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THE 2008 STORY

April 20, 2008

Youth Vote in 2008 Election Ranked Among the Highest Ever, Data Show

About two million more young people voted for president last November 4 than in the 2004 election, raising the percentage of people under the age of 30 who voted to 31 percent, according to a new report by the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.

MISTAKING A MOMENT FOR A MOVEMENT

• The 2008 election was indeed momentous, but did not build a movement

• Attention turned to Washington and federal policy opportunities, instead of to the grassroots base

• The hope of 2008 didn’t translate into sustained civic participation to support a broader vision of social justice

In response, state-based community organizing groups decided to do 2012 differently.
THE 2012 STORY

2012’s story was not the glitter of something new but resolve to protect something old . . .

AND BEHIND THE RESOLVE (IN SOME PLACES)

State-based Integrated Voter Engagement (IVE)

Seeking to Link Moments with Movements

With All the Implicit Tensions and Tightropes
INTEGRATED VOTER ENGAGEMENT

WHAT IS IVE?

IVE employs classic election cycle tactics—canvassing, mailers, phone banking—but views elections themselves as but one tool for building broader, lasting, social movements.

There is a strategic intent to convert campaign infrastructure into long-term base-building to build voter mobilization over multiple election cycles & grow long-term leadership.

WHAT CAN IVE DO?

IVE has been documented to:

1. Increase voter registration and turnout
2. Heighten awareness of election issues
3. Move “unlikely voters” to the polls
4. Mitigate voter suppression efforts
5. Develop authentic community leaders

(Funders’ Committee on Civic Participation, 2009)
IVE 2.0

2012 saw a push towards IVE 2.0:

- Application of IVE at the state level - both voter contacts and organizing;
- A data-driven approach to identify where voters most needed contact and organizing; and
- An emerging willingness of unions to work with community groups.

And, the continuation of a vision, agenda and organizing structure that consistently looked beyond elections.
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IVE 2.0

Why States?

- Community education and base-building are fundamentally local activities
- Shaping broader change happens when communities are civically engaged and can scale up
- A good level for experimentation in a variety of social environments and political climates—such as CA, OH, CO, and IL—to test IVE as a successful, reliable tactic for combining electoral efforts with ongoing community organizing to build power, long-term.
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**IVE 2.0**

*Why Now?*

- Realization that getting out the vote is **necessary but insufficient** for movement building
- Recognition that electoral organizing is an opportunity for **greater breadth** by contacting undermobilized groups
- Greater willingness on the part of both grassroots and unions to build lasting, equitable partnerships
- With increased voter suppression, IVE elevates voting as both a **tool and an issue** – re-energizing voters by harkening back to the Civil Rights Movement

---

**IVE’S TENSIONS AND TIGHTROPES**

IVE sits at the intersection of community and electoral organizing and, so, tensions between the movement and the moment are bound to come up. Some include:

1. Mobilizing & Organizing
2. Tools & Transformations
3. Pragmatics & Principles
4. Partnerships & Alliances
5. Interests & Values
**IVE’S TENSIONS AND TIGHTROPEs**

**MAIN TENSION:** Breadth v. Depth of Outreach

**SOLUTIONS:** One-the-phone and at-the-door questionnaires that incorporate electoral and base-building concerns, predictive dialing technology, maintain both volunteer organizing and paid door-to-door

---

**IVE’S TENSIONS AND TIGHTROPEs**

**MAIN TENSION:** Training Canvassers v. Developing Leaders

**SOLUTIONS:** Transformative leadership development that builds organizing capacity as well as tapping into their deepest sense of purpose, Maintaining a few electoral organizers to help pivot to base-building work
**IVE’S TENSIONS AND TIGHTROPEs**

**Main Tension:** Electoral goals v. Social change principles

**Solutions:** Align long-term and short-term goals—e.g. the Florida Freedom Charter—before the thick of the electoral organizing sets in

---

**IVE’S TENSIONS AND TIGHTROPEs**

**Main Tension:** Diverse organizations working together and finding the “uncommon common ground”

**Solutions:** Transparent decision-making processes, Intentionally designing collaborations before the electoral cycle, Joint staff leadership development programs, Establishing systems of accountability
**IVE’S TENSIONS AND TIGHTROPES**

