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Ken: I've got the top of the hour here. There are folks that are joining right now. I'm going to wait until 1:01 and then hit the record button. Glad we have Jenna on doing captioning today. Thanks, Jenna. Make sure you have that visible if you need it. I'll give you a quick cue in a second here to kick us off.

We're recording.

Joanne: Welcome, everyone. I am Joanne Carter, Executive Director of Results. And a special welcome to anyone joining us for the first time. As I was preparing for this last webinar of 2021, I've been thinking back on this time last year when we were nine months into the COVID pandemic. Congress at that time had failed to pass any relief measures in months. I said to many of you on this webinar last December that I believed that we were entering one of the most consequential moments of our 40 year history. Looking back on 2021 today, I feel like you proved that right. And despite the horrific and equitable circumstances for so many people, the victories you helped when for poverty this year some of the biggest and most transformational in our history. As many of you know, for the last six months, millions of families have received a monthly child tax credit. Low income workers who had been shut off from the ITC before now had access. And all this because of the changes you helped secure in March. In communities all over the world have a surge of resources to combat COVID, AIDS, TB, and malaria that you helped make possible. Seeing the scale of what's possible, it makes it even clearer with left undone. We know that millions of people are still struggling to get by. And that includes many people online today and one's community members. Profound levels of poverty and suffering ongoing, and health apart tied, and the forces of systemic oppression alive and well stop

Which is why this emergency relief has to be just the start. As transformational as the policies this year have been, they are temporary. And today you're going to hear what they had in 2022. In all of that, all of it, it's about going through an emergency response to locking in change. You will see how the breakthroughs you've achieved this year help make that possible. And again, I think there's no clearer example than the expansions of the child income tax credit. The bill back better legislation we are all working so hard on right now will make a positive change to who receives the child tax credit. But the others will still expire after this year. We need to be a model for how equity should work.

And on the global front, I think many of you may have seen this, but it's really exciting. The White House just announced that it will host the major pledging conference next fall for the global fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. The instrument that many of you have worked on for years or even decades. And again, the $3.5 billion global record-setting fund that you help secure this month, it not only demonstrated the global role that Results can play in shaping pandemic response in the future. Next year's pledging conference can be a historic moment to both regain the progress to actually end the epidemics of AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis this decade but also define pandemic preparedness and global health security and build the health systems that reach everyone for the long run. We see the need for this so clearly, even just this week with the omicron variant.

So all of our work in 2022 will be about going again from a short-term emergency response to this kind of lasting, structural change. Will Congress make the child tax credit and the earned income tax credit expansions permanent? Or let poverty skyrocket again because of inaction? Will the White House boldly assert leadership to end the old and new pandemics? Will the federal government to do its part to undo the underlying housing crisis? These are the questions at the center of our work in 2022. In our advocacy, your advocacy, will help shape the answers and really determine transformation in this next year.

In a moment, my colleague Alicia will remind us of the powerful actions you've taken this last year. And we believe that grounding ourselves in what we've achieved helps set us up for the big job ahead. And while the crucial progress this year does not guarantee the kind of progress we need, it does make it possible.

I just want to end my opening with a special shout out to the 2021 class of the Results fellowship in the class that just closed out a year of powerful advocacy. Raina in Arizona had six congressional meetings, including four in the senator's office. Bringing people together to tackle the housing crisis on both the local and federal level. In Connecticut, this summer they got a letter published, and broke their record and got it published in eight months.

Now I'm going to hand it over to Alicia, who is a Fellowship alum herself. I hope this will remind you of your power in the future we all want to create.

Alicia: I'm Alicia Stromberg on the grassroots expansion team. It's incredible to think of how much we've accomplished this year and the millions of people were feeling the powerful effects of her advocacy. As Joanne mentioned, increased funding to fight AIDS, TB, and malaria. Her impact really reach all corners of the world, and it takes a lot to achieve these great wins. I think I have the best role today because I get to celebrate all that we've accomplished in 2021 and share about the hundreds of actions we've taken this year. Our advocacy really adds up. So while I'm speaking and sharing over the next few minutes, I invite you to put a + in the chat if you've taken the action I mentioned. If you've taken multiple actions this year, don't hesitate to put multiple plus signs in the chat.

So in 2021, we hosted 581 lobby meetings, and nearly 100 of those were face-to-face meetings with senators and representatives. I know we are still working hard on reporting for the year, and some of you are still even in action. Though I'm sure we're going to clock in over 600 lobby meetings by the time we are closed out. That is incredible. All of your collective actions add up. So if you did any of these things to influence Congress this year, keep putting those plus signs in the chat. Wow, it's so awesome to see all of these actions adding up.

We also published 477 media pieces, including the Washington Post, and shout out to the consistent media efforts of our Arizona and West Virginia chapters. Congrats to all of our media superstars in the network. If you published a media piece, reach out to a media outlet, or even send your LTE to an outlet on social media, put your pluses in the chat. And don't forget, we made Results history this year by meeting with all 100 Senate offices as part of the first 100 days campaign. That was something I was so proud to be a part of. So if you were involved in that historic campaign earlier this year, please put a + in the chat. Joanne has told us all about what your advocacy has made possible, and that's only because of the hundreds of hours you dedicated this year. So please, give yourself a pat on the back and take a moment to acknowledge all of your hard work. Congratulations to everyone, and thank you so much.

Look at all these awesome plus signs in the chat. It's so true that every single one of us today has played a role in this and whether you've been with us a few weeks, a few months, or a few years, we are so proud of what you've accomplished with us together. It's also exciting because our movement is growing. We are excited to be welcoming new volunteers and building our influence in Congress with more voices and stories, and we would not have achieved all these amazing accomplishments in 2021 without the new folks that have been joining Results. So it's my pleasure today to welcome the newest volunteers in the network, who joined us most recently as part of our fall recruitment campaign. Thank you so much for being here as part of our fight against poverty. I hope that this time next year, you're here with us celebrating your compliments too.

