

---

## LOOKING BACK: PROJECT CHANGE FROM 1991-2005

---

The authors, Sally Leiderman (primary), Shirley Strong, and Mark Patrick George, would like to acknowledge the hard work of the community leaders, task force members and residents of Albuquerque, New Mexico, El Paso, Texas, Knoxville, Tennessee and Valdosta, Georgia. They shaped Project Change in their communities and some took the time to let us interview them extensively for these reports. Each person who did the work, and who allowed us to speak with them about the work, offered insights, critique and lessons that we have tried to share as faithfully as possible. In addition, special thanks are due to Vicki Plevin, Director of the Anti-Racism Training Center of the Southwest at Albuquerque; Saadia L. Williams, Director of the Race Relations Center of East Tennessee at Knoxville; and Frank Morman, Valdosta Project Change Board Chair, at Valdosta. All three let us speak with them many times over the course of our own research and reviewed the documents as they neared completion. We are very grateful.

We are also grateful to the people who worked on Project Change while they were at the Levi Strauss Foundation and Levi Strauss & Company and who were willing to look back with us and share their thoughts. Judy Belk, Henry Ramos, Rachel Sierra and Richard Woo were especially candid and generous with their time.

However, these documents particularly reflect the insights, patience and tenacity of Shirley Strong. Ms. Strong began her Project Change involvement as a task force member in Albuquerque, and then was selected to become the national project director, first at the Levi Strauss Foundation, and then again as Project Change became a project of the Tides Center and continuing today as the Project Change national office works in partnership with the Institute for Democratic Renewal at Claremont Graduate University. Shirley had a vision for a report that could make a contribution in two ways – one, by describing the history and accomplishments of Project Change in ways that might help others that want to design, manage and/or fund similar efforts, and two, by sharing the struggles of the work on the ground to help validate and support those who are doing the work. She worked hard to make sure these reports met her standards. We hope they also realize her vision. Thank you, Shirley.

Sally Leiderman  
Mark Patrick George

April 2005

# INTRODUCTION

**Project Change** is a community of organizations working to eliminate racism. It began in 1991 as a partnership between three communities – Albuquerque, New Mexico; El Paso, Texas; and Valdosta, Georgia and the Levi Strauss Foundation. A fourth community, Knoxville, Tennessee, joined the partnership in 1993. In 1997, Project Change became a project of the Tides Center.

The **goals** of the community partnership have been to:

- Dismantle institutional policies and practices that promote racial discrimination;
- Ease tensions between minority and majority groups and reduce inter-ethnic conflict;
- Promote fair representation of diversity in the leadership of community institutions; and
- Stop overt or violent acts of racial or cultural prejudice.

In 2002, Project Change (PC) entered into a partnership with the Institute of Democratic Renewal (IDR) at Claremont Graduate University. The goals of IDR/PC are to assist communities in dismantling racism and achieving full and equitable participation in the democratic process through a variety of projects, learning communities, convenings, publications and technology.

***Looking Back: Project Change From 1991-2005***, explores the history, model and accomplishments of Project Change and their implications. It was developed from interviews with a number of participants in the Project Change Initiative, a review of program documents and previous evaluations, and the experiences of the authors with the initiative and other anti-racism and anti-oppression efforts.

A **companion** report, ***On the Ground: Struggles and Lessons for Anti-Racism Work.***, offers insights about what people experience as they do this work. Both publications were developed from the same research. Additional copies are available at these websites:

[www.projectchange.org](http://www.projectchange.org)

[www.race-democracy.org](http://www.race-democracy.org)

[www.capd.org](http://www.capd.org)

[www.evaluationtoolsforracialequity.org](http://www.evaluationtoolsforracialequity.org)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| About this Report .....                                       | 4  |
| <i>Summary of results and challenges</i> .....                | 4  |
| <i>Purpose of report</i> .....                                | 7  |
| Background and History of Project Change.....                 | 7  |
| Project Change Model.....                                     | 10 |
| <i>Site Selection</i> .....                                   | 10 |
| <i>Community Task Forces</i> .....                            | 11 |
| <i>State of Race Relations Reports</i> .....                  | 13 |
| <i>Strategy Development and Implementation</i> .....          | 13 |
| <i>Phases and Funding</i> .....                               | 17 |
| <i>Implications of the Model</i> .....                        | 18 |
| Project Change Accomplishments: 1991-2005 .....               | 20 |
| <i>Albuquerque, New Mexico</i> .....                          | 20 |
| <i>El Paso, Texas</i> .....                                   | 21 |
| <i>Knoxville, Tennessee</i> .....                             | 21 |
| <i>Valdosta, Georgia</i> .....                                | 22 |
| <i>National Office (Oakland, CA)</i> .....                    | 23 |
| Other Related Project Change or CAPD Reports and Resources... | 24 |

## *About This Report*

This report describes the experiences, results and struggles of Project Change from the vantage point of more than a decade of work. Project Change is a community-driven anti-racism initiative.<sup>1</sup> It was conceived in the late 1980s by the Levi Strauss Foundation (Foundation), through a special gift from the Levi Strauss & Co. (LS&Co.). The project began in 1991 as a partnership between the Foundation and three communities in which the LS&Co. and the Levi Strauss Foundation had an interest: Albuquerque, New Mexico; El Paso, Texas; and Valdosta, Georgia. In 1993, Knoxville, Tennessee became the fourth community partner.

For its first six years, the program operated under the direction of a project manager housed within the Levi Strauss Foundation, and with attention and oversight provided by Levi Strauss Foundation management and Board. While this arrangement kept the Foundation and the communities in close contact with each other, the Foundation had never been structured as an operating foundation. After six years, it was decided to place the initiative in a new home. The intent was to find a host institution that could support the work in the sites and sustain Project Change over time. After investigating a number of possibilities, Levi Strauss Foundation found no existing organization that focused on anti-racism work with multi-racial leadership, staff and credibility that could support work at both a local and national level. Thus, the decision was made in 1997 to transfer Project Change to the Tides Center.<sup>2</sup> Project Change then began to support work at the national level as well as in the Project Change sites.

## *Summary of Results and Challenges*

Today, 14 years after communities began their Project Change work, three of the four original Project Change sites are still actively engaged in anti-racism work that is a continuation and legacy of the original Project Change partnership. Albuquerque Project Change and Knoxville Project Change continue and have expanded significantly – as the Anti-Racism Training Institute of the Southwest in Albuquerque and the Center for Race Relations in Knoxville – with full agenda, staff and programming. In Valdosta, Project Change continues to operate as a volunteer task force and to support programming and activities within a constrained budget. In El Paso, Project Change officially ended in 1999. Several of its key leaders continue doing anti-racism work in other settings; Project Change itself did not endure. Over time, the national office, in addition to overseeing the evolution of work within the Project Change communities, contributed its expertise to numerous other organizations and anti-racism efforts, forged new partnerships that have led to a national network of anti-racism training institutes and produced a number of well respected and well-used anti-racism

<sup>1</sup> A glossary developed by Project Change defines racism as “an ideological system of oppression and subjugation, held consciously or otherwise, based upon unfounded beliefs about racial and ethnic inequality. This system of oppression is based on a view that an arbitrary set of physical characteristics, such as skin color, facial form or eye shape, are associated with or even determine behavior, culture, intellect or social achievement.” Anti-racism efforts explicitly aim to interrupt or eradicate this system of oppression and subjugation.