**MAIN TENSION:** Tapping narrow self-interests v. broader values

**SOLUTIONS:** Identify and speak from values instead of issues; identify voters/members based on values not identities; intertwine issues and values in electoral and base-building work.
Total Florida Registered Voters: 11,934,446
Total 2012 turnout: 8,474,179 (71%)
Total 2008 turnout: 8,390,744 (75%)

FNM targeted voter universe*: **1,278,292**
Total Voted of FNM Universe: **737,616**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race-Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total People</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>585,332</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>343,330</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>299,618</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50,012</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCALE IMPACT**

- Total Contacts: 210,528
- Total FNM Contacts: 188,948
- Total turnout of FNM electorate: 58%
  - 88,595 voters that we talked to
- FNM turnout in targeted counties: 72%

**FLORIDA IMPACT**

PICO Network.
http://www.piconetwork.org/news-media/news/2012-
GOTV-Florida.png
JACKSONVILLE

- 8,296 contacts, 86% AA
- Average Turnout: 71%
- 62% Average Turnout of FNM Contacts

Top Performing FNM Precincts - Duval County

ORLANDO

- 37,724 contacts; 15% AA, 51% Latino
- Average Turnout: 63%
- 71% Average Turnout of FNM Contacts in Top Precincts

Top Performing Precincts - Orange County
GP2 We could combine tampa and orlando for central florida numbers.

Gihan Perera, 3/18/2013
TAMPA

- 12,302 contacts; 53% AA, 30% Latino
- Average Turnout: 66%
- 71% Average Turnout of FNM Contacts

Top Performing FNM Precincts - Hillsborough County

PALM BEACH

- 28,449 contacts; 38% AA, 9% Latino, 51% white
- Average Turnout: 67%
- 75% Average Turnout of FNM Contacts

Top Performing Precincts - Palm Beach County
MIAMI DADE

- 58,872 contacts; 40% AA, 52% Latino
- Average Turnout: 67%
- 83% Average Turnout of FNM Contacts

Top Performing Precincts - Miami-Dade County

OVERALL IMPACT

- We hit 340,577 unique doors and engaged in 188,948 conversations
- 88,595 FNM Contacts voted
- 23% of FNM Contacts voted early
- Statewide FNM electorate voter share: 8.7%
- Contact vote share: 1%
- 58% of our conversations voted
LEARNING AND EXPERIMENTS

Sustained Breadth

Innovation: MOBILIZATION and ORGANIZING

TOOLS FOR MASS VOTER ENGAGEMENT
PHONE, MAIL, POLLING, PREDICTIVE DIALER, ROBOSURVEY, DATA DRIVEN CAMPAIGNS

❖ CARING ACROSS GENERATIONS
➢ 34,000 SENIORS JOIN CALL ON MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

❖ EARLY VOTING
➢ 10,000 LOW PROPENSITY VOTERS JOIN CALL 2 DAYS BEFORE EARLY VOTING STARTS

❖ IMMIGRATION
➢ 39,514 CALLS TO LEGISLATORS
➢ 54% WHITE; 31% LATINO; 12% AA

Innovation: Tools and Transformations
LEARNING AND EXPERIENCES

Leadership Development

Vision
Infrastructure
Freedom Clubs

Innovation: MOBILIZATION and ORGANIZING

LEARNING AND EXPERIENCES

*Total Participation & Participation Types: Individuals who were mobilized, or who’s information was gathered from an event, house party, training or volunteer shift (includes multiple appearances.)
Long Term Strategy

- Target 1,278,292 voters over 4 years
- Follow up and build on cycle leads
- Move to more Clear and Formal Partnerships
- Scaled engagement through issue campaigns

Innovation: Tools and Transformations

Pivots: Electoral to Policy and Movement
Changing the Rules of the GAME
Amplified Feedback Loops

- Voting Rights
- Immigrant Rights and Integration
- Criminalization and Mass Incarceration
- Building an Integrated Leadership Pipeline

CLARIFYING QUESTIONS?
WHAT THE TIMES CALL FOR:
THE CALIFORNIA CALLS EXPERIMENT, IVE, AND BEYOND

1. Decades of assaults on communities of color, the poor, the safety net, role of government.
2. State policies increasingly preempting local organizing and policies.
3. Multiple crisis across issue areas.
4. Constituencies and communities being played off against one another.
5. Inability of Social Justice organizations to have scale of impact needed at the state level.

