

THE FoundationReview

Social Movements and Philanthropy: How Foundations Can Support Movement Building

*Barbara Masters, M.A., MastersPolicyConsulting; and
Torie Osborn, M.B.A., The California Alliance*

The Peer-Reviewed Journal of Philanthropy

*Published Quarterly from The Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy and Nonprofit Leadership
at Grand Valley State University*

Social Movements and Philanthropy: How Foundations Can Support Movement Building

*Barbara Masters, M.A., MastersPolicyConsulting; and
Torie Osborn, M.B.A., The California Alliance*

Key Points

- As foundations seek to catalyze broad-based social change, there is a need for greater understanding of what social movements are, how they evolve, and how foundations can support them.
- Movement building presents unique challenges to foundations. Because movements, by definition, must be driven by the people who are most affected, foundations cannot determine the goals and timetables of a movement.
- The authors identify five core elements to movement building: organizing an authentic base; leadership; vision and ideas; alliances; and advocacy infrastructure.
- A framework for evaluating movement building is proposed, which can help foundations identify measureable outcomes and track progress throughout a movement's various stages.

Introduction

Over the last several years, many foundations have been considering how to best support efforts to build broad-based movements for progressive social change. The goals of such movements – fundamental shifts in priorities, power, and social norms – are to change the economic or social conditions for people excluded from the mainstream. Currently, much of the focus is on low-income people and people of color, who have seen their opportunities increasingly limited in the past quarter century.

Although there is much discussion about movements and movement building, there is little

agreement or even a clear understanding of what movements are, how they evolve, and, in particular, what a foundation can do to support them.

Building on research conducted for The California Endowment, this article describes five core movement-building elements and provides a framework for activities that foundations can support to foster movement building. Movement building presents unique challenges to foundations. Because movements, by definition, must be driven by the people who are most affected, foundations cannot determine the goals and timetables of a movement. Foundation investments in movements are just that – investments for the long term. Foundations tend to prefer projects that have specific goals and outcomes, whereas movement building requires investments in infrastructure, including capacity building and leadership development, often without the kind of tangible successes that can be clearly identified and credited. Moreover, the timeline of foundation grants – one to three years – is short by movement standards. Finally, traditional evaluation methods do not apply to movement building. Nevertheless, drawing from a variety of new approaches developed for evaluating advocacy and policy-change strategies, a framework for evaluating movement building is proposed that can assist foundations in identifying measureable outcomes and tracking progress.

What Is a Movement?

While there is no formula for a social movement, we know that successful ones share some things in com-

mon. First, people become mobilized around issues they hold dear; at some level they share a powerful vision about what is wrong with society and how it must be improved; and they engage in lots of diverse activities not under any one leader's direct control. The resulting political motion and its effect lead to a change in attitudes, practices and public policy. (Hardisty & Bhargava, 2005)

Over the last thirty years, there has been a proliferation of academic studies of social movements, both in the United States and in Europe. Although we do not provide a comprehensive literature review in this article, we draw on it (McAdam, 1996) in our attempt to fill a critical gap – linking social-change movements to philanthropic practice and strategy.

Social movements challenge conditions and assumptions about people's lives. In doing so, they strive to reshape certain core values widely accepted by the mainstream of society. Because these core values influence the distribution of power, movements for social change must, ultimately, seek to change prevailing power dynamics by influencing the public discourse and public policy.

In general, a mature movement is characterized by a widely shared analysis and vision. There must be deep and broad capacity to employ multiple mechanisms of influence to disrupt, persuade, and negotiate – from legislative advocacy that operates “inside” the policymaking arena to community organizing that puts pressure on institutions of power from the “outside.” And there must be mechanisms to knit together disparate organizations and individuals who can put ideas into action and translate the action into change.

To achieve these transformational goals, movements must be large scale, multiracial, multidimensional, multisector, and multi-issue. A movement is *not* the same as a single-issue organizing or policy campaign. Seen through a movement lens, policy change is a means to a broader social-change goal; it is not the goal itself. In that regard, there may be “movements within the Movement” – coherent strands of mini- or sub-movements within a broader social movement. In the

women's movement, for example, there were sub-movements involving issue-focused campaigns aimed at gaining and protecting reproductive rights, achieving economic equity, and fighting sexual and domestic violence; all of these issue campaigns, however, were in service to advancing a vision of obtaining equality for women in all aspects of American society. The key is that “a movement still exists, even though the issues change” (Pastor, 2009).

Movements for social change must, ultimately, seek to change prevailing power dynamics by influencing the public discourse and public policy.

The civil rights, LGBT, and women's movements are well-known movements of the last half-century. They sought to confront the social and political power structures that were serving to exclude blacks, gays, and women from a wide range of institutions and opportunities. There have also been issue-based movements, although they tend to originate more from a policy-change orientation than from the grassroots. The most successful public health movement is the tobacco-control movement, which sought to challenge the hold of the powerful tobacco industry on public policy, industry, media, and even the scientific and medical establishment in order to advance its product, inflicting great harm on people.