<sup>2</sup> The Tides Center serves as an incubator of non-profit organizations and provides a core set of administrative and related services.

publications. By several measures, then, Project Change has made a substantial contribution, and one that is poised to continue for some time.

At the same time, Project Change suffered its share of disappointments, and its participants struggled considerably in trying to move an anti-racism agenda in the four communities and nationally. Some of the disappointments reflect the slow and uneven progress against the ambitious expectations that participants at all levels – people on the Project Change task forces in communities, community residents dealing with racism day-in-and-day-out and the management of the Project at the national level – set for the effort. So far as can be determined, Project Change was the first national foundation/community partnership explicitly aimed at reducing institutional racism as one of its four major goals. The people who established it were not naïve about the difficulty of that task. But they were also determined that the funding, technical resources, visibility and leverage of a major national foundation and corporation, and the hard work of community leaders over time could produce real changes in community outcomes that would be meaningful for community residents.

As will be described more fully below, sometimes this happened and sometimes it did not. People in the Project Change communities differ in their opinions about how much Project Change accomplished and whether what it did accomplish made a meaningful difference in people's lives. While Project Change was an ambitious effort, it existed within prevailing economic and political systems. Several of the foundation and community participants, and some observers, wonder whether any foundation/community partnership, no matter how well intentioned or implemented, can interrupt institutional racism to a significant degree without dramatically changing those prevailing systems.

Given that context, there are accomplishments. All of the Project Change communities were successful in raising awareness about racism through trainings, community forums, media coverage and by other means. Three of the four created entities or vehicles for ongoing attention to race relations, access to key community institutions and/or to address hate crimes.

In addition, there are significant examples of progress against institutional racism. For example, Albuquerque Project Change and its local and regional partners improved access to capital for people of color through use of the Community Reinvestment Act and related opportunities (when the CRA was an important tool). More recently, as the Anti-Racism Training Institute of the Southwest, they have helped to organize hundreds of anti-racism advocates and worked with partners to gain passage of some of the toughest anti-predatory lending legislation in the country. Valdosta Project Change, Knoxville Project Change and El Paso Project Change have all successfully raised awareness of institutional racism in their communities, brought key leaders into anti-racism activities (some of whom were transformed in the process, according to their own testimony), raised awareness of and changed policies with regard to hate crimes and reduced bias in the coverage of people of color in the media.

At the same time, while all of the Project Change communities worked on institutional racism in education in one form or another, none claim significant, lasting success in the outcomes they cared about – for example, decreasing differences in rates of graduation between students of color and white students. Further, most of the sites were more successful at engaging white and African American participants in Project Change leadership than they were at engaging leadership that reflected the full composition of their

communities, including Latino, Asian American and Native American leaders. Project Change has been disappointed over the years at its inability to crack these two issues, each of which will be discussed in more detail below.

Finally, Project Change participants in every community struggled with a number of issues endemic to anti-racism work. The Project Change model called for multi-racial task forces that “*include direct representation of all socio-economic groups of the community*”, and were 51% people of color and 51% female.<sup>3</sup> It asked these task forces to review data and qualitative information about the history of race relations in their own community and the well-being of people by race by various indicators (income, education, access to home ownership, etc.) that would identify targets for institutional change. Task forces were asked to plan and implement strategies to address the targets they identified.

In the course of this work, issues of class and gender surfaced along with unexamined white skin color privilege and internalized racial oppression. Task forces and other participants did not find it easy to put these issues on the table and work them productively. People in the communities struggled to figure out how to work with institutional funds and institutional oversight from the Foundation while addressing institutional racism.

Different beliefs about what it takes to be anti-racist, and to do anti-racism work, sometimes surfaced for discussion but sometimes were left unexamined and interfered with the ability of groups to work together. Some technical assistance and oversight offered by the Foundation was very helpful (particularly dismantling or undoing racism training and opportunities for personal transformation work) and some was not – sometimes these supports challenged the autonomy of the communities or were not culturally appropriate, in the communities’ opinions (for example, some training for the groups in the South West that did not take into account local Anglo, Chicano and Hispanic histories of privilege and oppression). One of the lessons that the Foundation and the communities learned over time was how to know when, how and what kinds of technical assistance to offer or request. The Foundation and the communities also grew to understand more about what might be a sufficient range of technical assistance that could be useful. That ‘bundle’ included:

- communication support,
- fund raising support,
- support to develop and use data to point out the disparate effects of institutional racism on different groups (in education, access to capital, access to housing, health and well-being, etc.),
- strategy development support,
- undoing racism training to help people develop a common analysis and language to talk about privilege and racism (head work), and
- • opportunities for personal transformation (heart work) to help people refine their anti-racism skills and the capacity to continue in the struggle.

<sup>3</sup> From June 1992 memo of the Project Change project manager describing composition, structure and operating policies of the Project Change task forces.

In addition, it took time (some would say a long time) for people in the communities to develop a common language for talking about racism, power, privilege and oppression – and not every group got there. Some people took enormous personal risks – they jeopardized their jobs and their social networks – while some others constrained the impact of the work when the level of risk was greater than they could absorb. According to a participant from the Foundation, at first, there was a concern that *“no local site had enough community based activists willing to take the needed risks [on behalf of Project Change] in order to change conditions. However, two of the sites were able to move beyond this initial challenge; one site is still struggling; and one was unsuccessful.”*

No one should be surprised by these struggles, though many Project Change participants who are highly experienced in anti-racism work wished they could have been managed more effectively as they were occurring. At the same time, it is critical to remember how much courage people in communities showed in accepting the invitation from the Foundation to do this work. As another key Foundation participant noted, *“I remember flying to Valdosta Georgia to be there for the release of the findings of the State of Race Relations report. I was told to book a small room, after hearing no one would show up, [because] several major white leaders had made it clear [to people in the community] that it wouldn’t be a good idea to show up. But the room was overflowing. The multi-racial coalition was working class folks who really viewed this as a vehicle to finally put a mirror up to the community. [I remember] knowing I was going to fly out the next day [thinking to myself] – I get paid for this. But for the people in the room – t:hey were saying this isn’t our day job, and we may even lose our jobs for doing this. You can talk about all the strategies and outcomes but it really comes down to individuals and people. All along the spectrum of what has moved me, transformed me, [it’s what happens] when people have the resources and support to do what they believe in doing. At the very best of Project Change, we provided the vehicle, but the heavy lifting was done by people on the ground.”*

### ***Purpose of Report***

The purpose of this report is to share Project Change’s story as it played out, and continues to play out, over more than a decade of work so that people can draw their own insights and lessons from Project Change’s experience. The report is based on the insights and lessons expressed by many of the participants in Project Change – captured through interviews, and supplemented by a review of materials and earlier assessments and evaluation reports. We hope that sharing what Project Change has been and done will contribute in a modest way to supporting other individuals, communities and partners who are working to eliminate persistent inequities based on white privilege and racism.

