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A Research Study Inventorying Community Network Grants of the C.S. Mott Foundation

If one advances confidently in the direction of her/his dreams, and endeavors to live the life which she/he has imagined, she/he will meet with a success unexpected in common hours... If you have built castles in the air, your work need not be lost, that is where they should be. Now put the foundations under them.

Thoreau

I. INTRODUCTION

This research study examines grants made to community organizing networks from 1997 – 2000 by the Pathways Out of Poverty program at the C.S. Mott Foundation. Mmapeu Consulting (Diane J. Johnson, Ph.d., President and Pamela Zappardino, Ph.D., Principal Consultant) was retained by Program Officer, Ronald White, to conduct a preliminary inventory of several Foundation grants. The goal of the study was to identify the various strategies utilized by ten grantees, all community organizing groups or networks within the Pathways Out of Poverty Program, and their ability to leverage various community resources. Of special interest was the process of identifying public and/or private sources garnered via community organizing efforts. Several objectives were identified in association with the aforementioned goal:

- To inventory the successes of community organization networks receiving grants from the Pathways Out of Poverty Program,
- To identify common strategies of the ten community organizing networks
- To assemble brief accounts of campaigns which led to the acquisition of various community enhancing initiatives; and
- To identify implications of this preliminary study, and suggestions of further research to be conducted.

The research methodology consisted of qualitative data generation through interviews with executive directors of ten Mott programs. Research protocol included in-depth, structured, one-on-one telephone interviews with standardized, open-ended questions and open-ended probes allowing for spontaneity, directness and richness in responses.
Additional data included content analysis of secondary materials, e.g. newspaper clippings, magazine articles, website articles, funding evaluations, etc.

The impetus for this initial study was the desire to test two hypotheses:

1) Community organizing (and therefore, community organizing networks/groups) acts as a tool for effective community engagement and civic participation that creates the mechanism for under-resourced communities to access financial and other resources for their neighborhoods.

2) Community organizing networks leverage initial grant allocations to expand the depth and scope of monies distributed into under-resourced communities.

To test these hypotheses a preliminary assessment was conducted to identify actual dollar amounts garnered by the ten Mott grantees within various communities across the country over a three-year period. The report includes identification of the issue areas addressed in the community organizing campaigns, the rationale given for using community organizing as a tool for social change and community empowerment, and the financial impact of the community organizing campaigns.

II. WHAT ARE COMMUNITY ORGANIZING NETWORKS & COMMUNITY ORGANIZING TOOLS

Community organizing networks (CON) are organizational entities that provide the infrastructure for under-resourced, poor communities to engage local residents in civic engagement, leadership development and public advocacy to empower and improve their neighborhoods. CONs work with a diverse geographic and thematic range of constituents to furnish resources: community organizers, technical assistance, training, convening of meetings and gatherings and public education; to build and sustain community institutions and coalitions addressing critical community issues. The networks are often statewide, in some instances, local affiliates of national organizations, focused on community development, democracy building and empowerment. Members of the network are local churches, schools, individual community members or other public institutions committed to public discourse, civic participation and resource equity.

Community organizing, the specific methodology used to engage local citizens, follows a complex process of issue identification, research of a particular challenge or community problem, a public accountability forum (or “action” in community organizing nomenclature), and evaluation of the process. This dynamic cycle propels community residents to develop leadership capacity with which to engage with public officials, decision makers and key stakeholders of civic stature and power, negotiating and collaborating in order to benefit their communities.
III. LESSONS LEARNED: THE UTILITY OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZING & THE MEANS BY WHICH CHANGE TAKES PLACE

Effective community organizing networks and their individual staff --- community organizers --- exercise both a strategy for community change and the implementation of a comprehensive vision for community empowerment. This vision is the articulation of the passionate deliberations of community residents and the organizers in which needed shifts in resource allocations are identified. Organizing is a strategy that effectively allows for individuals and neighborhoods to develop mechanisms that address critical issues impacting communities, working across racial, economic, language and ethnicity, and educational barriers. Community organizing networks thus facilitate the creation of grassroots community-based institutions ---- churches, schools, community centers, ad hoc coalitions --- to work with, negotiate and obtain vital resources for their communities.

A crucial philosophy of community organizing is that communities, everyday people, must play a substantive role in those decisions which affect their lives --- whether it be public policy decisions about access to education, community safety or economic development; or as simple a decision as whether to install a traffic signal at a corner. While this kind of agency, the ability to affect one's life, may seem to be an obvious part of our basic democratic belief system, it is one that is often not strong in under-resourced and poor communities. “Community organizing works,” noted one grantee, with some amusement, as though the question, ‘ Why is community organizing used?’ was so obvious that a response was not really necessary.

Over and over again, grantees reported that while many strategies could offer the promise of short-term improvement in conditions, both community organizing networks and their accompanying community organizers were working for permanent change both in communities, and within the participants themselves. “We want to change people's minds, not just force decisions,” opined one interviewee. Community organizing is viewed, by these groups, as the only strategy that truly produces lasting change; it is the “means by which change takes place.” As we shall report later, the results of their work bear out this proposition.

Interestingly enough, grantees were almost unanimous in their agreement on a definition of community organizing. Not a singular strategy, community organizing is, rather, a multifaceted approach to community issues. It involves building new relationships, developing leadership, learning new skills, working with public policy, being accountable and expecting accountability from others across the spectrum of race, class, power and privilege. Rejecting the view that community problems must be solved by outside “experts,” community organizing begins with an assets-based approach to local people and looks to identifying and eliciting their strengths first. Community organizing also incorporates community values. The approach also stresses public
education, public awareness, communication, and coalition building while simultaneously recognizing power in all segments of the community, bringing it to bear on important concerns. Community organizing “expects results.”

