1000 LEADERS (AND MORE) RISING

DEVELOPING A NEW GENERATION FOR PROGRESSIVE GOVERNANCE

BY ROBERT CHLALA, MADELINE WANDER, JENNIFER ITO, AND MANUEL PASTOR
USC PROGRAM FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND REGIONAL EQUITY
JANUARY 2019

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The recent and unprecedented election of progressives to U.S. Congress like Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez from New York, Rashida Tlaib from Michigan, and Deb Haaland from New Mexico have many asking: How did such a dramatic change occur in leadership? What supports do the newly elected progressives need to fundamentally change policymaking on Capitol Hill? And how can we transform the recent wave of victories into a steady stream of progressive leadership and lasting impact?

In answering all these questions, it is important to remember that the sort of national change reflected in the 2018 elections actually started locally. The recent wave at the federal level happened district by district as progressives returned to grassroots organizing that engaged new and occasional voters and offered candidates who better and more authentically suited communities. Movements across America—some long-standing, some booted up in this new era of resistance—have created intentional and strategic leadership development that inspires and prepares grassroots leaders to run for *local* office—which then creates the conditions for leaders to pursue higher office.

This report dives into such locally focused leadership development efforts—particularly Working Partnerships USA's 1000 Leaders Project and similar programs. These programs recruit and train grassroots leaders to run for local and regional posts as well as equip them with the technical knowledge and political know-how to help them succeed in passing and implementing policies once elected. Since its founding in 1997, 1000 Leaders has transcended its name and trained 1,500 community and elected leaders in regions across the country. But what makes this model unique—and what lays the groundwork for sustaining and scaling it—is that it is situated in broader power-building strategies and is implemented in tandem with local and regional efforts working to achieve governing power. To this end, 1000 Leaders also prepares those leaders typically considered "on the outside" to work in coalition with each other as well as those in office.

In detailing the 1000 Leaders model, we hope to give new insight on how we can support thousands more leaders who will not only open but also break down the doors to governance. 1000 Leaders' successes tell us that developing leaders for governance relies on a set of factors right in the reach of movements: **a collective approach to leadership** across "inside" and "outside" groups, an emphasis on the **values that unite and drive leaders,** and a focus on strategically and equitably **shifting governing power.**

Leading Collectively

Partnering with local power-building efforts sits at the crux of the 1000 Leaders model. Any 1000 Leaders Project partnership begins with an intentional process of generating **collective leadership** by creating a *governing coalition*—which brings to the table a diverse set of government officials, community-based organizations, unions, and faith-based institutions to advance a common, long-term policy platform rooted in shared principles and collective action.

1000 Leaders Project trainings are geared toward building such a "team" ready to move a progressive agenda forward both inside and outside government. Partner organizations representing marginalized voices head up the recruitment and selection of the cohort of leaders that go through the training process. Training series like Values-Based Leadership (VBL) or Leading a New Way (LNW) formally last several weekends, but the cooperation and coordination forged last years. Not everyone on the governing coalition team will run for office, but everyone commits to working together across election cycles.

In New Haven, a coalition of progressive aldermanic candidates worked with community and labor groups to win two-thirds of the seats on the Board of Alders. The coalition continues to hold a majority of seats on the Board of Alders. In California's Santa Clara County, Working Partnerships and its allies in the labor-progressive governing coalition have supported the development of new leadership in elected, appointed, and other key positions across San Jose and other cities, and up to the county level, enabling major advancements in affordable housing and workers' rights, and elevating community concerns about the impacts of unchecked tech development in the last several years.

Many who come to the 1000 Leaders table may never have thought about running for public office before. They are often people of color, women, LGBTQ individuals, and members of other communities that have been excluded from the halls of power. And of those who manage to make it to such halls, they often face isolation and an inability to produce change. 1000 Leaders responds to this by catalyzing leaders to connect with each other and also to find leadership role models (sometimes even bringing in these role models to facilitate trainings). The program then helps the leaders work together to figure out how to break from business as usual.

Leading With Values

1000 Leaders helps potential and current electeds understand that **values** are the deep bonds of a governing coalition; they are essential to weathering opposition, electoral cycles, and entrenched racism, misogyny, homo/transphobia, and other exclusions. While government processes are often cast as technocratic, 1000 Leaders helps participants understand that deeply felt values are already part of (and can change) governance. Together, participants dig beyond the policy

issues to see what experiences, challenges, and aspirations drive their governing coalitions, and how this can become the foundation for them to build a shared policy platform. In exercises like the "Me-Tree," participants look to what, in their backgrounds, resides at the "roots" of their movement work, and what might be the "fruits" (or policy outcomes) of their leadership. Presenting these diagrams to each other, participants dialogue about where they have been nurtured from common roots and where there are commonalities (and conflicts) among the "fruits" they are seeking.

Partially because transactional approaches—or, one-to-one exchanges aimed at moving individual policies rather than changing the status quo—dominate government, leaders often believe that values have no place there. In reality, even in government, it is possible to engage as a transformational leader who dynamically works toward a larger vision, empowers staff and colleagues, and changes paradigms. Realistically, public leaders will have to tap into both transactional and transformational interchanges, but 1000 Leaders prepares trainees to infuse values in each approach. An example of a leader imbuing a transactional "reward" exchange with values—which 1000 Leaders' trainers use— is when an elected leader secures support from a colleague on, say, an affordable housing bill by making sure the colleague's constituents know their mutual support of the bill is based on their shared value of equity. Facilitators suggest that even when looking at the "transaction" of winning a vote, leaders should be listening to constituents and figuring out how to build a progressive, values-driven platform.

Leaders strategize on how to use a transformational approach to work with colleagues, staff, and social justice movements to drive their values-based platform. In New Haven, for instance, the hard work of building such a platform spurred the newly-elected Board of Alders to approach the urgent question of violence prevention in new, holistic ways. They listened, learned, and developed new programs based on the voices of marginalized communities and youth, which led to significant decreases in violence and improvements in neighborhood life without turning to over-policing. On the other side of the country in Oregon, where "progressive" has not always fully included communities of color, immigrants, and indigenous leaders, Oregon Futures Lab has motivated new leaders of color to run and support movement-anchored campaigns for groundbreaking initiatives like educational reform.

Leading Toward Governing Power

A progressive electoral sweep may make headlines, but in reality it is only a small step on a much longer journey toward building power. How then do progressive leaders collectively advance transformational, values-based platforms given the complexities of government systems—especially when so many of these systems lack sufficient staff and other crucial resources? After all, policymakers can safeguard their power by keeping their day-to-day activities an obscure game of "insider baseball" where the wealthy win. To correct this imbalance—and to do so in ways that stay collectively-oriented and values-based—1000 Leaders offers in-depth technical knowledge that leaders need to claim their positions' authority on behalf of *and* alongside the communities they represent.

Trainings like LNW brief leaders on policymaking "101"—basically the rules of the game—while other specialized workshops go in-depth on topics like budgeting or pensions. However, the programs we profile stress that movement-rooted leaders and those historically excluded from elected office do not *lack* anything. On the contrary, these trainings help leaders and governing coalition organizations reflect on their own expertise, the conditions facing them and their communities, and how organizers' skills can directly apply once "inside" the halls of power.

Specifically, the trainings focus on how to map and move power from the "inside," realizing that even with a small group that represents majority interests, you can move policy forward. To do so, leaders look at what motivates their colleagues, how they operate, and what might get them to come on board—or get out of the way. Sometimes community groups on the "outside" make their voice heard on policy through simultaneous public actions and media. In addition, trainings include opportunities for leaders to gain feedback from more veteran leaders on how they can sharpen their communication "behind the dais" to ensure the success of values-based platforms.

Leaders learn strategies to bring communities of color and other marginalized groups "inside" as policy experts while also learning how to work with and bring along the broader network of technocratic staff. Groups like Stand Up Nashville, for example, learned how to make the needs of workers and communities understood by appointed staff focused on economic development. They organized to secure the Do Better Bill in 2017, which requires transparency in city contracts. This legislation curbs development deals that benefit fly-by-night corporations while offering nothing to Nashville's actual long-term residents: working and poor communities.

Looking Ahead

Drawing from and building upon 1000 Leaders and other programs, we recommend the following to help advance and sustain a leadership development model toward progressive governance:

- **Invest in alumni networks.** A program-based alumni network can facilitate the critical processes of sharing knowledge among leaders, honing strategies for broader change, and creating a permanent infrastructure to strengthen coordination among progressive leaders inside and outside of government.

- **Support on-going policy and strategy training and dialogue.** The more leaders are exposed to trainings like those of 1000 Leaders and other model programs that provide both technical policy knowledge and strategy development through a collectively-oriented, power-building, and equity lens, the more equipped they will be to change the status quo.

- **Provide holistic supports for leaders from marginalized communities.** Providing culturally-relevant mental, physical, and emotional support spaces can sustainably underpin a new generation of leaders and help them avoid burnout as they navigate the isolating and often hostile halls of power.

- **Support long-term leadership ladders and lattices.** Strengthening relationships with youth organizing groups can inspire a new generation of people of color, immigrants, and indigenous people to consider and prepare for a career in governance early on in their trajectories.

- **Shore up organizations' electoral and legislative capacities.** In addition to investing in future leaders, strengthening organizational capacities contributes to a leadership development program's sustainability as well as a governing coalition's effectiveness. Employing various organizational forms and legal entities, such as 501(c)(4) status that allows for direct political engagement, can greatly expand organizations' capacities to execute their strategies and work with elected leaders.

- **Build from local and regional to state-level impact.** Leveraging governing coalitions at the local and regional levels—and building connections across them—can potentially have state-level impact.

These are contradictory times: In the wake of seemingly insurmountable challenges—particularly among the virulent xenophobia, racism, misogyny, and risks of violence fueled by the current administration—there is hope as a new generation of progressive leaders take the stage. Some may wonder just how much change this new crop of leaders can bring in such challenging times. But many programs and organizations profiled in this report emerged in exactly such moments. By tapping into the public's deepest frustrations *and* aspirations, leaders stood up alongside and for movements to suggest a new way forward: one rooted in collective action, values, transformation, and inclusion, and which gave a voice to and sought power for the vast, unheard majority. They have set an example for beating all odds. It starts with right where our feet are planted today: with the challenges that affect daily lives, and the potential leaders who stand among us, ready to make lasting and sustainable change in policy, movements, and practice.

INTRODUCTION

Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, New York. Ayanna Pressley, Massachusetts. Stacey Abrams, Georgia. Andrew Gillum, Florida.[1] Ilhan Omar, Minnesota. Rashida Tlaib, Michigan. Deb Haaland, New Mexico. Veronica Escobar, Texas. The list goes on.

In a historical midterm season, a new generation of energized, progressive, mostly women of color from across the U.S. not only approached the political stage, but claimed seats at the table (McBain 2018). And not just any seats: they included Congressional and state positions of long-term Democratic incumbents (e.g., Boston and New York) and places where pundits asserted constituents would never respond to progressive messages (e.g., the Midwest and the South). Some media outlets are recognizing the fact many of these candidates eschewed corporate funding and instead drew from grassroots organizations and formations like the Working Families Party, Democratic Socialists of America, or Bernie Sanders's Our Revolution PAC (Conniff 2018; Kampf-Lassin 2018; Sennott 2018).

With the excitement comes new questions: Can this progressive wave fundamentally change how Capitol Hill and statehouses throughout the U.S. work? How will newly-elected leaders implement the movement-born ideas they champion, such as abolishing ICE, making college less financially burdensome and even free, expanding Medicare for all, and launching a "Green New Deal"? New leaders will face significant barriers such as operating in a system geared toward maintaining the status quo (or worse) as well as conservative efforts to stop communities of color from voting, much less running for office.[2]

If the 2018 midterm victories are indicative of one thing, it is that the work ahead—of passing *and implementing* progressive policy while growing new cohorts of diverse, movement-oriented leaders—will not happen just because people are *against* Trump or the GOP (Kampf-Lassin 2018). It will take intentional efforts and strategies led by grassroots movements driving *toward* something: achieving racial, gender, class, and intersectional justice. It will require identifying, convincing, and training grassroots leaders to run for more offices and claim more government appointments and staff positions to obtain governing power. And this work starts at the local level.

---

[1] We include Stacey Abrams and Andrew Gillum here because by most reputable accounts, if their opponents had not ramped up voter disenfranchisement, they would have won. It is also clear that the Abrams campaign's widespread success in a supposedly "red" state proved a victory for progressives in numerous other ways.

[2] Significantly, this election drew attention to active voter disenfranchisement in states like Georgia and Florida. In addition, it called attention to the victories of initiatives supporting voting rights like Florida's Amendment 4 and Michigan's Proposal 3.

Fortunately, there are models to learn from and opportunities to build upon to help buoy this new wave of progressive leadership and create lasting change. Local organizations from Florida to California have been investing in intensive strategies to engage voters before *and* after elections and to develop and run grassroots leaders in races from local school boards to the Senate. They are working not just toward the next election, but rather toward the longer-term vision and strategy to achieve *progressive governance.*

The following report delves into such models to develop and support leaders for governance, particularly one led by Working Partnerships USA (Working Partnerships), a nonprofit community organization founded by labor and community groups in the Silicon Valley in 1995. Former Executive Director Cindy Chavez is a Santa Clara County Supervisor (and former San Jose Vice Mayor) who along with her colleagues in the San Jose City Council, like Sergio Jimenez, has worked with community partners to drive forward an economic and housing justice agenda anchored in local grassroots organizing. This helped lay the groundwork for Jimenez—after a concerted campaign led by a local tenant rights coalition—to step into a leadership role to navigate the just cause eviction protection ordinance (i.e., landlords must have a legally-vetted reason to evict tenants, such as not paying rent)—proposed by the coalition—and to build a supportive coalition of Council allies. In one of the most expensive housing markets in the U.S. and in a state where housing policy and renters' protection often sparks aggressive response from corporate apartment owners, their industry associations, and other politically powerful interests, this is a particularly significant victory.