The conservative movement is another example of a wide-ranging, issue-based movement. Begun in earnest in the 1970s and 1980s, this movement has dominated American society and politics ever since and with a great deal of success. Foundations played an important role in the movement's creation and growth (Krehely, 2004 and Delgado & Stefancic, 1996). In the wake of the defeat of Republican presidential candidate Barry Goldwater in 1964, a set of conservative foundations – the Sarah Scaife, Lynda and Harry Bradley,

Key Elements and Accomplishments of the Tobacco-Control Movement

- Developed extensive member networks, a multimillion-dollar strategic communications infrastructure that penetrated nearly every household, high levels of intermediary development, strong cross-sector collaboration, and extensive training and leadership-development capacity.
- Achieved significant policy victories, including banning smoking in restaurants, airplanes, public sector offices, and other venues; limiting marketing and advertising; and raising taxes on cigarettes, which produced revenues for tobacco-prevention efforts.
- Reshaped public norms around smoking. Whereas smoking was once glamorous and considered safe and relaxing, it is no longer considered “cool” by the vast majority of the population. The medical profession went from being spokespeople for the health benefits of smoking to being among the strongest opponents of tobacco.
- Operated at all levels of society – from local communities to statehouses and Congress and even internationally – and sustained over nearly two decades.

and John M. Olin foundations among them – coordinated funding to reinvigorate the “New Right.” These foundations thought of themselves as movement strategists, not funders, and made long-term investments to develop the ideas, communications channels, and grassroots organizing networks that became the infrastructure of the conservative movement.

The language of movement building was explicit, driven by a broad-based vision defined by the values of individual liberty, faith, family, and patriotism. Within this broad vision, many individual issues and agendas were advanced – from issues of concern to the religious right (school choice and vouchers, abortion, anti-gay rights) to those of vested corporate interests (restructuring the tax code, shrinking public services).

Two lessons stand out:

- The movement had a unifying vision and big ideas that brought economic, social, and religious conservatives together and gained support among the public. Ultimately, the movement succeeded in changing the terms of the political debate. The vision of smaller government and lower taxes, conservative social values, and an unfettered free market has driven much of government policy over the last 30 years.
- The movement benefited from deep, long-term investments in the infrastructure that provided the space for philosophical alignment among the various components. Individual issue campaigns were mounted, while still paying attention to the linkage among the different

issues. Creation of nimble multi-issue organizations at the local, state, and national levels enabled the different parts of the movement to stay connected while specific policy issues were advanced.

Philanthropy and Movements

Foundations do not make history – they fund it. There have been funders that have stepped up and financed social movements since the American Revolution – through abolitionism, suffragism, the civil rights movement, women’s rights, gay/lesbian equality, and more. Philanthropy is well-suited to fund movement *building* – that is, the infrastructure needed to advance and sustain movements. Philanthropy, however, is not well-suited to lead a movement.

Movements ebb and flow. According to American historian John D’Emilio (2002), “change come(s) in the form of alternating cycles of what we might colloquially call *leaping and creeping*” (p. 89). During the “creeping” times, the infrastructure, organizations, relationships, and leaders of a movement are built so that during the great “leaping” times – those so-called “movement moments” – public engagement, attitudes, and policies rapidly move forward. How well the infrastructure for the movement is built determines how high the leap will be when the ripe time comes.

It is critical that funders interested in movement building understand the stage of the movement in order to make strategic investments, engage in appropriately targeted activities, and manage expectations. Although it is tempting to fund or

Stages of Movements and Movement Building

Social movements are not built overnight, but in stages. The New World Foundation (2003) identifies four different stages, although it is a fluid process:

- Stage 1: Building Movement Infrastructure – Organizing centers, anchor institutions, and networks mobilize new constituencies or a broad base of activists with the most at stake.
- Stage 2: Building Identity and Intention – The vision is developed, which gives urgency and guides and deepens participation. This is not a laundry list of demands, but an aspirational social agenda.
- Stage 3: Social Combustion: The “Movement Moment” – Transformative and collective, this highly visible time produces a profound shift in moral legitimacy and expands democratic terrain.
- Stage 4: Consolidation or Dissipation – Movements flow and ebb, and the fruits of change become incorporated into society as policies and new attitudes, or the movement dissipates.

organize to create the movement moment where there is high visibility, great public attention, and rapid change – and skip the other steps – if the readiness and capacity do not exist, it simply is not possible to artificially create those catalytic events.

Strategic investment in movement building is conscious and intentional, focused on investing in infrastructure and ideas and

in organizing networks and coalitions capable of working simultaneously at local, state, and national levels, linking ideas and policy to organizing, juggling several campaigns simultaneously so that they are always in motion ... surviving defeats, and building on victories. (Dreier, 2002)

Philanthropy can inadvertently hinder movement building as easily as it can promote it. Foundations often want potential grantees to demonstrate their uniqueness and focus on their increasingly narrow niches, whereas movements depend on collaboration and a sense of the collective. In addition, foundations that want to support movement building need to think outside of their traditional program silos, cede a degree of control to grantees, and be willing to stay the course over many years. To assess readiness to fund movement building, the foundation engagement tool developed for foundations considering public-policy work provides a good starting place (Campbell & Coffman, 2009). Ideally, like-minded foundations – even those that work on different issues – would join in support of an overarching vision and pool resources to support a robust infrastructure.

Funding Movement Building

It is important to distinguish between the state of the “movement” versus the state of movement building. They are different. The movement is the whole – the rise in consciousness, coalitions, cross-networking. But movement building is rooted in particular organizations. (The California Endowment, 2008)

Scholars and activists have sought to identify the most important elements that undergird a vibrant movement. Based on a review of the literature, philanthropic activities, and a convening of movement-building leaders hosted by The California Endowment, we believe there are five basic categories of movement-building activities:

- Organizing an authentic base
- Leadership
- Vision and ideas
- Alliances
- Advocacy infrastructure

In addition to these core elements, movement building must incorporate other certain fundamental principles, including a commitment to the long haul, recognition of the need and ability to scale up, and a willingness to network with other movements. These are dealt with extensively in the excellent paper, “Making Change: How Social Movements Work and How to Support Them,” by Manuel Pastor and Rhonda Ortiz, and therefore will not be covered in this article. The paper, which provides a brief overview of movement theory and practice, also identifies six key capacities for social movement organizations: the ability to organize a base constituency; the capacity to

research, frame and communicate; the ability to strategically assess power; the capacity to manage large organizations; the capability to engage and network with others; and the ability to refresh organizational vision and leadership. Funders thinking about supporting movement building should consider these essential organizational capacities as they assess which organizations to support and what they are supporting them to do.

