



EVIDENCE OF CHANGE

**Exploring Civic
Engagement
Evaluation**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Civic Engagement Measurement and Impact Survey	1
Advancing the Conversation	2
Applying What We Learned: The Women Alive Case Study	6
<i>Shifting from Individual Outcomes to Civic Impact: Advice from Participants</i>	<i>7</i>
Support Groups	7
Peer Health Educator Program	7
Role Model Stories	8
<i>Implementing New Tools: Women Alive After the Summit</i>	<i>9</i>
Next Steps	10
Endnotes	11

ABOUT THE BUILDING MOVEMENT PROJECT

The goal of the Building Movement Project is to build a strong social justice ethos into the nonprofit sector, strengthen the role of nonprofit organizations in the United States as sites of democratic practice, and promote nonprofit groups as partners in building a movement for progressive social change.

Many individuals in the nonprofit sector are strongly motivated by the desire to address injustice and promote fairness, equality, and sustainability. The Building Movement Project supports nonprofit organizations in working toward social change by integrating movement-building strategies into their daily work.

To accomplish its goals, the Building Movement Project makes use of four core strategies:

- » Changing the discourse and practice within the nonprofit sector to endorse social change and social justice values.
- » Identifying and working with social service organizations as sites for social change activities in which staff and constituencies can be engaged to participate in movement building.
- » Supporting young leaders who bring new ideas and energy to social change work.
- » Listening to and engaging people who work in social change organizations—especially grassroots and community-based groups—to strengthen their ability to shape the policies that affect their work and the communities they serve.

INTRODUCTION

For the past several years, the **Building Movement Project**, the **Alliance for Children and Families** and the **Ms. Foundation for Women** have worked with their individual networks to promote civic engagement as a way to enhance services, create strong communities, and promote progressive social change. As a result of these efforts, many thousands of constituents across the nation are engaging with their communities in new ways and an increasing number of service providers continue to ask how to incorporate meaningful social change into their organizations. However, one of the common concerns identified by providers is their ability to show the impact of this work.

Social change activities are not easily quantifiable and it can be difficult to navigate and keep up with emerging evaluation methods. In many cases, not knowing how to demon-

strate results has hindered service providers from adopting social change activities and has prevented them from receiving funding for this work. The Building Movement Project, the Alliance and the Ms. Foundation, came together to draw on their collective experience with their networks and respond to this call for methods and tools for measuring the impact of social change work.

This report offers a look into how organizations currently view their relationship with impact measurement. It then presents a brief summary of the key findings that came out of the Civic Engagement Evaluation Summit convened by the partner organizations and ends with a set of recommendations for how to increase the nonprofit sector's capacity to respond to the increasing need for tools to measure the impact of civic engagement and social change work.

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT MEASUREMENT AND IMPACT SURVEY

Building Movement, the Alliance and the Ms. Foundation were all part of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation's Civic Engagement Learning Year in 2008. As part of the project, groups who formed partnerships were eligible for small Connect Grants. The three groups received a grant to hold a summit with practitioners, researchers, intermediaries and funders to look at civic engagement impact measurement and dialogue with other organizations.

To plan for the summit and to add an analytical foundation to their work, the partners surveyed individuals at a range of organizations, foundations and academic institutions working in civic engagement and social change. The survey asked about the need to create dialogue across groups doing this work, which voices should be involved in the conversation,

how civic engagement or social change was defined in their work, what challenges they confronted and which strategies they currently used to assess impact and outcomes.

The survey revealed the following:

A wide umbrella for civic engagement and social change work. The organizations surveyed were working with multiple definitions of civic engagement and indicators of social change. These ranged from specific behaviors associated with civic participation to shifts in systems and institutional structures. In some organizations, social change work included programs or services that engaged individuals in skill-building that would allow them to advocate for their own needs and the needs of their family—further broadening the realm

of possible areas of impact. [See “**Defining Civic Engagement & Social Change**”, p. 3, for a detailed list of survey responses.]

