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The **Youth Organizing Capacity Building Initiative** (YOCBI) is a three-year effort to strengthen the effectiveness of non-profit, community-based organizations (CBOs) dedicated to increasing the number of young people leading social justice grassroots campaigns in Southern California. Particularly focused on communities most impacted by racial, economic, and social injustice, this initiative emerged from a key action item at a 2017 Equity Convening. Almost 200 leaders from the nonprofit, philanthropic, public, and business sectors gathered. Investing in youth organizing in under-resourced and marginalized communities was identified as a proven leadership development strategy that could advance social justice and contribute to relevant policy change. To achieve this goal, it was determined that CBOs focused on youth organizing could benefit from organizational capacity resources to effectively develop, support, and engage young people.

Assisted by UC Santa Cruz Professor, Dr. Veronica Terriquez, an assessment of the needs and opportunities necessary to grow the youth leadership pipeline in Southern California was conducted. A key finding was the need for CBO organizational capacity support via unrestricted funding. Capacity building needs ranged from growing organization infrastructure to strengthening/expanding youth leadership development and regional/summer programming, to creating/expanding youth organizing networks. The assessment concluded that:

> “...funders support existing youth organizing organizations with flexible, multi-year, unrestricted support to allow each organization to prioritize funding to their greatest needs.”

Dr. Terriquez’s assessment informed the establishment of the Southern California Youth Organizing Funder Collaborative, consisting of the Annenberg Foundation, The California Community Foundation, The Liberty Hill Foundation, The California Endowment, and The Weingart Foundation. In May 2019, the Collaborative dedicated $4.1 million in grants to 26 nonprofits engaged in youth organizing.¹

**The Initiative and Its Components**

In this competitive grant program grantees were selected based on their existing mission and track record of youth organizing in Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Santa Barbara, or Ventura counties. These counties were viewed as the epicenter for YOCBI because they contained communities most impacted by racial, economic, and social injustice in Southern California. CBOs with a track record of systems change campaigns, leadership development, personal growth and transformation, civic engagement, base building, and movement building were funded. Three years of unrestricted operating support grants, a peer learning community (PLC) for grantees, and a learning collaborative for funders were the pillars of the initiative. Grantees received flexible dollars (between $120,000 and $180,000 across a three-year period) to prioritize a range of infrastructure and programmatic capacity needs.

---

¹In the first quarter of the Initiative in 2019, one grantee organization underwent significant organizational restructuring leading to layoffs of youth organizing staff. They ultimately withdrew their involvement in the Initiative as they determined that they would not be able to fulfill their self-defined grant objectives or meaningfully participate in the peer learning community at that time. This resulted in a final YOCBI cohort of 25 grantees.
**Initiative Goals**

Five initiative goals were outlined in the grantee Request for Proposal (RFP 11/01/2018). They were to:

- Strengthen the capacity and effectiveness of youth organizing groups advancing racial, social, and economic justice in Southern California.
- Increase the number of young people of color leading social justice grassroots campaigns, especially from communities most impacted by racial, economic, and social injustice.
- Strengthen the network of youth organizing groups in Southern California.
- Increase awareness of the comprehensive impact of youth organizing among funders.
- Increase the level of funding from philanthropy to youth organizing groups.

**Peer Learning Partner – Youth Organize! California (YO! Cali)**

Youth Organize! California (YO! Cali) was brought in specifically to help facilitate a peer learning community (PLC) among the cohort of 25 grantees. YO! Cali specializes in expanding the capacity of young people and organizations in California to practice transformative youth organizing, build power, and create long-term community change. They accomplish these outcomes by building leadership pathways and serving as a hub for youth organizing, which places directly impacted young people at the forefront of a bold, multi-issue movement for transformation, liberation, healing, collective power, and justice.

The YOCBI Peer Learning Community (PLC) was at the heart of YO! Cali’s efforts. Designed to build the infrastructure of both established and emerging youth organizing CBOs, the PLCs provided a space for YO! Cali to share their holistic model with grantees, which blends positive youth development approaches with youth organizing, systems change campaigns, and movement building. During the YOCBI planning stages, YO! Cali met with and interviewed several grantees, where they collectively developed five key PLC learning goals.

- **Best Practices and Lessons Learned**: Provide grantees with opportunities to learn and share best practices, lessons learned, curriculum, and concrete tools with organizations facing similar challenges using a wide range of models, strategies, and experiences.
- **Relationship Building**: Build authentic and trusting relationships with other organizers and organizations across different communities, identities, and issues.
- **Leadership Pathways**: Develop the skills and capacity of frontline organizing staff and strengthen pathways for youth leaders to become organizers.
- **Sustainability**: Develop sustainability for youth organizing, including staff sustainability, funding, and organizational infrastructure.
- **Collective Effort**: Support the potential for grantee organizations to collaborate and connect across issues and communities to engage in collective efforts and build regional power and leadership.
**Evaluation Overview**

**Evaluation Learning Partner - The Psychology Applied Research Center (PARC @LMU)**

Under the leadership of Dr. Cheryl Grills, the Psychology Applied Research Center at Loyola Marymount University (PARC@LMU) is a multi-ethnic and multi-disciplinary center. PARC's mission is to provide program evaluation, action research, and technical support that is participatory, culturally relevant, collaborative, flexible, and which results in meaningful individual, community, organizational, and systems/policy change. Along with its sister non-profit organization, Imoyase Community Support Services, PARC has over thirty years of experience providing evaluation and technical assistance to tribal/racial/ethnic and LGBTQ+ communities at the local, statewide, and national levels often employing mixed methodologies. Its evaluation and technical assistance projects have been multi-site, multi-year, and multi-level, with youth organizing and leadership development as one of its primary foci.

**Evaluation Purpose**

The public health field increasingly recognizes that community organizing is a viable public health strategy for addressing socioeconomic inequities that are at the core of health disparities. Community organizing advances health and well-being at the community, organizational, and individual levels (Douglas et al., 2016; García et al., 2020; Grills et al., 2014; Pastor et al., 2018; Subica et al., 2016). Youth community organizing influences a range of positive youth development outcomes (e.g., development of skills, knowledge, civic engagement, empowerment, and changes in self-concept) (Schwartz & Suyemoto, 2013). Less explored is how philanthropy can expand the capacity of these organizations, deepen their connections and networks with each other, maximize youth organizing effectiveness, and best fund and support these organizations.

YOCBI presented an opportunity to implement a comprehensive and robust evaluation of youth organizing in Southern California to inform philanthropy and benefit the network of youth organizing groups across the region. One goal of the YOCBI evaluation was to use data as a stimulus for dialogue among CBOs engaged in youth community organizing and with philanthropy. It also presented an opportunity to broaden the field’s understanding of the needs of CBOs dedicated to developing youth leaders who can both inform policy and positively affect the social determinants of health in their communities. The Initiative with its complement of 25 grantees offered a data-driven guidepost for how and why to use core operating resources to support youth organizing efforts.

The program evaluation was designed to:

- provide data to grantees to strengthen and sustain their work;
- expand grantee and funder knowledge about regional needs and challenges of youth-serving organizations and how they work individually and collectively to address those needs; and
- contribute to the field of youth organizing and social movement research by identifying ways that philanthropy can adapt and evolve to meet the changing needs of nonprofits working in these spaces.
Evaluation Objectives and Questions
The evaluation is centered around three objectives and three research questions. See Figure 1.

Figure 1: YOCBI Evaluation Questions and Objectives
✓ **Objective 1**: Use Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR) to engage key stakeholders (grantees, and other funder collaborative representatives) in all phases of the evaluation from design to interpretation of findings.
✓ **Objective 2**: Launch and implement the evaluation workplan.
✓ **Objective 3**: Conduct formative and summative data analysis and report writing and disseminate findings.

**RESEARCH QUESTION 1**
What impact did the initiative’s investment of unrestricted grants, PLC, regional scope, and pooled funding model have on grantee’s: a) growth in organizational capacity, b) youth project goal attainment, and c) future trajectory plans?

**RESEARCH QUESTION 2**
What emerged from the PLC in terms of a) collaboration/alliances, b) local and regional social change agenda, and c) organizational/campaign/project capacity?

**RESEARCH QUESTION 3**
What can be learned from a deeper case study analysis of a representative sample of four grantees in terms of a) growth in organizational capacity, b) youth project goal attainment, c) future trajectory plans, d) collaboration/alliances, e) local and regional social change agenda, and f) positive youth development?

Design and Methodology
The evaluation design was participatory, culturally, and contextually grounded, and flexible. An integrative, multi-year, multi-site evaluation with a mixed-methods approach was used in which diverse cross-site baseline\(^2\) and outcome data were collected. A case study was conducted with a sub-sample of four grantees selected to reflect a cross-section of issue foci, organizational and youth organizing capacity/experience, and regional and ethnic diversity.

Evaluation Framework
Using a grantee perspective, the evaluation was organized within a six-point roadmap to answer questions that informed grantees’ work while also providing insights for funders. See Figure 2.

---

\(^2\) Due to COVID-19 impact on grantees and other considerations (e.g., grantee burden), baseline data was not collected for the self-study tool nor the case study focus groups. Further explanation is provided in the narrative findings.
Table 1 provides an overview of the evaluation questions, measures, and variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions from A Grantee Perspective</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (1) At the start of the Initiative (2019), this was where we were [grantee capacity]. | -Grantee Proposals (2019)  
-Grantee Self Study Tool (Time 1: May-Aug 2020) | -Grantee characteristics  
-Organizational capacity strengths and needs |
| (2) At the start of the Initiative (2019), this was the community context (a set of racial, economic, and social issues and disparities impacting our [grantee] community; and how we fit into the social change landscape). | -Grantee Proposals (2019)  
-Grantee Baseline Network Survey (2019) | -Top Community issues/concerns  
-Top issues/concerns for children and youth  
-Grantee connections and relationships |
| (3) At the start of the Initiative (2019), these were our [grantee] project goals and this is how the grant could help us get there. | -Grantee Proposals (2019) | -Grantee goals |
| (4) Across the three Initiative years (2019-2022), this is who we [grantee] interacted with and how we benefitted from these interactions. | -YO California! Peer Learning Community (PLC) records and documents  
-PLC Direct Observation Forms  
-Grantee Post Network Survey (2021) | -PLC activities and grantee level of involvement  
-Changes in grantee network connections and relationships |
| (5) Across the three Initiative years (2019-2022), this is the impact the grant had on our organizational capacity and the ripple effect on local and broader youth social change involvement. | -Grantee Progress Report Year 1 (2020)  
-Grantee Progress Report Year 2 (2021)  
-Grantee Self Study Tool (Time 2 – Summer 2022) | -Changes in grantee organizational capacity  
-Grantee accomplishments with project goals  
-Grantee organizational challenges and organizational resiliency |
| (6) At the end of this initiative (2022), this is where we want to go (future goals) and this is what we need to get there. | -Grantee Post Network Survey | -Future goals and supports/resources needed |
The remainder of this report summarizes the YOCBI evaluation findings using the six-point grantee perspective roadmap and story. See Figure 3 for a delineation of the evaluation stops along the grantee roadmap and story.

**Figure 3: YOCBI Evaluation Stops**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STOP 1</th>
<th>STOP 2</th>
<th>STOP 3</th>
<th>STOPS 4 and 5</th>
<th>STOP 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 2019, this was where we were at.</td>
<td>In 2019, this was the community context.</td>
<td>In 2019, these were our YOCBI organizational goals.</td>
<td>From 2019-22, this is who we interacted with and how we benefited/grew.</td>
<td>Moving forward, this is where we want to go and what we still need to get there.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STOP 1:** This was where we were at the start of YOCBI (2019).

**REGIONAL CONCENTRATION OF GRANTEES**

In 2019, more than half (60%; n=15) of the YOCBI CBOs were concentrated in Los Angeles County. This includes one grantee who was involved in youth organizing in all six counties. The Central Coast (Santa Barbara, Ventura) and the Inland Empire (San Bernardino, Riverside) each had four grantees. See Figure 4 for a list of YOCBI grantees by region.
Figure 4: YOCBI Regional Concentration of Grantees

YOCBI GRANTEE NETWORK SURVEY/PROPOSALS 2019 (N=25)

Los Angeles County
- California Native Vote Project
- Central American Resource Center
- Communities for a Better Environment
- Community Coalition
- East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice
- Gender & Sexualities Alliances Network**

Santa Barbara County/Ventura County
- Morroco Indigena Community Organizing Project
- One Step a la Vez
- Future Leaders of America*
- Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy*

Orange County
- Charitable Ventures of Orange County
- Gay & Lesbian Community Services Center of Orange County
- Korean Resource Center

San Bernardino County/Riverside County
- Alianza Coachella Valley
- Inland Congregation United for Change*
- Congregations Organized for Prophetic Engagement

SoCal Region Wide:
- Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights

*FLA and CAUSE youth organizing efforts were concentrated in both Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties.
**GSAN primary youth organizing efforts were concentrated in LA County but had also begun expanding into the Inland Empire.
+ICUC youth organizing efforts were concentrated in both San Bernardino and Riverside County.

ORGANIZATIONAL SIZE AND LENGTH OF OPERATION IN 2019

Twenty-five grantees provided information in their grantee proposals including their years in operation, annual budget size, and number of staff.

Years in Operation
At the start of the Initiative, most grantees (84%; n=21) were in operation for over a decade, with ten founded over 25 years ago. Four grantees were in operation for less than a decade including three who were in operation for five years or less.

Annual Budget
In 2019, the median (midpoint) size of grantee annual budgets was $1.3M. This included a range from $118K to $7.8M. Regionally, Los Angeles County grantees had the highest median annual budget ($2.1 million) while Riverside/San Bernardino grantees had the lowest ($956K).

- Most grantees (72%; n=18) had annual budgets of $1 million or higher (five had $5 million to $9.9 million annual budgets).
- Seven grantees had annual budgets of less than $1 million (two of these groups had very small budgets of $250K or less).

Number of Staff
The median (midpoint) number of full-time staff was ten (range of 0 to 108 staff). The median size of part-time staff was five (range of 0 to 66 staff).
- Of note, one grantee had no full-time staff at the start of YOCBI, while two grantees had no part-time staff. Two grantees had very large staff sizes of 108 and 93 respectively.
Additional Organizational Characteristics
The median number of volunteers overall was 140 (range equals 10 to 1,200 volunteers). Sixty was the median number of young adult volunteers (range equals 0 to 280). The average number of board members was nine, with young adult board member averaging one per grantee. Nine grantees did not have any young adult board members.

See Figure 5 for an overview of grantee organizational size and length of operation in 2019.

**Figure 5. YOCBI Grantee Organizational Size and Length of Operation in 2019 (N=25)**

*Because one to two grantees numbers would skew the mean (or average), the median score was used as a more accurate representation of the typical grantee's budget and staff size.*

YOCBI grantees primarily fell into three clusters based on a review of their 2019 organizational size and length of operation (See Figure 6).

- **The first cluster** consisted of five grantees with annual budgets ranging from $5 million to $8 million. Three were large and well-established grantees in LA County (i.e., years in operation ranging from 29 years to 51 years, and staff size of 32 to 93). Another long-standing statewide organization (33 years) had the largest number of staff (n=108).

- **The second cluster** consisted of six grantees with annual budgets ranging from $2 million to $3 million, eleven or more years in operation and staff size ranging from 16 to 35. These grantees represented LA, Orange, and Ventura Counties.

- **The third cluster** consisted of fourteen grantees with smaller annual budgets. They represented all Southern California regions. Six had annual budgets of over $1 million dollars, while the remaining seven had annual budgets under $1 million. Staff size was varied across these grantees (range 3 to 46).

- One LA County-based grantee did not fall into any of these clusters. This organization had a large annual budget ($7 million), a very small number of staff (3) and was in operation for only three years.
2019 ORGANIZATIONAL COMPONENTS & SOCIAL JUSTICE APPROACH

Using the self-study tool, grantees (n=24) reported on various aspects of their organization including their social justice foci, issue platform, strategies/tactics, and approach/philosophy.

Organizational Components

- All 24 grantees identified community organizing or policy advocacy/campaign components at the start of the Initiative. See Figure 7. These two components were primary or of highest importance or concern to most CBOs (92%).
  - Civic engagement (75%) was the next highest primary component, followed to a lesser extent by direct services/programming (46%) and community development (42%).
- For a handful of grantees (n=3), community organizing and/or policy advocacy/campaigns were ancillary. For one grantee in particular, direct services/programming was their only primary component. Grassroots organizing, policy advocacy/campaigns, civic engagement, and community development were designated as ancillary. For two other grantees, grassroots organizing was ancillary to policy advocacy campaigns or vice versa.
As described by grantees, direct services included, among other things, academics and wellness, substance abuse prevention, personal wellbeing, social emotional health, referrals, counseling, and immigration services. See Figure 8 for grantee examples of direct services provided to their youth members.

**Figure 7: CBO Components (n=24)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Ancillary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizing</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Advocacy/Campaigns</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Services/Programming</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To support the immediate needs of their members, most grantees (79%) had a *direct service component* that was either primary (46%) or ancillary (33%). These direct services or programs focused on:

- personal growth (71%)
- community education (e.g., substance use prevention, nutrition, etc.) (70%)
- service referrals (58%)
- service linkage and service navigation (50%)
- service enrollment/registration (42%)

As described by grantees, direct services included, among other things, academics and wellness, substance abuse prevention, personal wellbeing, social emotional health, referrals, counseling, and immigration services. See Figure 8 for grantee examples of direct services provided to their youth members.

**Figure 8: YOCBI Grantee Examples of Direct Services Provided to Youth**

"We facilitate youth organizing programs to develop the leaders of our young people to get involved in policy campaigns. We also provide academics and wellness services to youth to help facilitate academic success and personal wellbeing. We provide workshops to young people on substance abuse prevention and health education (including sexual and mental health). -Grantee

Our leadership development program includes wellness and healing components to support young people’s growth and social emotional health. We do wellness-based series that educate young people on selected topics they choose to do a deeper dive in that could educate them on the issues that’s impacting them and their families. [We provide] referrals to mental health services, healthcare services, legal services, housing services including academic services, navigating, and applying to college, financial aid and getting the proper counseling. -Grantee

We provide mental health counseling, peer and support groups, tobacco prevention, youth programs, immigration resources, and transgender health and wellness programs. [We provide] linkages to culturally competent healthcare providers and mental healthcare providers. -Grantee"
Grantees' primary organizational components were community organizing and policy advocacy/campaigns. They often used multiple components or “sources of action” to assist with implementing changes and improvements at the community-level (e.g., community development) and the individual/family-level (e.g., direct services). Notably, by combining community organizing and/or policy advocacy/campaigns with direct services, grantees simultaneously addressed the root causes of inequity in their community and their impact on constituents by supporting emotional, physical, spiritual, and political — development of their members.

**Grassroots Community Organizing Praxis**

**Social Justice Platform**
Education justice (83%), racial justice (58%), and health justice (50%) were the most frequently cited social justice platforms among grantees at the beginning of the Initiative. To a lesser extent, they also identified immigration justice (42%), economic justice (33%), environmental justice (33%), housing justice (33%), criminal justice (33%), juvenile justice (33%), and gender and sexuality justice (25%).

**Organizing Type**
A majority of YOCBI grantees engaged community members through:

- *issue-based organizing* (75%) (organizing a group of individuals who are directly affected by the same issue, such as housing, health care, immigration, etc.), and
- *alliance/coalition organizing* (71%) (a network of community-based organizations and advocacy groups who build shared power to advance strategic campaigns that touch on a cross-section of multiple social justice platforms).

There was also diversity in the scale and scope of organizing efforts. Slightly over half used place-based/neighborhood-based organizing (58%), broader social movement building (58%) and community wide organizing (54%)

**Organizing Strategies and Tactics**
Consistent with the basic parameters of community organizing, all or most grantees used community engagement and outreach (100%), base building (100%), leadership development (100%), alliance/coalition building (96%), political education/popular education (92%), direct action/mobilization (83%), and movement building (83%). Action research (63%) and media advocacy (63%) were used to a lesser extent.

**Organizing Approaches**
While youth-led organizing (96%) (i.e., placing youth in leadership and decision-making positions within their own communities) was the top approach used by grantees, intergenerational organizing (75%) interestingly was number two (i.e., intentional integration of multiple generations — parent, child/youth, grandparent, etc., learning and working side by side to effect change). Nearly two-in-three grantees used art and cultural organizing (63%), while a little over half used integrative voter engagement (58%) or narrative change (58%). The least used approach was asset-based community development (33%).

See Figure 9 for details about YOCBI grantee 2019 grassroots community organizing praxis.
GRANTEE EXPERIENCE WITH YOUTH ORGANIZING IN 2019

Information related to YOCBI grantee youth organizing efforts were extracted from the 2019 grantee proposals (N=25) or the grantee network survey (n=23).

Length of Involvement
At the start of the Initiative, nearly half (48%; n=11) of YOCBI grantees engaged in youth organizing for eleven plus years. The largest cluster of these (n=9) was concentrated in Los Angeles County. The next largest cluster (35%; n=8) were newer to youth organizing with one to five years of involvement. These grantees were equally spread across all six regions. A smaller number of grantees (17%; n=4) had six to ten years of youth organizing experience representing four regions. See Figure 10.
2019 Geographical Concentration of Youth Organizing Efforts
Unsurprisingly, the highest concentration of youth organizing efforts was in the county of Los Angeles—i.e., central Los Angeles, Long Beach, East LA, and Southeast LA (e.g., Compton, Wilmington) with a smaller cluster operating in the San Fernando Valley.

