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INTRODUCTION

In the ongoing process of evaluating our work, Marguerite Casey Foundation began surveying its grantees in 2008 to assess the impact of foundation support on grantee organizations and their collective work with and on behalf of low-income families.

The first grantee survey, conducted in spring 2008, gathered information about the work in which organizations were engaged, the policy impacts they were facilitating, organizational development activities, and the nature and level of networks and collaborations. In 2009, we modified the survey instrument (see Appendix A) to gather information regarding three core questions:

1. What impact has general operating support from Marguerite Casey Foundation had on grantee organizations?
2. What movement building activities have grantee organizations undertaken?
3. What outcomes have grantee organizations achieved?

The second grantee survey was distributed online in June 2009. It comprised 25 questions, including four background questions and questions regarding progress made in five areas we believe are fundamental to movement building:

1. Organizational capacity
2. Leadership development
3. Network development
4. Impact on families
5. Impact on policy

Unless indicated otherwise, the questions referred to the organizations’ activities in 2008. Finally, we included three questions on the effect of the economic downturn on the foundation’s grantees and their communities.

The survey was sent to all Marguerite Casey Foundation grantees active in 2008 (n = 248). There were 172 completed surveys submitted, for an overall response rate of 69 percent. Organizations were not asked to identify themselves. The survey responses were collected and the results compiled by Capacity for Change, a public interest consulting group located in West Chester, Pennsylvania.

FINDINGS

Profile of Grantees
Marguerite Casey Foundation supports cornerstone organizations in five regions of the United States (Deep South, Home State [Washington state], Midwest, Southwest and West), along with national organizations that have a record of putting families at the forefront of efforts to address chronic poverty.
The breakdown of survey respondents by region is as follows:

![Pie chart showing regional breakdown of respondents.]

Respondents were asked to indicate the annual operating budget of their respective organizations. The operating budgets range from less than $200,000 to more than $5 million. Approximately one-half of the organizations have budgets below $1 million.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Range</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $200,000</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000–$499,999</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000–$749,999</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$750,000–$999,999</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000–$1,999,999</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000,000–$4,999,999</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5 million or more</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The grantees were asked if they were an intermediary organization, defined as one that provides services such as training, technical assistance and research to other groups, and/or re-grants to other organizations, but does not work directly with constituents. Twenty-nine percent of the organizations identified themselves as intermediaries. Of those organizations that identified themselves as intermediaries, most (80 percent) reported that they provide training and/or technical assistance, followed by research/advocacy (25 percent) and re-granting (16 percent) to other organizations (some organizations provide more than one type of intermediary service).

Marguerite Casey Foundation provides multi-year general operating support to cornerstone organizations. Our first full grant year was 2002. When asked when they received their first grant from the foundation, nearly 8 percent responded that their first grant was in 2002. More than half of the grantees active in 2008 (61 percent) first received a grant from the foundation at least four years ago. Thirteen percent reported that 2008 was the first year they received a Marguerite Casey Foundation grant.
### Year of First Grant and Percentage of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of First Grant</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organizational Capacity

Marguerite Casey Foundation provides general operating support because we believe such support helps grantees build organizational capacity and effectiveness. The survey asked several questions related to organizational capacity building, including questions about staff and board development activities. Respondents could choose from a list of activities and add their own; the results are shown below:

#### How Grantees Built Organizational Capacity in 2008

- **Collaboration/partnership development**: 87%
- **Staff training/development**: 84%
- **Hired new staff**: 64%
- **Issue analysis/research**: 62%
- **Strategic planning/needs assessment**: 61%
- **Improved information systems**: 59%
- **Marketing/outreach activities**: 55%
- **Program expansion**: 55%
- **Board training/development**: 54%
- **Formal evaluation activities**: 37%
- **Expanded/improved office space/facilities**: 29%

The most common staff development activities in 2008 were:

- Engagement of staff in organizational decision making (85 percent)
- Staff training (84 percent)
- Creation or update of staff policies and procedures (58 percent)

The most common board development activities in 2008 were:

- Recruitment of representative community members to serve on board (59 percent)
- Strategic planning training (44 percent)
- Fundraising training (41 percent)
When asked to complete the sentence “As a result of Marguerite Casey Foundation funding, my organization…” the respondents cited a number of ways in which support had an impact in 2008.