Difficult but not insurmountable challenges in measuring outcomes and impacts. While the responses reflected a deep commitment to doing social change work, there were a number of significant challenges that groups associated with measuring impacts. These included the challenge of defining civic engagement and social change (see above), identifying “the wins” associated with complex initiatives, and meeting the demands of an outcome evaluation climate that seeks immediate and generalizable results from initiatives that are non-linear and multifaceted. [See “**Challenges of Civic Engagement Evaluation**”, p. 5, as defined by respondents.]

A need for multiple perspectives to inform tools and designs. The survey tapped the need to have nontraditional “experts” at the table to discuss evaluation and tools. Respondents identified the input of service providers, foundations *and* evaluators as equally crucial to this dialogue. To a lesser extent, community members and IT professionals were also believed to be necessary to advance this work. Respondents were interested in the views of groups that were involved in advocacy, community organizing, human service provision, and leadership development.

This information was used to frame the Civic Engagement Evaluation Summit as a cross-sector learning opportunity that would combine innovative methods, ideas, practitioners and thought leaders.

ADVANCING THE CONVERSATION

The Civic Engagement Evaluation Summit took place in March 2009 in Santa Ana Pueblo, New Mexico and included a day and half of structured conversations among 28 participants representing the nonprofit service community, funders, evaluators of civic engagement, advocacy, policy and other social change initiatives. [See “**Participants**”, p. 6, for full attendee list.]

The agenda that emerged from the planning process focused on the needs and challenges of the nonprofit service sector but also explored other nonprofit social change initiatives affiliated with participating organizations. There was an emphasis on utilizing the expertise of attendees, presenting multiple perspectives, and a focus on uniting thinking rather than creating divisions. Most important, planners sought to advance the following goals:

- » To move the dialogue around civic engagement measurement towards a framework that reflects the complexity and broader impact of this work;
- » To share powerful, practical tools for measuring the impact and outcomes of civic engagement and social change work;
- » To share models for effective collaborations between foundation staff, evaluators and practitioners; and
- » To develop a common understanding of future directions in measuring the impact and outcomes of civic engagement.

The Summit planners were conscious about holding a gathering that would value the contributions of all participants and promote open exchange. To create this space, a fourth partner was brought in from the **Center for Community Change (CCC)**—a group that focuses on building power and capacity of marginalized populations to change their communi-

- Social service agencies and other non profits work with constituents to strengthen their voices and support efforts to engage in social change/community development activities. We work to enhance the capacity of the agency (a family resource center) to address systemic problems through social change work within the context of their usual services and activities.
- Action by individuals or organizations that both strengthens our democratic institutions and encourages public involvement in civic life—with priority given to work in communities that have been historically underrepresented in our democratic process.
- Grantmakers seek to support improvements to society for a variety of reasons (improved education, improved employment opportunities; reduction of poverty, etc.). No matter the reason, it is still an attempt to achieve “social change”. A key approach to such change is effectively engaging those most involved and affected—i.e., “civic engagement”. Civic engagement is empowering community members to be involved in their own improvement, whether it be voting, donating, volunteering or advocating for change.
- Our program views Charity/Social Service as the temporary and immediate relief for the oppression of women of color who are taught to believe that they do not have the right to speak for themselves. Internalized and institutionalized racism and stigma keeps women of color away from participating in HIV planning, advocacy, and coalition building that adversely impact their lives. Thereby contributing to women not feeling entitled to have opinions about policies that directly affect them. Our vision for Social Change requires that we motivate a diverse group of constituents to share in the responsibility of promoting health education, advocating for inclusiveness in the HIV planning process, and demanding justice so that HIV disease does not continue to crush disenfranchised communities through stigma, systematic oppression, and institutional racism and gender biases.
- Given my university location: civic engagement means active involvement on the part of students, faculty or the university as a whole in actions related to the public good; I personally also promote such involvement in partnership or dialogue with other constituents outside the university. Social change is an alternation, even on a small level, in the conditions affecting some group within a society.
- Electoral engagement.
- Developing youth leaders who can have an impact on their local community and beyond.
- We think of it as 1) focused grassroots and legislative action on specific policy issues of concern to our constituents, in a manner that 2) strengthens and grows a base of individuals and groups capable of taking grassroots and legislative action on “the next issue” once short-term policy objectives have been achieved.
- We agreed that four elements recur in the course of most social movements. These pieces of work are: to develop values, generate opposition to institutional and structural racism, create shifts in the political climate and culture and institutionalize solutions. These can appear to be linear, but actually operate in an iterative dynamic that grows in scale over time (with good strategy). Even when we are clear about these elements, however, social change is an unpredictable process that requires tactical flexibility, even within a clear overarching strategy.