### ***Background and History of Project Change***

In the late 1980s, Levi Strauss & Company announced that it would be making a substantial one-time gift to the Levi Strauss Foundation. The board of the Foundation wanted to use these funds for what they termed a *“special initiative.”* They asked senior staff to do some research in communities to find out what were, as one senior staff member said, *“really pressing issues emerging in the country and in communities*

*where the company operates where there isn't any corporate leadership and on which it would make sense for us to take a leadership role."*

Staff and the board thought they would hear about things like child care or poverty – issues being talked about in philanthropic and corporate circles a lot at that time. But what emerged were issues about racism. Again, in the words of a senior staffer: *"They went back to the communities two-to-three times, and that was really the issue – when you peeled the onions, Levi Strauss & Co. employees and community leaders were talking about issues of race – this was what was percolating, what people were concerned about. They brought this data to the board – yes, people talked about child care and poverty, but we are picking up really interesting data about race."*

The board decided to pursue an initiative about race. In doing so, they made a few key decisions. One was to let the initiative be informed by an independent national advisory board.

The advisory board concluded that a corporate foundation could play a role in addressing and reducing racism, but that, in order to make a difference, the work could not be just for a year or two, it would have to last longer than typical foundation investments at that time. In addition, the advisory group indicated that Levi Strauss & Co. and Levi Strauss Foundation would have to invest not just dollars but other kinds of resources including leadership, influence, technical assistance and management support.

The board decided to accept the advisory committee's recommendations. A Foundation participant recalls that the organization was serious about having an impact and taking leadership on a race relations initiative, in much the way it had taken a leadership role on HIV-AIDS advocacy, at a time when neither were popular causes and, in fact, most corporations *"were just beginning to think about 'diversity' and 'diversity training' – nobody was talking about racism."*

The board also made another key decision, and that was to focus on four goals – one of which was institutional racism. In our interviews, we asked why the focus on institutional racism (rather than diversity, race relations, equity or other sometimes less controversial goals) – which, as noted earlier, was unique for a community/foundation initiative at that time. One participant in the decision process explained it this way: *"A lot of the seeds for that were in the national advisory group's recommendations. People were already feeling [those working in the trenches] an aversion to diversity (and thought we would all sing 'We Are the World' and go in the sunset). We wanted to have to dig in deeper – taking on issues about power, resources, who made the decisions – all of that. The board was putting pressure on us to focus the initiative – they recognized you can't do it all – so we kind of backed into institutional racism as [one of the areas of] focus."*

In November 1990, staff presented their recommendations to the board on the process, structure and timeline of an initiative. They also named the initiative Project Change, and recommended four goals, which the board approved:

1. Dismantling institutional policies and practices that promote or encourage racial discrimination;
2. Easing tensions between majority and minority groups, as well as inter-ethnic conflicts;

3. Promoting fair representation of community diversity in the leadership of important community institutions; and
4. Stopping or preventing overt acts of racial and cultural prejudice.

Communities were encouraged to work on any or all of these goals – based on their assessment of the best targets for change. All four goals received equal weight in the beginning of the initiative. For example, all four communities implemented strategies to stop or prevent overt acts of racial and cultural prejudice. These strategies included mobilizing a coalition to stop a Ku Klux Klan march (in Valdosta) and working with law enforcement on policies and practices (e.g., training of law enforcement officers) to report and address hate crimes (in Knoxville and El Paso). Albuquerque implemented strategies to change the process by which individuals were appointed to key boards and commissions which diversified a number of them. All of the sites implemented training efforts in the community or within institutions (e.g. banks, social service agencies, schools) to increase cultural competence, for conflict resolution, to develop multicultural curriculum and/or to promote positive race relations. So all of these goals were addressed to varying degrees.

However, over time, the first goal – addressing institutional racism – became the major focus of Project Change. There are several reasons. First, the Foundation and many of the community leaders felt this was the way to make the most substantial changes that could be felt by people in communities. They felt that directly focusing on institutional racism came closest to addressing the root causes of racial inequities. Second, the communities often had many organizations that were addressing race relations in some form, but few (or none other than Project Change) targeted to institutional racism – so that became Project Change’s “niche.” And finally, the people involved in Project Change at the national and local levels were often part of national anti-racism networks that were trying to support a national awareness and national strategies to address institutional (or structural) racism, so they brought that advocacy and lens to their work in Project Change.

In making their recommendations for Project Change, staff also reported that: (a) They had not been able to find corporate partners for an initiative on racism; the foundation and company would have to go it alone; (b) Doing this work would raise the level of scrutiny directed at the company in terms of its own racial record, policies and practices; and (c) The initiative was not going to be able to solve the problem, “*We can’t come back to you and say we are going to eradicate institutional racism.*”

They positioned Project Change as a risky, long-term commitment. The board accepted the recommendations and moved to go forward. They also, in the words of one board member, said, “*Let’s call it what it is – racism.*”

<sup>4</sup>.For more information about Project Change’s theory of change, see Project Change Research Brief on [www.capd.org](http://www.capd.org) or [www.evaluationtoolsforracialequity.org](http://www.evaluationtoolsforracialequity.org). For more information about the start-up of Project Change in the sites, see *Lessons Learned, Planning an Anti-Racism Initiative*, available at [www.projectchange.org](http://www.projectchange.org); [www.capd.org](http://www.capd.org) or [www.evaluationtoolsforracialequity.org](http://www.evaluationtoolsforracialequity.org)

## ***Project Change Model***<sup>4</sup>

Levi Strauss Foundation staff developed an operational model for Project Change. Levi Strauss Foundation would partner with communities, beginning by sending the Project Change Manager (a seasoned community organizer) to the communities to identify people to join the effort. The Project Manager initially traveled with senior Levi Strauss Foundation and Levi Strauss & Co. staff to a series of meetings in

each community. The team met with activists, organizers, business and community leaders generally identified by Levi Strauss & Co. Community Affairs Regional Managers. Using an organizing approach, the Project Change Manager then returned to each community to meet with people who were recommended by the initial group and whom she identified based on her own reconnaissance. The intent was to move out from those leaders already known to systems and power brokers in the community to a broader group that included those leaders but also other people known mostly within their own communities.

In addition, the initial Project Manager engaged two researchers/activists in the anti-racism field to advise her on how to structure her work with the communities. She also commissioned research about various training programs that could be used to support the work in communities. The author created descriptions of various approaches to social justice or anti-racism work. These helped to clarify the distinctions among them (see *Anti-Racist Work: An Examination and Assessment of Organizational Activity*). Those descriptions, in the form of a typology, have since been widely used by others in the field.