Later on in this webinar, our guest speaker will be speaking to us about how to live strong movement and harness our collective power. It's very inspiring to think about as we celebrate our growth and our impaction this last year. I can't wait to hear from Liz later today, and thank you all again for your advocacy this year. Now I'm going to turn it over to Meredith Dodson to talk about more actions we can take. Next go all.

Meredith: Thanks, Alicia. Hi, everyone. It's a beautiful December day here in Washington DC. Meredith Dodson, Dir. of US poverty policy work. As we go through this conversation, I think the next slide is a slide about our anti-oppression values as an organization. Obviously we hope in the short term with our policy work this month that we are moving towards greater equity, we know there is more to be done. And for all of you that were able to join us on our last webinar, we talked more about plans to engage across the network and move to become a more anti-oppressive organization. So with that, let me update you with what's happening here in Washington DC. Right now, so much of our work, a lot of the great accomplishments, a new folks, longtime folks, were all clapping your plus signs in the chat. Those were all related over the last six, nine months to a recovery package, a large skill package that brings us much closer to equity that allows us to dramatically address poverty here and around the world. The good news is that that package has now passed the House of Representatives. On November 19, the House passed the bill that makes the child tax credit fully refundable on a permanent basis. That makes sure that the lowest income families structurally in our tax code will get the full value of the CTC from here on forward.

In addition it extends eligibility for immigrants for the child tax credit. For low and moderate income families, the monthly payments will continue. It also extends the earned income tax credit, a really important tax provision for younger workers and others who don't claim dependence. And has historic investments in rental assistance, over $22 billion in expanding new housing choice vouchers for an estimated 300,000 households as part of a $150 billion housing investment in the build back better package. It also helps us move towards vaccine equity by including resources that can be used for global vaccine manufacturing capacity.

So good news, one chamber is passed. Next slide, let's talk about what's next. Let me make it crystal clear. This is only going to happen if folks continue to raise their voices, if they continue to push that this needs to be a priority in the next few weeks. We are in the homestretch, folks. What make it happen.

The Senate leadership is going through process in looking at the changes that they will make to this legislative process. There are things that have to do with the rules and their negotiating and reviewing with the Senate parliamentarian. Obviously there are other changes that need to be made to ensure that it will be passed on the Senate floor. That's happening kind of behind the scenes now. We are hoping that by December 13, this package will be brought to the Senate floor. So that could mean we have votes on a whole bunch of amendments, we call voterama. In the neighborhood of December 15, 16th, 17th. This is a very tentative timeline, and you all, again, can make this happen. Whatever the Senate passes, hopefully in the next two weeks, gets sent back to the House. And then it would go to the president's desk for signature.

As a reminder, we do have a full blog post you can use to keep updated.

I do want to underscore some new data about what's at stake. We know that 9/10 families are eligible for these expanded child tax credits. This data was made available from Columbia University this past week or so. You can see 6.8 million children moved above the poverty line the child tax credit itself. That's in comparison to what child poverty would be like without this expansion that you will make happen for 2021.

It's great to see these numbers as we go month by month, they'll put a link in the chat if folks do want to check out the research later. But we know that if Congress does not pass this package, child poverty will increase. It will increase for all racial and ethnic groups. 9.9 million kids are at risk of slipping back to live the poverty line or deeper into poverty without this expanded CTC going into 2022. I will also put a link in the chat that will include a summary afterwards, research that really digs in on what it means. You can see some information here on the children raised above the federal poverty line, but will share more information that really breaks down by race and ethnicity. So next slide, just to close out.

We've got to get this thing done. We want to make sure that policymakers know that they want to pass a large-scale recovery package. The key action to make this happen is to keep up the pressure by generating media. So keep up the great work on that. We'll circle back and keep you updated on when we expect Senate votes and some key places to push to make sure that we protect this antipoverty package. Really, the key action you can take this month is continuing to do the great media work, and keep the pressure on folks all across the country.

So that's the brief legislative update. With that, I think I'm turning it over to Karyne, who's going to introduce our guest speaker. Karyne, are you there?

Karyne: Yes, I am. Can you hear me okay? Wonderful. Thank you, Meredith. Good afternoon and good morning. Welcome, everyone. I'm honored today to present our special guest speaker, Liz McKenna. She is the co-author of Prisms of the People. They did six case studies in Arizona, Minnesota, Ohio, and Virginia have been able to build capacity in engaging constituents through the everyday work of democracy and translate those actions into political influence. The analysis included the characteristics of winning and losing campaigns and showed immense power for change. Welcome, Liz.

Liz: Thank you so much, Karyne. Can you hear me okay? Thank you all so much for this invitation. Karyne for the introduction. That was such a sick synced and nice summary of the book. I wish I had recorded that. And Ken, thank you for the invitation to be here.

Hello, everyone. My name is Liz McKenna. I'm zooming in from the Bay Area, California. I apologize because I have a little bit of a cold. Going to pull up my slide deck here, and I'm very excited to show you a talk about our book and what we have learned over the past five or six years in studying these outlier cases in the US. The book is called Prisms of the People. I think I shared with the organizers a 20% off code. But the book itself kind of tackles this question. We began the research right after Donald Trump was elected in the fall of 2016. I'm a sociologist, and we have a political scientist and another sociologist. We study the science of social change. What is it that we can do, what is it that the people can do to influence change in political outcomes? We found ourselves at a loss as to what to tell people around that time. Because more people had been mobilized and contacted at the doors in 2016. There were lots of cases where we had thousands, if not tens of thousands of people pouring into the streets protesting over the last few years. And in many cases, we found we'd actually regressed in terms of the things we care most about.

So we trying to see where we can systematically study when and where change happens. What I'm showing you here is a table. Each row represents a type of resource available, and the not yet filled in column, the second column, will be populated with the percent of issues where the side that had greater control of that particular resource one. There was a study published in 2009 that looked at 500 bills in Congress, so not unlike the recovery package that we were just hearing about beforehand. Before they knew whether or not it would pass, they tallied up which side had greater control of each of these types of resources. And the intuition behind the study was to say, which of these resources was predictive of success?

