

# Capacity Building With Small Groups: Good Practices and Added Value

## Introduction

Over the last few months, an number of CLP intermediaries have engaged in a learning circle to share our experiences in building the capacity of small and emerging organizations. In November, we came together for a deeper conversation exploring our role as intermediaries and the value we bring to the process, our victories and challenges, and the trends we see in providing effective capacity building in low-income communities and communities of color. We really appreciate Learning Partners' guidance in facilitating these discussions and their very detailed notes that captured everyone's input. This memo draws from LP's notes to pull out important highlights (with detailed examples as an appendix). We look forward to continuing the conversation and hope this information will be helpful to the CLP partners or anyone else interested in investing in small groups.

## November 7<sup>th</sup> Learning Circle Participants

- Kaki Rusmore, CFMCO
- Aurelio Salazar, CFMCO
- Karla James, Rose Foundation
- Tim Little, Rose Foundation
- Nayamin Martinez, ACTA
- Amy Kitchener, ACTA
- Cynthia Nagendra, HomeBase
- Laila Mehta, AAPIP
- Mely Trujillo, Families in Schools
- Ruth Brousseau, Learning Partnerships
- Lucia Corral Peña, Learning Partnerships
- Melissa Ramos, Learning Partnerships

## Understanding the Capacity Scale

We've adopted the term "good practices" rather than the more common "best practices" because at the core of our approach in working with small groups is the concept that you have to meet each organization where it is and build from there, not insist that they fit a standard solution often designed for larger groups with professional staff. Therefore, since each of our grantees may be starting from a different baseline, there is no universal set of "best practices" that works for all. The ability to understand where a small group is on the capacity scale, including both financial and non-financial measurements, and tailoring a capacity-building approach that builds on the group's strengths and offers a doable and "community-competent" roadmap towards greater sustainability is one of the fundamental values that we add as intermediaries who specialize in relating to small groups.

## Starting with Budget Size (or the "4 Sizes of Small")

### \$100,000-\$250,000:

- Staff: Usually have managerial, professional and support staff; may utilize significant numbers of volunteers, but generally rely primarily on staff to do the program work.
- Funding: may have diversified funding, but often grant or contract-reliant; probably has professional development experience on staff; generally has relatively solid financial administration systems.
- Board: board members may or may not closely engage in day-to-day program work.

- Planning/Consultant Capacity: organization often has experience with long-term planning and/or consultant management.

#### \$25,000-\$100,000:

- Staff: Managerial/professional staff maybe same person, plus some support staff; often relies on volunteers for significant amounts of program work.
- Funding: Often reliant on 1-3 core funders, plus constituent support; may not have experienced development staff; may have solid financial administration systems in place.
- Board: Board members probably engage roughly equally with staff on day-to-day program work.
- Planning/Consultant Capacity: Organization may have some experience in long-term planning and/or consultant management.

#### Under \$25,000 (incorporated):

- Staff: Usually just has one P/T staff whose main job is to coordinate volunteers and board members, plus manage communications and fundraising;
- Funding: Usually primarily constituent-based, plus maybe 1-2 small grants; staff/board usually have no development experience; usually minimal financial administrative systems.
- Board: Board members conduct most/all of the program work.
- Planning/Consultant Capacity: Usually does not have significant planning or consultant management experience.

#### Under \$25,000 (unincorporated)

- Staff: Usually has no paid staff, everything is done by volunteers.
- Funding: Any funding is constituent-based; in-kind services probably outweigh cash donations (but are generally not counted); zero development experience; probably zero financial administration systems.
- Planning/Consultant Capacity: Usually does not have any long-term planning or consultant management experience.

### **Going Deeper than Budget Size**

The smaller the group, the more likely it is that non-financial measurements of capacity (such as numbers of volunteers or degree of influence in the community) may be better measurements than budget size of the group's true capacity. In fact, many grassroots activists are tremendously proud of their all-volunteer efforts and feel that volunteer-driven passion is the best engine to drive lasting change. But the more that a group relies on volunteers, the more you have to schedule capacity-building events around volunteer-friendly timeframes. For example, most small volunteer-based groups simply cannot send people to weekday trainings because their volunteers are all at their day jobs during regular business hours. Yet most of the off-the-shelf trainings, even from great providers such as CompassPoint, only happen during regular working hours because they are geared for non-profit paid staff, not volunteers. So the intermediary needs to be able to find (or design themselves) evening or weekend training sessions, and these trainings need to teach skill-sets and techniques that will not require significant amounts of time to implement. Even with larger-sized small groups, there need to be different approaches towards capacity activities directed towards the staff vs. those designed to include board members and

volunteers. To allow for participation from various levels of the organization, i.e., board members or one staff person, one intermediary does its trainings on the weekend and holds webinars.