Community organizing is often misperceived as the instigation of people working “against the system” in an attempt to “bring down the system”. However, it is abundantly clear from this preliminary study of grantee organizations, that community organizing is a powerful (and effective) method of negotiating societal and governmental systems so that they can work well for the full range of constituencies, including those most often, either deliberately or unintentionally, forgotten --- the poor, underprivileged, under-educated and under-resourced. Organizers and organizing networks are pushed to “think outside the box,” developing innovative and unique ways to overcome institutional and personal barriers which develop during their community change work. In doing so, they “deepen the thinking of communities, businesses, and government officials,” noted one veteran community activist and organizer.

CONs and organizers champion true American principles --- democracy, civic participation and engagement, leadership and community and individual agency. One interviewee noted that many elements of everyday life --- universal suffrage, seat belts, food labels, safety warnings, and child labor laws – came about as the result of organizing campaigns. By participating in organizing efforts local community residents strengthen their capacity to connect situations within their own lives to the political and civic issues on a city, state or national level. Local citizens become role models to their peers, who in turn, learn to become more effective in their own circles of influence.

Because of the many different aspects of an organizing campaign, people can participate in a level and type of work with which they are comfortable. As they become more involved, they are able to take on different tasks and make new contributions to their communities. The myriad skills which they develop, i.e., public speaking, fundraising, issues identification and analysis, conflict mediation and negotiation, etc. transfer across many parts of their lives.

In much the same way, organizing strategies transfer across issues. Once a community has mobilized to address a single concern, it is empowered to move forward and tackle other critical community issues. Through working with CONs public officials become more educated about community needs and are more responsive to community input. Power, an important aspect of all of these situations, becomes more equalized.

Grantees noted that organizing, when done well, is frustrating to some because it is labor intensive and time consuming. There are no quick fixes. But, they also point out, quick fixes seldom last, and rarely have a strong impact. The investment in the multi-pronged organizing effort is generally repaid many times over. Investment by all segments of the community, from the top officials to the grass roots and everywhere in between takes time, but is more likely to result in permanent change that everyone can
live with. In an era when all things are expected to move quickly, however, this aspect of organizing work is, perhaps, the biggest challenge. When used as an ongoing strategy though, community organizing can often settle issues before they become problems.

As we talked with the participants in this research, we were struck by the profound respect they have for all people and for the abilities of all people. As one said, “It’s easy to say, ‘Bad People Suck,’” but community organizing isn’t about blame.” Getting results means working with everyone and respecting everyone. Getting results means examining one’s own belief system and making changes as necessary.

Each of these grantee organizations is involved in community organizing because it has an underlying belief that organizing is the most effective and most respectful strategy. This is where their commitment is strongest. This basic respect fuels the passion these groups feel for their work – and for the people with whom they work. And their effectiveness is due, in large part, to this passion.

In the following pages, ten organizations will come to life as we outline some of their efforts and the resulting changes in their communities. We will also make note of their role as catalysts for other organizations who carry the work even further.

IV. INDIVIDUAL SUMMATIONS OF PROJECTS

Organizations Participating in the Research Study:

♦ Baltimoreans United in Leadership Development (BUILD)- Maryland, Washington, D.C.
♦ Direct Action and Research Training Center, Inc. (DART) – Miami, Florida
♦ Federation of Southern Cooperatives Land Assistance Fund (FSC/ LAF) – East Point, Georgia
♦ New Orleans Interfaith Sponsoring Committee (NOISC/ LIFT) – New Orleans, Louisiana
♦ Michigan Organizing Project (MOP) – Muskegon Heights, Michigan
♦ Northern Plains Resource Council (NPRC)- Billings, Montana
♦ Oxfam America (OA) – Partnership in Action for Authentic Community Development - Boston, Massachusetts
♦ Peace and Justice Center – Vermont Livable Wage Campaign – Burlington, VT
♦ Pacific Institute for Community Organization (PICO) – The California Project- Sacramento, California
♦ Southern Rural Development Initiative (SRDI) – Raleigh, No. Carolina
Baltimoreans United in Leadership Development (BUILD)

Baltimoreans United in Leadership Development (BUILD) was established in 1997 as an affiliate project of the Industrial Areas Foundation, a national congregation-based community organizing network focused on multi-faceted community economic development, leadership development and community empowerment. Through its work, BUILD, located in Baltimore City, Maryland has fostered the creation of three grassroots community organizing networks: the Interfaith Action Communities (I.A.C.) - Prince George's County, MD, the Washington Interfaith Network (W.I.N.) - Washington, D.C., and Action in Montgomery (AIM) - Montgomery County, MD. Several specific issues are the target for the organizing and community work: housing development, education capacity building and community development.

BUILD aims to transform communities through community organizing. The wide range of ethnic, economic, racial and educational diversity of the region demands a strategy that creates substantive relationships, and leadership development that builds community consensus around critical political, social and economic issues. The activities of these three projects have accumulated an impressive record of positive social, economic and political change on behalf of low and moderate income residents in areas served.

Social & Community Impacts:

- In Wards 7 & 8, W.I.N. has successfully partnered with the DC Housing Authority and has received a parcel of land adjacent to public housing which is currently being redeveloped. 147 units of affordable housing for residents with incomes between $15,000 and $60,000 will be built on this parcel of land.

- BUILD and its community organizing efforts have helped raised $2.5 million from various neighborhood churches and church denominations and Riggs Bank has committed $500,000. This $3 million will serve as no-interest construction loan fund. The city of Washington DC has committed an additional $3.6 million for construction.

- BUILD has organized a community planning process in which over 150 residents have participated and over 125 people have participated in four homeownership training sessions. In addition, a not-for-profit development group comprised of Enterprise Homes, W.I.N. and residents of the Fort Dupont neighborhood, has been created.

- W.I.N. has organized parents, teachers and community residents in Ward 7, leading to the creation of the Aiton School-Community Group. This group launched an after-school program with a $150,000 grant from the city. The Aiton School Community Group has been able to work with the school district to obtain a commitment to make at least sixty percent of necessary facility repairs to the school.
General community organizing in Latino communities has led to numerous one-on-one and house meetings of community residents. Meetings have occurred in schools, churches and in the community.