### As a Result of Marguerite Casey Foundation Funding, My Organization...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Percentage of Grantees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reached more community members</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deepened relationships with existing partners</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded number of organizations that are partners</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated new strategies into existing programs</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraged new funding from other sources</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased understanding of Movement Building</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved more families in planning/program delivery</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded scope of issues</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired new staff</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leadership Development**

Organizations were asked in an open-ended question how they define the process of leadership development of community members for movement building. The most common responses were that the process was one of training (30 percent), actions (13 percent), collective learning (11 percent) and planning and implementation (11 percent).

**Adult Leadership Development**

To clarify that process further, the grantees were asked to indicate (choosing from a list of activities) what they did in 2008 to develop the skills and leadership of adults in their communities; they could specify activities not on the list as well.

Their responses demonstrate that our grantees use diverse strategies to develop leaders in their communities. As shown below, the most frequently used methods are issue education (79 percent) and the development of community organizing skills (76 percent). Approximately two-thirds (66 percent) of the organizations reported they regularly involved adult community representatives as members of their board and/or advisory board. Note that while less than half of the organizations (44 percent) report utilizing a formal leadership training curriculum, more than three-quarters (79 percent) employed at least one strategy to develop leadership among families in their communities.
Youth Leadership Development
Approximately three-quarters (76 percent) of the organizations stated that they work with youth in their communities. Those organizations chose, from a list, the methods they used in 2008 to develop the skills and leadership of their young constituents; they could also specify methods not on the list.
There were a number of similarities in how organizations developed adult and youth leaders. The youth, however, were more likely than the adults to be provided opportunities to work in the organization and receive mentoring by more experienced leaders. Youth were less likely than the adults to be involved as members of a board or an advisory board.

**Network Development**
The survey included several questions regarding how grantees communicate with other organizations as well as their constituencies as a component of network and partnership development. Grantees were asked how they shared their work and/or best practices with other organizations in 2008. Most of the organizations (89 percent) use individual meetings as a method of communication, followed by convenings/conferences (79 percent). Nearly three-quarters (74 percent) report sharing their work through a Web site, followed by e-mail alerts (68 percent), telephone calls (66 percent) and publications (65 percent).

Social media represent an expanding area of communications for the foundation as well as its grantees. More than two-thirds (70 percent) of our grantees reported they used at least one type of social media to share their work and/or best practices in 2008. The most commonly utilized medium was Facebook, which was used by approximately one-half (51 percent) of the organizations. Facebook was followed by YouTube (41 percent), Twitter (14 percent) and Flickr (14 percent). A small proportion (3 percent) of the grantees reported using Digg and Vimeo; 4 percent had used MySpace. Although grantees have begun to use social media to expand their reach, there is room for growth.

Grantees were asked to choose from a list the ways in which they collaborated with other organizations in 2008 and the number of organizations with which they worked for each method. As shown below, most grantees collaborated with other organizations in several ways:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies Used to Collaborate with Other Organizations in 2008</th>
<th>Percentage of Grantees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchanged information</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held public events together</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared analysis/research</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursued funding opportunities together</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained together</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursued campaigns together</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared constituencies</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared funds</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared staff</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared membership lists</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Grantees
The average number of organizations with which grantees collaborated using the above methods ranged from a high of 80 (information exchange) to four (staff sharing). The complete results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Collaboration</th>
<th>Average Number of Collaborators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information exchange</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared analysis/research</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint sponsorship of public events</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint campaigning</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared constituencies</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint training</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint pursuit of funding opportunities</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds sharing</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership-list sharing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff sharing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, grantees collaborate with other organizations through a variety of methods, and with each method, they work with a number of different organizations. In addition, 88 percent of the grantees belong to at least one formally structured network or coalition that focuses on advocacy activities.

**Impact on Families**
The grantees were asked to give their opinion as to what impact the Equal Voice for America’s Families campaign had on families’ abilities to advocate for themselves in their respective communities. Eighty-three percent of the grantees conveyed that the campaign did have an impact on families’ ability to advocate in their own behalf. The most common theme in the responses was that the campaign deepened families’ understanding of issues and how they are connected (30 percent). Other themes included building relationships with other organizations and among the families themselves (20 percent) and building the confidence of families by empowering them and giving them the opportunity for their voices to be heard (19 percent). A few grantees opined that the campaign provided a model of coming together (9 percent). Three grantees (2 percent of the respondents) cited voter engagement as the key impact on the families, and three cited engagement in local issues.

