

**November 1, 2011**

**To:** The James Irvine Foundation

**From:** John Fanestil, Executive Director, San Diego Foundation for Change

**Re:** Grant 2011078 – For regranting to community organizations to conduct outreach that encourages and informs participation in the state redistricting process.

**FINAL REPORT  
Grant 2011078**

**I. Summary overview of progress toward achieving goal.**

*GOAL: To encourage informed public participation in the state redistricting process.*

The “Redistricting Fund 2011” at the Foundation for Change represented a significant opportunity for the San Diego-based Foundation for Change and for the leaders, organizations and networks we support in San Diego’s historically under-represented communities. With so much attention being paid to the redistricting of San Diego’s City Council seats, there was little attention being paid in San Diego to the work of the State Redistricting Commission. By supporting and convening key networks of leaders from communities of color, we were able to take the work these leaders were already committed to doing at the City level, and leverage their engagement of the State Commission, as well.

With only seven months to complete the project, the Foundation for Change accomplished each of the objectives set out in its grant agreement with the James Irvine Foundation. A “coalition of coalitions” was built through a re-granting and convening process that was quick, efficient and effective. The leadership networks of Foundation for Change grantees were engaged in the process and became critical players in a local “communities in unity” coalition that engaged in redistricting work at the City, County and State levels. By establishing a meeting site adjacent to the San Diego Redistricting Assistance site, the Foundation for Change ensured that this coalition became deeply engaged with the Assistance Site.

The Foundation for Change is just now completing its own evaluation of the entire project, of which this written report is an important component. Overall, we are able to conclude that four of six grantees exceeded the expectations that were attached to their re-granted funds, while one met expectations, and one failed to meet expectations. At least three of six grantees made significant connections, which otherwise would not have been made, to Irvine grantees working statewide to promote engagement with the State Redistricting Commission. All six of the Foundation for Change grantees used the San Diego Redistricting Assistance Site for developing maps and submitting both oral and written testimony to the State commission – an outcome that clearly would not have been achieved without this project.

Thanks to Irvine’s support the Foundation for Change is better positioned and better equipped than ever to serve as a convener and catalyst to civic participation efforts in San Diego, California’s second most populous County. Along with our partner organizations in San Diego, we are more familiar than before with statewide organizing and advocacy networks with whom we share in common the desire to create a vibrant democracy truly representative of our State’s changing demographic profile. We look forward to future engagement with the James Irvine Foundation and other funders of Civic Participation initiatives in California.

## II. Summary overview of progress toward achieving objectives.

### OBJECTIVES

*Objective 1: To regrant to five to seven community organizations to conduct public education among San Diego area residents and encourage their informed participation in the state redistricting process.*

This objective was fulfilled quickly and effectively. First the Foundation issued a competitive call for grant applications. This process, while time-consuming, is in keeping with the tradition of the Foundation for Change and ensured that there would be a high degree of transparency and confidence in the process by which funds were disbursed.

Second, because of the tight timeline, stringent funding guidelines were developed to ensure that only a select group of applicants would be eligible. Specifically the funding requirements were listed as follows:

Through the “Democracy for All – Redistricting Fund 2011,” the Foundation for Change will support only:

- 1) already-existent **multi-agency collaborative organizations or networks**;
- 2) whose membership is actively engaged with specific **under-represented communities of color** in San Diego County;
- 3) some of whose membership can demonstrate **active engagement in current redistricting efforts** around the work of either the City of San Diego Redistricting Commission, the San Diego County Redistricting Advisory Committee, or the California Citizens Redistricting Commission;
- 4) who can identify **one member organization to serve as fiscal sponsor** for the project (if the collaborative itself is not a non-profit 501c3 corporation);
- 5) whose can present **concrete plans for engaging member organizations** in the work of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission;
- 6) who can identify as part of their application **an individual to be hired as a “redistricting organizer”** for work with the member organizations of the collaborative during the period of the grant;
- 7) who can demonstrate **a willingness to collaborate** with other partners in three opportunities for shared learning during the six-month period of the grant (week of April 18 or 25, week of June 20, week of September 19, 2011).

Third, the Foundation for Change convened a “Community Funding Panel,” empowering them with the review of applications and the authority to make funding recommendations (through the Foundation’s Funds & Program Committee) to the Board of Directors. Members of this Community Funding Panel were selected for their acknowledged reputation within under-served communities and for their established expertise in matters pertaining to civic participation and redistricting. Members of the Community Funding Panel included:

- Barry Pollard, former San Diego City Council candidate (African-American)
- Pat Washington, community activist (African-American)
- Patricia Cowett, Superior Court Judge (Asian-American)
- Linda LaGerrette, community activist (Latina)

- Stephen Whitburn, former San Diego County Supervisorial Candidate (LGBT)
- Olivia Puentes-Reynolds, Foundation for Change Board member (Latina)
- Joni Lowe, Lawyer (Asian-American)
- Marquise Anderson, student (African-American, Latino)
- Lou Terrell, Foundation for Change Board President

Grant applications were distributed prior to the meeting of the Funding Panel, and on April 12, 2011 the Panel met for review and funding recommendations.