In New Haven, a coalition of progressive aldermanic candidates worked with community and labor groups to win two-thirds of the seats on the Board of Alders. The coalition worked with the Connecticut Center for the New Economy which, for over a decade, had been highlighting New Haven's failed development model that entrenched inequality in New Haven and led to a record-high homicide rate. The coalition offered an alternative vision for New Haven by pursuing a three-issue agenda: jobs, youth opportunities, and community safety. After winning in 2011, the coalition has seen a rapid decrease in the homicide rate, the establishment of a new jobs program and unprecedented large-employer commitments to local hiring agreements, and the development of new community facilities that provide youth opportunities. The coalition continues to hold a majority of seats on the Board of Alders.

The Silicon Valley and New Haven leaders and their victories hinged fundamentally on years of patient base-building and organizing by community groups and labor. Their success over the long term required the continued engagement and activism of these coalitions. The support and training by Working Partnerships' 1000 Leaders Project helped translate such grassroots energy into lasting electoral and legislative power in each case (and in quite a few others we will soon describe).

This report details the 1000 Leaders model—and specifically the Values-Based Leadership (VBL) and Leading a New Way (LNW) trainings—and discusses key themes and learnings for this particular moment. Over the last two decades, 1000 Leaders has lived up to (and indeed surpassed) its name by working with more than 1,500 community and elected leaders across the country. To this day, 1000 Leaders inspires and prepares grassroots leaders to run for office and then equips them with the technical knowledge and political know-how to help them succeed in passing and implementing policies. Working Partnerships does not train these leaders apart from the regional power-building coalitions from which they have been recruited; in fact, the program is intentionally designed to help networks and alliances transform from policy campaign coalitions into *governing* coalitions. To this end, 1000 Leaders also includes those leaders on the "outside" to prep them to work in coalition with each other as well as those in office.

Through 1000 Leaders, those running for office and their supporters identify and stay connected to the values and relationships that inspired them to run in the first place. In other trainings, 1000 Leaders also provides leaders in power with the fundamental skills for governance, helping them bring movement builders in as experts and partners in policymaking, to wield authority effectively but inclusively. 1000 Leaders prepares trainees, as a whole, to continue to think like organizers and work with ever-broadening inside and outside circles to drive a shared platform that strengthens the collective power of communities of color, immigrants, indigenous communities, women, LGTBQ individuals, and working-class and poor communities.

Three central tenets from the 1000 Leaders approach are to:

- **Lead collectively.** Transformational change happens when individuals— electeds on the inside and movement builders on the outside—work collectively toward a shared agenda and collaborate in ways that redistribute power.

- **Lead with values.** Centering around values, rather than narrow issues or individual aspirations, motivates leaders to stay true to their communities of origin and serves as a "true north" toward which a governing coalition can aim.

- **Lead toward governing power.** The ability to navigate often-opaque technical government processes and to play a power-shifting role from the "inside" is a new and critical realm for many progressive movements.

This report is organized as follows: It starts with an overview of leadership for progressive governance and a description of our research methods. We highlight our interviews with and data from 1000 Leaders affiliates and others to show the centrality of these three tenets to a widely-applicable model of leadership development for progressive governance. We conclude by suggesting that the three elements form an overall strategy that moves from simply building leaders to understanding leadership development for governance as a means to organize leaders to shift power—and provide recommendations for funders and the field to further pursue this strategy.

In the context of an increasingly authoritarian and racist federal government under President Donald Trump, the dial has been turned up. Newer leadership development programs and organizations—like those of Oregon Futures Lab and the regional coalition Stand Up Nashville—are emerging while the 1000 Leaders Project is expanding its network of partners and allies and therefore its reach and depth. Taken together, the programs, organizations, and leaders we profile in this report model why and how 2018's progressive wave is less about winning this game, or the one to come in 2020, and more about changing how the game is played. So what better time to harness the energy—both the fear within the current political context and the excitement around our increased voter turnout and newly-elected progressives—to chart the road ahead?

LEADERSHIP FOR PROGRESSIVE GOVERNANCE

Building from the theory and framework that Working Partnerships, Strategic Concepts in Organizing and Policy Education (SCOPE) in Los Angeles, and other grassroots organizations have developed and used for decades to create strategies to build power, the USC Program for Environmental and Regional Equity (PERE) conducted a two-year research project on the concept of progressive governance in the United States. Progressive governance is the ability to win, implement, and sustain long-term change that can further social justice. It is about the broader structures and processes that shape decision-making and include institutions that are both inside and outside of government, thus *governance*—rather than *government*.

Based on quantitative and qualitative analyses, field visits to five states, and discussions with experts on, and organizers of, social movements, *Changing States: A Framework for Progressive Governance* (Pastor, Ito, and Wander 2016) calls on a strategic imperative for progressives to cast their sights on governance, and provides a three-part framework to help inform efforts toward this end. Specifically, it offers a way to systematically understand the terrain and possibilities for progressive governance through three distinct yet interrelated dimensions:

- What are the **conditions** that create the context for social change efforts? These include demographic, economic, political, and geographic conditions.

- What are the decision-making **arenas** where efforts for change are waged, won, implemented, and protected? These include the electoral, legislative, judicial, administrative, corporate, and cultural arenas.

- What are the **capacities** necessary to build power for governance? These include an organizational ecosystem centered on grassroots organizing and base-building, alliances and networks, a diverse resource base, and leadership ladders and lattices.

The report you are reading builds upon *Changing States* by digging deeper into the capacity of **leadership ladders and lattices**—specifically into the kind of capacity building that prepares members of a grassroots base for leadership positions within civic organizations, appointed boards and commissions, and elected offices. "Leadership ladders" refers to the kind of leadership development that is key in organizing: developing leaders among the grassroots base. These grassroots leaders can increase the base's involvement, influence, and identity with an organization or movement. On the other hand, "lattices" (lateral leadership transfers) cross-pollinate organizations' and sectors' ideas and interests, creating stronger relationships across the entire ecosystem.

To better understand leadership ladders for governance, we started with a review of academic literature from the fields of business, social psychology, and sociology from which to develop a theoretical framework around the *what* (the models), the *how* (the practices), and the *why* (the broader goals and values) of progressive leadership development. We then conducted a scan of prominent progressive leadership programs and selected a sample of 16 in order to compare how the various theoretical models play out in practice.

Three key findings about the what, how, and why are: 1) Leadership development models have moved from an almost sole focus on competencies and characteristics to a more holistic approach emphasizing underlying values and visions. Likewise, the models have also transitioned from a focus on the individual to an emphasis on the system in which leaders and communities operate. 2) In terms of practices, more and more leadership programs combine a deliberate emphasis on values driving one's work—particularly in the context of broader social, political, and economic realities—with experiential, practice-based learning. 3) Finally, evidence from studies of on-the-ground work shows that leadership development is an important complement to the alliance-building integral to achieving social change.

The 1000 Leaders Project, and other social justice-oriented leadership programs, are examples of the leading models and practices of leadership development that are inextricably linked to a broader, holistic view of social transformation. This report details such programs in an effort to provide new insight on leadership development for those working to achieve progressive governance in regions across the country. To do this, we reviewed documents, curricula, and other materials from 1000 Leaders. We then worked in close collaboration with both current and former staff of Working Partnerships to identify and conduct in-depth, one to one-and-a-half hour interviews with 11 trainers, participants, and leaders from related programs who we list at the end of this report. What follows is our analysis of these data.

As we enter a new era of elected leadership, now is the time to set the groundwork for lasting progressive governance both inside and outside government institutions. Next, we turn to the 1000 Leaders Project, which can help provide a model for how to get there.

The 1000 Leaders Project

Working Partnerships has been a leader in theory and strategy toward a vision of progressive governance since 1995. Key to this vision is its work of building cross-cutting, long-term governing coalitions connecting diverse community-based organizations, unions, and faith-based institutions with each other as well as government officials (i.e., they connect "outside" and "inside" leaders) in pursuit of a common platform that advances democracy, equity, and inclusivity. Indeed, this coalition-building work has resulted in groundbreaking policy campaigns. For example, in 2016, Working Partnerships helped pass the first ballot initiative to ensure fair work scheduling practices. In 2018, the organization supported one of the first ordinances in California to require all publicly-subsidized construction

development to include fair wages, hire local workers, and create career opportunities for underrepresented communities. Its strategy has also included pioneering leadership development programs, such as the 1000 Leaders Project (Dean 1996; Pastor, Benner, and Matsuoka 2009).

In 1997, Working Partnerships launched the Labor/Community Leadership Institute (LCLI), an initiative to bring together a diverse set of leaders to build a collective vision for the regional economy and the levers that could advance shared prosperity in the region. In 2004, in an attempt to scale Working Partnerships' work—particularly its leadership development model—and help other organizations replicate it, a separate but parallel organization called Building Partnerships was formed. Specifically, using the LCLI model, Building Partnerships offered technical assistance and created a template curriculum for what it called Civic Leadership Institutes, which organizations like Community Labor United (CLU) in Boston, Georgia STAND-UP in Atlanta, FRESC (now called United for a New Economy [UNE]) in Denver, and the Connecticut Center for a New Economy (CCNE) in New Haven used to launch their own institutes.

About five years later, based on years of experimentation, Building Partnerships and Working Partnerships co-launched the pilot Values-Based Leadership (VBL) and Leading a New Way (LNW) trainings—first in the Silicon Valley, then in Denver (FRESC replicated VBL), and finally in New Haven (CCNE replicated VBL and LNW). The following summarizes each training:

> **Values-Based Leadership** is a multi-day intensive course that drafts community activists from differing movement aspects for roles in public leadership and builds relationships among community, labor, and current and future elected or appointed officials. Over subsequent two- to four-day sessions, participants are carried through a process of developing frameworks for analyzing models of leadership, reflecting on their own values and the roots of their leadership. They build skills and translate key lessons into next steps.

> **Leading a New Way** is a multi-day course that develops elected officials' hard skills, technical expertise, and strategic savvy to take on the challenges of governance and policymaking. This program brings elected officials to the table with leaders from community groups and labor in order to learn from each other and from the expertise of those most affected by critical issues. This course equips these differently-positioned leaders to move forward with bold policy positions.

Shortly after launching these trainings, Building Partnerships rebranded as the 1000 Leaders Project, and became a program of Working Partnerships. Since then, the 1000 Leaders Project has developed six trainings (including VBL, LNW, and a modified Civic Leadership Institute) that help leaders cultivate shared visions, relationships, and strategies, and offer tools so movement and civic leaders can advance regional equity, inclusion, and progressive governance. In addition,

1000 Leaders affiliates hold trainings on the technical skills and expertise necessary to advance and implement progressive policy, as well as some focused on board and commission leaders (Way 2016).

Since its founding, 1000 Leaders has expanded its reach to several regions with the goal of training and supporting a new generation of leaders who can move a regional social and economic justice agenda—and, ultimately, achieve governing power by having leaders on the inside and outside of government institutions working collectively and in coalition. Specifically, the 1000 Leaders Project has worked with and/or developed curricula for and with the following organizations:

- Alameda Labor Council and Oakland Rising (Oakland/East Bay Area, CA)
- Center for Policy Initiatives and San Diego and Imperial Counties Labor Council (San Diego region, CA)
- Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy (Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties, CA)
- Community Labor United (Boston, MA)
- Connecticut Center for a New Economy (New Haven and Hartford, CT)
- Doing Development Differently in Metro Detroit (Detroit region, MI)
- United for a New Economy Colorado (formerly FRESC) and the Denver Area Labor Federation (Denver region, CO)
- Georgia STAND-UP (Atlanta, GA)
- Good Jobs, Livable Neighborhoods, now part of Citizen Action (Milwaukee, WI)
- Orange County Communities Organized for Responsible Development (Orange County, CA)
- Puget Sound Sage (Seattle/Puget Sound region, WA)

Many of the organizations above participate and collaborate as part of the Partnership for Working Families (PWF), a national network of regional economic justice organizations that shares the 1000 Leaders vision for enacting regional change for long-term governance. At the same time, new efforts like the Oregon Futures Lab and the regional coalition Stand Up Nashville are joining this struggle, building from labor and community coalitions and from new energy directed to raising progressive people of color, immigrants, women, and LGBTQ individuals into positions of power.

The rest of this report delves into the elements of the 1000 Leaders Project—specifically the VBL and LNW trainings—as a way to detail its model but also extract key themes and learnings for others trying to achieve similar goals. Before we dive into the details, however, we think it helpful to state the key findings upfront, as this guides the analysis and recommendations that follow.

In studying 1000 Leaders, as well as related organizations focusing on leadership development for progressive governance, three central tenets critical to shifting the power to achieve progressive governance emerge (which we introduced earlier but elaborate upon here):

Lead collectively. While there is a common perception of leadership as an individual activity with an emphasis on raising up charismatic, powerful figures, in fact singular leaders can only make limited changes on their own. Effective civic leadership parallels what we have learned in the broader study and practice of movement building: transformational change happens when individuals work collectively toward a shared agenda. And this can only happen if leaders— electeds on the inside and movement builders on the outside—collaborate in meaningful, effective ways that distribute power among different positions. This *collective leadership,* in the terms used by 1000 Leaders, must include and, in fact, center on the voices of communities of color, including women, LGBTQ individuals, and immigrants who have been disenfranchised. To this end, Working Partnerships Executive Director Derecka Mehrens uses a definition of leadership that is inherently collective: "the art of making others successful."

Lead with values. As both research and practice show, centering on values (rather than narrow issues or individual aspirations), motivates leaders to stay true to the communities from where they come. Values shared among leaders and communities come to serve as a "true north" toward which a governing coalition can aim. Shared values also provide common ground which progressive electeds can use to cement a long-lasting agenda for governance. 1000 Leaders helps leaders to identify these values and create a platform based on them.