So to begin with a little audience interaction, haven't populated this table is because I'm curious. For many of you, this is your bread and butter. Which of these resources on the left do you think is most predictive of the side that wins? Do you think the side that spends more business and financial resources, it has greater membership, more people, higher levels of campaign contributions, you think those sides are more likely to win? Going to ask everyone to just pop in the chat. This is not a pop quiz. You will not be graded on this later. Which of these resources do you think matter the most for passing policy in Congress?

Ken with the first vote for covered officials lobbying. High-Level government allies. Couple more votes for kind of economic, material campaign contributions. Willey with the optimistic vote. Membership. People. People matter. Business. Lobbying in general. Mid-Level government allies. That's really interesting. So we have a range of votes here. And I would say, if I had to go with the modal response here, it looks like resources. So far I've only seen one for membership, which is the people power element of this.

So here's the results. What these say is that 78% of the time, the side of the bill that had more high-level government allies one, either in passing or blocking the bill, whatever their interest was. 63% of the time, covered officials lobbying, and 60% of the time, mid-level government allies. Before you knew whether or not the bill was going to pass and if you look at the recovery act a few months ago, and tallied up the resources, you would say there's a 60% chance that mid-level government allies wins.

What's disappointing in this research is everything else. So 50% of the time, the side that had more people, more membership, one. So essentially it was a flip of the coin, there you are looking at the side that had more people, more financial resources. And surprisingly, all those votes for money, the side that spent more didn't necessarily win. It was a 50-50 chance. So scholars for social movements, people involved in collective action, this is potentially a very pessimistic finding, which is to say that wow, it doesn't even matter. Even if I were to get the biggest number of people on my side, I would only have a 50-50 percent chance of winning the most probable outcome is actually the status quo, no change. So as I said, kind of what we sought to do was to say, where are the pieces that are outliers? Where we find that these groups, organizations come together and effectively build political power despite the improbability of the work? In the row in the table that said membership, we all know that there are membership organizations and their membership organizations. That row in the table doesn't distinguish between a group that has millions of people in its listserv and a group that has maybe 10 people.

In the second way to situated was, one way to figure out what we were looking at the kinds of cases we wanted to understand in greater depth was, groups that fell in a table that looks like this had access to resources, high levels of resources or levels of resources. All kinds of resources. And then on the other axis, the degree to which they exercise power. Low-Power versus high-power, or influence. We can think about it that way. So the first box is populated here. It's easy to think of lots of cases where organizations don't have access to high-level government officials. Don't have a big warchest, don't have many people, and also don't exercise much power. We can think of lots of those cases.

On the flipside, it's also possible to think of groups like the NRA. Where you have a group that has massive, massive grassroots infrastructure as well as access to all those high-level officials and money and so forth, all those connections. And they also exercise high degrees of power. So those are more obvious cases of grassroots power and action.

Groups that have high levels of resources and yet fail to exercise a high degree of political power. And the image here is sort of who represent the climate change movements, apiece in 2013 analyzed how and why it was that the claimant movement had more money that almost any other movement in history. So an extremely well-funded movement was unable to make policy changes that they cared about. And similarly, cases that have low levels of traditional resources. They don't have access to the halls of Congress or opinion pieces. And yet they are able to exercise a lot of power. I put two different books that are very wonderful reads if you're interested in this line of research. One is by Elizabeth Clemens. It's called The People's Lobby. Prior to even having the franchise, so it was a constituency of people that didn't even have access to the ballot to influence legislation in a meaningful way.

Another example is Marshall Ganz, who is a sociologist and organizing scholar and organizer himself at the Harvard Kennedy school. The book is called Why David Sometimes Wins. He tries to understand why the United farmworkers movement, which had very low levels of traditional resources, was able to out match and overcome an extremely well-connected union at the time. So we were interested in the modern cases that fell in that upper right quadrant.

So the way we designed the study and the way we selected our cases. I'm not going to going to too much detail about this, although I'm happy to in the Q&A at the end if folks are interested. We wanted to get cases that were as different as possible in terms of the issue they were working on, the state they were working on, the level of government, some municipal and some statewide and even nationwide. And the reason we did that is that we know there are some things that are predictive of success. There's something called the political opportunity structure. If it's favorable, if you have allies in Congress and in media, you're likely to be successful. We didn't want to choose cases where the political opportunity structure was equal across the board.

So we look at a range of possible cases, and we ended up coming up with examples in the four states that Karyne mentioned. Arizona, we looked at the immigration rights movement, particularly following the passage of the show me your papers law which passed in 2010. And in Minnesota, we observed a faith-based group and their attempts to influence the gubernatorial election in 2018. In Virginia our case looked at the rights restoration. So Virginia to that point before our study was one of only one states that permanently disenfranchised formerly incarcerated people. And the group that we followed was one of the key actors helping overturn that legislation.

So what you're looking at here is a quick sense of the analysis on the dimensions. We wanted to choose places that were not already and were not all blue. But were kind of in the middle. That had Democrats and Republicans in power. The density of civic organizations is quite distinct across the cases. So Arizona in 2010, which is when this data is from, were in the bottom five in all 50 states in terms of number of organizations for all people. If it were true that all the states that we selected were green across a bunch of these variables come it would be hard to explain the outcome beyond the economic factors of the density of civic organizations and so forth.

So another key challenge in this research was, we actually had to demonstrate that a power shift occurred. So the intuition behind the strategy was come choose cases that were low resources, high-power. Welcome what is high-power? How do we think about measuring and understanding whether a power shift actually occurred? The bottom line is that it typically comes down to what we think of as the tip of the iceberg. Power is often reduced to who wins and who loses? Who got 50% +1 of the vote and who didn't? Who wins in a fight? These are very kind of obvious physical ways of measuring power. There is a lot of research, and certainly most of you work in organizing and social movements understand that power operates at less visible levels as well. So this is the metaphor of the iceberg, where there's the water line and then there's deep beneath the waterline, where the structure and paradigms and narratives that even make certain kinds of change feasible or not. So we want to look at these more durable, often list visible markers of power.