**Impact on Policy**
The foundation was interested in which issues – as defined by families in the Equal Voice for America’s Families National Family Platform – were the most salient for grantees during 2008. We asked the grantees to rank the platform issues on which they worked in 2008. As shown in the chart that follows, each of the platform issues was a top priority for at least some of the grantee organizations. That diversity reflects the foundation’s approach to grantmaking: Marguerite Casey Foundation does not fund by issue; thus, the overall portfolio consists of organizations that work on many different issues that affect families.
Overall, the grantees do advocacy work at several levels of government and community. Respondents indicated doing advocacy work at each of the following levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Government or Community</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Advocating at the Level in 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School district</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifteen percent of the respondents reported that at least half of their advocacy work was at the state level; 10 percent reported that at least half of their advocacy work was at the federal level.

Three-quarters (75 percent) of the organizations that responded worked on a major policy issue campaign in 2008. The most common campaign goals were immigration reform (20 percent), education (13 percent) and housing (11 percent). Policy campaigns in 2008 also focused on criminal justice reform (9 percent), jobs/workers’ rights (9 percent), health care (9 percent), government funding (9 percent), public safety (4 percent), use of public space (3 percent) and green economy (3 percent).
When asked to list the partner organizations with which they worked on their policy issue campaign, the respondents listed 256 organizations as campaign partners. Thus on average, grantees worked with at least two additional partners to wage policy campaigns in 2008.

Grantees were asked to report what their organization accomplished with their policy issue campaign. The most commonly noted accomplishment was educating the public about a particular policy issue (23 percent), followed by an increase in government funding or the prevention of further cuts (16 percent), and built momentum (15 percent). Several grantees described bringing about local policy changes (14 percent), including changes in predatory lending and living wage policies, green spaces and building, housing preservation and the closure of a youth correctional facility.

Examples of Policy Impacts by Region
Many of the accomplishments noted by grantees represent processes rather than outcomes. This is understandable considering the time that it often takes to bring about policy change. However, several grantees noted specific policy impacts that were achieved in 2008. The following list provides examples of these policy wins. The list illustrates the wide range of issues that grantees have addressed, as well as the differences among organizations in terms of scale and capacity to mount a policy issue campaign. Because grantee responses are confidential, policy wins are identified by region only.

**Deep South**
- Passed county ordinance requiring rebuilding of 850 units of public housing, the right of displaced public housing residents to return, and LEED-certification.
- Doubled state budget for pre-kindergarten schooling.
- Increased federal funding for child care subsidies, expanding number of children served.
- Passed legislation to close a youth prison.
- State legislature approved funding for Mississippi Adequate Education Program.
- State legislature fully funded Mississippi’s public education funding formula for two consecutive years for the first time in history.

**Home State**
- Resolution by Seattle city council that connects job quality to zoning and requires affordable housing be built on site for smaller projects.
- State legislature passed $15 million weatherization program for low-income families with apprenticeship utilization and direct entry agreements.
- Expanded enrollment in state prescription drug program; health insurance partnership created that establishes health care options for low-income employees of small businesses.
- Introduced bill in state legislature to provide financial aid to undocumented students.

**Midwest**
- Achieved full funding for HUD-subsidized housing.
Allotted $3 million in state funding to education of homeless students.

Won funding for new pilot restorative justice programs.

Gained commitment from the city of Chicago to develop more green space.

Secured commitment from Chicago Public Schools to build a new school.

Integrated civic-engagement organizing campaign that mobilized 126,000 immigrant voters, registered 25,000 voters, and naturalized 5,000 new citizens.

**National**

- Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP) reauthorized with $35 billion increase in funding, expanding coverage to 4 million children in the United States.

- Recrafted green jobs training bill to make it more racially equitable by providing multiple education pathways (college and trade school).

**Southwest**

- Increased voting percentage in county by 10 percent.

- Defeated $14.8 million payday lending industry–funded ballot proposition that would have legalized triple-digit interest on small loans.

- Increased funding equity in public education; expanded access to college for minority students maintained.

**West**

- Elimination of welfare benefits to children rejected by California state legislature; benefits for 1.2 million Californians maintained.

- Adoption of the Children’s Right to Lead Safe Housing ordinance.

- Won Green Retrofit and Workforce Development Ordinance for the City of Los Angeles.

- Almost 5,000 residents filed for the Earned Income Tax Credit; almost $5 million refunded.

