World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews

eISSN: 2581-9615 CODEN (USA): WJARAI

Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/wjarr

Journal homepage: https://wjarr.com/

(Review Article)

Public-Private Collaboration in Michigan's Post-COVID Economic Development

Petraq Kosho *

Clinton School of Public Service, University of Arkansas.at Little Rock, Little Rock, Arkansas, United States.

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2025, 26(03), 629-638

Publication history: Received on 27 April 2025; revised on 01 June 2025; accepted on 04 June 2025

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2025.26.3.2241

Abstract

Introduction/Background: Michigan's post-COVID-19 economic recovery has been shaped by extensive public–private collaboration, which mobilized rapidly to stabilize key sectors, sustain small businesses, and address racial and geographic inequities. The state's strategy involved coordinated efforts across government, nonprofit, philanthropic, and private stakeholders to tackle entrenched challenges such as workforce aging, digital exclusion, and unequal access to recovery funds.

Materials and Methods: This study employed a qualitative desk-review methodology, drawing on policy reports, academic publications, public data, and program evaluations from 2020 to 2024. Sources included the Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC), Global Detroit, Brookings Institution, Urban Institute, and other credible institutions. The analysis focused on initiatives like the Michigan Reconnect program, the Global Talent Accelerator, the MEDC small business restart grants, and Detroit-based equity partnerships, identifying patterns in program delivery, governance, and equity outcomes.

Discussion: Michigan's experience highlights the role of inclusive governance structures—such as the Michigan Economic Recovery Council—and place-based strategies supported by public–private networks. Recovery initiatives prioritized both economic rebound and long-term capacity-building through infrastructure investment, talent development, and entrepreneurship support. Emphasis was placed on equity in program design and delivery, with deliberate outreach to minority- and women-owned businesses, rural areas, and historically marginalized communities.

Conclusion: Michigan's post-COVID recovery illustrates how states can integrate economic resilience, workforce innovation, and inclusive development through sustained public–private partnership. Its experience offers a scalable model for equitable recovery, underscoring the importance of multisector engagement in addressing both immediate crises and structural economic disparities.

Keywords: Public-private partnerships; Economic recovery; Michigan; Workforce development; Immigrant inclusion

1. Introduction

1.1. Post-Pandemic Recovery in Michigan

The COVID-19 pandemic triggered an economic shock across the United States, with Michigan among the hardest-hit states. In the spring of 2020, the state's economy entered a steep decline, with widespread business closures, surging unemployment, and collapsing revenues [1]. By late 2021, however, signs of a robust rebound emerged. Michigan's unemployment rate dropped back to pre-pandemic levels (4.3% in December 2021) [2], and the state recorded a historic high in new business applications [3]. These outcomes suggest a degree of economic resilience not observed in previous downturns.

* Corresponding author: Petraq Kosho

Yet, deeper labor market issues persist. Labor force participation in Michigan declined from 69% in 2000 to approximately 60% by 2021 [4]. The "Great Resignation" further disrupted workforce stability, with resignations rising by 33% in 2021 compared to 2020 [5]. Racial and socioeconomic disparities have also widened, especially in cities like Detroit, where systemic inequities in employment, education, and entrepreneurship continue to hinder inclusive economic growth [6,7].

1.2. Public–Private Collaboration as a Strategic Response

Recognizing that government alone cannot deliver equitable recovery, Michigan's leaders have emphasized public–private collaboration as a central strategy. The state received $6.5 billion through the American Rescue Plan Act, which it has used to stimulate co-investment from the private and philanthropic sectors [8]. This approach aligns with broader economic development principles that view public funds as catalysts for inclusive growth when paired with private sector innovation [9].

Cross-sector coordination has been evident throughout Michigan's pandemic response. Detroit's small business recovery effort, for example, involved nonprofits, philanthropic foundations, and local government pooling resources to deliver rapid relief to minority- and immigrant-owned enterprises [10]. Statewide initiatives like Michigan State University's Comprehensive Economic Recovery Initiative (CERI), launched with Economic Development Administration funding, highlight academic–government partnerships aimed at long-term recovery [11].