Figure 11: Heatmap Depicting the Location of YOCBI Youth Organizing Efforts in 2019
Youth Constituents

In 2019, there were 8,403 youth constituents across the 25 grantees. This number must be interpreted with caution because 36% of the total youth base was accounted for by one grantee, and three other grantees accounted for 12%, 10%, and 9% of the youth base respectively. The remaining 21 grantees each accounted for 3% or less of the youth base count. While the range of youth constituents was 3 to 2,900 youth, the median (midpoint) base size of 138 is a more representative indicator. See Figure 12.

Grantees engaged:
- High school youth (100%)
- Transition age youth (TAY) (84%)
- Middle school age youth (52%)

One grantee engaged children as young as 5 to 10 years of age.

While grantees typically engaged youth at their physical office locations, half (52%; n=13) were in high school settings, and three organized in college settings.

Two in three grantees (68%) engaged Latinx youth followed to a lesser extent by African American/Black youth (16%), Asian American Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander (8%), American Indian/Alaska Native youth (4%), and Indigenous youth (4%). Other priority populations included youth (and families) with low socio-economic status (96%), limited English fluency (72%), immigrant background (68%), juvenile justice system involvement (48%), first generation college students (32%), unhoused status (24%), alternative education students (16%), foster care involvement (16%), and LGBTQ+ community (8%).

Figure 12: YOCBI Grantees’ Youth Constituency Characteristics

Youth Constituency Size and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Median youth (138)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAY (19-24 yrs)</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School (13-18 yrs)</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (5-10 yrs)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range: 3 to 2,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Youth Organizing External Settings

- High Schools: 52% (13 grantees)
- Colleges: 12% (3 grantees)

Youth Priority Populations

- Race:
  - Latinx (n=17 grantees): 68%
  - AAI (n=4 grantees): 16%
  - AANHP (n=2 grantees): 12%
  - AI/AN (n=1 grantee): 4%
  - Indigenous (n=1 grantee): 4%
- Immigrant (n=17 grantees): 68%
- Limited English Fluency (n=17 grantees): 48%
- Low-SES (n=18 grantees): 96%
- Unhoused (n=16 grantees): 24%
- Foster Care (n=16 grantees): 16%
- First Generation College (n=3 grantees): 32%
- Alternative Education (n=3 grantees): 8%
- Limited English Fluency, and Immigrants (n=17 grantees): 72%
ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY IN 2019

Organizational Life Stage
Relying solely on indicators like years in operation, size of budget, or staff size provides an incomplete picture of an organization’s developmental status. Arguably, organizations are more like people, with continuous stages of development across a lifespan. In line with this, grantees were asked to identify their organizational life stage at the beginning of project year two (2020). They were provided with four organizational life stages from which to self-assess and characterize their organization in three types of organizational elements. See Figure 13 for definitions of the four life stages and the corresponding three organizational elements.

Figure 13: Definitions of Organizational Life Stages and Elements

Twenty-four grantees rated their developmental status in terms of what they stand for, what they do, and what the organization is made of.

What Your Organization Stands For.
Most grantees (71%; n=17) rated themselves in the maturity/sustainability life stage in terms of achieving their organizational mission and core values. Seven grantees were in the growth (n=6) or turnaround (n=1) stage.

What Your Organization Does.
More than half of grantees (58%; n=14) rated themselves in the in the maturity/sustainability life stage with respect to delivering high quality programming to their constituents and contributing to community change. Ten grantees were in the growth (n=9) or turnaround stage (n=1).

What Your Organization Is Made Of.
Nearly one-in-three grantees (33%; n=8) rated themselves in the maturity/sustainability life stage in relation to their infrastructure and operations matching their needs and priorities. Four grantees were in the startup phase, while 12 grantees were in the growth (n=9) or turnaround stage (n=3).
While most grantees identified themselves in a mature/sustainability phase related to their mission and core values, they also hinted at challenges, barriers, or even crises in relation to quality of program delivery, community change efforts, and their infrastructure. In other words, for some grantees it's complicated.

For example, one grantee rated their organization in the:
- “turnaround” stage related to “what your organizations stands for,”
- “growth” stage related to “what your organization does” and
- “startup” stage related to “what your organization is made of.”

Another grantee rated their organization in the:
- “maturity/sustainability” stage related to “what your organizations stands for” and “what your organization does”, and
- “turnaround” stage related to “what your organization is made of.”

These data provide a more nuanced understanding both organizational capacity of youth organizing groups and what they may need to continue in a growth trajectory. This type of assessment, if conducted during pivotal moments, could inform capacity building strategies and decisions to address/solve these issues. See Figure 14.

Figure 14: Grantee Self-Ratings of Organizational Life Stage by Element in 2019 (n=24)

Organizational Capacity Domains
At the beginning of project year 2 (2020) grantees were also asked to self-assess and rate their organizations on four organizational capacity domains using a scale from one (i.e., We don’t do this well or consistently = novice to low capacity) to four (i.e., our work is excellent; we are considered leaders = high level of capacity). Twenty-two grantees (88%) completed this section of the self-study tool (time 1).
Figure 15 provides definitions of the four organizational capacity domains.

Figure 15: YOCBI Organizational Capacity Domain Definitions

Organizational Capacity Ratings in 2020
In summer 2020, the highest mean (or average) scores were in three domains, with grantee ratings falling in the category, “we’re doing well” (i.e., moderate to advanced level capacity) (range = 3 to 4). These were:
- equity and inclusion (3.22),
- client/constituent/ally engagement and development (3.16), and
- organizational strategy and adaptability (3.03).

The lowest mean score was in the staff and infrastructure domain (2.60)—the “we do a satisfactory job” range (i.e., low to intermediate capacity).

An item analysis within each of the four domains yielded a more nuanced picture of grantee capacity during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic (spring/summer 2020).
- The lowest mean scores (low to intermediate capacity) were comprehensive database and management reporting systems (2.18), community joining grantees as a formal member (2.27), successful volunteer recruitment systems (2.36), website maintenance (2.41), staff development processes (2.45), managerial staff recruitment, development, and retention processes (2.55), sufficient resources and strategies for auxiliary services (2.59), and use of program evaluation/CBPR (2.59).
- In contrast, the highest mean scores (moderate to advanced capacity) were that CBO is viewed as inspiring by community (3.59), CBO addressing the root causes of inequity (3.50), CBO is known/engaged/responsive to community (3.50), analysis of racism and disparities (3.32), and knowledge of stakeholders, community, and policy issues (3.22).

See Figure 16 for a visual summary of these findings.
STOP 2: This was the community context at the start of YOCBI (2019).

The grantee solicitation process provided important context for understanding the social change landscape in Southern California. In their YOCBI proposals, grantees (N=25) described their organizational mission and current youth organizing campaigns. They also shared their strategies to advance their mission and campaigns, including information about external partnerships and program outcomes—challenges and accomplishments. The evaluation team extracted and thematically coded these data, particularly uplifting areas related to the primary community and youth concerns grantees sought to address.

TOP ISSUES OR POLICIES IMPACTING THE COMMUNITY IN 2019

At the start of the Initiative, a quarter of grantees identified two big-picture issues or policies as having a negative impact on their communities.

- Seven grantees (28%) representing three of the four regions listed human rights and immigration policies (e.g., ICE raids, detentions, deportations, and resultant fear/anxiety; poor worker conditions for farmworkers; etc.) as a top concern.
- Six grantees (24%) identified environmental health and safety (e.g., air quality; water quality and access; neighborhood oil drilling and fracking, etc.) as another top concern in their community. Five of the six grantees were from the LA County region.

All other community concerns were uplifted by one to three grantees. These included:
- Economic conditions (n=3)
- Transportation access and barriers (n=3)
- Criminal justice system (n=3)
TOP ISSUES OR POLICIES IMPACTING CHILDREN AND YOUTH IN 2019

Nearly half or more of grantees identified two issues or policies negatively impacting children and youth. These concerns were relevant across regions.

- Sixteen grantees (60%) listed lack of or need for positive youth development programs in the community (e.g., LGBTQ+ mental health services or career development; Indigenous youth leadership pipeline; holistic & trauma-informed youth development services).
- Twelve grantees (48%) identified education inequity as a top concern (e.g., continued factors that contributed to school-to-prison pipeline; over policing on campus; criminalization of students of color; low graduation rates; lack of college prep access; unaddressed student mental health issues; poor-quality school infrastructure).
- Other issues or policies impacting children and youth included:
  - Health inequity - 9 grantees (36%) (e.g., disparities in health and health care access; exposure to chronic violence; high Native suicide rate; poverty/displacement)
  - Racism and discrimination in schools - 7 grantees (28%) (e.g., harassment/violence based on sexual orientation, gender identity or race; fears of ICE targeting youth or their family members in schools)
  - Economic inequality - 6 grantees (24%) (e.g., lack of employment opportunities; wealth gaps; gentrification/displacement of low-income/vulnerable youth and their families; food insecurity; homelessness)
  - Institutional racism in the juvenile justice system - 6 grantees (24%) (e.g., disproportionate arrests, citations, incarceration, and recidivism of youth in communities of color, particularly Black youth)
  - Lack of access to transportation - 4 grantees (16%) (e.g., need for free/subsidized public transportation passes)
  - Civic/voter engagement - 3 grantees (12%) (e.g., youth voter disenfranchisement/low voter turn-out; need for youth mobilize around ICE, DACA, CA Dream Act/AB 540; denials of in-state tuition and access to college)
  - School environmental health and safety - 1 grantee (4%) (e.g., poor air quality)

Unsurprisingly, the (lack of) or need for positive youth development (PYD) programs (out-of-school) in their communities, followed by education inequity were of greatest concern among grantees. This is likely a reflection of their awareness and understanding that social justice and healing are interrelated and imperative to transform the lives and communities of people most harmed by systemic and structural racism. It is no wonder then that 79% of YOCBI grantees had a primary or ancillary direct service component to address the dearth of afterschool PYD programming and the low-quality education in their communities. Grantees, via their youth grassroots organizing programs, are filling an important service gap by addressing critical outcomes that are not limited to youth political leadership development and youth-led
systems/policy changes, but also includes psychological and emotional healing and empowerment, academic career, occupational development, and more.

GRANTEE NETWORK IN 2019 (BASELINE)

Social Network Analysis Overview
Grantees identified a variety of shared social justice issues that are negatively impacting their youth and communities. It became clear that operating in silos was not the most prudent option. Thus, an initiative goal of both the funder collaborative and the grantees was to strengthen the Southern California regional network of youth organizing groups to collectively tackle these challenges. The intent of the YOCBI Peer Learning Community (PLC) was to provide opportunities for grantee organizations to develop and nurture relationships, collaborate, share resources and information, and build collective power. The charge to the evaluation was to determine a metric to capture this process.

The use of metrics in movement/power building can:

“...help organizations articulate where they are going, what road they are taking, and what they expect to find along the way. They can help groups strike the right balance in the trade-offs above, allocating time and energy to be maximally effective. They can serve as a guide and tool for lifting up lessons for the field and for funders. But they should never be the tail wagging the dog; as one convening participant warned, it is the "mission that determines the path – not the metrics." (Pastor et al., 2011)

Thus, PARC used social network analysis (SNA) concepts and methods to detect and interpret the degree of social ties among the grantees before the PLC started. This assisted with identifying strengths and opportunities for growth within the YOCBI cohort of youth organizing groups. PARC’s grantee network survey measured the nature and strength of these social ties (or connections) before the PLC started (i.e., pre-test or baseline) and again at the end of the initiative (post-test). This section of the report presents the baseline grantee network findings. Nearly all grantees (92% ; n=23) completed the baseline survey. Appendix E contains the tool.

Youth Organizing Work Conducted in Partnership or Collaboration in 2019
In 2019, grantees were asked to indicate the extent to which their youth organizing work was done in partnership or collaboration with youth organizing groups in their local community. Nearly two-in-three grantees (61%) spent one-quarter or less of their time in partnerships or collaborations. About one-in-four (22%) partnered or collaborated with other organizing groups half of the time. Only four grantees (17%) conducted their organizing in partnership with other youth groups either most or all the time. See Figure 17.
**Number, Type, and Purpose of Partnerships and Collaborations in 2019**
Grantees were asked to list up to three youth organizing groups they partner or collaborate with on a regular basis in their local community.

- Most grantees (n=20) identified at least one group for a collective total of 30 groups.
  - These groups were comprised of 14 grassroots CBOs, 8 regional coalitions, 5 statewide/national coalitions, and 3 human service/resource centers.
- Thirteen of the groups listed were other YOCBI grantees, while 17 were external to the initiative.
- Grantees noted that the primary purpose of engaging in partnerships and collaborations with the 30 groups listed was to share a campaign demand (work together on a common issue) (n=14, 61%). This was followed to a lesser extent by coordination of strategies and tactics (n=9, 39%), sharing of youth leadership development/political education strategies (n=9, 39%), and sharing other resources to build organizational capacity (e.g., curriculums, best practices, staff development, deepened issue analysis) (n=8, 35%).

**Sense of Connection Among YOCBI Grantees in 2019.**
In 2019, nearly half (48%) of grantees felt moderately to very connected to the cohort of YOCBI grantees, indicating room for improvement in the overall sense of connection within the YOCBI network.

- Specifically, four grantees (17%) were not connected, eight (35%) felt slightly connected, nine (39%) were moderately connected, and two (9%) were very connected. See Figure 18.

In terms of regional differences, a higher proportion of grantees from LA County and San Bernardino/Riverside reported higher levels of connection (moderate to very) with the cohort (54% and 66%, respectively) compared to Orange and Santa Barbara/Ventura County grantees (0% and 25%, respectively).

**Social Network Analysis (SNA) Findings**

**YOCBI Grantee Network: Levels of Connection in 2019**
The baseline network survey asked grantees to assign each of their fellow YOCBI cohort members to one of six levels that best described the intensity of their connection in 2019 (see all six levels and their corresponding definitions in Figure 19 below). The SNA findings reported only include grantee connections deemed most meaningful for advancing youth organizing efforts (i.e., level 3 connection or higher between grantees).
The output network depicted in Figure 20 shows clear regional separation of grantees with about four sub-networks of groups or "communities" having closer working relationships with each other. In other words, geography was the organizing factor for strong connections among the Southern California groups.

- LA County-based grantees appear both more central to the network (more ties) and have smaller node sizes (higher proportion of within-region ties vs. outside of region).
- Both Orange County and San Bernadino/Riverside (Inland Empire)-based grantees have a higher proportion of outside of region ties (large node size) and appear on the periphery of the network (fewer overall ties).
- The Santa Barbara/Ventura grantees formed a ‘kite network,’ where a single organization served as an important ‘gatekeeper’ to the rest of the YOCBI grantees. In other words, this CBO was strategically positioned to connect other Central Coast grantees with their initiative peers from other Southern California regions—e.g., LA County.
- The one Southern California-wide grantee had connections with CBOs from all regions but the Inland Empire.

Box 1: Explanation of Network Diagrams

How to Interpret the YOCBI Network Diagram: Level of Connection in 2019

Nodes (i.e., squares) represent grantees:
- Black nodes are groups in Santa Barbara or Ventura Counties
- Blue nodes are groups in LA County
- Grey nodes are groups in Orange County
- Red nodes are groups in San Bernadino or Riverside Counties
- Pink nodes are Southern California-wide groups

Lines connecting nodes indicate a relational tie of 3 or higher.

The size of a node depicts the proportion of within vs outside of region ties:
- Smaller squares indicate more ties or relationships within their own region.
- Larger squares indicate more ties or relationships with groups outside of their own region.
YOCBI Grantee Network: Aspirational Connections in 2019
At baseline, grantees also selected up to five youth organizing groups within the YOCBI cohort that their organization aspired to connect with strategically during the PLC. SNA was used to construct a network depicting grantees’ aspirational connections (Figure 21). Boxes 1 and 2 explain how to read the network illustrations.

Box 2: Explanation of Network Diagrams – Aspirational Network

How to Interpret the YOCBI Network Diagram: Aspirational Connection in 2019

Nodes (i.e., circles) represent grantees:
- **Black nodes** are groups in Santa Barbara or Ventura Counties
- **Blue nodes** are groups in LA County
- **Red nodes** are groups in San Bernardino or Riverside Counties
- **Pink nodes** are Southern California-wide groups

Lines connecting nodes indicate an aspirational relational tie (desire to connect).

Arrows point to the org. that grantees aspired to connect with (nominee). Arrow color reflects the home region of nominator

The size of the node (i.e., circle) shows how much groups want to connect with other groups in the network. In other words, the number of time a group was identified by other groups.

Larger circles = more mentions by others regarding a desire to connect strategically.
To avoid overinterpreting aspirational ties and the significance of any one grantee, organization names were removed from this illustration.

**Figure 21: YOCBI Grantee Network Aspirational Connections in 2019**

Aspirational grantee network findings for 2019 must be interpreted in comparison to the actual level of grantee working relationships during that period (pre-PLC launch). As seen in Figure 22 below:

- The aspirational network suggests strong, collective grantee interest in building density—i.e., strengthening or forging new ties.
- Grantees also appear to be leaning towards decreased network centrality (i.e., less emphasis on ‘gatekeeper’ organizations and more connections distributed evenly across the network).
- The aspirational network generally had fewer regional separations and more connections across regions.
  - This observation was driven by a strong desire among grantees from the outlying Southern California Regions to establish ties with LA-County-based organizations, as indicated by the color and direction of the arrows in the network.
- Grantees from LA County and the Central Coast also aspired to continue working closely with their in-region counterparts.

A side-by-side comparison (see Figure 22) is illustrative of the contrast between the actual state of connections and the kinds of connections grantees would like to see happen.
Figure 22: YOCBI Grantee Network comparison between a) grantees actual working relationships in 2019 versus b) their aspirational ones in 2019.

Top Reasons for Aspirational Grantee Connections
Grantees also listed the types of aspirational strategic connections they wanted to establish. The top six areas that grantees wanted to connect strategically were: youth leadership development models (n=14 grantees), youth outreach and engagement (n=9 grantees), healing or trauma-focused approaches (n=7 grantees), strategies and tactics to build community power (n=5 grantees), social justice and/or racial equity campaign strategies and tactics (n=5 grantees), and parent outreach and engagement (n=5 grantees).

In their 2019 proposals, grantees identified up to five organizational goals to accomplish within the three-year period using their YOCBI unrestricted grant funds.

- Collectively, YOCBI grantees listed 81 organizational goals in 2019, with an average of 3 goals per grantee (range of two to five goals per grantee).

GRANTEE GOALS BY CAPACITY DOMAIN AND AREA

Goals were thematically analyzed and coded using the seven domains from the YOCBI self-study tool: fund development, board governance and engagement, financial operations and management, staff and infrastructure client/constituent/ally development and engagement, organizational strategy and adaptability, and equity and inclusion.

- Nearly all grantees listed organizational goals in either the client/constituent/ally development and engagement domain (96%; n=24) or the staff and infrastructure domain (92%; n=22). This was followed to a lesser extent by organizational strategy and adaptability (32%; n=8). A small handful of grantees listed equity and inclusion, fund development or board governance and engagement as an organizational goal. No grantees identified financial operations and management as a goal (Table 2).
An analysis of organizational goals revealed a more nuanced picture of desired capacity growth.

- Within the **client/constituent/ally development and engagement domain**, grantees emphasized working on “building the youth base” and “conducting formal youth leadership training/development”. This was listed by 20 grantees (80%) and 18 grantees (72%), respectively. To a lesser extent eight grantees (28%) wanted to “form high-impact relationships/build alliances with other grassroots CBOs”.

- Within the **staff and infrastructure domain**, “sustaining appropriate and consistent staffing” was a frequent goal area listed by over half of the grantees (52%). This was followed by “having sufficient resources for auxiliary services” (28%).

- Within the **organizational strategy and adaptability domain**, “establishing program evaluation/CBPR as part of organizational culture” was a goal area for five grantees (24%).

Across the six capacity domains, the top three grantee specific goal areas were: **growing youth membership (80%; n=20 grantees), conducting youth leadership development (72%; n=18 grantees), and maintaining appropriate and consistent staffing (52%; 13 grantees)**. This was followed to a lesser extent by developing high-impact relationships with grassroots CBOs (24%, n=6 grantees) and establishing program evaluation/CBPR as part of their CBO culture (20%; n=5 grantees).

See Figure 23 for a summary of goal related findings in 2019.
Appendix H provides grantee goal areas thematically coded by capacity domain and area.

Grantee descriptions of how they would use their unrestricted funds to support their organizational goal attainment is summarized in Table 3.