- Living wage policy expanded to include more workers; enforcement strengthened.

- Created joint-use task force comprising school board and city council members to discuss open-space opportunities within the community.
Impact of the Economic Downturn
The survey included three questions regarding the impact of the economic downturn on grantees and on families in their communities. When asked what area of their work has been most affected by the economic downturn, the respondents’ most common responses were:

- Reduced staff or hours (17 percent)
- Reduced funding (16 percent)
- Reduced services/programs (12 percent)
- Revised strategies/new opportunities (12 percent)
- Increased demand for services (10 percent)

When asked what the impact of the downturn on low-income families in their communities has been, the respondents noted the following (several grantees cited more than one impact):

- Employment (46 percent)
- Housing, including foreclosures, instability and homelessness (34 percent)
- Reduced support from nonprofits (12 percent)
- No health care (9 percent)
- Food scarcity (8 percent)

Grantees were also asked to project what they thought the greatest impact of the economic downturn would be on the work of their organization in the upcoming fiscal year. The most common responses to this question were:

- Reduced funding (19 percent)
- Reduced services/programs (14 percent)
- Increased demand for services (13 percent)
- Revised strategies/new opportunities (13 percent)
- Reduced staff or hours (11 percent)

In the face of tremendous pressure from the economic downturn, our grantees are demonstrating incredible resiliency. Less than one in five has had to reduce its staff or services, or experienced reduced funding. The proportion of grantees that anticipate a reduction in funding in the upcoming fiscal year is below 20 percent.

In some cases, the economic circumstances have created opportunities for new collaborations and revised strategies. Our grantees appear to be doing better than many organizations in the nonprofit sector, yet the economic downturn has had a significant impact on low-income families. According to our grantees, the impact on families has been the greatest in the critical areas of employment and housing. Clearly, the continued organizational health of cornerstone organizations such as our grantees is vital to meet the needs of low-income families in communities.
IMPLICATIONS

The findings from the survey suggest several important implications about the impact of general operating support on grantees, the activities in which grantee organizations have engaged and the outcomes they have achieved:

- Grantee organizations build capacity with general operating support from Marguerite Casey Foundation. Such support is critical to sustain organizations during an economic downturn.

- Grantee organizations are reaching families in their communities through leadership development of adults and youth, including involving community members in their work, and in the engagement of families in the Equal Voice campaign.

- Grantee organizations have made it a priority, particularly important in this economic downturn, to partner with other organizations to maximize their impact.

- Grantee organizations are engaging in policy advocacy on issues important to low-income families at all levels of government and community, often in partnership with other organizations.

- Grantee organizations are achieving impressive policy wins in a number of issue areas, across all of our grantmaking regions.

CONCLUSION

The 2009 grantee survey results provide a profile of the capacity of cornerstone organizations to do important work with and in behalf of low-income families across the United States. This capacity is not only sustained by general operating support from Marguerite Casey Foundation, which gives organizations the flexibility to respond to their needs as well as those of their communities, but also by the partnerships the grantees have developed with other like-minded organizations. The collaborative efforts maximize the impact of the organizations as they develop youth and adult community leaders, and work to effect policy change that will ultimately improve the lives of low-income families.
Appendix A:
Marguerite Casey Foundation 2009 Grantee Survey

1. In which Marguerite Casey Foundation grantmaking region does your organization operate?
   - California
   - Deep South
   - Midwest
   - National
   - Southwest
   - Washington state

2. What is your organization’s annual budget?
   - $199,999 or below
   - $200,000 to $499,999
   - $500,000 to $749,999
   - $750,000 to $999,999
   - $1,000,000 to $1,999,999
   - $2,000,000 to $4,999,999
   - $5,000,000 or above

3. An intermediary organization may be defined as one that does not work primarily with constituents directly, but provides services such as training, technical assistance and research to other groups and/or re-grants to other organizations. Is yours an intermediary organization?
   - Yes
   - No

   If yes, what type of intermediary services does your organization provide? (open-ended question)

4. When did your organization receive its first grant from Marguerite Casey Foundation?
5. How did your organization build organizational capacity in 2008? Please check all that apply.