Lead toward governing power. How can leaders drive forward a collective, transformational, and values-based approach when there are significant existing power imbalances that hit leaders from marginalized communities especially hard? The 1000 Leaders Project helps current and future officials address the barriers to enacting progressive change in two ways. First, it provides concrete technical skills training that equips leaders with often-opaque knowledge regarding technical governance processes and brings in movement and community groups as experts. Further, and perhaps most critical to an agenda of long-term governance, 1000 Leaders helps leaders realize they must continue to be organizers "inside," and that they can map, strategize, and shift power in this way. As this power-shifting role within the halls of government is probably the newest realm for many progressive movements, 1000 Leaders and its partners and allies are building the knowledge and strategies that can help leaders concretely understand and sustain governing power, inside and out.

Other organizations profiled here, such as Stand Up Nashville and Oregon Futures Lab, utilize and draw from these three threads as well. We include interviews and data from these interrelated groups to show the centrality of the three elements to a widely-applicable model of leadership development for progressive governance. We conclude by suggesting these three elements form an overall

strategy that moves from simply building leaders who may win an election to understanding leadership development for governance as a means to organize leaders to shift power. Furthermore, we suggest that this strategy can inform future investments for funders and directions for movements.

It is also important to note that leading collectively, with values and toward achieving governing power, also dramatically expands on the aforementioned research on leadership development more broadly. The literature suggests that the most effective leadership trainings are constructed *in relation* to: 1) the underlying values and visions of the institution and leaders; 2) the skills needed in a given sector (technical expertise); and 3) the people one works with inside and outside an institution ("distributed") (Bolden 2011; Brown 2004; Komives and Wagner 2012; Osula and Ng 2014; Spillane 2005). Below, we further discuss these bodies of research, showing where 1000 Leaders and related trainings both align with and adapt the research to the context of progressive governance.

Leading Collectively

In recent years, there has been an upsurge in organizations that offer leadership training and electoral support to people of color, LGBTQ individuals, women, and other historically-excluded candidates. They offer new leaders the nuts and bolts of launching, running, and winning campaigns. Many draw upon models of leadership development that center on building up and ensuring the success of the individual leader running for office—a goal they meet with increasing success. The involvement of these training organizations, aside from alumni networks, often ends with the election. While some highlight collaboration with community and labor groups, it is often only via endorsements and get-out-the-vote efforts.

Supervisor Cindy Chavez points out that part of what inspired her and her colleagues at Working Partnerships to launch the Community-Labor Leadership Institute (CLI) in 1997—which evolved into the 1000 Leaders Project—were the limits of a model focused on individual leadership. "We've seen great people get elected or appointed," Chavez notes, "and it's as if the job drained their bravery and innovation."

Even the most well-meaning elected officials have to face what Lauren Jacobs, Executive Director of Partnership for Working Families (PWF), describes as the "loneliness" of being a progressive in elected power. Imagine how being the only woman of color in office, for example, magnifies such isolation. White male voices and power already dominated this setting, and now the Trump government has further normalized racism, misogyny, and hate speech in the halls of power. Moreover, the fragmentation of communities means that leaders from one marginalized position cannot always expect support across boundaries like race and gender.

The commitment to entering elected office—especially in positions that often have little to no compensation—poses a struggle as leaders also strive to raise children, care for extended family, and in many cases, hold down day jobs. Dominant leaders and their institutions (if they do not isolate leaders of color and women entirely) court such leaders, offering training, mentoring, and the opportunity to lead, but on easier—or already-popular—issues. This "support" compounds the power of past practice, the status quo, and the pressure to defend existing institutions at the expense of the communities and movements from which they came.

As former Managing Director at Working Partnerships (and now California Director at PWF) Elly Matsumura notes, "Other women, people of color, and grassroots activists who consider following in the footsteps of these leaders see them—stretched thin, losing big fights, or judged as 'sold out' or self-promoting—and say, 'If that's what leadership is, then it's not for me.'" Ana del Rocío, State Director of the Oregon Futures Lab, explains, "We can't just cycle through candidates and faces without changing the way systems and [organizations] are functioning," including addressing structural racism and gendered inequality.

The challenges of structural inequality and siloed leadership are paralleled by the risks of siloed policy wins (cf. Komives and Wagner 2012). The more isolated the win, the more likely the policy secured can disappear as fast as it came. For example, the impact of an increase in minimum wage could be skirted without the follow-up work on wage enforcement. Or police reform such as eliminating ticket quotas could fall short without deep cultural change within police departments. In an environment where the difficulties seem to outweigh the rewards of taking up governance, how can movements raise up new leaders for government office and help them succeed as leaders capable of securing far-reaching policy and political change that benefits their communities?

In an attempt to address the challenges, but also fundamentally to help achieve progressive governance, 1000 Leaders broadens the view of power beyond the individual to the collective. The program emphasizes leadership embedded within an ecosystem of relationships. Academics describe this model as "distributed" (or "shared") leadership, in which leadership is a collective process that examines and assesses group interactions (Bolden 2011; Harris 2009; Spillane 2005). Leadership development through this lens focuses on the quality of the relationships built, as well as the empowerment of different actors through shared responsibilities and commitment—hence, "distributed" (Angelle 2010; Pearce and Conger 2002).

"[The 1000 Leaders Project] is a political home for the labor movement, for Working Partnerships, for our community leaders, to build the teams and get the tools and knowledge folks need to make change."

Derecka Mehrens,
Working Partnerships USA

Building on the distributed approach, collective leadership is the understanding that governance happens by coalitions—not individuals—and actively requires a give and take of support and accountability. These kinds of leaders, as the 1000 Leaders curriculum describes, reject wedge issues and act with partners both to limit the effectiveness of opponents and to rein in would-be allies who have gotten off track. With the goal of advancing the positional power of the movement as a whole, they strategically step up (to lead), step back (to let others lead), and encourage their colleagues to do the same.

The idea of collective leadership drives the goals and structures of the VBL and LNW trainings, as well as 1000 Leaders' long-term mission. In order to develop collective leadership that can in fact lead to concrete changes in power and policy, 1000 Leaders aims to do the following:

BUILD GOVERNING COALITIONS

1000 Leaders brings diverse individuals and organizations together to lead collectively in governing coalitions. The coalition is the fundamental unit of 1000 Leaders' work. The trainings themselves center on a cohort of representatives from across this governing coalition, comprised of leaders from diverse sectors including government, community-based organizations, unions, and faith-based institutions. Some of them will run for (and often obtain) office, some of them are in office, and some will remain "outside" and continue to lead movements and organizations. The cross-sectoral composition provides the foundation to build an effective "inside-outside" strategy in which there is a team of like-minded lawmakers on the "inside" supported by and providing support for progressive groups and leaders on the "outside."

In each purposefully-small cohort, around 12 to 20 individuals engage in deep relationship-building—a skill critical to sustaining an effective governing coalition. The key, VBL participant Reverend Scott Marks of CCNE and New Haven Rising explains, is "keeping the number of leaders small enough that you can have an intimate enough of a conversation to get as deep as you can." At the same time, the group is diverse enough to include a broad representation of movements *and* decision makers or government officials—all of whom must govern, together (i.e., governance). For example, in one 1000 Leaders cohort assembled to train leaders on policy and leadership during the Great Recession, San Jose community and city leaders had to sit with members of the police and fire unions, but also with community leaders from low-income communities of color. Through some of the training exercises we detail below, they learned to come together around common values even as pension cuts loomed and budgets tightened.

The 1000 Leaders trainings offer interconnected actors a space to have more vision- and values-oriented conversations to help them think and act collectively and for the long term. They learn how to propose and implement legislation and do so in a way that keeps the voices of marginalized communities at the center, namely by allowing representative organizations to drive governing coalitions.

"This is really about helping groups of people dive in and run for office that have shared values and shared vision that then allows them once they get elected to run and to serve in a much more generous manner. And by generous, I mean that it's focused on the outcome for others—this model of servant leadership—and that you're doing it in a collective way."

1000 Leaders co-founder and Santa Clara County Supervisor Cindy Chavez

CONNECT TO A REGIONAL POWER-BUILDING STRATEGY

1000 Leaders partners with organizational affiliates that already have a long-term vision and strategy to build *power*—which we define as the influence that is created by the relationship between interests or goals (e.g., the change that organizations seek) and resources (e.g., people, expertise, knowledge, relationships, demonstrated success, money) that can be used to achieve the desired change.

These partner organizations are often cross-cutting, long-term alliances of homegrown groups with strong grassroots bases. 1000 Leaders partner Connecticut Center for a New Economy (CCNE) is a strategic labor-community alliance that deploys research, policy analysis, and issue campaigns to improve the lives of working families and communities. CCNE hosted a values-based leadership training in 2011, helping galvanize potential leaders from a wide array of partner grassroots and labor organizations. From there, New Haven Rising and labor campaigns supported a cohort that had great success in New Haven's Board of Alders elections. Many PWF affiliates that are engaged in work for progressive governance and the 1000 Leaders program, like Stand Up Nashville, are similarly-structured bodies uniting labor, community, faith-based, research, and other groups.

1000 Leaders is a vehicle to shift alliances within and across movements into governing alliances. It gives alliance leaders a permanent seat at the decision-making table, strengthening their connection to their bases. Some training programs also bring these regional coalitions' members face-to-face with other actors in governance (which we elaborate on below). As Working Partnerships Executive Director Mehrens describes, "Our vision would be that [regions like Silicon Valley become] co-governed by those sectors and that working people have voice, power, and institutions as well that represent them in that ecosystem."

EMPHASIZE HISTORICALLY-EXCLUDED LEADERSHIP

The regional coalitions and organizations that work with 1000 Leaders give voice to working poor communities, communities of color, women, LGBTQ individuals, immigrants, and other groups historically excluded from decision-making processes. There is, as noted, a growing group of organizations beyond Working Partnerships affiliates that are recruiting underrepresented leaders who may already be interested in pursuing decision-making positions, particularly elected office. 1000 Leaders and similar projects, like Oregon Futures Lab, look to answer to the lack of representation while simultaneously supporting potential movement-rooted candidates.

Often, however, candidates-in-the-making from historically-excluded and marginalized communities are initially less interested in running for office. Many such leaders see their values as potentially clashing with governing power. "It's a challenge to recruit and retain folks to really see their own personal path to being in governance…being an appointed or an elected official," says Oakland City Councilmember Nikki Fortunato Bas, formerly of the progressive, community-

based East Bay Alliance for a Sustainable Economy (EBASE) and PWF, and elected to office in 2017. Instead of recruiting those "called" to office, 1000 Leaders recruits leaders from movements by drawing on their interest in shifting the way power works and gets distributed.

To help new and diverse leaders get more comfortable with the idea of governing power, the VBL training encourages and supports them to consider how they can continue to center their values while running, winning, and succeeding in elected positions (much more on centering values in the next section). The LNW curriculum provides training to public sector leaders from underrepresented groups, offering them the kind of training and tools to conceptualize their leadership as a collective venture. In each of its programs, 1000 Leaders partner organizations representing the working class, immigrants and communities of color are active participants in selecting and training the cohorts. Members of the progressive governing coalition are involved in all phases of a training program from nominating to interviewing and training participants. Their leadership helps define the direction of the governing work from the onset.

Bringing people of color, women, LGBTQ individuals, and other historically-excluded leaders into a broader governing coalition builds strong relationships and alliances across communities. In New Haven, for example, 1000 Leaders brought together food service workers, maintenance staff, progressive advocates, and professional organizers, including women of color and immigrants (some of them white), to form a small-sized cohort where they could build understanding *across* lines of difference but *with* the commonality of being historically excluded. It is important to note that by including unions and other community organizations in Latinx, Asian, and Black communities, the coalition offers an opportunity for non-citizen immigrants and formerly-incarcerated people who are otherwise unable to run in elections or vote to have their voices more clearly heard on the policies that impact their lives and communities.

Collective Leadership as a Way to Take on the Third Rail in Boston

1000 Leaders Project participants remarked that the combination of comprehensive training and ongoing relationships with regional and state movement-building organizations gave them the capacity to build sufficient power to work on what are often considered "third rail" issues—in other words, issues considered so controversial by mainstream politicians that the very mention of them will start a political war in which few are willing to engage.

Lauren Jacobs of PWF describes a specific situation: "When I was [in Boston] at the union and janitors were striking, we were told by people, 'Do not mention race.' But it was very hard not to—it was blatant. All the people on strike were brown. Most of the people that owned the cleaning companies and certainly all the people in the buildings were white."

When she participated in the Community Labor United's (CLU) 1000 Leaders training with leaders beyond the union and in other sectors, Jacobs saw how attempting to build collective leadership helped prepare leaders to take on the third rail issue of racial inequality directly. Trade unions, community organizations, church leaders, and others came together, and many described how this was the first time they talked openly about race and class with people of other backgrounds. As participants talked, Jacobs realized that "…there had been no conversation in the city that had been interracial or any unpacking of what happened around the violence that exploded when the schools were desegregated [in Boston]—and how much that hung over the whole politics."

Through the trainings, the CLU-Boston cohort built *transformational relationships* that have sustained and shaped governance. Today, leaders who participated in the trainings can be found in political office, at the head of the carpenters' union, at the pastor's pulpit in Black churches and in the chaplain's office at the police department, and in other key positions throughout the city. They hold these positions with a shared perspective on racial inequity and a desire to work together beyond one or two election cycles. That is the power of spending time to discover shared values and to develop a long-term strategy for governance.

Working Partnerships Executive Director Mehrens explains: "People are much more bold when they're not alone. I think it's easier to take on those kinds of hard issues when you are part of a team and you know that folks have your back and that we're being strategic."