Although it may be simplistic to break down movement building into five core elements, we believe that they provide a useful organizing framework for philanthropic investment in movement building. Moreover, funding strategies will need to change over the life cycle of a movement, as described above. Activities associated with Stage 1, such as building capacity and relationships, will be different than those needing support for Stage 2, such as deepening collaborations and implementing campaigns.

Funding strategies will need to change over the life cycle of a movement.

1. An Authentic Base and Base Building

Any movement must, at its core, engage individuals and communities affected by the social conditions that the movement is seeking to change. In addition to the various rights movements (civil rights, gay rights, women's rights), the HIV/AIDS and disability movements were built on the advocacy and activism of individuals who felt their basic needs were not being addressed (Praxis, 2008). These communities know best what they need and what will be effective.

In contrast to the model of policy change that depends primarily on experts and insiders developing and advancing solutions to problems – the so-called policy-entrepreneurship model – social-change advocates believe that a “base” of some kind has to be organized and engaged to advance the change agenda. Ultimately the movement

infrastructure must enable the base to be connected to the policy advocates, especially at the national level, so that the policy prescriptions are truly informed by and representative of grassroots concerns.

Base building is the hardest part of movement building and has become even more so over recent years because of the erosion of community structures and increased mobility of residents. Although base building is generally focused on engaging people who are ideologically aligned with the movement goals, leaders are increasingly recognizing that people are not always motivated by ideology or ideologically consistent; yet, they can and should be part of the movement (Hardisty & Bhargava, 2010). Successful organizing, then, requires some type of infrastructure to engage new people, take the organizing to scale, and replenish leaders, as burnout and turnover are not uncommon. New social media tools can be useful organizing tools – particularly for youth – as they can facilitate engagement beyond geography and enable people who are not members of an organization to participate.

Funding options: Base building can take on many forms and focus on many different groups of individuals.

- Community organizing. Fundamentally, foundations wishing to support movement building must support community organizing. There are various schools of thought and models of organizing. What they share is the idea that the communities engage in a process to define their problems, identify solutions, and then act together to bring the pressure to bear to see their desired solutions enacted. Organizing is grounded in real engagement of people and the development of volunteer leaders. It must balance the need to energize current members through mobilizing activities, while involving and recruiting new ones. In supporting community organizing, foundations must recognize the importance of building organizational capacity; while volunteer leaders are critical, organizations led by paid staff must be supported and allowed to grow.

From Services to Advocacy: The California Endowment's Hmong Health Initiative

Begun as a response to the influx of new refugees in 2004, this initiative evolved from a focus on helping Hmong refugees navigate the health care system and access health services to a multi-region collaborative focused on advocacy capacity building and policy change. This took several years and many different kinds of support and technical assistance. Key lessons learned include:

- It takes time to build trust and develop collaborative relationships among different organizations and regions, including the Hmong-serving organizations, the Hmong leaders, the funders, and the intermediaries. As evidence of the trust that has been built, in the final phase of the initiative The Endowment supported the organizations as a single collective entity with a common vision working toward a common policy agenda, as opposed to individual organizations, and all of the groups were comfortable with that funding arrangement.
 - Frequent convenings and neutral facilitation were essential to provide the “connective space” for the groups and leaders to build relationships and, ultimately, develop their own agenda. Intermediaries provided technical assistance, coaching, training, strategic counsel, visioning, facilitation, and other ongoing supports.
 - A funder can be particularly effective in helping to “connect the dots,” facilitating connections to state- and national-level advocates to work with the Hmong Collaborative.
 - Culture matters in advocacy as it does in direct services. The advocacy training had to be culturally sensitive and appropriate to the Hmong community in order for it to take hold. With the connection to the South East Asian Research Action Center, a national advocacy organization, the advocacy training became more culturally competent.
 - The evaluation, which was integrated into the initiative from the beginning, informed both the organization's activities and the foundation's strategies.
- Direct social services providers. Another avenue to build an authentic base is through direct service organizations. Nonprofit health and social service organizations are already organized around a mission. They exist to fill service gaps and meet human needs that arise primarily because of inequalities in society. These agencies have daily contact with large numbers of underserved people. Yet, typically these organizations – their professional staff, volunteers, and boards, as well as their clients – have not been organized to participate in social-change activities. Engaging this untapped resource requires a strategic and concerted effort to help service agencies transform into service and social-change agencies. For example, the health and human services sector could play a meaningful role in helping to develop a culture of electoral engagement since they can best reach the most marginalized populations, who tend to be non-voters and most affected by social and health inequality.
- In order to help service organizations become social-change organizations, the Building Movement Project has developed a step-by-step process that nonprofit organizations can use to identify how to address systemic problems through social-change work within the context of their usual services and activities. It identifies the steps and stages of transformation as well as needed capacities, which can be the focus of foundation-funded training and support (Campbell & Kunreuther, 2008).
- Educate new recruits. In order to engage new recruits, especially those who may not be predisposed to the movement, mechanisms to help them understand the larger context and social history of issues are critical. Hardisty and Bhargava (2010) term this “the age-old tradition of making meaning and teaching: through traveling lecturers (drawing on the history of populism); teach-ins (the [Vietnam] antiwar movement), citizenship schools (from the civil rights tradition); consciousness raising (feminism), and popular education.”
- These practices are not largely present today – in part because of a lack of funding. Foundations could support movement organizations to develop practices, both traditional and ones that utilize social media and other forms of communications, to enable self-education of movement participants.

Because movement building requires the engagement of people at all levels of organizations and the community, it is important to invest in ways to lower the barriers to participation, including enabling organizations to build team leadership and bench strength.