C.S. Mott Foundation Support - $300,000 grant to support a regional collaboration of community organizing affiliates.

**Direct Action and Research Training Center, Inc. (DART)**

DART promotes justice and equality of opportunity through the empowerment of low and moderate-income people. The program utilizes grassroots community organizing in communities facing various symptoms of social and economic disintegration in four states — Florida, Michigan, Ohio, and Kentucky. DART assists in initiating and building church-based and congregation-based community organizations by training community residents and community-based organizations in leadership development, community organizing, partnership and coalition development. Through this process participants develop an understanding of institutional and personal power, organizational development, and community development. DART also offers internship programs to train new community organizers, and conducts workshops on effective community organizing methods.

DART utilizes community organizing as a strategy towards community capacity building. By working in low-moderate income communities on crucial issues that impact the root causes of inequity, DART helps individuals and organizations to build their capacity to negotiate with those institutions which influence public policy, political, and economic decisions affecting local communities. Organizing, “works because it achieves a lot for a relatively small investment,” according to DART’s Director.

Organizations and communities that participate in DART’s programs are racially, religiously, and economically diverse, and emphasize leadership development amongst minority groups and women, religious and other community leaders. Leadership development requires relationship building at the forefront of the community organizing work. DART believes that when people share their personal stories and experiences, the identification of common interests and benefits is easier. This forms the initial juncture for community consensus building. The establishment of relationships facilitates people (and institutions) holding one another accountable for actions, creating the possibility for change and progress to occur. Part of DART’s work as a facilitator of community leadership development includes nonviolence and conflict mediation training which often deals with issues such as employment, public education, police-community relations, municipal services, homelessness, banking policies, and health service delivery.

**Social and Community Impact**
- Development of a $500,000 program focused on developing a Supervised Suspension policy in the Louisville Public Schools

- Obtained agreements with banks in 4 cities to reinvest over $100 million in mortgage loans for housing in low to moderate-income communities.

- Secured $7.5 Million for public school curriculum improvement in Florida

- Won commitment for $20 million housing trust fund for affordable housing from the city of Columbus

- Developed program to conduct local leadership training

- Worked with Daytona Beach corrections department to implement drug rehabilitation program for inmates

C.S. Mott Foundation Support - $300,000 to support organizing networks involved in building and sustaining organizations in low-income communications across the country.

**Federation of Southern Cooperatives Land Assistance Fund (FSC/LAF)**

Social economic development is at the heart of the work of the Federation for Southern Cooperatives Land Assistance Fund (FSC/LAF). FSC/ LAF has built collaborative relationships with 85 cooperatives, 35 of which are agricultural; 15 credit unions and 25 community-based development groups in twelve states. FSC/ LAF member organizations are in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. Current constituents of FSC/ LAF include 10,000 African-American farm families who own over ½ million acres of land; 15 credit unions with accumulated assets in excess of $18 million, with approximately 10,000 members; more than 400 low and moderate income community residents who are individual members of the organization. As part of its work FSC/ LAF operates a training center in Epes, Alabama; support of and access to housing and legal assistance for poor family farmers; and public education and advocacy on public policy issues related to family farming and rural economic development.

FSC/ LAF has articulated several objectives encompassing the areas of community economic development, leadership cultivation and training, youth development, public education and advocacy, and institution building (both of the FSC/ LAF and its member organizations). Activities of FSC/ LAF include advocacy for land retention and other economic concerns of low-income farmers; housing development, continued organizational and community organizing support for farmer cooperatives, CDFIs and overall members; and special marketing projects which develop the marketing capacity and distribution capabilities for cooperatives and small minority farmers in the region.
Social and Community Impact:

- Public Education: Over 20,000 African-American farmers and landowners have filed claims against the USDA in the class action lawsuit, *Pigsford, et. al. v. Glickman,* during the grant period, 350 farmers received critical information on the appeal process related to rejection of their claims. Claims are currently being rejected at a 40% rate, therefore the appeals process is crucial for African-American farmers to pursue their next legal step in receiving claims against the USDA.

- More than 400 meetings and workshops reaching over 3,000 African-American farmers and landowners which offers training and technical assistance on land retention, farm development, risk management and market development.

- The FSC/LAF Land Retention Program operates a Sustainable Agriculture Project funded by the USDA under the 2501 Outreach Program, a federal program operating in Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi and South Carolina. This program provides technical assistance to minority farmers which helps build their farming, organizational and marketing capacity. No Georgian farmers participating in the program lost their farms. Part of the FSC/LAF’s work during the remainder of the grant period will be to educate and advocate for the re-allocation of funds from next year’s federal budget --- the funds for the program were depleted after only six months time, an indication of the stringent need for the program.

- FSC/LAF provided on-going technical assistance and support to more than 75 member cooperatives and credit unions; organizing five additional CDFIs: the South Carolina Coastal Community Development Credit Union, CREMS Community Development Credit Union, ANSC Community Development Credit Union, Little Haiti Community Development Credit Union and Atlanta Empowerment CDCU.

- FSC/LAF also continues to work on issues of affordable housing development in Alabama, Georgia and Mississippi where HUD funding enables the organization to develop low income housing cooperatives.

- FSC/LAF operates a Sustainable Forestry Program for limited resource farmers. The program includes training, a youth camp, economic development surveying and entrepreneurial training. A new component of this program is exploring non-wood forestry products including herbal cultivation.

C. S. Mott Foundation Support - $300,000 towards the development of organizations that help people to build their own prosperity and gain equal access to economic equality.

