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Over the course of the BHC initiative, TCE has invested significantly in building community power to advance health equity through partnership with state and local organizations and alliances in the 14 BHC communities.

As TCE’s understanding of power building evolved, so did BHC’s strategy – the “pivot to power” represented an important shift in efforts and resulted in significant investment in organizing & base building.

This work resulted in numerous accomplishments – over 1,500 policy, systems, and physical changes that cut across BHC communities and built momentum for further changes across BHC Sites and statewide efforts.

The power ecosystem consists of deep and multifaceted partnerships with lots of potential to continue to build power. BHC investments were critical to building partners’ capacity for power building, a lesson to carry forward.

These learnings are grounded in BHC’s Theory of Change.
In the BHC Theory of Change, Power is a **Strategy**, an **Outcome**, and a **Mediator** of Desired **Outcomes**.

### Power as a Strategy for Systems Transformation

**What did TCE invest in power building?**
- Analyzed & coded >10k grant descriptions.
- Mapped >8k BHC grants to the Power Flower.

**What did it look like “on the ground”?**
- Analyzed over 70 BHC partner-produced documents to summarize the work in communities.
- Launched CA Network Project to map organizational connections.

### Power as an Outcome/Mediator

**What was the impact of TCE’s investment in power?**
- Coded & analyzed data on >1,500 policy & systems changes.
- Used the CA Network Project to map power building capacities in the partner ecosystem.
- Gathered other outcomes data, but still working to complete full analyses of impacts.
Power as a Strategy
BHC represents a massive, multi-level investment in building power to advance health equity. From 2010-2019, TCE invested $1.8 Billion in BHC & related work, including a mix of site-focused work and complementary statewide strategies. Major areas of focus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>TCE Strategy or Fund¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$615 Million</td>
<td>Healthy Communities Program [site-specific awards]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$449 Million</td>
<td>Healthy California Program [state-level work]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$351 Million</td>
<td>The ACA Fund [state-level work]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$85 Million</td>
<td>Program Related Investments [PRIs]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$54 Million</td>
<td>Fight for All Fund [state-level work]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Grants classified as multiple funds were counted in each category.

The combination of site-focused and statewide investments exemplified BHC’s original place-based and community-led concept, as well as the critical importance of aligning state and local efforts.

BHC investments weren’t just about supporting the work – they were also intended to boost the capacity for change by helping connect diverse partners in the power building ecosystem.

❖ Smaller Organizations: 40% of all grants went to organizations with operating budgets of $5 million per year or less, including many (14%) with budgets of $1 million or less.

❖ BIPOC-Led Organizations: Improved to 60% of all dollars awarded going to BIPOC-led organizations. This amount increased over the life of BHC, from 40% in 2010 to 60% by 2018.

**BY THE NUMBERS:**

- $1.8 Billion
  - Total Investments
- 10,615
  - Distinct Grants & Awards
- $175 Million
  - Average Annual Investment
- $126 Million
  - Average Funding Per Site
- $1,724
  - Average Funding Per Resident
- $808 Million
  - Total Investments in BIPOC-Led Organizations
While investments often contributed to momentum on multiple fronts, the increase in investments supporting the “Building Voice & Power” campaign is a clear signal of the “pivot to power.”

BHC very quickly pivoted its investment strategy to focus on resident voice, agency, & power. By 2019, nearly all awards included these essential elements:

BY THE NUMBERS:

$1.4 Billion
Total funding that supported the Building Voice & Power campaign

87%
Percent of HComm funding that supported the Building Voice & Power campaign

28%
Percent of investments in 2011 supporting youth representation, voice, & power

61%
Percent of investments in 2018 supporting youth representation, voice, & power

INVESTING IN YOUTH: The “Pivot to Power” was especially reflected in investments that supported youth representation, voice, & power, which saw steady increases over time.
(3) BHC investments were largely well aligned with existing priorities of participating sites and community partners.

In general, topics that were consistently mentioned as top priorities by the sites -- as determined through analysis of their documents -- were also the most highly funded in BHC.

This suggests good alignment between TCE investments and what was most important to local stakeholders in the BHC communities – but there remains room for improvement. The topic that was the highest priority overall, community & economic development, was not one of the highest funded areas.