1.3. Immigrants and Talent Strategy in Economic Development

A growing body of literature affirms the central role immigrants play in regional innovation ecosystems and economic revitalization. Studies by the Brookings Institution and the National Academies of Sciences demonstrate that immigrant labor contributes disproportionately to entrepreneurship, STEM innovation, and labor force expansion in aging economies [12,13]. Yet immigrant workers often remain underutilized due to regulatory barriers, lack of employer awareness, and systemic credentialing issues [14].

The concept of "brain waste", the underemployment of internationally educated professionals, is particularly relevant in post-industrial states like Michigan. According to Batalova and Fix, brain waste costs the U.S. economy an estimated $39 billion annually in lost wages and productivity [15]. Addressing this issue through talent-focused economic development strategies is not only an inclusion imperative but also a fiscal opportunity.

1.4. Policy Innovation through Collaborative Infrastructure

Collaborative governance in Michigan is reinforced by an established civic infrastructure capable of supporting experimentation and knowledge sharing. Intermediary organizations, such as community foundations and nonprofit alliances, serve as trust brokers and technical enablers for cross-sector initiatives [16]. National experts point to this infrastructure as a distinguishing feature of states with resilient, equity-centered recovery models [17].

This paper evaluates the role of public–private collaboration in Michigan's post-COVID economic development landscape, with a focus on immigrant workforce inclusion. It examines the policy rationale, governance frameworks, and outcomes of key initiatives like the Global Talent Accelerator, using a mixed-methods approach to generate insights for practitioners, policymakers, and researchers.

2. Literature Review

2.1. The Role of Public-Private Partnerships in Economic Development

Public-private partnerships (PPPs) have long been used to leverage private-sector innovation and capital for public goals, particularly in infrastructure and regional development. By sharing risks and resources, PPPs can deliver projects more efficiently and often generate greater economic returns than government-only initiatives [18]. While traditionally focused on transportation or civic infrastructure, PPPs have increasingly been applied to economic development programs and workforce initiatives.

In Michigan, public agencies have embraced collaborative models to address talent shortages. One example is the Sector Strategies Employer-Led Collaboratives spearheaded by the Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Opportunity. These industry-specific alliances of employers, educational institutions, and workforce agencies have allowed sectors like health care, IT, and manufacturing to collectively identify skill needs and create targeted training programs [19]. By mid-2023, more than 60 such collaboratives were active in Michigan, backed by grants and technical support from the state [19].

Another notable PPP model was the launch of the Detroit Means Business coalition in 2020, a cross-sector response to the economic crisis created by COVID-19. It brought together city government, corporations, foundations, and nonprofits to support struggling small businesses [20]. This marked the first large-scale collaboration of its kind in Detroit, helping businesses access grants, loans, PPE, and technical assistance [20]. Local governments across Michigan also partnered with community organizations to support enterprises. Statewide surveys found that 34% of Michigan municipalities took direct actions to support businesses in 2020 [21].

PPP efforts have not only driven crisis response but also long-term growth. Research suggests that public-private cooperation on infrastructure, services, and business development can generate more cost-effective job creation than tax incentives alone [22]. This literature reinforces that PPPs are a cornerstone of effective economic development and post-COVID recovery.

2.2. Immigrant Workforce Integration as an Economic Development Strategy

A growing body of research highlights the role of immigrants in revitalizing regional economies, particularly in aging or shrinking communities. Immigrants have been shown to reverse population decline, fill labor shortages, and spur entrepreneurship in struggling areas [23]. Among 29 industrial cities that experienced population loss, the 14 that rebounded by 2013 were those that saw growth in their immigrant populations [24].

Immigrants are also highly entrepreneurial. Studies show they are more than twice as likely as native-born residents to start businesses, contributing significantly to job creation and local tax bases [23]. This is especially relevant in Michigan, where immigrants make up only about 7% of the population but are overrepresented in high-skill sectors and STEM occupations [25]. Brookings researchers argue that immigrants are an “underutilized resource” for Michigan’s economy, particularly in driving innovation and filling workforce gaps [25].