ties and affect public policy—to help shape and facilitate the agenda. Together, the four partners developed an agenda that included two sessions and an evening presentation/discussion on Day 1 while the next morning was devoted to a case study where different evaluation methods could be applied.

The first session on ***How Evaluation Works (and Doesn't Work) for Social and Human Service Organizations*** was designed to explore the various ways that evaluation can be integrated into and tailored to an organization's work. The three-member panel discussed the strengths and challenges of the models used within and promoted by each of their organizations. Nicole Robinson, an Evaluation and Organizational Development Specialist from Mosaica¹, for example, offered an integrated approach in which evaluation is conducted from within the organization by a staff evaluator. Ehren Reed, a Senior Associate with the Innovation Network², spoke to an evaluation model in which an outside evaluator is embedded within the organization for a period, but maintains some distance from programming and services. The panel was rounded out by Greg Crowley, Vice President of Program Development and Evaluation for the Coro Center for Civic Leadership³, who shared his experience and insights based on their developmental evaluation model in which an outside evaluator works with the provider to develop tools and measures for impact that can be used long after the evaluator leaves the site.

Varied Outcomes of Civic Engagement, the second session, was designed to highlight how evaluation models can capture the various levels of impact—individual, organizational and societal—that can be elicited by civic engagement and social change work. In this case, four panelists offered their perspectives. Laura Pineseault, Consultant for the Alliance for Children and Families⁴, presented both the Theory of Change and the tailored evaluation tool used by their agencies to measure impacts of their civic engagement initiatives in the context of their service provision. Bo

Thao, Director of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy's (AAPIP)⁵ BRIDGE Program, presented participants with the Anatomy of a Social Justice Organization—a creative framework for evaluating an organization's capacity to work for social justice at the individual, organizational, and societal levels. Shep Zeldin, Co-Director of the Center for Nonprofit Leadership at the University of Wisconsin-Madison⁶, pointed towards one organization's incorporation of youth-adult partnerships as evidence of change. Finally, Jackie Williams Kaye, Strategic Learning and Evaluation Executive for the Atlantic Philanthropies⁷, spoke to the value of demonstrating impact at all levels as evidenced by Atlantic's funding support of both promising new evaluation models and the field of evaluation in general. The conversation with the audience during the session underscored the need to integrate these frameworks in ways that reflected different organizations' missions and made the impact of their work more evident to funders.

The first day ended with a dinner presentation, ***Making Connections: Framework, Tools for Action, Documentation and Case Making*** where Audrey Jordon from the Annie E. Casey Foundation presented their framework when evaluating the community impact of their work with residents. The Honeycomb Model is built upon what Casey calls "Authentic Demand"⁸ by residents for developmental, organizational and societal outcomes, emphasizing the critical role community members play in social change work and the need to document their impact.