While an important consideration, budget size alone does not necessarily correlate to other levels or preparedness to engage in capacity-building work. For example, we have all seen groups at the \$25,000 level who have well-developed strategic plans – what they most need is implementation support. Conversely, we also see plenty of groups with budgets at the \$200,000 level that have little planning experience – these groups may well be ripe to be led into an in-depth planning process that is sensitive to the past obstacles that have hindered long-term planning. One of the key factors here will be the level of trust in the intermediary that is trying to catalyze what may be a difficult growth step for the end-grantee.

### **Regardless of budget size, what do all the “Small Groups” have in common?**

#### Strong Leadership:

The “leader” may be one person or several. And, the smaller the organization, the more often the leadership is volunteer-based. Their skills related to running a nonprofit organization may not be as developed as the CEO of an agency with a \$1 million budget, but they have a strong vision, commitment to the community and they understand community need. In fact, the organization may kind of serve as a “container” for that leader. Therefore, the budget size of a group is not necessarily a good indicator of their leader’s stature in the community. More reliable measurements relate to the leader’s ability to inspire new people, recruit others and create a movement of volunteers toward those goals. Therefore, capacity-building in small groups must focus on building their leaders’ abilities, not just organizational infrastructure. And, capacity-building in the community means identifying and supporting emerging leaders who have not yet coalesced strong groups around them. For example, in the Occupy Movement, leaders are spontaneously emerging without organizational structure.

#### Recession Resistant!

Small groups are used to operating with low budgets. Therefore, unlike large nonprofits that rely on paid staff to do the work and have struggled during the financial crisis due to funding cuts and staff layoffs, small organizations (by definition!) have never been well funded. So the recession has not had such a serious impact on their ability to move forward, because they are used to reaching for big results while working on a shoestring.

#### Deep Knowledge of Community Issues

Small organizations are the stewards of a cause in their community. Instead of well-developed administrative skills, groups that are directly tied to their neighborhoods and communities have the passion to make change, and an intimate knowledge of their local community, environment and political dynamic. For example, schools were not allowing folklorico groups to operate on school campuses because of insurance liabilities. But the local group organized and talked with city council to change these policies.

#### The Only “Game” in Town

In places where there is not a strong nonprofit infrastructure, very small organizations may be the nexus for community impact far beyond the apparent scope of the group. For example, the

neighborhood soccer program is also the place where families meet each other to begin to form the bonds of community, where kids have a safe place to go after school and positive role models, and where the US obesity epidemic gets solved – one kid at a time. That’s a lot of return on buying a few \$25 soccer balls and some T-shirts. But in communities that live far below the poverty level, the balls and uniforms won’t be bought without outside help. Similarly, in rural locations, the local community group may be quite small and under-resourced, yet they may well be the only forum for people to connect in order to advocate for or help improve their communities.

### **Good Practices in Working with Small Groups Add Value to the Grant Investment**

#### Don’t Assume Financial Growth is What the Grantee Really Wants

A group may not be on an evolutionary path to grow larger; therefore financial growth is not their goal. A \$25,000 organization with a 50+-member base and a \$100,000 group with 1-2 staff person have different needs, and the expectations about whether your grant is successful should be measured by the goals the groups identify for themselves.

#### “It Takes Capacity to Build Capacity”

A very true statement, but as discussed in the Capacity Scale section, you need to look at a group’s human assets and role in the community, not just budget size. For one intermediary, it’s about “thirst.” Does a grantee or potential grantee have the willingness to learn, grow, and share what they learn with others?

#### Don’t Over-Program the Outcomes (Let the Grantee Identify its Own Goals)

Most organizations know what they need, but they don’t necessarily know how to get there. So the cornerstone for capacity building with small groups is to be flexible and willing to meet an organization where it is – Start by asking “What are you already doing?” “What works for you?” One intermediary had one set of assumptions when they started working with their cohort, and then did things differently the second year as their knowledge of their end-grantees evolved. So instead of mandating certain technical assistance in year 2, they provided a general list of TA topics that organizations could choose from, and it worked a lot better. Another intermediary had assumptions about doing some regional convenings. Once they started, they found that the organizations had little in common. The group TA approach proved to have limited value, so instead they spent a lot of time with individual organizations. Thus, the TA could be targeted to the specific person who needs that skill.