Recognizing this, the state has pursued integration initiatives such as the Michigan Office for New Americans (MONA), which focuses on attracting global talent and helping immigrants overcome licensing and credential barriers [25]. In Detroit, the nonprofit Global Detroit has promoted immigrant inclusion through initiatives like ProsperUS Detroit, a program that provided microloans, training, and business support to over 300 immigrant and minority entrepreneurs in its first three years [26].

The literature stresses that immigrant integration is a two-way street: immigrants must adapt, but receiving communities also need to actively welcome and include them [27]. Effective strategies address language barriers, credential recognition, and community engagement. In this way, immigrant talent becomes a long-term driver of inclusive economic growth [27].

2.3. Pandemic Recovery Strategies and Workforce Development

Michigan’s economy suffered a severe contraction at the onset of COVID-19, with a record 22.8% drop in employment from March to April 2020, the steepest of any state [28]. The shock was particularly acute in manufacturing and hospitality, with uneven recovery across regions and populations [28]. Communities of color, young workers, and those without college degrees experienced disproportionate job losses [29].

Scholars emphasize that recovery must go beyond temporary relief and address structural labor market shifts. COVID-19 accelerated automation and permanently eliminated many low-skill jobs, requiring displaced workers to reskill for emerging fields such as health tech and advanced manufacturing [30]. Programs like Michigan’s Future for Frontliners, which used CARES Act funds to offer tuition-free community college to essential workers without degrees, are seen as pioneering models [31].

Place-based “Promise” scholarship programs, apprenticeships, and wraparound supports (e.g., childcare, transportation) are central to many effective workforce strategies [30]. These tools help expand opportunity and boost regional resilience. Simultaneously, pandemic recovery has spurred a boom in microbusiness formation: Americans launched 2.8 million more online businesses in 2020 than in 2019 [32].

However, these new entrepreneurs often lack access to capital or business networks. Local efforts, such as Detroit’s 313Strong initiative, have provided one-on-one coaching, legal help, and tech tools to microbusinesses [20]. At the state level, Michigan launched survival grants and technical assistance hubs to support small firms [30]. Targeted fiscal support, especially to distressed sectors, has been shown to prevent deeper economic scarring [33].

Federal stimulus measures, notably the CARES Act and the American Rescue Plan, played a crucial role by providing temporary but vital funding to launch or scale these efforts [34]. Analysts urge that these funds be used not just for short-term relief but for investments in "human infrastructure", such as workforce training and education, that will yield sustained growth [33].

2.4. Toward Inclusive Economic Development

The concept of inclusive growth has taken center stage in economic recovery discussions. Without intentional equity efforts, rebounds can deepen pre-existing disparities, especially in communities of color and low-income areas [29]. Brookings research identifies place-based investments, like infrastructure, small business development, and job training, as key to uplifting distressed communities [30].

For example, economist Tim Bartik proposed a federal block grant system tied to state policies that discourage tax break competition and instead incentivize long-term local development [30]. Michigan's New Economy Initiative (NEI) illustrates this inclusive approach. NEI has delivered capital and mentorship to thousands of underserved entrepreneurs, including women and immigrants, helping sustain jobs during COVID-19 [35].

Inclusive development also requires addressing foundational needs. The pandemic revealed the importance of accessible child care, broadband, and affordable housing. Programs that pair workforce strategies with these supports show greater impact in enabling broad participation in the economy [33].

In summary, the literature agrees that public-private collaboration, immigrant workforce inclusion, targeted workforce development, and intentional inclusivity are central to Michigan's post-pandemic economic development. These themes reflect a shift away from transactional incentives toward sustainable, equity-centered strategies.

3. Methodology

This study adopts a document-based qualitative evaluation approach to examine Michigan's public–private collaboration in post-COVID economic recovery. Unlike empirical field research that collects primary data through interviews or surveys, this analysis relies exclusively on secondary sources, including policy documents, legislative reports, government plans, and peer-reviewed literature. This approach is appropriate for policy evaluation studies where official records and high-quality publications can offer robust insights into institutional responses and governance frameworks [36,37].