Leading with Values

Turning a group of emerging individual leaders into an established coalition of leaders who move collectively *and* in coordination with "outside" movements is, to say the least, challenging. Turning them into a collective body that can *concretely* advance social justice and progressive goals is even more daunting. Often, in the U.S., it is assumed that leaders must somehow "meet in the middle," which often means compromising on the needs of communities of color, immigrants, and other marginalized groups. Public leaders are expected to distance themselves from the values and issues that matter deeply to them and instead engage in horse-trading and deal-cutting. Decision making ends up being more about brokering, maintaining one's power, and advancing up the ranks than creating change to improve peoples' lives.

The 1000 Leaders' VBL and LNW trainings help emerging leaders understand that instead of just meeting "in the middle," in order to further a progressive agenda, they need to meet around and work to drive forward a set of shared values. Centering values, rather than narrow issues or individual aspirations, not only helps leaders stay focused on improving their communities (rather than getting waylaid by political wheeling and dealing), but also provides common ground which progressive electeds can use to cement a long-lasting agenda for governance (cf. Komives and Wagner 2012).

Specifically, VBL emphasizes preparing leaders who are running for office to root themselves in shared values through in-depth exercises and activities. LNW draws from similar exercises to help establish a common ethical and cultural foundation—and from there a shared platform—among leaders in office and social justice, labor, and other community representatives. In both VBL and LNW, the 1000 Leaders curricula help current and future officials anchor themselves in a solid foundation of shared principles so that they can stand against the many forces that try to sway them. How? First, the facilitators generate critical dialogue to establish shared values and vision among a governing coalition's participants and in relationship to constituents. Second, they help participants concretely think through how values can inform a transformational approach to everyday decision-making from the campaign trail to the day-to-day of elected or appointed office. Here, we detail how 1000 Leaders does each, in turn.

CREATE SHARED VALUES AND VISION

Since many training participants are working together for the first time, VBL and LNW trainers focus first and foremost on building a sense of shared vision rooted in a set of jointly-held values. Exploring values requires significant introspection, but also helps participants more closely see the connections among their individual experiences and their overall policy and governance goals (or it encourages them to re-think these goals). These more self-reflective elements of the trainings align with the ways in which some in the movement-building field are taking steps to address personal transformation as part of developing strong movement and political leaders. (For one example, see Ito et al. 2014.)

A word on what we mean by "shared values," as it can be interpreted in many ways: What we are talking about here is not a watered-down version of "American values" that is often promulgated by major political parties. The 1000 Leaders Project trains electeds and their staff and others to recognize where and how to lift up their values, while also concretely thinking about how they can align their aspirations with those of other communities and perspectives. Understanding values, in 1000 Leaders' view, must also include how racial, gender, and other inequities affect policy and how we can make leadership an opportunity to uphold the values (and aspirations) of communities that have been long left out of governing authority.

To draw out and connect participants' values and ultimately develop a shared vision for the region (or state), the 1000 Leaders Project uses the following strategies:

Create an environment where participants can safely explore and articulate their personal values. Opening the conversation on values can be challenging, even for movement builders and organizers. Values can seem intangible and assumed. To help break the ice, 1000 Leaders trainers often begin the first session by asking participants to share an object that represents the ideals that guide their leadership. The goals in the exercise are to help draw out personal values (which can be hard to articulate) and establish a baseline of trust by engaging participants' emotions through storytelling.

To help drive home why values matter and how to use them in leadership roles, VBL and LNW ask participants to provide examples of leaders they admire and leaders they do not. Participants then take a step back to assess why and how they admire certain leaders and to name the virtues they want to emulate. Facilitators help leaders think beyond iconic leaders (e.g., Martin Luther King Jr., Mahatma Gandhi, etc.) by raising examples of local leaders who have brought transformational change on issues like LGBTQ rights, domestic violence, or the criminalization of communities of color. By thinking concretely about other less-recognized local leaders, it helps participants realize that, whether in movements or in governance, what makes or breaks a leader is how they use their values to drive their actions. Looking at prior generations in their own communities, trainees also realize that, despite our common perceptions of politics as merely transactional or wholly corrupt, it is far from naïve to actually put one's ethics and aspirations into practice.

Draw on participants' personal backgrounds and experiences to reveal shared values. To build a bridge between their values and current roles running for and/or being in office, participants map the connections among their background, their experiences, and their goals and objectives in taking up movement and government work. To do this, trainers use the 1000 Leaders' "Me-Tree" exercise, in which participants draw a tree: the roots represent one's childhood and family (however they define this) experiences; the trunk represents early and formative leadership experiences; the branches represent one's guiding values that come out of their past and present; and the fruit represent outcomes they would like to see.

Participants come back to their Me-Trees several times throughout a training series to reflect both on where they come from and where they would like to go as leaders (elected or otherwise)—and how values provide the bridge between their past, present, and future actions.

Use shared values to build bridges across difference. 1000 Leaders trainers point participants to the fact that no leader's "tree" grows alone—rather, they are in a forest. The roots, branches, and fruit of many trees entwine and affect each other. Some hold similar roots: community, family, and leadership experiences that nurtured them. Importantly, participants identify common branches (i.e., values) that inform their leadership goals. At the same time, there might be conflicting branches or fruit (i.e., desired outcomes). Participants often find that many of the differences they identify in the exercise are shaped by intersecting racial and class inequalities, amongst others, and untangling them (to come together on shared values and vision) requires addressing such systems head on.

VBL participant Reverend Marks explains that the Me-Tree exercise was an important means for the developing governing coalition in New Haven to see where disagreement arose and figure out how to build consensus from a place of shared values. Given the cross-sectoral nature of the cohort, participants came from different aspects of movements and communities. As they looked across the trees at the "fruit" (i.e., outcomes) they each wanted, participants saw alignment but also conflict. In discussing these conflicting visions, some saw how a few of their desired outcomes could exclude other communities. These discussions regarding deeply-held values and aspirations even sparked anger and frustration shaped by years of racial (and other) inequalities, which trainers helped participants channel.

As Reverend Marks explains, using the tree, participants realized, "It was more than 'if I like this issue or not'…It is about taking a lot of steps back to see where our activism actually originated from and see how before we get to the issue, how much we have in common." Participants came to realize there were places "[they] had to agree or not agree but also hear others out. Looking at the values represented by the branches, they recognized that they had "more in common to be fighting together for than to be separate on these issues that are sometimes put in place on purpose to block our shared vision."

Facilitate relationship-building based on values beyond issues.
VBL participant Adam Marchand describes how sharing and dialoguing about one's moral, cultural, and ethical motivations not only helped bridge differences but also helped him develop deeper relationships with his fellow VBL cohort members, including Delphine Clyburn. Both Marchand and Clyburn ran together for the New Haven Board of Alders, and both won seats. The relationship-building exercises exposed Marchand to issues he felt he was unaware of prior, and allowed them to develop a shared platform toward a collective vision that cuts across issues.

Specifically, Marchand comes from a predominantly white Protestant church background and Clyburn helps run a predominantly African-American church. The 1000 Leaders training gave Marchand the time "to build that relationship with [Clyburn] and open my heart and my mind and listen, and try to understand our common ground." In this case, they found, it was faith. Marchand was able to connect with Clyburn regarding shared values, and with this, understand the importance of violence prevention to her. Violence had disproportionately impacted Clyburn's Newhallville community, and, based on their shared faith, these leaders put resolving these inequities at the center of their policy platform.

By shifting from an individual orientation to one based on building relationships anchored in shared values, 1000 Leaders not only helps build a sustainable governing coalition, but also strengthens the coalition's ability to fend off the opposition, which most often tries to pick off different members or isolate leaders. The ability of progressive coalition members to remain true to their values under duress is key. In New Haven, Matsumura explains, strong opposition to the kinds of progressive change labor and community allies sought came from the then-mayor, who had served since the 1990s, had concentrated power, and was closely tied to Yale University's political machine. The 2011 VBL training created an environment in which moral clarity and conviction were prized. As Marchand's above sentiment underscores, Clyburn was a role model of values-based constancy, which helped anchor the governing coalition. In this setting, the group was able to see and appreciate Clyburn's vital contribution and leadership, which they might otherwise have missed.[1] The Me-Tree exercise challenged Clyburn to share very difficult parts of her story—modeling introspection and also showing how hard-earned her values are. Her struggle and courage demonstrated in the exercise won her colleagues' enduring respect. The coalition's strength helped shift power away from the mayor and distribute it more collectively.

---

[1] We were in fact never able to find a time to interview Delphine Clyburn for this project because, during the interview period, she was working night and day in her continued role as an employee of a group home, supporting local community movements, and serving in her recently-elected 4th term in office. She was committed to such duties as attending the funeral of a local resident, but we learned much about Clyburn through the praise from her fellow alders, governing coalition members, and 1000 Leaders staff.

TRANSLATE VALUES INTO ACTION

Now that we have explored how 1000 Leaders helps its participants find shared values, we also want to understand how it trains them to translate those values into an actionable form. The training helps participants think about how values guide more than which pieces of legislation they will or will not support—values also inform how they get elected (e.g., who do they accept donations from), how they craft policy (e.g., who is at the table?), and even how to do routine government operations (e.g., how do they ensure strong accountability in government contracts?).

Leadership development practitioners emphasize that *transformational leaders* can mobilize shared values into action. Transformational leadership models, which have been well-researched, hold that values help leaders transcend individual aspirations and take actions grounded in shared purpose and vision (Bass 2015, 1990; Bass and Riggio 2006; Rafferty and Griffin 2004). Transformational leaders often break the confines of existing rules and systems, as they are willing to challenge those paradigms to create larger change. Scholars have concluded that such a model is not simply focused on an individual's charisma, optimism, and confidence, but the capacity of leaders to be self-aware of their own morals, values, and power within the larger social context (Bass 1990; Rafferty and Griffin 2004; Sosik and Megerian 1999). Being transformational requires putting values into practice in ways that serve as a model to others, while helping motivate and empower one's colleagues and employees (Gumusluoglu and Ilsev 2009; Paarlberg and Lavigna 2010; Tekleab et al. 2008). Rather than impose a values-based framework, such leaders build an organization's ethical and professional vision *with* those who follow or work "under" them in any hierarchy (Avolio and Gardner 2005; Carlson and Perrewe 1995; Currie and Lockett 2007; Wright, Moynihan, and Pandey n.d.).

1000 Leaders aims to inculcate participants with the skills of transformational leaders who can listen, learn, and motivate change to improve their communities in ways driven by the shared values and vision. To help do so—as well as to integrate shared values into all aspects of the decision making that comes with elected office—1000 Leaders uses the following strategies:

Distinguish between—and demonstrate the role of values in both—transformational and transactional leadership. The paradigm-shifting, values-driven qualities of transformational leadership at times seem incompatible with holding public office. Research confirms that many leadership theories hit roadblocks in attempting to nurture the aforementioned transformational qualities for positions in government. For example, the dynamic nature of interpersonal relationships, which are the emphasis of many programs, do not work within the siloed structures and processes typical of government bureaucracies (Currie and Lockett 2007; Getha-Taylor et al. 2011; Ingraham and Getha-Taylor 2004; Paarlberg and Lavigna 2010).

Furthermore, sticking to a set of values to guide decision-making can be challenging when an elected official's ability to serve is determined by the will of voters and constituencies who may have conflicting values (Bass and

Steidlmeier 1999; Maak 2007). Because of this, leaders often default to more *transactional* modes of leadership, focused on individualized reciprocal or reward (and punishment) exchanges to achieve discrete goals, and to keep policy and other processes moving forward (Bass and Steidlmeier 1999; Paarlberg and Lavigna 2010).

1000 Leaders trainers spend significant time guiding participants on how to distinguish between *transactional* and *transformational* approaches to leadership. Trainers draw attention to how transformational leadership succeeds when leaders envision and enact change in coordination with and in relation to community, stakeholders, and other non-governmental leaders. It also involves considering how to motivate and empower staff and other elected and non-elected governing positions through shared values, and how to change the processes of governance themselves to make them more transparent and accessible to the public. Across the board, being transformational entails taking steps to increase accountability such as centering voices of and taking direction from communities often excluded from decision making—such as low-income people of color.

To help participants observe the difference between using transactional and transformational approaches, VBL and LNW trainings utilize scenarios like passing an affordable housing bill. Trainers discuss the ways a values-based approach affects both leadership styles. They share the following sample requests for support for the hypothetical housing bill to illustrate what is possible to accomplish with—and what sets apart—each approach:

---

1) Transactional
    a. Values-based: *"Will you support my affordable housing legislation? I will make sure that the affordable housing groups in your disctrict know how important your leadership was on this issue."*
    b. Not values-based: *"Will you support my affordable housing legislation? I need to be able to tout it when I run for mayor. I'll add some language that will make sure that you can keep affordable housing out of your district."*

2) Transformational
    a. Values-based: *"I'm supporting this affordable housing legislation because I believe that our city is strengthened by diversity. The same people who work here should be able to afford to live here."*
    b. Not values-based: *"I'm opposing this affordable housing legislation because I believe in freedom, and that the free market is the best way to provide housing. We don't want to burden our job creators with these costs."*

By using this example, participants realize the role of both transformational and transactional leadership in different contexts, and discuss how they can infuse values into both approaches. Even in the transactional values-based approach, the transaction is not "horse-trading" to secure future individual power, but rather (in the sample case) to build a deeper relationship with local affordable housing groups and advance collective power.

Participants also learn how transformational approaches can be used to undermine shared values and actually impact communities in a negative way. In the sample exercise, a transformational approach (2b) tries to inspire collective action based on conflating the value of "freedom" with the "free market," which is driven by self-interest versus collective and equitable values—or, in short, *progressive* values. As such, it will likely not meet the goals of the community and stakeholders beyond a powerful few.

Share concrete ways to infuse transactional strategies with values.

Social movement experience does not always translate into capacities for transactional leadership, values-based or otherwise. But without adeptness at transactional exchanges, Matsumura explains, leaders find themselves facing two options: 1) change their proposals to make them easier to sell, or 2) back proposals that will never make it through legislation. 1000 Leaders allows leaders to try their hand at transactional exchanges that still prioritize values in order to build skills in this new area.