#### Trust & Relationships

One of the common themes amongst participants in the Small Group Learning Circle is that we have prior relationships with many of the grantees in our cohorts. In addition to helping us make smart grant investments with the CLP funding, our role as a bridge between communities and the often-intimidating world of philanthropy is crucial. Even if the CLP had been structured to allow small groups to directly apply to the three funders, many of our end-grantees would have been too intimidated to apply directly to the larger foundations or would not have had the capacity to respond to the complexity of the RFP. For example, one intermediary stresses that their entire cohort was recruited out of participants in an existing grassroots grants program. Through this existing program, the intermediary identified small groups that were ripe for more intensive and

long-term capacity-building. And, from the end-grantees' perspective, they trusted the intermediary to help lead them into organizational analysis that they had never tried before.

It takes time to build this kind of trust – often 2-3 years. But once you are at the point where an organization trusts you, and is excited and ready to go, the subsequent 12-18 months are a particularly high leverage period. And the CLP has unlocked a lot of pent-up TA potential amongst the intermediaries as well. Although many of us has had built strong relationships with members of our cohorts through previous series of annual grants, the CLP was our first experience in thinking through how we would work intensively with a small organization for three year stretch. So we feel that we ourselves are at a high-leverage point in terms of being poised to fruitfully invest a subsequent CLP round. As a corollary, we feel that we are also in a great position to identify groups that are ready to grow, work with them to build their capacity, and then graduate them into direct relationship with the CLP funders for larger programmatic grants.

The value of the trust we have with our grantees manifests itself in a variety of ways. For example, one key intermediary role is to help organizations frame choices about how to move forward structurally. For example, if an unincorporated organization is thinking about incorporating, they need to make informed decisions about whether or not they want to take the time to run an organization (instead of just serving their target populations). They need advice they can trust in weighing their options.

In addition to the trust that flows from existing relationships, it's important to design programs that cultivate the development of new relationships. For example, one intermediary is very intentional about the connectivity among their leaders, so to build mutual trust they often ask them to do projects with people they have not met before. Another convenes their cohort 6 times each year and they collaborate in learning circles on issues that they identified as important to their communities. This gives them the space to come together and trust each other. The members of the cohort also identify outside resources to help them with their agendas.

#### Include the Community in the Decision Making Structure

Having an advisory body guiding community grant making and technical assistance is important, and it's really important to listen to them and give them real decision-making power. It's another way to engage with and listen to the community, especially if it's not a community you generally work in.

#### Help End-Grantees Define Outcomes and Understand Approaches to Evaluation

Large foundations tend to focus on outcomes, but many small groups do not fit into the traditional outcome checklists. On the other hand, small community-based organizations know what success looks like in their communities (the soccer program continues or they get a stoplight at a dangerous intersection), but they do not understand how to translate that into the terms that foundations use (obesity prevention or civic engagement). Intermediaries who understand both the foundation world and small groups help their grantees translate locally-focused work into language and methodologies that can fit into larger funders' overall frameworks. It's reasonable to expect that grantees should be goal-oriented, but it's important that setting the goals is a bottom-up approach. In fact one intermediary suggested that a good

process for establishing outcomes would be to make the grant award, then have a conversation to mutually decide on the outcomes.

The intermediary's role is to explain to small groups that good evaluation is about what you learned and how to do things better. But this is a problem when groups have to report on outcomes that are listed for them, rather than having groups tell the story of what they have learned and what they believe their accomplishments have been. One intermediary holds learning activities, but instead of freighting the process with the sometimes-loaded term "evaluation," they simply call it "reflecting" (on what worked well, what could be improved and unanticipated outcomes). Another intermediary uses one-on-one interviews as a central feature of their evaluations and thought they were really effective.

#### Fit the Grant to the Community (Not the Community to the Grant)

Regardless of how the grant expectations are delineated, they need to be tailored to individual communities. Most small organizations may not have well-developed infrastructure. For example, a small basketball clinic didn't have a sustainability plan, evaluation tools, etc., but it was working well for its community. If the funder had required a sustainability or evaluation plan, it would have tied them up in lots of paperwork and really taken them away from the critical work. Life in the community doesn't begin and end around the start and finish of the grant period. In a lot of cases, a good outcome is just the continuation of a program that is working.