Understanding this alignment represents an opportunity to ensure TCE's work helps advance the community's priorities.

**BY THE NUMBERS:**

4 out of 5

Of the areas that received the most BHC funding were also identified as a consistent priority by local sites.
TCE Investments in Power Building included support for each category of the Power Flower, but investments in organizing and base building were especially central to the work:

(4) Over $800 M of TCE investments in power building supported organizing & base-building efforts.

BY THE NUMBERS:

8,833
Distinct grants awarded that supported Power Building (across 1,967 different organizations)

$1.4 Billion
Total invested in grants that supported Power Building

50.3%
Amount of total that went to BIPOC-led organizations [$654M].

14.6%
Percent of power building grants that went to small organizations with annual budgets of less than $1M [$112M]

POWER FLOWER INTERCONNECTIONS:
A majority (86.7%) of the Power Building Investments included support for more than one Power Flower category, highlighting that Power Building seldom operate in silos; in fact, Power Building categories are interconnected and interdependent.

Percentages refer to the % of total power building investments that supported that category. Investments could be counted in more than one category; percentages will not add to 100%.
Power as an Outcome
Investments in power helped advance significant policy, systems, & physical changes. As of February 2021, 1,526 distinct changes were tracked and reported by BHC sites and partners, youth organizations in BHC sites, and TCE’s Statewide team. Overall, changes occurred across all three major campaigns:

**Changes Reported By:**
- BHC sites & partners
- Youth organizations in BHC sites
- TCE’s Statewide team

*GOAL-DRIVEN SYSTEMS CHANGE:* During the first part of BHC, surveys were used to collect advocacy goals from Site & State partners. 83% of those identified goals were ultimately connected to at least one documented change, indicating alignment between stated goals and policy efforts. Progress may have been made in advancing other goals as well, even if there was not yet a documented systems change that resulted.

**BY THE NUMBERS:**

- **1,526** Distinct changes were tracked across the initiative [2010-2019]

- **33%** Of BHC sites reported changes were related to Neighborhood Environments & Land Use

- **50%** Of "youth-reported changes" were related to School Climate & Student Success

- **83%** Of State or Site Advocacy Goals were connected to an accomplished policy, systems, or physical change
Site-level changes often reached across multiple jurisdictional or geographic levels, indicating TCE investments did not just benefit the BHC site. Instead, the footprint of BHC investments stretched across sites, cities, counties, and school districts.

**BY THE NUMBERS:**

- **32%** Of site-level changes occurred at the school district level
- **28%** Of site-level changes occurred at the city level
- **22%** Of site-level changes occurred at the county level
- **18%** Of site-level changes occurred at the community/neighborhood level
- **5%** Of site-level changes occurred at the tribal government level
- **3%** Of site-level changes occurred at the state level

(6a) Policy, systems, & physical changes transcended BHC site boundaries.
Statewide & BHC site change efforts were analyzed to explore connections between TCE teams. We found a high level of overlap between changes reported by TCE’s Statewide team and the BHC Sites. This suggests that there are natural areas of overlap and synergy between statewide and local efforts. However, the degree of overlap and impact of these changes could have been greater if there was intentional alignment between these teams to align policy, systems, and physical change efforts.

BY THE NUMBERS:

68% Of Statewide changes overlap with a BHC Site-level change

32% Of BHC Site-level changes overlap with a Statewide change

State-BHC Site Overlap of Changes

157 Statewide changes
- 106 Related to Site changes
- 68% of Statewide changes overlap with a BHC Site change

1,263 BHC Site changes
- 407 Related to Statewide changes
- 32% of BHC Site changes overlap with a Statewide change
Policy, systems, & physical changes often connected to each other to build momentum and create a cascade of related changes.

- Overall, 45% of BHC Site-level changes were connected to at least one other BHC Site-level change, indicating that changes and successes compound and build upon one another.

**A Cascade of Related Changes with a BHC SITE**

- **2015**: Monterey Co funds program to cover laboratory & prescription services for undocumented immigrants
- **2017**: County expands existing Esperanza Care pilot project for undocumented adults
- **2018**: County expands Esperanza Care to 3,500 uninsured, undocumented adults
- **2019**: County continues funding Esperanza Care due to efforts of resident base building organizations

**BY THE NUMBERS:**

45%

Of Site-level changes were connected to at least one other BHC Site-level change.
Sometimes Statewide changes preceded BHC Site-level changes; other times changes at the BHC Site-level preceded a larger change Statewide. This visual shows how a statewide bill built momentum across several BHC sites investing in related efforts.