New Orleans Interfaith Sponsoring Committee (NOISC)
The Mission of the New Orleans Interfaith Sponsoring Committee (NOISC) is to "address the obstacles of powerlessness, apathy, fear and hopelessness pervasive in communities. It works to reinvolve people in the public environment and assists in their growth as they learn the art of effective citizenship and self-help." The Committee is the sponsor of All Congregations Together (ACT), which shares a belief that change begins with the active and broad-based participation of a city's people engaging in the art of effective citizenship. ACT's broad goals include:

♦ transcending income, race and ethnic differences
♦ collaborating with local public and private institutions for the common good of the community to assist in the creation of solutions to key community problems
♦ providing the historically disenfranchised a seat at the decision making table where their political, economic and social future is debated
♦ challenging the politicians to become more imaginative, responsive, effective and accountable
♦ serving as a catalyst in the development of similar organizations

More than 20 congregation based groups comprise ACT. NOISC provides a statewide network (Louisiana Inter-Faith Together – LIFT) to facilitate all of the Committee's efforts both in New Orleans and in other communities. Community organizing is viewed as the vehicle by which local community decisions are made and local governments and municipalities can respond to the needs of people. Community organizing is a unifying principle for NOISC's varied member organizations and that community organizing is based on values that are the "cornerstones" of faith traditions, i.e., justice, decency, and peace – and the way "we would like to see our community reflected in those values."

NOISC utilizes a community organizing strategy which includes the identification of critical community issues, engaging in conversations with congregations and communities; and conducting "one-on-one listening campaigns". Once an issue raises concern across a variety of constituents, NOISC helps to develop a consensus on the framing of the issue and then develops intervention methods which attempt to resolve the issue. In general, each congregation-based group is expected to work on one local issue as well as a citywide issue. The process of community engagement and community organizing results in an increased level of expectation for community residents.

Social and Community Impacts

- Established an after-school homework program in the Beinville Corridor through a grant received from the city of New Orleans.
- Secured $5,000,000 from the city for infrastructure improvements, street repairs, and lighting.
Worked for a major drainage project, scheduled to begin in 2002, to relieve flooding in one community. (Prior to this plan, no significant money had been spent in this particular area for 73 years.)

Obtained city designation of $600,000 for the renovation and building of 30 new homes to be sold at low interest rates to first time home owners.

Continued to monitor and evaluate progress on the revitalization plan and discussed strategies for continued progress.

Drafted blueprint for redevelopment of the Lower Ninth Ward which has inspired development of similar planning efforts in a number of areas across the city.

Formed a partnership with the Tulane Law Clinic to provide community members with the means to file civil suits against the owners of slum properties.

Joined with the City and District Attorney’s offices to test a law which ACT helped create which allows for the criminal prosecution of slum owners.

Accelerated street repairs scheduled for mid 2000 in the Pontchartrain Park and Gentilly Woods areas. Repairs were completed in 1999.

Developed Youth Organizing committees which arranged for students to participate in job search/ work ethic training classes.

Led effort to clean up Lincoln Beach, a historically Black beach closed in 1964, which had become a haven for drug trading and other illegal activities. Obtained a 5.1 million dollar bond issue to clean and re-open the Beach to the public.

ACT and LIFT are working closely together to improve education at the state level and in New Orleans. Accomplishments include:

- Helped to convince the legislature to fully fund K-12 education, as mandated by law, for the 1st time ever. This resulted in nearly 10 million new dollars for the New Orleans Public School System.

- Worked with the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education to increase funding available for After School Academic Learning Centers ($2.7 million.) Received credit for being the first group ever to come before the legislature to lobby for the children.

C. S. Mott Foundation Support - $200,000 to support a statewide network dedicated to encouraging the civic participation of low-income communities and improving the educational outcomes of children

**Michigan Organizing Project (MOP)**

The Michigan Organizing Project is a statewide network of community organizing groups focused on workforce development, community empowerment, healthcare provision issues and other quality of life elements. The development of Workers’ Councils composed of unemployed and underemployed workers seeking to enter the job market for living wage jobs is the method that MOP uses to recruit, train and engage its members. A current expansion strategy of the program includes creating
congregational-based affiliates across the state who play a vital role within the Workers’ Councils and other MOP projects.

The goal of the councils is to combine civic engagement (which eventually improves the surrounding community) with job skill training for MOP members. The model also includes engaging businesses as partners who commit to placing workers in high paying and more stable jobs. This process results in creating a ladder of advancement for those who make up the contingent workforce.

MOP was established with the notion that community organizing and community organizing networks are the most powerful vehicles for communities and residents to effect change. MOP believes that the electoral system requires grassroots engagement and participation between local communities and local, state and national institutions. Community organizing begins at a basic one-on-one level where individuals form relationships with one another --- in parishes, in neighborhoods. Once connections are made, relationships are built across parish and neighborhood boundaries, eventually creating a cohesive network of concerned, engaged and empowered citizenry.

MOP not only recognizes but advocates the development of a shared sense of vision and purpose for communities. By redefining what “development” means, both economic and community development, MOP can effectively address those issues which usually separate people and neighborhoods. Making these connections requires crossing racial, denominational, class and ideological divides. Currently, MOP is focusing on both city-wide and state-wide action campaigns to address critical community issues of quality education, access to adequate community healthcare, workforce development and community financing and credit.

**Social and Community Impacts:**

- MOP organized, educated the community and public officials and advocated for additional state appropriations for workforce development monies from JTPA. The result was an increase of $10 million in job training programs allocations.

- Successfully organized in Muskegon, Michigan for an accessible community clinic for African-American community residents. Currently more than 120 residents are participating in community clinics for poor and low income residents. These activities have led the city of Muskegon to create a city-wide health initiative focused on African-Americans.

- Organized an interracial group of 20 pastors in Grand Rapids; set up Workers’ Councils with an initial membership of 70 members, developed relationships with 15 employers and placed 20 members in higher paying jobs.

- Creation of a model for a public jobs program, approved by the Workforce Development Board of Muskegon County.
Establishment of chapter in Grand Rapids and Berrien County with anticipated creation of a new chapter in Kalamazoo in January 2001.

Gained commitment from state legislators to support job training of poor/low income workers until the household income reaches $33,500 for a family of four.

Conducted numerous legislative forums, including one during Spring 2000 involving 100 residents from Grand Rapids and Muskegon and four state legislators.