**Table 3: Examples of Grantee Organizational Goals by Capacity Domain and Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal by Capacity Domain</th>
<th>Goal Area</th>
<th>Grantees in their own words…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client/Constituent/ Ally Development and Engagement</td>
<td>Growing youth membership</td>
<td>“[We] will be expanding to the remaining high schools in the area…as well as formalizing a club [at a] Community College. …We hope to build a youth-powered movement that will impel the people in the community that are able to become citizens of the United States and/or vote.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting youth leadership development</td>
<td>[Will] add an additional leadership bootcamp annually in the next year and move toward quarterly bootcamps in subsequent years…[the bootcamp] facilitates leadership development through knowledge and skill-building…[it] will also help students evaluate their current work and develop a plan to create and implement campaigns in their schools. A larger cohort of boot camp graduates will support the continued growth of the [youth] Convening and increase our network of LGBTQ youth leaders who will be engaged in systems change to address intersecting issues both in and out of school.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining appropriate and consistent staffing</td>
<td>“We would like to hire a program coordinator/community organizer who can deeply relate to the youth. This key person would be dedicated to the [youth organizing] campaigns and supporting and coaching the youth organizers. With this hands-on support and skill building the youth organizers will have a greater capacity to work on their campaigns and see greater outcomes. This will also serve the youth in their personal growth since youth who get involved in community leadership blossom into their individual strengths.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Staff and Infrastructure**

| Having sufficient resources for auxiliary services |
| Expand program operations, to include transportation support (a new van) and funds to utilize ridesharing via LYFT or UBER; Provide financial support/scholarships to youth leaders to maintain their focus in organizing, thereby augmenting income for families of youth leaders. |

**Organizational Strategy and Adaptability**

| Establishing program evaluation/CBPR as part of CBO Culture |
| “We will utilize] a variety of participation data, pre and post evaluations, and anecdotal data to measure progress. Gathering information about the reduction of discrimination, bullying, and other hostile activities [will give] a platform for students to…discuss these issues allows [us] to [assess changes].” |

---

STOP 4: From 2019-2022, this is who we interacted with and how we benefitted from these interactions.

This section of the report provides key findings related to grantee involvement and subsequent benefits from participation in the Peer Learning Community, a key element of YOCBI. It also includes changes in the YOCBI grantee network (i.e., growth in grantee connections and relationships by the end of year three).

**PEER LEARNING COMMUNITY (PLC)**

YO! Cali designed the PLC to strengthen skills, capacities, and relationships among the Initiative grantee organizations by coordinating and facilitating opportunities for shared learning and networking.

The PLC events provided a space where grantee staff and/or young leaders shared best practices, tools, and lessons learned from their experience in the field through activities such as panels, peer exchanges, and coaching circles. Ideally, this space subsequently allowed grantee organizations to build knowledge, resources, and relationships that strengthened the capacity of individual grantees and lead to collective goals and action.

Only the first two events in the PLC arc were in-person—held prior to COVID-19 restrictions. The remaining seven PLC events were held virtually over Zoom. In these online spaces, YO! Cali staff regularly used panel discussions, breakout rooms, etc. to interact with attendees (both grantee staff and youth). PARC staff attended and observed six PLC events (two in person, four virtual). Observation data were collected using a standardized direct observation form (see Appendix G). Although, it was difficult to gauge the engagement of some participants during virtual convenings because their webcams were turned off, PARC noted that many of the attendees were actively engaged in all observed PLCs.
GRANTEE INVOLVEMENT IN PLC

- From December 2019 through May 2022, YO! Cali organized and facilitated nine, YOCBI PLC events with 363 unique participants in attendance. Attendees included 113 organizational leaders (e.g., directors) and youth organizing staff, as well as 250 youth members and leaders. These unique counts may be an undercount due to inconsistencies in attendee login information provided during zoom gatherings.

- There was 100% (n=25) grantee organization involvement across the nine PLC events, with an average number of seven events attended per grantee (range 3 to 9 events). Over half (52%; n=13) of grantees attended eight or more PLCs.

On average each PLC event had:
- 19 grantee organizations in attendance (range of 15 to 23 grantees),
- 46 individual participants in attendance (range of 30 to 74 attendees),

The PLCs with the highest number of participants were the three youth-specific events:
- July 2020 Youth Power Assembly (n=52 attendees),
- July 2021 Youth Exchange (n=74), and the
- May 2022 Youth Gathering (n=51).

The two events with the highest grantee representation (n=23 grantees, 92%) were the February 2020 Youth Organizer’s Convening and the April 2021 mid-point check-in.

See Figure 24 for a summary of PLC schedule of event and grantee level of involvement.

---

3Along with the nine formal PLC events, ten additional YO! Cali events were opened to YOCBI grantee to attend at their own discretion. These non-PLC events ranged in focus from health justice and cultural strategy sessions to youth and adult yoga and herbalism classes.
PLC ALIGNMENT WITH AND STRENGTHENING OF GRANTEE ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS AND CONNECTIONS

The purpose and outcomes from each PLC were qualitatively coded to assess how convening foci aligned with and improved areas related to grantees’ organizational capacity goals. See Table 4 for a summary of each PLC event, and its’ audience, participation, purpose, and desired outcomes.

Table 4: YO! Cali Peer Learning Community (PLC) Events Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Date</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th># Grantees</th>
<th># Participants</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Desired Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grantee Kickoff/ December 2019</td>
<td>Org leaders and organizing staff</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Set guiding principles and practices, identify key learning community goals, and determine convening frequency and calendar.</td>
<td>- Develop relationships - Engage grantees in designing PLC goals (format to frequency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Organizer’s Convening/ February 2020</td>
<td>Organizing staff</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Build relationship and ties between organizations, uplift and share tools/lessons learned around program development and campaigns.</td>
<td>- Develop relationships - Explore and share strengths, areas of growth, and overlap - Learn 1-2 tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Power Assembly/ July 2020</td>
<td>Youth leaders and members</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Launch youth-centered demands, engage youth leaders in grassroots decision-making, and strengthen relationships.</td>
<td>- Develop relationships - Learn about key issues and demands - Prioritize demands and solutions - Celebrate youth power and voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Fall Gathering/ December 2020</td>
<td>Organizing staff</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Connect, share, and learn best practices/models around virtual program design and</td>
<td>- Develop relationships - Learn 2-3 key practices/tools/lessons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
facilitation including digital organizing strategies. -Engage in group conversations for peer learning/ sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midpoint/ April 2021</td>
<td>Org. leaders and organizing staff</td>
<td>23-43</td>
<td>Reflect on key findings from the network survey and envision where organizations would like to see the network evolve; get feedback on PLC moving forward. -Develop relationships -Make meaning of network survey findings -Determine 20201 PLC calendar and topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Organizing Gathering/ Jun 2021</td>
<td>Organizing staff</td>
<td>14-30</td>
<td>Connect, share tools/resources, and learn best practices and models on political education and addressing racial justice/anti-Blackness and supporting youth mental health. -Develop relationships -Hear and learn from two experts -Engage in group conversations for peer learning/sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Exchange/ July 2021</td>
<td>Youth leaders and members</td>
<td>18-74</td>
<td>Connect and build relationships, learn about each other’s orgs and campaigns, and practice integrating arts, culture, and healing into their organizing. -Develop relationships -Share and learn about local youth organizing campaigns -Explore 2 topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Gathering/ March 2022</td>
<td>Organizing staff</td>
<td>21-34</td>
<td>Build relationships and share tools/practices related to youth leadership development models, supporting youth mental health, and campaign strategy. -Develop relationships -Learn tools and practices in 2 key topic areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Gathering/ May 2022</td>
<td>Youth leaders and members</td>
<td>15-51</td>
<td>Connect and deepen understanding of transformative youth organizing and learn/share current campaign work/wins. -Develop relationships -Understand elements of transformative youth organizing -Learn about current org campaign efforts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengthening grantee relationships was at the heart of every PLC event. This was a primary initiative goal for both grantees and the funder collaborative. This also aligned with “building high-impact relationships with grassroots CBOs/ allies”, the fourth most frequent capacity goal area identified by grantees in their proposals (n=7 grantees, 28%).

Below are examples of PLC direct observations that demonstrate grantee relationship building and strategic collaborations that emerged from involvement in the PLC. These benefits were observed across the duration of the convenings.

An idea that got a lot of traction by PLC participants was groups sharing expertise with one another. One grantee participant said they were good at positive youth development (PYD) activities but had trouble engaging their youth in the political education material. He knew of another grantee that was exact opposite. He suggested an inter-organization youth-exchange strategy to promote better programming (i.e., PYD and political education), so that all the young people could get the best available to them without every organization needing to excel in every area. Another idea that emerged was an inter-org organizing effort aimed at increasing the number of young men participating in youth organizing.

Direct Observation of the PLC Kick off observation – Dec 2019 (Convening #1)

Grantee participants discussed forming alliances between a) mentoring programs for youth of color with b) youth organizing groups as a way of both gaining members (growing their membership) and simultaneously providing political education.

Direct Observation of the PLC Kick off observation – Dec 2019 (Convening #1)
Over half of the PLC events focused on grantees sharing tools and best practices related to positive youth development and youth leadership development. Again, PLC objectives were directly in-line with grantee organizational goals. Lack of positive youth development programs in grantee communities was the most prevalent issue/concern affecting youth/children at the beginning of YOCBI (n=16 grantees, 60%). Furthermore, in the 2019 grantee network survey, “youth leadership development models” was the most often mentioned area around which grantees wanted to connect during the PLCs (n=14 grantees, 61%).

Direct Observation of the PLC
Youth Organizer’s Convening – Feb 2020 (Convening #2)

Sharing tools/best practices for digital organizing (n=1 PLC event, 11%) was a main outcome addressed in the PLC in the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic. The pandemic fundamentally transformed how youth organizing groups implemented their programs, including their youth outreach and engagement efforts. While social distancing and remote operations posed an unanticipated challenge for all community-based organizations, it also presented a new opportunity to use technology in creative and innovative ways transforming how grassroots youth organizing is delivered. In response, YO! Cali organized a convening where grantees could share and learn about digital organizing strategies/solutions. This was important as youth engagement was one of the most frequently cited challenges faced by grantees in their 2020 annual progress reports (and subsequently 2021 progress report) (n=13 grantees, 52%).

Examples of tools, strategies, and solutions shared by participants included:

- Keeping members/youth engaged on Zoom calls and other online activities to combat zoom fatigue. One grantee shared a strategy of streaming music during planning sessions with youth. Another grantee shared their strategy for addressing the lack of technology with their youth and what they did to re-engage them.
- Gently encouraging youth to turn on their screens during organizing events/activities.
- Scheduling programming around the needs of youth to prevent youth burnout/Zoom fatigue. One grantee shared their best practice of working with smaller groups of youth to deliver wellness and related activities.
- Maintaining youth momentum after a campaign win and strategies for how to build their youth base during a pandemic.

Participants shared virtual organizing tools and resources in a Google doc, which was distributed to grantees at the conclusion of the PLC.

While digital organizing was formally addressed early in the PLC series, grantees continued to raise, discuss, share, and learn from each in subsequent convenings. For example, in the April 2021 PLC, one participant shared how “…Zoom has increased youth engagement, they can be at any place in the country/city, it makes things accessible.”

While the evaluation did not explicitly measure the impact of this specialized PLC, program adaptations to virtual or socially distanced platforms were the most cited examples of COVID-19 resiliency (n=20 grantees, 80%).
Collaboration around organizational practices to strengthen racial justice work was the focus of the June 2021 PLC, which specifically examined racial justice, anti-Blackness, and Black liberation. This was in alignment with the fourth most cited priority area (collaborating on social justice and/or racial equity campaign strategies and tactics) in the grantee network baseline survey (n=5 grantees, 22%).

Grantee Connections Made During the PLC
As part of the grantee network post-survey, administered Spring 2022, 24 grantees ranked the extent to which the PLC served as a place to connect with other youth organizing groups around six priority areas. See Figure 25.

The PLC met the top needs and area of interest expressed by grantees, as evidenced by the post-survey findings. The top three areas in which most grantees were able to connect other grantees at the PLC were the following:

- All 24 grantees said they connected either “a little” (42%) or “a lot” (58%) around youth leadership and development models. This was the most cited grantee priority area at baseline (n=14).
- Twenty-two grantees connected “a little” (54%) or “a lot” (38%) around youth outreach/engagement strategies. At baseline, this was the second most frequently listed priority area desired for collaboration among grantees (n=9).
- Twenty-three grantees connected “a little” (29%) or “a lot” (67%) around healing or trauma-focused approaches. At baseline, this was the third most frequently listed priority area desired for collaboration among grantees (n=7). See the Case Study report (Appendix A) for examples of the increased attention over time given to healing and trauma focused approaches.
Figure 25: Extent of Connection Related to Six Priority Areas During the Peer Learning Community.

CHANGES IN YOCBI GRANTEE NETWORK FROM 2019 TO 2022

Using a matched pre-post sample of 23 grantees, grantee network changes from 2019 to 2022 were assessed in three areas: youth organizing work conducted in partnership or collaboration, sense of connection among YOCBI grantees, and social network analysis.

Youth Organizing Work Conducted in Partnership or Collaboration: 2019 to 2022

At the end of the three-year Initiative, YOCBI grantees increased the amount of time spent in partnership or collaboration with other youth organizing groups in their local community. See Figure 26.

Half of the grantees (52%, +16% from pre-YOCBI) reported their youth organizing was done more than half the time in partnership or collaboration with other youth organizing groups in their local community.

- Most striking is the number of grantees who reported partnering/collaborating “most” or “all of the time” at baseline in 2019 (18%) versus at the end of the Initiative in 2022 (40%). This was a 22% increase.
- Conversely, the number of grantees who spent one-quarter or less of their time in partnerships or collaborations decreased from 14 grantees (61%) in 2019 to 10 grantees (44%) in 2022. This was a 17% decrease.
At post-test (2022), grantees were also asked to share the extent to which youth organizing partnerships or collaborations were occurring with groups external to their local community or region. While this question was not asked at baseline, it nonetheless yielded important insights. 

- Over half (57%) had external partnerships or collaborations less than a quarter of the time.
- The remaining grantees, 35% had external partnerships/collaborations one quarter of the time, and only 9% were half or most of the time.

These findings suggest that there is still room for growth to build external partnerships and collaborations.

**Sense of Connection Among YOCBI Grantees from 2019 to 2022**

**YOCCI grantees strengthened connections with fellow YOCBI cohort members from pre- to post-test.** Figure 27 visually depicts how the sense of connection among the grantees increased in every category from 2019 to 2022.

- From pre (35%) to post-test (13%), the number of grantees who felt slightly connected decreased.
- From pre (39%) to post-test (57%), the number of grantees who felt moderately connected increased.
- From pre (9%) to post-test (21%), the number of grantees who felt very connected increased.

From a regional perspective, grantees from all but one region reported strengthened connections. While none of the Orange County grantees felt connected with the cohort at baseline, all felt moderately or very connected by the end of the Initiative. There were similar increases among LA County (+23% from pre-YOCBI) and Ventura/Santa Barbara County-based grantees (+50% from pre-YOCBI) who felt more highly connected at the end. The percentage of grantees from the Inland Empire who felt moderately to very connected remained the same (66%).
Figure 27: Grantees Sense of Connection with YOCBI Cohort from 2019 to 2022

Social Network Analysis (SNA) Findings

YOCBI Grantee Network: Levels of Connection from 2019 to 2022

As described earlier in the baseline network survey findings, grantees assigned each of their fellow cohort members to one of six levels that best described the strength of their connection at the conclusion of YOCBI. Findings in this section include grantee connections at level 3 (exchanged information or resources) or higher in the post-test SNA.

The post-YCOBI network diagram depicts the strengthened ties between grantees. In fact, this network appears to be an intermediate step toward grantees’ actual and aspirational networks at baseline (Figure 28).

- LA County-based grantees continued to both appear more central to the network and to have more within-region ties than other outside regions. The post-test network more closely aligned with their aspirational network goals. This is understandable considering the composition of the YOCBI cohort (more LA CBOs) and the more central geopolitical role that LA County plays in Southern California.
- Central Coast-based grantees no longer formed a kite network with a single organization anchoring them to the rest of the Southern California youth organizing network. While still connected to each other, all but one, the Ventura/Santa Barbara-based grantee, developed meaningful ties with organizations from other regions.
- Some Orange County and Inland Empire-based grantees reported fewer ties and still appeared on the periphery of the network (or not in the network at all), while others became more central and increased their number of connections with grantees outside of region. The grantees who became more central established more ties with LA-based CBOs—i.e., moved closer to their aspirational network goals.
- One Southern California-wide grantee maintained connections with LA and Orange County-based organizations. They no longer had ties with any CBOs from the Central Coast and still did not have any connections in the Inland Empire.
Figures 28a, 28b, and 28c contain social network diagrams depicting grantee relationships during YOCBI. Figure 28a displays the grantee network prior to PLC launch (2019) —discrete regional clustering apparent. Figure 28b shows grantees’ aspirational network at pre (2019) revealing a desire to bridge regional boundaries. Figure 28c depicts the network after the completion of YOCBI (2022) showing that grantees built working relationships across regions, while maintaining close ties with local organizations.

**Figure 28a: Prior to PLC Launch**

**Figure 28b: Aspirational**

**Figure 28c: Post YOCBI Network**
STOP 5: From 2019-2022, this is the impact YOCBI had on our organizational capacity and on youth social change involvement.

ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY GROWTH

About the Self-Study Tool

In 2019, PARC developed a self-study assessment tool on grantee organizational capacity that tapped into the capacity areas of greatest need/importance to social justice organizations like YOCBI grantees. (See Appendices C and D for a copies of the self-study tool). In early 2020, input and feedback on the tool was provided by both Weingart Foundation program officers and four grantees which was incorporated into the final measure. In consideration of the COVID-19 pandemic impact on non-profits organizations, including the resulting stay-at-home orders, the tool was disseminated to grantees in May 2020 with a due date of July/August 2020.

- In 2020 (after one year of project implementation), the self-study tool was completed by 23 of 25 grantees. As has been well documented, this was a turbulent time in the SoCal region and globally. It included the devastating summer surge of COVID-19 that resulted in significant racial disparities in both infection and death rates for communities of color compared to White communities; ongoing anti-racism uprisings and protests related to Black violence (sparked by the murder of George Floyd in May 2020); the rise in anti-Asian hate/violence; and a contentious presidential election. Further, during this period grantees were continuing to pivot/adjust to remote and virtual operations and programming and were also stepping up to provide critical resources and services to their communities who were especially hard hit by the pandemic at all levels. It is important to note that grantee self-rating scores in 2020 on any domain/item may reflect some of these impacts.

- In spring of 2022 (after two years of project implementation), the self-study tool was completed once again by 20 of 25 grantees.

A true pre-test (baseline) and post-test comparison in grantee self-study assessment scores was not possible. Nonetheless, an analysis of organizational capacity assessment early in the Initiative (2020) compared to the end of the Initiative (2022) provides important insights about the organizational capacity of youth organizing groups during a period marked by great instability/ﬂuctuations due to external conditions and flashpoints and another period marked by greater stability.

Eighteen grantees who completed the YOCBI organizational capacity self-study tool both in 2020 (i.e., time 1) and in 2022 (i.e., time 2) were included in the analysis of capacity needs, strength, and growth over time. Seven grantees were excluded from this analysis because they completed the self-study tool for one period only (five grantees completed a time 1 only self-study tool while two grantees completed a time 2 only).

The self-study tool assessed organizational capacity in four domains with self-ratings ranging from 4=high capacity to 1=novice/low capacity.

- **Staff and Infrastructure** addresses capacity related to human resources (staff recruitment/retention, workforce development, leadership training, etc.) and physical/technological infrastructure. It includes concrete materials and tangible assets that support programs and operations, as well as equitable policies and practices that promote staff wellness and needs.

- **Client/Constituent/Ally Development and Engagement** refers to the capacity to grow and develop grassroots power so that youth and adult residents can become active
agents of change in their community. It also includes high-impact collaborations/strategic alliances with like-minded community-based organizations.

- **Organizational Strategy and Adaptability** examines the capacity to develop visions, strategies, and tactics for winning campaigns and building long-term grassroots power for broader social movement efforts. These efforts are both context and data informed.

- **Equity and Inclusion** addresses the capacity for community organizing, coalition, and power-building efforts using racial equity and/or intersectional lenses. These are directly informed by community history and culture and addresses systemic and institutional racism.

A comparison of grantee organizational capacity building average score in 2020 and again in 2022, among the 18 grantees revealed:

- Statistically significant growth in the staff/infrastructure capacity domain (time 1=2.65, time 2=2.89, p<0.05),
- Some growth in the equity/inclusion domain (time 1=3.22, time 2=3.49, p=0.1) that was not statistically significant,
- Slight increases in the organizational strategy/adaptability domain that were not statistically significant (time 1=3.02, time 2=3.12, p=0.48), and
- Relative stability in the client/constituent/ally engagement and development domain (time 1=3.19, time 2=3.14, p=0.70).

See Figure 29 below for a summary of changes from time 1 (2020) to time 2 (spring 2022), including key takeaways. See Appendix K for a detailed overview of grantee self-rating scores on all self-study tool items for both time points.

**Figure 29: Grantee Changes in Organizational Capacity from 2020 to 2022 (n=18 matched sample)**

**Organizational Capacity Rating Scale:**

4—High capacity; 3—Moderate/advanced capacity; 2—Low to intermediate capacity; 1—Novice to low capacity

![Graph showing changes in organizational capacity](image-url)
ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN PROJECT GOALS

In this section of the report, findings are centered on grantee progress (or achievements) toward their individualized goals set prior to the start of the Initiative. At the end of project year 1 (2020) and project year 2 (2021) grantees looked back and reported on their progress towards goal completion using a progress report template designed and provided by the Southern California Youth Organizing Funder Collaborative. Grantees were not required to submit a final progress report at the end of project year 3 (2022). Therefore, progress towards goal attainment is based on two years of grantee effort and may reflect an undercount of total goal attainment.