### ***Site Selection***

The site selection process was designed to identify a small number of communities in which Project Change would begin, with the thought that it might be expanded to additional communities over time. Levi Strauss Foundation was interested in partnering with communities that met four criteria:

- They were places in which Levi Strauss & Co. had a major manufacturing presence, so that positive results from Project Change, if any, would directly benefit the quality of life of Levi Strauss & Co. employees;
- They were communities in which racial disparities or other evidence of racism suggested a need;
- They were places in which at least some key local leaders (at grassroots, political, economic or other levels) were interested in tackling issues of racism; and
- They were places in which the work of Project Change might reasonably be expected to make a difference in at least some of the goals set for the project.

Levi Strauss Foundation retained a research organization to help them develop and implement a site selection process. Its founder was a well respected community leader and social scientist who had done very progressive work on social issues in the Bay Area, according to one of the senior staff of the Foundation who oversaw the site selection process. They conducted community assessments of the 36 communities in the United States where Levi Strauss & Co. had a major presence as a manufacturer.

The researchers and Levi Strauss Foundation staff conducted various levels of assessments. They reviewed socio-economic census data, information available from chambers of commerce and newspaper articles to get a picture of the racial characteristics and dynamics of the communities. They also developed

a matrix of the communities in terms of population size, demographics, racial dynamics (were issues and demographics primarily black/white or Hispanic/white, or multi-ethnic rather than bi-ethnic), so that the final group would represent a mix along these dimensions. From these data, they winnowed the choices to 10 to 12 sites in which to do site visits.

During the sites visits, Levi Strauss Foundation and the research organization's staff interviewed a wide variety of people. They did interviews in Levi Strauss & Co. factories with managers and other employees and with people throughout the communities. As one person noted, it was *"like doing a climate survey in an organization. [For example], we talked to a City Council member who was Chinese American. We talked about what it's like to be a person of color but not a Latino person of color in this community. We talked with other people about what's happened in the last five to ten years – public incidents, policies – around race. As we talked with the communities, we began to identify particular issues in communities that were visible or just under the surface, if we could encourage the community to have this self-reflection that might become the basis for their Project Change work."*

According to one of the participants, the goal of these types of discussions was to try to answer two key questions, *"Is there a civic acknowledgement of race in this community -- what would be the likelihood of at least a positive reception for Project Change?"* and *"would Project Change's focus on anti-racism provide some added value to what the community was already doing in this regard. Our goal was to find the intersection between need and the likelihood of success, but without creaming just the places where the work might be easiest."*

For example, the group visited one community with a great deal of evidence of racial conflict but where the local leadership was so opposed to Project Change that the group felt that Project Change was likely to do more harm than good in that community. On the other hand, their visit to another community indicated that the city was really very well positioned to take on Project Change because the leadership of the community was determined to take steps to move past the legacy of racism from school desegregation. However, the community was already implementing two major anti-racism initiatives, and was about to launch a third. So Levi Strauss Foundation determined that their resources, while they would have been well used, might be more needed in other communities.

The site selection team eventually recommended five communities: Albuquerque, New Mexico; El Paso, Texas; Knoxville, Tennessee; Little Rock, Arkansas and Valdosta, Georgia. The board elected to begin work in Albuquerque, El Paso and Valdosta. The board decided that Little Rock had other resources that were being directed to anti-racism work so that the need was greater in the other communities. They also decided to begin in just three communities, and added Knoxville later. The initial thinking was that each community would receive a planning grant for perhaps six months to a year, then receive three years of funding to implement strategies that were developed during the planning phase. (Please see the section below on Phases and Funding for more information about how this played out over time.)

### ***Community Task Forces***

Based on their early thinking, Levi Strauss Foundation originally thought the task forces would be coalitions of organizations. However, the early organizing efforts in the communities led to task forces of

individuals with constituencies behind them, but not necessarily to a coalition of individuals representing organizations. This was because the early reconnaissance and organizing did not identify broad-based organizations with constituencies and legitimacy across lines of class, race, gender and sector (public, private). The fact that most communities lacked such organizations in the early 1990s was one of the reasons that Project Change was developed in the first place.

Levi Strauss Foundation established criteria for choosing organizations to invite to the task force: that the organization was multi-racial and, in the words of one senior staff person, “*reflected the full diversity of the community and enjoyed respect across the lines.*” What they found was that “*every organization there had a lot of baggage...we listened to community about who should be leading this effort...people talked about individuals, not organizations*”. In addition, according to another senior staff person, [There] *wasn't anything existing – wasn't the right vehicle. [There was] lots of competition among groups with the same constituency (grassroots) and no groups that crossed the mix – poor people, people with positions of power in mainstream institutions.*”

As noted earlier, the original task forces were required to reflect the socio-economic diversity of the community, to be at least 51% people of color, and at least 51% female. One key foundation participant noted that “*Any initiative had to involve the people most affected – [for Project Change] it's poor people of color – in every situation, wanted that voice recognized.*”

The original task forces did reflect these distributions, and though they changed over time, women and people of color always made up a substantial proportion of the leadership of Project Change. As is discussed more fully in *On the Ground and Moving Forward*, it was much more difficult to retain diversity of class and socio-economic status – the richest and poorest Project Change task force members tended to leave the task forces early in the process.

In developing the task forces, Levi Strauss Foundation also encouraged a non-hierarchical structure including consensus decision-making processes. The intent, according to one participant in developing the model, was “*that the process itself should reflect what we hoped to be the outcome. We hoped for a process that would share power, leadership, give voice to people who would not normally be at the table – including around economic levels.*”

Consensus decision making did not take hold in any of the community task forces. The task forces generally decided to have a small executive committee or other leadership group which was a subset of the full task force make many of the key decisions. They also ending up doing much of their work by traditional committee and subcommittee structures. It is not completely clear why consensus decision making did not take hold. However, we can speculate a bit. First, there was not much technical assistance put behind this idea, so people just gravitated to more traditional majority rules or less formal but still leader-led decision making processes. In addition, there was a sense in some groups that concensus or other less heirarchical leadership methods would take a long time to learn, and the groups were generally eager to get going on their work. Finally, the groups were working out a number of issues as they were forming – what would be their targets for work, what strategies might make a difference, how would they engage stakeholders and community members, what would be the relationships between the task forces and community institutions (e.g. the schools, the media) and between the task forces and the Foundation and

LS&Co., etc.? These issues took priority and the initial attention to how decisions would get made in the group got less attention, and generally didn't resurface until much later, by which time power dynamics were fairly well established. In hindsight, more attention to "the rules about how the rules get made" might have helped some of the groups think differently about their internal and external relationships, and, in particular, might have led the groups to think earlier about leadership and how to manage leadership transitions. Eventually, each task force faced these issues and developed its response. There was often a great deal of stress in doing so.