Conducted successful public education on the need for language appropriate workforce and job training.

C.S. Mott grant - $110,000 to support an organization helping the unemployed, underemployed, and hard-to-employ to enter the job market.

**Northern Plains Resource Council (NPRC)**

The Northern Plains Resource Council focused on bringing about economic justice, rural self-determination, environmental protection, democracy, and government accountability. There is the understanding that these issues are inextricably linked to each other, with the orientation of a long-term vision, patience, commitment and effective community organizing.

Montana has seen a significant rise in poverty levels in the mid-90's, much of it brought on by a crisis in family agriculture. Large commercial farming organizations, combined with low product prices and high production costs have precipitated this crisis which has many effects beyond the immediate loss in small farm incomes. As people have become more desperate, heavy chemical use has grown in a vain attempt to maximize production. In addition, as small farms are sold, subdivision development has grown often in inappropriate locations and scale and with shabby methods. A third impact is the radicalization of desperate people and consequent fear and violence. Finally, persistent economic stress has caused many farmers and ranchers to look for scapegoats. They have become fearful of minority groups, environmental protection laws and anyone who sounds “liberal.”

Organizing is critical to breaking down some of these barriers between people and interests, and is a necessary strategy in Montana. The scale and scope of local communities (e.g., a neighborhood can encompass a radius of fifty or more miles), and the marginalization of small towns that are rarely well represented politically because of small numbers require community organizing. For example, 150 legislators represent 500,000 people in Montana.

Philosophically committed to rural self-determination, the Resource Council views organizing as the truest form of community development and self-determination. “The people, given the right information and the opportunity, can make the best decisions.”
Community organizing is the most effective method of assisting local people in defining issues, planning, locating resources and evaluating progress while bringing lasting change.

C.S. Mott Foundation support - $100,000 to sustain the public will to protect family scale agriculture and Montana's natural resources

**Social and Community Impacts**

- Created jobs in the wake of winning reclamation standards for strip mines
- Created value for native grass seed - something that had no value before - because standards required replanting of native grasses.
- Negotiated Montana Hard Rock Mining Impact Act which requires mining companies to provide money up front to communities to conduct infrastructure development. This has leveraged millions of dollars into communities that might have been devastated by a failed mining operation.
- Built coalitions with native peoples and other constituencies. For example, in the case of the Tongue River Railroad Project, a coalition comprised of the Northern Cheyenne, the Crow, the Nations on the Fort Belknap Reservation, ranchers, railroad unions, and the local chambers of commerce all worked together to block construction. In doing so, they discovered common interests that have helped diminish racism and suspiciousness, as well as dealing with the presenting issues.
- Brought important issues to the forefront that are now a part of public debate, including: the role of corporations in the demise of the family farmer, use of severance taxes to prevent unfair burdens on communities, the need for sustainable ranching and farming, the connection between locally produced food and food safety that promotes local jobs and the benefits of smaller, more diversified farming
- Promoted pride in pro-environment stands on the part of public officials.
- Negotiated and signed an enforceable “good neighbor agreement” with the Stillwater Mining Company which has been lauded in many sectors for its creative and innovative approach. The NPRC and the Mining Company negotiated directly, without the assistance of governmental agencies.

**Oxfam America (OA) - Partnership in Action for Authentic Community Development**
The overall organizational vision of Oxfam America is to help “create a world in which all people shall one day know freedom ---freedom to achieve their fullest potential and to live secure from the dangers of hunger, deprivation and oppression --- through the creation of a global movement for economic and social justice.” The goal of the US
Program of the Boston-based national development agency is to support a series of partnership networks of grassroots community-based organizations that address issues of economic and social justice through economic development strategies, organizational and leadership development, and public policy engagement.

Offering technical assistance, providing skills-building training, expanding the partnership network to include more groups targeted towards under-represented Native American and Southeast Asian communities, and building linkages to national and international community partners are its specific objectives through 2001. Strategies used to achieve these objectives will be the development of learning cluster activities oriented toward strengthening the capacity of the collaborative networks of grassroots organizations and their members; increased technical assistance in organizational development, fundraising, advocacy and public policy, leadership development, and technology; developing and sharing best practices across community organizing networks; and increasing the capacity for evaluation and assessment of their work in community change and economic development including the conceptualization and utilization of action research activities. The latter will result in increased sustainability and capacity to conduct effective and impactful programs by Oxfam US Program partners.

**Social and Community Impacts:**
The work of the US Program of Oxfam America has facilitated and supported a diverse range of community organizing networks. Below are some of the successes of US Program partners:

- The Southern Mutual Help Association (SMHA) and its housing development subsidiary Southern Mutual Housing Development Corporation garnered $2 million in state and federal funds, culminating in $2.6 million in new construction assets for the nine parishes in Acadiana, Louisiana. With a construction investment multiplier factor of 1.8, $4.7 million is the economic impact upon its service area.

- SMHA expands from five parishes to nine parishes in FY 2000.

- In 1999, thirty-five families became new homeowners in Acadiana parishes (SMHA).

- Close to 150 community residents began investing in building family assets working toward financial stability and sustainability.

- OA US Program partner, Community Farm Alliance (CFA) led a successful public education and advocacy campaign for the passage of HB611, legislation that defines the allocation of tobacco settlement funds, resulting in Kentucky agriculture and farmers receiving $184 million between 2000 – 2002 and $1.7 billion over the next twenty-five years. CFA developed the bill’s appropriation formula for funding to 120 Kentucky counties.
OA facilitated the creation of a Hmong produce market cooperative in Northern California – the Hmong American Cooperative. 48 charter members with a potential 546 members joining over the next year. A $25,000 grant from OA was leveraged to garner $50,000 from Pacific Gas & Electric and $75,000 from State Farm Insurance Agency.

C.S. Mott grant - $250,000 to support efforts to challenge the interlocking structures and social and economic systems that perpetuate poverty in America.