I want to look at two examples come Arizona and Ohio. And I'm happy to talk about this or anything else in the future. Going to spend a little bit of time telling you how we measure this because this is a question that comes up a lot. When we say political power, what are we talking about? Are we talking about just passing the bill, or are we talking about a collective of people who are able to influence power over a long period of time on those less visible indicators?

As I mentioned, the Arizona case looks at the 2010 passage of SB 1070. Immediately following the passage of the build him the organizers in the case that we looked at launched a vigil. It lasted 104 days on the capital lawn in Phoenix, and if anyone's been to Arizona in the summer, this was 110-degree heat. Thousands of people, high school students walked out. Women held prayer circles. And there were militiamen, so people in black masks, who patrols to intimidate the people who were on the capital lawn protesting the passage of SB 1070. So this was a very difficult moment, and there was a mass mobilization in response. But yet the bill still passed. So the governor signed it into law. So what we want to understand is, what happened after that?

What you're looking at here is an analysis that uses the ideology score in the houses. The story this tells is, it's not looking good if you're an immigrants rights organizer in Arizona post 2010. Because both the house and the Stennett Senate and the state legislature are growing more powerful. It's unlikely that the advocates who had this really dramatic, draconian anti-immigrant bill pass in 2010 were able to do anything to stop it.

But what we found by downloading and coding all the immigration -related bills that came to the legislature in Arizona as either expansive -- so pro-immigrant or restrictive anti-immigrant -- was that the number of anti-immigrant bills fell by half over this period. So I shaded that in blue here. You also see the vertical lines. The first vertical line is when SB 1070 past. Just two years later, the movement succeeded in Arizona's first statewide recall. For the author of the bill, then Pres. of the Senate. And after one attempt at that failed in 2012, they ended up ousting Sheriff. So even as they were having these high-profile wins, they were also changing the durable policy configuration with respect to immigration in Arizona. If we were to expand this graph, certainly the story of 2020 in Arizona must tell the story of what was happening in their response to SB 1070. These were many of the immigration rights groups who turned out and helped flip the situation in 2020.

So the other way we looked at power shifts was told through the case of Ohio. So again, there's a long history of this. Another major learning for us. Anytime you're trying to understand power shifts, you just look at one single moment, probably missing the long work or history of what the configuration was before and after. But in 2001, a Cincinnati police officer shot and killed Timothy Thomas, an unarmed black man. And not unlike what happened in response to the George Floyd's murder in Minnesota last year, there was a mass uprising.

In response, a business led, sort of city elite, well-connected political commission came together and said how do we solve this problem? One of the things this commission came up with was to say -- Meredith was talking about child poverty. This is one of the central challenges that the commission came up with as being one of the root causes of racial disparity in the city, was a lack of childhood education. So this group of people got together and said, we need more preschool. And so they put together a privately funded, mostly funded through the United Way. They put together a really large sum of money. They had the backing of all the Fortune 500 CEOs. They have political clout. Were getting off Ed's in the New York Times. And yet, despite all those resources, they were unable to move the needle on early childhood readiness.

Second campaign happened in 2010. What they tried to do was mobilize public support for early childhood education through a pledge drive. So this very well resourced mobilization campaign will exceeded their goal of something like 5000 signatures of people who were in support of preschool. They even had all of the city Council members go before television cameras and newspaper and very dramatically signed the pledge in front of everyone and say, here we go, we're going to pass preschool. But the person who led this campaign whom I interviewed said, that was great. It looks like a presidential press gavel. We had all the things we needed in order, and when. Push came to shove, it wasn't funded by the city Council because we had no teeth.

They decided to organize a base of people who are interested in cared about the challenge of childhood racialized poverty in Cincinnati. So instead of a pledge drive, what they did was built out a grassroots base of people who did some of the turnouts during the elections. The ballot measure ended up passing in 2016 in a Trump election. So this was a major upset, huge win. The story of how they did it is the story we tell in the book. And the key take away from this timeline is that there were at least two attempts to sell this problem using these traditional resources: money, media, even mobilizations. And yet it was only when the a most projects got involved that they were able to get enough power to shift the policy on that issue.

We did a network analysis. So we surveyed everyone who was a member of the coalition to try to pass preschool in Cincinnati at two different points in time to see if there was a reconfiguration of the power network. So what you are looking out on the left side of the screen here is a network map that ties between each of the different maps are to indicate whether or not those two nodes strategize together based on their sponsors. In the color of the nodes indicates whether they were a business group, a policy group. The dark blue groups stands for Cincinnati public schools. And the green nodes were members of the AMOS project, the organization we studied on the previous slide.

What you'll see here is that the central nodes are the business, the United Way, and the CPP. The size of the node is a function of that node's influence. The key point here is that at time two, the network had dramatically shifted. So Troy, the director of the network project, went from being one of the most peripheral nodes to being at the center of people who were determining how the ballot measure would be written, how the campaign would be run, and also how much it would be implemented.

That was one way of making visible not just whether or not the bill passed but also the entire network of relationships changing over time as a result of their organizing.

Just one more measure that we used which is pretty fascinating is not strategizing together but negotiating conflict. So the network map at time one looks different as well, different from time to. This indicates the ties here of people who said they were negotiating conflict with one another. Which means that they were basically hashing it out. What was going to be the substance of the legislation, what was going to be written, what was going to be prioritized first for child care. Here you see again at time one, the network is quite sparse. People were mobilizing. They were getting people to sign. Everyone's in favor of early childhood education. It was easy to do that, to get people to sign a pledge and say I am in favor of early childhood education. When it came time to actually rate policy about it, you have the members here at time to. Troy, who became the largest note in the middle at time to come was actually bringing his constituency to the table and holding others to account on parts of the platform and the issue that really matter to them. So that was one way we thought we could make it visible, the power shift from time one time two.