2. Leadership

“The difference between disorganization and organization is leadership,” said Marshall Ganz, Harvard University professor, former United Farm Workers organizer, and creator of Camp Obama, which trained grassroots volunteer leaders for 2008 presidential campaign. Leadership is critical to any endeavor, and for the purposes of movement building, leadership takes on particular importance. Building organizational leadership is very different from movement-building leadership. Running nonprofits does not require the same skill set as organizing or coalition building. The leadership qualities that are necessary for movement building – clarity of purpose, vision, collaboration, the ability to identify and develop other leaders, strong interpersonal skills, and comfort working across racial and generational divides – are not typically the qualities selected for to run an organization (Marsh, 2003; Raynor, 2009). Importantly, movement leadership also requires the ability to set aside or subsume a group’s top priority or ego to support another issue or even another organization, if it can better advance the overall movement’s agenda. As Pastor (2009) states: “Narrow silos, autonomous intermediaries, noncollaborative organizing, and egocentric leadership will not contribute to a long-term movement.”

Leadership for movements is also fundamentally different than for a policy-change campaign. While a campaign usually relies on a leader or a

small leadership group, a movement’s leadership is more diffuse and depends on people fulfilling leadership roles at multiple levels and in multiple ways. For example, the tobacco movement identified a range of leadership qualities that would be needed over the course of time and spanned so-called insiders and outsiders, agitators and conciliators (Pertschuk, 2003):

- *Visionaries* set the big goals to aim high.
- *Statespersons* give “credibility” to the issue/movement. They are well-known and well-respected, are often public figures, and stay above the rough and tumble.
- *Experts* ensure policy positions are grounded in facts and data, science and academics.
- *Movement builders* build bridges to other groups and constituencies. They are the keeper of the vision.
- *Spark plugs* advocate and agitate and generally operate outside the political establishment.

Funding options: Foundations have supported a wide variety of leadership efforts, and leadership programs abound. One foundation has sponsored a “retreat for advocates” over many years, which facilitated relationship building as well as providing these leaders with needed time away from the intense political and policy work (Holton-Hodson & Brousseau, 2006). However, because movement building requires the engagement of people at all levels of organizations and the community, it is important to invest in ways to lower the barriers to participation, including enabling organizations to build team leadership and bench strength.

For movement building, foundations can consider two main approaches: support for individual leaders and support for the development of collective movement leadership.

- **Individual leaders.** Foundations can provide movement leaders with one-to-one peer-mentoring as a way to help established leaders, develop emerging ones, and promote cross-issue or sectoral bridge building. Some foundations have focused on providing movement leaders with the time and space for spiritual and intellectual renewal – identified as critical to being

TABLE 1 Framing an Issue Campaign vs. a Movement

Nuclear Freeze	Civil Rights
Framed war and peace narrowly	Focused on core values
Ignored structural roots of problem	Explained the problem as anathema to democracy
Advanced a single, concrete solution	Required removal of multiple barriers
Could not grow to embrace larger peace issues	Grew to embrace women's rights, gay rights, etc.
Sowed dissent between single- and multi-issue groups	United diverse groups

able to sustain a movement over the long term – by providing retreats and sabbaticals.

- Collective movement leadership. Foundations can invest in specific leadership development programs and training for emerging and existing movement leaders to develop key skills, such as coalition building, constituency development, and communications. Various leadership institutes exist and they should be assessed for whether they are helping develop individuals' skills, as well as providing the opportunities for participants to self-organize, build relationships, and develop collective leadership. The nonprofit leadership field is talking increasingly about new leadership models for social change that are more inclusive, collaborative, and networked, and foundations can invest in developing programs and enhancing the field (Leadership for a New Era, 2010).

3. Vision and Ideas

A movement must provide for a common narrative that can inspire and connect people. The vision acts as the umbrella under which individual issues can move. Since movements are fundamentally about changing power, the vision should convey a clear idea of the role of government and other holders of power, and their relationship to people. Messaging and framing are important *tactics*, but they are in service to the vision and ideas – not in place of them.

A movement vision is different from a policy goal. Equally important is how the vision is framed, as it will determine whether the vision has longevity and whether the policy goals gain traction. Framing refers to how the communication cues different responses: “the way an issue is framed

explains who is responsible, and suggests potential solutions conveyed by images, stereotypes, messengers, and metaphors” (Frameworks Institute, 2007). Pastor defined these concepts in the following way: “The vision sets the goal, the frame sets the terms of the debate, and the policy package describes how interests might be met” (The California Endowment, 2008).

As an example of how the framing of an issue affects whether it is considered as a narrow policy issue or part of a movement agenda, consider the difference between the nuclear freeze campaign of the 1980s and civil rights (Table 1). The nuclear freeze campaign, which sought to freeze the deployment of nuclear weapons, was a narrowly focused policy goal and did not address the broader issues related to international conflict. The campaign did not succeed at that time, did not sustain, and was not in service to a broader movement. Contrast that approach with the civil rights movement, which affected a broad swath of American life, spoke to high-level values, and influenced many other rights movements, from women's and gay rights to animal rights (Frameworks Institute, 2007). Some suggest that the “rights” frame is no longer resonant, that the conservative movement frame of individual freedom and values has superseded it and that a new frame is needed (Zemsky & Mann, 2008).

A vibrant research base and research capacity that can help generate big ideas, as well provide the data and analysis to address the variety of movement needs, is critical. Think tanks, academic institutions, and other research organizations, such as Frameworks Institute and American Environics, both of which research framing and

The California Alliance

The vision of the California Alliance (a project of SCOPE, a south Los Angeles community-based organization) is to build grassroots power to achieve structural reform. It is an active state alliance of organizations in 12 counties focused on educating and engaging 500,000 new and “occasional” voters on fiscal and tax reform policies and priorities.