The evaluation team extracted information from the two progress reports for qualitative thematic analysis, and where feasible, converted into quantitative data points. Information from the two progress reports were combined to assess achievements in each area. Evaluation of progress towards goal completion was conducted on the top six grantee goal areas listed below from highest to lowest:

- Goal 1: Growing youth membership (20 grantees)
- Goal 2: Conducting youth formal leadership development (18 grantees)
- Goal 3: Maintaining appropriate and consistent staffing (13 grantees)
- Goal 4: Developing high impact relationships with grassroots CBOs and allies (7 grantees)
- Goal 5: Having sufficient resources for auxiliary services (6 grantees)
- Goal 6: Establishing program evaluation/CBPR as part of CBO culture (5 grantees)

Goal 1: Growing Youth Membership
Twenty grantees identified growing their youth membership as a goal prior to the start of the Initiative in June 2019. Findings in this section reflect 16 of 20 grantees. Four grantees did not provide enough information to obtain a quantifiable measure of progress in their youth membership across the three data sources (i.e., 2019 grantee proposal, 2020 progress report, and 2021 progress report).

- At baseline in 2019, 16 grantees reported a cumulative count of 6,914 youth base members (6,569 youth, 396 youth leaders, and 118 alumni youth members). This number must be interpreted with caution because 42% of the total youth base at baseline was accounted for by one grantee, while three other grantees accounted for 14%, 12%, and 11% of the youth base, respectively. The remaining 12 grantees each accounted for 4% or less of the youth base, with 7 grantees each accounting for approximately 1% to 4% of the count and 5 grantees each accounting for less than 1% of the count. **While the range was from 26 to 2,900 youth per grantee at baseline, the median (midpoint) size of 125 is a better indicator of the youth base per grantee.**

- At the end of project year 2 in 2021, these same 16 grantees reported a cumulative count of 7,113 youth base members (+3% increase). This number likely reflects a combination of returning and new youth. This number must also be interpreted with caution as 34% of the total youth base at baseline was accounted for by one grantee, while two other grantees accounted for 19% and 17% of the youth base respectively. The remaining 13 grantees accounted for 7% or less of the youth base (with 5 of these grantees accounting for less than 1%). **While the range was from 3 to 2,404 youth at the end of year two (2021), the median (midpoint) size of 177 is a better indicator of growth per grantee.** This represents a 42% increase in the size of the base.
See Figure 30 for an overview of these findings including selected grantee impact stories about growing their youth membership through support from the YOCBI grant.

**Figure 30: Progress Towards Goal Attainment from 2019 to 2021: Growing the Youth Membership**

Despite the devastating consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic on communities of color and other marginalized communities, as well as the nonprofit sector, YOCBI grantees, possessed competences and a renewed vision on how to engage young people, especially with diverse digital and social media platforms. This is evidenced among the sample of 16 grantees who had a goal of growing their youth membership pre-pandemic and were able to exceed their baseline numbers by at least 3% within two years of project implementation amid a global pandemic. This is striking given that less than half (43%) rated themselves as having fully accomplished their goal by the end of year 2, while over half (57%) rated themselves to have somewhat or mostly accomplished reaching this goal. (See Figure 31). It is very likely that these numbers were higher at the end of project year 3 in 2022. Furthermore, digital organizing was a central theme of the PLC, and this increased capacity may be, at least in part, attributed to some of the peer sharing and learning that was occurred in the PLC. With the support of YOCBI grants, young people rose to the multitude of challenges that emerged in 2020, continued to help build resilience in their communities, made their voices heard, spurred collective action, and drove social change during the pandemic and the racial uprisings.

**Figure 31: YOCBI Grantee Self-Ratings of Progress (Base Building Goals)**
Goal 2: Conducting Youth Formal Leadership Development

Eighteen grantees identified youth formal leadership development as a goal prior to the start of the Initiative. Findings in this section reflect 17 of 18 grantees. One grantee did not provide enough information to obtain a quantifiable measure of progress related to formal youth leadership development across the two data sources (i.e., 2020 progress report and 2021 progress report). For this goal area, quantitative baseline information related to leadership development was not provided, so findings are centered around achievements reported by grantees across two project years.

- At the end of project year 2 in 2021, 17 grantees collectively provided formal leadership development to 1,415 youth members (962 youth, 434 youth leaders, and 118 alumni youth members). This number must also be interpreted with caution because 36% of youth involved in formal leadership development was accounted for by one grantee. Four grantees accounted for 9% to 14% of the youth developed, while five grantees accounted for 1% to 5%, and the remaining seven accounted for 1% or less. With a range from 3 to 514 youth at the end of year two (2021), the median (midpoint) size of 33 is a better indicator of the number of youth who received formal youth leadership development per grantee.

See Figure 32 for an overview of these findings including selected grantee impact stories describing formal youth leadership development with the support of the YOCBI grant.

Figure 32: Progress Towards Goal Attainment from 2019 to 2021: Conducting Youth Formal Leadership Development
Across two project years (June 2019-May 2021), 17 grantees provided formal leadership development to 1,415 youth (median youth size per grantee of 33). YOCBI formal youth leadership development programs required time, resources, and caring adults to meaningfully implement them.

This was important to grantees who were committed to the idea that young people could gain the skills and knowledge to lead civic engagement and community organizing activities. While over half (57%) of grantees rated themselves as having fully accomplished their goal by the end of year two, 43% rated themselves as having somewhat or mostly accomplished this goal. (See Figure 33). Thus, it is very likely that these numbers were higher at the end of project year 3 in 2022.

In the qualitative analysis, we also found a relationship between youth leadership development and other grantee goal areas. For example, Figure 34 illustrates the effect that capacity goal attainment fosters youth leadership development.

**Progress Towards Other Top Grantee Project Goals**

Figure 35 provides an overview of progress in grantee project goals in four other areas: maintaining appropriate and consistent staffing, developing high impact relationships with grassroots CBOs and allies, having sufficient resources for auxiliary services, and establishing program evaluation/CBPR as part of CBO culture.
Progress Towards Other Top Project YOCBI Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Goals (May 2019)</th>
<th>Progress: June 2020 – May 2021 (two project years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining Appropriate and Consistent Staffing</td>
<td>85% made progress (11 grantees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 grantees</td>
<td>Median: 2 staff hired /grantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range: 1-21 staff hired /grantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 49 staff hired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 youth organizing (9 grantees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 leadership/mgmt. (3 grantees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 general support (3 grantees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing High-Impact Relationships w/ Grassroots CBOs/Allies</td>
<td>100% made progress (7 grantees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 grantees</td>
<td>Median: 10 allies formed /grantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range: 1-49 allies formed /grantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 119 allies formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76 schools (2 grantees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 CBOs (4 grantees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 coalitions (2 grantees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 county agency (1 grantees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 civil rights group (1 grantees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having Sufficient Resources for Auxiliary Services</td>
<td>100% made progress (6 grantees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 grantees</td>
<td>Median: 4 resource types provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range: 1-5 resource types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 13 resource types provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing Program Evaluation &amp; CBPR as Part of CBO Culture</td>
<td>80% made progress (4 grantees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 grantees</td>
<td>Median: 3 evaluation tools used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range: 1-4 evaluation tools used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 11 evaluation tools used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surveys (2 grantees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restorative Dialogue (2 grantees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Post (1 grantees)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shares grantee examples of how the YOCBI supported progress in these top four goal areas.

Table 5: Grantee quotes describing progress to other top YOCBI goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Area</th>
<th>Grantee Impact Stories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining Appropriate &amp; Consistent Staffing</td>
<td>&quot;We secured enough funds to hire a full time Operations Manager...who supports the Executive Director with grant writing and submitting reports in addition to building strengthening existing operation policies and office management. This role has been essential during the COVID-19 shutdown...With improved capacity in grant writing, we have also been able to increase funding among all regions.&quot; -- Grantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;This grant has allowed us to add to our youth organizing team to help expand outreach and support to schools. Our new staff provided additional support to LGBTQ+ students and youth during our youth leadership group...as well as outreach and support to schools and school districts.&quot; -- Grantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing High-Impact Relationships with Grassroots CBOs &amp; Allies</td>
<td>&quot;We definitely have engaged with other key organizations, such as other YOCBI grantees, CBOs, and service/resource organizations, that engage with youth across Ventura County...We already co-sponsored a community forum on tobacco and vaping with [another CBO], and... We hosted [a project] on sexual violence awareness and prevention with [a service/resource organization]... -- Grantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;We established partnerships with [3 CBOs], which were also our partners for our first Leadership Summit in the Inland Empire...We are also in the process of solidifying our relationship with [another YOCBI grantee] which is still building its own youth leadership development program that can directly serve LGBTQ+ youth. [We] are both members of Dignity in Schools – California...and have had discussions about supporting the development of their staff at their request as they carry out organizing work in continuation schools...we also established a connection with the local chapter of the ACLU and they have extended an offer to support [our organization] as it relates to any advocacy needs or opportunities.&quot; -- Grantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having Sufficient Resources for Auxiliary Services</td>
<td>&quot;We provided a $200 stipend to each participant as well as self-care packages with snacks, notebooks, and materials to provide financial support for students’ families and help address food insecurity during this economic recession...[Additionally, we] launched a new scholarship for 13 graduating high school students who are headed to college this fall...[we] provided a scholarship of $1,000 to each student.&quot; -- Grantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;[W]e purchased a 15-passenger van for the total amount of $27,471. This purchase has dramatically increased the ability of the organization to effectively engage the new youth membership...The van has been consistently used for [youth organizing] activities and the campaigns...and it has increased [our] ability to mobilize youth while ensuring a reliable and safe form of transportation for them.&quot; -- Grantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing Program Evaluation/CBPR as Part of CBO Culture</td>
<td>&quot;Evaluation is performed every month using restorative dialogue. Every 3-6 months, youth engage in more formal evaluation by filling out google surveys that help highlight best practices and areas of growth...[Additionally, every] summer...we request for volunteers of current YoC members and alumni to meet with the purpose to review the curriculum of the year. It's an all day retreat where community building activities are part of the design of the evaluation of the curriculum.&quot; -- Grantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;[O]ur approach to evaluating youth’s improvement is by having youth affirmation...As an Indigenous grass roots organization our goal is to uphold indigenous based healing approaches and practices. This looks like check-ins before and after meetings both collectively and individually. During youth meetings we offer what is called consciousness where youth let us know what head space they are in and after meetings we ask what they take away from the meetings. This practice teaches us as organizers what approaches youth like and dislike.&quot; -- Grantee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 36 offers a summary of grantee self-ratings of progress in the four goal areas. As with other goal areas, grantee accomplishments likely continued into year 3 but these were not captured due to the absence of a required year 3 report.
CHALLENGES, LESSONS LEARNED, AND COVID RESILIENCY

Grantees did not simply complete objectives in a vacuum in which they had complete control. Dynamic socio-political, ecological, and other contextual factors disrupted, influenced, shifted, and inspired YOCBI grantee activities. Despite major challenges, grantees rose to the occasion and continued meaningful youth organizing activities. Below are results from thematic analyses of the grantees’ annual progress reports (Summer 2020 and Summer 2021). Data includes themes related to (1) COVID-19 challenges and resiliency and (2) non-COVID organizational challenges and lessons learned.

COVID-19 Challenges and Resiliency

All 25 grantees discussed the unprecedented challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic in their annual progress reports. The most often cited issues stemmed from mental health challenges experienced by youth and their families (14 grantees) and disrupted youth engagement (13 grantees) (Figure 37). That notwithstanding, grantees demonstrated organization resilience. The most frequently mentioned examples of COVID-19 resiliency included adaptability in program approach to engage youth virtually (20 grantees) and the development of new methods for youth outreach, including offering mental health resources (15 grantees). These resiliency themes were in direct response to challenges, as grantees met youth needs during times of crises.
The pervasive disruption of COVID-19 on youth and community engagement was reflected in both the Time 1 and Time 2 organizational capacity self-score data. For example, the lack of access to the community caused by COVID-19 stay-at-home orders likely contributed to two of the four lowest scoring domains at Time 1 (Summer 2020), recruiting community residents as dues-paying members (2.38) and volunteer recruitment (2.56). The early pandemic also
exposed the need for digital infrastructure, which explains the remaining two lower-scoring capacity domains: database/management reporting systems (2.22) and website maintenance (2.39). More broadly, grantees scored “efficient/effective technology” at the level of intermediate capacity in 2020 (2.72). Please note, the average Time 1 self-scores reported in this section are from the matched sample (N=18).

At Time 2 (Spring 2022), grantees reported the greatest increase in their self-rating for efficient/effective technology (3.22, +0.50). Many grantees quickly pivoted and established the requisite infrastructure to provide their services virtually. These included digital organizing events as well as virtual wellness gatherings to help youth navigate the stress and trauma of the COVID-19 pandemic (i.e., the two most frequent themes that emerged in coded progress reports). By bolstering their virtual/online capabilities, grantees also reported substantial increases in their database (2.50, +0.28) and website (2.67, +0.28) management/maintenance capacities in 2022.

Grantees also reported considerable growth in their volunteer recruitment systems (2.94, +0.38) in 2022. Recruiting community members as CBO members, however, remained a challenge (1.94, -0.22).

**Organizational Challenges, Accomplishments, and Lessons Learned (Non-COVID)**
While most challenges, accomplishments, and lessons learned were overwhelmingly related to the pandemic, grantees did mention a few non-COVID-19 related factors. Most of these were connected to youth organizing campaigns/programming (n=15 grantees, 60%; see Figure 38). Challenges were related to partnerships issues (n=2 grantees) and campaign setbacks (n=2 grantees), while grantee accomplishments/lessons learned included establishing new coalitions/alliances (n=5 grantees) and achieving campaign wins (n=3 grantees).

Challenges and lessons learned related to staff and infrastructure were the next most common area reported by grantees (n=6, 24%).
Figure 38: Non-COVID-19 related challenges and lessons learned

Top Challenges & Lessons Learned

Youth Organizing Campaigns & Programming

**15 of 25 grantees discussed:**

**Challenges (n=4 grantees)**

- Challenges with Partners (n=2)
  
  "Our goal is not to have young people parrot our agenda, but to connect with a cause that is authentic to their being. While we assumed this to be the essence of most youth organizing entities, we are finding more and more that it is not. Accordingly, we have had to sever ties with a couple of partners whom we felt were using young people as mouthpieces to move their agenda."

- Campaign Setbacks (n=2)
  
  "Several campaign efforts were not successful and will be reinitiated, including: Senate Bill 516… AB 1007… And bills to limit probation terms to six months, eliminate the use of chemical spray in youth lock-ups, and decriminalize truancy statewide."

**Lessons Learned (n=12 grantees)**

- Built Partnerships (n=5)
  
  "One of the largest challenges that we faced was around coalition building around organizing efforts to impact the city budget. While there has normally been a coalition of youth, residents, and community organizations in Santa Ana to address budgetary issues there was a lack of coordination and direction in the coalition. In order to address this challenge we chose to take a leadership role within the coalition and spearhead efforts to host everyone, bring about consensus, and lead in research efforts."

- Campaign Wins (n=3)
  
  "[We] successfully defeated the [Associations] slap suit against our… Youth Environmental Justice team at the California Supreme court."

Staff & Infrastructure

**6 of 25 grantees discussed:**

**Challenges (n=4 grantees)**

- Staff Conflict (n=2)
  
  "[We] encountered significant challenges when half of its staff resigned in the fall of 2019. With that, most of the civic engagement and organizing activities came to a standstill. It was in May/June of 2020 that new leadership took over and began stabilizing the organization and moving the work forward."

- Hiring Needs (n=1)
  
  "…we desired to hire a full-time youth organizing director to coordinate our efforts across all six of our youth organizing platforms… While we have clearly had success implementing our programming and much of our success can be attributed to this grant, we remain acutely aware of how much more we could potentially achieve if we had a director in place. Though we have interviewed a number of candidates and made offers to a couple, we have yet to secure a director."

**Lessons Learned (n=12 grantees)**

- Staff Growth (n=2)
  
  "…we were also challenged to address the impact of more than doubling the size of our organization. During our work on the Census and the election our staff mushroomed to more than 150 staff, mostly part time youth. Our full-time staff grew to 16 organizers and 5 full-time administrative staff. To address these challenges we moved to team-based structures and we hired a full-time HR staff person and an additional administrative assistant."

- Staff Growth (n=2)
  
  "One challenge was experiencing staff turnover in one staff position during the grant year. We immediately hired another staff member to participate in the transition process, which allowed us to train and carry the work effectively without issue or interruption."

---

Grantee
In conclusion, grantees identified a few ways in which funders could support Southern California Youth Organizing Groups moving forward.

All 25 organizations answered two debrief questions as part of the grantee network postsurvey. The first item asked them to discuss the most critical ways funders could support Southern California youth organizing groups moving forward.

- Almost half of YOCBI grantees indicated foundations should continue to prioritize youth organizing funding, especially unrestricted, flexible dollars that can meet individual groups specific needs (e.g., hiring, extending campaigns, funding youth programming, etc.). See the Case Study Report in Appendix A for additional grantee insights on the benefit of unrestricted funds.
- Grantees encouraged funders to extend the grant period beyond three years, which will allow for sustained movement on campaigns.
- Many stressed the importance of ongoing communication between funders and organizing groups during RFP development, so that grant opportunities align with current community and CBO needs/social movements and prioritize innovative approaches. This open dialog could also lead to relationship building between CBOs and funders, which could increase access to additional revenue streams (e.g., foundations connecting CBOs with other funders who are invitation only).
- Lastly, two of the three Inland Empire groups stressed the need for funding in their region, especially to new organizations. They hoped that funders would consider their specific barriers to programming—political, environmental, geographical, etc., when developing grant opportunities, issues that could be resolved through planning conversations between CBOs and funders.

Five grantees (20%) uplifted the role of the PLC as a vital component for future initiatives. In addition to continuing to provide a space for grantees to build capacity/share organizing and youth development models, they envisioned the PLC to maintain momentum with both relationship and movement building. With these relationships in place, three of these grantees (12%) thought the next version of the PLC could serve as an intentional collaboration space, where grantees could build power and strategize campaigns. Adjacent to the PLCs, two grantees (8%) thought that future funding should also provide staff mental health resources, workshops, etc. to prevent burn-out and sustain wellness.

The other major theme was the need for more investment in positive youth development (PYD) initiatives (n=6, 24%). Groups identified the need to first focus on developing foundational PYD areas (e.g., socio-emotional wellness, critical consciousness, etc.) before moving to leadership development. This would provide youth with foundational personal self-awareness and wellness skills before they begin to organize, build power, and push for systems change. Two of these CBOs (8%) proposed a possible means to accomplish the latter, via formal youth exchange programs between grantees, including youth summits. One grantee also suggested incorporating skill/career building exercises into programming. Lastly, one grantee recommended funding focused on the backend of the process—i.e., funding organizing groups that are actively pushing toward systems change.
Grantees also shared what their collective efforts could focus on should funding and resources continue for YOCBI and the PLC. Close to two-thirds (n=15) wanted to continue to work together to share youth organizing strategies and eventually bring about systems change. The next iteration of the PLCs would extend beyond convenings to include specific training sessions, site visits, mentorship for staff, and shared narrative building. Five of these grantees (20%) mentioned that they wanted the PLC to serve as an intentional space for alliance formation, where grantees could strategize innovative ideas that they could pilot together. These alliances would be based on shared campaign interests and would acknowledge differences in organizational capacity before formation (i.e., CBOs would not be pressured into collaboration if it was not sustainable). As with the first debrief question, grantees from regions peripheral to LA County discussed bringing in more CBOs from their home regions (e.g., the Central Coast). Ultimately, the goal of additional capacity building and alliance formation would be to bring about systems change—e.g., ending the school to prison pipeline, de-funding the police, bridging the digital divide, etc.

The remaining nine grantees shared suggestions related to youth and alumni engagement (36%). These included employing PYD strategies (i.e., healing, establishing critical consciousness, empowerment) and holding youth exchanges before developing organizing strategies. They also discussed having established mental health resources for leaders to prevent burnout as well as incentives for participation to ensure sustainability.
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APPENDIX

Appendix A – Case Study Report

INTRODUCTION
This portion of the Youth Organizing Capacity Building Initiative (YOCBI) evaluation focused on a case study that included a diverse subsample of grantee organizations. As indicated earlier, there were three overarching evaluation questions. This section focuses on question three:

What can be learned from a deeper case study analysis of a representative sample of grantees in terms of growth in organizational capacity, b) youth project goal attainment, c) future trajectory plans, d) collaboration/alliances, e) local and regional social change agenda, and f) positive youth development (i.e., youth involvement, extent to which this strengthens local and/or regional social justice movement, and youth well-being)?

METHOD
Sample
Four of the total 25 grantee organizations were selected for deeper case study analysis. These included:

- California Native Vote Project
- Communities for a Better Environment
- Congregations Organized for Prophetic Engagement
- One Step a la Vez.

These organizations were chosen to provide diversity in ethnicity (African American, American Indian/Alaska Native, and Latinx), geography (Los Angeles, Ventura, San Bernadino, Riverside and Orange counties), and campaign focus (political action, equity, environmental justice, and civic engagement).

A total of four focus groups, covering one of four topics, were conducted over Zoom. These included:

- System Change Campaigns and Movement Building
- Personal Growth and Transformation
- Civic Engagement and Leadership Development
- Youth Members Discussion (A Combination of Topics)

See Appendix B for a complete overview of the focus group methods.