I know I speak quickly, so I built in this pause to see if there were any questions about our major findings. I see the chat has one or two questions from earlier that I may have missed. I apologize about that. By built in this moment halfway through the presentation to see if folks have any print questions about the study design, about how we measured power, or anything I've gone over so far. And please, don't be shy.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, Liz. What are some examples of mid-level allies?

Liz: It depends on the arena. High-Level allies are essentially government level allies. These are people in cabinet positions, legislative staffers, and so forth. But in the Cincinnati case that I just gave him a high-level ally would be someone more like that CEO of Procter & Gamble or someone who's on the city commission or in the Chamber of Commerce. So it really depends on the arena that we are talking about. In the case of Arizona, we're looking at the state level in a legislative arena. I would be people our high-level staffers or even electives or decision-makers. So it really depends, but just to be crystal clear about that first slide, Baumgardner's colleagues were looking at high-level government officials.

>>SPEAKER: What are CPS and CPP?

Liz: Yes, I know I have so many acronyms here. CPS is Cincinnati public schools, and CPP is campaign political promise. That was the campaign that gathered so many signatures.

>>SPEAKER: So far, what are the implications for Results as an organization?

Liz: Great. I'm going to go into some of the big findings and to? So far come with a couple of things I'll highlight is thinking very critically about how you measure power will stop as far as just winning an election, there are lots of cases where people win an election but lose power or lose an election but Bill power. There was the first initial attempt by the Arizona immigrant rights groups to oust Joe Arpaio, and they lost by a lot. But in the way they picked that fight and build the campaign, actually ended up building their strategic capacity, their collective capacity, their supporter lists, their number of allies, and so forth. Another example of that is Stacy Abrams. She lost by a very razor thin margin. On the tip of the iceberg, that's a loss. But she was able to shift power in other dimensions.

The other I would point to, especially since I went into a little more detail on that in the Ohio campaign so far come is thinking about just having money. Just having lobbying. Even having access to high-level allies and so forth was not enough in this case. So there actually had to be immobilized and organized constituency base to mobilize and move the policy over time. I saw a question in the chat about staying powers. Absolutely. Because we are talking about long arcs of time, at least 10 years here.

Those are great questions, and just in the interest of time, I'm going to go straight to my sort of, so what? And what we found was common across all these cases. So we developed this metaphor of a prism, sort of the central metaphor of the book. And the idea here is that the white light that goes into a prism can be analogized to different resources that an organization absorbs. Money, media attention, signatures on a campaign, people's volunteer hours, and so forth. Depending on the internal design of the prism, that white light can be reflected in different ways. And all four of the cases that we looked at +2 extension cases come we think about the internal design of the prism. Refracting those resources into these colorful vectors of external power, outward power. So that sort of the thought behind the prism metaphor. The resources in, and some organizations can just be resources in, resources out. Other organizations can take those resources and refract them in powerful ways.

And what we found in cases across different arenas, even in different periods of time, is that they focus on. For major things at the heart of their prism. Maximizing strategic choice set. This focuses on what strategic choices are enabled by the resources they have. So in the case of CPP, they collected 5000 pledges. They even got the city Council to sign on. That was the resource they had. They had some public will manifested in that. But when push came to shove and the city Council decided not to fund preschool. They didn't have anything but that stack of pledges. When AMOS went to the table, they had an organized group of people who are going to turn up. So all of the groups, all of the leaders and all the cases were focused much less on, do we win on this particular point are not, but rather, are we agile? Are we able to adapt in a given circumstance? Do we have resources we can adapt and change as the political weather shift and so forth.

The main way they did that was by investing in a base of people. A relationally connected base of people who have these three characteristics I'll walk through. They were independent, committed, and flexible. Independent basically means that they were not beholden to someone else's assessment of their value in any given moment. This means that they weren't dependent on philanthropy dollars, for example. So there was a base of people who showed up whether or not there was grant money. If your power depends solely upon access to a specific official, and that official is no longer elected, then you don't have an independent source of power.

When we say committed, we mean loyal to the organization and people within the organization even more loyal to a particular issue. And then flexible, so able to shift and redeploy their resources in different ways as their resources shifted. Because in all cases, there was pushback. If you're truly challenging power, there will be a reaction. If you find yourself attempting to confront power, and you never are confronted back, it might mean you're not actually confronting power.

So here's the example of what I mean when I say an independent source of power, again from our Ohio case. So Troy Jackson, the Executive Director of this organization that I mentioned, shared with us years worth of weekly reflections that he wrote. At the end of the week, he would sit down and say, here are the one on ones I had come here were the meetings with officials I had come here are the risks I took compare the risks I didn't take. I'm going to share one excerpt from one of these reflections, and it happened when the coalition was at a very difficult moment, and they were fighting essentially about how to fund preschool. And Troy and his base wanted one thing, and the powerful business leaders in the coalition wanted another. And it Troy, wielding his base in that space, challenge the business groups. And someone pulled him aside after he gave that speech and said, aren't you afraid you're going to make people angry? These are the high level elite, the movers and shakers. I quickly said no. I realized why: because of where my power comes from. Most people in the room from the Chamber of Commerce group have power that is vested in and determined by their proximity to wealth and power via corporate leadership. They have to make certain trade-offs with their source of power, which means that they have to be careful what they say and how they say it, lest someone get upset with them and upset their career and livelihood. With organizing, our power does not come from networking or proximity and access to people of wealth and influence. It comes from a base to whom we are accountable.

So this is just one quote from the book that illustrates what it means to have a base.

In the second example of committed and flexible. Sometimes we say those words together and it sounds kind of opposite. How do we have people who are really committed but also kind of flexible? In answer to that, I'll tell you the story of our Minnesota case. In this particular case, it was a large, multiracial, multifaith organization based in Minnesota, and what they decided to do to influence the gubernatorial election in 2018 was to run what they called a face a delicate campaign. This meant they were going to elect members of their base, their own, to caucus to actually cast a vote in the Democratic Party of Minnesota's primary. I'm sure many of you who work in these kinds of spaces understand that people have opinions. Just because they were all members of the same organization didn't mean that they were all agreed on who the best candidate was. So even though faith in Minnesota had the organizing muscle to elect 150 of their own members to cast a vote in this DFL primary, they didn't have a consensus to begin with about who that vote would be cast for. So they ended up controlling something like 12% of all votes, which meant that the gubernatorial candidates started to call them and tried to divide and conquer them. So they went, oh wow, there's this block of Isaiah people. They have 12% of all the votes. Candidates were thinking, if I could pick some of those foods off, because some of them are supporting me and some are supporting other people. When it came time to actually vote this organization went through a difficult but, I think the way they described it was an extremely strategic process. They said, because we are committed to our organization, to our collective power, we know that if we act individually, will be devoting that power.