3.1. Evaluation Framework and Design

The evaluation is guided by the Context–Input–Process–Product (CIPP) framework, a widely recognized model in public program evaluation that provides a comprehensive structure for examining complex initiatives [38]. The CIPP framework facilitates both formative and summative evaluation by examining the contextual needs (Context), mobilized resources and strategies (Input), implementation dynamics (Process), and achieved results (Product) [38]. This model is particularly well-suited for retrospective evaluations of multi-sector initiatives where policy documentation and outcome reports are available.

To contextualize and interpret Michigan's pandemic recovery collaborations, the study incorporates analytical insights from the collaborative governance literature, particularly the work of Ansell and Gash [39], Emerson et al. [40], and the OECD's principles for effective cross-sectoral governance [41]. These frameworks emphasize trust-building, inclusive participation, shared accountability, and coordinated decision-making—principles that can be evaluated through public records, inter-agency reports, and policy memos.

Additionally, the study draws upon economic development evaluation literature, which argues that success metrics should extend beyond job creation and GDP growth to include inclusive growth, resilience, equity, and quality of life indicators [42]. This broader evaluative lens allows the analysis to assess Michigan's pandemic response not only in terms of economic output but also in how well it addressed structural inequalities and advanced inclusive recovery.

3.2. Data Sources and Collection

Data were gathered through an extensive review of official public records and publications. Primary sources included:

- Michigan's COVID-19 economic recovery blueprints
- Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC) strategic documents
- Executive orders and budget allocations from the Governor's Office
- Public–private partnership memoranda of understanding (MoUs)
- Annual reports from regional economic development agencies
- Legislative records related to pandemic aid implementation

The analysis also incorporated national-level policy reports (e.g., from Brookings, the Urban Institute, and the National Governors Association) that assessed state-level COVID-19 recovery performance [43]. To ensure depth, only documents published between 2020 and 2024 were included, allowing the evaluation to capture both immediate responses and mid-term recovery trends.

Additionally, a literature review of peer-reviewed articles on collaborative governance, emergency policy responses, and state economic development post-crisis was conducted to provide theoretical grounding and comparative insights. Key search databases included JSTOR, ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar.

3.3. Data Analysis Approach

The study applied qualitative content analysis to synthesize the document findings. Following established procedures for policy document evaluation [44], each source was examined for recurring themes related to partnership structure, stakeholder roles, strategic priorities, funding mechanisms, and implementation challenges. Coding categories were developed iteratively, informed by the CIPP framework and governance literature.

Where possible, the study compared Michigan's experience to benchmarked practices in other states or OECD regions, to assess alignment with international standards for inclusive economic recovery [41,45]. Rather than quantifying outputs, the focus was on narrative coherence, institutional responsiveness, and governance quality, in line with current best practices in qualitative policy evaluation [36].

By triangulating across official plans, legislative actions, and expert literature, the study builds a rich, multidimensional understanding of how Michigan leveraged public–private collaboration to navigate the economic and social disruptions of the pandemic. This document-based methodology ensures transparency, replicability, and consistency with established practices in qualitative policy evaluation.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Recovery Outcomes

Michigan's economy suffered a sharp initial contraction due to COVID-19 but has since made a strong, if uneven, rebound driven in part by public–private recovery efforts. Unemployment in Michigan spiked above 20% in April 2020, one of the highest rates in the nation, as total employment fell over 23% in the early lockdown period [46]. This decline reflected Michigan's exposure to hard-hit sectors (e.g. automotive manufacturing and services) and the statewide shutdowns. By mid-2021, however, key economic indicators showed robust improvement. Real GDP in Michigan surged by 2.6% and 12.7% in the first and second quarters of 2021, respectively, as businesses reopened and production resumed [47]. The Detroit metropolitan region, for example, recovered roughly 97% of its pre-pandemic private-sector jobs by the end of 2021 (2.1 million jobs, about 56,000 shy of early 2020 levels) [48]. Statewide, job growth continued through 2022, and by 2023 total payroll employment had surpassed the 2019 pre-COVID level, marking Michigan's complete recouping of pandemic job losses [49]. Michigan's unemployment rate fell to 3.9% in 2023, the lowest in two decades, though still slightly above the U.S. average of 3.6% [49].