Analysis
Zoom recordings generated focus-group transcripts which totaled 105,838 words. These transcripts were edited for punctuation and formatted for analysis with NVivo, a qualitative data analysis software package. The analysis began with selecting keywords from the three overarching PARC evaluation questions, the Funder Collaborative’s organizational-capacity framework, and the Grantee Self-Study tool. These keywords, and others similar in meaning were classified into themes relevant to this evaluation project. NVivo used keywords in each of the initial themes to search the transcripts. When a keyword was located an excerpt was created by capturing the keyword and the surrounding text. This excerpt was added to the associated theme. Building this framework of themes was an iterative process. During and after these analyses, transcripts and excerpts were read and discussed multiple times; theme name,
definitions or keywords were revised; and different transcript queries (commands for NVivo to search specific combinations of keywords) were explored and conducted. Taking advantage of NVivo’s ability to mathematically construct clusters from among transcript excerpts, nine themes were extracted.

FINDINGS

Understanding Social Inquiry and the Analysis of Text
Qualitative research, and its resulting data, have advantages and limitations. Specifically:
- Although results are presented in a discrete, linear sequence, it is more appropriate to view these results (themes, issues raised by participants, etc.) as interconnected and interacting. The findings typically touch on multiple areas of focus, themes, and topics, because social ideas and action are complex.
- Qualitative results indicate not only the frequency of what participants discuss, but also how they think about, understand, and apply the terms they use.
- One limitation is sample size. While the analysis worked with over 100,000 words (i.e., a depth approach), its findings typically are not generalizable to broader populations.

Emergent Themes
Nine specific themes emerged from focus group transcripts. These themes (see Table A1) aligned with, but were not in the exact form of, the larger evaluation questions.

Table A1: Nine focus group themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Foundation Interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organization Capacity-Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Youth Community Organizing (YCO): Core Activities and Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Goal Attainment and Successes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Difficulties and Problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Base Building and Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Well-Being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (JEDI) Matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Unique to the Times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the nine themes were analyzed for content, ideas, and specific comments elicited by focus group questions and prompt. These are organized and presented by theme. However, some comments related to more than one theme.

The transcript quotes that follow were lightly edited for clarity/brevity, but without impact on the content and meaning.

1. Foundation Interventions
The YOCBI provided grantee organizations with unrestricted funds, a peer-learning community, and coalition alliance partners for collaborative regional growth to promote the development of youth organizers. Discussion focused on where, when, what, and how each of those initiative interventions worked.

Unrestricted Funds
Focus group participants agreed that the unrestricted funds were essential to the survival of their organizations, the work they were committed to doing, and – more importantly – their constituents. This contrasted with the generally uncertain nature of financial support:
“Kaiser [funder] pulled out - they also switched in general from funding grassroots initiatives to wellness/health initiatives. Two other foundations we are waiting to find out if we can still apply...Some foundations are iffy but also new support is surfacing I am more worried about how the foundations will be impacted by the economy going forward and what this will mean in the next few years about available funds” - Executive Director

Flexible, unrestricted funding gave organizations freedom to decide how to spend their grant money. One discussant highlighted a specific social justice issue that unrestricted funding enabled them to work on:

“...we can begin to plan a vision for what our communities look like and rethink public safety ... we did have [other monies that] were restricted that we did have to submit [a lot of paperwork] ...” - Director

More than one organization had to shift efforts from original goals to helping the young people and their families survive the early stages of the pandemic - like getting gift cards for basic needs (e.g., food, gas, hygiene products).

“When funders ... allowed us to shift some funding, we could do hotel vouchers and rental assistance and so on. So, we have to shift from [campaign work] to work on direct response ... we are a small organization [and] for me to shift from program coordinator and go into full-fledged direct response was interesting. [It] became case management overnight, where we was able to actually serve about 90 families multiple times, [at] multiple levels.” - Grantee

This participant shared how that work turned into another part of community engagement as they were able to engage stores, other community members, and a regional housing organization to ensure that no one was evicted or had their utilities turned off. Similarly, another organization was able to assist a young person with a temporary place to stay and transportation to and from school. These types of interventions may have shifted focus from specific campaigns but keep their base functioning so they could return to that work after the world-wide health emergency.

An unexpected comment came from one participant who saw the benefits of unrestricted funding in strengthening their relationship with foundations--highlighting the importance of trust the YOCBI Funder Collaborative had in their organization.

“...they're like a dream funder they're very trusting of our leadership, they trust us to lead and to use their money as we think, as we see fit, like they have really just been a model of I think what a healthy relationship with the funding entity looks like.” – Executive Director
Peer-Learning Community (PLC)

Grantee participants saw many benefits of Youth Organizing! California (YO!Cali) convenings such as learning from other organizations, obtaining resources, and even recruiting and hiring staff and interns.

“We also have…large long-standing [relationship with] organizations who we’ve learned a lot from. And those include [fellow grantee organization]…and now [another] Latina group have been doing this for a long time too. And there's a few others … who we had a chance to learn quite a bit from.” - Manager

“Yes, I definitely have been in the YO!Cali space for a long time and [youth organizer] has come into that space and that's been great, and we've actually been able to [hire] one of our interns to be in the YO!Cali fellowships and so you're kind of definitely involved” – Youth Organizer

One focus group participant spoke of how the PLC convenings left them feeling connected and hopeful.

“...financially [the grant has] been really great but [it is] also…the resources [provided]. We've been in YO!Cali spaces…it was amazing it's helped me personally.” - Organizer

Coalition Alliances

Focus group participants spoke of creating and strengthening relationships at YO!Cali events – particularly allying with others to support larger social justice endeavors:

“... I think of broader social justice activities that are not specific campaigns. That falls a lot into our solidarity work … like students deserve police free campuses. I know that's what a lot of membership have been wanting to support more of and although that's not a campaign really and not entirely our expertise, it's a part of the work we do...” - Grantee

However, collaboration on specific projects was less common. This was often due to not having the same organizational campaign priorities or the bandwidth for engaging in additional campaigns that other organizations had expertise in. They still strove to support their allies in their work.

“... we get other folks leading that work and that's their direct campaign that's their focus. ... even now, with our meeting today we're going to have an overview of how that broader social justice campaign ties into our work. Then, how can we support their specific asks... that's what I think of when we’re engaging ....” - Grantee

2. Organizational Capacity-Building

This theme centered on the growth and development of organizations’ capacity to meet its mission and goals (particularly as they related to the development of youth leaders). While there were many aspects to capacity-building, the discussants focused on the immediate issue of staffing. There were a variety of ways in which unrestricted funds were essential to hiring and retaining talented people – both staff and youth members.

“[we established] a leadership pipeline for our [youth] membership to actually get paid to do...the on the ground, civic engagement and work as well [with] bankers or civic engagement leads when it came to…passing a specific proposition or a candidate campaign.” - Grantee
Others spoke about retaining staff and that they were losing talented people due to the limited salaries they could provide:

“Our main youth organizer was one that chose layoff rather than reduction in hours - all youth organizing has been spread to other staff who have their own programs - and me too.” - Executive Director

In that case, the staff member had to secure a higher paying job that offered ‘livable wages.’ This was also related to the issue of ‘brain-drain’ - staff, youth and/or program alumni who learn, develop, and train at the grantee organization, before bringing those experiences and toolkits to other organizations/corporations that can pay them a salary commensurate with their talents and skills.

Another challenge to retaining staff was the frequently shared experience of the ‘many hats’ they had to wear (i.e., cover multiple positions), as illustrated in the Executive Director quote above. This was particularly true for smaller and ‘younger’ organizations that were trying to grow. Grantees talked of the mixed blessing of organizational growth – helping develop their young people and being of service to the community in more ways but not having sufficient staff to cover those needs. Unrestricted funding enabled them to hire staff for specific jobs like finance or human resources.

Between round one and round two of the focus groups, one of the grantee organizations had a significant staff turnover, including the executive director. This further emphasized the need for staffing stability for organizational functioning and, even more importantly, youth development.

Finally, one organization was able to use the unrestricted funding to rapidly develop their fledgling youth programming within just three years of YOCBI grant period. It enabled them to:

“engage more staff-focused on our new youth program…” - Grantee

The change in their discussion from the first to second round of focus groups was inspiring and they credited their success in this endeavor to YOCBI.

3. Youth Community Organization (YCO): Core Activities and Methods
This theme centered on how organizations helped their young people develop as organizers and leaders.

Focus group participants identified a variety of formal and informal ways their staff and organizations develop young leaders.

“We've tried to foster leadership in a number of ways. Trying to be supportive in the day to day, like getting ready for meetings and ensuring that youth are leading our meetings. Our young people are engaged have been engaged in community and in all the campaigns. In addition to that we have been very intentional about any and all leadership development opportunities and training outside of the organization. So, we have joined Power California and Youth Organized! California and their training cohorts. Like two of our youth were part of Youth Organized! California yearlong fellowship and did a whole year of training and received coaching from them. Doing our own internal leadership development capacity building, but then also to take advantage of non-native
partnerships where are our staff could also be part of multi-racial, multi-community cross issue capacity building on leadership development.” – Grantee

Much of that development came through work on specific campaigns, civic, or direct service activities/projects.

“... we did have Native youth involved with the census awareness and getting out the count. So, they helped with making a census PSA [public service announcement] which was a statewide effort ... shot here in LA.” – Grantee

Another benefit that came from that PSA included enabling their youth organizers to meet with other young organizers from different regions. They also received requests for collaboration from another organization serving other youth constituent groups. Collaboration on educating youth organizers went beyond local to statewide organizations, including YO!Cali.

“We began working with another statewide organization, called Youth Organized! California ...[they] started training our youth on the tools and the skill building of beginning campaigns and how to develop a campaign. And then we open[ed] it up to more community members and invited folks from the community and specific individuals to start building our team and what we want it to look like. We want it to be intergenerational, we wanted to make sure that we had everyone from the local community as well as youth and elders and everyone in between.” - Grantee

Of note, is this organization’s desire to include local community members of all ages. They discussed the importance of mentorship from elders and other community for their youth organizers. Grantees felt that funders might not always recognize the importance of this type of mentorship.

Other leadership development opportunities offered youth members compensation and additional avenues for collaboration with other community entities.

“... this grant has given us dedicated resources to really build and be able to emphasize [our] youth leadership development...[also,] many of the other organizers have sustained their thought leadership through a rethink public safety coalition, [which] really pushed us around police accountability ...” – Grantee

The young, developing organizers also spoke to the impact of the activities that organizations had implemented and how it helped them. For one young lady, one on one work with staff helped prepare her for in person lobbying.

“It felt like not overwhelming. I felt very prepared because they [prepared me] beforehand. ... like ‘you’re going to talk to these individuals’ and ‘you’re going to talk to them about this.’ And I felt like my public speaking became better as well as...my leadership skills...because I have been part of [grantee organization] for a very long time... [from] my freshman year of high school [up until] right now. I'm a sophomore in college. So, they helped me a lot... gain all the leadership skills to be [able] to go forth and bring good back to the community.” - Youth Member

Other youth members also spoke about how their work helped them develop communication skills and confidence in working on campaigns.
“I would go around and inform people about… (the) drilling because there's like a community and they live next to oil drilling sites or they go to a church where there's oil drilling. It was really challenging for me because I had to tell these people face to face. It was not like a petition, and it wasn't not an email, and I have really severe anxiety. So, it was really hard because some of these people are like I've lived here and I've never…dealt with cancer … and because they like look at [me] like 'why is this 18 year old talking to me, trying to educate me on stuff' … I just had to find myself. I just had to…put my foot on the ground, learn how to be more calm when I'm telling…people, you know, hey, like 'this, it will happen.'” - Youth member

“...kind of like every time you get a new set of phone calls…[you] have to adjust the way you're going to approach [each] person, right? What you say? You just build that switch… if this person is working this way I know how to react.” - Youth member

Discussants from many of the organizations spoke about the ‘pipe-line’ of youth moving from members to alums to staff, and staff moving up to positions of more leadership.

“And it's been like an organic evolution of how they came to be staff. [Name] was [working on] parent involvement in our education campaign, she became the executive director, right? We're trying to create these pathways to formalize the leadership that's already been happening within our communities in many ways.” - Grantee

4. Goal Attainment and Successes
This theme refers to the organization’s evaluation of their ability to meet their mission and goals (particularly as they related to the development of youth leaders). The theme also includes their goal outcomes. An important part of these discussions centered around what “success” looked like to the grantee organizations.

For many, success was tied to the outcomes of their campaigns.

“We were able to do it in a way where residents and committee members…have been involved [with political] hearings and meetings. Through all these different challenges, I do think that we were…very successful… we're not just winning our campaigns from organizing,…we have to take political action and influence at the political level as well, to win and that has definitely been to our benefit.” – Grantee

This was especially true during the pandemic.

“Campaign victories were achieved during the pandemic…we stopped the expansion of the 710 freeway…[a] 20-year campaign … I think [that] is really incredible…the concrete victories environmental justice victories that happened in these last few years. While moving everything online, I think is really incredible and a huge testament to…our organizers and our members.” – Grantee

Others saw success in the development of their young people.

“... [The youth] have been at the forefront of pushing our political consciousness… many of the organizers have sustained their thought leadership through a rethink public safety coalition, but [they] really pushed us around police accountability really exploring and getting the base conscious and ready to explore the possibility of police abolition and also grappling with the challenges around that there have been multi-generational conversations really anchored in led by our youth organizers. And
we’re still growing in that area but and then you know so that’s been a really beautiful benefit …” - Grantee

The young organizers saw the success in the development of their skills and passion for the work.

“...when we went door knocking. So, it was honestly kind of scary. But then as I kept doing it. I felt like it needed to be done because these were homes that were right next to the freeway already, so I can imagine what it would be like when they actually start building it…and then most of them are renters [that] don't really have any protection…” - Youth member

“….members, keep on coming and...keep doing the work, even though we might not be getting paid because it's something that we're passionate about and...we all care about [the] members [who] are here… [Members'] love being part of this organization because they're able to…spread the knowledge and just like be more informed and then inform their other communities.’ - Youth member

5. Difficulties and Problems
This theme centered on the various challenges organizations faced in trying to meet their goals. Some of these difficulties focused on the nature of the work itself.

“... there’s just a huge volume of work you have [for] direct campaign work and then the civic engagement ... component is another body of work.” – Grantee

Grantees emphasized the need to care for their community members beyond campaigns or political actions and beyond regular locations and hours.

“...I was actually doing direct responses...I was going to meet people at parks and hotels and corners and whatever wherever places I needed to meet them from whatever hours.” – Grantee

Others shared about the challenges that come naturally with developing young organizers.

“…our youth members [sometimes had] a hard time being as consistent [with other aspects of the program] as they were with the organizing, engagement portion of our work.” - Grantee

Engaging, and keeping youth engaged, became even more difficult during the pandemic lockdowns. Organization staff talked about how they needed to contend with ‘Zoom fatigue’, as young people were online for hours for classes and then had to get back online for organizing and campaign work after school.

However, almost all grantee discussants linked the challenges and difficulties they faced to the victories experienced after.

“I think [it] is really incredible the concrete, environmental justice victories that happened in these last few years…Despite all the challenges that obviously happened a little bit later. I mean the mental health piece.” - Grantee

6. Base Building and Engagement
This theme centers on who the organizations identified as the recipients of their work and the efficacy of their outreach. While all agreed that engagement, education, and growth of their base community was central to their work, grantees talked of engaging and sustaining their team (including youth members).

“We had a huge win.........., and it happened during that time the epidemic was happening” – Grantee

Still others talked about the need to move from in-person to virtual outreach (i.e., phone banks) during the pandemic. They highlighted the need for clearly defined plans and engaging their youth base for the human-power needed to carry out all parts of those plans.

“.... we ensure that we really…craft a very detailed outreach plan where...each person has...a task and a role....” – Grantee

One grantee spoke about the intersection of campaign work (housing justice) and supporting their base constituents through a housing crisis.

“I came [into the organization working] with housing, and now that’s grown for me. [I am] sitting on the healthy justice committee at the state and regional level. .... We had an incident where [an] apartment complex evicted [tenants] and they only had...four days' notice, and so [us and] a few [other] organizations came together to rally around those 60 families that [were] being displaced.” – Grantee

One Coordinator spoke to the personal benefits of base building - that it was not just for the organization’s constituency but also for themselves as professionals.

“I’m just getting to meet other like-minded Black youth in my area that we were all pretty much aligned in every way we have the same end goal. We actually did reading groups, [where] we read theory and really looked at...the past history of different Black [people]. We [took] that [knowledge] into the IE [Inland Empire region], [where] we...felt that...nothing...was happening, and so we were able to connect and build a network.” - Youth Coordinator

As she continued, it becomes apparent that the work and those connections have been effective, long-lasting, and deeply satisfying.

“... we still talk today. We’re still very good friends. Not only friends, but we do a lot of work together... Even two years later, so it's been really an nice to build a Community...and have that feeling [of] a person to lean on, or just find a group of people that want to see...change in your community and that hope is still there....” - Youth Coordinator

It was inspiring to see how youth members found base building and community education work encouraging and exciting.

“... as I was door knocking, it became really empowering to be able to see how much these people cared about their communities... sometimes when I knocked on the door, they wouldn’t answer but then there were others that actually cared about what we were saying...because this is their community. Parents were the ones that [usually] answered, and they were more concerned about their children. Now it's really empowering to see
like the amount of people that gather together, so we inform them about what we're doing as an organization …” - Youth member

Base-building and outreach was not only initiated by adults, one youth member talked about a strategy she and her peers instituted.

“So we're youth and mostly a lot of adults don't really listen to us. So, what we do is we target the youth like us... in our own...school, we would do classroom presentation[s]. So, we would go from classroom to classroom and talk to the students. ...because we know them...they'll most likely be pay attention.” - Youth member

7. Well-Being
This theme focused on the identification, description, and assessment of participants' health and included the programs organizations use to achieve and maintain participants' well-being. Grantees often spoke about activities and events conducted at their organizations.

“... we've done with our Native youth...a coven talking circle...we also bring in...mental health wellness providers from...Indigenous circle of wellness to talk to the youth...[about] hard subject[s] like...missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls. We'll [also] make sure to bring in...a mental health wellness provider for afterwards. “ - Youth Coordinator

“We have a practice [that] we do with staff and youth called Way of Council for connecting and wellness. I have been meeting with a support group every Tuesday morning of social justice leaders. I am part of a Courage to Lead cohort "Leader Circle" and the YOI Peer Network has a workshop coming up about wellness” - Executive Director

“...being able to go on field trip hikes and showing the youth some survival skills. Also, some working skills. Construction/cleaning/ communication/ interviews for jobs etc.” – Coordinator

Participants talked about how some of the young people took the initiative in getting care that they and their peers needed when returning to in person education following the pandemic lockdowns.

“... last year, some of [emotional mental health issues were] in response to going back [to] school--thinking about how ... students were dealing with it. In fact, one of our youth leaders was so passionate about it ...[she].... [pushed] her own school district around the need for...mental health resources and support.” - Grantee

These funds also enabled organizations to retain and sustain the valuable staff they already have.

“... taking care of people...can be exhausting at times emotionally...sometimes it's hard to build these relationships with youth when we are inundated.” -Grantee

And provided resources for grantees to offer mental health services for staff and youth members.
“... as an organization around the mental health piece... it's incredible that we are paying for therapy for our membership now...like this organization is able to provide that resource to our members and to staff.” - Grantee

8. Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (JEDI) Matters
This theme centered on grantee organizations' work to address each of these issues. Their conversations covered their identity and goals as organizations, JEDI issues that their community faces, and opportunities for community collaboration. One youth organizer noted the importance of the successes achieved in relation to their unique identity.

“... just the fact that [our organization exits]... to service the urban and rural communities, Native communities. And we work within these different realms going back and forth - a lot of people say that we live in two worlds... you have probably noticed that now is that when we explain our life we have to talk about history, our ancestors, and then at the same time we also have to work with funders [who] speak from a Westernized, colonial context [when] talking about organizing. So, it's really good to know that we have a space for that and people who are doing this work and want to do this work. So, it feels good to know that we are...setting the bar and setting the trend for other communities to also do the same. And we're here to support them and uplift them as well.” - Youth Organizer

One organization has, as its foundational objective, fighting racism in the criminal justice system.

“[Our] organization has as its central focus...the transformation of the criminal justice system. Because we see the criminal justice system is the vehicle [by which] our people are oppressed and disenfranchised and denied ... it's legalized racism, it's legalized disenfranchisement, it's legalized stealing our rights and our resources, even down to the Constitution that gives cover for people who want to do such things.” – Grantee

Others make their focus on areas of JEDI like anti-blackness.

“[Our organization] was one of the panelists [at a YO!Cali event] to share the work that we've been doing around anti blackness and communities of color, and racial equity, and moving our organization towards being an Anti-racist organization.” - Grantee

9. Unique to the Times
This final theme served two purposes. First, it was a catch-all for issues that came up in the transcripts but did not fit any of the themes described above. Second, as many of those issues were specific to certain time periods, it became a cluster of discussions around unique historical events.

Focus group participants from all organizations spoke to the benefit of the flexibility that unrestricted funds provided as they pivoted to meet unexpected needs during the COVID-19 pandemic.

“... we've been lucky in that most of our funding is general ops support, so we don't have to ascribe to staying really strict within specific budget line items which has been really helpful for the COVID pivot.” – Grantee

Availability of resources (like technology) were important to the survival of youth and community members, as well as to the organizations and their work.
“Throughout the pandemic, [we had] to do [our programming] at a distance…we [actually] were able to get a lot of applicants both summers. I think it was the most we had in a while…over 100 applicants both summers of folks wanting to participate in our leadership trainings, and we obviously didn’t have the capacity to accommodate all of them. - Youth Coordinator

“... in terms of programming it was also tricky because our workshops are meant to be very interactive, they are meant to be very hands on. We had to learn a lot of tools. and actually through YO!Cali, we were able to connect with other people.” - Youth Coordinator

Others spoke to the changes in their meeting schedules and trying to find the right balance to keep youth engaged without burning them out.