#### Ongoing Evaluation Challenges

It's important to have some measures of evaluation, even if it's self-defined (for example, simply counting the number of participants is a good starting point). On the other hand, you can measure the number of kids going to folklorico classes, but talking to the families really tells the story of the impact of the classes. One intermediary created new tools to try to capture their audience because many of the communities they serve are the most vulnerable and many are undocumented. So they counted the number of people and the new leaders developed, but went deeper into telling the story as well. But, while the stories are great, they don't fit into a traditional evaluation chart very well – so we struggle with how to share deeper and very valuable outcomes with our funders.

For smaller organizations, the best evaluation question may be, "What have you learned this year?" But, most groups see evaluations as a necessary evil required by the funder, and in the traditional evaluation paradigm, if there are no results, you feel like you are going to be punished. Thus many evaluations simply become seen as a test to pass, and the stress of evaluations is a real factor for both end-grantees and intermediaries because everyone wants to look good and they want continued funding. A related challenge is when organizations "cream" the clientele so they get the best outcomes, or simply "bury their dead" and refuse to report or acknowledge real challenges or failures that occurred during the year.

#### **In Conclusion**

The CLP process has been tremendously worthwhile for all of us, both in terms of enabling us to focus resources towards developing community capacity, and in giving us the opportunity to develop and field-test much longer-term or deeper capacity engagement strategies than several of

us had previously attempted. And the results we are starting to see throughout everyone's cohorts justify the effort, and the investment.

But we are all poised to do much, much more. Just as we have seen our cohorts move through their capacity-building learning curve, we have progressed on our own curve, and we have also seen the CLP funders move forward on the continuum of how to best engage in capacity building, technical assistance and leadership development. We appreciate our grantees', our funders' and our colleagues' spirit and commitment to learning from each other. Any new program is a risk, and we appreciate the risk that the CLP funders have taken in launching the CLP. Tremendous positive energy has been created over the past two years. Wherever that energy goes from here, the only mistake would be to stop investing in the small groups that are the most connected to low-income communities and communities of color throughout California.

## Appendix:

# Illustrating the Impact and Added Value: CLP Small Group Learning Circle Success Stories

## Alliance for California Traditional Arts

### Arte Americas

This organization established in 1987 is a Latino-focused arts center located in downtown Fresno. Arte America's role has been vital to serve the large Latino population, which represents over 40% of Fresno county, providing numerous traditional arts programs, including exhibits and demonstrations of folk arts (e.g. weaving, Day of the Dead Altars, Nacimientos); and hosting folklorico dance festivals and convenings.

One of the main resources this organization has been able to leverage is its 1,500 square foot facility that includes classrooms, a main gallery, 2 gift shops, an outdoor fenced plaza with a performing stage and a catering kitchen; they had been able to **generate earned income** (25% of their annual budget) by renting this facility, organizing guided tours and by co-organizing multiple cultural events (music concerts, theater performances, workshops) with local groups.

The other extraordinary asset this organization possesses is having a **core group of volunteers** (Executive Director and board members) who run the the center. This volunteer work is estimated at a value of \$125,000 a year. Despite the lack of paid staff, Arte has managed to **diversify its income**, with 22.34% coming from individual and corporate donors; 10.6% from special events; 7.7% from grants; and the rest coming from other earned income ventures including sales, rental of their facility, membership dues and admissions to the gallery & tours.

### Centro de Unidad Popular Benito Juarez (CUPBJ)

This organization has over ten years of experience working with the Oaxacan indigenous communities in Kern County. CUPBJ is managed primarily by Mixtec leaders who have been successful in **establishing partnerships** with other groups, both local (Bakersfield College, Art Council of Kern) and statewide (CRLA, AFL-CIO, JBS International) which allowed them access to resources such as meeting space, free venues for their cultural events and free coaching from academics and professionals, among others.

Despite its modest budget –of roughly \$33,000- its leadership has managed to **work across sectors**, not only **organizing cultural events** (such as la Guelaguetza, Festival Mixteco and Dia de los Muertos) but also provides other valuable services including **scholarships** for Oaxacan youth who want to go to college, **workshops & paralegal advice** on labor rights and housing rights; and community education about law enforcement, to mention some of its more relevant activities. Behind the organization of all these events are over **50 volunteers** that donate their time and material resources to help their community.