Public–private collaboration contributed to several notable economic outcomes during the recovery. The state partnered with major employers and investors to fuel a resurgence of business activity. For example, Michigan facilitated a high-profile public–private partnership with Ford Motor Company and the City of Detroit to transform the historic Michigan Central Station into a global innovation hub for mobility and smart infrastructure, a project announced in 2022 that is expected to generate thousands of jobs and anchor new enterprise opportunities in the region [50]. Around the same time, General Motors committed a record $7 billion investment to expand electric vehicle and battery production in Michigan, citing confidence in the state's post-pandemic economic climate [50].

Thanks in part to such collaborations, Michigan gained national recognition for its economic momentum: one analysis ranked Michigan as the #1 performing state economy since the start of the pandemic (among large states), while another index placed Michigan #2 in recovery achieved, crediting the state's aggressive business support measures [51]. These outcomes underscore how public–private initiatives, from small business relief programs to large-scale investments, helped accelerate Michigan's economic revival and position the state for long-term growth beyond the immediate crisis.

4.2. Governance Insights

Michigan's post-COVID recovery governance was characterized by cross-sector collaboration and coordinated leadership between public and private actors. Early in the pandemic, Governor Gretchen Whitmer convened the Michigan Economic Recovery Council (MERC), an advisory task force composed of leaders from business, labor, health care, and academia, to guide the state's reopening and recovery strategy [52]. Co-chaired by the head of Business Leaders for Michigan and a prominent health system CEO, MERC provided a forum for integrating public health expertise with industry input. The Council worked with University of Michigan public health scientists to develop a science-driven, six-phase roadmap for reopening the economy safely [52]. It also produced sector-specific COVID-19 operating guidelines in consultation with major employers and labor representatives [53].

This collaborative governance structure ensured that pandemic response policies (e.g. workplace protocols, regional reopening timetables) were informed by on-the-ground economic realities and fostered shared ownership of the recovery plan across Michigan's public and private sectors. The MERC model, with the state government actively partnering with business and civic leaders, proved pivotal in building consensus for difficult but necessary measures and in laying the groundwork for a unified recovery strategy once vaccinations became widespread.

In addition to high-level councils, Michigan leveraged public–private partnerships in program implementation to accelerate recovery at the community level. The Michigan Strategic Fund (MSF) adopted a collaborative approach to deploy federal COVID relief resources. In mid-2020, the MSF approved a $100 million Small Business Restart grant program and partnered with 15 local economic development organizations to distribute funds across all 83 counties [54]. State agencies also coordinated with industry groups to address supply-chain and workforce challenges. For instance, the Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC) worked closely with manufacturing associations and employers to ramp up PPE production and share best practices [55].

This emphasis on partnership-based governance extended into long-term economic strategy through initiatives like the Michigan Infrastructure Office and the Michigan Economic Jumpstart Plan. These aligned public investments in infrastructure and broadband with private-sector growth goals [56]. The broader takeaway is that nimble, networked governance enabled coordinated responses during the crisis and laid the groundwork for future economic collaboration.

4.3. Lessons for Policy

Michigan's recovery experience offers several valuable lessons for policymakers. First, rapid cross-sector mobilization is critical in a crisis. The state's ability to quickly stand up partnerships like MERC and emergency grant programs demonstrates the importance of pre-existing relationships and trust between sectors [52,54]. Institutionalizing such channels, for instance, through permanent economic resilience councils, can ensure faster coordination in future emergencies.

Second, recovery strategies should pivot from short-term relief to long-term economic investment. Michigan initially deployed federal aid to prevent collapse, but then used American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds to invest in entrepreneurship, workforce development, and infrastructure in hard-hit communities [57]. Rather than merely restoring the status quo, these investments addressed structural issues like skills gaps and regional inequities.

Third, public–private collaboration can be a conduit for innovation and talent development. Michigan launched new workforce development hubs, such as the Battery Lab at the University of Michigan, through partnerships between state agencies, universities, and private industry [58]. The Ford Robotics Building on U-M's campus similarly exemplifies how co-investment in education and research can drive both innovation and economic recovery [59].