“…prior to the pandemic, we were meeting weekly, then [once it began, we switched to] five times a week… then we [realized that we] didn’t want to also overwhelm our members, as [they] were also just trying to survive.” - Program Coordinator

One youth member talked of the stress of trying to continue with community organizing work during quarantine alongside other responsibilities.

“... for me, being a college student, and trying to pursue my soccer career at the same time… it was kind of challenging trying to find a way to go to the youth meetings at the time when we were in quarantine. But [staff] made it all work with the scheduling, which was really great. And on top of that, I also had a job to work too. So, it was...hard to get everything figured out... because I really wanted to be a part of the youth meetings and... help out with my community.” - Youth member

One participant spoke to one of the other major issues in the past few years - events and issues surrounding the Black Lives Matter movement.

“... for me personally, um, with the Black Lives Matter, I'm really thankful that people are now seeing this stuff and doing something about it! And it's about time that the...African Americans...are getting... justice for what's going on with police brutality. Like this is going on for so many years that, so many, like, YEARS, that it's finally time for something to happen...” - Youth Member

One participant spoke to the issue of solidarity.

“I think one thing that makes us so special [is that for] anything that we do, we have this notion of Black liberation...we're [now] starting to actively support and engage with other [ethnic/racial] groups and help them in their way to find their own liberation. By...having that knowledge that our liberation is tied with theirs...it just builds a larger connection and like, not even [through] a Winnable campaign, but just an idea of standing in solidarity with other people as a way to transform and to achieve liberation in the end. - Youth Organizer

Theme Prevalence
The most prevalently applied themes across Round 1 focus groups (spring/summer 2020) were:

1. YCO Core Activities and Methods (18%)
2. JEDI Matters (17%)
3. Goal Attainment and Successes (15%)
4. Well-Being (13%)
5. Organization Capacity Building (13%)
6. Base Building and Engagement (9%)
7. Difficulties and Problems (7%)
8. Unique to the Times (5%)
9. Foundation Interventions (4%)

The rank order of themes shifted slightly during Round 2 (summer 2022).
1. YCO Core Activities and Methods (19%)
2. Well-Being (18%)
3. Goal Attainment and Successes (15%)
4. JEDI Matters (13%)
5. Organization Capacity Building (11%)
6. Difficulties and Problems (7%)
7. Unique to the Times (6%)
8. Base Building and Engagement (6%)
9. Foundation Interventions (5%)

Differences and similarities in theme frequency between the two focus group rounds/timepoints are depicted in Figure A1.
YCO Core Activities and Methods was the most applied theme in both discussion rounds, increasing by 1% from Round 1 to 2. Being youth organizing CBOs, YOCBI grantees were unsurprisingly excited to talk about their work developing the next generation of leaders and how their efforts evolved between the two timepoints. Along with the consistent application of the Goal Attainment and Successes theme (15% at both R1 and R2) and lower discussion frequency of the Difficulties and Problems theme (7% at both R1 and R2), the high focus on their core organizing activities is a positive and consistent finding.

On the other end of the frequency spectrum, the Foundation Intervention theme had the least discussion time during both rounds. That notwithstanding, it should be noted that discussion frequency does not directly correlate with importance. While participants took less time conversing about this theme, transcription quotes reflect the notable impact that YOCBI, particularly the unrestricted funds and PLC, had on grantee programming. A similar observation was made regarding the impact of COVID (i.e., the Unique Times theme). While grantees did not spend much time discussing its impact, as indicated by the Round 1 (5%) and Round 2 (6%) frequencies of the Unique Times theme, the pandemic undoubtedly impacted many aspects of their program.

The most notable shifts in code incidence from Round 1 to Round 2 were the increase in the Well-Being code (+5%) at the expense of JEDI Matters (-4%) and the decreasing frequency of the Base Building and Engagement code (-3%). While JEDI issues still constituted the focal point of many of the grantees’ organizing platforms at Round 1, as reflected in the transcripts, meeting the wellness needs of youth and staff was elevated to an even more prominent position in Round 2. The transcripts can also explain the increased conversation around base building.
and engagement during Round 1 versus Round 2. Grantees discussed the novel strategies they developed to engage youth during summer 2020 due to the pandemic.

**Interactions Among Themes**

NVivo measured how much the themes overlapped using the Jaccard similarity index (range of 0 – 1.0—i.e., the percent of overlap). Overlap can be thought of as the integration of topics or how people see relate the themes to each other. For each of the nine themes (Group A), Table A2 shows the corresponding theme with the highest percent overlap (Group B). The overlap percentage determines the position of themes in the table (from highest to lowest). Please note that the table’s bounded rectangles can be misleading, as there are many overlaps and associations among themes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Group A Themes</th>
<th>Overlapping Group B Themes</th>
<th>Jaccard Similarity Index</th>
<th>Group “A” Themes</th>
<th>Overlapping Group “B” Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>YCO Core Activities</td>
<td>Well-Being</td>
<td>0.67*</td>
<td>YCO Core Activities</td>
<td>Well-Being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Goal Attainment</td>
<td>Well-Being</td>
<td>0.60*</td>
<td>Goal Attainment</td>
<td>Well-Being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Org. Cap-Building</td>
<td>JEDI Issues</td>
<td>0.58*</td>
<td>Well-Being</td>
<td>JEDI Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Well-Being</td>
<td>JEDI Issues</td>
<td>0.56*</td>
<td>Org. Cap-Building</td>
<td>Well-Being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Base Building</td>
<td>JEDI Issues</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
<td>Foundation Intervention</td>
<td>Org. Cap-Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Difficulties</td>
<td>Base Building</td>
<td>0.43*</td>
<td>Difficulties</td>
<td>Well-Being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Foundation Intervention</td>
<td>Org. Cap-Building</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>Base Building</td>
<td>Well-Being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>JEDI Issues</td>
<td>Unique Times</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
<td>JEDI Issues</td>
<td>Unique Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unique Times</td>
<td>Well-Being</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>Unique Times</td>
<td>JEDI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p<0.05

The strongest overlap for both focus group rounds was between the YCO Core Activities and Methods and Well-Being themes. The similarity index score increased from 0.67 in 2020 to 0.75 in 2022. This finding aligns with the code frequency data, which demonstrates increasing prevalence of the Well-Being theme from round 1 to 2, as well as the transcripts, which illustrate grantee efforts to weave mental health and socio-emotional wellness elements into other aspects of youth programming. These efforts likely were to counter the heavy toll that the COVID-19 pandemic had on youth.

Well-Being also overlapped considerably with the Goal Attainment and Successes theme. The second most prevalent association in both focus group rounds, its score also increased in strength from 0.60 to 0.65 between 2020 to 2022. This finding not only underscores the emphasis that grantees placed on blending YCO activities with mental health and wellness but
also that improved youth mental health outcomes were deeply linked with grantee goal accomplishments.

From Round 1 to Round 2, Well-Being replaced JEDI Issues as overlapping the most with both Organizational Capacity Building and Base Building. This finding is consistent with the individual frequency themes, where JEDI Issues slightly decreased in prevalence from 2020 to 2022 and was replaced by Well-Being. While JEDI still informs staff capacity and youth base-building in 2022, the focus may be shifting slightly from political and civic campaigns to the survival needs of constituents. Indeed, it was essential for grantees to focus on mental health and wellness during the ongoing worldwide health crisis, as without it, it could erode the capacity for political and cultural activism.

Unexpected Findings
The case-study process began with ideas about the evaluation process and expected outcomes. However, grantee participants see the work of youth organizing - the activities and even the language used to describe it - differently than funders and other stakeholders. For example, terminology like ‘organizational capacity-building’ was not typically used in focus group conversation (and when it was used it was usually the focus group facilitators using the terminology to ask questions). Some grantee organizations were also very clear on needing to contend with colonialist perspective and language. For example, one Native youth member made it clear that leadership equals service, something they did not always see appreciated in interactions with those outside their community.

The case-study process was the only part of the larger evaluation effort to collect the experiences of the youth who are the focus of the work of these organization’s programs. It highlights the need to increase the collection of direct, first-hand experiences of youth developing into future leaders.

Finally, all participants found the process of the focus groups pleasant and expressed gratitude for the chance to reflect on their work and all that they have accomplished. Many indicated that they do not always dedicate time to acknowledge their work and the successes that result from that work.

CONCLUSIONS
The case-study process proved an invaluable source of triangulation for the overall evaluation effort. It brought clarity to grantee experiences and revealed several important findings.

• There was a notable difference in perspective between Funder’s indicators and the Youth community organizers’ notion of “capacity-building.” CBOs engaged in youth organizer development rarely used the term and, when considering the concept, focused most on ensuring sufficient, talented, and committed staff were available for their young people.

• The consistent emphasis on Youth Core Activities between rounds 1 and 2 indicate that this was important. Much discussion time was spent on this regardless of when the focus groups were held. This is consistent with the aims of the organizations and the purposes of the current grant.

• Strong connections between Youth Core Activities and self-evaluated success in terms of Goal Attainment also makes sense as this is the focus of the work of these organizations and success would be considered in light of these activities.

• The COVID pandemic led to an unusually high level of concern for the welfare of the base, and quickly resources were diverted to survival essentials and other forms of
civic and service activity. The ability to “pivot” and adapt swiftly when faced with unexpected events is the single best example of how YCO participants see “capacity.” Organizational capacity for them is having a set of capabilities they can successfully apply to a unique situation—especially a critical campaign or project situation. The unrestricted nature of the YOCBI funds allowed them to be flexible and meet community needs.

- YO!Cali’s efforts to increase networking was a clear success with the participants, even if they were not always able to collectively work on specific campaigns and projects. The sense of community and the relationships established were invaluable to morale and survival.
Appendix B – Case Study Report: Methods

Thirty-three individuals, from the selected grantee organizations, participated in two rounds of focus group discussions. Twenty-two individuals participated in Round 1, 23 participated in Round 2, with some participating in both rounds. Focus group size ranged from as few as 3 to as many as 11 individuals per group. Average group size was 5.75 people. Focus group participants varied in age, ethnicity, and organizational role: e.g., youth members, program alumni, organizational staff, and leadership (middle management, executive, and board members).

A total of 18 focus group discussions were held in two rounds: Round 1 groups (n=14) were conducted during the spring and summer of 2020. This was approximately one year into the three-year grant period. Two years later, focus groups for Round 2 (n=4) were held in the summer of 2022, approximately 2 months after the end of the grant period. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, all focus groups were held via Zoom, and with permission from the participants, the discussions were recorded for later analysis.

In Round 1, leadership from each participating organization were contacted in advance to schedule short informational Zoom meetings. These meetings served to explain the purpose and process of the focus groups and to answer any questions. Participating grantee organizations were then sent a one-page information sheet to prime and prepare them for the questions under discussion.

Round 1 focus groups were conducted over two separate dates with two discussion topics per day to reduce ‘Zoom fatigue.’

A total of four focus groups, covering one of four topics, were conducted over Zoom. These included:

- System Change Campaigns and Movement Building
- Personal Growth and Transformation
- Civic Engagement and Leadership Development
- Youth Members Discussion (A Combination of Topics)

Three organizations were able to participate in all focus groups thereby covering all topics. One organization was only able to meet once and covered only two of the four topics.

An expanded list of questions and prompts were prepared for the focus group facilitators that included questions relating to questionnaires the grantees completed for other portions of the overall PARC evaluation.

In Round 2, leadership for each participating organization were contacted again and offered an information meeting before focus groups were held. Representatives for each organization indicated that they were familiar with the process and did not need such a meeting. A single focus group was conducted with each organization.
Appendix C: Self Study Tool (Time 1 – Summer 2020)

Youth Organizing Capacity Building Initiative
Organizational Capacity Self-Study Tool 2020

Please provide the date (mm/dd/yyyy):

Please provide the grantee organization name:

Please provide your name and title:

For each activity or component below, indicate if it is PRIMARY (i.e., of highest or chief importance or concern to an organization), ANCILLARY (i.e., provides necessary support to the primary activities or operation of an organization), or NOT-APPLICABLE to your organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>PRIMARY</th>
<th>ANCILLARY</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grassroots Community Organizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Services/Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Advocacy/Policy Campaigns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: please specify [Fill in]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[If you selected “Primary” or “Ancillary” for “Direct Services/Programming”]
What type(s) of services are provided to your community constituents:
Please select all that apply
☐ Service referrals (please describe:   )
☐ Linkage & service navigation (please describe:   )
☐ Service enrollment/registration (please describe:   )
☐ Programs aimed at personal growth/transformation (please describe:   )
☐ Community education (e.g., substance use prevention, nutrition, etc.) (please describe:   )
☐ Other (please describe:   )

[If you selected “Primary” or “Ancillary” for “Grassroots Community Organizing”]
Please select the type (A) of used in your grassroots community organizing.

What type of grassroots organizing is your organization focused on now?
(select one or all that apply)
☐ Issue based
☐ Faith based
☐ Place-based/neighborhood based
☐ Community-wide
☐ Alliance/Coalition
☐ Broader Social Movement

Please select the social justice platform (B) used in your grassroots community organizing.
What social justice platform is your organization currently working on now?  
(select top 3 that apply)

☐ Criminal Justice  
☐ Education Justice  
☐ Health Justice  
☐ Gender & Sexuality Justice  
☐ Immigration Justice  
☐ Economic Justice  
☐ Environmental Justice  
☐ Housing Justice  
☐ Racial Justice  
☐ Transportation Justice  
☐ Juvenile Justice  
☐ Fair Justice  
☐ Reproductive Justice

Please select the activities (C) used in your grassroots community organizing.

What activities make up your grassroots organizing efforts?  
(select one or all that apply)

☐ Community Engagement and outreach  
☐ Direct action/mobilization  
☐ Action research  
☐ Base building  
☐ Leadership development  
☐ Political education/Popular Education  
☐ Media advocacy  
☐ Alliance/coalition building  
☐ Movement building

Please select the approaches/philosophies (D) used in your grassroots community organizing.

What approaches or philosophies guide your grassroots organizing efforts?  
(select one or all that apply)

☐ Intergenerational organizing  
☐ Arts/Cultural organizing  
☐ Integrative voter engagement  
☐ Freirean/Narrative Change  
☐ Asset Based Community Developed  
☐ Youth-led organizing
To date, which of the following youth organizing activities has been most impacted by your involvement in this initiative (including your participation in the peer learning community)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>No impact in this area</th>
<th>A little impact in this area</th>
<th>A lot of impact in this area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systems/policy change campaigns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal growth and transformation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: please specify [Fill in]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizational Life Stages**

There are three things to keep in mind when it comes to characterizing or describing the life stage of an organization.

- **First**, there are multiple dimensions to an organization: *What you stand for* (Organizational Mission and Values); *What you do* (Impact on Community); *What you're made of* (Infrastructure).

- **Second**, organizations are like people. Across our lifetime, we are at different stages of development, from infancy to elder status. For our purposes, these stages are: 1) Start-up, 2) Growth, 3) Maturity/Sustainability, 4) Turnaround.

- **Third**, at any given moment, you can be at different levels of development or capacity across these different dimensions – and your status in any given dimension can change in response to internal and external forces. For example, an organization might be in the “Growth” stage and an internal (loss of ED) or external community crisis hits (COVID-19) occurs. This can catapult the organization backwards one or a combination of the multiple dimensions of the organization.

**Stages of development**

**What you stand for** (i.e., our organization has a clear and guiding mission with supporting core values; we have made significant progress towards achieving our mission and embodying our core values).

My organization is currently in the (select one only):

- Startup stage
- Growth stage
- Maturity/Sustainability stage
- Turnaround

**What you do** (i.e., delivering high quality programming/activities/opportunities to your constituency; they contribute to community transformation and systemic change)
My organization is currently in the (select one only):

- Startup stage
- Growth stage
- Maturity/Sustainability stage
- Turnaround

What you’re made of (i.e., having an organizational infrastructure such as a strong governing board that helps fundraise for the organization, effective financial operations and management, budget and staff size that match your needs and priorities, long number of years in operation, consistently able to raise your operating budget, etc.)

My organization is currently in the (select one only):

- Startup stage
- Growth stage
- Maturity/Sustainability stage
- Turnaround

For the following sections, please use the drop down menu to rate each of the items below from 1-4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff and Infrastructure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We don’t do this well or consistently (we have a novice to low level of capacity on this)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We do a satisfactory job with this (we have a low to intermediate level of capacity on this).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We do this well (we have a moderate to advanced level of capacity on this).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our work in this area is excellent - we are considered leaders (we have a high level of capacity on this).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. All positions are appropriately and consistently staffed (both administrative and programmatic); a staffing structure exists to effectively implement core administrative and programmatic work.

2. Have a well-planned staff development process for key managers, general staff, and CEO/ED; relevant and regular internal and external training, coaching/feedback, and consistent performance appraisals are institutionalized.

3. Volunteer recruitment systems successfully fill organizational needs and advance organization goals with appropriate volunteers; robust volunteer management systems in place (e.g., orientations, trainings, deployment, rewards); staff experienced and/or extensively trained in volunteer management.

4. Have well-planned process to recruit, develop, and retain key managers; recruitment and promotion methods ensure that management team reflects the diversity of the community and constituents most relevant to the organization’s key interests.

5. Have access to sufficient resources and strategies to provide auxiliary services that support and ensure community member participation in programming/activities/opportunities (e.g., transportation, childcare services, meals); Auxiliary services are prioritized in budget and fundraising priorities.
6. Staff wellness is prioritized through formal policies and practices; this includes robust health care packages for individuals and families (including dental, vision, and mental health wellness), staff development opportunities, budget, healing, self-care, mutual support, and culturally affirming or other practices that promote well-being.

7. Have formal organizational practices (e.g., feedback mechanisms, trainings on implicit bias) where staff openly and honestly work through instances and effects of (un)conscious bias related to members of historically excluded groups (e.g., youth, parents, ethnic groups, LGBTQ, religious affiliation, socioeconomic status, education-level, etc.) that can affect relationships and the work; strengthen organization strategies to increase inclusivity.

8. Physical space is well-designed to enhance effectiveness and efficiency; favorable locations for constituents and staff; space encourages teamwork; layout increases critical interactions among staff and constituents; decor reflects and affirms community/cultural traditions of constituents and/or organization's brand, etc.

9. Communications plan and strategy in place and updated on a frequent basis; communications carry a consistent and powerful message; are professional in appearance, appeal to a variety of stakeholders, are used consistently and updated on a regular basis; all materials are provided in multiple languages as needed; have various channels for external communication, e.g. social media, email blast, canvassing, home visits, website, public events, etc.

10. Access to efficient and effective technology to conduct work, including telephone, computer, copier, scanner, and fax; fully networked computing hardware with comprehensive range of up-to-date software applications that facilitates collaboration and productive communication (e.g. email, shared calendar, cloud-based server to share documents, etc.); IT support is easily accessible by staff; regular training provided to all staff members.

11. Comprehensive electronic database and management reporting or systems exist for tracking program participants or clients, staff, volunteers, program outcomes, and financial information.

12. Regularly maintained and up to date, comprehensive and interactive website that allows for external communication and online fundraising; provides user-friendly and depth of information; includes links to related organizations and useful resources.

Are any of the “Staff and Infrastructure” items #1-12 unclear? If yes, please tell us the item number and any recommended fixes to language.

Is there anything missing that should be added to the “Staff and Infrastructure” section? If yes, please write it in below.

**Client/Constituent/Ally Development and Engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We don't do this well or consistently (we have a novice to low level of capacity on this)</td>
<td>We do a satisfactory job with this (we have a low to intermediate level of capacity on this).</td>
<td>We do this well (we have a moderate to advanced level of capacity on this).</td>
<td>Our work in this area is excellent - we are considered leaders (we have a high level of capacity on this).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Constituents or community members (including youth) take on a volunteer leadership role in organizing and policy campaign work, needs assessment, programming and strategic decisions; paid staff work collaboratively with these community leaders to plan and lead organizational efforts including recruitment, public speaking, meeting facilitation, training and program development.
2. Skills training and political education is provided in areas needed to affect change, shift political consciousness, and inform social identity among membership base; Staff regularly utilizes leadership assessment tools and development plans to support the development and engagement of members; Resident and youth leaders led leadership development and training activities with membership base; programming and activities are dedicated to political and leadership development of individual members.

3. Community members (including youth) see organization as inspiring and motivating; they are excited to be involved and routinely participate in meetings and programs; strong ability to motivate community members (including youth) into direct action.

4. Have strong, high-impact, relationships with grassroots community-based organizations or allies with clear, agreed upon set of roles and responsibilities and mutual benefits (e.g., work on projects together, networks where they share ideas and resources, short-term alliances for campaigns, etc.); ally relationships reflect stable, long-term, mutually beneficial collaborations; mass based collective power enhanced and social capital strengthened through alliances.

5. Organization is widely known within the community (including among youth), and perceived as actively engaged with and extremely responsive to it; community stakeholders and decision makers call on organization for its input on issues important to organization; ready for and often called on to participate in substantive systems or policy discussions.

6. Community members join the organization as members and pay dues or otherwise support grassroots fundraising.

Are any of the “Client/Constituency/Ally Development and Engagement” items #1-6 unclear? If yes, please tell us the item number.