CHALLENGES OF CIVIC ENGAGEMENT EVALUATION

- The challenge is that traditional evaluation techniques work well in assessing linear processes, however, the impact of civic engagement is not linear. Community residents live in a web and as individuals become more civically engaged, the outcome and impact of their behavior is difficult to track. A person who joins a community group and develops as a leader does not just use the new skills in that organization. These skills are applied and passed on to others within the community along the lines of the web. To fully assess the impact we would need to have detailed knowledge of the web and the web is constantly evolving. The challenge is to be able to track changes in the web that can be attributed to a specific set of actions.
- Challenges I have found which may also apply to civic engagement and and/or social change center on the fundamental tension between defining individual, community, and programmatic impacts. What does civic engagement look like beyond voting patterns, number of hours spent volunteering, and/or government participation (running for office, public advocacy, campaigning, for example). With respect to social change, the challenge of identifying specific behaviors that indicate authentic change in a context.
- The major challenges in evaluating this type of work have been the complexities inherent to advocacy and policy change efforts: the long timeframes, the multitude of players, the opposition, the political climate, etc. These complexities make it difficult to parse out the outcomes attributable to one single advocate.
- We rely on evidence derived from single or multiple case studies. On the positive side, case studies give us in-depth understanding of mechanisms that bring about or prevent desired outcomes. On the negative side, the small number of cases makes it harder to generalize
- People use the words civic engagement, social change, and prevention, but when you begin to dig down deeper you often discover that they are simply describing some aspect of service delivery. This makes it challenging to get accurate data regarding people's actual involvement in social change work and civic engagement.
- Identification of control groups that can be removed from programs to measure their impact that do not create a burden on the organization or program in question.
- Measuring outcomes in civic engagement and social change work requires a significant cultural shift within organizations to do work in a very focused, disciplined fashion. It has been and continues to be a challenge to get organizations to embrace the necessary strategic focus and planning to determine measurable outcomes and impact of the work.
- There are not really existing tools that measure social change work of organizations. Most tools are purely focused on traditional organizational development.
- As a grantmaker—I see the central challenges in measuring outcome and impacts are three fold. First, clearly defining the desired change, second lack of tools or systems track the data and, third, time. Most of the social change is years in the making and yet the time horizon for evaluation is shorter than that.

Civic Engagement Evaluation Summit Participants:

Barbara Schaffer Bacon

Animating Democracy, Americans for the Arts

Gigi Barsoum

The California Endowment

Carrie Broadus

Los Angeles' Women Alive Coalition

Margaret Camarena

Social Science Research Center/Old Dominion University

Julia Coffman

Evaluation Consultant

Greg Crowley

Coro Center for Civic Leadership

Ryan Friedrichs

State Voices

A. Caroline Hotaling

Ms. Foundation for Women

Helena Huang

Funders' Committee on Civic Participation

Tammy Johnson

Applied Research Center

Terri Johnson

Jane Addams Hull House

Audrey Jordan
Tom Kelly

Annie E. Casey Foundation

Scherazade Daruvalla King

Project: Think Different and Empowerment Records

Pam Korza

Animating Democracy Americans for the Arts

Frances Kunreuther
Trish Tchume

Building Movement Project

Linda Nguyen
Laura Pinsoneault

Alliance for Children and Families

Bill Oswald

Springfield College

Teresa Purcell

Purcell Public Affairs

Ehren Reed

Innovation Network

Nicole Robinson

Mosaica: The Center for Non-profit Development and Pluralism

Bo Thao

Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy

Sean Thomas-Breitfeld

Center for Community Change

John Everett Till

Family & Children's Service

Jackie Williams Kaye

The Atlantic Philanthropies

Shep Zeldin

Center for Non-Profits, University of Wisconsin-Madison

APPLYING WHAT WE LEARNED: THE WOMEN ALIVE CASE STUDY

The gathering culminated on the second day with a session designed to apply the models and frameworks that had been presented at the conference to a case study. The case study organization—Women Alive—is a coalition of, by and for women living with HIV/AIDS in the Los Angeles area. The organization began as a support group for HIV-positive women and has expanded to include a wide variety of programs and services. Although Women Alive members and activists have been on the forefront of AIDS policy issues—including advocacy for HIV clinical research specific to women and fighting to ensure that women have equal access to high quality, life-saving care and treatment—there has been no formal assessment of the impact of their work.

This is the context which Carrie Broadus, Executive Director of Women Alive, offered the Summit participants when the case study was presented. Summit participants were divided into three groups with a combination of foundation staff, service providers and evaluators/researchers and were facilitated by one of the expert evaluators in the room. Each small group was assigned the task of developing a framework for assessing the impact of one of three primary services areas at Women Alive: Support Groups, Peer Education, and Role Model Stories. The goal was to develop a plan that took into account the organization's current capacity and would assist Women Alive in demonstrating not only the impact that engaging and supporting HIV positive women

had on empowering women to advocate for themselves and manage their own treatment, but also the effect of their activities on efforts by the community to stop the spread of HIV.