To do so, trainers point to examples of mundane transactions where a governing official can indeed act in a way that aligns with values they share with communities and movements. Policymakers, for instance, can select the city's maintenance contract in ways that are not just about the lowest bid, but rather that consider the impact on labor standards, environmental and racial justice, and other matters of equity. As Santa Clara County Supervisor Chavez describes, "[We] needed training and [the ability] to understand how to translate [our] values into how potholes get filled and translate your values into what streets are going to get stop signs— [to see] that those things are inextricably linked." In fact, in New Haven, the VBL-trained alders drove a major streets and sidewalks policy initiative by drawing attention to the inequitable distribution of well-maintained roads and walkways among different neighborhoods, advocating for an approach that enshrined racial equity.

Prepare participants for the tough decisions.
Participants also discuss what 1000 Leaders training refers to as a "tipping point" moment, or the moment when a leader knows they are making a decision that may implicate their values. To help further exemplify how various leadership models play out, training sessions sometimes include a simulated "policy battle" where these tipping points arise. Participants debrief afterward about how they felt going through the process and how values-based decision-making and transformational and transactional approaches worked in practice.

Established leaders who serve as mentors in 1000 Leaders share their own stories with program participants, including times when they navigated tipping point moments and were able to live out their values and visions in office. The hope in these scenarios and real-life examples is that emerging leaders see how values are not dogma that a leader applies no matter what, but are principles to guide transformational and transactional actions even in challenging circumstances.

Build a proactive values-based platform. 1000 Leaders also helps prepare participants to take more pro-active approaches to putting their values into action, rather than just waiting for these tipping points to come to them. To do so, as Marchand explains, values-based leadership approaches also build upon the strengths and skills organizers already have—particularly "authentic listening," which involves listening with genuine curiosity to hear every layer of what a person is communicating, with empathy to fully understand their perspective, and with acceptance of how their statement unfolds as they tell it, undirected by the listener's questions or reactions. In the training and eventually in office, that listening is now geared toward learning from each other and a wide range of stakeholders to collectively build a vision for change, which directly informs the platform of ideas and solutions for which the governing coalitions fight.

Utilizing authentic listening and learning how to employ values-driven transformational and transactional leadership informed how Marchand and his cohort approached the electoral process altogether. They worked to set a more transformational vision for the city, he explains, "through our knocking on doors and our engagement with each other." Campaigning leaders' visits with voters, they realized, were not just about individualized transactions—what they could do for one family or another—but about including voters in a bigger vision and movement. It turned out to be a key moment for transformation—to build a platform linking the shared values and interests of candidates, voters, and community partners. When Marchand's cohort swept the Board of Alders elections, they then spent time with their broader governing coalition focusing on how to tangibly (through transactional and transformational approaches) advance their consensus-based platform in ways that kept values at the center.

Leading toward Governing Power

1000 Leaders trainers—and other power-building organizations we interviewed—are realistic about the roadblocks to implementing and sustaining a values-based, collective approach to leadership in the context of public office. Two significant issues in the U.S. complicate such a leadership orientation, and both have to do with power: First, there are entrenched interests that refuse to cede any of their privilege and power; second, the stakeholders and communities who may share leaders' deepest-felt values, like communities of color, immigrants, and more, have been historically shut out of positions of power.

Related to the latter, elected and appointed positions also carry with them technical demands, processes, and policies. This kind of knowledge is vital to translating values into real policy, and to tapping into—and holding onto—the authority that many governing positions hold. But communities of color and other marginalized communities rarely have access to formal policy training. Simultaneously, the knowledge and expertise these communities and leaders have is often discounted in the legislative arena.

Del Rocío describes the conundrum: "Here is a common story: We elect a progressive person of color. They come from movements and we train them on campaign skills, fundraising, engaging voters, doing a stump speech. They do

the work to build their platform with movements." But, del Rocío notes, "The campaign skills are not always translatable to governance." She knows this from her own experience coming from a social movement background then running for and winning a school board position. "There is no warm handoff," del Rocío notes. "Officials need a new toolbox to succeed once in governance, in ways that still keeps them grounded in movements."

To address this, 1000 Leaders, Oregon Futures Lab, and others prepare leaders to shift power for the long term in two important ways: 1) by providing crucial technical knowledge that leaders need to claim the authority of their position, and 2) by helping leaders and governing coalition organizations see themselves as experts and tap into their existing skills as organizers. Both become vital to sustaining power beyond singular policy victories to the kind of multi-year wins that can significantly impact progressive issues. Here, we describe how 1000 Leaders does each.

WIELDING SKILLS WITH AUTHORITY

As discussed in the previous sections, while a collective approach to leadership rooted in values is at the crux of the 1000 Leaders model, emerging leaders also need technical knowledge and skills to navigate government institutions and their processes. In other words, understanding what Santa Clara County Supervisor Chavez calls the "practical-ness" of their job is essential to claiming authority and sustaining shifts in the balance of power.

In this way, 1000 Leaders participants are no different from other kinds of leaders. Leadership development research suggests building technical capacity in a given field is key to a leader's success. Scholars and practitioners in the field argue building technical expertise—for example, software development in an IT management position or teaching pedagogy in a school administration position—can be critical to translating a mission and vision into concrete results. This may sound self-evident, but often leadership development has focused on creating managers or centered solely on "soft skills," regardless of experience in the area of work (Jokinen 2005). Some leadership development research has recognized, though, the importance of equipping leaders with technical expertise related to the profession or industry in which they operate through practices like interdisciplinary training and experiential learning (Jokinen 2005; Leatt and Porter 2002; Lee et al. 2010; Thamhain 2004). Such training becomes vital for elected leaders, given the technocratic, complex nature of the processes in which they have direct authority and influence, like actively writing regulation and legislation, dealing with public contracts, and convening public forums.

1000 Leaders approaches technical skills in the same way it does the other aspects of leadership—with a collective, values-driven approach with a strong emphasis on equity. In fact, research has also shown that more collective models of leadership (like that espoused by 1000 Leaders) can enhance the technical capacity of an organization and allow for those in different roles to share and build upon technical knowledge together (Lee et al. 2010; Thamhain 2004). Existing policy and governance training is by no means oriented in this direction,

"Truly running things—that is, governing—means that the power to win and sustain change is rooted in both outside pressure on democratic institutions—government, labor, congregations, major nonprofits, civic associations—and the authority, influence, and resources of those institutions."

Changing States, USC PERE

and working with stakeholders and communities is often seen as slowing down rather than improving effectiveness. 1000 Leaders bucks this trend without skimping on sharing the in-depth knowledge and skills needed for governance.

LNW, the Budget Fellows program, and other 1000 Leaders programs provide these key skills—and an ability to think about how to wield authority using more collective, values-driven methods—in the following ways:

Policymaking 101. Through the LNW training, 1000 Leaders offers officials the essential tools for moving a policy that matters to a community—i.e., drafting, passing, and implementing concrete solutions through legislative and administrative channels. As part of understanding these processes, trainers offer knowledge of Robert's Rules of Orders and other parliamentary rules and constraints that constrict how elected or appointed leaders can or cannot interact in public and private. For example, in California, all 1000 Leaders training curricula includes an explanation of the Brown Act, which prohibits secretive meetings and workshops on policy and requires disclosure of interactions for public commissions, boards, and councils. Given the emphasis on coalitions and collective action, 1000 Leaders explores the tensions that leaders with movement ties may face, and how to effectively operate within the rules.

Budgeting is another black box to many new and even established leaders; leaders may have direct authority, but they find themselves constrained by the realities of technical processes (and how their opposition manipulates the rules—e.g., government shutdowns). A large segment of 1000 Leaders training curricula is devoted to developing budgeting skills and expertise, and to engaging the community in budgeting processes. In fact, several 1000 Leaders partners, like the Center on Policy Initiatives in San Diego, have hosted the program's standalone trainings on budget processes for both officials and those in "outside" organizations. The 1000 Leaders Budget Fellows Program is led by community and policy leaders with long-term budget experience. They train advocates who have been organizing to secure budgets that serve community needs, and officials and staff who must learn budget policy and strategies.

Understand the role of staff and ways to work with them. In keeping with a coalition-driven, collective approach, 1000 Leaders helps trainees understand themselves as part of a bigger ecosystem of staff and officials who have significant technical authority and knowledge. "Once you are on the inside, you realize some of the people who hold power are the chiefs of staff, the behind-the-scenes policy experts—those are the ones pushing on the electeds to go a certain way," del Rocío explains, "You have to understand how power is wielded in these relationships to disrupt it more effectively."

In some jurisdictions, from the municipal to the state level, electeds do not get their own staff due to underfunding. Therefore, many 1000 Leaders participants must deal with, and can find challenges with, staff hired to and appointed for management/administration—such as the city manager, city attorney, or

director of economic development. There are hundreds of these staff, and doing this work is their full-time job and their professional expertise; by contrast, there may be five or seven elected officials in a city or county jurisdiction who are in some cases doing this as part-time volunteers, often with no public policy experience. At the state level, there are more electeds present, but many still lack dedicated staff, and must work with an even larger number of appointed staff and bureaucracies (see *Changing States* for more on the importance of looking at state-specific administrative and legislative configurations).

While many staff use their experience to help and serve new electeds, sometimes staff see elected officials as micromanaging amateurs whose every move is politically motivated and from whom the stable operations of the jurisdiction must be carefully protected—and, of course, this could very well be based on prior experience. However, this assumption can lead staff to attempt to curb the power of elected officials by misleading them and/or telling them that they cannot do things (e.g., that they are not allowed to put items on meeting agendas). 1000 Leaders helps emerging leaders understand where they have concrete, technical authority in relation to staff and technical processes, or where they may need to blend more organizing-based strategies to have influence. In short, 1000 Leaders helps show participants how to wield skills with authority.

Recognizing the importance of staff inside governing institutions, Vonda McDaniel describes how Stand Up Nashville—a PWF collaborator—has focused on shaping and supporting staff in elected offices. Specifically, Stand Up Nashville organized to get allies appointed to workforce and community economic development staff for the mayor. Though these positions may get "their marching orders," as McDaniel says, from the mayor, they have backgrounds in labor organizing and have strong relationships with Stand Up Nashville. The relationships ended up being key to driving forward the Do Better Bill, which makes deals among the city and corporations for contracts and location incentives more transparent. The city is now required to make the potential costs and benefits more public before making any deal with corporations, and to hold corporations accountable for providing what they claim they will to communities. At time of writing, the processes borne of this bill—and continued engagement on the development issue—resulted in a Community Benefits Agreement as part of building a new Major League Soccer Stadium in Nashville, guaranteeing, among other changes, a $15.50 wage floor and direct hire for all stadium staffing, 20 percent of units at the corresponding housing set aside for affordable housing, and a 4,000 square foot sliding scale payment childcare facility (Elliot 2018).

Expand the team providing policy and other types of expertise.
Beyond staff, 1000 Leaders brings power-building organizations in as part of a team of experts that can help shape policy and other types of decisions. They work with and provide some of the same functions staff would—but with a strong community perspective. Outside partners are critical for a range of roles: conducting research, identifying policy models, drafting and providing language for policy memos, even sharing important perspectives for talking points for behind the dais. Their know-how is especially vital given the context of reduced staffing and even no staffing in many positions, and the fact many officials are part-time volunteers. At the same time, such support helps officials overcome the hurdles related to coming from communities and identities where they have been shut out of access to technical expertise. This, of course, is the governing coalition at work.

As Jimenez explains: "I always tell my team, and I do it myself, that when a topic comes up, we reach out to people. We have conversations. We're open to having conversations and learning about how some of these things impact folks on the ground."

ORGANIZERS, ON THE INSIDE
The 1000 Leaders model and curricula recognize that much of what is critical to progressive change and moving power is neither new nor novel to movement leaders who enter governance. Indeed, through 1000 Leaders, Matsumura notes: "Institutional leadership roles are treated as continuations of the work of grassroots activists, not departures from it." As such, 1000 Leaders trainings emphasize the importance of elected or appointed officials strategically moving power by organizing fellow decision-makers "behind the dais."

Organizing leaders "on the inside" has the same premise as organizing communities on the outside: it is about building a base of people collectively rooted in shared values advancing an intentional strategy to influence and achieve power. Going beyond relationship-building, 1000 Leaders helps prepare leaders to organize from the inside in the following ways:

Bring power into the equation. The VBL and LNW programs use a crucial organizing tool and skillset—power mapping—to help participants strategize about how to move forward their values-based agenda. Together, the group plots out the various interests and relationships—including their own—and the level of power and influence each actor has in the jurisdiction (i.e., city, region, state). The matrix the group creates helps determine who holds influence and therefore who to target with direct actions, media, and other campaign activities to drive their shared platform aimed at redistributing power and wealth.

Power mapping does not mean, as organizers know well, being confined by the existing relationships but being aware of who the players are and, in the case of governance, how to move them to action through both transformational and transactional means. As Santa Clara County Supervisor Chavez explains: "Governance can be achieved via a significant minority of legislators with sufficient capacity and strategic focus to consistently put together a majority."

Power mapping in VBL training is more focused on which elected positions are crucial to win to shift the balance of power, and who or what obstacles stand in the way of getting elected to these positions. In LNW, trainers place the emphasis on putting together a minority that can actively move a platform forward. This requires identifying key allies who align with one's values, who can be moved, and who can (or cannot) move others.

Specifically, LNW participants watch public meetings to see how power relations translate in the actual workings of boards, commissions, councils, and other governing bodies. In one series of trainings in San Jose, participants watched clips from a local school board voting on funding and the city council examining gay marriage. They then analyzed the dynamics among officials and with the public to see how power played out behind the dais.

During the course of training, LNW participants also engage in a power-mapping analysis of their own elected or appointed body. Trainees present a strategy to navigate the power dynamics and get feedback from their cohort and a group of experienced leaders, which results in both the development of comprehensive organizing strategies and the cross-fertilization of knowledge among leaders.