### Kings Regional Traditional Folks Arts (KRTFA)

This organization, located in a **rural area of Kings County** was founded in 2005 to foster and expand music, dance and visual arts. What started as a folklorico group in a small garage grew to become a 2,500 square facility that serves as a cultural hub in the region offering classes on mariachi music and different dance genres (folklorico, hip-hop, salsa) to children, youth and adults, the majority of whom



are Latino farmworking families. Because KRTFA is the **only organization offering this kind of services in the region**, they have students from numerous rural communities in Kings County (Armona, Hanford, Lemoore and Corcoran) as well as the surrounding counties, Fresno (Selma, Laton) and Tulare (Tulare, Kettleman City).

With an annual budget of over \$55,000, this organization is an example of a unique **hybrid business model: it pays its teachers but all the administrative duties are performed by volunteers**, who have had the motivation to enhance its administrative skills (e.g. received training on accounting software) in order to perform in a more efficient way. Another unique factor of this organization is that **most of its income is earned** through tuition fees, sales of musical instruments and folklorico costumes and shoes; fee for service for mariachi performances; and through special events (bi-annual recitals). CLP is the first and only grant KRTFA has ever received and represents less than 20 percent of its total income.

### **Teatro de la Tierra**

This nonprofit organization has become the avenue for immigrant families in the Central Valley to tell their stories and strengthen their cultural identity through traditional Mexican and Latin American culture.

Teatro has changed the lives of numerous youth and young adults who had experienced traumatic situations and problem behaviors. Through the hard work of its volunteer directors, which includes National Heritage Fellow Agustin Lira, this \$42,000 annual budget organization, is raising the community awareness around themes that many other groups fear to talk about: discrimination, racism, labor exploitation and more recently, how the epidemic of obesity is affecting the low income communities.

Additionally, Teatro has **garnered the support** of other groups outside the arts world, including The Center for Nonviolence, The Unitarian Universalist Church of Fresno, Partnerships in Understanding, Centro Binacional Para el Desarrollo Indigena Oaxaqueno and various local ethnic media outlets (Radio Bilingue, Community Alliance, the Undercurrent), to mention just a few. These partnerships enabled Teatro to have access to **free space** for their music classes, theater rehearsals and performances, as well as **free publicity** for their music, performances, print articles and reviews.

## Asian American/Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy

### **Program Design Intended to Build Capacity Around Collaborations:**

The primary focus since 2010 has been to jointly explore how to build collective power within the AMEMSA communities, leading to greater potential for long-term community change. Through the program, groups are creating a shared analysis of issues affecting the AMEMSA communities and exploring how this work can translate into more coordinated efforts across communities and organizational practices. The Civic Engagement Fund's program is designed to support organizations to gain a deeper understanding of each other's civic engagement work and explore the potential for coordinated strategies across various issue areas: Immigrant and Refugee Rights; Civil Rights and Liberties; and Political and Civic Participation.

### Example 1:

Thus far, the grantees who are in the **Immigrant and Refugee Rights Learning Circle** have come together for the first time under the AMEMSA banner to march on May Day in San Francisco. This was an early strategy to raise visibility of the AMEMSA political identity among those immigrant and worker rights communities and organizations who have a longer history of working on immigration issues. The learning circle -- which has named itself the Immigrant Rights Coalition -- has planned a series of events to continue public and political education within their own organizations and communities since there was a recognition that there was so much to learn about within the AMEMSA group. Organizations that are involved represent these communities: Arab, Somali, South Asian, Iranian, and other African communities. While this internal education is going on, the Coalition is reaching out to other organizations and coalitions who have been working on immigrant rights for decades, in order to build relationships and connections that will allow the incorporation of AMEMSA voices into the ongoing debates at the local and state-wide levels.

### Example 2:

The grantees that are in the **Political Engagement Circle** have decided to embark on a 2012 Voter Education guide. The development of this guide will include community input meetings and a candidate forum, that for the first time will create a demand for candidates to respond to issues and concerns that are of importance to local AMEMSA communities. The communities represented in this group include: Afghan, Sikh, Arab and South Asian Muslim. Input into the frame and the questions for the voter guide will be sought from the entire AMEMSA cohort.

### **Contributions of Small Organizations:**

Many of the organizations in these learning circles are small. They may struggle to attend meetings regularly, and have challenges in other ways, but since the issues and the group learning and building are important for each organization to be a part of, they are integral parts of the process. Their perspectives are vital in terms of creating an AMEMSA identity that allows for both internal and external education around key issue areas. They are close to their communities and understand the challenges and the priorities, and are the ones who have the ability to lift these up. Further, their participation in this process strengthens their ability to prioritize as organizations, to see the benefits of collaborating with others, and to practice creating shared visions and collective action.