- Hired new staff
- Staff training or development
- Board training or development
- Improved information systems
- Expanded or improved office space/facilities
- Marketing/outreach activities
- Strategic planning/needs assessment
- Program expansion
- Collaboration or partnership development
- Issue analysis/research
- Formal evaluation activities
- Other (please specify)

6. In what type(s) of staff development activities did your organization engage in 2008?

- Provided staff training
- Created individual staff development plans
- Developed leadership succession plans
- Engaged staff in organizational decision-making
- Created or updated staff policies and procedures
- Other (please specify)

7. In what type(s) of board development activities did your organization engage in 2008?

- Fiscal accountability training
- Fundraising training
- Strategic planning training
- Communications training
- Recruited representative community members to the board
- Developed board transition/succession plans
- Other (please specify)

8. Please complete the following sentence by checking all of the items that apply to your work in 2008. As a result of Marguerite Casey Foundation funding in 2008, my organization:

- Leveraged new funding from other sources
- Hired new staff
- Reached more community members
- Expanded the scope of issues it addresses
- Incorporated new strategies into existing programs
- Expanded the number of organizations that are partners
- Deepened relationships with existing partner organizations
- Increased understanding of movement building concepts
- Involved more families in organizational planning and program delivery
- Other (please specify)
9. How does your organization define the process of leadership development of community members for movement building? (open-ended question)

10. How did your organization develop skills and leadership among adult community members in 2008? Please check all that apply.

- Developed skills in community organizing
- Developed skills in government structures and policy creation
- Developed skills in power analysis
- Developed pride in ethnic cultures and preservation of traditional values
- Provided issue education
- Provided opportunities to work in the organization
- Provided opportunities to work in partnership with government agencies
- Provided mentoring by more experienced leaders
- Provided a formal leadership training curriculum
- Provided media training
- Involved community members as members of the board or an advisory board
- Involved community members in organizational planning
- Prepared community members for elected or appointed positions
- Provided direct services
- Other (please specify)

11. How did your organization develop skills and leadership among youth in 2008? Please check all that apply.

- Developed skills in community organizing
- Developed skills in government structures and policy creation
- Developed skills in power analysis
- Developed pride in ethnic cultures and preservation of traditional values
- Provided issue education
- Provided opportunities to work in the organization
- Provided opportunities to work in partnership with government agencies
- Provided mentoring by more experienced leaders
- Provided a formal leadership training curriculum
- Provided media training
- Involved youth as members of the Board or an Advisory Board
- Involved youth in organizational planning
- Provided direct services
- Other (please specify)
- We do not work primarily with youth

12. In your opinion, what impact did the Equal Voice for America’s Families campaign have on families’ abilities to advocate for themselves in your community? (open-ended question)

13. How did your organization share your work and/or best practices with other organizations in 2008? Please check all that apply.
Web site  
E-mail alerts  
Telephone/conference calls  
Face-to-face meetings  
Convenings/conferences  
Publications (newsletters, research papers, briefs, etc.)  
Other (please specify)

14. Did your organization use any of the following online social networking tools to share your work and/or best practices with other organizations in 2008? If yes, indicate which tools, and if no, indicate it below.

Blog  
Facebook  
Twitter  
YouTube  
Flickr  
Vimeo  
We did not use online social networking tools

15. Indicate the number of organizations with which you used each of the methods below. If you did not use a method, answer with a “0” for zero organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number of organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchanged information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursued funding opportunities together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held public events together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared membership lists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared constituencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared analysis/research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursued campaigns together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Does your organization belong to a formally structured network/coalition that focuses on advocacy activities?

Yes  
No

17. Please rank the top Equal Voice National Family Platform issues on which your organization worked in 2008. Indicate as many issues as applicable by numbering them starting with 1 as the issue of greatest strategic priority to your organization.

Child Care  
Criminal Justice Reform
18. Approximately what percentage of your advocacy work in 2008 took place at each level of government or community?

- Federal
- Tribal
- State
- County/Parish
- City
- School District
- Neighborhood

19. In 2008, did your organization work on a major policy issue campaign?

- Yes
- No

20. What was the goal of the primary issue campaign that your organization worked on in 2008? (open-ended question)

21. List the partner organizations with which you worked on your primary policy issue campaign in 2008. (open-ended question)

22. What did your organization accomplish with your primary issue campaign? (open-ended question)

23. What area of your organization’s work has been most affected by the economic downturn? (open-ended question)

24. What has been the greatest impact of the economic downturn on low-income families in your community? (open-ended question)

25. What do you expect to be the greatest impact of the economic downturn on the work of your organization in the upcoming fiscal year? (open-ended question)