This group of 150 faith delegates were committed enough to each other, their relationships with one another, to their collective power in the organization, they were willing to be flexible as the circumstances shift because they were willing to exercise that power in the collective.

And then a final feature of all of our cases in terms of the ones that were most. Successful is that they decentralized their strategy. Sometimes it just one. Sometimes it's a coterie of four or five leaders. In all the cases, we found that there was distributed strategy, not just among staff but across all members of the organization, specifically leaders within the organization. To illustrate what I mean by this, it's another network analysis. This came from Minnesota as well. And what you're looking at from the 2019 graph in the middle is a green node, Vivian, who is the one staffer from this organization will be involved in any of these graphs. Vivian developed any of these dark purple notes. These are people who are extremely committed to the organization, and they took responsibility for recruiting and developing 18 to 20 democracy builders, demonstrated here in the blue dots. And by the time they were going to vote in this municipal campaign, those democracy builders reached out to something like 2500 voters in a very local municipal election that ended up shifting the Results.

So the key point here is that there's only one staffer here who is responsible for ultimately reaching 2500 people. If it were just one person culling through lists, they wouldn't be able to do real, relational impact voter contact that all these other leaders were able to do. So the image here that you can see is that there were these distributed, intermediate tiers of leadership the kind of scaffold healthy organization that allow them to do this kind of deep organizing and mobilizing work. This is a three month period.

Wasn't Vivian deciding what the message was going to be, calling all the people on her own. It was Vivian recruiting and developing other people who then developed 20 and 30 of their friends and family. And this happened not just at the level of individual organizations but also whole movement ecosystems. At time one, there was these satellite nodes come these groups that were not connected to one another stop in this case, the acronym CSO stands for civil society organization. And then the labor groups were indeed in strategic alignment, but they were kind of isolated often their own sub- community here. But by 2016, the strategy had been much more integrated into what they call an alignment coalition. One Arizona is there C3 table, Arizona wins is there C4 table, and there were organizations that sat on both tables. This is where strategy happened at the level of a movement ecosystem as opposed to in the previous slide when we were looking at a single organization. We also saw this happening at the level of inter-movement dynamics in the case of Arizona and elsewhere.

So just to kind of wrap up, I think we have 10 minutes after this. I have a few more summary slides here. The kind of key observation that we had is that what was going on inside the prism to turn the light into that kind of power rainbow refraction were choices that the organization made about what choices can we make now to expand our strategic position over time? To expand the number of possible choices we have? So it's not just we dump a bunch of pledge, petition signatures somewhere and then leave. Rather, today we're going to be talking about childhood poverty. Tomorrow we're going to be talking about racist policing tactics in Cincinnati. And the next day it's going to be climate change. Because they had built this kind of independent base of people who were racially connected, who had distributive strategy come who had developed as leaders come they were able to be nimble across those issues. So that meant that the leaders were accountable to members. They weren't accountable to elites and the business interests. Troy felt accountable to the members who sent him to the negotiating table. He did not feel accountable to the Procter & Gamble CEO.

There was this constantly expanding the latticework of relationships that the network graph kind of illustrates.

This comes from research in social psychology and social movements where some groups bring together homogenous groups of people, and those are what are sometimes called bonding ties come so people like you. In all these groups I mentioned a couple times the words multiphase, multigenerational, etc. Each of these groups were trying to build backgrounds across different races, different ages, and so forth.

So the last analytic slide I'll leave you with this kind of a compare and contrast here. So what do these groups look like relative to other groups that are trying to build people, power, change? And I'll give you one example. Actually three examples. The first is what we might think of as the electoral machine. Each of these on the y-axis are the accounts of people that are involved at a given moment in a campaign, and the X axis is the date over time. I know these are really small, but this is 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018. We see these peaks and troughs on the even years. We all know what that might be, right? These are election years. This is kind of the boom and bust cycle of engagement on the electoral calendar.

And then there are other organizations who have a solid, steady baseline here and what we're calling the mass action group. They have 100 members were really committed and show up at every meeting. And then once a year, maybe twice a year, they have a mass action. This is data from a group in Arizona that had rapid response to ICE deportation.

And then in the groups in the cases that we studied, attended to have these sort of much slower growth kind of trajectories. So the bottom line here of the super leaders in Lucha, one of the organizations we were studying in Arizona, and this slow, studied growth over time. So the numbers are a lot smaller here. Again, I know these are really small the side. But having 300 leaders who can then engage 20 people who can then engage 30 people and that being a lot easier to scale over time.

This is my summary slide, I promise. I can tell. Our question was, how do collective action groups build political power despite how improbable their work is? We found these key characteristics. But they were independent, they were not beholden to someone else's assessment of their value, committed, loyal to the organization and to each other. Flexible, willing to shift as political circumstances change, and then distributed strategists who came from different race, age, and so forth. That's the TLDR summary.

Karyne: There were some really great questions in the chat, and unfortunately for the sake of time, we are not able to address those now stop but I have Liz's direct email if anyone wants to follow-up. I've been tracking the questions, so I can share those with you following the call. As Liz mentioned at the top of her presentation, you may also purchase the book Prisms of the People at the website. We'll be sharing the savings code after the webinar.

I'd like to pose with the wonderful data and analysis that was shared, as you embark on your 2022 group planning this month to think about independence, flexibility, and commitment come not only to our values of ending poverty and oppression as well as your commitment to each other as well as to advocates and leaders and how we are studying our goals for 2020. How do we build a bigger tent for diverse voices and empowerment in our communities?