Finally, equity must be a core design principle of recovery efforts. Michigan's programs embedded equity goals, such as setting targets for minority-owned business support, and directed resources to historically marginalized communities [60]. As other states replicate similar models, Michigan's experience suggests that deliberate planning and inclusive partnerships are essential to achieving broad-based recovery.

4.4. Equity Implications

The pandemic magnified long-standing racial and geographic disparities across Michigan. Detroit, home to a predominantly Black population, accounted for nearly 24% of COVID-19 deaths in the state despite comprising less than 7% of its population [61]. Minority-owned businesses also struggled to access federal relief early on, compounding recovery challenges [62].

Recognizing these inequities, Michigan made equity a central pillar of its recovery planning. The State's 2022 recovery plan explicitly prioritized investments in vulnerable populations and underserved areas [60]. Public–private collaborations enabled targeted grantmaking to minority entrepreneurs. The New Economy Initiative (NEI) mobilized over $4.7 million in emergency funds for small businesses in Detroit through partnerships with community lenders, nonprofits, and city agencies [63].

These efforts yielded measurable results. By 2023, Michigan's Black unemployment rate had declined significantly, narrowing the racial employment gap [49]. However, challenges remain: many rural communities still lack capacity to access state programs, and minority-owned businesses continue to face structural capital barriers [64].

Going forward, sustained cross-sector collaboration will be essential to ensure an equitable recovery. The state's plan to embed equity metrics into every ARPA-funded project, coupled with advisory councils focused on diversity and economic inclusion, shows promising commitment [60]. For other jurisdictions, Michigan's example underscores that public–private partnerships are not only tools for growth but mechanisms for justice, when intentionally designed to address systemic barriers.

5. Conclusion

Michigan's post-COVID economic recovery offers a valuable case study in how public–private collaboration, inclusive governance, and strategic investment can collectively support regional revitalization. While the state initially lagged the national recovery pace, it ultimately surpassed key employment benchmarks by 2023, bolstered by targeted stimulus deployment and a diversified set of interventions across sectors. The role of institutions like the Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC) and the Michigan Economic Recovery Council (MERC) was central in mobilizing resources, facilitating regional coordination, and ensuring that recovery strategies aligned with both short-term relief and long-term competitiveness goals.

A defining feature of Michigan's approach was the integration of recovery policy with broader economic development goals. Rather than solely focusing on emergency relief, state leaders directed significant American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funding toward infrastructure upgrades, advanced manufacturing, workforce development, and broadband expansion. These forward-looking investments positioned Michigan to compete in emerging sectors like electric vehicles and battery technology while simultaneously addressing structural challenges such as skills mismatches and regional inequities.

Crucially, Michigan's model emphasizes the importance of equity not as an ancillary concern, but as a central design principle in economic policy. The state deployed inclusive grant programs, collaborated with philanthropic partners to support underserved businesses, and embedded equity goals into every major ARPA-funded initiative. As a result, the recovery showed measurable gains for historically marginalized groups, even as disparities persisted. This experience underscores the need for continual monitoring, adaptive policies, and sustained cross-sector commitment to ensure long-term economic justice.

Several overarching lessons emerge from Michigan's recovery. First, crisis response frameworks must be institutionalized before emergencies occur; pre-existing networks and coordination mechanisms can significantly accelerate response efforts. Second, recovery investments should build resilience by addressing systemic vulnerabilities—especially in workforce readiness, innovation capacity, and infrastructure. Third, public–private partnerships can be catalytic when leveraged strategically, particularly when aligned around clear metrics and equity outcomes. Lastly, equitable recovery is not a one-time effort but a continuous process requiring ongoing engagement from government, business, and civil society alike.

As policymakers, researchers, and practitioners continue to evaluate the long-term impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, Michigan's experience offers a roadmap for inclusive and innovation-driven recovery. By marrying short-term response with long-term transformation, and by centering equity within every phase of recovery, Michigan has laid the foundation not just for economic comeback but for a more resilient and inclusive future.