Assess and move power from "behind the dais." Different from community organizing, the "work" of moving politicians to change policy often happens outside of public view. "You can't necessarily operate the same way in public meetings anymore behind the dais (the raised platform elected officials often sit behind in government chambers). It is less about being outspoken, vocal, and performative as it is about listening, securing votes, and negotiating," del Rocío explains, "You have to engage with your colleagues—but to be transformative, you have to do it in a way that is more transparent, engaging, and accountable to communities of color."

Working Partnership's Mehrens further explains: "When you [as an official] start to think like an organizer, you realize that your job is not to brow beat someone into agreeing with you and voting with you. Your job is to actually figure out what their needs are, where they are on your issue and their own issues, and how their success is tied to yours."

Coupled with the training on transactional and transformational leadership, LNW pushes trainees to build and leverage relationships with their colleagues for the sake of advancing a values-based platform. During the LNW trainings, more experienced leaders or 1000 Leaders alumni share how they built relationships that led to significant wins. Participants are also given the opportunity to provide feedback to one another on their relationship-building skills, as it is often hard for one to assess their own capacities in how they interact with others. In the longer LNW trainings that span multiple weeks, participants observe their fellow participants at a public meeting—when they are sitting behind the dais—and then provide feedback on how to improve their interactions with their colleagues, staff, and the public.

Bring historically-excluded communities into decision-making processes. Importantly, 1000 Leaders, Oregon Futures Lab, and others emphasize that organizing behind the dais is necessary but insufficient; they must continue to coordinate and organize with movements. This means branching beyond the existing governing coalition to constituencies they had not previously engaged with. This wider base can help hold progressive elected leaders accountable, sustain their approach to racial and intersectional equity, and expand the depth and breadth of their coalition through their new vantage point from "inside."

For example, as described above, violence prevention was a key issue identified in New Haven during a VBL training. After the newly-elected alders took their positions, Marchand explains, New Haven Rising continued to work on "day-to-day organizing and engagement in neighborhoods." The organization started to work closely with Ice the Beef, a grassroots violence prevention group run by young men of color, and one of whose leaders was killed by gun violence.

Together, the New Haven alders were able to engage with youth in the area and build what Marchand highlights as a "diverse and inclusive group" from different racial, gender, and sexual orientation identifications and educational backgrounds. Some actors brought a more participatory, youth-led research approach to understand the root causes of violence, and the city developed a "call-in" program that worked to help those associated with incidences of violence get counseling, job opportunities, and other supports (Connolly Martell 2016). The coalition was also able to bring in more than $1 million in federal funding to support community-led violence prevention efforts in the Newhallville neighborhood (Community Foundation for Greater New Haven 2015). In line with a values-based approach, the program has centered and drawn from local respected community voices and "moral voices" who can help build bridges and heal conflict (Connolly Martell 2016).

The new cohort of officials was able to regularly engage in public forums and meetings with youth, in part through New Haven Rising, to make them a central part of shaping a violence prevention policy platform—one that has contributed to a marked decrease in shootings and improved conditions for residents (Mack

2018). They were also able to build up what was at that time a nascent street outreach program that focused on peacebuilding among gang-affiliated and other youth, and to move away from other intensive, data-driven policing strategies (Community Foundation for Greater New Haven n.d.).

Negotiate to win. Even with the best power-mapping strategies and the strongest coalition ties, governing coalitions must contend with major power inequities. Because of this reality, 1000 Leaders helps participants turn to their skills as expert negotiators through in-depth scenario and strategy sessions. As PWF's Jacobs explains: "Good negotiation skills really matter…whether it's locally or at the state, [it's] about figuring out how you bring different sectors or perspectives together and have some back and forth and some give and take to figure out how they get past the places where we get stuck."

1000 Leaders has roots in and works closely with the labor movement, which has a wealth of institutional knowledge regarding how to sit with opposition and come out with a deal (i.e., collective bargaining). The trainings provide opportunities for labor partners to share their experiences—as in the aforementioned pension negotiations in the Budget Fellows training—and integrate collective experience from unions throughout the curricula.

1000 Leaders prepares participants to effectively negotiate by giving them the opportunity to discuss the roadblocks they are facing in advancing their agenda and receive coaching on how to break through them. 1000 Leaders again emphasizes collaboration with outside groups to effectively negotiate to win. Through their extensive knowledge and relationships, "outside" groups can map power, build political will, and help identify and persuade the votes needed for passage far beyond a singular legislative cycle.

When the San Jose City Council created a working group to talk about community benefits in regards to a newly-planned development by Google, Jimenez and other councilmembers pushed to include organizations that represent disenfranchised residents, including a nonprofit law firm, faith-based coalitions, and small-business groups. He explains that the VBL training allowed him to think concretely about how his values link to the ways the governance process is done—from initial decision-making to implementation. The training process also helped him to be aware of the power dynamics of working in coalition during tough council debates, including those regarding Google and economic development. By bringing his new technical knowledge to bear, ensuring community was at the table, and working with his Council colleagues and community members to organize and shift certain players "behind the dais," Jimenez worked to elevate key equity issues like displacement and gentrification in council debates regarding projects backed by major economic power brokers in the region.

CASE STUDY:
SANTA CLARA COUNTY LIVING WAGE CAMPAIGN

The wake of the Great Recession might seem like the wrong time to bring up a minimum wage increase—and an area like Silicon Valley, hard hit by the housing crisis and financial slump, the wrong place. But a progressive coalition with its eye on governance, borne of values-driven leadership training via 1000 Leaders and patient base- and relationship-building via allied organizations, knew the conversation could not wait. In the early 2010s, stagnating wages were increasing massive inequality in Silicon Valley, a region where the wealthiest were still reaping tremendous benefits from bailouts and tech booms. A new generation of workers and students were demanding better. Starting from a place where values matter first and foremost, a network of organizations and officials affiliated with 1000 Leaders drew from collective leadership to advance and win a long-term strategy. The results were transformative: the nation's most comprehensive living wage ordinance passed in Santa Clara in 2014, and became a vehicle for ongoing change in the form of the new Silicon Valley Rising campaign.

The seeds of the living wage ordinance were planted in 2011 in San Jose, Santa Clara County's largest city. A multi-racial, working-class group of students from San Jose State University had the idea to raise the minimum wage by ballot measure (Dean 2012). Their professor, Scott Myers-Lipton, a 1000 Leaders alumnus, brought the idea to Working Partnerships, then headed by 1000 Leaders Project co-founder Chavez. After participating in a 1000 Leaders training, Myers-Lipton knew that Working Partnerships and its labor partners could provide the infrastructure and electoral capacity to give wings to the students' vision. Many partners who joined the living wage struggle, like United Way, also trained through 1000 Leaders in the course of the campaign (and would later form the backbone of the county-wide effort).

In 2012, the grassroots effort paid off with a ballot win securing a 25 percent wage jump in the minimum wage and subsequent incremental increase in San Jose. At the time, Chavez noted that the success blended horizontal outreach with vertical institutional structures: "On the horizontal side you have youth and hope… On the vertical front though, there's a level of expertise that [labor] institutions bring with them, along with resources that can't be easily garnered by a horizontal group. It's exciting. In a way, the students are the tip of the spear of the new activism" (Dean 2012).

Indeed, the win was just the beginning of new and innovative organizing. In 2013, Working Partnerships brought together 1000 Leaders alumni and other leaders of unions and community, housing, and racial justice organizations for a summit on how to build on San Jose's momentous minimum wage win. As headlines heralded an economic recovery, the incomes and well-being of workers (overwhelmingly immigrants and people of color) continued to suffer. The tech industry and its large-scale subcontracting of blue-collar jobs was clearly, to residents, organizers, and researchers alike, further bifurcating the economy into two unequal tiers. By subcontracting, workers are often rendered invisible in the wage estimates and statistics regarding direct employment with large tech employers companies; they are often paid much less—and given far less benefits— than those directly employed by the companies in question, and subcontracting companies take a cut of what could have gone to their wages (Benner et al. 2018). Governments like Santa Clara County's were failing to buck the low-wage subcontracting trend. Community groups together with multiple local unions determined collectively at the summit to launch campaigns particularly targeting the issue of subcontracting. They aimed to organize marginalized workers and pass a more comprehensive, county-wide wage ordinance.

The catapult from San Jose to a regional effort to raise the wage in Santa Clara County hinged on the fact that the 1000 Leaders Project had visibly shifted the makeup of power in the region via an ever-expanding governing coalition. Four 1000 Leaders training alumni and faculty now held positions on Santa Clara's Board of Supervisors, including the Living Wage Ordinance co-sponsors, Ken Yeager and Dave Cortese, and Chavez. The supervisors' staff were likewise trained by 1000 Leaders, meaning their research and policy support were infused by a similar set of principles.

To understand the Santa Clara win, we also have to broaden the lens from elected officials to the full governance infrastructure. County-appointed officials and staff must remain strictly neutral on proposed legislation as a matter of policy, but 1000 Leaders alumni among them ensured that deep public engagement from all perspectives informed the living wage ordinance. The alumni led town halls, forums, and public education on residents' economic challenges in the Office of Human Relations, the Commission on the Status of Women, and the Human Relations Commission (which authored a crucial report on the town halls).

But, as noted throughout our study, a governing coalition is not just on the "inside." 1000 Leaders alumni, faculty, and hosts at the front lines of racial justice

and labor organizations drove the Santa Clara wage campaign, including the South Bay Labor Council, SEIU 521, the NAACP, Latinos United for a New America (LUNA), and the Evergreen Teachers Association. Helming the effort at Working Partnerships was a director who had worked frequently with and even trained leaders across the inside and outside in the region via the 1000 Leaders Project.

In other jurisdictions, the fight for a wage increase was being stalled by nonprofits who said they could not comply financially. This was especially a risk in Santa Clara, as the focus of the wage ordinance was on government subcontractors, many of whom were nonprofits. But organizers had cemented a foundation for labor-community organization dialogue (and, eventually, collaboration) during the prior San Jose wage campaign. 1000 Leaders alumni on the board of the Silicon Valley Council of Nonprofits brought the influential body to publicly support the wage increase. On the "inside," 1000 Leaders alumni appointed in the Office of Women's Policy led employer engagement meetings, essential to making sure that the voices of nonprofits, among others, were heard loud and clear.

The results of this collective leadership effort were groundbreaking: Though over 120 local governments already had living wage policies on the books, none went so far as what Santa Clara County passed in 2014 in terms of a package of worker protections and guarantees. The venue was significant as well; today, the County of Santa Clara is Silicon Valley's largest employer and boasts a budget of nearly $7 billion, the third largest county budget in California. The living wage policy immediately covered an estimated 22,000 workers—including those directly employed by the county and those hired through county contracts—and included a guaranteed wage now of $21.73/22.98 in 2018 with Cost of Living Adjustment, earned sick leave, incentives for employer-paid health coverage and retirement, a voice at work, and equal access to these jobs with these benefits for local, disadvantaged, and formerly incarcerated workers. In addition, it was the second fair scheduling policy in the country, following San Francisco by a few weeks.

The wins energized a new labor-progressive governing coalition still reeling from the defensive fights of the Great Recession to envision proactive change through the Silicon Valley Rising (SVR) campaign, which launched officially in 2015. As some leaders moved forward the living wage effort taking on government subcontracting, another subset began to attack the issue in the tech sector—including 1000 Leaders alumni, faculty, and host committee members at UNITE HERE Local 19, Teamsters Joint Council 7, SEIU United Service Workers-West, LUNA, and the Affordable Housing Network. The SVR campaign has since supported more than 5,500 subcontracted service workers to win a voice at work and higher wages, benefits, and job security at major tech companies across the Valley. SVR continues to make companies including Google, Facebook, and Apple come to the negotiating table regarding the wellbeing of subcontracted workers and their families and communities. Workers and their advocates in these conversations—supported by leaders who share their values and collective approach throughout elected and appointed positions—have been emboldened to demand better from tech giants, knowing that the County of Santa Clara, a giant in its own right, had proved that higher standards are possible.

STRENGTHENING THE FIELD: RECOMMENDATIONS

In this last section, we offer a set of recommendations based on our interviews and research on how to advance a model of leadership toward progressive governance. The 1000 Leaders Project and other programs like the Oregon Futures Lab provide such models, demonstrating what a collective and values-based leadership approach can look like in practice. To strengthen this work, we offer the following recommendations to funders and the field, each of which builds upon the model training programs to achieve progressive governance in regions across the country. At this particular junction, such investments and acceleration can be vital to expanding the progressive insurgency redefining today's political landscape.

INVEST IN ALUMNI NETWORKS

Since its inception, 1000 Leaders affiliates have trained 85 cohorts nationally. With a growing base of alumni in 16 cities, 1000 Leaders has engaged alumni in the following ways:

- As recruiters: 1000 Leaders alumni bring new members into the ranks to develop the next generation of leaders; some also participate in the process of selecting cohorts.

- As trainers: Alumni play key roles in training future leaders; they participate and lead workshop modules for both the LNW and VBL trainings.

- As elected, appointed, and community/labor leaders: Alumni stay involved as part of enacting campaigns and advancing movement-driven change while in office. Appointed leaders and staff also approach their work, as documented in the case studies, through a movement lens and help bring marginalized communities to the decision-making table.

As noted above, alumni also develop strong ties as a governing coalition that allows them to collectively redistribute power within decision-making processes at a city or regional level. But, this work takes time and patience and needs to be able to outlast electoral cycles to be effective. To build on this approach, 1000 Leaders and similar programs could form an alumni organizing committee that builds power across governing coalitions and keeps leaders engaged in strengthening progressive leadership across cycles.