In the end, the Community Funding Panel recommended six grants for funding out of seven applications received. The Foundation’s Board of Directors approved these grants at its meeting on April 19, 2011, and the funds were distributed by April 30:

<u>NAME OF GRANT RECIPIENT</u>	<u>TOTAL GRANT</u>	<u>PURPOSE OF GRANT</u>
1. San Diego Refugee Forum	\$12,800	To train and organize leaders within <b>San Diego County's refugee communities</b> for engagement with the work of the California State Redistricting Commission
2. Center for Social Advocacy	\$12,000	To train and organize leaders within <b>San Diego County's eastern and southern Latino communities</b> for engagement with the work of the California State Redistricting Commission
3. Pastors on Point	\$12,000	To train and organize leaders within <b>San Diego County's African-American communities</b> for engagement with the work of the California State Redistricting Commission
4. Council on Philippine American Organizations	\$12,000	To train and organize leaders within <b>San Diego County's Asian-Pacific Islander communities</b> for engagement with the work of the California State Redistricting Commission
5. Sherman Heights Community Center	\$12,000	To train and organize leaders within <b>San Diego's urban Latino communities</b> for engagement with the work of the California State Redistricting Commission
6. National Latino Research Center, Cal State San Marcos	\$9,200	To train and organize leaders within <b>San Diego's northern Latino Communities</b> for engagement with the work of the California State Redistricting Commission
<b>TOTAL RE-GRANTED:</b>	<b>\$70,000</b>	

This process – a competitive grant application, restrictive guidelines, and an engaged panel of decision-makers representative of communities served – accomplished its purpose, forcing groups from historically under-represented communities in San Diego County to engage in the work of redistricting through an explicit process of networking and collaboration. In several instances this kind of coalescing had already begun, resulting in applications that were entirely unsurprising. In other instances, the grant application process forced allied organizations to come together, agree upon a fiscal sponsor, and formalize the manner in which they would work together. In only one instance were competing grant applications received from within the same ethnic-minority network ... and even

these competing agencies ended up splitting the grant among themselves with stipends to organizers from the competing agencies after the fact of the grant award.

*Objective 2: To enhance the capacity of local organizations by training their leaders, providing outreach materials and coordinating their efforts.*

This objective was effectively met through a series of interventions by the Foundation for Change.

- Executive Director John Fanestil worked with staff from the UC Berkeley to ensure that the San Diego Redistricting Assistance Site was housed at a location easily accessible to leaders from San Diego's historically under-represented communities – at the corner of Market & Euclid in San Diego's "Diamond" neighborhood, an historically African-American neighborhood now home to a diverse racial-ethnic population. The importance of this cannot be overstated, as the locations being considered prior to this consultation were profoundly inaccessible in this regard.
- The Foundation for Change contracted with Emily Serafy-Cox to play the key role of "Participant-Evaluator." Emily was already well-positioned for this role, by virtue of her position as the part-time Executive Director of Empower San Diego, a small grassroots organization which had already selected the redistricting of San Diego's City Council districts as a key focus of work.
- At an original gathering of grantees, terms of the grant were reviewed, expectations were set, and a commitment to collaboration was secured.
- As a part of their grant agreement, grantees engaged with their constituents in an "entry survey" testing the knowledge of and engagement with the work of the State Redistricting Commission. The results of this survey – and the results of a follow-up "exit survey" now being conducted of a sample of original respondents – will be included in a final evaluation of the project now being prepared for public distribution.
- As Participant-Evaluator, Emily Serafy Cox became a conduit of information to grantees, frequently updating them on the timing and activities of the Redistricting Commission, including opportunities for public input.
- Building off of Empower San Diego's already established relationships and work-plan, Foundation for Change grantees became incorporated into an already existent network engaged with the work of redistricting. Because of the limited capacity of this network, however, there was great peril that the work of the State Redistricting Commission would be overshadowed by the politically prominent project of redistricting (and increasing the number of) San Diego City Council seats.
- The Foundation for Change rented a room and purchased chairs for a room adjacent to the Redistricting Assistance Site at the corner of Market & Euclid. This simple step gave the coalition a "home" and ensured that their work would be intimately intertwined with the work of the Redistricting Assistance Site and its staff.
- Through the dual-faceted work of Emily Serafy Cox (as part-time Executive Director of Empower San Diego and part-time contract staff at the Foundation for Change), this network came over time to adopt for itself the name of the "*Communities in Unity Coalition.*"
- The Foundation for Change convened a mid-grant breakfast gathering on June 3, 2011, at which redistricting grantees shared their work with community allies and also received an update on preliminary maps from the State Commission. Over 75 people were in attendance.