Shifting from Individual Outcomes to Civic Impact: Advice from Participants

Women Alive was chosen in part because it already had tools in place to measure the individual outcomes of service provision. Thus, the charge of the Summit group was to broaden the evaluation focus of each service program area from individual outcomes to include civic impact as well.

Support Groups

Women Alive **Support Groups** use the support of and between HIV positive women to improve health outcomes for participants and engage these women in their community. Particularly geared to women of color living with HIV/AIDS and their children, the Support Groups provide a safe environment to express emotions and to ask for information, ultimately helping to reshape the ways women view their experience and value to the community.

Women Alive tracks attendance, treatment plans and keeps progress notes to document medical outcomes, risk behaviors, and willingness of clients to self disclose their status publicly.

Summit attendees advised extending the impact of Support Groups by asking women to take a proactive stance in identifying how they expected group support to help them find their power in the community and organization. Specifically Summit attendees recommended:

- » A *participatory evaluation design* that allowed women attending Support Groups to determine criteria of success. This type of design is both reasonable in terms of

scope and cost for an organization like Women Alive and directly links the organization's service goals to impact.

- » Questions to guide the development of the evaluation that include a closer examination of the following:
 - Recruitment—who and why
 - Sustainability—who, why and for how long
 - Process—what is working/not working
 - Effectiveness—what are the benefits and who benefits
- » Data collection methods that demonstrate impact in *meaningful* ways, and are *accessible* and *understandable* to participants. These might include photo journals, written journals and presentations.
- » Alignment of evaluation with the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Authentic Demand model that emphasizes resident leadership, community organizing, civic participation and social networks as a framework for change.

Peer Health Educator Program

The **Peer Health Educator Program** trains volunteer members of Women Alive in community health education, prevention, domestic violence and outreach to increase awareness of HIV and the importance of prevention and testing. The program also aims to increase support and services for people living with HIV/AIDS in Los Angeles County. Peer health educators share their knowledge and experience through health fairs, home visits and other outreach encounters.

The Peer Health Educator program transitions women living with HIV from “client” to volunteer by developing knowledge and leadership skills that the women can then take into the community. The recommendations to Women Alive suggested they look beyond demonstrating reach by counting participation, atten-

dance and lengths of encounters, to learning more about the education process in order to assess which messages work with which recipients, and what happens as a result of the messages.

Specifically Summit attendees recommended:

- » Developing a menu of questions for various audiences that ask what is most important to know *today* concerning HIV risks and transmission. Asking this question at each outreach opportunity keeps Women Alive current on the needs and issues relevant to the community they serve.
- » Identifying and documenting a clear model of engagement that responds to the following:
 - What is the overall environment in which the interaction takes place and how does the environment impact the type and effectiveness of the message?
 - Who is the recipient of education and how does the message need to change?
 - What is the end message and how does this impact the recipient of this message?

In asking these questions, Women Alive can demonstrate the clear impact of Peer Health Education and use this information to strengthen messages to different audiences.

- » Adopting a longitudinal strategy that follows up on (1) the impact of the experience on the Peer Health Educators, (2) how the Educators' messages at different outreach sites is received by recipients, and (3) the difference in awareness at the community level.

Role Model Stories

Role Model Stories use first-person narratives by women committed to changing behaviors to support their health and well-being. The printed stories are made available to businesses throughout Los Angeles County and help to elevate the experience of HIV-positive women and highlight the importance of safe sex practices and condom use.

The Role Model Stories, with real time appeal, have both power and meaning for the women of Women Alive. The current outcomes model counts the number of stories and the locations where they are being distributed—a model which could also be extended to capture greater systemic impact.