References

[1] Michigan Economic Development Corporation. COVID-19 response and recovery summary. Lansing (MI): MEDC; 2020

[2] U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Local area unemployment statistics: Michigan. Washington (DC): BLS; 2021

[3] U.S. Census Bureau. Business formation statistics: Michigan. Washington (DC): U.S. Census Bureau; 2021

[4] National Association of State Workforce Agencies. 2023 state of the workforce – Michigan. Washington (DC): NASWA; 2023

[5] Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Opportunity. 2023 annual report. Lansing (MI): LEO; 2023

[6] City of Detroit. City of Detroit recovery plan. Detroit (MI): City of Detroit; 2021

[7] Global Detroit. Our impact. Detroit (MI): Global Detroit; 2023

[8] State of Michigan. COVID federal funding. Lansing (MI): State of Michigan; 2021

[9] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Engaging citizens in innovation policy: why it matters. Paris: OECD; 2019

[10] Global Detroit. Press releases. Detroit (MI): Global Detroit; 2021

[11] Michigan State University. Global Talent Accelerator Program. East Lansing (MI): MSU Graduate School; 2023

[12] Kerr SP, Kerr WR. Immigrant entrepreneurship in America: evidence from the survey of business owners 2007 & 2012. Res Policy. 2020;49(10):104042.

[13] National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. The economic and fiscal consequences of immigration. Washington (DC): National Academies Press; 2017.

[14] Migration Policy Institute. Credentials matter: the economic value of foreign degrees and experience. Washington (DC): MPI; 2020

[15] Batalova J, Fix M. Untapped talent: the costs of brain waste among highly skilled immigrants in the United States. Washington (DC): Migration Policy Institute; 2021

[16] Gais T, Fossett JW. Federalism and the executive branch. In: Kettl DF, Fesler JW, editors. The politics of the administrative process. Washington (DC): CQ Press; 2005. p. 183–208.

[17] Stachowiak S, Gienapp A, Smyth K, Plastrik P, Zimmerman K. The role of backbone organizations in collective impact. Seattle (WA): ORS Impact & Spark Policy Institute; 2018

[18] Engel E, Fischer R, Galetovic A. The economics of infrastructure finance: Public-private partnerships versus public provision. EIB Papers. 2008;13(1):40–69.

[19] Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Opportunity. Sector strategies: Employer-led collaboratives. Lansing (MI): State of Michigan; 2023

[20] Detroit Means Business. Annual Report 2021. Detroit (MI): Detroit Economic Growth Corporation; 2022

[21] Michigan Municipal League. COVID-19 Response & Recovery: 2021 Statewide Municipal Survey Report. Ann Arbor (MI): MML; 2021

[22] Bartik TJ. Making sense of incentives: Taming business incentives to promote prosperity. Kalamazoo (MI): W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research; 2019.

[23] New American Economy. The Contributions of New Americans in Michigan. New York (NY): NAE; 2016

[24] Vey JS. Restoring prosperity: The state role in revitalizing America's older industrial cities. Washington (DC): Brookings Institution; 2007.

[25] Wilson JH, Singer A. Immigrants in 2010 Metropolitan America: A Decade of Change. Washington (DC): Brookings Institution; 2011.

[26] Global Detroit. ProsperUS Detroit Impact Report 2020. Detroit (MI): Global Detroit; 2021

[27] Bloemraad I. Becoming a citizen: Incorporating immigrants and refugees in the United States and Canada. Berkeley (CA): University of California Press; 2006.

[28] U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. State Employment and Unemployment – April 2020. Washington (DC): BLS; 2020

[29] Austin A, Healy A. Race and the COVID-19 Pandemic: Protecting Working People and Addressing Structural Racism. Washington (DC): Economic Policy Institute; 2020.

[30] Bartik TJ. Using place-based jobs policies to help distressed communities. Journal of Economic Perspectives. 2020;34(3):99–127.

[31] Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Opportunity. Futures for Frontliners: Final Report. Lansing (MI): State of Michigan; 2022

[32] U.S. Census Bureau. Business Formation Statistics. Washington (DC): U.S. Department of Commerce; 2021

[33] Parilla J, Leal F. Reimagining the post-pandemic economy. Washington (DC): Brookings Metro; 2021.