### ***State of Race Relations Reports***

Once task forces were identified in each community, they received a planning grant. During the planning phase, task forces oversaw the research for the State of Race Relations Report and participated in interpretation of findings. They used data and their own professional and personal experiences to identify targets for change and strategies that could be implemented in an action phase of work.

The original Project Manager and her consultants felt that the communities would need some way to understand the extent to which racism, including institutional racism, existed in their communities. As one senior staff person said, "*We were meeting with bank presidents, college presidents – people in the community who were real systems people, based in institutions – every one of them questioned us about why our community was invited to be part of Project Change, since we have no racism here. It was clear that there had to be something that documented that racism did indeed exist in order for the initiative to gain any kind of currency among movers and shakers in a community.*" Initially, Levi Strauss Foundation hired a university to create the State of Race Relations Report. The Albuquerque task force did not feel that the initial report represented them well enough – they asked to take over the task. From that point forward each of the newly formed task forces oversaw the development of their own State of Race Relations report (sometimes referred to as the executive summary). The goal for the report was to put a face on the facts and to include information that would make it very difficult for communities to deny ongoing racist practices and outcomes. Eventually, the reports included the history of race relations in the community, results of a community telephone survey of racial attitudes, and an analysis of data on income, education, home ownership and other facts by race. (Please see [www.projectchange.org](http://www.projectchange.org) for an example of one of the State of Race Relations Reports. For more information about the State of Race Relations Report and other start-up tasks, please see *Lessons Learned: Planning an Anti-Racism Initiative*, also available at [www.projectchange.org](http://www.projectchange.org).)

### ***Strategy Development and Implementation***

*"If you think empowering people to make change for themselves is the most important thing, then you see the results differently."* (Quoted by a long-term Project Change participant and leader.)

Albuquerque, El Paso, Knoxville and Valdosta Project Change each developed their own approaches to implementing the basic Project Change model and each worked toward the four Project Change goals, though to differing extents and with differing results.

While the sites made strides in reducing institutional racism, particularly in Albuquerque, for the most part they found it easier to make progress toward the other Project Change goals – diversifying key community institutions; improving race relations across groups and stopping or responding differently to hate crimes. There are several reasons this occurred. For one thing, hate crimes were being spotlighted nationally because of recent church burnings. Further, diversifying key community institutions and reducing hate crimes (or responding to them more effectively) were more tangible goals than reducing institutional racism, so that communities and task forces knew when something was accomplished – they could point to a success and show it to others. In addition, Levi Strauss Foundation put pressure on the communities to create tangible successes. While everyone hoped that these early successes would provide momentum and increase the skills to create more difficult and less tangible ones, this was not always the case.

Further, the strategy work, except in one community, changed focus and goals often. In hindsight, task force leaders felt this limited their ability to make substantial progress against institutional racism. All of the communities identified the same general targets for change: law enforcement, media, education, financing and lending and housing segregation. Over the course of implementation, most pursued strategies in at least three or four of these areas, and often, over time they put in place strategies to achieve several different objectives within a given area. For example, one community worked on reducing conflict in the schools, changing media perceptions of people of color, improving access of people of color to the media, improving access to higher education, and changing law enforcement practices. Another worked on education, financing and lending, housing and media at different times. In the area of education, they worked on changing graduation and diploma policies, increasing parental influence in the schools, adoption of and teacher training to use multi-cultural curriculum and changing the criteria by which the School Superintendent was selected. Each of these efforts had some short-term influence. But they were not organized against a long-term and defined outcome, and did not ultimately lead to sustained changes in outcomes or processes within the schools. Few of the task forces focused on a single outcome or two and then pursued them until they were successful. One community, that did achieve success on reducing institutional racism, made a decision about seven years into the work to focus on two areas only, and to drop their efforts in other areas even though they were important and had had some limited success. Other task force members in other communities, looking back for this report, believe that their strategies would have had more impact if they had identified one or two key outcomes and stayed focused on them over time.

A senior staff person who was also a task force member at one point sums up the strategy work as follows: *“The goal of reducing institutional racism was the most difficult of the four goals to address and the least understood – in part because, with institutional racism, we were asking people to focus on the root causes of the problem rather than the overt manifestations. In order to experience a degree of success, collectively, the foundation staff encouraged sites to become involved in the hate crimes work. The national issue was playing itself out at the local level. The idea was to focus on this issue, at least initially, in order to build momentum and gain traction. Sites needed a win. However, the key was the local leadership. It was important to use the early wins to tackle the more difficult and riskier issues. So in fact, the momentum*

*around hate crimes was supposed to be a stepping stone to deepen the work, to take it to the next level. This required task force members to take greater risks and to be confrontational if necessary. At least one site took that step; others weren't ready to. Also, the foundation sent mixed signals that said, 'we need tangible successes that can be taken to the Board.' At the same time that this created a sense of accomplishment, it also allowed all of us to avoid dealing with the tougher issues of institutional racism for a while."*

Project Change participants were often able to come together and mobilize around overt hate crimes or hate group activity. For example, two of the Project Change sites were effective in drawing attention to and thwarting Ku Klux Klan activity in their areas. A third site did extensive discussion and education around the hate motivated killing of James Byrd (an African American man who was dragged to his death behind a truck in a hate crime) in Jasper, Texas. On the other hand, what proved more difficult was how and where to spend energy and resources to address issues beyond these more overt acts of racism. Or as one participant in the Southwest put it, it was *"easier for us to be angry and upset about what happened to James Byrd than to deal with the pain over economic injustices/disparities [within the Latino community]."*

Similarly, all of the communities developed training, workshops and other efforts to help people work on personal racism, prejudice and discrimination. Early on, Project Change supported these efforts through investments in various kinds of training efforts and by bringing trainers, facilitators and speakers to support the task forces who wanted to work on issues of inclusion and race relations. Task forces then brought these or similar, locally developed training, to local college campuses, community institutions (e.g., the Department of Child and Family Services), faith communities and broad community forums. Many in the communities believe that these kinds of efforts, along with release of the State of Race Relations reports and other strategies, eventually engaged many people in the communities and contributed to increased awareness about the existence of hate crimes, prejudice and racist outcomes in the communities.

At the same time, early trainings and supports were less successful in helping people in communities focus on creating and implementing effective strategies to reduce institutional racism. Observation and the comments of many participants suggest there are four reasons:

- Early trainings focused much more on race relations and inclusive processes than on helping people develop a clear understanding of the existence of institutional racism, what it looks like and how to address it. The communities that eventually made the most progress in this area credit Undoing Racism™ training they received from the People's Institute for Survival and Beyond for moving them dramatically forward.
- The nature of institutional racism is such that it is very entrenched and very central to how communities function. As one participant said, *"At some point, the leaders of El Paso decided to make this a low-wage town and it takes racism to keep that in place."* So strategies that can begin to make a real dent in institutional racism have to be comprehensive, deep, very well implemented and able to respond to inevitable resistance and new forms of institutional racism that arise as older forms are threatened. Task force members who understood fully what it would take to do this work were also volunteers with limited resources and time, and they were often working with other people who did not fully appreciate what they were being asked to do.