With that, I would like to transition it over to a my colleague John who will lead us in an overview of our 2022 campaigns. Over to you, John.

John: Thank you. And thanks again, Karyne. I noticed a number of people admiring especially the cover of your book.

I wanted to highlight the issues will be looking at in our 2022 campaigns. I will be brief so we can cover some of those other elements, but also because we'll have a years worth of stuff coming in 2022 to support you on these campaigns, and even before that, next week we'll have a slightly longer written summary of the main issues we want to highlight in 2022. Joanne talked about at the top of the call, we really want to move from emergency response to a global pandemic to a structural response that locks in many of the changes that we've been able to secure in the last year, year and 1/2.

First it's really transforming the fight against both old pandemics and new pandemics. As Joanne referenced, this is really primarily about the replenishment of the global fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. Great news in the last couple of weeks that the United States will host that replenishment, meaning it will take response ability for organizing the meeting and gathering donors to make their pledges. This is a really critical year. I know you hear that from us a lot. But first of all, we know that the fight against AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria has been rocked back by the pandemic. TB deaths increased in 2020 for the first time in a decade, reversing progress. And there's also the role that the global fund has played in fighting COVID as well. Really bringing its community focused, country owned, Results driven approach to pandemic preparedness and response beyond AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. I know that the global fund, with our support, wants to be very, very ambitious about the total amount of money that they want to raise, and it's going to need our support and mobilization.

We also want to take short-term changes to the tax code that we've been able to win and make them permanent. The extraordinary statistic that Meredith shared that just due to the changes in the child tax credit, 3.6 million kids have moved above the poverty line. And while we've made changes that allow the lowest income families access to the benefits of the child tax credit, the larger monthly payments that families have received this year are set to expire. Even in the house version of the build back better act. So we know we've got work to do to make both the increased level of the payment as well as the eligibility permanent.

We also want to push the US to do its part on global malnutrition. Again, a situation in which the pandemic is caused spikes in malnutrition, both the kind of immediate, severe lack of nutritious food to long-term consequences from kids not getting the nutrients that their brains and bodies need to grow and to stay healthy. And we have some opportunities this year, including the global malnutrition treatment and prevention act, a bipartisan, bicameral bill to improve the quality of aid that the US is providing around nutrition. Again, move beyond emergency response and make sure that we are sustainably and durably addressing the crisis of malnutrition. As COVID has driven up the prices of food, we need to confront that crisis. This is not a new problem. We have some really great opportunities in the year had to confront that problem.

Again, we really want to continue to work with Congress and show them the role it has to play in tackling the affordable. Housing crisis. Historic investments in housing have been made and will be made, as I'm knocking on wood, when Bill back better has passed. There are still only one in four families that receive rental assistance when they needed. Multiyear funding for rental assistance, increasing funding for the voucher program, as well as enacting a refundable renter's credit.

So I am excited about the work to come in 2022 with lots more details to come on these campaigns and moving from this emergency response to COVID to a more structural. Response. Looking forward to working with all of you. I'm going to turn it over to Jos.

Jos: Thanks. Whether you've been with Results for a few decades or a few days or in between. This is the time that we reflect on what we've achieved and what more there is to do and how to make it happen. Yep, it's group roadmap time. I know this announcement is usually met with a resounding hooray, and sometimes a groan. We ask you each time this year to do this,. All the countless achievements you've made over the years were made in great part because you plan for them. That's why we do this planning. Plus planning is fun. Think about it. Joining Results, you believe that poverty can be eradicated. So you're literally imagining and pursuing a world that in all of human history has yet to exist. Who wouldn't want to plan that? So let's get to it.

As in every year, we prepare resources to make this process inspiring, easy, and fun. We have a 2022 roadmap guide that walks you through your planning meeting. We also have an individual planning form so you can set personal goals that you and your group can incorporate into your group roadmap. So you can see that you can find these resources on your working with your group page. The link is at the bottom of that slide under make your group plans. You can see the guide and the individual roles members can take on.

Finally, we have updated your 2021 roadmaps, the ones you did last year, to include new space to make your 2022 goals. This is a roadmap you did last year, and you can find it down here at the bottom your group rosters there and your 2022 roadmap is in their as well as all the information that you entered from 2021. I also want to highlight your that we've moved some things around in the roster to move your roles closer to the front so people will make sure to fill that out. Those group rules are really, really key in making sure that everybody has a role in their group. It's going to be key to your success in 2022.

So now I'm just going to run through some quick best practices that really have centered around allocating these roles that could be good for your discussions this month. And shout out to my colleagues for coming up with these.

First, be inclusive. Help people feel comfortable and avoid accidental overwhelm by setting intention to create a welcoming group space in your plan. Use time during your group planning to discuss these roles and depths. Expectations, responsibilities, and so on. How people share about their experiences in different roles as your group discusses this in a learning environment. Address the time commitments head-on. A role doesn't have to be a 12 month responsibility. Ask people what they feel comfortable with committing to and then go from there. If you're still getting to know a volunteer, ask a lot of questions to provide as much information as they need to feel comfortable about making a decision about a role. For example, being a point person for a member of Congress is a great role for someone who's interested in learning more about Congress. It's a rewarding role where people learn a lot of valuable skills.

Also remind volunteers that they don't need to have a certain level of experience and Results to take on a role, and that they will be supported to succeed. Remember Results offers volunteer support and their group rules with coaching webinars, training and support calls, and will have new targeted trainings for specific group roles in 2022.

Also, avoid making assumptions about people's interests. Folks often join Results to learn new skills. So we don't want to put people in a box based on their day job or their background or their skills based on experiences.

Finally, shared leadership is a great opportunity for people to take on new roles. Their people together so they can support each other and take on those new roles.