- The Foundation for Change convened an end-of-grant gathering for grantees only on September 30, 2011.

*Objective 3: To facilitate coordination among local groups and other Irvine grantees engaged in redistricting outreach to coordinate and leverage their various efforts.*

This objective was met in large measure due to the intense engagement of Foundation for Change grantees with the Redistricting Assistance Site. As noted above, the “Communities in Unity” coalition took up residence in the room adjacent to the Site. All grantees engaged with the Redistricting Assistance Site and all reported great satisfaction with the site and the work of its staff person, Tom McDonald. All Foundation for Change grantees used the Redistricting Assistance Site to develop maps and all created written submissions to the State Commission. Three of six grantees report that their submissions resulted in substantive alterations to final district boundaries that were protective of their identified “communities of interest.”

Beyond this intense engagement with the Redistricting Assistance Site, the objective of coordinating local efforts with other Irvine grantees was met to a limited degree. As a late entry to the network, the Foundation for Change became engaged with other Irvine grantees “on the fly” – for instance:

- The Foundation for Change hosted HealthyCity on June 3, 2011, for an introduction to the *ReDrawCA.org* project.
- Emily Serafy Cox and John Fanestil participated in numerous conference calls with other Irvine grantees.
- John Fanestil will attend the November 1 evaluation meeting of Irvine grantees.

However, at least three grantees of the Foundation for Change did become engaged with other Irvine grantees, as referenced in their final reports:

- The Latino Redistricting Committee hosted a joint community meeting with representatives from MALDEF and NALEO, resulting in a substantial revision of the proposed MALDEF map as this would have impacted San Diego’s historic barrio district.
- COPAO had sustained and continuing coordination with SCAPAL and CAPFR, becoming in effect the San Diego partner in these Statewide networks.
- Sherman Heights Community Center hosted Greenlining Institute for a local training and mobilization, and remained actively engaged in Greenlining’s statewide work.

*Objective 4: To evaluate the efforts of local groups’ outreach and inform the UC Berkeley study of the 2011 state redistricting process.*

The Foundation for Change is presently engaged in a thorough evaluation of the redistricting project. Elements of this evaluation include:

- The already-mentioned end-of-grant gathering of grantees on September 30, 2011.
- The review of written final reports, received on October 15, 2011.
- The contributions of Emily Serafy Cox, Participant-Evaluator.
- The writing of this final report for the James Irvine Foundation.

- An “exit survey” of constituents is now being conducted. Responses from this sample population will be compared to the responses of those who participated in the original “entry survey.”

Among the key findings of this evaluation will be the following highlights of the Foundation for Change’s redistricting project:

- Built capacity of grantees
  1. “Our organization is now more informed about the need for long-term and consistent involvement in the democratic process.” – Sherman Heights
  2. “The grant funding has built the capacity of the participating community organizations in both general terms around community organizing as well as in specific terms regarding redistricting and other components of the political process.” - San Diego Refugee Forum
  3. “[As our own] organizational limitations became evident, COPAO leadership has moved toward the discussion of building organizational capacity and becoming a resource for its community membership.” - COPAO
- Promoted civic participation among constituents
  1. “We are already seeing people step forward to participate and plan for the next elections ... One of our participants has even decided to run for office.” - Sherman Heights Community Center
  2. “The interest created by the state redistricting fund in the APA population, we are in the process of developing a series of workshops and educational outreach efforts centered on delivering civic education and on increasing the policy awareness of our targeted public.” – COPAO
  3. “As a result of our efforts, many community members learned that participation in public hearings and testimony is key in having a voice.” – Latino Redistricting Committee
- Pioneered new alliances/relationships
  1. “The San Diego Refugee Forum was able to engage all major refugee resettlement agencies in San Diego to collaborate on sharing proprietary data sets. These led to the first-ever comprehensive mapping of the initial resettlement locations of all refugees arriving in San Diego over the last decade.” – San Diego Refugee Forum
  2. “We have become more familiar with how to partner with groups that are doing this type of work.” - Sherman Heights Community Center
  3. “While sitting around the table at the meetings conducted at the Foundation for Change offices, it occurred to us that it might be worthwhile to bring leaders of refugee communities into contact with leaders of other under-represented minority communities ... One major concern with this approach, however, would be the potential for co-opting of refugee groups (with their own unique needs and aspirations) by members of other minority groups. We continue to work on building refugee groups’ comfort with being stronger advocates for themselves, which should mitigate this concern over the long term.”
  4. “COPAO believes that connecting with local non-APA local organizations could have been better facilitated if a pre-redistricting relationship existed. COPAO endeavors to create common collaboration and partnerships with community organizations in its targeted areas of work in San Diego County around issues that may have a common interest with its community neighbors.”