- Early on, communities focused in large part on developing strategies for working within institutions but less on organizing the community to support those strategies, and not at all on organizing the community to lead those strategies. That changed over time in at least one community, in part because of their experience and in part through exposure to different kinds of training, as noted above. One participant described the difference – *“before, we were just asking institutions to change. When the work is led by the community – then we are demanding change, not asking.”*
- By design, many of the people working on Project Change had ties to important local community institutions (schools and universities, banks, newspapers, law enforcement, etc.). As the work of Project Change became more “real”, it became more threatening to the institutions and thus to some of the task force and committee members). Many people left the Project Change task forces when they became uncomfortable with its work or the way it was planning to raise awareness of institutional racism in institutions with which they were connected. Success on issues of institutional racism came when key people stayed (for example, a community advocate highly experienced in banking).

All of the Project Change communities attempted to address institutional racism in education. Over the years they implemented many strategies including training teachers on multicultural education; trying to organize parents and community residents to raise issues related to different rates of promotion, retention and placement in special education and gifted classes in public high schools; raising awareness of different conditions and resources allocated to schools in communities of color; and working with school boards on criteria for hiring school superintendents and teachers. None of these efforts was successful in changing the kinds of outcomes that they were seeking in the long run (for example, improved rates of graduation for students of color compared to white students).

One issue that has been particularly difficult for Project Change to discuss openly is the extent to which many of the Project Change task force members were educators or connected to local educational institutions in some fashion, and confrontation with those institutions. There were a number of educators of different racial/ethnic identities at different levels on the task forces, including K-12 grade teachers and administrators, college faculty and administrators, assistant superintendents, school board members. They were invited to participate because of their role in education. It was thought they could access data and provide leadership on identifying and challenging institutional racism in the education systems. In some instances they did, and in some instances they acted to maintain the status quo in those systems.

Given all this, it is not surprising that the communities found it easier to work on race relations, addressing overt racial acts such as hate crimes and on diversifying community boards and institutions than on institutional racism. In spite of this, three communities made demonstrable progress in addressing institutional racism. Of these, one saw much of its progress undone – illustrating how important it is to be vigilant and to include strategies to address retrenchment. Two others made more lasting progress and one of these made quite substantial progress in addressing institutional racism. Both have mechanisms in place to guard against retrenchment, because, as one says *“we have to go back to the legislature every year to make sure our work doesn’t get undone.”*

## *Phases and Funding*

The model initially anticipated planning of six months, leading to an action phase of up to three years of Levi Strauss Foundation funding. Timing was kept flexible however, since planning was intended to last as long as it took for each community to identify and coalesce its task force around two products: public dissemination of the State of Race Relations Report and an action plan for change. Each community eventually moved into the action stage of its work. The planning phase ended up lasting from between nine to thirty months. The length of planning depended upon the readiness of the community to address directly institutional racism, the composition and risk-taking capacity of the initial task force, the quality of paid staffing each group was able to identify and support, and the quality of interactions between the task force and the Foundation.

Though the model also anticipated up to three years of Levi Strauss Foundation funding for implementation of strategies (action grants), as work proceeded Levi Strauss Foundation extended its funding commitment considerably. Funds have been distributed as follows:

- An initial planning grant;
- Up to three one-year grants to implement plans, based on budgets submitted by the sites; Up to two additional one-year grants as sites obtain additional funding and in-kind support. These transitional grants were about 60 percent of action grants; and
- Up to two additional one-year periods of matching funds at lower rates in order to institutionalize successful outcomes in the community. These legacy grants are about 40 percent of action grants.

Communities were not guaranteed renewed funding. The task forces and initiative management (at Levi Strauss Foundation or the national office once it was established) have negotiated these agreements year by year. The last Project Change grant, from Levi Strauss Foundation funds, was awarded in 2002 (to Knoxville).

In addition to the funding provided by Levi Strauss Foundation, Albuquerque Project Change also received funding over three years to support development of the Anti-Racism Training Institute of the Southwest. These funds were raised through Project Change national efforts in partnership with the Institute for Democratic Renewal at Claremont Graduate University and matched locally. It is important to note that many of the individuals participating in Project Change, and at least one of the task forces as a collective, struggled with the idea of accepting funds from Levi Strauss Foundation and Levi Strauss & Co. to address institutional racism, given that Levi Strauss & Co. was a major institution in each of the communities. All of the communities struggled with this issue at the beginning. Some were concerned about Levi Strauss Foundation and Levi Strauss & Co.'s sincerity in addressing racism; some were concerned about whether they, as Project Change task force members, would be asked to defend Levi Strauss & Co. employment policies, and some – in communities where groups had organized to protest

Levi Strauss & Co. employment practices – were concerned about offending community partners and allies who were important to their own organizations or regular work (outside of their participation in Project Change). Everyone who became part of Project Change in the beginning either reconciled their participation in Project Change with these concerns or they elected to leave. These issues surfaced again as Levi Strauss & Co. downsized and then eventually closed its plants in the Project Change sites.

One Project Change site openly engaged Levi Strauss Foundation in a conversation about what participants were and were not willing to do to secure funding. As a result of that frank conversation, participants and foundation representatives were able to lay out concerns about what they expected from one another. In the end, and because of their willingness to lay out their concerns, that site was able to overcome its reservations and do the work it wanted to pursue. Other sites with similar concerns often discussed them amongst themselves, and occasionally collectively discussed them with Levi Strauss Foundation. But those sites never organized themselves to propose alternative ways of doing the work (as Albuquerque did with the State of Race Relations report) or took the stance that they were ready to turn down Levi Strauss Foundation funds if the community could not control important aspects of the work. The site that took the toughest stance with the foundation ended up being the one that accomplished the most.

Over time, Project Change staff began to describe their model as a five-step process (as described on [www.projectchange.org](http://www.projectchange.org), “About Us”):

- √ Assess – Assess local conditions by conducting community-based research to identify racial disparities;
- √ Identify -- Identify a group of community activists and power brokers committed to the removal of institutional policies that sustain racial barriers;
- √ Educate – Educate through community forums and trainings on institutional policies and practices that perpetuate racial disparities;
- √ Act – Act to develop and implement concrete strategies that promote equity and reduce racial disparities; and
- √ Evaluate, share and disseminate – Evaluate, share and disseminate lessons learned to inform and assist others engaged in or supporting race and community-building work.

### ***Implications of the Model***

So far as we know, at the time it began the model was unique among partnerships between a foundation and communities, and among social justice efforts in many respects. Many of its features turned out to have major implications for how the effort played out in communities over time.

Key features of the model that turned out to matter are listed below:

It was explicitly about institutional racism. From the very start and even more so over time, a major portion of the work was about changing institutional policies and practices that contribute to unequal outcomes for people of color compared to whites in each community.