Is there anything missing that should be added to the “Client/Constituency/Ally Development and Engagement” section? If yes, please write it in below.

Organizational Strategy and Adaptability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Organizational priorities, strategies, programs and services are informed by analysis and understanding of institutionalized racism and racial disparities across health, social and economic systems; analysis designed to disrupt and/or address drivers of poverty and racial disparities in health, social and economic outcomes in local communities; analysis includes systematic review of the history of social movements, race, and poverty in America; it engages active participation of all staff and community members in the analysis and critical reflection; analysis informs all outreach and communication strategies &amp; messages.</th>
<th>2. Emphasis given to growing constituent capacity and social capital to tackle issues/problems; grassroots advocacy work is aligned with that focus; a developed strategy for long-term change used by staff and board exists that guides work and decision-making; plan includes appropriate campaign targets and community organizing strategies and tactics; strategy is reviewed regularly to check progress and make adjustments when necessary (based on program challenges, emerging opportunities, or prevailing political environments, etc.).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organizational priorities, strategies, programs and services are informed by analysis and understanding of institutionalized racism and racial disparities across health, social and economic systems; analysis designed to disrupt and/or address drivers of poverty and racial disparities in health, social and economic outcomes in local communities; analysis includes systematic review of the history of social movements, race, and poverty in America; it engages active participation of all staff and community members in the analysis and critical reflection; analysis informs all outreach and communication strategies &amp; messages.</td>
<td>2. Emphasis given to growing constituent capacity and social capital to tackle issues/problems; grassroots advocacy work is aligned with that focus; a developed strategy for long-term change used by staff and board exists that guides work and decision-making; plan includes appropriate campaign targets and community organizing strategies and tactics; strategy is reviewed regularly to check progress and make adjustments when necessary (based on program challenges, emerging opportunities, or prevailing political environments, etc.).</td>
<td>Drop down menu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Knowledge and use of a formal power analysis tool or methodology used to understand how and by whom power is exercised to cause and maintain problems the organization seeks to change; resulting analysis used to develop more effective strategies, such as selecting issues and campaigns to help build power and win progressive social change, as well as track and refine campaign strategies.

4. Knowledge of key stakeholders, emerging community & policy issues; organized social change efforts and best practices in the field inform the development of organizational goals, priorities and strategies.

5. Program evaluation is a part of organizational culture; evaluation metrics used by staff in determining goal attainment and target-setting; careful attention paid to cultural appropriateness of evaluation process/methods; community participation sought out in design, implementation, and interpretation of program evaluation efforts.

6. Staff capable of working with external data/information and making assessments (i.e., action research) about relevance and cultural appropriateness of findings for its community members; external research regularly scanned for relevant data to support decisions, proposals, and advocacy; important organizational questions answered through research; able to effectively present data using charts, tables, and graphics for a variety of audiences.

7. Have established procedures to solicit constituent input that informs organizational priorities and key decisions (e.g., advisory groups, needs assessments, polls etc.); conduct community scans and reviews of relevant administrative data, reports, websites, white papers etc. to understand and utilize relevant external environment factors/forces.

8. Are responsive to current conditions and flashpoints, proactively influence systems and policies in a highly effective manner at the local, state, and/or national level (as relevant and appropriate); always ready for and often called on to participate in substantive systems or policy discussions.

9. Engage in broader social justice activities that are not solely connected to winnable campaigns or the self-interest of community members; includes collaborative, long-term, processes that seek to change systems (i.e., has transformational goals and transformation in power); reflects an articulated consciousness of being actively connected with some broader social movement.

Are any of the “Organizational Strategy and Adaptability” items #1-9 unclear? If yes, please tell us the item number.

Is there anything missing that should be added to the “Organizational Strategy and Adaptability” section? If yes, please write it in below.

How does your organization define equity and inclusion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Political analysis and campaigns intentionally use an intersectional lens; engage in cross-sector and/or multi-racial coalitions/networks, and/or movements to promote greater racial justice and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drop down menu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equity and Inclusion
equity; seek solidarity with organizations whose concerns overlap, even if they have a different
c constituency; have serious and much needed conversations on racism and other “isms” among
allies from different communities of color and other marginalized communities; deep education
and consciousness raising is done to incorporate racial justice lens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. The culture and history of our membership base informs our analysis of social problems and conditions, strategies and tactics; we use cultural practices and traditions to deepen our members’ relationship to each other and the organization; engagement with our organization helps participants see their community’s history and culture as a source of empowerment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Engage in a variety of forms of systems or policy change efforts aimed at addressing the root causes of inequity through community organizing, advocacy/ and building electoral engagement; draw upon organizing history, expertise, and knowledge of diverse and historically marginalized groups to increase participation in traditional civic engagement tactics and tools (e.g. voting, delegation visits, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use an explicit lens and approach to community organizing that intentionally engages diverse racial, cultural, linguistic, sexual orientation and gender identity of the community our organization serves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are any of the “Equity and Inclusion” items #1-4 unclear? If yes, please tell us the item number.

Is there anything missing that should be added to the “Equity and Inclusion” section? If yes, please write it in below.

**Thank you!**

Click the forward arrow ONLY if you wish to submit.
Appendix D: Self Study Tool (Time 2 – Summer 2022)

Youth Organizing Capacity Building Initiative
Organizational Capacity Self-Study Tool 2022

Please provide the date (mm/dd/yyyy):

Please provide the grantee organization name:

Please provide your name and title:

To date, which of the following youth organizing activities has been most impacted by your involvement in this initiative (including your participation in the peer learning community)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>No impact in this area</th>
<th>A little impact in this area</th>
<th>A lot of impact in this area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systems/policy change campaigns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal growth and transformation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: please specify [Fill in]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the following sections, please use the drop down menu to rate each of the items below from 1 to 4 (1 = We don’t do this well or consistently (we have a novice to low level of capacity on this; 2 = We do a satisfactory job with this (we have a low to intermediate level of capacity on this; 3 = We do this well (we have a moderate to advanced level of capacity on this; 4 = Our work in this area is excellent - we are considered leaders (we have a high level of capacity on this).

**Staff and Infrastructure**

1. All positions are appropriately and consistently staffed (both administrative and programmatic); a staffing structure exists to effectively implement core administrative and programmatic work.

2. Have a well-planned staff development process for key managers, general staff, and CEO/ED; relevant and regular internal and external training, coaching/feedback, and consistent performance appraisals are institutionalized.

3. Volunteer recruitment systems successfully fill organizational needs and advance organization goals with appropriate volunteers; robust volunteer management systems in place (e.g., orientations, trainings, deployment, rewards); staff experienced and/or extensively trained in volunteer management.

4. Have well-planned process to recruit, develop, and retain key managers; recruitment and promotion methods ensure that management team reflects the diversity of the community and constituents most relevant to the organization’s key interests.
5. Have access to sufficient resources and strategies to provide auxiliary services that support and ensure community member participation in programming/activities/opportunities (e.g., transportation, childcare services, meals); Auxiliary services are prioritized in budget and fundraising priorities.

6. Staff wellness is prioritized through formal policies and practices; this includes robust health care packages for individuals and families (including dental, vision, and mental health wellness), staff development opportunities, budget, healing, self-care, mutual support, and culturally affirming or other practices that promote well-being.

7. Have formal organizational practices (e.g., feedback mechanisms, trainings on implicit bias) where staff openly and honestly work through instances and effects of (un)conscious bias related to members of historically excluded groups (e.g., youth, parents, ethnic groups, LGBTQ, religious affiliation, socioeconomic status, education-level, etc.) that can affect relationships and the work; strengthen organization strategies to increase inclusivity.

8. Physical space is well-designed to enhance effectiveness and efficiency; favorable locations for constituents and staff; space encourages teamwork; layout increases critical interactions among staff and constituents; decor reflects and affirms community/cultural traditions of constituents and/or organization’s brand, etc.

9. Communications plan and strategy in place and updated on a frequent basis; communications carry a consistent and powerful message; are professional in appearance, appeal to a variety of stakeholders, are used consistently and updated on a regular basis; all materials are provided in multiple languages as needed; have various channels for external communication, e.g. social media, email blast, canvassing, home visits, website, public events, etc.

10. Access to efficient and effective technology to conduct work, including telephone, computer, copier, scanner, and fax; fully networked computing hardware with comprehensive range of up-to-date software applications that facilitates collaboration and productive communication (e.g. email, shared calendar, cloud-based server to share documents, etc.); IT support is easily accessible by staff; regular training provided to all staff members.

11. Comprehensive electronic database and management reporting or systems exist for tracking program participants or clients, staff, volunteers, program outcomes, and financial information.

12. Regularly maintained and up to date, comprehensive and interactive website that allows for external communication and online fundraising; provides user-friendly and depth of information; includes links to related organizations and useful resources.

For the following sections, please use the drop down menu to rate each of the items below from 1 to 4 (1 = We don’t do this well or consistently (we have a novice to low level of capacity on this; 2 = We do a satisfactory job with this (we have a low to intermediate level of capacity on this; 3 = We do this well (we have a moderate to advanced level of capacity on this; 4 = Our work in this area is excellent - we are considered leaders (we have a high level of capacity on this).

**Client/Constituent/Ally Development and Engagement**

1. Constituents or community members (including youth) take on a volunteer leadership role in organizing and policy campaign work, needs assessment, programming and strategic decisions; paid staff work collaboratively with these community leaders to plan and lead organizational efforts including recruitment, public speaking, meeting facilitation, training and program development.

2. Skills training and political education is provided in areas needed to affect change, shift political consciousness, and inform social identity among membership base; Staff regularly utilizes
leadership assessment tools and development plans to support the development and engagement of members; Resident and youth leaders led leadership development and training activities with membership base; programming and activities are dedicated to political and leadership development of individual members.

3. Community members (including youth) see organization as inspiring and motivating; they are excited to be involved and routinely participate in meetings and programs; strong ability to motivate community members (including youth) into direct action.

4. Have strong, high-impact, relationships with grassroots community-based organizations or allies with clear, agreed upon set of roles and responsibilities and mutual benefits (e.g., work on projects together, networks where they share ideas and resources, short-term alliances for campaigns, etc.); ally relationships reflect stable, long-term, mutually beneficial collaborations; mass based collective power enhanced and social capital strengthened through alliances.

5. Organization is widely known within the community (including among youth), and perceived as actively engaged with and extremely responsive to it; community stakeholders and decision makers call on organization for its input on issues important to organization; ready for and often called on to participate in substantive systems or policy discussions.

6. Community members join the organization as members and pay dues or otherwise support grassroots fundraising.

For the following sections, please use the drop down menu to rate each of the items below from 1 to 4 (1 = We don’t do this well or consistently (we have a novice to low level of capacity on this); 2 = We do a satisfactory job with this (we have a low to intermediate level of capacity on this); 3 = We do this well (we have a moderate to advanced level of capacity on this); 4 = Our work in this area is excellent - we are considered leaders (we have a high level of capacity on this)).

### Organizational Strategy and Adaptability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Organizational priorities, strategies, programs and services are informed by analysis and understanding of institutionalized racism and racial disparities across health, social and economic systems; analysis designed to disrupt and/or address drivers of poverty and racial disparities in health, social and economic outcomes in local communities; analysis includes systematic review of the history of social movements, race, and poverty in America; it engages active participation of all staff and community members in the analysis and critical reflection; analysis informs all outreach and communication strategies &amp; messages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Emphasis given to growing constituent capacity and social capital to tackle issues/problems; grassroots advocacy work is aligned with that focus; a developed strategy for long-term change used by staff and board exists that guides work and decision-making; plan includes appropriate campaign targets and community organizing strategies and tactics; strategy is reviewed regularly to check progress and make adjustments when necessary (based on program challenges, emerging opportunities, or prevailing political environments, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Knowledge and use of a formal power analysis tool or methodology used to understand how and by whom power is exercised to cause and maintain problems the organization seeks to change; resulting analysis used to develop more effective strategies, such as selecting issues and campaigns to help build power and win progressive social change, as well as track and refine campaign strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Knowledge of key stakeholders, emerging community & policy issues; organized social change efforts and best practices in the field inform the development of organizational goals, priorities and strategies.

5. Program evaluation is a part of organizational culture; evaluation metrics used by staff in determining goal attainment and target-setting; careful attention paid to cultural appropriateness of evaluation process/methods; community participation sought out in design, implementation, and interpretation of program evaluation efforts.

6. Staff capable of working with external data/information and making assessments (i.e., action research) about relevance and cultural appropriateness of findings for its community members; external research regularly scanned for relevant data to support decisions, proposals, and advocacy; important organizational questions answered through research; able to effectively present data using charts, tables, and graphics for a variety of audiences.

7. Have established procedures to solicit constituent input that informs organizational priorities and key decisions (e.g., advisory groups, needs assessments, polls etc.); conduct community scans and reviews of relevant administrative data, reports, websites, white papers etc. to understand and utilize relevant external environment factors/forces.

8. Are responsive to current conditions and flashpoints, proactively influence systems and policies in a highly effective manner at the local, state, and/or national level (as relevant and appropriate); always ready for and often called on to participate in substantive systems or policy discussions.

9. Engage in broader social justice activities that are not solely connected to winnable campaigns or the self-interest of community members; includes collaborative, long-term, processes that seek to change systems (i.e., has transformational goals and transformation in power); reflects an articulated consciousness of being actively connected with some broader social movement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For the following sections, please use the drop down menu to rate each of the items below from 1 to 4 (1 = We don’t do this well or consistently (we have a novice to low level of capacity on this; 2 = We do a satisfactory job with this (we have a low to intermediate level of capacity on this; 3 = We do this well (we have a moderate to advanced level of capacity on this; 4 = Our work in this area is excellent - we are considered leaders (we have a high level of capacity on this).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Equity and Inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Political analysis and campaigns intentionally use an intersectional lens; engage in cross-sector and/or multi-racial coalitions/networks, and/or movements to promote greater racial justice and equity; seek solidarity with organizations whose concerns overlap, even if they have a different constituency; have serious and much needed conversations on racism and other “isms” among allies from different communities of color and other marginalized communities; deep education and consciousness raising is done to incorporate racial justice lens.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. The culture and history of our membership base informs our analysis of social problems and conditions, strategies and tactics; we use cultural practices and traditions to deepen our members’ relationship to each other and the organization; engagement with our organization helps participants see their community’s history and culture as a source of empowerment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Engage in a variety of forms of systems or policy change efforts aimed at addressing the root causes of inequity through community organizing, advocacy/ and building electoral engagement; draw upon organizing history, expertise, and knowledge of diverse and historically marginalized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>groups to increase participation in traditional civic engagement tactics and tools (e.g. voting, delegation visits, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use an explicit lens and approach to community organizing that intentionally engages diverse racial, cultural, linguistic, sexual orientation and gender identity of the community our organization serves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thank you!**

Click the forward arrow ONLY if you wish to submit
Appendix E: Grantee Network Baseline Survey (2019)

Youth Organizing Capacity Building Initiative
Grantee Network Survey 2019

Please select the name of your organization: (Drop down list of grantee names)

Please provide your name and title:

How many years have you worked for your organization?
☐ Less than 1 year ☐ 1 to 3 years ☐ 4 to 6 years ☐ 7 to 10 years ☐ 11+ years

In what city(s) do you concentrate your YOUTH ORGANIZING efforts? Please specify.

In what region(s) do you concentrate your YOUTH ORGANIZING efforts? Please select all that apply.
☐ Santa Barbara
☐ Ventura
☐ Los Angeles
☐ Orange County
☐ San Bernardino
☐ Riverside

In your own words, what are the goals of this YOUTH ORGANIZING CAPACITY BUILDING INITIATIVE, as you understand them?

To what extent do you feel a connection to the overall cohort of grantees in the Youth Organizing Capacity Building Initiative?
☐ Not connected ☐ Slightly connected ☐ Moderately connected ☐ Very connected

How long has your organization done YOUTH COMMUNITY ORGANIZING?
☐ Less than 1 year ☐ 1 to 5 years ☐ 6 to 10 years ☐ 11+ years

What percentage of your youth organizing work is done in partnership or collaboration with other YOUTH ORGANIZING GROUPS in your local community or [region(s) selected in previous question]?
☐ Less than 25% ☐ 25% ☐ 50% ☐ 75% ☐ 100%

Please list at least ONE but no more than THREE YOUTH ORGANIZING GROUPS you partner or collaborate with on a regular basis in your local community or region(s). Share the main purpose of engaging with each group you list, and how it advances your youth organizing efforts. If you currently don’t partner or collaborate with other youth organizing groups, please leave this section blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth Organizing Group #1:</th>
<th>What is the main purpose of engaging with them?</th>
<th>How does it advance your youth organizing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Organizing Group #2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Youth Organizing Group #3:

Instructions:
In the LEFT Column is the list of grantees involved in the YOUTH ORGANZING Capacity Building Initiative, including your own organization. In the RIGHT column are SIX different types of connections your organization may have with other organizations. Use your mouse to click and drag your own organization into the first box. "This is my organization." Next, click and drag the remaining 24 organizations into boxes #1 through #6 that best represents your organization's connection with them, with "1" representing no connection and "6" representing the most substantive connection. You may need to hold down your selected choice and use your mouse scroller simultaneously to navigate the page. There is no limit to the number of organizations you can click and drag into any one box. It’s ok to leave a box blank if it doesn't apply to your organization; however, each organization needs to be moved into one of the boxes in order for you to proceed.

Items:
[List of all grantees]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior to June 2019, my organization...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is my organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had never heard of them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew them only by reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchanged information or resources with them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received formal TA/support on one of our campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated strategies and tactics on a specific campaign to prevent overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed a formal partnership to achieve long-term systematic change (a formal partnership may include but is not limited to establishing an MOU, designating specific role and responsibilities for each group, strategic sharing of staff or resources)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select the top 3 ways your organization would want to connect with [grantee] on:

- Outreach and engagement strategies with YOUTH (please specify):
- Outreach and engagement strategies with PARENTS (please specify):
- Youth leadership development models or approaches (please specify):
- Healing o trauma-focused approaches to working with YOUTH (please specify):
- Engagement strategies with decision makers (please specify):
- Communications/media strategies to support a policy campaign (please specify):
- Conducting and/or using research to support a policy campaign (please specify):
- Power analysis and campaign strategy development (please specify):
- Social justice and/or racial equity campaign strategies/tactics (please specify):
- Strategies/tactics to build community power (please specify):
- Policy campaign wins, challenges, and lessons learned (please specify):
- Civic engagement and/or integrative voter engagement (please specify):
- Leveraging relationships/connections with decisionmakers, funders, other like-minded groups (please specify):
- Expanding into new issues, regions, or populations of interest (please specify):
- Aligning with regional, statewide, or national campaigns (please specify):
- Connecting my organization’s policy solutions to social movement efforts at the state or national level (please specify):
Select no more than FIVE YOUTH ORGANIZING GROUPS your organization would like to connect with strategically.
[List of all grantees]

For purposes of this initiative we are defining a FORMAL ALLIANCE (also referred to as network, coalition, collaborative, partnership) as a group of organizations with shared decision-making power working together to advance youth organizing efforts that often has a formal name. Is your organization a member of any formal youth organizing alliances at the regional, statewide or national level?
☐ No (skip to Q13)
☐ Yes

[If yes] If you are part of a FORMAL YOUTH ORGANIZING ALLIANCE(S), please write their names below and specify if they are regional, statewide, or national.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Write in the name of formal youth organizing alliance you are a part of.</th>
<th>Geographic Level</th>
<th>If you selected region, please specify.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance #5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance #6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance #7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance #8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance #9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance #10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[If no] Are you interested in connecting with FORMAL ALLIANCES at the regional, CA statewide or national level that will help advance your organization’s YOUTH ORGANIZING efforts?
☐ No (Please specify):
☐ Don’t know of any but would like to be connected.
☐ Yes, know of some and would like to be connected.

Please indicate a formal alliance geographic level you would like to be connected to. Please select all that apply.
☐ Regional
☐ CA Statewide
☐ National

[If grantee says, “Yes, know of some and would like to be connected.”] Name up to THREE FORMAL ALLIANCES at the regional, CA statewide or national level that you would like to be connected with and specify how this will help advance your organization’s youth organizing efforts.
Formal Alliance #1
Formal Alliance #2
Formal Alliance #3

Is there a youth organizing issue(s) that your organization is currently grappling with, thinking or curious about, that the Learning Community might serve as a place to connect with other YOUTH ORGANIZING groups around?

☐ No  ☐ Yes → Please describe the issue(s) in a few words.

Do you give permission for PARC@LMU to share your survey responses with Yo! California?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Thank you!
Click the forward arrow ONLY if you wish to submit.
Appendix F: Grantee Network Post-Survey (2022)

Youth Organizing Capacity Building Initiative
Grantee Network Post Survey

March 2022

1. Please select the name of your organization:
   (Drop down list of grantee names)

2. Please provide your name, title, and email address:
   Name: _______________________________________________________
   Title: _______________________________________________________
   Email: _______________________________________________________

3. How many years have you worked for your organization?
  ☐ Less than 1 year  ☐ 1 to 3 years  ☐ 4 to 6 years  ☐ 7 to 10 years  ☐ 11+ years

4. To what extent do you feel a connection to the overall cohort of grantees in the Organizing Capacity Building Initiative/Peer Learning Community?
   ☐ Not at all  ☐ Slight  ☐ Moderate  ☐ Very much

5. Instructions: In the LEFT column is the list of all the grantees involved in the Youth Organizing Capacity Building Initiative, including your own organization. In the RIGHT column are FIVE different types of connections your organization may have with other organizations.
   ● Use your mouse to click and drag each of the 24 organizations into boxes #1 through #5 that best represents your organization’s connection with them, with “1” representing minimal connection and “5” representing the most substantive connection. You may need to hold down your selected choice and use your mouse scroller simultaneously to navigate the page.
   ● There is no limit to the number of organizations you can click and drag into any one box. It’s ok to leave a box blank if it doesn’t apply to your organization; however, each organization needs to be moved into one of the boxes in order for you to proceed.
   ● Please leave your organization in the left column

Select the category that best describes your organization’s connection with each grantee organization:

During the Youth Organizing Capacity Building Initiative/Peer Learning Community, my organization has...