The alliance is made up of 27 organizations that reach a broad range of constituencies in both suburban and urban regions, including poor and working communities; African American, Latino, Asian, and Pacific Islander communities; immigrants; women; youth; people on public assistance; seniors; and low-income workers. Diverse member organizations mount coordinated, large-scale civic engagement campaigns in addition to their work in community organizing, social services delivery, leadership development, policy research, and public-policy advocacy.

communications, should inform the development of a vision, but – to be clear – a vision cannot be created by a think tank or a foundation. It must come from a process of creating broad consensus across communities, constituencies, and the people who are most affected.

Funding options: Idea generation is an area where foundations have long made important contributions. They have supported academic scholarship, the development of new ideas, “think tanks,” and a variety of analyses and reports, for example. Although some of these traditional activities will be equally important for movement building, foundations will need to be mindful that supporting the development of an overarching vision or framing big ideas is not the same as funding policy analysis on individual issues, and different strategies may be required.

- Vision. Foundations can seed the development of a vision by providing opportunities among leaders and organizations to build trust and promote collaborative visioning. Support for travel, meeting space, and facilitated discussion is often in short supply for nonprofits. Moreover, funders can play a role in bringing people together who would not otherwise know each other or have an opportunity to meet. At the same time, as one foundation staff observed, among the keys to success are “letting things evolve organically and authentically, instead of forcing an agenda or partnership on the participants, and suspending the need to articulate clear outcomes at the beginning” (The California Endowment, 2008).
- Research capacity. Support for research, data

analysis, and scholarship is also important to the development of big ideas and the vision. Investment in think tanks, and building research capacity and policy leadership, is critical to establishing the credibility of ideas and solutions by policymakers, the media, and the public. Foundations should think about building institutions and elevating individual leaders who are articulate strategic thinkers and scholars, rather than program areas. This is an area in which the conservative movement foundations have heavily invested, with great success. For example, the Heritage Foundation, which is funded by conservative foundations and corporations, has been very influential in the development, active dissemination, and adoption of national public policy over the last 30-plus years; equally important has been the growth of state-based conservative think tanks that have formed the backbone for the advancement of market-oriented public policies across the country.

4. Alliances

Connectivity is the lifeblood of movements; they depend on the ability to collectively strategize and work together across levels (i.e., local, state, national), issues, organizations, and communities. This is more than just coordination, coalitions, or even collaboration. Alliances are about a shared commitment to a vision and the long term; they are multi-issue, rather than dedicated to single-issue campaigns. Alliances rely on key set of “anchor” organizations. But in contrast to traditional nonprofit organizations, anchor-movement organizations have “permeable boundaries,” meaning that they seek to engage new people as part of the

organization whether they are officially associated with it or not (Zemsky & Mann, 2008). They also view building the capacity of additional organizations that share the overall vision as enhancing the mission, not as competition.

Alliances require intentionality to enable trust and relationships – the currency of a movement – to be built. Advancing a broad agenda and going to scale requires that some issues will be identified as priorities and others will be postponed. Without the trust and belief that the movement will ultimately address a constituency or community's primary cause, the movement will not advance. Moreover, there are inherent tensions that exist between different movement elements – advocacy and organizing, for example, are not always natural partners because of differences in perspectives and roles. Funding alliance building is key to ensuring these tensions are managed and mitigated.

Funding options: Building alliances is labor- and time-intensive, and it often is not recognized as the critical glue needed to produce outcomes over the long term. There are several ways in which connectivity can be facilitated and supported. All of them, however, depend on funders recognizing the need to fund organizations across issues, geographies, or sectors, and to fund them in a way that promotes collaboration.

- Convening and joint planning. Convening is one of the most important movement-building tools. Providing the space and time for key movement leaders in the community to build relationships and trust and develop the foundation for collaboration is vital. It is the means for developing a vision, mapping strategies, and building cohesion. It is essential for overcoming the barriers to movement building – competition, siloed activity, and diverging perspectives, roles, and tactics. For example, advocates acknowledge that they are responsible to their boards and funders to advance specific agendas, which makes working across silos challenging. Competition for resources compounds the problem. Yet, they also acknowledge that greater collaboration is needed to advance all
 - of their agendas. Providing the space – physical and financial – and time for people and organizations to meet, both for short-term tactical discussion and longer-term strategic planning, is critical.
 - Network building. Some people talk about movements as networks or even networks of networks. It is the basic infrastructure model for how the right was able to knit together pro-life, pro-market, and pro-defense forces. Networks can be formal or informal; either way, networks provide the mechanism for like-minded groups and individuals to work together across a particular issue or constituency. Furthermore, detailed network analysis, which seeks to identify with whom each member of the network has relationships, enables the network to understand the potential reach – if it can be mobilized. Although it can be extremely challenging to develop a network of networks across issues and constituencies, foundations could be helpful to that process by bringing potential allies together and supporting staff and communications, and providing other resources dedicated to building and maintaining the networks. It is encouraging to note that, according to a recent survey by the Foundation Center (Lawrence, 2009), funders appear to be more inclined to work in this way than ever before. As Pastor (2009) describes it, cross-sectoral networks are the infrastructure for the final step of movement building.
 - Intermediaries. Intermediaries play a variety of important roles in a movement and are a part of the contemporary nonprofit landscape. They are resource institutions and act as go-betweens and bridge builders. They can serve specific constituencies; connect grassroots organizing to advocacy; facilitate networks and coalitions among different grassroots groups; bring a particular skill – such as media, policy development, or research – to the cause; provide technical assistance; and generally amplify grassroots voices. Some are local; others may be statewide, regional, or even national in reach.
- However, it is important to understand that intermediaries are one step removed from the

people who must be at the core of the movement. Because foundations often are not familiar with the variety of grassroots organizations that are closer to the ground, they tend to support intermediaries, sometimes even empowering them to re-grant dollars to the grassroots. This dynamic can lead to tensions with the grassroots – particularly small nonprofit movement groups, which struggle to obtain access to foundation funding.