Specifically Summit attendees recommended:

- » Documenting the Theory of Change for Role Model Stories by capturing the impact at multiple levels—storyteller, women of Women Alive, business owners and consumers, broader community and political movements.
- » Developing tools for linking data to targets (i.e. color coding of stories for specific locations or areas of town, focus groups, tracking referrals and donations, on-going interviews with businesses and community members)

In addition to these program-specific recommendations, Summit participants also urged Broadus to use the many strengths and tools of Women Alive to draw in professional evaluators who might be interested in the organization and its work as a subject for research. Women Alive has a leader who can communicate with multiple audiences, clear group processes, tools and programs that serve as hubs for data collection. This is a solid climate for external evaluators to come in and work effectively and efficiently to provide wider audiences with real data about the community and the impact of such initiatives.

Implementing New Tools: Women Alive After the Summit

At the request of several Summit attendees and in the interest of making social change work and impact measurement visible, the Building Movement Project followed up with Women Alive at the end of 2009, six months after this case study was presented at the Summit. Much had changed for Women Alive. The group had experienced a significant drop in funding and was mobilizing to meet the demands for their programs and services despite reduced capacity. As is often the case for organizations that lose resources, implementing impact evaluation became secondary to meeting the service demands and needs of the women they serve.

Although Women Alive's capacity to immediately implement the evaluation frameworks developed at the Summit was limited, executive director Broadus's attendance at the meeting in March continues to shape and inform Women Alive as they move forward. Evidence of the framework that was developed at the

Summit appears in their current strategic plan. Broadus attributed much of her confidence in the survival of Women Alive to the energy and relationships that came from the Summit and seeing her passion shared by others. Those days at the Summit affirmed for her that her instincts were on target for Women Alive—they needed to focus at a structural level and they needed to demonstrate their impact.

In addition, the Summit helped Broadus enhance her capacity to communicate her evaluation needs. As a result, she was able to pursue one of the stronger recommendations of the group and develop the language and tools needed to create a strong partnership with a professional evaluator. Broadus is the Co-Principal Investigator on a grant proposal being submitted to support and evaluate the services of Women Alive. She sees the current success of this partnership stemming from her knowledge that the relationship between evaluation and organizational goals can be non-divisive and can actually contribute to the work of the organization.

NEXT STEPS

As a result of the Summit, the following next steps were identified as critical to advancing this work:

- » **Create an informational hub for frameworks, models and tools presented at the Summit.** Summit attendees and presenters discussed and shared final and working drafts of tools and approaches for defining civic engagement and measuring the outcomes and impacts of this work in organizational settings. Many of these tools were found to be applicable in other arenas and could save time and expense if they were made widely available to other practitioners and evaluators.
- » **Create space for emerging methods.** Much of the discussion focused on how traditional methods of evaluation did not always apply to civic engagement and social change work. Several participants were working on innovative methods and approaches that reflected the impact of this work at multiple levels including capturing “outcomes in the moment” rather than the linear method of traditional evaluation. Presenters and others who were designing these new methods were anxious to hear feedback on their models and to find places to test and expand their thinking. There was a strong desire to find places where new methods could be discussed, tested and modified with the help of other evaluators, practitioners, constituents and foundation partners.
- » **Opportunities for more dialogue.** The lack of clarity and fragmentation of this type of evaluation was identified as one of the forces creating divisions between evaluators, service organizations and foundations. Finding ways to continue the conversation via electronic communications and new collaborations were recognized as efficient and fundamental to ad-

vancing the impact of the Summit. At the same time, participants also expressed the need for more face-to-face time that allowed for opportunities to dialogue within and across sectors. The Summit attendees recognized that these types of meetings hold the power to change traditional dynamics (i.e. the funder/practitioner divide), build relationships and steer impact and outcome evaluations in a constructive direction.