**Peace and Justice Center - Vermont Livable Wage Campaign**
The principle mission of the Peace and Justice Center is to work for a “peaceful, just and ecologically healthy world through education, advocacy, training, and nonviolent action.” The Center focuses on economic and racial justice in Vermont implementing a Livable Wage Campaign/ Vermont Job Gap Study and anti-racism trainings to nonprofit organizations and Burlington, VT employees. The center also operates a resource center and lending library, publishing a monthly newsletter and operating a nonprofit fair trade store.

The Center's philosophy is that in order to create systemic change amongst institutions and businesses community pressure must be used. Although people with decision-making and public policy power might be open to new things, without community building efforts insisting on accountability and demanding changes, poor, minority and under-resourced communities never see sustainable and worthwhile change. Educating public officials and building community support are parallel processes.

The Livable Wage Campaign is focused on instituting the rights of all Vermonters to hold a livable wage job that meets their basic needs, to organize themselves into a union, and to work in a respectful work environment. The Campaign comprises several components: broad-based education, impactful and useable public policy research and the creation of worker networks. One of the program's objectives is to get to the point where “livable wages” is not just the dream of a few, but is integrated into the understanding of Vermont economics, public policy and day-to-day life. By the conducting and/ or sponsoring substantive analytical research, the campaign makes unbiased data available to legislators, public policy makers, community leaders and non-profit organizations. The campaign also seeks to build a viable coalition of hardworking people --- individuals struggling to make ends meet -- and engage them in leadership and civic education that builds awareness of the political process and their ability to effect community change.

**Social and Community Impacts**

- Helped to pass Act 21 in 1999 which raised the minimum wage from 5.25 to $5.75 per hour and allocated $60,000 to find a Livable Wage study.
- Helped pass Act 119 in 2000 which raises the minimum wage from $5.75 to $6.25 per hour; puts an additional $3.5 million into the Vermont Earned Income Tax Program; requires the state to calculate basic needs budgets for families over the next 4 years (this was formerly done by private organizations and required grant funding); requires additional reporting on wages and hours by employers; 35,000 Vermonters will receive up to $1250 in additional income a year.
- Developed and supported local livable wage campaigns which helped pass livable wage ordinances for city employees in Burlington, Montpelier, and Barre.
- Generated awareness of the livable wage issue in 5 Vermont counties/communities.
- Released 6 phases of research on the state of Vermont’s economy and wages and new opportunities for livable wage job creation (Vermont Job Gap Study).
- Helped make “livable Wage” a household term. Influenced state government agencies to incorporate livable wage language and goals into work plans.
- Served as a catalyst for various community actions.
- Vermont Businesses for Social Responsibility has released a Livable Wage Toolkit for small business owners.
- Five local towns have passed resolutions calling for the state legislature develop more public policies which assist creating livable wage jobs.
- Regional workforce development corporations have leveraged the Center’s research to obtain grants.
- Received unprecedented media coverage on the issue of livable wages; have conducted successful outreach into the Faith Community.

C.S. Mott Foundation Support - $120,000 - To support efforts to increase economic and racial justice in Vermont.

**Pacific Institute for Community Organizing (PICO) - California Project**

PICO is a national network of congregation based community organizations working in more than 80 cities. The California Project is a collaboration of thirteen California community-based grassroots organizations and non-profits which represent 350 congregations and 260,000 families. The Project works with both Democratic and Republican representatives on the federal, state, county and city levels in over half of California’s State Assembly and Senate districts. The goal of the Project is to “bring the
voices and concerns of ordinary Californians to the statewide policy arena on issues relating to the well-being of families.”

The philosophy of PICO’s work is undergirded by a commitment to community organizing because of the direct correlation between the development of leadership and how communities improve. PICO affiliated groups cross the traditional dividing lines of class, ethnicity and religion requiring intense investment in the creation of relationships built during organizing campaigns.

**Social and Community Impacts**

- Successfully sponsored Senate Bill #394 (1997) which redirected $5 million of Job Training Partnership Act funds to support school-to-career-internships for low income high school students

- Prompted the Governor and legislature to dedicate $50 million to a new statewide After-School Learning and Safe Neighborhood Program

- Brought 2500 leaders together to work on placing a $9.2 billion bond issue for school repair and construction on the ballot in November 1998, which was approved by the voters.

- Worked with Assemblywoman Nell Soto to develop legislation which led, in 1999, to a new $15 million program to support parent/ teacher home visits.

- Sacramento affiliate secured $1.7 million increase for county health clinics. in 1999.

- In 1999, Contra Costa County affiliate secured commitment of County Board of Supervisors to dedicate their entire share of tobacco settlement funding, nearly $10 million annually, to health services.

- Mobilized support for $ 50 million in funding for healthcare for the uninsured in 2000 which can be used for infrastructure development in primary care clinics.

- These are the only facilities helping uninsured people who have no eligibility for any other programs.

- Worked on legislation signed by the Governor in 2000 to create a policy framework necessary to insure parents of children enrolled in Healthy Families and Medi-Cal programs

C.S. Mott Foundation Support - $200,000 to support efforts to secure state funds for after school programs and seek out economic issues of importance to low-income families
Southern Rural Development Initiative (SRDI)

SRDI is a regional collaborative focusing on community economic development utilizing a comprehensive approach to create and build upon financial and social capital resources in the rural South. Their strategy is to establish and/or support community organizing networks focused on issues critical to sustained development and empowerment of southern rural communities.

SRDI is constituted by organizational members across geographic, regional and programmatic dimensions within the eleven states in which it works. Members include: Center for Economic Options, West Virginia; North Carolina Community Development Initiative, Raleigh, N.C. Carolina; Arkansas Land and Farm Development Corp., Brinkley, Arkansas; Penn Center, St. Helena Island, So. Carolina; Center for Community Self-Help, Durham, N.C. Carolina; Arkansas Association of Community Development Corporations, Raleigh, N.C. Carolina; Community Shares of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN; Foundation for the MidSouth, Jackson, Miss.; Georgia Shares, Atlanta, GE.