- Engaging Youth, Young Adults and new Citizens
  1. “We have also identified and began to educate a new generation of leaders ... LLEA is already working on a strategic plan for 2012 to mobilize the vote with the youth. This was an outcome of working with the redistricting issue.” – Latino Redistricting Committee
  2. “Instead of viewing youth as a shortfall, community organizations should take the opportunity to work with this population at an early age and invest in creating a future generation of civically engaged individuals who would arrive to the next redistricting cycle ready to make a real influence.” – National Latino Research Center
  3. “The very fact that, as a result, four refugees from various regions around the world and representing a broad spectrum of San Diego’s diverse refugee communities, provided testimony to the California Redistricting Commission, speaks volumes about the success of this project.” - San Diego Refugee Forum

**III. Level of public engagement in our efforts.**

**Foundation for Change grantees reported the following levels of participation**

	<b>Core Organizers</b>  (people on your core team, either stipended or salaried through the grant)	<b>Regular Participants</b>  (people actively and ongoingly engaged in redistricting strategy, including the core organizers)	<b>Attendees at Community Meetings</b>  (people who were exposed to the redistricting project through a community meeting of one kind or another)	<b>Testified at Hearings of State Commission</b>  (people affiliated with your project who presented formal testimony before the State Commission at one of its hearings)
<b>Sherman Heights</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>200+</b>	<b>NR</b>
<b>NLRC</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>200+</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>SD Refugee Forum</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>125+</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>COPAO</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>300+</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Latino Redistricting Co.</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>50+</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Pastors on Point</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>NR</b>	<b>NR</b>

**NR = Not Reported**

**IV. Media and communications efforts.**

Media and communications efforts were beyond the scope of this grant. The “Communities in Unity Coalition” received considerable attention from local San Diego media for its work on City

Council on San Diego County redistricting. San Diego media paid less attention to the work of the State Commission than to these other levels of redistricting. The project would have benefitted from a coordinated communications component.

#### **V. Progress made toward improving governing systems and processes.**

The grant cycle for redistricting was one of the first two cycles administered by a short-term Community Funding Panel. (In the past, all grants recommendations were made by a standing “Grant Making Committee.”) This new model was highly successful in that we identified a way for people with specific issue-area expertise to participate meaningfully in a short-term volunteer opportunity. This brings concrete benefit to the project at hand and expands our network of allies in the long haul.

Through the course of this grant we also discovered the benefit of mixing formal and informal gatherings of grantees with other community allies. The mid-grant breakfast – at which redistricting grantees shared their work with other friends and allies of the Foundation for Change not directly involved in redistricting – was recognized as a success by all. At the same time, the formal grantee-only gathering at the end of the grant cycle produced a rich and meaningful evaluation.

Finally, this project has helped the Foundation for Change to clarify that the contributions to local capacity-building that it is uniquely positioned to make:

- the bringing together of leaders, organizations and networks across racial-ethnic, geographic and issue-area dividing lines;
- the coordination of leaders from disparate coalitions to promote collaborative engagement with issues of common concern;
- the “linking up” of these local actors organizations to larger regional and statewide issues, networks and initiatives.

San Diego lacks a local “convener” of this sort and this role is one we intend to pursue.

#### **VI. Contributions toward working in coalition.**

The Foundation for Change project succeeded in promoting a “coalition of coalitions.” Each grantee was itself a multi-agency coalition and the work of decennial redistricting presented a unique opportunity to challenge these varied coalitions to work together. In the end, these groups made a solid commitment to work collaboratively on redistricting at the City, County *and* State level. Vince Hall, a long-time political organizer who signed on as the group’s technical expert (“on loan,” as he puts it, from his work as Vice-President of Public Affairs and Communications at Planned Parenthood of the Pacific Southwest), called the redistricting initiative “without close comparison the most effective multi-racial, multi-district political organizing effort I have seen in San Diego.”

At the same time, the project highlighted the need to promote capacity at all levels – individual leadership, organizational capacity, informal and formal networking – as a precursor to successful participation in broader coalitions. Notes from the end-of-grant collective evaluation include these responses to the question, “What would you identify as the challenges of working in coalition?”