There was an attempt to model more equal power relationships. For example, one senior staff member recalls, *“One of the most challenging decision points for both the communities and the foundation was the selection of the fiscal agent. It was the first test where we had to navigate the constant themes of who controls/gets the money, power and management of special interests. The foundation resisted the temptation of decreeing who would be the fiscal agent and I think for the most part, the sites made terrific unorthodox choices.”*

The effort was established, funded, and overseen by a corporate entity – often a major employer in the community. This gave the work visibility and clout, and access to resources including technical assistance and the ability to convene local business leaders. For example, Levi Strauss & Co.’s CEO at the time personally put time and effort into Project Change, including convening meetings with business leaders in three of the sites. He talked about racism and the responsibility of corporations to address it in national meetings of business leaders. The company used its contacts and expertise with media to develop sophisticated marketing and other tools for the communities, and brought in media consultants to support their local efforts. As noted earlier, the downside was that task force members wrestled with the implications of taking funds to address institutional racism from a corporate funder and some imposed constraints on strategies based on their beliefs about what Levi Strauss Foundation and Levi Strauss & Co. would or would not tolerate and the consequences of pushing too hard. As noted above, the one community that was least concerned about this issue is also generally considered the most successful in terms of changes that affect community residents.

Levi Strauss Foundation offered planning and implementation grants that were the sole funding support for Project Change for many years. Part of the appeal to some of the original task force members was that they would not have to fundraise for Project Change – so they wouldn’t be competing with the fundraising needs of their own organizations. The transition away from Levi Strauss Foundation funding was difficult, for all of the obvious reasons. The amount of funding available to support anti-racism work is quite limited. The Project Change sites also have relatively small amounts of local funding available to them. And, as noted above, the Project Change task forces had to decide whether or not they felt it was their responsibility to sustain the work given other competing demands on their time and their own assessments of the value of Project Change to their communities. All of the sites struggled to find other sources of funding; two have been successful, one has not, and one chose to discontinue Project Change.

Communities were invited into Project Change by Levi Strauss Foundation (they didn’t come to Levi Strauss Foundation and seek or compete for inclusion through a Request for Proposals (RFP) or other similar process). In at least one of the communities, the community actively sought inclusion in Project Change; two others accepted the invitation but did not push for it; and the fourth was somewhat reluctant to take the Initiative on. In hindsight, many of the foundation staff believe an RFP process would have better identified communities that really wanted to bring Project Change to their cities.

Levi Strauss Foundation selected the initial boards/tasks forces. The process and criteria by which initial task force members were selected turned out to be a crucial element of the model. In some cases, this set the stage for an effective start and implementation of very sophisticated and effective strategies. In others,

bringing together people with so much at stake personally meant that the work never really took off until the membership turned over almost completely.

The intent was for work to be community driven. As one early foundation participant said *“It was really important, not something that could be imposed on a community. We could come up with a great package of activities – but wouldn’t work – there needed to be local control and involvement.”* At the same time, the foundation identified the initial task (creating and releasing a State of Race Relations Report), and continued to play a strong role in the composition of task forces, criteria for staffing and strategy development. At times this level of advice and oversight was very welcome and critical to advancing work in the communities and at times communities felt their energies were being distracted from the work they wanted to do in trying to meet the requirements of the funder. As is true in most foundation/community partnerships, issues of power, autonomy and control between the communities and foundation and its representatives came up over and over again. And, as noted above, the community that asserted its own power earliest in the process – including its willingness to walk away from Project Change – achieved the most in terms of short-term results and ongoing legacy to date.

A senior manager of the effort at the foundation summarized the foundation’s perspective below:

*“We lost a lot of sleep by saying we would have to create a coalition in each community. And that was really tough. Thought – who are we to come in to designate who would be at that table? Also, we were essentially trying to launch this new initiative, at the same time launching a start-up organization. Most difficult and most important decision we made. Don’t think we’d be talking now if the foundation had just given money. I also think we had really great intentions, and some rather innovative ideas. Unfortunately the communities suffered because we were making up the process as we were doing it. The State of Racism reports were a great idea, but we didn’t come up with the criteria( in advance for how they would be released) – like who owns this report? Who makes the final decisions (about what goes in them). Finally came up with criteria for fiscal agent for the coalitions – who makes those decisions. Backed into how much money each coalition would get. The foundation – we talked a good game, but it took us a while – really had to rethink our entire way of grantmaking – not traditional grant making process, said and knew that, but we had a difficult time walking the talk – made life very frustrating for the communities. On the other hand, some communities said just give us the money and go away – so we didn’t do enough work on our side and the community side, about what does a partnership really mean...”*

### **Project Change Accomplishments: 1991-2005**

Below is a brief summary of Project Change’s major accomplishments. It is not intended to be an all-encompassing list.

#### ***Albuquerque, New Mexico***

- Creation of a Fair Lending Center at the University of New Mexico. The Center provides training, resources and technical assistance to communities of color addressing bank and lending practices and policies throughout the state.

- Access to support through an 800 number
- Activities have contributed to an increase in home ownership for people of color.
- Support for establishment of a predatory lending task force to institute legislation at the local and state level to eliminate this practice.
  - Provided leadership and staff support in the development and passage of the New Mexico home loan protection act, considered the toughest anti-predatory lending legislation in the country.
  - Worked to increase the number of counselors in the state who can counsel people about how to avoid predatory lending; increase in the number of lawyers who can litigate around it.
- Establishment of the Anti-Racism Training Institute of the Southwest to train people in the state on a common framework and lens to address individual and institutional racism to build coalitions of people interested in reforming key institutions (e.g., banks, education, criminal justice, health, and community development).
  - Helped to create a network of 500 trained community members.
  - Graduates of the training institute formed community coalitions became key partners in anti-predatory lending and health care reform work
  - Graduates have changed inequitable policies and practices of their institutions (for example, the legal system, Head Start).
  - Training has been certified for continuing legal education credits by the Hispanic National Bar Association.
- Participation in development of a community coalition for health care access. The coalition has increased the number of interpreters, reduced charges to uninsured workers that were serving as barriers to health care and worked on improving access to health care for undocumented people.
- Unsuccessful in developing momentum for an effective effort to reduce disparity in racial outcomes in the schools, despite many different strategies at multiple levels. Decided to focus limited resources on areas where the work was having the most success (access to capital/anti-predatory lending and health care) and not continue to pursue an education agenda. At the same, Project Change support served as a catalyst to launch a major community/schools outreach program.

### ***El Paso, Texas***

- Created the Hate Crimes Taskforce to address more sensitive law enforcement along the Texas/Mexico border and to address racial profiling issues.
- Implemented a conflict resolution training in the schools
- Improved diversity of coverage of local media, and access of grassroots groups to local media.
- Unsuccessful at adapting the Project Change model to the needs of El Paso. The model did not frame issues in ways that resonated with a predominantly Latino community.