(List of YOCBI grantees)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Met them only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Exchanged information or resources with them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Received formal TA/support on one of our campaigns

4. Coordinated strategies and tactics on a specific campaign to prevent overlap

5. Developed a formal partnership to achieve long-term systematic change (a formal partnership may include but is not limited to establishing an MOU, designating specific role and responsibilities for each group, strategic sharing of staff or resources)

6. Has the Peer Learning Community served as a place to connect with other youth organizing groups?  
☐ No  ☐ Yes  
[If yes] Please select the extent to which you connected around the items listed below:  
Youth leadership development models or approaches  
☐ None  ☐ A little  ☐ A lot  
Outreach and engagement strategies with youth  
☐ None  ☐ A little  ☐ A lot  
Healing or trauma-focused approaches to working with youth  
☐ None  ☐ A little  ☐ A lot  
Outreach and engagement strategies with parents  
☐ None  ☐ A little  ☐ A lot  
Strategies/tactics to build community power  
☐ None  ☐ A little  ☐ A lot  
Social justice and/or racial equity campaign strategies/tactics  
☐ None  ☐ A little  ☐ A lot  
Virtual strategies working with youth during COVID-19  
☐ None  ☐ A little  ☐ A lot  
Other (please select and specify below:)  
Specify: [Fill in]  ☐ None  ☐ A little  ☐ A lot

7. What percentage of your youth organizing work is in partnership or collaboration with other youth organizing groups WITHIN your local community or region(s)?  
☐ Less than 25%  ☐ 25%  ☐ 50%  ☐ 75%  ☐ 100%

8. What percentage of your youth organizing work is in partnership or collaboration with other youth organizing groups OUTSIDE of your local community or region(s)?  
☐ Less than 25%  ☐ 25%  ☐ 50%  ☐ 75%  ☐ 100%

9. Please list up to 3 youth organizing groups that you have collaborated or partnered with in the Southern California region from December 2019 through April 2022. These can be connections WITHIN or OUTSIDE of this initiative/Peer Learning Community.

In the table below, please provide information around how this collaboration or partnership formed and how it advanced your youth organizing.
Write up to 3 youth organizing groups here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specify region(s) (e.g., Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Ventura, etc.)</th>
<th>How did the collaboration or partnership form? (E.g., through emergent battles, flashpoints, or other events)?</th>
<th>How did the collaboration/partnership advance your youth organizing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Now that the **Youth Organizing Capacity Building Initiative** has completed, what are the most critical ways funders can support **Southern California Youth Organizing Groups** moving forward? [Fill in]

10a. If there were funding and resources to continue this Initiative and **Peer Learning Community**, what should **Southern California Youth Organizing Groups** focus our shared efforts on?

11. Do you give permission for PARC@LMU to share your survey responses with Yo! California?
   - Yes
   - No

   We thank you for your time spent taking this survey.
   Your response has been recorded.
Appendix G: Peer Learning Community Direct Observation Form: Version Used for April 2021 Midpoint Convening

Observer: ____________________________________ Date: __________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network Survey Findings &amp; Meaning Making: Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the participants seem clear about the purpose of the presentation and breakout?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ YES, please describe:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the presentation spark questions or discussion among participants?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ YES, please describe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was there any notable pushback, additions to, or affirmation to presentation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ YES, please describe (silence and disengagement can be pushback)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network Survey Findings &amp; Meaning Making: Break Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were participants engaged for the 20 min break out (few are fiddling with phone, in side conversations vs. asking questions, absorbed in exercises, taking notes, making comments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ YES, please describe:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was there an acknowledgment of the diversity in the room and an appreciation of how relationships can be an asset for collaboration, network and movement-building?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ YES, please describe:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were there frequent instances of conversation that indicated that organizations have worked together in the past?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ YES, please describe:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did it appear that new relationships were being developed between groups who hadn’t worked together?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ YES, please describe:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did larger more sophisticated organizations dominate the discussions and decisions? Were smaller organizations as engaged in the discussions and decisions?</td>
<td>-NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did participants describe specific experiences of inter-org collaboration or networking?</td>
<td>-NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did participants describe any general principles or methods of promoting inter-org collaboration or networking?</td>
<td>-NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did participants describe any challenges or impediments to inter-org collaboration or networking?</td>
<td>-NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did participants describe any best practices or successes to inter-org collaboration or networking?</td>
<td>-NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were groups open to hearing perspectives different than their own?</td>
<td>-NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was a practice built to work through principle struggle when there is divergence among the groups?</td>
<td>-NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did participants’ discussion suggest a movement toward building alliances and solidarity around a campaign or issue (e.g., forming strategic relationships, innovation and use of new models/strategies, resources commitment, broadening organizational interests to include long-term collective interests, membership involvement in other campaigns)?</td>
<td>-NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did participants transcend narrow organizational interests and talk explicitly about the steps they would need for ambitious actions involving multiple CBOs over an extended period?</td>
<td>-NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alliance Building**
### PLC Activities: Presentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the participants seem clear about the purpose of the presentation and breakout?</td>
<td>☐ NO</td>
<td>☐ YES, please describe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the presentation spark questions or discussion among participants?</td>
<td>☐ NO</td>
<td>☐ YES, please describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there any notable pushback, additions to, or affirmation to presentation?</td>
<td>☐ NO</td>
<td>☐ YES, please describe (silence and disengagement can be pushback)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLC Activities: Break Out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were participants engaged for the 20 min break out (few are fiddling with phone, in side conversations vs. asking questions, absorbed in exercises, taking notes, making comments?)</td>
<td>☐ NO</td>
<td>☐ YES, please describe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there an acknowledgment of the diversity in the room and an appreciation of how relationships can be an asset for collaboration, network and movement-building?</td>
<td>☐ NO</td>
<td>☐ YES, please describe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were there frequent instances of conversation that indicated that organizations have worked together in the past?</td>
<td>☐ NO</td>
<td>☐ YES, please describe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did it appear that new relationships were being developed between groups who hadn’t worked together?</td>
<td>☐ NO</td>
<td>☐ YES, please describe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did larger more sophisticated organizations dominate the discussions and decisions? Were smaller organizations as engaged in the discussions and decisions?</td>
<td>☐ NO</td>
<td>☐ YES, please describe:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
☐ NO  ☐ YES, please describe:

Did participants describe specific experiences of inter-org collaboration or networking?
☐ NO
☐ YES, please describe:

Did participants describe any general principles or methods of promoting inter-org collaboration or networking?
☐ NO
☐ YES, please describe:

Did participants describe any challenges or impediments to inter-org collaboration or networking?
☐ NO
☐ YES, please describe:

Did participants describe any best practices or successes to inter-org collaboration or networking?
☐ NO
☐ YES, please describe:

Were groups open to hearing perspectives different than their own?
☐ NO
☐ YES, please describe:

Was a practice built to work through principle struggle when there is divergence among the groups?
☐ NO
☐ YES, please describe:

Did participants’ discussion suggest a movement toward building alliances and solidarity around a campaign or issue (e.g., forming strategic relationships, innovation and use of new models/strategies, resources commitment, broadening organizational interests to include long-term collective interests, membership involvement in other campaigns)?
☐ NO
☐ YES, please describe:

Did participants transcend narrow organizational interests and talk explicitly about the steps they would need for ambitious actions involving multiple CBOs over an extended period?
☐ NO
☐ YES, please describe:
### NEXT STEPS, EVALUATIONS AND CLOSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breakout Report Back and Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What were the key goals for the Peer Learning Community? Mid-point convening with director-level leaders and organizing staff from SoCal YO Capacity Building grantee organizations to reflect on key findings from the initial PARC evaluation survey of the network & envision where organizations would like to see the network of relationships to evolve, and get insight and feedback on the key topics and flow of our convenings in 2021. By the end of the PLC Convening, participants will:  
  - Engage director-level & organizing staff in making meaning of initial PARC Evaluation Survey and engage in small group conversations to envision individual and collective network relationship growth.  
  - Determine calendar or activities & flow for 2021  
    Provide input/insight for key topics & support of network gatherings in 2021  
What decisions were made about the PLC moving forward? SV and SS NOTES  
What were the agreed upon Next Steps? SV and SS NOTES  
Group Dynamics? (connecting, cross talk or talk through facilitator, level of engagement etc.)  
Additional thoughts/notes from the day (e.g., lunch, events not fitting in above categories, etc.) |
Appendix H: Expanded Grantee Organizational Goals Tables

Grantee Distribution of Total Number of Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Goals</th>
<th>Number of Grantees</th>
<th>Percentage of Grantees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Goals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Goals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Goals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Goals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grantee Goals by Organizational Capacity Subdomains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area (Domain)</th>
<th>Number of Goals* (Number of Grantees)</th>
<th>Percentage of Goals</th>
<th>Percentage of Grantees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growing Youth Membership (Client/Constituent/Ally Development and Engagement)</td>
<td>28 goals (20 grantees)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Youth Formal Leadership Development (Client/Constituent/Ally Development and Engagement)</td>
<td>24 goals (18 grantees)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining Appropriate &amp; Consistent Staffing (Staff and Infrastructure)</td>
<td>14 goals (13 grantees)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing High-Impact Relationships with Grassroots CBOs/Allies (Client/Constituent/Ally Development and Engagement)</td>
<td>7 goals (7 grantees)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having Sufficient Resources/Strategies for Auxiliary Services (Staff and Infrastructure)</td>
<td>7 goals (6 grantees)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing Program Evaluation &amp; CBPR are Part of CBO Culture (Organizational Strategy and Adaptability)</td>
<td>5 goals (5 grantees)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development: Leadership Assessment Tools/Models (Client/Constituent/Ally Development and Engagement)</td>
<td>4 goals (4 grantees)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Planned Staff Development Process (Staff and Infrastructure)</td>
<td>3 goals (3 grantees)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Designed Physical Space for Effectiveness/Efficiency (Staff and Infrastructure)</td>
<td>3 goals (3 grantees)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in Collaborative/Long-term Broader Social Justice Movement Efforts (Organizational Strategy and Adaptability)</td>
<td>3 goals (3 grantees)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization of Staff Wellness Policies/Practices (Staff and Infrastructure)</td>
<td>2 goals (2 grantees)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent and Powerful Communications Plan and Strategy (Staff and Infrastructure)</td>
<td>2 goals (2 grantees)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Database/Management Reporting Systems (Staff and Infrastructure)</td>
<td>2 goals (2 grantees)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Members Join CBO as Members (Client/Constituent/Ally Development and Engagement)</td>
<td>2 goals (2 grantees)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healing Justice (Other)</td>
<td>2 goals (2 grantees)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOD Committed and Involved (Board Governance and Engagement)</td>
<td>1 goal (1 grantee)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOD Participation in Ongoing Development (Board Governance and Engagement)</td>
<td>1 goal (1 grantee)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversified Funding Stream and Sustainable Revenue Generating Activities (Fund Development)</td>
<td>1 goal (1 grantee)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Staff Whose Primary Responsibility is Fund Development (Fund Development)</td>
<td>1 goal (1 grantee)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Volunteer Recruitment Systems, including alumni (Staff and Infrastructure)</td>
<td>1 goal (1 grantee)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient/Effective Technology (Staff and Infrastructure)</td>
<td>1 goal (1 grantee)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Strategy to Grow Constituent Capacity/Social Capital in Place (Organizational Strategy and Adaptability)</td>
<td>1 goal (1 grantee)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Procedures to Solicit Constituent Input to Inform CBO Priorities/Decisions (Organizational Strategy and Adaptability)</td>
<td>1 goal (1 grantee)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigns Use an Intersectional Lens &amp; Engage in Cross-sector and/or Multi-Racial Coalitions/Networks/Movements (Equity and Inclusion)</td>
<td>1 goal (1 grantee)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One goal may be coded into more than area*
### Appendix I: Baseline Grantee Network Survey Social Network Outputs

#### Baseline Grantee Network Survey Centrality Measures (N=24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Out Degree</th>
<th>In Degree</th>
<th>Out Close</th>
<th>In Close</th>
<th>Between</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alianza Coachella Valley</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>102.000</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Native Vote Project</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>157.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central American Resource Center</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>102.000</td>
<td>87.000</td>
<td>9.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>81.000</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Ventures of Orange County Resilience Orange County</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>77.000</td>
<td>162.000</td>
<td>15.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>104.000</td>
<td>87.000</td>
<td>40.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities for a Better Environment</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>97.000</td>
<td>83.000</td>
<td>60.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Coalition for Substance Abuse, Prevention, and Treatment</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>115.000</td>
<td>106.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations Organized for Prophetic Engagement</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>90.000</td>
<td>162.000</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>90.000</td>
<td>98.000</td>
<td>13.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Leaders of America</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>162.000</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay &amp; Lesbian Community Service Center of Orange County</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>90.000</td>
<td>162.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genders and Sexualities Alliance Network</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>87.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gente Organizada</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>96.000</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Congregation United for a Change</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>105.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InnerCity Struggle</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>100.000</td>
<td>95.000</td>
<td>21.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmer Girls in Action</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>93.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>32.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Resource Center</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>81.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor/Community Strategy Center</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>108.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>3.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy LA Youth Development</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>87.000</td>
<td>89.000</td>
<td>63.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Brotherhood Crusade</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>35.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixteco Indigena Community Organizing Project</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>97.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Step a la Vez</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>162.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice Learning Institute</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>88.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Justice Coalition</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>88.000</td>
<td>93.000</td>
<td>47.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Baseline Grantee Network Survey Group Level E-I Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>E-I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside/San Bernardino</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>70.000</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td>86.000</td>
<td>-0.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura/Santa Barbara</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>14.000</td>
<td>-0.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Baseline Grantee Network Survey Individual Level E-I Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>E-I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alianza Coachella Valley</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central American Resource Center</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>-0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Ventures of Orange County Resilience Orange County</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Amount 1</td>
<td>Amount 2</td>
<td>Amount 3</td>
<td>Amount 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities for a Better Environment</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>-0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Coalition for Substance Abuse, Prevention, and Treatment</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>11.000</td>
<td>-0.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations Organized for Prophetic Engagement</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Leaders of America</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay &amp; Lesbian Community Service Center of Orange County</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genders and Sexualities Alliance Network</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>-0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gente Organizada</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Congregation United for a Change</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InnerCity Struggle</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>14.000</td>
<td>-0.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmer Girls in Action</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>-0.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor/Community Strategy Center</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>-0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy LA Youth Development</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Brotherhood Crusade</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixteco Indigena Community Organizing Project</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Step a la Vez</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice Learning Institute</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Justice Coalition</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>11.000</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>Out Degr</td>
<td>In Degr</td>
<td>Out to Local</td>
<td>In to Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riv/SB 1</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 2</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB/Ven 1</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC 1</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 1</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 3</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 4</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riv/SB 2</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 5</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB/Ven 2</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC 2</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 6</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 7</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riv/SB 3</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 8</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 9</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC 3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 10</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>18.000</td>
<td>16.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 11</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>19.000</td>
<td>9.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 12</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td>33.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB/Ven 3</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>14.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB/Ven 4</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>23.000</td>
<td>30.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 13</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>19.000</td>
<td>44.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 14</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>19.000</td>
<td>44.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix J: Post Grantee Network Survey Social Network Outputs

### Post Grantee Network Survey Centrality Measures (N=24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Out Degree</th>
<th>In Degree</th>
<th>Out Close</th>
<th>In Close</th>
<th>Between</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alianza Coachella Valley</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>155.000</td>
<td>161.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Native Vote Project</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>68.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central American Resource Center</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>91.000</td>
<td>69.000</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>81.000</td>
<td>97.000</td>
<td>25.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Ventures of Orange County Resilience Orange County</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>70.000</td>
<td>161.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>84.000</td>
<td>69.000</td>
<td>2.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities for a Better Environment</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>78.000</td>
<td>161.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Coalition for Substance Abuse, Prevention, and Treatment</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>74.000</td>
<td>68.000</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations Organized for Prophetic Engagement</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>71.000</td>
<td>76.000</td>
<td>65.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>161.000</td>
<td>81.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Leaders of America</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>84.000</td>
<td>16.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay &amp; Lesbian Community Service Center of Orange County</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>161.000</td>
<td>161.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genders and Sexualities Alliance Network</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>82.000</td>
<td>60.000</td>
<td>78.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gente Organizada</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>161.000</td>
<td>83.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Congregation United for a Change</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>87.000</td>
<td>76.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InnerCity Struggle</td>
<td>11.000</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>69.000</td>
<td>54.000</td>
<td>125.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmer Girls in Action</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>77.000</td>
<td>60.000</td>
<td>28.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor/Community Strategy Center</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>75.000</td>
<td>63.000</td>
<td>15.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy LA Youth Development</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>77.000</td>
<td>70.000</td>
<td>30.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Brotherhood Crusade</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>74.000</td>
<td>59.000</td>
<td>20.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixteco Indigena Community Organizing Project</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>70.000</td>
<td>155.000</td>
<td>6.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Step a la Vez</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>77.000</td>
<td>155.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice Learning Institute</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>73.000</td>
<td>62.000</td>
<td>9.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Justice Coalition</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>80.000</td>
<td>61.000</td>
<td>5.533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Post Grantee Network Survey Group Level E-I Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>E-I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>E-I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside/San Bernardino</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>0.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>82.000</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td>98.000</td>
<td>-0.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura/Santa Barbara</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>14.000</td>
<td>-0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Post Grantee Network Survey Individual Level E-I Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>E-I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alianza Coachella Valley</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Native Vote Project</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>-0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central American Resource Center</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>-0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Ventures of Orange County Resilience Orange County</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities for a Better Environment</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Coalition for Substance Abuse, Prevention, and Treatment</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations Organized for Prophetic Engagement</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Leaders of America</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay &amp; Lesbian Community Service Center of Orange County</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genders and Sexualities Alliance Network</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>-0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gente Organizada</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Congregation United for a Change</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InnerCity Struggle</td>
<td>11.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>-0.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmer Girls in Action</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>-0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor/Community Strategy Center</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>-0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy LA Youth Development</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Brotherhood Crusade</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>-0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixteco Indigena Community Organizing Project</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Step a la Vez</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice Learning Institute</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Justice Coalition</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>-0.778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix K. Self-study Individual Capacity Domain Scores by Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Time 1 Only (n=22)</th>
<th>Time 1 Matched (n=18)</th>
<th>Time 2 Matched (n=18)</th>
<th>Delta (n=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff &amp; Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriately/Consistently Staffed</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>+0.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Planned Staff Development Process</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Volunteer Recruitment Systems</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Planned Process to Recruit/Develop/Retain Managers</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>+0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient Resources/Strategies for Auxiliary Services</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization of Staff Wellness Policies/Practices</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>+0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Practices to Address (Un)conscious Bias (e.g. race, gender, SES, etc.)</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>+0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Designed Physical Space for Effectiveness/Efficiency</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>+0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent and Powerful Communications Plan &amp; Strategy</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>+0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient/Effective Technology</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Database/Management Reporting Systems</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>+0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintained/Comprehensive/Interactive Website</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>+0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Client/Constituent/Ally Engagement &amp; Development</strong></td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Role by Community Members in Organizing/Policy Campaign</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development Provided to Community (i.e. skills training and political education)</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Members View CBO as Inspiring/Motivating</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Impact Relationships with Grassroots CBOs/Allies</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO is Widely Known/Engaged/Responsive to Community</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Members Join CBO as Members</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Strategy &amp; Adaptability</strong></td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>+0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Racism and Disparities Informs CBO Priorities/Strategies/Programs</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Strategy to Grow Constituent Capacity/Social Capital in Place</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>+0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge/Use of Formal Power Analysis Tool to Win Progressive Social Change</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Key Stakeholders/Community &amp; Policy Issues Inform CBO Goals/Priorities/Strategies</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>+0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation &amp; CBPR are Part of CBO Culture</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>+0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Work with Data to Support CBO Decisions, Proposals &amp; Advocacy Efforts</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Procedures to Solicit Constituent Input to Inform CBO Priorities/Decisions</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>+0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive to Current Conditions &amp; Flashpoints at the State/Local/National Level</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>+0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in Collaborative/Long-term Broader Social Justice Movement Efforts</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>+0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity &amp; Inclusion</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.22</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.49</strong></td>
<td><strong>+0.25</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigns Use an Intersectional Lens &amp; Engage in Cross-sector and/or Multi-Racial Coalitions/Networks/Movements</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community’s Culture and History Informs Analysis of Social Problems &amp; Conditions including Community Engagement</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address the Root Causes of Inequity through Community Organizing, Advocacy/Building Electoral Engagement</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of an Explicit Equity and Inclusion Lens to Community Organizing</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>