At the most basic level, such an alumni committee could help staff at programs like 1000 Leaders to mobilize alumni more quickly for opportunities like training other leaders (given their important role in workshops) and speaking engagements. Further, cohorts could share experiences with others across the nation in a more sustained way. Alumni could build a shared sense of identity across programs. Strengthened alumni structures could also be part and parcel of spreading the best practices that 1000 Leaders and its affiliates have developed across organizations, as well as allow new linkages to build among different organizations that are working in parallel—like the Oregon Futures Lab and Stand Up Nashville.

An alumni committee could also build a base of power by organizing across different cohorts in the same regions and states. Over time, alumni and their bases and governing coalitions could establish enough influence within traditional progressive power-brokering institutions, such as political parties or labor unions, to secure and scale up a progressive governing agenda. Indeed, leadership development is about continuing to empower members to take action on the issues that matter to them and to give them ownership over their organization (Fletcher and Hurd 1998; Milkman and Voss 2004).

Silicon Valley Rising's policy victories around living wages came out of 1000 Leaders cohort trainings, and it was ultimately the efforts of alumni that carried out the long-term struggle to advance ever-more expansive wins in these areas. With investment in an alumni structure, so too could 1000 Leaders and other model programs have a space to share the knowledge and sustain the energy necessary for ever-broadening wins and long-term shifts in governing power.

SUPPORT ON-GOING POLICY AND STRATEGY TRAINING AND DIALOGUE

One of 1000 Leaders' key contributions to the current leadership development field is its ability to provide technical policy knowledge through a collectively-oriented, power-building, and equity lens. As noted in the living wage case study, training and on-going activities among a governing coalition offer opportunities to crystallize new campaigns and activate electeds, appointed officials, staff, and organizations.

Diversifying the format and making more frequent policy education available can help increase the impact of this work. The knowledge can be delivered through half-day trainings, community teach-ins, multi-day intensive workshops, and one-on-one mentorship.

1000 Leaders and similar organizations could increase trainings that use presentations, discussion, and exercises to give organizers, alumni, and key allies expert-level insights into policy issues on which people are campaigning—or would like to take up—together. New trainings could also include broader-level questions, like addressing racial equity or incorporating indigenous communities. Aligning with the collective leadership model, policy-oriented conversations among movements should lift up the often-unheard perspectives of affected communities on a larger scale.

In line with the emphasis on building shared platforms for action, leaders and movements can together create dialogue, develop solutions, and take action for issues that arise beyond the scope of the core trainings. Here are examples of how Working Partnerships is already starting to do this:

- **Budget 101:** This training gives stakeholders from grassroots to grasstops an insider's understanding of local government budgets, and helps move them from fighting each other for resources to creative, collaborative problem solving.

- **Land use training:** This training aims to inform participants about a daunting topic that lies at the heart of local government's power: land use. It explains the way that this policy area sits at the nexus of issues such as budget, health, environment, and job quality and reviews the decision-making process step by step, examining levers for public accountability.

- **Privatization training:** This training comes in two modules: a role-play and a half-day workshop for elected officials. Each emphasizes the impacts of privatization on diverse stakeholders, its connection to values about government and justice, and the importance of asking bold and critical questions in its wake.

Training opportunities could also further develop leaders' tactical and strategic skills. While VBL and LNW do important work providing key scenarios where leaders put their knowledge into practice, many thorny issues of strategy and tactics arise while leaders are out "in the field." With a robust alumni network also in place, leaders could continue to troubleshoot and learn from the experiences of other leaders in a workshop setting, and could continue observing how strategies like negotiation work in practice.

PROVIDE HOLISTIC SUPPORTS FOR LEADERS FROM MARGINALIZED COMMUNITIES

Values-based leadership, as we have discussed, helps shift the emphasis in leadership to moral clarity, vision, and shared struggle. Such work is, as many interviewees noted, emotionally draining and takes a heavy toll on individuals. 1000 Leaders alumni may be the first leaders of color or women in elected office, for instance, in a region; as such, they are often asked to step out in front and advocate for the toughest issues. And often, they must do so while raising families, taking care of extended family, and dealing with their own economic struggles. Furthermore, they have to juggle these competing personal demands all while on the campaign trail or in office.

"There is this misperception of what being an 'elected official' is—that they're rich, well-resourced, have access to abundant social capital," del Rocío recounts. "That may be true for the TV shows, but for the vast majority of our elected officials here in Oregon—where there is a citizen legislature that does not pay its members a living wage—there is little to no compensation and instead of abundant social capital, there is abundant

isolation and alienation. They are putting themselves forward to serve their community for no monetary payback, and worse, not enough structured training and support, creating sky-high risk of burnout and attrition."

Even further, Rocío recounts, many leaders of color "share the experience and nuances of building power in mostly white-dominated, KKK-founded Oregon." This looks like "explicit racism, death threats, micro-aggressions." The traditional political party caucuses or bureaucratic mechanisms, which have often been built with independently wealthy candidates in mind, are not places where leaders feel safe sharing these deeply-jarring interpersonal burdens.

Part of the work, then, of sustaining leadership requires attention to the emotional and spiritual needs of officials at the front lines. Toward this end, Oregon Futures Lab has developed a pilot program, the Healing Leaders Project that links elected and appointed leaders with counselors, culturally-specific healers, and more. Del Rocío compares the current state of politics to an "ER" with movement-elected leaders in the role of triaging significant issues. "Our leaders fighting on the trickle-down of Trump and other conservative leadership, especially in a state like Oregon are fading quick. They need to think about how to both drive policy and…community care. By caring for and sustaining themselves, they ensure that they can work in a way that reflects genuine care." With the right resourcing, the Healing Leaders Project offers a potential model to provide the kind of invisible, often "feminized" labor, in del Rocío's words, that undergirds the policy work.

SUPPORT LONG-TERM LEADERSHIP LADDERS AND LATTICES

As 1000 Leaders participant and San Jose Councilmember Jimenez notes, "I didn't necessarily get put in a pipeline, so to speak, when I was a little younger, and, so, what I try to do is really mentor and open up the doors to folks, whether it be hiring them in my office or lending mentorship or other such things through the 1000 Leaders Project and other networks." To Jimenez, engagement with future leaders and mentorship is a critical element to building "long-term power." He notes, "I think it's incumbent upon me and many of the other folks in these type of leadership roles to really build up the future generation." To codify this kind of work, 1000 Leaders and other model programs could build more sustained leadership ladders and lattices, particularly that help inspire and raise up young leaders and place them on leadership tracks from an early stage.

In recent years, 1000 Leaders has provided training to organizations at their request, and the approach has been a more mobile, technical assistance model. Building on the lessons of this approach, 1000 Leaders, affiliates, and related organizations could develop more intentional, long-term, place-based relationships with organizing groups working with young leaders and in communities of color, immigrant, indigenous, LGBTQ communities—and more. Some of the elements noted throughout this report can be integrated into smaller-scale, newer leadership development work in organizations, and these organizations can also provide important input on how to continue to develop this leadership model in innovative ways that meet community needs.

Such sustained relationships among youth-centered organizations could provide more ongoing opportunities for existing leaders to get to know and motivate potential future leaders—and also feed into a virtuous cycle that makes leadership feel more in reach. In this scenario, youth participants have a chance to interact with elected and appointed leaders and can start seeing themselves in these roles. As Jimenez says, it is necessary to "build those relationships and build that sort of infrastructure of mentorship for some of those younger folks coming up."

SHORE UP ELECTORAL AND LEGISLATIVE CAPACITIES OF ORGANIZATIONS

One of the major roadblocks in developing the strength to shift electoral and legislative power are the limits imposed upon the legal status of movement organizations as 501(c)(3) organizations. Labor unions, as specially designated 501(c)(5) organizations, do not have the same limits. As such, unions have built unique strength in the political field and have been foundational to the formation of many of the regional coalitions noted in this report (Boeve and Brune 2018). Numerous regional governing coalitions noted in this report eventually built 501(c)(4) entities to expand their capacities in the electoral and legislative arenas.

As Reverend Marks noted, even before members chose to run for office, the 501(c)(4) status of New Haven Rising was an important addition to the local movement's ability to build power. "With the (c)(4), basically, we could go beyond voter registration projects we had done in the past; we had a way to hold the elected officials accountable because we had the 501(c)(4) we could endorse and bring people in and do that work. Then it also opened the opportunity for the most important work, for us to be training and developing leaders as we move forward." Linked with Connecticut Center for a New Economy as a regional hub, and continuing to build with individual organizations that persisted in their own community-based initiatives, they had the essential building blocks of a governing coalition—or, what Marks calls, a "power network."

Moving forward, it will be important to understand how different organizations that want to resource movements—including progressive businesses and donors—can best be mobilized to support (c)(3), (c)(4) and (c)(5) entities (especially with labor under threat in light of the Supreme Court's *Janus* decision) (Rushe 2018). Oregon Futures Lab's partnership with the c(4) ColorPAC, or similarly Oakland Rising and the c(4) Oakland Rising Action, provide models of how to link the entities doing the training and direct leader-preparation work. There are numerous configurations, but it will be important to continue to collect best practices and help different regional and state movements determine what will work best for them—and how to resource these different entities appropriately.

BUILD FROM LOCAL AND REGIONAL TO STATE-LEVEL IMPACT

As 1000 Leaders builds more alumni networks, holistic supports, and long-term leadership pipelines, there is an opportunity to leverage the ladders and lattices across regions to toward state-level governance. Scholars and organizers alike have noted the need to move organizing toward the working-class and poorer suburbs where low-income people are starting to move as urban cores have become increasingly expensive and gentrified (Kneebone and Berube 2013; Benner and Pastor 2011). Indeed, many of the organizations in this report are already starting to bridge urban and suburban organizing by linking leaders. As they build power in previously-untapped bases, 1000 Leaders affiliates have the opportunity to shift state elections and advance a values-based, collectively-driven platform at a greater scale.

As programs like 1000 Leaders looks to apply their models to state-level change, there are several examples to draw from. One is the Oregon Futures Lab, whose work with leaders of color and movement organizations attempts to shift a range of local, regional, and even some statewide elections. Given their similar contexts of having liberal city bases, changing rural demographics, and entrenched conservative elements, Oregon Futures Lab has also partnered in the past with Washington state-based Amplify to share strategies and cross-state visions for the Pacific Northwest. Another program to look to is the Mississippi Black Leadership Institute (MBLI), housed within One Voice, which brings together young organizers, academics, business leaders, and others to prepare them for leadership in public positions. While the work of 1000 Leaders is locally focused, efforts in Oregon, Mississippi, and elsewhere could provide guidance in leveraging regional governing coalitions—and building connections across them—to have state-level impact.

CONCLUSION

The success and persistence of movement-rooted political action raises the potential to change who is in government as well as how they improve people's lives over the long term. In the wake of rising racism, inequality, and nativism, it may be seemingly impossible to think past the daily fight against the threats and attacks on our most vulnerable communities. But despite the odds, from Portland to Nashville, we are seeing new leaders backed by grassroots movements on the rise. With an intentional and strategic effort to harness this energy and train and support freshly-elected and appointed leaders, we can take the progressive insurgency from a hopeful news story in 2018 to the fundamental narrative defining the U.S. for generations to come.

To be effective, organizing and leadership development (and models that marry both, like 1000 Leaders) must be able to work in a wide range of conditions. In a place as diverse as the United States, no one size fits all. Its success in multiple regions with very different politics and histories shows that the 1000 Leaders model is nimble enough to adapt to local conditions. As 1000 Leaders co-founder and Santa Clara County Supervisor Chavez notes, "I think that Working Partnerships, in collaboration with other great organizations like PWF and others…have a model that really anybody can take as a starting kit." Referencing the Silicon Valley technology ethos, she humorously refers to the model as a "'plug-in platform' for people to do what's best for their community, and it could look a million different ways."

The crux of 1000 Leaders' mobile model lies in building and sustaining a values-based platform, driven forward by a collective approach and through developing skills and knowledge to achieve and advance long-term governing power. The 1000 Leaders model shows us that "outside" organizing is just as important as—if not more important than—developing "inside" leadership cohorts because, ultimately, outside groups hold governing institutions accountable. Indeed, social movement organizations provide an institutional home for a values-based platform and for inside-outside relationships to flourish beyond any singular legislative cycle. Organizations like Silicon Valley Rising, Stand Up Nashville, and the Oregon Futures Lab are providing spaces for movements to learn, grow, and expand their influence alongside the leaders they help elect. These organizations have already started to sweep elections in ways that never seemed possible—and from there, as our case study and examples suggest, to drive ahead with agendas that have concretely improved wages, job prospects, community safety, and other issues that matter to long-ignored communities.

As our recommendations suggest, much work lies ahead to take the existing networks and shore up more permanent infrastructures—in terms of alumni networks, mentoring, variegated legal structures, but also in terms of deeper

emotional supports to help those on the front lines last long in the face of racial bigotry and violence. As Matsumura notes, long-term structures of leadership development and organizing are key elements to concretely see "how [leaders'] organized power becomes greater than the sum of its parts." At the same time, it will also be important to look to the next frontier of power building—linking up existing regional governing coalitions, and, like in Mississippi and Oregon, strategizing around broader-scale change, such as at the state level.

Of course, much of this is uncharted territory. Movements, funders, donors, unions, and many more actors will be asked to take risks and have faith in each other in ways they may hesitate to, especially in today's volatile political environment. For leaders taking their first seat at the dais, it may feel even more perilous. The fact is, no matter how much training leaders get, the rubber must eventually meet the road. That road can be bumpy, especially when one is pioneering a path toward progressive governance that does not rely on a single charismatic leader who holds all the power. And it is especially challenging in a context where racism, nativism, and misogyny have not only risen to the national stage—but have long permeated movement spaces and fueled tensions among progressives as well.

1000 Leaders and similar programs, as well as emerging groups like Oregon Futures Lab, are demonstrating that *who, why,* and *how* people are trained to take up leadership are key to ensure that progressive governance goes from being a great idea to a real and, at times, necessarily messy process. Redefining leadership development as movement building, these organizations are helping leaders see themselves as capable of participating in progressive governance from a collective and values-based perspective, addressing racial and gender inequities in the way governance works, and spearheading platforms that can shift even the most "third rail" of issues. They are helping us see, as del Rocío explains, that "election nights aren't the finish line; they are the starting post to redefining how policymaking works and to making it work for communities."