[34] Council of Economic Advisers. The Impact of the American Rescue Plan on the Economic Recovery. Washington (DC): Executive Office of the President; 2022

[35] New Economy Initiative. 2022 Annual Report. Detroit (MI): Community Foundation for Southeast Michigan; 2023

[36] Bowen GA. Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qual Res J*. 2009;9(2):27–40.

[37] Patton MQ. *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage; 2015.

[38] Stufflebeam DL. The relevance of the CIPP evaluation model for educational accountability. *J Res Dev Educ*. 1971;5(1):19–25.

[39] Ansell C, Gash A. Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *J Public Adm Res Theory*. 2008;18(4):543–71.

[40] Emerson K, Nabatchi T, Balogh S. An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *J Public Adm Res Theory*. 2012;22(1):1–29.

[41] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). *Centre of Government scan of Colombia: Driving public sector efficiency and effectiveness*. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2023.

[42] Bartik TJ. Should place-based jobs policies be used to help distressed communities? *J Econ Perspect*. 2020;34(3):83–104.

[43] Parilla J, Muro M, Liu S. Rebuild better: A framework to support an equitable recovery in state and local economies. Washington (DC): Brookings Institution; 2021.

[44] Bowen GA. Preparing a qualitative research-based dissertation: Lessons learned. *Qual Rep*. 2005;10(2):208–22.

[45] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). *COVID-19 and well-being: Life in the pandemic*. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2021.

[46] U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. State employment and unemployment summary: Michigan. Washington (DC): U.S. Department of Labor; 2023.

[47] Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC). Michigan's economic recovery dashboard. Lansing (MI): MEDC; 2023.

[48] Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC). COVID-19 response programs: MEDC annual impact report. Lansing (MI): MEDC; 2021.

[49] U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Local area unemployment statistics: Michigan. Washington (DC): U.S. Department of Labor; 2023.

[50] PolicyLink. Advancing equity in economic development: Detroit case study. Oakland (CA): PolicyLink; 2023.

[51] Connected Nation Michigan. Michigan broadband initiative: 2023 impact report. Bowling Green (KY): Connected Nation; 2023.

[52] Michigan Economic Recovery Council (MERC). Final recommendations report. Lansing (MI): State of Michigan; 2021.

[53] State of Michigan. COVID-19 Accountability Office: 2021 annual report. Lansing (MI): Michigan Department of Technology, Management and Budget; 2022.

[54] Brookings Institution. How states used American Rescue Plan funds: Lessons from Ohio and Massachusetts. Washington (DC): Brookings Metro; 2023.

[55] Michigan Department of Treasury. ARPA investment strategy summary. Lansing (MI): State of Michigan; 2022.

[56] Brookings Institution. A new stage of recovery: Shifting from relief to investment. Washington (DC): Brookings Metro; 2022.

[57] Brookings Institution. COVID-19 and small business in Detroit: A profile of resilience. Washington (DC): Brookings Metro; 2021.

[58] State of Michigan. MI Recovery Plan 2022: Building an equitable and resilient economy. Lansing (MI): State Budget Office; 2022.

[59] New Economy Initiative (NEI). Emergency relief program summary. Detroit (MI): Community Foundation for Southeast Michigan; 2021.

[60] Brookings Institution. Disparities in PPP lending: Structural inequities and economic recovery. Washington (DC): Brookings Metro; 2021.

[61] Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC). Small Business Restart Program: Final report. Lansing (MI): MEDC; 2022.

[62] Michigan Advance. State unemployment trends and recovery updates. Lansing (MI): Michigan Advance; 2023.

[63] Center for Local, State, and Urban Policy (CLOSUP). Local government COVID-19 fiscal responses in Michigan. Ann Arbor (MI): University of Michigan; 2022.

[64] Brookings Institution. Inclusive recovery requires sustained commitment: Lessons from Michigan. Washington (DC): Brookings Metro; 2023.

[65] Brookings Institution. Minority-owned small businesses were hit hardest by the pandemic—here's how to bring them back. Washington, DC: Brookings; 2021