1. The need to organize internally within a community as a precursor to effective collaboration in broader coalitions.
2. The need to build relationships across constituencies prior to engaging in formal coalition work.
3. The need to eliminate “oppression Olympics” and ground the process in the value of equality.
4. The need to address squarely the question of allegiance – is your allegiance to the coalition or to your constituency?

This project has helped the Foundation for Change to further define its role within the landscape of civic engagement in San Diego. As Vince Hall emphasized in his end-of-grant interview, “The work of the Foundation for Change was critical in leveraging the groups’ commitment and collaboration.” This assessment was echoed in these comments from Foundation for Change grantees:

1. “The Foundation for Change has a very democratic approach that allows small groups and communities to have an equal voice with larger, well-funded organizations, which allows for improved communication, better policy, and a democratic system that empowers from the grassroots rather than dictates from the top.” – Sherman Heights Community Center
2. “Overall, working with the Foundation for Change was a remarkably smooth experience. The grant submission/application process was straightforward and painless, and the mid-course and closing grantee meetings were effective learning experiences.” – San Diego Refugee Forum
3. “Through their funding, the Foundation for Change made it possible for us ... to speak for a community that formerly was statistically under-represented.” – Latino Redistricting Committee

## **VII. Lessons learned and disseminated.**

The writing of this report now positions the Foundation for Change to disseminate its learning more widely.

- Executive Director John Fanestil and Participant-Evaluator Emily Serafy Cox look forward to participating in the UC Berkeley evaluation.
- John Fanestil will attend the November 1 gathering of Irvine redistricting grantees.
- A final report for public distribution will be published on the Foundation for Change website.

## **VIII. Challenges and obstacles.**

- *Prior capacity for civic engagement.* All grantees cited the prior engagement of constituents as a limiting factor in securing participation in the redistricting effort. One grantee called re-districting “an elite battle for political power,” and another made reference to redistricting as the “major leagues” of civic participation, requiring far savvier and sophistication than projects such as voter registration, voter education and get-out-the-vote. Representative of grantee feedback on this point are these comments:
  1. “Missing from this redistricting cycle was a targeted attempt to bridge the visible information divide between minority groups and those who belong to the world of politics.” – National Latino Research Center

2. “It is not enough to make technology tools accessible to citizens if no education has previously taken place.” – National Latino Research Center
- *Timing, as this enables planning and preparation.* The San Diego project was launched at the eleventh hour (April, 2011). While the project was very successful, given the constraints, more lead time would certainly have improved the performance of both the Foundation for Change and its grantees. As one grantee put it: “This collaboration needs to take place years in advance of the next redistricting cycle.” – National Latino Research Center
  - *Limited capacity of Foundation for Change.* The Foundation for Change remains a grassroots 501c3 organization, and as such faces many of the same challenges as do the organizations it supports, among these: funding for core operations, adequate administrative and operational support, and stable staffing structure. The support offered by the James Irvine Foundation for contract staffing and indirect expense was essential to the success of this project.
  - *Accountability of grantees.* Of course the performance of the six Foundation for Change grantees was varied, as evidenced by the level of their engagement through the period of the grant. The final written reports submitted by grantees give an accurate picture of four grantees which exceeded expectations, one which fulfilled the terms of the grant agreement in the face of significant challenges, and one which by most objective measures failed to fulfill their grant obligations. This is one of the perils of working with low-capacity grassroots organizations – depending on the life-circumstances and working context of specific individuals, follow-through can be affected by circumstances well beyond the funders’ control. It should be noted (in keeping with the aforementioned limitations of the Foundation for Change) that a more fully-staffed effort at the Foundation for Change may have been able to secure greater participation from the two under-performing grantees, both by holding them more accountable throughout the period of the grant, and by offering more meaningful support to their efforts.

## **IX. Additional comments helpful to Irvine.**

The Redistricting Fund 2011 was a decided success. Its impact would have been even more substantial, of course, had:

- 1) the Foundation for Change (or another San Diego-based actor) been included from the outset in Irvine’s redistricting program;
- 2) the Foundation for Change been able to build a continuous program of organizing that led directly from its work on Census outreach to this organizing campaign around decennial redistricting (In another realm of our work – advocacy promoting access to healthcare – the Foundation for Change has benefitted from multi-year funding from The California Wellness Foundation.)
- 3) the Foundation for Change been able to offer to the project an already-established venue for meeting and training.

The Foundation for Change looks forward to future engagement with the James Irvine Foundation and other funders of Civic Participation initiatives in California.