As this report goes to press, many are looking with hope to the freshly-elected, mostly women of color leaders to advance revolutionary platforms in regards to abolishing ICE, socializing healthcare, and other long-needed changes. We can garner even greater hope if we not only look up to them, but look around to the movements that they are anchored in and that brought them to power in the first place. As we widen the lens, we can capture the true essentials of leadership development for progressive governance: the strength borne of collective and coordinated action, the clarity and compass provided by deeply-shared values, and the wisdom offered by grassroots experts and communities. The more we train current and future elected and appointed leaders with these critical components at the forefront, the more we can assure that the wave of electoral victories today transforms into a vast ocean of progressive policies and new leaders tomorrow.

INTERVIEWEES

Cindy Chavez, *Santa Clara County Supervisor, District 2*

Abby Feldman, *New Haven Rising*

Nikki Fortunato Bas, *City Councilmember-elect, Oakland, District 2*

Lauren Jacobs, *Executive Director, Partnership for Working Families*

Sergio Jimenez, *City Councilmember, San Jose, District 2*

Adam Marchand, *New Haven Alder, Ward 25*

Rev. Scott Marks, *Co-Founder, Connecticut Center for a New Economy (CCNE)*

Elly Matsumura, *California Director, Partnership for Working Families
(former Managing Director, Working Partnerships USA)*

Vonda McDaniel, *Stand Up Nashville; President; Central Labor Council of Nashville
and Middle Tennessee*

Derecka Mehrens, *Executive Director, Working Partnerships USA*

Ana del Rocío, *Director, Oregon Futures Project*

REFERENCES

Angelle, Pamela S. 2010. "An Organizational Perspective of Distributed Leadership: A Portrait of a Middle School." *RMLE Online* 33(5):1–16.

Avolio, Bruce J. and William L. Gardner. 2005. "Authentic Leadership Development: Getting to the Root of Positive Forms of Leadership." *The Leadership Quarterly* 16(3):315–38.

Bass, Bernard M. 1990. "From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to Share the Vision." *Organizational Dynamics* 18(3): 19–31.

Bass, Bernard M. and Ronald E. Riggio. 2006. *Transformational Leadership.* New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Bass, Bernard M. and Paul Steidlmeier. 1999. "Ethics, Character, and Authentic Transformational Leadership Behavior." *The Leadership Quarterly* 10(2):181–217.

Bass, Paul. 2015. "Yale Promises To Hire More New Haveners." *New Haven Independent.* (https://www.newhavenindependent.org/index.php/archives/entry/yale_promises_to_hire_more_new_haveners/).

Benner, Chris, Gabriela Guista et al. 2018. *Still Walking the Lifelong Tightrope: Technology, Insecurity and the Future of Work.* UC Santa Cruz, Everett Program.

Benner, Chris and Manuel Pastor. 2011. "Moving On Up? Regions, Megaregions, and the Changing Geography of Social Equity Organizing." *Urban Affairs Review* 47(3):315–48.

Boeve, May and Michael Brune. 2018. "If US Unions Tumble, the Progressive Movement Could Go with Them." *The Guardian.* (https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/mar/02/public-unions-progressive-movement-janus).

Bolden, Richard. 2011. "Distributed Leadership in Organizations: A Review of Theory and Research." *International Journal of Management Reviews* 13(3):251–69.

Brown, Kathleen M. 2004. "Leadership for Social Justice and Equity: Weaving a Transformative Framework and Pedagogy." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 40(1):77–108.

Carlson, Dawn S. and Pamela L. Perrewe. 1995. "Institutionalization of Organizational Ethics through Transformational Leadership." *Journal of Business Ethics* 14(10):829–38.

Community Foundation for Greater New Haven. 2015. "End Youth Violence." Retrieved December 5, 2018 (https://www.cfgnh.org/About/NewsEvents/ViewArticle/tabid/96/ArticleId/101/End-Youth-Violence.aspx).

Community Foundation for Greater New Haven. n.d. "Street Outreach Workers Build Trust." Retrieved December 5, 2018 (https://www.cfgnh.org/About/NewsEvents/ViewArticle/tabid/96/ArticleId/72/Street-Outreach-Workers-Build-Trust.aspx).

Conniff, Ruth. 2018. "The Blue Wave Keeps Rolling On." *The Progressive.* Retrieved November 20, 2018 (https://progressive.org/api/content/1c20e140-e83d-11e8-b357-120e7ad5cf50/).

Connolly Martell, Bess. 2016. "New Haven's Project Longevity Shows Promise in Reducing Violent Crime in the City." *YaleNews.* Retrieved December 5, 2018(https://news.yale.edu/2016/04/21/new-haven-s-project-longevity-shows-promise-reducing-violent-crime-city).

Currie, Graeme and Andy Lockett. 2007. "A Critique of Transformational Leadership: Moral, Professional and Contingent Dimensions of Leadership within Public Services Organizations." *Human Relations* 60(2):341–70.

Dean, Amy. 2012 "Student Activism as the Tip of the Spear: Raising the Minimum Wage in San Jose." The Nation. (https://www.thenation.com/article/student-activism-tip-spear-raising-minimum-wage-san-jose/).

Dean, Amy. 1996. "Working Partnership USA: The Latest Initiative for a Council On the Cutting Edge." *Labor Research Review* 1(24): 43–48.

Elliot, Stephen. 2018. "MLS team, community group signs benefit agreement." *Nashville Post.* (https://www.nashvillepost.com/politics/metro-government/article/21020665/mls-team-community-group-sign-benefits-agreement).

Fletcher, Bill and Richard Hurd. 1998. "Beyond the Organizing Model: The Transformation Process in Local Unions." Pp. 37–53 in *Organizing to win: New research on union strategies,* edited by K. Bronfenbrenner, S. Friedman, R. W. Hurd, R. A. Oswald, and R. L. Seeber. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

Ganz, Marshall, Shea Sinnott, and Peter Gibbs. 2014. *Organizing: People, Power, Change.* Leading Change Network and the New Organizing Institute.

Getha-Taylor, Heather, Maja Husar Holmes, Willow S. Jacobson, Ricardo S. Morse, and Jessica E. Sowa. 2011. "Focusing the Public Leadership Lens: Research Propositions and Questions in the Minnowbrook Tradition." J*ournal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21(suppl 1):i83–i97.

Gumusluoglu, Lale and Arzu Ilsev. 2009. "Transformational Leadership, Creativity, and Organizational Innovation." *Journal of Business Research* 62(4):461–73.

Harris, Alma. 2009. "Distributed Leadership: What We Know." Pp. 11–21 in *Distributed Leadership, Studies in Educational Leadership.* Springer, Dordrecht.

Ingraham, Patricia Wallace and Heather Getha-Taylor. 2004. "Leadership in the Public Sector Models and Assumptions for Leadership Development in the Federal Government." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 24(2):95–112.

Ito, Jennifer, Rachel Rosner, Vanessa Carter, and Manuel Pastor. 2014. *Transforming Lives, Transforming Movement Building: Lessons from the National Domestic Workers Alliance Strategy - Organizing - Leadership (SOL) Initiative.* University of Southern California, Program for Environmental and Regional Equity.

Jokinen, Tiina. 2005. "Global Leadership Competencies: A Review and Discussion." *Journal of European Industrial Training* 29(3):199–216.

Kampf-Lassin, Miles. 2018. "Democrats Won the House. To Keep Winning, They Need to Move Sharply Left." *In These Times.* Retrieved November 20, 2018 (http://inthesetimes.com/article/21561/democrats-midterms-house-socialist-blue-wave-2018-bernie-sanders-congress).

Klein, Jennifer. 2015. "New Haven Rising." *Dissent Magazine.* Retrieved May 9, 2018 (https://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/new-haven-rising).

Kneebone, Elizabeth and Alan Berube. 2013. *Confronting Suburban Poverty in America.* Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Komives, Susan R. and Wendy Wagner. 2012. *Leadership for a Better World: Understanding the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.* John Wiley & Sons.

Leatt, P. and J. Porter. 2002. "Where Are the Healthcare Leaders" the Need for Investment in Leadership Development." *HealthcarePapers* 4(1):14–31.

Lee, Pauline, Nicole Gillespie, Leon Mann, and Alexander Wearing. 2010. "Leadership and Trust: Their Effect on Knowledge Sharing and Team Performance." *Management Learning* 41(4):473–91.

Maak, Thomas. 2007. "Responsible Leadership, Stakeholder Engagement, and the Emergence of Social Capital." *Journal of Business Ethics* 74(4):329–43.

Mack, Lori. 2018. "First New Haven Homicide In 2018 After City's Record Low Murder Number." *Connecticut Public Radio.* Retrieved December 5, 2018 (http://www.wnpr.org/post/first- new-haven-homicide-2018-after-citys-record-low-murder-number).

McBain, Sophie. 2018. "The 'Blue Wave' Has Left Congress and US Politics More Diverse than It Has Ever Been." *New Statesman America.* Retrieved November 20, 2018 (https://www.newstatesman.com/world/north-america/2018/11/blue-wave-has-left-congress-and-us-politics-more-diverse-it-has-ever)

Milkman, Ruth and Kim Voss, eds. 2004. *Rebuilding Labor: Organizing and Organizers in the New Union Movement.* First ed. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Osula, Bramwell and Eddie C. W. Ng. 2014. "Toward a Collaborative, Transformative Model of Non-Profit Leadership: Some Conceptual Building Blocks." *Administrative Sciences* 4(2):87–104.

Paarlberg, Laurie E. and Bob Lavigna. 2010. "Transformational Leadership and Public Service Motivation: Driving Individual and Organizational Performance." *Public Administration Review* 70(5):710–18.

Pastor, Manuel, Chris Benner, and Martha Matsuoka. 2009. *This Could Be the Start of Something Big: How Social Movements for Regional Equity Are Reshaping Metropolitan America.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Pastor, Manuel, Jennifer Ito, and Madeline Wander. 2016. *Changing States: A Framework for Progressive Governance.* Los Angeles, CA: USC Program for Environmental and Regional Equity.

Pearce, Craig L. and Jay A. Conger. 2002. *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership.* New York: SAGE.

Rafferty, Alannah E. and Mark A. Griffin. 2004. "Dimensions of Transformational Leadership: Conceptual and Empirical Extensions." *The Leadership Quarterly* 15(3):329–54.

Rushe, Dominic. 2018. "Supreme Court Strikes Blow against Unions with 'fair Share' Ruling." *The Guardian.* (https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2018/jun/27/supreme-court-unions-fair-share-ruling).

Sennott, Adam. 2018. "An Offshoot of the 2016 Sanders Campaign Supports Candidates Nationwide." *Street Sense Media.* Retrieved November 20, 2018 (https://www.streetsensemedia.org/article/an-offshoot-of-the-2016-sanders-campaign-supports-candidates-nationwide/).

Sosik, John J. and Lara E. Megerian. 1999. "Understanding Leader Emotional Intelligence and Performance: The Role of Self-Other Agreement on Transformational Leadership Perceptions." *Group & Organization Management* 24(3):367–90.

Spillane, James P. 2005. "Distributed Leadership." *The Educational Forum* 69(2):143–50.

Tekleab, Amanuel G., Henry P. Sims, Seokhwa Yun, Paul E. Tesluk, and Jonathan Cox. 2008. "Are We On the Same Page? Effects of Self-Awareness of Empowering and Transformational Leadership." *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies* 14(3):185–201.

Thamhain, Hans J. 2004. "Linkages of Project Environment to Performance: Lessons for Team Leadership." *International Journal of Project Management* 22(7):533–44.

Way, Jamie. 2016. "Cultivating Leaders in Silicon Valley and Across the Nation." *Partnership for Working Families.* (http://www.forworkingfamilies.org/blog/cultivating-leaders-silicon-valley-and-across-nation).

Wright, Bradley E., Donald P. Moynihan, and Sanjay K. Pandey. n.d. "Pulling the Levers: Transformational Leadership, Public Service Motivation, and Mission Valence." *Public Administration Review* 72(2):206–15.

IMAGE CREDITS

Unless otherwise noted, images used in this report belong to their respective owners and are used with permission and all rights are reserved by their respective owners.

The images are courtesy of the following:

Pg. 4   Working Partnerships USA

Pg. 10   Nikki Fortunato Bas

Pg. 11   Oregon Futures Lab

Pg. 17   Working Partnerships USA

Pg. 20   New Haven Rising

Pg. 24   Working Partnerships USA

Pg. 25   Working Partnerships USA

Pg. 26   Working Partnerships USA

Pg. 27   Working Partnerships USA

Pg. 33   Working Partnerships USA

Pg. 34   Working Partnerships USA

Pg. 35   Working Partnerships USA

Pg. 37   New Haven Rising

Pg. 38   Silicon Valley Rising

Pg. 42   Working Partnerships USA

Pg. 43   Oregon Futures Lab

Pg. 45   Silicon Valley Rising

Pg. 48   Oregon Futures Lab

1000 LEADERS (AND MORE) RISING

DEVELOPING A NEW GENERATION FOR PROGRESSIVE GOVERNANCE

BY ROBERT CHLALA, MADELINE WANDER, JENNIFER ITO, AND MANUEL PASTOR
JANUARY 2019

PROGRAM FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND REGIONAL EQUITY (PERE)
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
DORNSIFE COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS AND SCIENCES

950 W. JEFFERSON BLVD., JEF 102
LOS ANGELES, CA 90089-1291
PHONE: (213) 740-3643
EMAIL: PERE@DORNSIFE.USC.EDU
WEB: HTTP://DORNSIFE.USC.EDU/PERE

USC
Dornsife

*Program for
Environmental and
Regional Equity*