WHY INTEGRATED VOTER ENGAGEMENT
California Likely Voters are also older, more educated, and more affluent; they own homes and were born in the U.S. (residents earning $80,000 or more make up 41% of likely voters, 42% of likely voters are age 55 or older)

SOURCE: Public Policy Institute of California

WHY INTEGRATED VOTER ENGAGEMENT
SOCIAL JUSTICE MOVEMENT OFTEN IN SILOS, FRAGMENTED, ON THE DEFENSIVE

EDUCATION
HOUSING
POVERTY
HEALTHCARE
JOBS
HUMAN SERVICES
ENVIRONMENT
ELEM ENTS OF EXPERIMENT

1. Build an ongoing state alliance of local Anchor Groups in 12 key counties committed to developing and implementing an Integrated Voter Engagement Model over multiple years.

2. Construct state-of-the-art Civic Engagement System to reach/build support among key constituencies at the scale needed to impact state policy.

3. Develop a strategic narrative & values-based messaging that builds support & motivates a base of 500,000 supporters who normally don’t participate in state elections.

4. Forge Strategic Collaborations with key statewide efforts around a multi-year agenda to create a new center of gravity for social justice and inclusion.

IMPLEMENTATION
VALUES CONSTITUENCIES IN CALIFORNIA

- Tax and Fiscal Base 16%
- Anti-Base 13%
- Self-Centered Affluent 8%
- Balanced Suburbs 27%
- Aspiring People of Color 15%
- Angry Fatalists 6%
- Blaming Fearful 15%

OFF-CYCLE ORGANIZING

California Calls Anchor Groups had done **8 Civic Engagement Rounds** over 3 years talking to **488,484** individuals & identifying **360,535 supporters** of progressive tax reform leading up to 2012.

Only **One** of these rounds was during an actual election season.
RESULTS

SCALE: California Calls anchor groups have engaged 769,617 individual voters and Identifying 576,140 Supporters. This is the result of 3 years of integrated voter engagement work to change the California Electorate.

TURNOUT: 436,902 California Calls voters in November 2012 at a 5 to 9% higher rate than the state average.

CHANGING THE ELECTORATE

+7%

+8%

+12%
CALIFORNIA CALLS IMPACT ON THE ELECTORATE

Turnout by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Our ID Turnout</th>
<th>State Turnout</th>
<th>±</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>+9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>+15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>+10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turnout by Immigrants

- +13%

Turnout by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Our ID Turnout</th>
<th>State Turnout</th>
<th>±</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRICAN-AMERICAN</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>+18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATINO</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>+14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>+11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>+10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHAT DO WE THINK WE ARE LEARNING

- There are no quick fixes, magic bullets, or shortcuts. Achieving progressive, systemic solutions requires serious analysis and multi-year, strategic collaboration efforts.
- It is possible for the social justice movement (particularly local social justice groups) to move beyond issue silos and build capacity to the needed scale, even in a state as big and diverse as California.
- Organizing of constituencies and communities who are suffering most from the perpetual economic crisis is absolutely essential to expanding the electorate and insuring that solutions are based on equity and social justice.
- Motivating new and infrequent voters requires attention to messaging, but also the messenger and building a relationship of trust. This is the essence of Integrated Voter Engagement.
LOOKING FORWARD

INTEGRATED VOTER ENGAGEMENT 2.0

1. Transforming supporters into a formal base.

---

SPECTRUM OF FORMALIZING BASE

7. Grassroots Leader
6. No Donor
5. Agrees to Formally "Join"
4. Will Take Action
3. Wants to be Regularly Updated
2. Agrees with Agenda Being part of "New Calif. Voter", Will Vote Consistently
1. Agrees on Specific Issues
0. Not Interested

2. Transforming new and infrequent voters into consistent voters.
   - Moving supporters along spectrum of greater involvement.
   - Consistent, year-round engagement by trusted organizations & messengers with tailored approaches per constituency.
   - Continued development and training on strategic, values-based narrative.