### ***Knoxville, Tennessee***

- Creation of the Hate Crimes Working Group, a collaboration with law enforcement to raise awareness about hate crimes.
- Helped establish citizens review board to oversee police actions.
  - Helped change hiring practices for police.
- Development of a “traveling trunk” filled with objects that spark discussions in schools about hate crimes; to date up to 12,000 people have participated --- 90% who are youth or young adults.
- Transitioned Project Change into the Race Relations Center ([www.racerelationscenter.org](http://www.racerelationscenter.org)), a joint effort between the original Project Change task force and staff and a nine-county improvement effort, which will serve as a clearinghouse for anti-racism information, resources, research, and training. The training will focus on developing communication tools and frameworks to address racism in each of the nine counties.
  - Received support from city government, in the form of a substantial grant and high level city participation.
- Helped create a network of 200 influential people who have been trained in anti-racism work and who have agreed to participate in identifying and implementing strategies to further the work.
- Worked within the schools on hate crimes and conflict resolution. Attempted to work with schools on institutional racism in the form of educational disparities; unsuccessful in forming a partnership with the schools to tackle this work.

### *Valdosta, Georgia*

- Creation of the Micro-enterprise Loan Pool Program in collaboration with Valdosta State University’s Small Business Development Center to fund small business initiatives and provide outreach and technical support to clients who have little access to funding and limited opportunities to start small businesses and who have faced systemic barriers;
- Creation of a Center for Homebuyer Education and a Home Loan Pool for low income and first time home buyers, in collaboration with the Community Banking Coalition (eight of ten Valdosta banks) to assist non-traditional bank customers to become homeowners;
  - Program certified by the State of Georgia.
  - Three hundred people have gone through the training, which certifies them for mortgage assistance programs.
  - Developed programs to assist those participating to re-establish their credit, which serves as a major barrier to home ownership even among those certified.
- Establishment of a program for new Latino immigrants, in partnership with a local Latino organization (Amigos) to encourage awareness, participation and acceptance of the emerging Latino immigrant community in Valdosta. The group has created an interpreter guild to serve the needs of non-English speaking residents as they seek health care, access the legal system and other local services.
  - Effort has been institutionalized within the Department of Family and Children Services, which now has Spanish speaking interpreters on their staff.

- Helped raise awareness of how the local media consistently portrayed people of color only in negative ways; local coverage now routinely includes positive stories of people of color.
- Contributed to awareness of existence of institutional racism that supported changes in school personnel, personnel at the newspaper, allocation of resources across neighborhoods and other long-standing inequities.
- Unsuccessful in developing momentum for an effective effort to reduce disparity in racial outcomes in the schools, despite many different strategies at multiple levels.

### ***Project Change National Office (Oakland, CA)***

- While at the foundation, and later, as a national office, Project Change contributed to the national conversation on institutional racism by sharing the work in the communities with a broad national audience of organizations, corporations, funders and other colleagues, at national meetings and conferences and through publications and websites, noted below.
- Several community building and anti-racism efforts use lessons from Project Change, widely shared, to help design, guide and assess their own efforts.
- Supported the work of the Project Change sites through grantmaking, technical assistance, cross-site convenings.
- Established with the Institute for Democratic Renewal a National Network of Anti-Racism Training Institutes and partners in South Florida, Albuquerque and the California Central Coast Region focused on anti-racism training, community organizing and leadership development.
- Formed a joint venture with the Claremont Graduate University Institute for Democratic Renewal with a primary focus of combating racism through a variety of means that include workshops and convenings, information/education and strategic partnerships.
- Created an online Anti-Racism Network ([www.anti-racismnet.org](http://www.anti-racismnet.org)) to serve as a clearinghouse for anti-racism/social justice news and information in order to strengthen the infrastructure for civic engagement and democratic renewal.
- Served as the site for United States (NGO) organizing and communications related to the World Conference Against Racism (WCAR) in South Africa.
- Developed an online interactive educational program entitled “Symbols of Hate and Oppression” for middle and high school students to increase awareness of hate violence and reduce the incidence of hate crimes committed by youth.
- Co-published a *Training Guide for Racial Equity and Inclusion* (2002), which has been widely used and very well received.
- Co-produced *A Community Builders Tool Kit: 15 Tools for Creating Healthy, Productive Interracial/Multicultural Communities*, of which 70,000 copies have been distributed in six languages.
- Raised \$1,000,000 as of 2004 in conjunction with joint venture partner Institute for Democratic Renewal to support the national network of Anti-Racism Training Institutes.
- Developed new initiative in conjunction with the Institute for Democratic Renewal, “*Building Beloved Communities: Growing our Souls*,” a national spirit based social justice effort.

## RELATED PROJECT CHANGE REPORTS AND RESOURCES

*Lessons Learned, Planning an Anti-Racism Initiative\**

*Lessons Learned, Project Change in Action \*\**

*Training for Racial Equity and Inclusion: A Guide to Selected Programs,\*\**

written by Ilana Shapiro, Ph.D; produced by Project Change and Aspen Institute Roundtable on Comprehensive Community Initiatives for Children and Families, in consultation with Center for Assessment and Policy Development, 2002

*A Community Builder's Toolkit: 15 Tips for Creating Healthy, Productive Multicultural Interracial Communities; \*\**

produced by the Institute for Democratic Renewal and Project Change

*On the Ground and Moving Forward: Struggles and Lessons for Anti-Racism Work,\*\**

co-authored by Mark Patrick George, Shirley Strong and Sally Leiderman, produced by Project Change

*Anti-Racist Work: An Examination and Assessment of Organizational Activity,*

written by Gary Delgado, principal investigator, Applied Research Center.

*Project Change Evaluation Research Brief, \*\*\**

Center for Assessment and Policy Development

\*available at [www.projectchange.org](http://www.projectchange.org) and [www.capd.org](http://www.capd.org)

\*\*available at [www.projectchange.org](http://www.projectchange.org); [www.race-democracy.org](http://www.race-democracy.org) and [www.capd.org](http://www.capd.org)

\*\*\*available at [www.projectchange.org](http://www.projectchange.org); [www.capd.org](http://www.capd.org) and [www.evaluationtoolsforracialequity.org](http://www.evaluationtoolsforracialequity.org)

## WEBSITES

Project Change (national office) - [www.projectchange.org](http://www.projectchange.org)

Race Relations Center of East Tennessee - [www.racerelationscenter.org](http://www.racerelationscenter.org)

Valdosta Project Change - [www.valdosta.edu/prch](http://www.valdosta.edu/prch)

Institute for Democratic Renewal - [www.race-democracy.org](http://www.race-democracy.org)

Beloved Communities initiative - [www.belovedcommunitynet.org](http://www.belovedcommunitynet.org)

Anti-racism - [www.anti-racismnet.org](http://www.anti-racismnet.org)

Evaluation Tools for Racial Equity - [www.evaluationtoolsforracialequity.org](http://www.evaluationtoolsforracialequity.org)