The New World Foundation proposes a hybrid model of intermediary, which can better accommodate and bridge multiple movement-building aspects; it can also potentially mitigate some of the tensions that develop between the grassroots and intermediaries. This model operates primarily at the local level and consciously integrates the intermediary roles with base building. Such hybrid intermediaries build on organizations in base communities and integrate “constituency organizing, alliance building, and policy advocacy roles” (New World Foundation, 2000). They are movement organizations in that their policy agendas and campaigns build toward long-term agendas through interrelated goals, and they intentionally collaborate with peer organizations.

In funding intermediaries, foundations should identify what strategies, geographies, or skills they want to invest in, recognize the roles that intermediaries play best, be mindful of the tensions and dynamics that exist, and take steps to mitigate them to the extent possible.

5. *Advocacy Infrastructure*

Advocates play a central role in movements. They translate programs and problems into policy options and solutions, raise awareness and public consciousness about issues, develop relationships with policymakers so they can more effectively lobby and negotiate legislative and regulatory changes, and use litigation to challenge the status quo when other advocacy means fail.

Like the rest of movement-building work, advocacy does not lend itself to a short-term view. Organizations need to be able to build capacity,

expertise, relationships, and coalitions as well as respond to an ever-changing policy environment. Survey after survey finds that the greatest limitation to nonprofit engagement in policy advocacy is a lack of resources. Fundraising for advocacy comes mainly from foundations and, to a lesser degree, individuals. Sustainability apart from these sources is highly unlikely. Moreover, nonprofits report that even when foundations fund advocacy, it is not the type of ongoing support that is necessary for systemic change. Finally, social change is not achieved because one bill is passed. Beyond the implementation of that bill and holding the line against the opposition, real progress is dependent on legislative and regulatory changes as the local, state, and federal levels, which, over time, build upon each other and advance issues. Over the long term, these policy changes – if they are in service to an overarching vision – can change the broader priorities, including resource distribution, of society. “Bringing about change requires both a willingness to fund finite campaigns at opportune times, as well as a long-term commitment to build the capacity and leadership of key advocates” (Atlantic Philanthropies, 2008).

To be clear, within this broad category of advocacy are many different capacities and, by implication, organizations. Most of these capacities are well-documented and understood from a policy-change perspective, so this article will not detail them. However, it should be understood that an effective advocacy infrastructure includes:

- legislative and administrative advocacy expertise,
- legal advocates and litigation,
- communications and media advocacy (including framing and messaging), and
- policy research and analysis.

To be successful, this infrastructure, in combination with the grassroots and other core elements of the movement, must be able to connect local agendas throughout a region, take the local policy gains statewide and, ultimately, nationwide in an effort to bring community power to the seats of power. This process depends on a commitment to

maintaining community and grassroots engagement while operating within local, state, and national policymaking bodies. Most community and advocacy groups are small in comparison with the size of the army of lobbyists employed by vested private-sector interests, as was evident in the recent debate on health care reform. To be able to compete, advocacy organizations must be able to become sophisticated operations with a range of skills and expertise and develop a collective and collaborative approach with other organizations.

Funding options: Long-term, patient capital is critical for strong, vital anchor organizations. There is a need for both sustaining core support to established anchors and intensive capacity-building support for emerging ones.

- Core support. Core support is considered the “holy grail” of foundation funding. It enables advocacy organizations to support their administrative operations, be nimble to the changing policy environment, and build capacity. Foundations should be encouraged to provide multiyear core support to anchor advocacy organizations.
- Capacity building. Although there are many long-standing and well-resourced advocacy organizations, those that work on behalf of communities of color tend to be newer, smaller, and less well-funded. Attention should be paid, in particular, to building capacity in emerging advocacy organizations and connecting them to the more established advocates as an important way to ensure diverse voices are at the policy table.

Evaluation and Outcomes

We believe that by articulating our own evaluative indicators, we support the movement itself as well as our funder allies in finding alignment in ways that benefit organizing within communities and within philanthropy. (Asian Communities for Reproductive Justice, 2009)

Evaluating progress in movement building is important as it is in other endeavors. Although many funders and leaders have expressed concern that evaluation can be chilling to movement

building, evaluation – if structured to be appropriate to the activities – can actually help to clarify strategy and inform its progress. Developing the right metrics and indicators of progress will be critical. Most importantly, they must fit movement-building work and be of value to movement organizations and leaders. That means that the evaluation metrics should heavily emphasize process and infrastructure building – particularly in the early stages – rather than specific short-term achievements.

It is important to distinguish outcomes related to movement building from impact outcomes related to the movement's activities.

It is important to distinguish outcomes related to movement *building* from impact outcomes related to the movement's activities. Because a funder's role should focus on supporting movement building, it should, likewise, focus on outcomes and benchmarks related to progress associated with developing the five core components of movement building. Movement organizations may also want to identify impact outcomes as a way to clarify their goals; funders, however, should understand that these are much longer-term outcomes that will take many years to achieve.

In order to develop appropriate indicators, we believe that many of the principles guiding policy-advocacy evaluation are applicable (Guthrie, 2005). These principles emphasize the importance of approaching movement-building evaluation in ways that support collaboration (among movement organizations as well as between the organizations and foundations), reflection and learning in real time, capacity building, and the long-term nature of movement building.