---

Integrated Voter Engagement: Experiments and Lessons Learned in 2012

3.22.2013 KIRK NO DEN
Organizing: Community, Faith, Labor, issue based. Bottom up, base building.

Movement Building. Fluid organizing models that get to scale, can mobilize large #s.

Large Scale c3 electoral programs that are linked to organizing and movement building.

Improved environment for progress on race, jobs, criminal justice reform, deindustrialization.

4 KEY ALIGNED STRATEGIES = IVE
KEY LEARNING QUESTIONS

...FROM 2012 CIVIC ENGAGEMENT IN OHIO

- What percentage of our electoral engagement and contacts can we transition into long term involvement? Can we capture scale?
- How do we make every contact an opportunity to test our narrative about good jobs and strong communities and talk about values?
- How do we use our voter program as an avenue to expand our work in key constituencies and unlikely suspects like seniors and students?

OHIO ELECTORAL RESULTS 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGISTRATIONS</th>
<th>DOOR KNOCKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40,891</td>
<td>93,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>registrations</td>
<td>attempts at the door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>20,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cards per hour</td>
<td>contacts made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHONE CALLS</td>
<td>vote plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340,075</td>
<td>16,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phone attempts made</td>
<td>19,175 issue identifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51,362</td>
<td>DIRECT MAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phone contacts made</td>
<td>183,455 pieces mailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,718</td>
<td>conversations held</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OHIO IVE COMPONENTS**

- **Voter Registration** in 7 urban counties
- **Faith Program**: focus on early vote, voting rights in collaboration with PICO and AP
- **Students**: targeted on 8 universities with YEF
- **Seniors**: with Caring Across Generations
- **RAE Voter Program**: in key underperforming geographies in partnership with CCC and NPA

**EXPERIMENT 1: TEAMS AND ISSUES**

*MOVEMENT BUILDING TEAMS AND ISSUE IDS*

- 10 organizers – on a movement building team, fluid infrastructure, NOI model, small circles
- 19,175 Issue IDs on jobs, mass incarceration, neighborhood revitalization.
- Movement building organizers followed up with issue IDs on the phone and in person within 1 to 2 weeks of IDs – inviting them to trainings, circle meetings, etc.
- 6.3% of IDs actively engaged post election, 1,208 people.
EXPERIMENT 2: CAG

VOTER WORK TRANSITION INTO ENGAGEMENT

- Electoral Results: 44,499 conversations with voters, with a strong focus on early vote and made 7,309 Phone Issue IDs. 172,598 pieces of mail to a target universe of 39,528 unlikely voters

*How does this translate into ongoing organizing?*
- 2 Care Congresses with 700 people in attendance
- Town Hall Meeting w Senator Brown with 9,000 people
- Base for Medicaid Expansion work in 2013.
- Engaged base of more than 2,000 seniors across Ohio.
INTEGRATED TRAINING

In 2012, a total of 2,137 people went through a formal training sessions (many being multiple days)

• 321 people who attended movement building trainings
• 589 grassroots leaders trained on electoral program
• 1,227 people attending community organizing trainings

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE WORK

• Getting to 15% – transition from civic engagement to ongoing work.
• Continued integration of tools – targeting, tracking, tele-town halls, and methodology.
• Further development of civic engagement strategies to engagement of unusual suspects
• Use of more fluid organizing models that allow us to capture civic engagement work
CLARIFYING QUESTIONS?

PREPARING THE GROUND

- Get serious about data tracking and scale.
- Use IVE to reach out to unusual suspects.
- Stay focused on converting lists to leaders.
- Invest the time and resources to build common ground among those collaborating on IVE strategies.
- Make use of changing technology.
RECOMMENDATIONS GOING FORWARD

SUPPORTING THE FIELD

• Fund IVE innovations year-round.
• Recognize the range of legal vehicles being utilized.
• Use anchor community organizations as intermediaries.
• Continue to invest in leadership development, base building, and organizing.
• Work with state-based movement-building organizations to develop new funding sources.

RECOMMENDATIONS GOING FORWARD

WINNING THE FUTURE

• Recognize the strategic importance of state-level work.
• Poll and organize on issues and values.
• Prioritize strategy over urgency.
• Make the case for IVE.
• Protect the vote itself.
COMING TO (THE NEW) AMERICA?

DISCUSSION