**BY THE NUMBERS:**

- **4** Average number of changes within each cluster of related changes at the BHC Site or state level
- **3** Topic areas high a particularly high degree of overlap between BHC Site-level and Statewide changes:
  - Immigration Rights & Protections
  - School Climate & Student Success
  - Health Systems & Prevention

**Building momentum from a STATE change to BHC SITE level**

- **2015** Statewide
  - AB 1056. Second Chance Program. Directs Prop 47 savings to address root causes of recidivism, including the need for housing, mental health services, substance use treatment
- **2016** BHC Site
  - Richmond approves “Fair chance Access to Affordable Housing” to protect people re-entering society who are excluded from housing due to a criminal record
- **2017** BHC Site
  - Sacramento receives grants to support two year Pretrial Release Pilot Program
  - LA County establishes tracking system for Prop 47 resources, devotes 50% savings toward community-based prevention
- **2019** BHC Site
  - Los Angeles votes to create civilian Probation oversight Commission
  - Los Angeles receives grants for diversion, mental health services, substance use treatment for justice-affected individuals and reentry populations

**Policy, systems, & physical changes often catalyzed more changes, building momentum.**
Organizations that received TCE investments intended to help build capacity for a particular power strategy tended to later report more mature capabilities in that area.

**BY THE NUMBERS:**

437
Active members in the CA Network Project, of about 950 who have been invited so far.

53
CA Network Project members that are small organizations (< $1 million annual budget) working at the local or county level only.

48%
Percent of all member organizations that report mature capacity for community organizing and base-building.

---

Note: About 70% of CA Network Project participants as of the date of this analysis received BHC funding.
Collectively, CA Network Project members have reported **almost 3,000 connections** to date.

More than **460 funders** and almost **500 alliances or coalitions** have been named by project participants so far.

Regional and system-level networks appear to be well connected as shown here; most groups are part of large connected component, with only a few very small components on the outside.

**Example:** The Network of Connections of Southern CA Organizations Working on Community & Economic Development

Note: Members are shown in **blue**, reported partners are **orange**, alliances are **yellow**, funders are **green**

**BY THE NUMBERS:**

- **206**
  Number of CA Network Project members who have reported at least one ecosystem connection.

- **2,995**
  Connections have been reported by Network members to date. (connections to other organizations, alliances/coalitions, or funders).

- **460**
  Number of unique funders with whom Network members report collaborating.

- **498**
  Number of unique alliances with whom Network members report affiliating.
Among 600+ organization-to-organization partnerships:

- Most partnerships involve collaboration on three or more power capacities from the ERI Power Flower.
- More than half (56%) involve community organizing or base-building as part of the collaboration.

- **Partnerships described by BIPOC-led organizations involve more power building strategies than partnerships described by other organizations.**

  - Almost 40% of the partnerships described by BIPOC-led organizations include 5+ power strategies.
  - BIPOC-led partnerships are more likely to use organizing and base building as a power building strategy.

**BY THE NUMBERS:**

- **600+**
  Distinct organization-to-organization partnerships reported among Network members.

- **62%**
  Percent of reported partnerships in the ecosystem that are characterized by a formal agreement.

- **57%**
  Percent of reported partnerships that have existed for 5 years or more

- **3.7**
  Average number of power building strategies involved in organization-to-organization partnerships.
| What We Learned | TCE made significant investments in power, the impacts of which can be seen in policy, systems, and physical changes in BHC communities, and in organizational capacity across the power ecosystem. |
| Questions We Still Have | We still have questions about how power functions as an outcome and mediator of other outcomes, which we are currently exploring through CORE’s Impact Studies and ongoing enhancement of the CA Network Project. |
| Where We Are Going Next | CORE is continuing to work with TCE and practitioners to ensure that we are paying attention to the right metrics, so that ongoing and long-term impacts of power are visible, measurable, and captured by evaluation efforts. |