: Leadership in a Global Community, a wrinkle-your-forehead piece replete with our community’s shining successes, head-shaking failures and unrealized opportunities.

In January 2012, the FIU Center for Leadership took The Miami Case and convened the Miami Leadership Summit — a group of Miami’s civic leaders invited to tackle some important questions: “How can Miami become a globally competitive city...
of the future?” And “Why would I want to call this ‘Home’?” Dozens showed up. Unfettered comments and passionate opinions gave rise to the consensus that Miami is a great global city because — or in spite of — its challenges.

At the session’s close, we thought our work of jump-starting a debate was done. Instead, there was an overwhelming demand to continue the conversation, and to create a vision for Miami’s progress. The summit I had set the stage for identifying the economic and social issues confronting Miami. Subsequent summits hosted the Knight Foundation’s Alberto Ibargüen, who charged us to mentor a new generation of leaders and Harve Mogul, CEO of United Way challenged us to get more involved in our community. After several Summits it came down to, “What can I, as a proud Miamian, do? What can everyone get behind?”

We found that of the top three issues identified, education was being addressed through community task forces; and One Community/One Goal was driving economic development and providing strategic focus. We decided that the theme of civic engagement could provide a means to an end to attack the other challenges.

Miami, however, had also made another list: the “most likely to not be engaged.” According to recent studies, attachment to community is linked “to strategic outcomes such as local economic growth. ... and residents’ perceptions of the community are more strongly linked to their level of community attachment than to their age, ethnicity, or work status.”

We know that a community’s level of civic engagement is directly tied to its prosperity and overall health. So, how to build attachment? Well, you encourage citizens to volunteer, give, vote, talk to a neighbor, find their own ways to engage.

Yet according to studies, Miami’s civic involvement is dismal, and our excuses are plentiful: it’s a transient community, we have a dearth of political leadership, we are too fragmented, and so on. As the “least engaged” of the 26 communities served by the Knight Foundation, Miamians have a lot of work to do. But it’s doable. We are diverse, but we share common ground, including the desire to make our community a better place to live, work and raise our families. We don’t have to accept this designation.

With co-chair Katy Sorenson, a former Miami-Dade County commissioner and CEO of the Good Government Initiative at the University of Miami, we are working to redefine and enhance civic engagement. This is exciting because it will enable us to look at what we already have, which is substantial, and build from there by identifying opportunities for further involvement — through arts and culture, participation in one of our many governments, on environmental issues, through philanthropy, volunteering in human service organizations and other ways yet to be imagined.

That will be the best product of the summits, the execution of “doable deeds” that will engage our community and put us on a new kind of list: the global greatness list.

So what does Miami need? All of us. Volunteer, give, share, vote, learn more. I invite you to join me and Engage, Miami!

lead.fiu.edu