As the literature from the SRDI articulates: “We collaborate not to redivide a tiny pie but to make it bigger for the rural South. Our members are not competing with each other but aggregating to form a greater whole. We have expanded our members’ visions....”

Social and Community Impacts

SRDI’s focuses its efforts in five program areas:

- Rural land based institutions -- Helping sustain land based centers, in most cases, the oldest and longest running community-based organizations in an area or region focused on educating and supporting rural development, family farming and grassroots community economic development.

- Community economic development -- growing community based development organizations, which includes supporting the infrastructure for community development corporations (CDCs) that instigate housing and economic development in the South.

- Community based financial institutions -- Building community lending institutions and engaging banks to reinvest in the rural South, including building the region’s capacity to assert Community Reinvestment Act accountability of financial institution.

- Statewide advocacy, public education and support organizations -- Promoting effective social and economic policies for persistently poor rural places.
Community foundations and philanthropy -- Building a stronger, more effective philanthropic base within the South.

C.S. Mott Grant - $800,000 to support a collaborative of intermediary organizations working in persistently poor, rural communities in a 12-state region.

V. IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH & CONCLUSION

The first hypothesis -- community organizing (and, therefore, community organizing networks/groups) acts as a tool for effective community engagement and civic participation which creates the mechanism for under-resourced communities to access financial and other resources for their neighborhoods is supported by the qualitative analysis of the social impact data presented.

The second of the two initial hypotheses -- community organizing networks and community organizing strategies leverage initial grant allocations to expand the depth and scope of monies distributed into under-resourced communities - is at least suggested by the data presented above. Of the ten grantees all but two garnered grant dollars in excess of $5 million (one grantee furnished no specific data, while another estimated $1,314,000 financial resources garnered from their community organizing work). The cumulative total of dollars leveraged was $13,245,776,000 ($13.25 billion). Among grantees, leveraged funds ranged from $1.3 million to $9.3 billion. C.S. Mott grants to the ten organizations over the three years included in this study totaled $2,680,000 ($2.6 million).

What is necessary to identify the actual level of leveraged resources requires an analysis of all grants received, in addition to, the full range of resources including staff time, operating expenses and other inputs of the ten grantees.

This research, however, only skimmed the surface. The impact of these unique programs is broad and this study does indicate substantial leveraging of resources from initial Mott grants. It is also likely that this report underestimates the total amount of dollars leveraged as many of the grantees were not able to fully estimate the financial impact of far reaching interventions.

One of the greatest challenges in this research was obtaining external documentation of information provided by grantees. There was only moderate success in securing newspaper clippings, newsletter, and other ancillary materials supporting the grantees reports of leveraged dollars. Time constraints made it impossible to conduct the extensive study required to secure the documentation necessary to verify grantee reports.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Conduct further research that allows for detailed investigation of the relationships, negotiations and outcomes from community
organizing networks and their corresponding campaigns. By conducting a more thorough and comprehensive study, C. S. Mott (and other funders) might increase its understanding of the innovative dynamics and social indicators of effective community organizing. The researchers were severely limited by the time frame of the preliminary study and would suggest conducting a longitudinal study which examines not only the financial impacts but explores the social and relational aspects of community organizing and community organizing networks.

One research design might employ a diverse set of research methodologies, combining qualitative and quantitative data collection — an extensive national questionnaire survey, semi-structured one-on-one interviews, facilitated focus groups. An integrated, comprehensive research design would also include a convocation of significant community organizing networks to help identify best practices, the conceptual frameworks of community organizing and community development and community learnings from the research participants. Another recommendation would be to expand research to all Mott grantees (either within the Pathways Out of Poverty Program or for the foundation as a whole) engaged in community organizing campaigns. This level of research would allow for the identification of regional, topical and/or thematic trends and would create the opportunity for acquiring verifiable qualitative and quantitative data.

Alternatively, the next phase of this research could take a more in-depth approach and utilize a cost-benefit analysis. Three to four grantees who have engaged in successful community organizing campaigns could be selected per year for a several year period. Each of these grantees and their campaigns would be studied in detail. All dollars contributing to the support of the campaigns as well as all funds leveraged would be documented and verified. With such a design, a much clearer picture of the relationship between grantmaking and outcomes could be identified. A qualitative analysis of social impact would also be included in such a study.

Implications of this initial study are profound for the Pathways Out of Poverty Program, the C.S. Mott Foundation and the philanthropic world in general. Both grantmakers and those organizations and individuals sponsoring, organizing and strategizing for long-term systemic change will benefit from further study of community organizing networks and campaigns. The current study provides pilot data to assist in the design of either model outlined above and serves as a basis for developing a more comprehensive approach to studying these issues. Such additional study of C.S. Mott Foundation grantees --- their work, relationships, partnerships and concrete successes will assist in not only delineating best practices for both grantees and grantors, but possibly lead to the creation of a conceptual model that would help inform how to effectively support, engage, promote, fund and evaluate community organizing networks and community organizing.
VI. APPENDIX – SUMMARY OF LEVERAGED/GARNERED RESOURCES

1. **Baltimoreans United in Leadership Development (BUILD)**
   Summary of Leveraged Funds:

   Housing development monies leveraged

   $2.5 million – Various church denominations
   .5 million – Riggs Bank
   3.6 million – District of Columbia government
   $6.6 million SUB - TOTAL

   Education monies leveraged:

   $ 150,000 – District of Columbia
   120,000 – Prince George’s County – Teacher training
   $ 270,000 SUB –TOTAL

   Community assets leveraged:

   $ 34,000 – Community residents’ contributions to hire bi-lingual community organizer
   $6,904,000 TOTAL MONIES LEVERAGED

2. **Direct Action and Research Training Center, Inc. (DART)**
   Summary of Leveraged Funds:

   $ .5 million public funds - Louisville Schools (Public education)
   $ 7.5 million - Florida for Public School Curriculum Reform (Public education)
   $100 million – Local banks & financial Institutions in 4 cities for mortgage loans and community re-investment (Community development)
   $ 20 million - City of Columbus for Affordable Housing (Housing development)

   $128 million: TOTAL MONIES LEVERAGED

3. **Federation of Southern Cooperatives Land Assistance Fund (FSC/LAF)**
   Summary of Leveraged Funds:

   $500,000 - Non-member deposits (Member credit union deposits)
   $400,000 - Committed grants to a FSC/ LAF Endowment Fund
   $250,000 – Various sources (Grants to 15 member coops)
   $99,000 - (Estimated real estate value) 5 acres of land from Thomasville Chamber of Commerce
   $ 25,000 – Campaign for Human Development (Greeleyville, SC project)
$ 40,000 – New North Florida Cooperative
$1,314,000 – TOTAL MONIES LEVERAGED

4. **New Orleans Interfaith Sponsoring Committee (NOISC)**
Summary of Leveraged Funds

$5.0 Million - Infrastructure Improvements – City of New Orleans
$ .6 Million - Low Cost Housing – City of New Orleans
$ 5.6 Million Subtotal – Housing & Infrastructure – City of New Orleans

$ 5.1 Million - Lincoln Beach Clean-up – Legislative allocation
$10.0 Million - Fully Fund K-12 Education – Legislative allocation
$ 2.7 Million - After School Academic Learning Centers – Legislative allocation
$17.8 Million Subtotal - State of Louisiana

$ 50,000 - Rockefeller Foundation for Youth Organizing
$ 30,000 - The Veatch Foundation
$ 40,000 - Interfaith Funders
$ 27,000 - LIFT Congregational members
$ 147,000 - Subtotal - Foundations

$23,547,000 million – TOTAL MONIES LEVERAGED

5. **Michigan Organizing Project (MOP)**
Summary of Leveraged Funds:

Please note that lack of collateral materials and specific examples did not allow for an accurate dollar figure to be calculated

$ 10 million - JTPA monies across the state
$ $?? - City-wide healthcare initiative (Dollar figures not available)

$10 million+: TOTAL MONIES LEVERAGED

6. **Northern Plains Resource Council (NPRC)**
While specific dollar amount are difficult to determine, it is clear that the work of NPRC has saved local people millions of dollars and has assisted in the creation of industry and jobs that have brought millions more into the local region. “The nature of our work is preventative,” explains the staff director. It is difficult to assess the monetary value of prevention – but it clearly exists nonetheless.
7. **Oxfam America (OA) - Partnership in Action for Authentic Community Development**

Summary of Leveraged Funds:

Please note that OA is a unique example of intermediary funding of community organizing networks and constitutes a special scenario. The figures identified is a sample of the resources leveraged by the extensive community organizing networks OA has funded during its grant cycle. Figures represent dollars reported by community organizing networks funded by the OA US Program, and in turn garnered by OA grantees.

$184 million - Agriculture & farming infrastructure support - Tobacco settlement money - Kentucky legislature (Community Farm Alliance, Frankfort, Kentucky)

$2.6 million - Housing development in Acadiana parishes (Various corporate, state, federal and national partners) - Southern Mutual Help Association (SMHA)

$6 million - Housing development - Southern Louisiana Rural Home Loan Partnership (USDA/Rural Housing Service, Tri—Bank Partnership, Private investments, Fannie Mae Foundation, Rural LISC) (SMHA)

$200,000 - Housing Development - Iberia Bank (SMHA)

$125,000 - Hmong Marketing Cooperative - Various corporate donors

$192,925,000 TOTAL MONIES LEVERAGED

8. **Peace and Justice Center - Vermont Livable Wage Campaign**

Summary of Leveraged Funds

$43,750,000 - Increased income to workers from Vermont Act 119 (Vermont Legislation)

$60,000 - Study on livable wages (State Department of Labor)

$43,810,000 Million – TOTAL MONIES LEVERAGED

9. **Pacific Institute for Community Organizing (PICO) - California Project**

Summary of Leveraged Funds

California Monies:

$5 million - School-to-career internships - Job Training Partnership Authority (JTPA) (Federal monies)
Pacific Institute for Community Organizing (PICO) - California Project (cont.)

$ 50 million – Statewide After-school Program
$ 9.2 billion – Bond Issue for school repair and construction
$ 15 million – Parent/Teacher home visits
$ 50 million – Infrastructure improvements to aid in uninsured health care

$9,320,000,000 – STATEWIDE SUBTOTAL

Various Local Monies

$ 1.7 Million – County Health Clinics - Sacramento
$ 10 Million (annually) – Tobacco settlement monies to support health services

$ 11,700,000 – LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES SUBTOTAL
$ 9,331,700,000 TOTAL MONIES LEVERAGED

10. Southern Rural Development Initiative (SRDI)

Summary of Leveraged Funds:

$ 2 billion commitment – AmSouth (Small business lending)
$ 1.5 billion commitment – AmSouth (Mortgage lending)

5 million appropriation – South Carolina legislature

550,000 – Ford Foundation (Capacity building work)
500,000 – Babcock Foundation (PRI)
275,000 – Ford Foundation
262,200 – W.K. Kellogg Foundation (Public policy work & web site launch)
250,000 – Ford Foundation (Public policy work)
200,000 – Sapelo Fund (Work in Georgia)
150,000 – Bank of America (South Carolina & Georgia work)
150,000 - Babcock Foundation (Peer Leadership Training Program)
85,000 – Babcock Foundation (Grassroots Leadership Program with So. Carolina Association of CD C.S.)
75,000 – Bank of America (Capacity building work in South Carolina & Georgia)
29,000 - Community Development Financial Institutions Fund (Technical Assistance support)
25,000 - Ford Foundation (Asset mapping project)

15,000 - New Ventures Fund
10,000 – Babcock Foundation

$3,507,576,000 - TOTAL MONIES LEVERAGED