At the same time, it's important to recognize that the frameworks and tools for policy-advocacy

evaluation address only one aspect of movement building. The other four components – base building, alliances, vision, and leadership – are equally critical to movement building, and a comprehensive evaluation framework needs to incorporate outcomes related to those activities.

Moreover, because of the length of time involved in movement building and the different stages of movements described earlier, we believe that the evaluation framework should enable progress to be tracked as the movement develops; it should be adaptable to the different stages of a movement's development. Different outcomes should be identified for each of the elements and at each stage of the movement. Also, because different elements may be more important at different stages of the movement, the evaluation needs to be able to shift priorities over time. For example, outcomes related to capacity, relationship building, and leadership development may be most critical to monitor early in the movement's development, while others, such as alliances and policy change, would become more important during the middle and later stages.

To develop a movement-building evaluation framework, we reviewed various approaches to developing outcome categories associated with policy advocacy, community organizing, and social change. These can be useful to constructing a more detailed set of meaningful and measureable benchmarks for each of the elements. For example, one recently developed movement-building evaluation framework identified policy change, communications, leadership, and relationships as the key evaluation domains and identified a range of outcomes and benchmarks (Asian Communities for Reproductive Justice, 2009). Likewise, a policy-change evaluation framework suggested six categories for evaluation: social norms, organizational capacity, alliances, base of support, policies, and impact (Reisman, 2007). Another recent paper broke down community organizing into seven core components to guide evaluation (Foster & Louie, 2009). Lastly, the Advocacy Evaluation Tool (Alliance for Justice, 2005) outlines a framework for assessing the capacity of an advocacy infrastructure. What all of these tools

have in common is that they depend on organizations or coalitions being able to clearly articulate their goals and strategies up front as the basis for evaluation. These tools then pose questions that encourage reflection, assessment, and analysis in real time so that the information can be fed back to the organization, coalition, or alliance – as well as the funder – in order to inform and revise strategies. These tools also recognize the fluid nature of the environment in which change is being sought and the length of time involved in achieving that change.

Building on these efforts, we propose the following evaluation framework and offer sample benchmarks for the different categories (Table 2).

Conclusion

Funding movement building is not for every foundation. It likely is not for most foundations. It requires a different mindset and orientation.

There is no magic formula that will catalyze and sustain a movement to create real and fundamental change. Reviews of past and current movements demonstrate that movement building is a multifaceted, long-term effort that depends on “inside” and “outside” strategies, engaged residents and communities, advocates, and allies – all committed to a common agenda.

Fundamental to any movement is the active involvement of communities and residents directly affected by the current conditions that produce ill health. Therefore, community organizing and mobilization must be a core strategy. However, grassroots engagement alone is not sufficient to create a movement or change. It must be complemented by data and research, advocacy, key allies, leadership, and, most of all, a common vision and strategy that can knit together different issues campaigns, goals, and leaders. And a movement must be able to transcend and reach groups beyond its base to, ultimately, engage the public. All of these elements must be coordinated through some type of movement infrastructure.

Long-term investment and nurturing of the infrastructure, with time and space for leader-

TABLE 2 An Evaluation Framework for Movement Building

Stage of Movement	MOVEMENT BUILDING ELEMENTS				
	Base Building Sample Benchmarks	Leadership Sample Benchmarks	Vision Sample Benchmarks	Alliances Sample Benchmarks	Advocacy Infrastructure Sample Benchmarks
Stage 1: Infrastructure Building	<p>Participation and membership of both paid and volunteer leaders increase in base-building organizations</p> <p>Reflection time and assessment are built into movement activities</p>	<p>Movement leaders and the roles they play emerge and are recognized within the movement</p> <p>Leaders are supported to develop their skills, roles and visibility</p>	<p>A process for creating a shared analysis of the problem is developed</p> <p>Movement organizations develop strategic plans with explicit movement goals</p> <p>New "frame" is developed</p>	<p>Alliance anchors increase organizations capacity</p> <p>Capacity for collaboration is developed</p> <p>Intermediaries develop relationships with grass roots and anchor organizations</p>	<p>Needed skills and competencies regarding policy research and analysis, communications, legal advocacy, etc., are identified</p> <p>Organizational capacity for each of the skills is increased</p>
Stage 2: Identity and Intention	<p>New leaders (paid and volunteer) are developed and recruited</p> <p>New members and constituencies are recruited and the base expands</p>	<p>Collaborative leadership philosophy is widely adopted by movement leaders</p> <p>Leaders at all levels of the movement are respected for their different roles and responsibilities within the movement</p>	<p>Movement leaders develop shared values, motivations, and interests</p> <p>A new persuasive meta-narrative emerges</p> <p>Movement values and priorities begin to gain salience outside of the movement</p>	<p>Number, breadth, and capacity of alliances are strengthened</p> <p>Joint strategic planning and identification of priorities among anchor organizations occurs</p> <p>Trust is built among alliance members</p>	<p>Identification of policy goals</p> <p>Policy campaigns are carried out and progress is made toward policy "wins"</p> <p>Joint strategy development occurs among advocates</p> <p>Collaborative fundraising and sharing of resources increases</p>
Stage 3: The "Movement Moment"	<p>Power and leadership of the "base" are recognized by community and political leaders</p> <p>Movement experiences rapid recruitment and significant growth</p>	<p>Movement leaders are recognized by public and political institutions</p>	<p>Public support of the meta-narrative increases</p> <p>Political will for movement goals significantly increases</p>	<p>Movement organizations share resources</p> <p>Movement builds relationships with other movements</p>	<p> Policymaker champions are identified</p> <p>Major policy initiatives advance and are enacted</p>
Stage 4: Integration/Dissipation		<p>New generation of leadership emerges</p>	<p>Norms change and the vision becomes widely shared among public and political leaders</p>		<p>Policy priorities are widely accepted and continue to drive agendas of movement organizations</p>

ship, convenings, and network development, will enable trust and relationships to be built. Out of this process, a movement will be catalyzed when events and circumstances arise that a prepared and coordinated set of leaders and organizations can take advantage of to propel the vision into action and create change.