Though it’s been less than a year since the Civic Engagement Evaluation Summit, huge strides in the work of many of our attendees offer encouragement that that the field has taken up the call for better tools for measuring the impact of civic engagement and increased access to existing tools. These developments include:

- » The launch of the **Center for Innovation in Evaluation** directed by Summit participant, Julia Coffman, and described as a space “to push evaluation practice in new directions and into new arenas. The Center specializes in areas that are hard to measure and where conventional program evaluation approaches are not always a good fit. This includes, for example, advocacy and policy change, communications, and systems change efforts. The Center works with other organizations to develop and then share new ideas and solutions to evaluation challenges through: Research, Communications, Tool and training development, and Convening.”⁹ The Center is also a strategic partner of the Innovation Network (Summit Participant, Ehren Reed) who continues to serve on the forefront of the field of advocacy evaluation.
- » **Americans for the Arts** (Summit participants, Pam Korza and Barbara Schaeffer-Bacon) recently launched IMPACT

Arts—an online database for “those who want to make a difference in their communities through the arts and who want to understand what difference they’re making.”¹⁰ IMPACT Arts offers tools and suggestions for indicators but also offers a series of primers for groups entering into the realm of impact evaluation at different levels.

- » **Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy (AAPIP)’s National Gender Equity Campaign** (Summit participant, Bo Thao) developed and released its comprehensive BRIDGE Organizational Assessment Tool. The Tool, which is currently meant for use mainly by the groups in AAPIP’s Organizational Fellowship Program is designed to

1) provide each fellowship organization with a more holistic picture of areas of development; 2) uncover the organization’s internal assets, such as cultural competence, reputation and role in the community; and 3) help the organization better reflect and understand its starting point as it considers what to focus on in terms of building “social justice capacity” so that it can more fully determine its path towards being a more effective and sustainable social justice organization.”¹¹

The Building Movement Project is also committed to responding to these recommendations by continuing to serve as a convener, a hub for connecting practitioners with tools, and a champion for an increase in resources devoted to this field.

ENDNOTES

1. Mosaica is a multicultural and values-based nonprofit consulting organization headquartered in Washington, DC. <http://www.mosaica.org>.
2. The Innovation Network is a nonprofit evaluation, research, and consulting firm. <http://www.innonet.org>.
3. The Coro Center for Civic Leadership trains ethical, diverse civic leaders nationwide. <http://www.coro.org>.
4. The Alliance for Children and Families provides services to nonprofit child and family serving and economic empowerment organizations. <http://www.alliance1.org>.
5. Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy (AAPIP) is a national philanthropy advocacy organization dedicated to advancing community and philanthropy. <http://www.aapip.org>.
6. The Center for Nonprofit Leadership at the University of Wisconsin-Madison builds capacity in civil society and the nonprofit sector through the integration of education, research and outreach. <http://www.sohe.wisc.edu/centers/cnp/index.html>.
7. The Atlantic Philanthropies Strategic Learning and Evaluation efforts works with grantees to design evaluations that assess the implementation and the impact of projects. The range of evaluation designs and methods used reflects the range of approaches grantees use to achieve their objectives. <http://atlanticphilanthropies.org/news/evaluation>.
8. Nilofer Ahsan, *Sustaining Neighborhood Change*, Rep, Baltimore: Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2008, http://caseyfoundation.com/~media/PublicationFiles/Authentic_guide_r14.pdf. (Date Accessed 11 Feb. 2010).
9. “Overview,” Center for Evaluation Innovation, http://www.innonet.org/index.php?section_id=2&content_id=722. (Date accessed 11 Feb 2010).
10. “Home Page,” IMPACT Arts, <http://impact.animatingdemocracy.org>. (Date accessed 11 Feb 2010).
11. “BRIDGE Organizational Assessment Tool (BOAT),” National Gender and Equity Campaign, <http://genderandequity.org/boat>. (Date accessed 11 Feb 2010).

To learn more about this initiative and the follow-up of this work, please contact us:

Trish Tchume at ttchume@demos.org

Building Movement Project | 220 Fifth Avenue, Fifth Floor | New York, NY 10001
T 212.633.1405 | F 212.633.2015

www.buildingmovement.org

Visit the websites of the Civic Engagement Evaluation Summit partners:

Building Movement Project www.buildingmovement.org

Alliance for Children and Families www.alliance1.org

Ms. Foundation for Women www.ms.foundation.org

Center for Community Change www.communitychange.org

The Civic Engagement Evaluation Summit was funded through the W.K. Kellogg Foundation Connect Fund—www.wkkf.org—as part of the Civic Engagement Learning Year initiative.