## Families In Schools

### **Leadership Development:**

Families In Schools (FIS) experiences in providing TA to participating organizations has been extraordinary. The ability to work hand-in-hand with the “great leaders” that represent these organizations has allowed FIS to develop a deeper understanding of the communities they serve, their interests, challenges, and needs. Strong leadership seems to be a commonality amongst all CLP grantees and having access to their leaders is critical to understanding the community they represent and a lens into community interests and needs that we would otherwise never know. FIS work with Camilla Chavez (Executive Director) and Dolores Huerta (Founder) of the **Dolores Huerta Foundation** has allowed us to deepen our understanding of the community needs and interests of Bakersfield and the remote areas that exist outside of the city. As a result, Families In Schools has been able to tailor TA that is most relevant and beneficial to the Dolores Huerta Foundation, thereby strengthening their ability to meet their mission and serve their community.

## Rose Foundation for Communities and the Environment

Type of Achievement	Grantee
Leveraging Resources	<p><b>Oakland Food Connection</b> trying to engage young people of color in East Oakland to care about and improve their community through urban gardening, nutrition education and access to healthy food. Oakland Food Connection has been able to leverage the CLP grant into funding partnerships with 2 other major funders including the California Endowment. This will allow them move into a new office and kitchen space, since their office has been broken into twice, and their van once. The new space will allow them to become a community grocery, and have a kitchen for cooking school meals and to do catering to raise money for the organization.</p>
Building Skills and Navigating Leadership Transition	<p><b>Ma’at Youth Academy</b> provides low-income youth of color with the educational, social and cultural opportunities that empower them to combat environmental and economic injustice. Ma’at is transitioning from a founder executive director to a young new executive director. The CLP funding is helping build the skills of the new executive director, and for board and staff development. They recently completed their summer youth leadership program.</p>
Building Collaboration to Win Policy Goals	<p><b>California Healthy Nail Salon Collaborative</b> is working to improve the safety of nail salon and cosmetology workers, who often work with unsafe chemicals and many are of reproductive age. As a collaborative of other nonprofits, salon owners and workers, they pour their efforts into the program work, leaving little or no time to do the administrative and fundraising aspects of the collaborative. They are using the CLP to strengthen their collaboration by improving their organizational structure. They co-led a Healthy Salons Week of Action in May in DC that included congressional briefing, white house meeting and congressional visits. They were also instrumental in getting San Francisco pass a voluntary ban of the toxic trio (DBP, formaldehyde and toluene) in nail polish products.</p>
Building Organizational Capacity	<p><b>California Indian Environmental Alliance</b> addresses health threats of mercury and other mining contaminants to California tribal members who depend on fish as a traditional subsistence food. They are using CLP funding for organization infrastructure (including new office space, equipment, telephone system, website, database) and administration (including human resources and accounting). The strengthening of the back office capacity of this group will help it reach out to more tribal members through community trainings, outreach to tribal medical clinics, and with their mercury toolkit for healthcare providers and community activists.</p>

<p>Accomplishing Cross-Sector Work</p>	<p><b>San Joaquin Valley Cumulative Health Impacts Project (SJV CHIP)</b> addresses the cumulative health impacts of pollution in the communities of the San Joaquin Valley through scientific research, advocacy, and empowering community members to speak about the impact of pollution to their health. The CLP funding is helping them stabilize their financial resources, and support collaborative members who have come together at this nexus of public health and environmental protection.</p>
<p>Supporting an Emerging Movement Leader and Building Youth Leadership</p>	<p><b>Oakland Food Connection</b> engages young people of color in East Oakland to care about and improve their community through urban gardening, nutrition education and access to healthy food. The founder of OFC has participated in the Rockwood Leadership program through the CLP. And he is working to develop new leadership from the community. He has been working with 2 young men who are from East Oakland, and teaching them the skills they need to teach gardening, nutrition and cooking classes in 4 Oakland schools with children age K-12. The young men also learning fundraising, leadership and nonprofit management.</p>
<p>Passionate About Mission – (will get it done one way or another!)</p>	<p><b>California Food and Justice Coalition</b> promotes the basic human right to healthy food. The CLP funding helped them to move out of a small cubicle and into a real office. With the larger office and CLP funding, they were able to develop an intern program which has help them to keep going despite fundraising setbacks that have left them operating at half staff. With the interns, a new database developed with CLP funding, and an executive director who is largely volunteering his time, they were able to host a 5-day national food security event in Oakland in November of 2011 which was attended by over 1,000 people.</p>