When and how a movement takes off is part planning and preparation, and part good timing and luck. A movement will not happen without the basic elements, supported in healthy doses and over a long period of time; nor will it happen as long as organizations, issues, and communities stay siloed and apart from each other. That must start with philanthropy. If a foundation chooses to invest in movement building, it must approach it from a holistic perspective and not from its individual program areas. Moreover, foundations could model cross-issue collaborations by pooling resources with like-minded foundations to support different elements of the movement infrastructure.

Foundations can play a critical role in movement building if it is approached with intentionality, strategy, and, most of all, humility – if successful, the movement will belong to the grantees, communities, leaders and, ultimately, the people most affected.

References

- ALLIANCE FOR JUSTICE. (2005). *Build your advocacy grantmaking: Advocacy evaluation tool*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Justice.
- ASIAN COMMUNITIES FOR REPRODUCTIVE JUSTICE. (2009). *Movement building indicators*. Oakland, CA: ACRJ.
- ATLANTIC PHILANTHROPIES. (2008). *Why supporting advocacy makes sense for foundations*. New York: Atlantic Philanthropies.
- CAMPBELL, L., & KUNREUTHER, F. (2006). *Social services and social change: A process guide*. New York: Building Movement Project, DEMOS.
- CAMPBELL, M., & COFFMAN, J., (2009). Tools to support public policy grantmaking. *Foundation Review*, 1(3), 123-131.
- D'EMILIO, J. (2002). *The world turned: Essays on gay history, politics, and culture*. London: Duke University Press.
- DELGADO, R., & STEFANCIC, J. (1996). *No mercy: How conservative think tanks and foundations changed America's social agenda*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- DREIER, P. (2002). Social justice philanthropy: Can we get more bang for the buck? *Social Policy*, 33(1), 27-33.
- FOSTER, C., & LOUIE, J. (2010). *Grassroots action and learning for social change*. Washington, DC: Center for Evaluation Innovation. Retrieved from http://www.innonet.org/client_docs/File/center_pubs/evaluating_community_organizing.pdf
- FRAMEWORKS E-ZINE ISSUE NO. 29 & 36. (2007, June 15). *Framing lessons from social movements literature*. Washington, DC: Frameworks Institute. Retrieved January 10, 2010, from <http://www.frameworksinstitute.org>
- GUTHRIE, K., LOUIE, J., DAVID, T., & FOSTER, C. (2005). *The challenge of assessing policy and advocacy activities: Part I*. San Francisco: Blueprint Research and Development.
- HARDISTY, J., & BHARGAVA, D. (2005, November 7). Wrong about the right. *The Nation*, 22 – 26.
- HARDISTY, J., & BHARGAVA, D. (2010, July 19). Holding the center. *The Nation*, 23 - 26.
- HOLTON-HODSON, R., & BROUSSEAU, R. (2006). Strengthening a state's health advocacy infrastructure. *Health Affairs*, 25(3), 856-859.
- KREHELY, J., HOUSE, M., & KERNAN, E. (2004). *Axis of ideology: Conservative foundations and public policy*. Washington, DC: National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy.
- LAWRENCE, S. (2009). *Social justice grantmaking II*. New York: The Foundation Center.
- LEADERSHIP FOR A NEW ERA. (n.d.). *Transforming leadership*. Retrieved July 15, 2010, from <http://www.leadershipforanewera.org>
- MARSH, D., DANIEL, M., & PUTNAM, K. (2003). *Leadership for policy change: Strengthening communities of color through leadership development*. Oakland, CA: PolicyLink.
- MCADAM, D., MCARTHY, J.D., & ZALD, M.N. (1996). *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- NEW WORLD FOUNDATION. (2003). *Funding social movements: The New World Foundation perspective*. New York: New World Foundation.

- NEW WORLD FOUNDATION. (2000). *A new look at intermediaries*. New York: New World Foundation.
- PASTOR, M., & ORTIZ, R. (2009). *Making change: How social movements work and how to support them*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
- PERTSCHUK, M., SALOOJEE, Y., & GLYNN, T. (2003). *Strategy planning for tobacco control movement building*. American Cancer Society. Retrieved from http://strategyguides.globalink.org/pdfs/guide2_MovementBuilding.pdf
- PRAXIS PROJECT. (2008). *From concern to action: A look at consumer engagement to advance quality health care*. Washington, DC.
- RAYNOR, J., YORK, P., & SIM, SHAO-CHEE. (2009). *What makes an effective advocacy organization?* Los Angeles: TCC Group and The California Endowment.
- REISMAN, J., GIENAPP, A., & STACHOWIAK, S. (2007). *A guide to measuring policy and advocacy*. Seattle: Organizational Research Services.
- THE CALIFORNIA ENDOWMENT. (2008). *Convening on movement building*. Los Angeles. June 24, 2008.
- ZEMSKY, B., & MANN, D. (2008). Building organizations in a movement moment. *Social Policy*, 38(3), 9-17.

Barbara Masters, M.A., was public policy director for The California Endowment and is now principal with MastersPolicyConsulting. She has more than 25 years of experience in public policy and advocacy, both in government and the nonprofit sector. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Barbara Masters, 80 North Raymond Avenue #207, Pasadena, CA 91103 (email: Barbara@masterspolicy.com).

Torie Osborn, M.B.A., is senior director of strategic relationships for The California Alliance. A lifelong social change activist, she was chief civic engagement officer with United Way of Greater Los Angeles, senior advisor to Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa, and executive director of Liberty Hill Foundation.