So here are your new steps to take on those numerals. One, schedule your 2022 planning meeting right now. Get it on the books for sometime in December or very early in January. Second, each person in your group should read the 2022 roadmap guide. You may have a special process you use for planning that time, but I encourage you to read that because it's going to walk you through the kinds of discussions we are hoping folks will be having this year. In particular, we want you to talk about how you're going to be advancing your anti-oppression values in your work in 2022 because that's obviously a big focus of Results going forward.

Three: each person should fill out the individual planning form before you meet. This is a way for you to articulate those personal goals you want to accomplish. You bring that to the meeting, and you have a discussion about everybody's individual goals, and that helps you set your group plan.

Four: meet to have your discussion. Sure you do that before your actual meeting. You can have a robust discussion stop we encourage you to allocate at least 90 minutes. And finally please fill out that group roadmap spreadsheet that I showed you before and fill out the group roster with everyone's roles and completing the 2022 roadmap sheet.

So we ask that you complete your spreadsheets by January 14. That's the Friday after the next national webinar. In one final thing. While we push the planning process to help you be successful in your advocacy work, I can't infest size enough how important your roadmaps are to us on the staff. We can click on a link and see who is and what role, what your group wants to do with expansion or what your efforts are with anti-oppression efforts. That's invaluable to us. We are grateful to you for taking time to do this, and it's well worth your time. With that, if you have any questions about this process or if you need a link to your roadmap, if you don't have that link handy, please get in touch with me. Otherwise happy planning. I think I'm going to turn it over now to Lisa.

Lisa: Hi everyone. This is Lisa Marchal. We want to commend to you the slide deck that is online on the national webinar page as well as will be shared out after the webinar because it's got some important dates. We are not finished meeting yet as action networks, as learning groups, as free agents, and dates and times of those gatherings are there for you on the slides. We do want to note a couple of important things, though. There are no policy forums in December. And the result office will be closed Friday, December 24, and Sunday, January 2, for winter break. And the dates are also in the weekly update as well. So as we finish out the year, join us for the remaining gatherings for learning and collaboration.

And now to the surprises. You may not have known that tomorrow, December 5, is international volunteer day. We celebrate you. We put in the chat a blog that has been constructed across several of the international partners that we have: Results Canada, Results UK, and more. There are stories if you, there are celebrations of you. And if you see some faces that you don't know waving at you, that's the Results US staff waving to you to say thank you for everything that you're doing. We were really excited to get together to make this picture for you. And that isn't even all of us.

So what you're going to be seeing if you follow us on social media is, you will see everything Any questions? video, you will see images, all sorts of things sprinkled throughout the weekend she celebrate you in the work that you do. What do you say to a group of people willing to freely share their time, their talent, their insight, their persistence, and their immense passion to the work that we do what Results? We are keenly aware that the work to alleviate poverty and build equity in the world is some of the most challenging work that you could ever choose to undertake, yet you choose to do it day in and day out because our collective vision of the world where we all have the opportunity and agency to thrive is a vision that we hold dear. And so although it feels a little bit inadequate, we simply say thank you.

And with that, I get to pass it over to our Executive Director, Joanne Carter, for a final surprise related to the Bob Dickerson leadership award.

Joanne: Thanks, Lisa. And again just to reinforce and say to all of you what an honor it is to work with all of you and the gratitude we have for all that you do. As part of marking international volunteer day, we are going to present the grassroots volunteer leadership award in honor of longtime grassroots volunteer Bob Dickerson. Bob was a passionate and relentless leader. After getting diagnosed with cancer, he quit his job and through all of his energy into advocacy for the next 15 years. And he helped us to be believer in prefer, even when things were at their hardest. Not long before Bob's death, Representative Adam Smith took to the Senate floor to honor Bob and his immense contributions as an advocate, and the New York Times wrote a piece about his advocacy that was titled Death without Regrets.

This year's honoree doesn't know who she is yes, but I did check just a few minutes ago and saw her face there on the screen joining us from Dallas Texas. And that's Margaret Smith. Margaret is the founding group leader of the Dallas Results group and has played a critical role in seeing that group grow and thrive, only supporting others in their creativity to take action and leadership. Margaret is constantly finding new ways to grow the influence and the impacts of the Dallas group and to build the kind of leadership we've been talking about. Just make sure that they have a set of norms that members create and revisit and live by them so that everyone decides and knows how they want to be together as a group. And I know because I've seen this, she measures and tracks everything. But it allows folks to hold themselves accountable to measures of diversity and having a really big impact in the world Margaret was sharing the recent successful Dallas fundraiser, and she praised the work of others who made that so powerful. She even wrote, I was superfluous, which I very much doubt, but it was a very powerful testament to the shared leadership in this group.

One of my favorite pictures of Margaret in DC a few years ago was when she saw Sen. Cruz. So she went up to shake his hand. But then she grabbed onto it with both of hers and didn't let go until she had delivered her ask on the global fund, which he eventually said yes to. The example of the groups working with former representative Pete sessions. For five years, they were reached out in every possible way. Face-to-Face meetings. They called and emailed him, send personal letters from constituents. And in all that time he never took action towards our policy requests. But they kept at it. Margaret even asked at town hall. Eventually they got him to not only say yes but to join a global health bill as an original cosponsor, which I can tell you no one in Washington saw coming.

Margaret herself has been published, I don't know, 40 times or more and has probably had too many congressional meetings to count. But I truly think her greatest legacy is the power of the collective group she continues to support. Margaret, I know you often don't like attention. You just want to get the work done. But just a huge thanks and congratulations to you as a model for our work and who we want to be in Results. We can't clap to you in a room together. But we are cheering you from across the country. So congratulations and thank you.

Everyone, this is the final webinar of the year. So I want to end again by thanking you so deeply for everything you have done this year. I know for many, it's been a really challenging year. Thank you for your advocacy, your financial support, all of your partnership. Keep up that advocacy in these crucial next weeks with Congress, and really all the best to you and your loved ones for the end of 2021. And happy Hanukkah for those who are celebrating right now. In a moment, we'll unmute the lines, and you can wish everybody a happy holiday and congratulate each other a really powerful year. Thanks again to Margaret, and thanks everyone for everything that you did.

[End of webinar]